

NEXT SENATE MEETING:
Thursday, October 30, 2003, 3:30 p.m., UC 307

Austin Peay State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, September 25, 2003
DRAFT Minutes

Summary

Dr. Bruce Speck, Vice President for Academic Affairs, provided opening remarks, including information on **minors** the **Academic Council's** recent meeting on **120-hour degree programs**. Mr. Mirch Robinson (Vice President for Finance and Administration) discussed the recent **hostage** situation at Dyersburg State Community College and the impact of this incident. He also answered questions regarding **compensation policy**. The proposed revision of the **post-tenure faculty review** form was discussed and eventually tabled. Reports from the **Dean's Council**, which included information about **confidentiality and ownership of research data**, and the **Tennessee Board of Regents Academic Subcommittee** were supplied. The issues of growing **class sizes**, and **team teaching**, particularly in Honors classes, were touched on briefly.

The meeting was called to order at 3:37 p.m. by Faculty Senate President Tim Winters. The roll call indicated that the following senators were absent: Kell Black, Elaine Busey, Marcy Maurer, Adel Salama, and Shirley Rainey.

Senators present were: Elaine Berg, Michele Butts, Art Carpenter, Steve Clark, Sue Evans, Jill Franks, Loretta Griffy, Ron Gupton, Sean Hogan, Phil Kemmerly, Matthew Kenney, Thomas King, Barry Kitterman, Susan Koch, Ramon Magrans, William Rayburn, Jordy Rocheleau, Omie Shepherd, Ann Silverberg, Nancy Smithfield, Gregg Steinberg, Janet Tracy, Tim Winters, Mary Lou Witherspoon, and Faye Zeigler.

Senator Kemmerly moved that the Agenda for the meeting be approved; it was immediately seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

A motion to approve the minutes from August 28 and September 11 meetings, the latter with a corrected attendance list, was made by Senator Rayburn, quickly seconded, and unanimously approved.

Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Bruce Speck delivered opening remarks, explaining that university President Dr. Sherry Hoppe was at a Tennessee Board of Regents meeting in Jackson. He told the senate that the searches for Deans are now national and are being advertised in the Chronicle of Higher Education and on that journal's website. Returning to a question raised at the August Senate meeting, he mentioned that a ruling from the Deans Council stated that a **minor** was not required of undergraduates; this is a local decision and not a Tennessee Board of Regents issue. Senator Gupton asked what the next step in the process is: does the Senate need to review the matter or minors? Dr. Speck explained that the ruling states that minors are allowed, but not required.

Dr. Speck stated that the university's 120-hour degree programs have been sent forward [to the TBR], but virtually none had been routed through the Teacher Education Council. Thus, these programs came before the **Academic Council** and were sent forward from the Academic Council without approval. Currently, we have no handle on what [professional education] hours [in required courses] will be for teaching licensure. The relationship between the licensure/teacher certification board, accrediting agencies, and the TBR is unclear and in flux. A letter from the Deans will be sent with the proposed **120-hour degree programs** explaining this situation. Tennessee Technological Institute has proposed 120-hour education [baccalaureate] programs, but has largely achieved this with smoke and mirrors, counting some courses both in the general education core and in education curricula, for example. Questions have been raised regarding these tactics. The "No Child Left Behind" federal education act has also affected these programs. The Academic Council did not in fact approve these programs.

The following dialogue regarding the **Academic Council's** action on the **120-hour degree programs** ensued:

Senator Kemmerly: The TBR Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs could have dealt with this problem. Why not raise this question there? The deadlines for the development and approval of these programs were unrealistic.

Dr. Speck: The deans of some programs have gotten together to work on this problem.

Senator King: Was there a compelling reason for getting this done [pursuing it in the Academic Council]?

Dr. Speck: TBR had a deadline, and there had been a lengthy process before this.

Senator King: The College Curriculum Committee knew it was trying to fit round pegs in square holes when reviewing these programs; then the Academic Council took these programs up for consideration before they were ready.

Dr. Speck: We talked to Kay Clark, and asked him what we should do. The answer was that the TBR would have to have something, so we were advised to go ahead and send them ahead; they were sent because of the deadline, but not approved.

Senator King: Sending the 120-hour programs ahead without approval was an eleventh-hour idea; it seemed that the goal was approval at the beginning of the Academic Council meeting.

Dr. Speck: Yes.

Senator King: Why was John Mitchell [chair of the School of Education] there?

Dr. Speck: I'm not sure, I don't know what happened.

Senator King: Education could have done little with these programs: the process should have stopped.

