

Austin Peay State University
Faculty Senate – Called Meeting
Thursday, March 17, 2022
Morgan University Center, Room 307 | 3 pm
Minutes

Call to Order: Senate President Jane Semler

Recognition of Guests: Soma Banerjee, Interim Senior Vice Provost Tucker Brown, Provost Maria Cronley, Teresa Crutcher, Associate General Counsel Corey Harkey, Uma Iyer, President Mike Licari, Heather Phillips, Chief Human Resources Officer JaCenda Robinson, James Thompson, and Tim Winters

Roll Call of Senators: Senate Secretary Gina Garber

Absent Senators: Ellen Brown, Stephen Kershner, Darren Michael, Marcia Shilling, Jennifer Yantz, and Harold Young

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

Approval of Minutes from February 24, 2022 Meeting: motion made, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes for February 24, 2022

Remarks:

1. Senate President Jane Semler (5 minutes)

Senate President Semler welcomed the senators and guests to the Called Meeting and made the following announcements:

- Sodexo will become the new dining services provider at Austin Peay State University (APSU) beginning July 1, 2022. Senate President Semler said she is hopeful that we might get meal delivery robots on campus with this new provider.
- APSU Board of Trustees will meet on March 18, 2022. If you are interested in attending those sessions, Senate President Semler said you should check your email for additional information.
- The U.S. Department of Education has provided an extension to be able to spend the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund (HEERF) by June of next year, 2023. This funding will assist APSU as we continue to navigate through the pandemic.
- The Department of Theatre and Dance announced that *Angels in America* is opening tonight, Thursday, March 17th, starring Darren Michael as Roy M. Cohn and Sara Anderson as Harper Pitt. The production will run this week and next week at the Roxy Regional Theatre in Clarksville.
- The next Science on Tap will feature a discussion about the movie *Moneyball*.
- There will be a free legal clinic sponsored by APSU Legal Affairs, Legal Aid Society of Middle Tennessee & the Cumberland, and the Tennessee Faith & Justice Alliance.

Old Business:

1. Enhanced Peer Review Compromise Proposal (20 minutes): Senate President Jane Semler - (Action item)

Senate President Semler introduced the Enhanced Peer Review Compromise that Dr. Kallina Dunkle wrote based on the feedback that the Faculty Senate provided during the February 24th meeting. Senate President Semler read the highlights and reminded everyone that the compromise retains the best practices of including the formative and summative evaluation of faculty in years one (1) through three (3). She said another benefit to the compromise is that it limits the burden on faculty performing the evaluations because the number of evaluations is decreasing. In years four (4) through tenure, instead of having two evaluators going to every class, there would only be one. The structure of the Enhanced Peer Review has not changed, it just lessens the burden on the faculty members performing the evaluations. Senate President Semler reminded everyone that many of the senators spoke up and said they would like this change along with eliminating or reducing the student course evaluations as criteria for evaluating faculty under RTP. Additionally, she recognized how much time Drs. Uma Iyer, Kallina Dunkle, and Mickey Wadia have spent meeting and writing the Enhanced Peer Review language. Senate President Semler reiterated that, if the vote passed today, the structure will not be voted on again. Your vote signifies that you trust the RTP Policy committee to draft appropriate language that will go into the RTP document.

Motion to discuss the Enhanced Peer Review Compromise Proposal made, seconded, and passed

Questions:

Q: Does this mean that the formative evaluation will go into the e-dossier?

A: The RTP Committee and Faculty Senate Executive Committee discussed this at length and believe if you are conducting a performance evaluation or a peer review, it needs to go into the e-dossier. If it doesn't, how will it be documented? The evaluator will need to reference the formative evaluation and so it should go into the e-dossier. To clarify this statement, anyone can do an informal evaluation at any time. Informal peer evaluations have never been included in the e-dossier, so they will not be included. The RTP Policy Committee is willing to add a statement like the following:

This formative evaluation is not to be used as criteria to evaluate the faculty member; it is for formative purposes for the faculty member to use to improve their teaching.

Q: My concern with Enhanced Peer Review, even with a statement, is that it is complicated. I would propose going in a different direction. I'm assuming this will be handled by the department chair. I think that since the summative reviewers are the same as the formative reviewers, they can look at their own notes. Why will the formative need to be in the e-dossier if that is the case?

Comment: There needs to be evidence of growth at the end of the evaluation. We need the documentation. There needs to be proof.

