

**Austin Peay State University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Meeting of Thursday, March 24, 2022**  
**Morgan University Center, Room 307 | 3 pm**  
**Minutes**

**Call to Order:** Senate President Jane Semler

**Recognition of Guests:** Soma Banerjee, Chad Brooks, Provost Maria Cronley, Matthew Crosston, Marylu Dalton, Jack Deibert, Tammy Delvendahl, Interim Senior Vice Provost Tucker Brown, Kenneth Faber, Uma Iyer, President Mike Licari, James Thompson, and Tim Winters

**Roll Call of Senators:** Senate Secretary Gina Garber

**Absent Senators:** Lisa Barron, Ellen Brown, Terry Damron, Jennifer Denk, Pam Gray, Michelle Robertson, Amy Thompson, and Bing Xiao

**Approval of Today's Agenda: motion made, seconded, and passed to approve the agenda**

**Approval of Minutes from March 17, 2022 Meeting: motion made, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes for March 17, 2022**

**Remarks:**

1. Senate President Jane Semler (5 minutes)

Senate President Semler combined her remarks with the recognition of Tammy Delvendahl.

2. Recognition of Tammy Delvendahl for Years of Service to APSU (5 minutes)

Senate President Semler invited Tammy Delvendahl, Assistant to the Provost, up to the front of the room to recognize her for her thirty-three (33) years of service to Austin Peay State University (APSU). Senate President Semler said within this time, Ms. Delvendahl has left her mark at the university and she has touched the life of everyone in the room in one way or another. She has worked with the Faculty Senate for thirty-three (33) years with numerous presidents. Senate President Semler said Ms. Delvendahl helped them like she helped her. She also said that it has been very helpful to have Ms. Delvendahl in this role for all of these years because, at times, being Faculty Senate President can be a little difficult to navigate. Ms. Delvendahl's guidance has been truly invaluable and all previous Faculty Senate presidents have felt this way. Ms. Delvendahl was presented with a card signed by many past Faculty Senate presidents, an award that was printed by APSU's GIS Center, flowers, and an APSU necklace. Past Senate President Chad Brooks said that Ms. Delvendahl was the most amenable, good natured person to work with at APSU. He recognized the amount of work that she deals with on a daily basis and that she does it with professionalism and is willing to help everyone. He said he wished her the best. Past Senate President Tim Winters said that he introduces Ms. Delvendahl as the "real" president of APSU. He said we are losing a ton of institutional memory.

Additionally, he said that Ms. Delvendahl was one of the most compassionate, kind, and caring leaders on this campus, and he was grateful for the opportunity to learn and work with her. A photograph of Ms. Delvendahl and the current and past Senate Presidents (Elaine Berg, Chad Brooks, Tucker Brown, Jack Deibert, Christine Mathenge, Rod Mills, Bill Rayburn, Jane Semler, Mickey Wadia, and Tim Winters) was taken in the front of the room.

Provost Cronley said that Tammy Delvendahl added value to the APSU landscape over the last three decades, and she will certainly be missed by the Academic Affairs Office and those who work with her across campus. The Provost thanked those at the university who came to Ms. Delvendahl's reception.

3. University President, Dr. Mike Licari (5 minutes)

APSU Board of Trustees: President Licari said he met with the APSU Board of Trustees (BOT) and, on Thursday evening, he had an opportunity to showcase the Business building [Kimbrough] with Dean Mickey Hepner facilitating a presentation about plans for the College of Business (COB), and the plans for the Kimbrough building renovations. He reminded everyone that the Kimbrough building renovations were included in the Governor's budget proposal. President Licari said it is important to get the Trustees familiar with key aspects of the University. He said so far the Trustees have visited the Aviation Science Program's flight school, APSU Farm, Newton Military Family Resource Center, and now the COB. He said it is a great opportunity to show off and brag a little bit about the good work that is going on at APSU.

Legislative Updates: The State "divisive concept" bill targeting colleges advances. The bill would prohibit public colleges and universities from punishing students or staff who don't agree with certain ideas. The bill identifies more than a dozen ideas sponsors say "exacerbate and inflame divisions" surrounding race, gender, and other cultural issues. President Licari said that there wasn't any way of stopping the bill's progression because of the support of the leadership in the Senate and House. Additionally, he said there was still work being done on the bill to line up the language. APSU will have to figure out ways to provide information, advice, and guidance to everyone on campus on how to navigate with this bill. President Licari is consulting with Dannelle Whiteside, Vice President for Legal Affairs & Organizational Strategy, on the work that we are doing or what we teach. It's more about providing information to the public and our students about why we are engaging in the specific classroom content, materials, and the like. He also said that he and Provost Cronley have had discussions about including new language in the faculty syllabi, and building in a component for student orientation/welcome week. President Licari said he and others will be working on some strategies to figure out ways to ensure that the University supports the faculty as we move forward.

The preferential treatment bill did not have enough votes to get out of committee. This bill prohibits any kind of benefit that might be gained as a result of race or gender. This bill would have called into questions many of our scholarships, our efforts that we engage in to get women into STEM, or men into Nursing or Teaching. He said basically any program that is geared toward specific students would have been called into question.