Dr. Speck: TBR said to put it forward, then work with discussion committees.

Senator Butts: The State Board of Education has not been consulted in the case of Tennessee Technological Institute's 120-hour programs in education.

Dr. Speck: The TBR asked us to supply 120 hour degree programs.

Senator Butts: Thus the TBR makes cuts to result in 120 hour degrees without considering the State Board of Education.

Dr. Speck: There is also the dilemma of music and art: gaining licensure and being employable are two [different] things.

Senator Clark: Here we have two bureaucracies [TBR and the Board of Education] not talking to each other.

Dr. Speck: We were required to offer an online education degree also: the State pushed this over all sorts of objections, and had no liaison person with the Board of Education, which is not good.

Senator King: There are different types of rules, different "colors" from three types of organizations [TBR, the Board of Education, and accrediting agencies].

Senate President Winters: Some individuals were also concerned about sending programs ahead in any form as well: this might result in someone else making these decisions about cutting programs down to 120 hours for us. Perhaps a disciplinary task force could be developed to work out these problems.

Dr. Speck: The deans and directors of nursing in the TBR are discussing how to look at curricula and hours, for example. It would be helpful to have similar disciplinary task forces that include representatives from various schools, and included subject specialists, licensure experts, and representation from accrediting agencies.

Senate President Winters: Could Austin Peay ask TBR for an extension on this project? Otherwise we may be allowing TBR to muck around [reconfigure programs] at the departmental level.

Dr. Speck: The TBR did take representatives from different campuses to constitute these committees.

Senator Silverberg: Are all TBR music programs accredited?

Senator King: I don't know.

Dr. Speck: We are not alone on this, we are not committed to those programs as sent forward.

Senator Witherspoon: Would TBR approve something we sent without approval?

Dr. Speck: I don't think so: we haven't given approval; I don't perceive they'll work that way with us.

Senator Butts: Department by department we will have to examine material in each course and try to reorganize in new ways in order to make courses which will cover these new overviews.

Dr. Speck: Paula Short extended the time for review of the proposed revision of TBR policies on promotion and tenure, the same may well happen here.

Senator King: Does your cover letter say that the programs won't work?

Dr. Speck: We don't see how you can have accreditation in art with only 20% education courses; this won't work with Board of Education requirements.

Senate President Winters: I would encourage bluntness in your letter.

Dr. Speck: Our point comes through

Senator Clark: Accreditation is part of the funding formula for the university.

Dr. Speck: It is indeed part of formula funding, so accreditation is valued at the TBR level; it doesn't make sense to let it lapse.

Senator Kenney: As for the new "no minor" requirement; is it now in effect?

Dr. Speck: We have a catalog out currently, so it has to be incorporated in the next catalog.

Mr. Mitch Robinson, the University's Vice President for Finance and Administration, addressed the Senate. Mr. Robinson stated that he knows of people involved in the Dyersburg [Community College's recent] **hostage** and shooting case and is aware that counseling is happening on that campus. Updated information shows that the individual left a suicide note, stating that he was going to die that day. It was a classic case of suicide by police. Many questions came to mind, including what might have kept the individual off campus and out of a building and classroom. The hostage-taker planned the event carefully, and he was determined: nothing could have been done to keep the man out of classroom. The person who noticed that something was going wrong in the classroom went down the hall, called 911, and went to other classrooms and told people to get out, everyone possible was out of the building before the police arrived. The adjunct faculty member in charge of the class had reviewed what you do and what you don't do in such a situation. This information was available on InnerAction [Austin Peay's faculty/staff newsletter] a year ago. The recommended course of action is to remain calm and estimate the rapport one has with the hostage-taker. The Dyersburg situation took nine hours to resolve. The instructor tried to develop a relationship with the individual, and the incident was contained to just one classroom. The two wounded students will be OK, but the perpetrator was killed. What can we do? The Clarksville police has been conducting hostage training situations, and the Austin Peay police have benefitted from this. In such a situation, the Austin Peay police call the Clarksville Police, who then take over, and university does public relations, showing compassion and respect for both hostages and perpetrators. All of our officers are certified; they receive forty hours of post-certification training yearly, including hostage and bomb training. We do have notification training, and a review of the emergency preparation plan is underway now. Dyersburg had a good plan in place with input from many quarters, and borrowed from other institutions, reflecting the post-9/11 effect on security. In Dyersburg, a post-incident review team is considering what went right, what went wrong, and how their response could have been better. We hope to have their [the review team's] input here at Austin Peay. This was a terrible situation we'd rather not be faced with, but readiness and practice are very important. Mr. Robinson asked the Senate for their questions regarding **compensation policy**, which also seems to be an issue.