Comment: I was vocal at the last meeting in February. I would like to go on record and say that the Enhanced Peer Review is still a little more than twice as much work as what we are used to doing, but it is workable. I think it is very workable from a department standpoint. At the end of the day, we need to have a workable way to implement the peer review so we can reduce the course evaluation weight.

Comment: Thank you for your comments. This is our way to have a voice in the policy, so it is a package. Without passing the Enhanced Peer Review, we cannot change the weight of the course evaluations.

Q: Is there anything to address a faculty member who would request an actual written evaluation be placed into their supporting document section of the e-dossier?

A: Current policy does not prevent a faculty member from placing a written evaluation within their supporting documentation area of the e-dossier.

Comment: A faculty member could ask for additional evaluations to be placed into their e-dossier.

Q: How is putting the formative evaluation that first time any different than the number score you get from your student evaluation? With this, you have a benchmark from which to measure how you improve. I'm just thinking that if I am on a college committee and I'm not part of that department, I really want a piece of evidence. The bias might be in that narrative, but if I have that piece of evidence, I can measure it against the next one.

Comment: If you have the same person doing a formative and summative, the evaluator can look back at their notes. If I am asked to do a formative evaluation, I might be hesitant to put certain things in the evaluation because I know it is going to end up in the e-dossier. Maybe I am trying to help the faculty member out.

Comment: What if the faculty member under review only gets a summative evaluation, and next year, it is a different evaluator? There needs to be documentation.

Comment: We need to be transparent. What if there is a conflict about the formative evaluation that was not documented. You don't have any proof.

Q: I'm curious. It says the faculty member chooses the evaluator. I had to make several requests to get someone to evaluate me. What happens if everyone is too busy to evaluate me? I was trying to get one person to evaluate me.

A: The chair or the dean would have to step in as some point if this is happening.

According to the language in the proposal, the faculty member will choose one evaluator and the chair will choose the other, but you mutually agree on them both.

Q: As a compromise is it possible to have a document signed by the faculty member being evaluated stating that the formative evaluation was done, but not have it submitted into the e-dossier? The faculty member will get the evaluation and sign a document that they received it and the evaluator will sign the document acknowledging that the evaluation was completed.

Comment: I agree with the RTP Policy Committee that the formative evaluation should be in the e-dossier. There was an excellent point that was made earlier about the way

faculty use the student course evaluations. This usually helps the faculty member by showing progress or improvement. I believe the RTP Policy is important, and that the faculty should figure out what they want.

Motion to extend the time by 5 minutes made, seconded, and passed

Q: Could this simply be a process that contains one form with both formative and summative evaluations, and then we would not have two separate documents? We can just use one document but have both formative and summative evaluations. On the form, one could see that the professor suggested this, this, and this. You would be able to see if the faculty member implemented the suggestion. Therefore, the document would be one cohesive review so when a committee is reading it they are getting the full story.

Comment: This sounds reasonable. This is not my decision, but it sounds very reasonable. Sounds like a great idea.

Comment: The candidate needs to have feedback immediately. The candidate needs to have this information so they can work on their improvements. We need to look at the timeline.

Comment: One giving feedback right after the class simply precludes the inclusion of this one specific “before” story. They get their feedback but what goes into the e-dossier is the full story of here’s where I saw opportunities, and here’s the one they took advantage of.

Comment: We are relying on the evaluator like we do right now to provide feedback in a timely manner.

Comment: Having everything on one form simplifies how many things are going into the e-dossier.

Comment: As someone who is taking care of the university records, I wonder if there could be a possible problem with the files if we do not place them in the e-dossier. Files disappear if computers crash, and thumb drives can get lost. If the completed form disappears, we don’t have evidence of the record. By keeping it in the e-dossier, we have a safeguard that the form is in there for both the faculty member and the reviewer.

Comment: The e-dossier is only open for a certain time period so it would be the faculty member’s fault if they didn’t have the form because they are responsible for their e-dossier.

Motion to vote on the Enhanced Peer Review Compromise with a friendly amendment to have one document that includes both the formative and summative evaluations that will go into the e-dossier made and seconded

Comment: This is an evolving process. We review our RTP Policy every year. It’s a living document.

Motion to call the question on the Enhanced Peer Review Compromise with the friendly amendment to have one document that includes both formative and summative evaluations that will go into the e-dossier made and seconded – by paper ballot: 32 for, 10 against, 0 abstained – The motion passes by more than two-thirds vote.