Salaries: President Licari said Human Resources has established the committee to study raises. He reminded everyone that the state approved a 4% salary pool for employees in higher education; 2% is funded by the state, but APSU must fund the other 2%. The committee is at work to provide recommendations as to how to distribute that 4% salary pool.

End of Year Wrap Ups: President Licari said Tis the Season for end of the year wrap ups. He was heading out to an APSU Alumni/PELP dinner and said that he will probably see many of us at upcoming celebrations and events.

**Motion to extend time by 2 minutes made, seconded, and passed**

Questions:

Q: On this Divisive Concept bill, does this mean we can't teach math anymore? Any topic can be divided by anything.

A: This is why I don't see us changing our current behavior in reference to the material that we teach. Instead, we can approach it with the reason of "why" you are being taught this material in history, math, or some other discipline. For example, you need to know "this" because "this is the way the industry works." You're right, anything can be upsetting to somebody. As a political scientist, by definition everything is going to be politically controversial and upsetting to somebody. We have accreditation standards to meet both in terms of the University itself and to the collegiate program. We are pulled in different directions. On one hand, we have a performance budgeting formula where we get rewarded if we achieve it with our accreditations; however, we get punished if we have a program that could be accredited, but we don't have the accreditation. We will have to report our findings and I will have to defend each one.

4. University Provost, Dr. Maria Cronley (10 minutes)

Provost Cronley greeted everyone and provided additional information to President Licari's remarks about HB 2670. Dannelle Whiteside, Vice President for Legal Affairs & Organizational Strategy and Corey Harkey, Associate General Counsel, have been proactive in reference to this bill. Provost Cronley said she had a productive meeting with our legal team. Together they decided it would be helpful to have a meeting on, Monday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, with the leadership team and the department chairs. This way, General Counsel Harkey could cover what is in this legislation. Once that happens, we will be able to discuss the legislation and begin to answer some of the questions that we have and that we have been asked. We are looking at developing some syllabi statements and good communication for you to be able to share. Provost Cronley recapped what the legislation seems to say in the bill that you can't force someone to believe something. She went on to say that we know we do not do that at APSU - we require students to learn something. Additionally, she said that she doesn't know if we've ever been able to force a student to believe or ascribe to an ideology. We can only help students learn something and then they can decide if they have enough information to be better critical thinkers to make decisions.

APSU Board of Trustees: Provost Cronley said that last Friday the BOT met and approved the thirteen (13) faculty members who were recommended for tenure. She also congratulated these faculty members.

The BOT also learned about new programs from the CoB, during the BOT Academic Affairs Committee Meeting. Provost Cronley said that APSU has plans to send letters of notification to THEC for a new BBA program in Human Resources Management and a new MBA program. She said the target dates are 2023 with THEC's approval.

CAFÉ: The Center for Advancement of Faculty Excellence (CAFÉ) is already collaborating with the Provost's office on the Pre-semester Calendar and working on the Annual Meeting schedule for August. Provost Cronley said you should have seen the email on March 24<sup>th</sup> with the subject: Faculty Conference and Annual Meeting, Fall 2022, that was sent from her office. If you are interested in submitting a proposal, click on the following Qualtrics link:

[https://apsu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_dmTBd3m8pmhV7hA](https://apsu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_dmTBd3m8pmhV7hA).

The theme is *The Whole Educator: Reimagining Who We Are*. Contact Melissa Kates, CAFÉ Director, if you have any questions.

Admissions: Provost Cronley said we are close to 40% higher than we were last year on admitting students. Admitted students are not matriculating students yet, so we have a way to go to get those students to come to Austin Peay. This is incumbent on all of us, so Provost Cronley encouraged the faculty and our colleagues to wear Austin Peay swag and gear. We are all trying to yield and get these students to attend APSU.

Govs Preview: APSU had a successful Gov's Preview event which included 158 prospective students and over 400 family members on campus. Provost Cronley thanked everyone who participated this this second Govs Preview event.

Govs Orientation: The first Govs Orientation is scheduled for April 23<sup>rd</sup> and we have many students signed up for that event. Provost Cronley reiterated that we need to all work together to make sure that we are matriculating these students. She said that once these students get to campus we need to ensure that they are successful and that we retain them for graduation.

Advising: Provost Cronley thanked everyone for what they do in advising and said that this is a very critical aspect of retention. She said if faculty have advisees who haven't been advised, reach out to them. Set up an appointment and try communicate with our students before they fall through the cracks. She said to encourage your colleagues to do the same.

5. Budget Advisory Task Force Report: Florian Gargaillo (5 minutes)

Faculty Senate Treasurer Gargaillo said the Budget Advisory Task Force (Sondra Hamilton, Notashia Crenshaw-Williams, Florian Gargaillo, Hassan Said, and Jerica Swiger) met on March 15<sup>th</sup> and discussed the following items:

- Update on APSU Budget and State Appropriations – Total available funds is \$8,547,400. Total Funds Applied is \$4,718,650. The Recurring Budget Gap is \$2,571,250. This is dependent on a stable enrollment for Fall 2022. APSU will be able to use the Higher Education Relief Funds (HERF) up until the end of next year. This will help us close the budget gap.
- Mandatory Costs – Each division presented a list of mandatory costs that initially was \$1,000,000. The costs were reduced to \$571,250.
- Resource Requests – These requests have been placed on hold pending 2022 fall enrollment.