Senate President Winters explained that some issues regarding **compensation** include the fact that Policy 5:010 (compensation for faculty merit) has been struck; and for information on new salaries, faculty are told to see a website, which is not a legal document. Using websites leaves no record of changes in a neutral location and seems to reference the website as legal document. This policy was approved by the President and the Board of Trustees, contingent on approval by Senate. We want to talk about it further. Mr. Robinson: Policies are available in Read Only PDFs on the website.

Senator Berg: Do you keep changes? The Board of Trustees' legal office does not require the library to keep policies and their changes.

Mr. Robinson: The library can keep changes if it wishes.

Senator Berg: The problem is that each change in policy might not be noticed or the library kept abreast of such changes. We would like to require copies to be sent to the library.

Senator Gupton: How do you know that the web is the same as what's done in a meeting?

Mr. Robinson: It's a technology transfer.

Senator Gupton: No changes are possible?

Mr. Robinson: Some changes are possible.

Senator Gupton: I have seen missing pages in a document; the hard copy was not the equivalent of the web version; there could be missing materials.

Mr. Robinson: Joe Filippo brought minor editorial issues to light in the conversion process. [Transfer from Microsoft] Word to Adobe used to create problems. We need to compare policies on the web with hard copies. It's like the TBR, they don't send out updates.

Senator Gupton: What is the official copy of a policy?

Mr. Robinson: As long as you have it in one office, that's all you need.

Senator Rayburn: Do you have an archive of what's been superseded?

Mr. Robinson: We have previous versions.

Senate President Winters: For untenured faculty wanting to review a policy it might be hard to come to an administrative office to get policy.

Mr. Robinson: Please feel free to come by.

Senate President Winters asked the Faculty Red committee to report on its work with the **post-tenure faculty review** form.

Senator Evans: Our committee met, and the latest version is in the hands of the Senate. The proposed form and the old form were put together in this document. It is now three pages long. The original form had self and supervisor ratings. Categories now include Effectiveness in Academic Assignment, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Professional Contributions. Additional materials are provided for, as is a new comment area. The supervisor's overall rating comes at the end.

Senator Witherspoon: Regarding merit salary: please change the wording since it's now a one-time bonus (does not affect salary permanently).

Senator Griffy: How about the "this document may be forwarded" provision? This statement/question appears on the last page. What effect might this have if in a particular year, the form was not forwarded or was forwarded late?

Senator Kemmerly: We need to move [have a motion] before discussing the document.

Senator King: I move to accept the form. [The motion was immediately seconded and discussion ensued.]

Senator Zeigler: There is no need to send this form up [for review at higher levels] if the faculty members is not going up for tenure, etc.

Senator Griffy: Eventually all of the forms could go forward when such decisions are made. Does this mean that negative personnel reviews would not be forwarded?

Senator Hogan: Should the sentences detailing forwarding of the forms be deleted?

Senator Griffy: The forms will be forwarded eventually.

Senator Gupton: When are the forms used?

Senator Griffy: They used to be used for faculty employed on temporary appointments.

Senator Magrans: These forms can't be part of the evaluation of non-tenured faculty.

Senator Gupton: The forms may be forwarded, but are not necessarily forwarded.

Senator Evans: We changed it to "may be" instead of "should be" forwarded.

Senator Carpenter: Our discussion shows a variety of views, but not agreement [with the revised form].

Senator Kemmerly: There are similar statements on chair's evaluations of faculty. These statements say you don't have to agree; the legal import is simply that you have read the item.

Senator Steinberg: People should know whether you agree or disagree with parts or all of the evaluation.

Senator Kemmerly: In the process of preparing the dossier you an opportunity for faculty to present disagreements.

Senator Zeigler: Faculty comments are summarized in the discussion with the faculty member; the faculty member under review can write comments.

Senator Kemmerly: University policy allows for input, but it's not the place for review and appeal.

Senator Zeigler: This is also an opportunity to provide explanations.

Senator Carpenter: We should lay out who fills out what, when on these forms.

Senate President Winters: Should we accept, return, or table the document?

Senator Rayburn: There should be a check box at end, if the faculty member wishes to add additional commentary.

Senator Magrans: It's already there.

Senator Butts: Who comes up with the faculty member's goals?

Senator Rayburn: The faculty member and his/her supervisor.

Senator Kemmerly: Let's turn down the motion and bring out a motion to table the document.

Senator Magrans: Please send in complaints.

Senator Carpenter: The portion on goals, the timeline, the yes/no box, and wording about comments need to be changed.