New Business:

1. Faculty White Committee Discipline and Performance Improvement Policy (new policy): Mickey Wadia, Emily Crane, Susan Cockrell, and Kristen Butler (40 minutes)
- (Action item)

Senate President Semler introduced the Faculty White Committee and let everyone know that no one likes to think about being reprimanded, disciplined, or being sent to the principal's office. What she really doesn't like is to be reprimanded, unjustly and without any way to be able to defend herself. Senate President Semler told a story about being disciplined as a teenager. She let the Faculty Senate know that there are faculty on our campus who have been disciplined, and that this policy is not opening a door to give your supervisor or the provost new ways to hurt you. There are faculty who have done things wrong on campus. Senate President Semler said that faculty have come to her to say that they have been punished in a certain way and wanted to know what they could do to help themselves. She said she tells them that we do not have a policy on faculty disciplinary actions. Senate President Semler met with Dr. Lynne Crosby and the provost during the summer. They took her to lunch and let her know that they would like Faculty Senate to consider developing a disciplinary policy so that faculty, chairs, and deans could have guidelines so that everyone knows what to do in case there is a disciplinary issue. Senate President Semler said this will help to keep everyone accountable on both sides and everyone will have the same corrective action if there is a disciplinary issue. She said this policy will prevent inconsistencies, and then invited Provost Cronley to speak to the Faculty Senate and guests.

Provost Cronley said she was surprised that APSU did not have a discipline policy when she arrived on campus, because it really provides transparency and a process for everyone. She said that this policy is not only for administrators, but for the faculty, too. Provost Cronley said this is a topic that she asked Senate President Semler and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to think about. She thanked them for their work regarding this policy. Provost Cronley also thanked the Faculty White Committee for writing the policy, particularly Dr. Wadia for his leadership. She acknowledged that the committee spent hours drafting this policy and she said her role here is to endorse their work, which is important because this policy is being written by the faculty body. Provost Cronley reiterated that she thinks this is an important policy and that we need to provide more transparency and consistency for faculty. She said that we currently don't have a transparent process for correcting minor infractions or when we need to do performance improvements. Provost Cronley said this policy gives faculty due process when there is corrective action needed. This policy will not affect 95% of the faculty at APSU. There is a small amount of faculty that it will impact. Provost Cronley thanked each member of the Faculty White Committee and the rest of the Faculty Senate. She said that APSU has

a great shared governance system. Everyone in this room recognizes that we all have shared responsibilities toward one another.

Dr. Mickey Wadia, Chair of the Faculty White Committee, asked the senators and guests the following question: How many of you know me? The majority of the hands went up. He wanted everyone to know that he has been writing policy since 1998 at APSU, and that he does it with love, care, and respect for the faculty. Dr. Wadia thanked the members of the Faculty White Committee (Ellen Brown, Kristen Butler, Susan Cockrell, Emily Crane, Rod Mills, Bing Xiao, Corey Harkey, and JaCenda Robinson) and let everyone know that they met for about fourteen (14) hours to work on drafting this policy. Dr. Wadia presented a slide show [[Appendix A](#)]. The slide show included information on why APSU needs this policy and pointed out the following text: “we sought to be diligent, fair, and thoughtful.” He said that the policy is not perfect, but it is like anything else, it will evolve. Dr. Wadia asked if anyone was afraid of the Walmart shoplifting sign. If you are not afraid, that means you probably do not engage in misconduct at Walmart. He said if you do not engage in misconduct at Walmart, you should not have any concerns about this policy. Dr. Wadia shared two additional examples of choosing to do what is right and how normal people use common sense to heed the warnings of danger ahead. One slide presented “The Ladder of Discipline” which showed the four levels of discipline:

- Level 4 – Sanctions
- Level 3 – Official Written Reprimand
- Level 2 – Written Warning
- Level 1 - Informal Discussion

Dr. Wadia shared examples of faculty misconduct and the possible sanctions that could occur.