Much of the budget depends on the pending enrollment for 2022-2023 ([See Appendix A](#)).

6. Provost's Council Report: Faculty Senate Vice President Perry Scanlan (5 minutes)

Senate Vice President Scanlan reported that the Provost's Council reviewed nine (9) policies that the Faculty Senate has already reviewed, so we should be familiar with them. There were changes to 2:056 – the Grant Proposal Application Preparation, and Award Policy. The general consensus of the Council was to rescind this policy because the information presented in Policy 2:056 was better suited as guidance for the university community on a website. Dr. Chad Brooks is working on moving this information.

There was a friendly amendment to Policy 2:038 - Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions Policy to use the word “may” instead of the phrase “are required to.”

Since APSU does not have a developmental program anymore, there was an amendment in section A.3 to remove the parenthetical (“with the exception of developmental instruction which, at the discretion of the University, may be treated as regular “instruction”).

Senate Vice President Scanlan raised the concern to the Council about staggering the dates on the policies to avoid reviewing all policies for approval every five (5) years ([see Appendix B](#)).

**Old Business:**

1. Academic White Committee Revised Report on Student Course Evaluations: Jeff Williams (20 minutes) - (Action Item)

Senate President Semler requested that the Senate vote on the language that would be submitted and entered in the RTP Procedures and Guidelines document before looking again at the measurement tool. She reminded the Senate that they heard the initial report about the Student Course Evaluations at the February Faculty Senate meeting, but we tabled the discussion based on Senate feedback. The consensus was that we needed to revise the course evaluation form. Senate President Semler also reminded the Senate that

it is the companion piece that goes along with the Enhanced Peer Review that was just approved at the Faculty Senate called meeting on March 17<sup>th</sup>. She said that this will eliminate the use of the student course evaluations as a criterion for evaluating faculty undergoing retention, tenure, and promotion. She said we are voting on this separately because the language is one part that goes along with the Enhanced Peer Review; however, the actual course evaluation tool is completely separate and they are not contingent upon one another.

**Motion to accept the Student Course Evaluation RTP P & G language made, seconded, and passed**

Questions:

Q: Assuming this gets approved, will someone who is not tenured be required to do this right now?

A: After the vote today and if this language is approved, we will forward it on to Dr. Uma Iyer who is the Chair of the RTP Policy Committee this year. She and the Committee will place this language in the P & G document. We will see this entire document at our Faculty Senate meeting scheduled for April 21<sup>st</sup>. These RTP changes will go into effect for Fall 2022.

Comment: These changes will not apply to faculty who finished their dossier in September. Some of the peer reviews would have been done under the old system.

Comment: Yes, some of those peer reviews would have already been done under the previous system. These faculty would only have three weeks to comply. The process will start in the Fall.

Q: The third sentence, "*Faculty will write a narrative analysis of student evaluation scores during the current dossier cycle.*" I'm confused because if it is a formative supportive tool, it should not be used to evaluate. So, why are we forcing them to look at the scores? I don't have a problem in the next sentence about the narrative. In fact, all of our faculty do this in our department. We are supposed to be reflective and so we coach our younger faculty to be reflective. This is weird to me. We all know the reason why, - if the numbers are low it's not a good qualitative or quantitative analysis for anything. If it's already a flawed student evaluation, why are we having the faculty member look at something like that? I guess my point is having that one student who isn't fair in their assessment of the class, and uses the evaluation tool that shows extreme bias because the faculty member was a woman or a person of color. How is this faculty member supposed to write a narrative analysis on that information?

Comment: Maybe the language could say something else rather than scores, like student results.

Comment: What will the faculty member write year after year when there are not enough students to add value to the course evaluation? For example, I have a class of thirty (30) and say only four (4) students complete the evaluation. How do you respond to this? This isn't complete or even accurate data that we will be required to include in a narrative. I love the idea of being a reflective practitioner, but I do not like the third sentence.

Comment: As a reflective practitioner, you should still look at your evaluations to see what your students had to say.

Q: Why does it say in the second sentence, *regardless of rank or evaluation score*? Using the word “regardless” seems to imply that there are exceptions to this policy. Someone might be thinking, my score is great so I don’t have to write a reflection.

**Motion to approve the Student Course Evaluation RTP P & G language with the combined friendly amendments to remove the word “*results*” in the first sentence, remove the words “*regardless of rank or evaluation score*” in the second sentence, and to remove the word “*score*” from the third sentence made, seconded, and passed**

Dr. Jeffrey Williams said that the Academic White Committee heard the comments from the previous meeting in February and used that feedback to develop two options for the Senate: Option A and Option B [See Appendix C]. In Option A, the content is focused around the instructor. For example, the questions all begin with, “*The instructor....*” Option B was created using the feedback to change some of the wording in the instrument. For example, the Committee added a variety of word choices at the beginning of the sentences like, “*The course,*” “*Critical engagement,*” or “*Effective feedback*” that took the focus off of the instructor and placed it on the course. The other changes are at the end of the tool where the Committee wanted the students to provide a self-evaluation. The Committee condensed that down from four options to two options: *agree* or *disagree*. The reasoning behind this change is that either the student attended class regularly or they didn’t. Additionally, the open questions are exactly the same.