Senator Butts: It is based on both the old and new forms. We just added the two together and did not consider policy.

Senator Evans: Some faculty are not being evaluated every year, is this common?

General comment: Everyone seems to do it [annual post-tenure reviews] here.

Senator Magrans: Is this being done?

Dr. Speck: The deans suggest that post-tenure reviews are not being done everywhere on campus, but we need it to be an annual process. In North Carolina, every five years post tenure some evaluation happens. This document is tied to something more substantial, and TBR is looking at it. Accountability is important, and doing it uniformly is important.

Senator Butts: Should faculty members establish their own goals?

Senator Evans: When faculty members do self-rating they are in some measure setting goals.

Senator Carpenter: The supervisor makes a rating, then the faculty member does it. Goals should come from faculty, then the supervisor can say something about these goals.

Senator Evans: Then these can be the faculty member's goals.

Senator Griffy: The faculty member can set his or her own goals, and the supervisor can see that. The faculty member identifies his or her own goals.

Senate President Winters: No comments on these issues were received on the Blackboard threaded online discussion.

Senator Griffy: I could not establish a thread on the Blackboard discussion group.

Senate President Winters made a note of this problem.

Senator Magrans: We have worked on the first paragraph here. The [Faculty Red] committee had four meetings working on the form and now it gets attacked.

The motion to approve the **post-tenure review** form as presented was unanimously rejected.

Senator Griffy made a motion to table discussion of the post-tenure review form; this motion was immediately seconded and the motion to table this matter carried unanimously.

Senate President Winters: This item will be brought back for yay or nay vote at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Senate President Winters announced that regarding the proposed TBR revision of promotion and tenure policies, the list of terminal degrees has been expanded. There were no reports from the Academic Red and White Committees, which are reviewing proposals for granting experiential credit and the place and practice of peer-review teaching.

Senator Elaine Berg delivered the **Deans Council** report, including four weeks' worth of meetings.

At the 3 September meeting, Dr. Bruce Speck announced TBR approval for the Liberal Arts Baccalaureate Degree; College of Arts and Letters Interim Dean James Diehr is to chair the committee developing this program.

Senator Kemmerly asked about the Master's degree program in Military History: has it been tabled or stopped?

Dr. Speck: It has been tabled since deployment; we are waiting for the return of the 101st Airborne Division to resume work on this.

Senator Berg stated that she felt that Dr. Speck's proposal to hire two full-time people to advise undecided majors and help with the Quality Enhancement Program etc., is a good idea.

Senator Witherspoon asked about the duties of these people.

Senator Clark asked if there is sufficient money to pay them.

Dr. Speck said that the situation requires the addition of these positions.

In response to Senator Kemmerley's question about the qualifications of these new student advisement hires, Dr. Speck said that the positions would probably require the Master's degree, but job descriptions have not yet been developed. There may be an open advisement center, with faculty stipends for staffing that center.

Dean for Extended and Continuing Education Stanley Groppe announced that a Bachelor of Science or Bachelor of Arts in Political Science will be offered online in 2004. Dr. Speck announced that searches for four deans are open.

This week, the Deans Council considered issues regarding the **confidentiality and ownership of research data**; a faculty member has asked for clarification about owning data. The TBR policy is on the Senate webpage link for document review. There was a long discussion involving Dr. Lou Beasley and the Institutional Review Board. Federal Regulations regarding research, ownership, access, the role of the IRB and its approval, and academic freedom are all being examined by the IRB. This issue may require a separate faculty senate or faculty meeting in the future.

Senate President Tim Winters noted that he will be asking Drs. Beasley and Jackson (University Counsel) to speak to Senate about this important issue and its broad effects.

Senator Kemmerly asked if it would be possible to consider having a Senate Committee summarize these concerns and check into this?

Senate President Winters responded that there is an advantage to doing it both ways (having a committee consider the issues and having a more open forum discussing these problems).

Senator Kemmerly: Formerly, the policy was that research was not owned by university except in the likelihood of profit from the data collected. Is there a proposal to scrap that policy?

Dr. Speck stated that the ownership issue is different from profits arising from patents. Here, the data results from research with human subjects. If the data has been sponsored by external ownership, that's different from internal funding, as far as the ownership of raw data is concerned. Richard Jackson will give an opinion about this.

The Academic Council met last week, and the report of its activities was essentially presented earlier in the meeting.

Senator Kemmerly asked if nominations for vacant seats on the Academic Council had been made.

Senate President Winters responded that nine nominations have been made and the election will be held soon.