**Motion to accept the two documents (Option A and Option B) for discussion made, seconded, and passed**

Questions:

Q: When I get surveys that ask me to go salt and pepper, I like to mix it up once in a while. Is there a possibility that a third column can be added so a student can be neutral? If I was a student, I am not so sure that I can agree or disagree based on some of the prompts presented here. Has the Committee considered that a student may want a neutral box so they are not forced to side one way or another? Adding a box doesn’t change anything. There have been times when I am taking a survey at Austin Peay and my box is missing. Did you discuss this?

A: We did not.

Comment: I really like Option B.

Comment: I think students who leave the answer blank is their way of being neutral.

**Motion to extend time for 10 minutes made, seconded, and passed**

Q: I see a couple of problems with Option B. The way the prompts are written lacks clarity, especially for a course that has many sections. It seems to take away the focus from the instructor; however, the focus should be on the instructor. In Option A, the prompts are focused on the instructor, but in a passive voice (“Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain”). Additionally, I would be a little irritated about having a neutral box because it looks like you are trying not to have the student think about the instructor. Comment: It’s not the beginning of those phrases we should be focusing on, although, I think we should use the word “*class*” instead of “*course*.” Looking at the end of those

prompts, I would like to see something like, “...to my ability to understand” so it lets the instructor know what the student got out of the class. I also recognize that there are two different paradigms going on here.

Comment: I like what Dr. Wadia said about adding a neutral box. It’s the middle ground and you don’t know if someone is having a medical issue with COVID or another medical problem with something else that may be a real challenge for the student.

Comment: I really like the discussion that is happening here. I feel really good about it. To be honest, any one of the options are better than anything we currently have.

**Motion to call the question to vote on the two options made, seconded, and voted on with a show of hands: 34 for, 2 against, 0 abstained – The motion passed**

**Motion to select an option made, seconded, and passed**

**Motion to vote for Option A or Option B by paper ballot made, seconded, and passed – Option A: 9, Option B 24, 1 Abstained – Option B was selected**

Senate President Semler said that since the Faculty Senate is not in charge of implementing the new course evaluation, it will be handed over to Academic Affairs. She said she has already discussed this with Interim Senior Vice Provost Tucker Brown and understands that the Provost’s Office will move forward with this as they see fit because this is just our recommendation. It may not stay exactly like this. Senate President Semler thanked Dr. Williams and the Academic White Committee for their work on the RTP language and with the two options.

2. RTP Policy Committee: Uma Iyer (15 minutes) - (Action Item) - University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Appeals Board Charge

Senate President Semler reviewed the proposed charge for the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board. She said this would give us some language that would appear in the P & G document.

Dr. Uma Iyer provided a history of the proposed language. She said there was nothing for the most important committee which is the Appeals Board. There was nothing written, no description, goals, or objectives. A subcommittee was developed from the RTP Policy Committee that included two previous RTP Policy Committee chairs: Dr. Mickey Wadia and Elaine Berg. They were included because of their combined wisdom in dealing with these types of issues. Dr. Iyer said the subcommittee worked on this policy for many hours including some Saturdays. They consulted policies at other institutions similar to APSU and designed a policy that is pro faculty. It was important for them to give the faculty a voice to be heard. Dr. Iyer reviewed the eight (8) bulleted points that are listed under the Appeals Board Objective [\[See Appendix D\]](#). She said that the subcommittee wanted the faculty member to have an option to appear in person. They also said if someone’s job is on the line, the faculty member should be able to have a voice; however, they only have thirty (30) minutes to address what is important and germane to the appeal. Dr. Iyer ended by letting everyone know that no additional investigation is



permissible after the Appeals Board votes. For clarity purposes, now everyone who is serving on the Appeals Board will have direction with this document.

**Motion to accept the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Appeals Board Charge made, seconded, and passed**

Questions:

Q: How will the Committee members be selected?

A: This is already in the P & G document.

Q: To clarify, where is this going?

A: This is going into the P & G.

Q: Can you explain more about the section where the Appeals Board members can investigate the faculty member?

A: The Appeals Board members will have discussions and see if there is a need to investigate the extra piece(s) of information that was/were not part of the e-dossier.

Comment: OK. I was hoping to be able to prevent information getting to the Committee that could be deemed as biased.

A: The chair of the Appeals Board should be able to make decisions about the investigation. They should be able to look at the information and decide if it is objective or not.

Comment: You can collect anything according to this document.

Comment: You are worried that some biased or prejudiced information is going to be available to the Appeals Board members, right? We have that covered under the Appeals Board Objectives. It's part of the goals.

Q: Would it be better if we added the word "specific" or "objective?"

Comment: I think there should be some guard rails.

Q: If any of you have served on the RTP committees, you know people bring stuff up all of the time. It is the job of the Committee to examine that information and decide to accept, reject, or interpret it. People speak up all of the time. I have served on these committees for years. Are you asking about if there was ever a rogue committee member pulling some kind of stunt by bringing in some information?

A: This is not a regular RTP Committee or meeting. Potentially, "*This is what I have learned about Jane Doe*" can be introduced.

Comment: The Committee will decide on this information before a vote will be taken.

Q: Would Jane Doe's information be specifically germane to the faculty member? The information must relate to areas I, II, or III. They cannot bring in stuff that happened at Target last week.

Comment: If I am reading this document as an outsider and I see these bullets, I would think the spirit of this document very clearly holds the Appeals Board to a very high standard of good behavior. I would hope that there wouldn't be a situation that you might be describing about Jane Doe. That would be hearsay.

Comment: This is a charge and I agree with you that perhaps in the P & G we could define the procedures more; however, this is the charge that we were given. We worked on the charge not the specifics of the operation. Additionally, each case may be very different. We hear you and would hope that the Appeals Board would hold each other accountable. If someone brought something that was negative to the members of the

committee, there will need to be evidence to back it up. This would not be taken just on hearsay.

Comment: There might be a time where you need evidence and maybe we need language and a process in the P & G procedures.

Comment: We were very careful about not telling the Appeals Board how to run their meeting and all of the little things that happen in that room. Very few people on campus would ever get to serve on this Committee. It's a small group of people who get to do this and that it is not your normal service. We were hoping not to get into the weeds of the process, but simply define the charge and what your duties are. Most charges for committees are fairly short. This is one of the longer charges. If a faculty member gets to this level, they are typically on the brink of a problem. Your job is at stake here. Your mortgage is at stake here. This is so important so we want to be clear that if you are serving on this Committee, you are being held to a somewhat higher standard of behavior. I am good with changing the word to "evidence" but it is up to Dr. Iyer and the rest of the RTP Policy Committee.

**Motion to extend time to five minutes made, seconded, and passed**

Comment: I haven't read the Committee charges, so I don't know what the use of any of the language after the bullets is because, to me, that is all procedural. That information tells you how you are going to run the Committee and what they can do and so on. Up until that point, it sounds great. The rest should be in the P & G under procedures. I think this will resolve some of the issues.

Comment: What the chair can do should be under the procedures. For example, "*the chair must approve any evidence that is brought to the committee*" is a procedure, not a charge in my mind.

Comment: The P & G is 62 pages right now and there is a procedure section where this language could be placed.

Comment: If we approve the language today, some of these procedural things can go below the charge of the Committee. Actually, the section of the P & G does need to be expanded.

Q: If we voted on the section up until the end of the Appeals Board Objectives, will that satisfy the senate?

Comment: The last paragraph should also be included with the objectives.

**Motion to amend the charge to evaluate the appropriateness of additional information to be included or excluded from the appeals process made, seconded, passed – 32 for, 1 against, 0 abstained**

**Motion to extend time for one minute to vote on the rest of the language, including the stipulation that the committee will move the procedural sections into the "Procedures" section of the P&G thus leaving only the actual committee charge in the "charge" section as well as on the Standing Committee Website made, seconded, passed**

**Motion to approve the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Appeals Board Charge made, seconded, passed – 34 for, 0 against, 0 abstained**

Dr. Iyer also presented the RTP Policy Committee's recommendation to change the title of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board to the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board because we do have retention candidates appealing to the Appeals Board. The title needs to be inclusive. The other recommendation to the P & G document is in the same spirit to change it to the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures and Guidelines document. If this is approved, we will streamline this in places where it is appropriate.

**Motion to rename the two documents to the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Appeals Board and Retention, Tenure, and the Promotion Procedures and Guidelines made, seconded, and passed**

3. Policy to Review:

- a. 2:059 - Sponsored Research Incentive Program - (Action Item)

Senate President Semler presented the section that Dr. Tim Atkinson, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, revised in the policy based on Faculty Senate feedback:

*"In the event of the declaration of a financial exigency as delimited by APSU policy 5:025, the administration can restrict, collect, or withhold PD funds to help resolve the declared exigency, and in the spirit of APSU policy 5:025 will involve the faculty in the process."*

**Motion to approve Policy 2:059 made, seconded, passed unanimously**

**New Business:**

1. Spring Senate Election Results: Senate Vice President Dr. Perry Scanlan (5 minutes) - (Information Item)

Vice President Scanlan presented the following newly elected senators:

- Library/Administration:
  - Christina Chester-Fangman
- College of Arts and Letters:
  - Soma Banerjee
  - Osvaldo Di Paolo Harrison
  - McLean Fahnestock
  - Andrew Kostakis
  - David Rands
  - David Snyder
  - Jennifer Snyder
- College of Behavioral and Health Sciences:
  - No current openings
- College of Business:

- Brandon Di Paolo Harrison
- Gloria Miller
- College of Education:
  - James Thompson
- College of STEM
  - Terri Crutcher
  - Robin Reed
  - Isaac Sitienei
  - Jennifer Thompson

## 2. Faculty Red Committee Report: Dr. Tatsushi Hirono (10 minutes) - (Information Item)

Dr. Tatsushi Hirono introduced the Faculty Red Committee (Rachel Bush, Amanda Estep, Alex King, and Darren Michael) and presented the findings and recommendations to Senate [\[See Appendix E\]](#). Dr. Hirono said the Committee recommended that all faculty, chairs, and deans review Policy 2:053 Annual Faculty Evaluation Review annually and that many of the concerns from faculty and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee are already addressed there. The Faculty Red Committee also recommended that each department develop specific guidelines that, at a minimum, include defining the rating system and include the following statement:

*“Every tenured professor is encouraged to write, publish, and/or produce peer-reviewed materials or professional work at least every three years.”*

Dr. Hirono said that the Committee was asked to consider changes to the evaluation tool and recommended that the optional self-evaluation be in a form of the faculty member’s choosing, but limited to two (2) pages; move the performance/merit criteria to the top of the form, and provide a greater distinction between the terms “performance” and “merit” on the form; perhaps using the phrases “across-the-board” or “cost of living” on the form. Dr. Hirono also said that they looked at the evaluation period and recommended no change to it at this time. Lastly, he said the Committee highly recommended a rolling three (3) year average OCR score for merit-based pay increases.