Senator Loretta Griffy presented the **TBR Academic Subcommittee** report. She noted the following developments:

1. In the General Education core revision the question was raised: will the review process allow for changes of it? The response is that review will be permitted after an interval;
2. Regarding the 120-hour baccalaureate degree situation, Dr. Short (Academic Vice Chancellor of the TBR) will identify areas that will go over 120 hours.
3. There is a person on the subcommittee from the Teaching Licensure board.

Senator King: Accreditation and the TBR mandate for 120 hours will not work for education (teaching licensure) degrees. Why didn't they identify the exempted areas, rather than simply accept the legislative push to 120 hours?

Senator Franks said that perhaps it was the same motivation as for changing the tenure and promotion document: so many exceptions were being made to policy, that they felt it should be revised. University and community colleges are separate the committee appointed came up with this policy. The trend seems to be to tighten up policies in many areas.

Senator Griffy stated that she felt a written policy should be created to show when promotion and tenure occurs. She asked for questions and comments for the TBR Academic Subcommittee.

Senate President Winters noted that the approved document was passed on to President's Cabinet and has not been posted; it will be posted on web and moved on at their next meeting.

Senator Franks asked if during personnel reviews, non-committee members may request to examine dossiers, and if so, does the faculty member have right to be present, and may photocopies be made?

Senator Evans stated that this policy was new to her, and Senator Kemmerley noted that it is not new: this practice has been in place for years.

Senate President Winters noted that policy on appropriate use of technology (Policy 4:032) is on the web, please consult it. The TBR Policy on the Regents Online Degree Program is also online (Policy 2:015).

Senate President Winters noted that **class sizes** are growing, and caps on the number of students per section have been raised.

Senator Kemmerly noted that a large number of students, above forty-five, has been the case in Geography; the high cap has been there all along.

Senate President Winters responded that he wasn't aware of these large sections.

Senator Griffy felt that we should ask Houston Davis about class size.

Senator Gupton said that departments do have classes larger than they ought to be.

Senate President Winters stated that the decision about class size should be made at the department level.

In the nursing program, some classes have over eighty students; these meet in the Kimbrough, building [Gentry Auditorium] etc., because larger classes are mandated.

Senate President Winters said that class size is a concern in other areas.
Senator Kenney noted that he asked his chair about this (growing class size): he wasn't aware of it.
Shelia McCoy (University Registrar) has provided a list of class rooms with more than forty-five seats; during prime teaching times (nine a.m. to two p.m. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday; nine a.m. to one p.m. Tuesday and Thursday) big classrooms should be used for these courses.
Senator Winters said that he would ask Houston Davis about this.

Senate President Winters brought up the question of the **team teaching** element in the Honors program: two faculty members used to get full teaching load credit for the course; now they will only get half credit. The general thinking is that this will kill team teaching. A committee is being set up by Speck to reconstitute honors in a different way. Send suggestions to Allene Phy-Olsen or other members of the committee.

Senator Rayburn asked if there is/was team-teaching across campus.

Senator Silverberg asked if lot of classes were team taught.

Senator Rayburn: responded that he didn't know.

Senator Kemmerly noted that he had never heard of receiving full credit in other areas when team teaching.

Senator Rayburn aksed if this meant that team teaching resulted in split teaching load credit for the faculty involved in these classes.

Senator Kemmerly responded affirmatively.

Senator Rayburn asked if such teaching was cross-disciplinary.

Senator Kemmerly again responded affirmatively.

Senate President Winters asked if students in these programs showed these cross-applied credits, such as three hours literature and three hours art, for example. Rather rhetorically, he asked what these students will do [to complete their core requirements].

The following comments and questions came from the floor.

Senator Carpenter asked about Fort Campbell Center nominations for Academic Council: can we keep the nominations open? Senator Carpenter has been nominated by Senator Thomas King, whose name is to be forwarded to Reggie Wooden to be placed on the ballot.

The Faculty Senate offered a vote of thanks to Senator Silverberg for her service as Senate Secretary as she resigns this position to take up the duties of interim chair of the Department of Music.

Senator Kemmerly asked if there was therefore a need to fill a vacancy on the Senate Executive Committee.

Senate President Winters stated that yes, there are vacancies on the Executive Committee.

Senator Kemmerly asked how the At Large position would be filled.

Senator King moved to adjourn the meeting

Senator Rayburn seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved at 5:27 p.m.

Respectfully and disgracefully tardily submitted,

Ann L. Silverberg

Faculty Senate Secretary

Professor, Department of Music

(931) 221-7810

silverberga@apsu.edu