Questions:

Comment: The idea of a rolling three-year average is a good one. Your report is good and your Committee has made good recommendations.

Q: What I am not seeing there is a deadline for feedback. Sometimes there is a long-time lapse in getting feedback once you have submitted the form. Couldn’t there be a reasonable turnaround time to receive feedback?

A: We discussed this that maybe notifications could be sent out earlier, like in January.

Comment: We review the time period for the evaluations in Academic Affairs.

Q: Am I correct that this evaluation will not go into the e-dossier, right?

A: We had discussions of this in the past about merging the annual faculty evaluation into the e-dossier. I can share with you good news that it will not be going into the e-dossier and that we are leaving it alone.

**Motion to extend time for 30 seconds made, seconded, and passed**

Q: The use of “professor” in that sentence, is that referring to the rank of professor or another synonym for faculty member? It should probably say, “every tenured faculty member” so you are including assistant and associate professors.

3. Staff Service Award Nominees: Patrick Gosnell - (Action Item)

The Staff Service Award Chair, Patrick Gosnell, thanked the Committee members (Ibukun Amusan, Wes Atkinson, and Harold Young) for their work. He presented the nomination letters and said that the Committee has reviewed the credentials and determined the winner is qualified to receive this award which will be announced at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

**Motion to ratify the nominee and winner of the Faculty Senate Staff Service Award made, seconded, and passed**

Senate President Semler said this year’s winner is very deserving of the award.

4. Faculty Handbook Committee Updates: Senate President Jane Semler - (Information Item)

Senate President Semler said the Faculty Senate Executive Committee reviewed the Faculty Handbook updates and determined that there was nothing that needed to be voted on at this time. She hoped that the senators reviewed the Handbook to be aware of the significant reorganization. She said there were very few changes to the text itself, and that the changes are non-substantive, which is why it is being presented as an information item.

5. Policy to Review

- a. 2:008 - Faculty Post-Retirement Program Senate President Jane Semler - (Information Item - no edits)

There were no edits to this policy.

**Adjourn: 5:07 pm**

# Appendix A

## Budget Advisory Task Force Summary of March 15, 2022 Meeting

Presiding: Sondra Hamilton.

Present: Notashia Crenshaw-Williams, Florian Gargaillo, Hassan Said, Jerica Swiger.

### 1. Update on APSU Budget and State Appropriations.

Governor approved the following funding for 2022-2023:

#### Funds Available.

Outcomes Distribution:	\$1,733,000
New Funding:	\$4,306,300
Employer Share of Health Premiums:	\$515,100
4% Salary Pool for Faculty / Staff:	\$1,993,000
<i>Total Available:</i>	<i>\$8,547,400</i>

#### Funds Applied.

Mandatory Fee Increase (Estimate):	(\$571,250)
4% Salary Increase:	(\$3,632,300)
Health Insurance:	(\$515,100)
<i>Total Applied:</i>	<i>\$4,718,650</i>

Recurring Budget Gap: \$2,571,250 [so long as enrollment remains stable in Fall 2022]

S. Hamilton: APSU has some Higher Education Relief Funds still available, which the university does not have to spend until the end of next year, so APSU should be able to close the budget gap. APSU is also trying to build up reserve funds (currently \$19,640,000) to get the university through the quarter. Together, the HERF funds and the reserve funds will cover the budget until July 2023. After that point, the university will likely need to see increased enrollment and stable retention to avoid a new budget gap.

### 2. Mandatory Costs.

S. Hamilton: President Licari requested that each division present a list of mandatory costs and mandatory cost increases (such as contracts) for the next fiscal year. Initially, the proposals amounted to \$1,000,000 total. The costs were then reduced to \$571,250.

### 3. Resource Requests.

S. Hamilton: President Licari requested a list of resource requests from various divisions, but did not have enough funding available. The requests were put on hold until fall, pending enrollment.

# Appendix B

Provosts Council Report 3/9/2022

Provost's Council called to order by Dr. Cronley on 3/9/2022 at 0900 via zoom call

The following policies were discussed at the provost council meeting:

- 1) 2:002 – Research (Faculty Staff and/or Student) Involving Human Subjects
- 2) 2:003 – Continuing Education Units
- 3) 2:004 – Non-Credit Activities
- 4) 2:019 – Misconduct in Research and Other Creative Activities
- 5) 2:034 – Faculty and Staff Academic Staff Abroad
- 6) 2:038 – Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions Policy
- 7) 2:045 – Definition of Faculty
- 8) 2:056 – Grant App Award Policy
- 9) 2:058 – Grants Management Budgeting Spending and Responsibilities

The council moved to rescind the policy 2:056 and instead place this on an APSU website.

Discussion on policy 2:038 Undergraduate and Graduate Admission Policy

Friendly amendment was made to change to “may” instead of “are required to”

Discussion on Definition of Faculty policy

Amendment to change language from section A.3 to remove parenthetical (with the exception of developmental instruction which, at the discretion of the University, may be treated as regular "instruction"), as developmental is not an appropriate term.

Dr. Perry Scanlan (Faculty Senate Vice President & Provost Council Rep.) Faculty Senate Executive Committee reviewed all policy changes. Additionally Faculty Senate has approved all policies of agenda items 1-7, and 9 aside from the new friendly amendments there were not substantial changes.

A motion was made to approve all 8 policy revisions including the amended policies and to rescind 2:056 was made and seconded. Motion approved.

Other Concerns:

Dr. Perry Scanlan (Faculty Senate Vice President & Provost Council Rep.) raised the concern about staggering the dates on policies to avoid reviewing all policies for approval every 5 years. It was noted that Provost's Council agrees with this and is working to stagger policy review.

Provost Council meeting was adjourned by Dr. Cronley at approximately 9:35.

## Appendix C

### RTP P & G Description

The student evaluation results shall be used as a formative, supportive tool rather than as a criterion for evaluating faculty. Every faculty member, regardless of rank or evaluation score, is expected to be a **reflective practitioner**. Faculty will write a narrative analysis of student evaluation scores during the current dossier cycle. The narrative will describe opportunities for growth and future goals for Area 1. There is no required length for this narrative; however, it should be concise and complete. This narrative will be uploaded under Area 1.



# Option A

## Proposed new Student Course Evaluation Instrument

### Student Evaluation of Course/Instructor

#### Presentation of Content

	Strongly Disagree-1	Disagree- 2	Agree-3	Strongly Agree-4
The instructor presented outcomes to be learned in the course				
The instructor organized the course to facilitate the understanding of concepts and techniques				
The instructor provided guidance for understanding course exercises				
The instructor supported critical engagement with the material				
Comments (related to content presentation):				

#### Class Environment

	Strongly Disagree-1	Disagree-2	Agree-3	Strongly Agree-4
The instructor encouraged student questions and participation				
The instructor provided constructive feedback to students				
The instructor included diverse perspectives in this course				

The instructor respected and acknowledged cultural and personal differences				
Comments (related to class environment):				

### Open Questions

How would you describe your personal level of engagement in this course?

What are one to three specific things about the course that especially supported your learning?

Which part of the course was the most challenging for you and why?

Do you have any specific recommendations of how the course could be improved?

### Student Self Evaluation

(note: these scores will NOT be included in the overall evaluation of the faculty member/instructor)

	Strongly Disagree-1	Disagree-2	Agree-3	Strongly Agree-4
I attended class regularly				
I was motivated to take responsibility for my own learning in this course.				
The course developed my ability to work critically				
I was well-prepared for class/discussion				

# Option B

## Proposed new Student Course Evaluation Instrument (March 2022 edit)

### Student Evaluation of Course/Instructor

#### Presentation of Content

	Strongly Disagree-1	Disagree- 2	Agree-3	Strongly Agree-4
The course delivery contributed to my ability to understand the underlying course objectives.				
The course is organized in a way that is clear and contributed to my ability to learn the material.				
Effective feedback is provided on assignments, tests, and class participation.				
Critical engagement with the material is encouraged.				
Comments (related to content presentation):				

#### Class Environment

	Strongly Disagree-1	Disagree-2	Agree-3	Strongly Agree-4
Students are encouraged to ask questions related to the course subject.				
Constructive feedback is provided for students.				
Diverse perspectives are supported in the course.				

Respect of cultural and personal differences are acknowledged.				
Comments (related to class environment):				

### **Open Questions**

How would you describe your personal level of engagement in this course?

What are one to three specific things about the course that especially supported your learning?

Which part of the course was the most challenging for you and why?

Do you have any specific recommendations of how the course could be improved?

### **Student Self Evaluation**

**(note: this will NOT be included in the overall evaluation of the faculty member/instructor)**

	Agree	Disagree
I attended class regularly		
I was motivated to take responsibility for my own learning in this course.		
The course developed my ability to work critically		
I was well-prepared for class/discussion		

# Appendix D

## University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board\* Charge

The responsibility of the University (Retention) Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board is to review appeals of faculty members who have received negative recommendations concerning their applications for retention, tenure, or promotion.

A principal responsibility of Austin Peay State University is to recruit and retain highly qualified faculty within its means, and to that end, the institution shall discharge these responsibilities by adhering to the highest standards of fairness and due diligence.

The Appeals Board is also charged with upholding the policies of Austin Peay State University while simultaneously protecting academic freedom and safeguarding individual faculty members from arbitrary decisions. Appeals should be resolved in the most expeditious manner as possible and be consistent with the following Appeals Board objectives.

### APPEALS BOARD OBJECTIVES

In the discharge of their duties, the Appeals Board shall

- review appeals of faculty members who have received negative recommendations
- uphold the policies of Austin Peay State University
- conduct the review with objectivity, accuracy, neutrality, and integrity
- safeguard individual faculty members from arbitrary decision making
- protect the academic freedom of individual faculty members
- seek out any additional information germane to the appeal
- investigate inconsistencies and irregularities within the RTP process
- avoid any real or perceived conflict of interest

A faculty member under review shall have the right to appear before the Appeals Board or the Appeals Board may request the faculty member to appear in person. Appearing in person shall be at the discretion of the faculty candidate. The candidate may be permitted to speak for up to 30 minutes. The Appeals Board may extend the candidate's speaking time at its discretion. The candidate is only allowed to speak on information germane to their appeal.

The Appeals Committee shall seek out the information it needs, consistent with university policies and procedures, to make its recommendation and shall gather information specific to the case from the candidate, the department, the administration, and external sources, as appropriate. All persons contacted by the Appeals Board as part of its investigation are encouraged to cooperate fully. Information requested by the Appeals Board that is consistent with university policies and procedures shall be provided in a timely manner and shall be kept confidential. Further investigations, if any, should occur before the Appeals Board members cast their vote. No additional investigation is permissible after the votes are cast by the members of the Appeals Board.

The report from the Chair of the Appeals Board shall include substantive rationale and clear narrative statements that (a) are specific and (b) demonstrate the importance of this document(s) for reviewers beyond the level of the Appeals Board.

\*Note: A name change for the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board has been recommended. Proposed new name is University **RTP** Appeals Board.

# Appendix E

## **Faculty Senate Faculty Red Committee Report Charge: Study the faculty annual evaluation tool (Dr. Tatsushi Hirono, Chair of the Faculty Red Committee):**

The Faculty Red Committee (the Committee) of the APSU Faculty Senate, at the behest of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and with input from faculty, administration, and Faculty Senate Executive Committee, has examined the process of the annual faculty evaluation. It is the Committee's finding that the process of the annual faculty evaluation is, on the whole, sound. The Committee does, however, have suggested improvements on the process.

### **Recommendations:**

1. **Ensuring that faculty, chairs, and deans review Policy 2:053 Annual Faculty Evaluation Review annually.** Many of the concerns that the Committee heard from both faculty and the Executive Committee are already addressed in the existing policy (2:053).

Specifically:

- a. That faculty supply an up-to-date CV and a summary of activities in the areas of Academic Assignment & Advising, Scholarly & Creative Activities, and Service (thus aligning with the existing areas from the RTP process as well as the annual faculty evaluation instrument);
- b. That pre-tenure faculty be allowed to use the 1-page summary of these areas from their most recent Dossier as evidence if they wish;
- c. That department chairs are meeting individually with faculty and providing them with a copy of their evaluation;
- d. That chairs and faculty are informed of the appeals process.

2. **Creation of department-specific annual faculty evaluation guidelines by all academic departments** that at minimum:

- a. Define the criteria that constitute a rating of 3 in each of the evaluation areas for that department;
- b. Include the statement "Every tenured professor is encouraged to write, publish and/or produce peer reviewed materials or professional work at least every three years."

Criteria should be drafted collaboratively with the department faculty and chair.

Deans should review departmental criteria to ensure that criteria are broadly similar across a College. This will effect standardization of the evaluation within each department – as this is the relevant unit when annual faculty evaluations are used for merit pay increases, this level of standardization makes the most sense.

3. **Changes to the evaluation tool.** The Committee was asked to consider possible changes to the evaluation tool itself.

- a. The Committee recommends that the optional self-evaluation be in a form of the faculty member's choosing, limited to 2 pages, and that it be supplied to the Chair prior to the evaluation meeting. Current policy uses the standard evaluation form (minus the Overall Composite Rating, or OCR) and is brought by the faculty member to their meeting with the chair.
  - b. Since the OCR is linked to eligibility for performance and merit-based pay increases, the performance/merit criteria currently in the box with the OCR score should be moved to the top of the form prior to Section I. This will additionally help faculty understand the annual faculty evaluation process as distinct from the RTP process.
  - c. The Committee recommends that a greater distinction be made between the terms "performance" and "merit" on the form. Either "across-the-board" or "cost of living" would be more clear.
4. **Consideration of the evaluation period and evaluation calendar.** The Committee was asked to consider potential changes to the period of evaluation (calendar year vs. academic year) as well as the calendar for evaluations (fall vs. spring). **The Committee recommends no changes to these schedules** because:
- a. When annual evaluations are used within a department for merit pay increases, those increases apply to both faculty and staff. The staff annual evaluation cycle has long been on a calendar year with evaluations happening in January or February of the following year. If a change in the calendar were instituted for faculty, a change for staff would also be needed.
  - b. Moving the entire process to fall would cause all annual evaluations as well as the RTP process to fall on faculty, staff, and chairs at the busiest time of year.
  - c. Moving the evaluation period to the academic year but keeping the evaluation calendar as it is would lead to increased confusion on the part of faculty as to what productivity items should be included.
5. **The Committee recommends a rolling 3-year average OCR score for merit-based pay increases.** Each annual faculty evaluation remains an evaluation over a single calendar year, but merit-based salary increases would be made on the basis of the average of the last three OCR scores. This will alleviate the issue encountered when a faculty member has a very strong year when no merit increases are available, but a poor year when they are. This would require a similar change for staff evaluations.

Should Faculty Senate feel that more substantial changes are needed, the Committee recommends that the aid of an Industrial-Organizational psychologist who specializes in employee assessment be enlisted.