Committee Member Dr. Kristen Butler shared her background in healthcare and her experience with these types of policies. She said she was also surprised to learn that APSU didn’t have a discipline policy in place. Additionally, she let everyone know that these types of policies are common practice in most workplaces such as academia, healthcare, K-12 education, consumer products services industry, and many more. Dr. Butler said these types of policies help to cultivate a really good culture and that we have an excellent culture at APSU. She said it really helps to boost employee morale and improve productivity. She acknowledged that we have all worked with people in the past who didn’t pull their weight, and went on to say that without this policy in place, there is no way to ensure that those employees will be addressed in some capacity. Dr. Butler said she is a non-tenured faculty member, and when the committee was writing the policy, she kept that in mind, so they were advocating for all faculty. Although the title of this policy is Discipline and Performance Improvement, she said it really is a progressive action plan so the leadership is not abusing their power or authority and it mandates them to be fair. With her experience, she has found that these types of policies foster communication between faculty and leadership. She said this policy really focuses on feedback and presents opportunities for improvement, coaching, and provides teachable moments. It gives the faculty member an opportunity to correct the issue or behavior and then be able to move forward.

Committee Member Dr. Emily Crane addressed the senate next and she said she didn't want to write this policy. She actually thought she was going to be editing the policy, not writing it. She said there was a lot of trepidation because she knew it would affect her as well as her colleagues. She said a lot of thought and time was put into this policy. The committee looked at models from other schools like ETSU. Dr. Crane said they tried to cover everything but, like you heard today, policies evolve because we are always changing. She said when you are serving as a chair, you do not have time to deal with these issues. Therefore, when there is a serious issue, it needs to be addressed properly. She said there hasn't been any guidelines for chairs. Dr. Crane said we need to model our own behavior. A new faculty member may not know what it means to be faculty. Their idea may come from a television show and they didn't realize they have to work much more than they thought. She said as ridiculous as this may sound, some faculty need to be told to meet with their classes every time they meet, but sometimes they don't do it. This can be difficult when you have to discipline someone. She reminded us that this policy will affect very few faculty members, probably less than 5%.

Committee Member Dr. Susan Cockrell recognized Dr. Wadia and the rest of the committee and their hours of work. She said at times she would go back and forth thinking that something was great, and then in another minute think it's awful. She said the committee had many discussions and went in many directions regarding the policy. She recognizes it isn't perfect, but we have a base to work from in case we need to make changes. Dr. Cockrell said we needed to have some type of policy. She shared that when she was a chair she knew there were faculty who were doing things that they shouldn't have done. She heard from students and other faculty, but she was powerless because there was nothing that she could do. Dr. Cockrell said she believes in the policy so faculty know where the guardrails are and for chairs and deans to use as support. She went on to say that there will need to be training for chairs so there is consistency across the university so there will not be capricious chairs doing strange stuff.

Associate General Counsel Corey Harkey said that we are legally in line with this policy. She said the policy has been thought out and provides faculty proper due process. Additionally, she said without this policy, many more things can happen to you. She stated that this policy offers faculty many more protections than are required by law.

Chief Human Resources Officer JaCenda Robinson agreed with Corey Harkey's remarks. She reiterated that they were very intentional in word choices to be sure that everyone was covered in the document.

Motion to accept the Discipline and Performance Improvement Policy for discussion moved, seconded, and passed

Q: I have a concern based on feedback from my department about the following:

- What is "professional personal integrity?"
- What constitutes "outside the classroom?"
- What if there are changes to the handbook?

A: As far as the Faculty Handbook goes, I will remind you that the Faculty Handbook is voted on by Faculty. So, any changes made to the Handbook would be presented and voted on at Faculty Senate. We have an opportunity to see what goes into the Handbook.

As far as who is interpreting those terms, that is between the provost, chair, and the faculty member. If you have done something wrong or the chair perceived that you've done something wrong, they are already laying out some punishments right now. All of these things are happening, although you may not know about them. Now, with this policy, we have those guidelines to help us.

Comment: I'm am going to say this up front. We are not the police here, we are not the cause of this policy. This comes from much higher up than us. We're happy to write the policy. As far as the interpretation of the policy and so on, you have read the policy. It starts with chairs and deans doing stuff. We cannot sanction others. I cannot sanction someone in another department. In reference to the meaning of "outside the classroom."

Dr. Wadia provided an example of a faculty member going to a conference in New York City to deliver a paper. The faculty member went to New York City, but never delivered the paper at the conference. They put the paper in their e-dossier. How do we know the faculty member delivered the paper? How do we know that they weren't at the Empire State Building and visiting statues? APSU paid for this person to attend this conference but they did not demonstrate professional integrity because they went on vacation. They might say, no one is checking on me. This is about honesty and trust. It's professional integrity. We understand that many of you want to get into the weeds of this policy. It's natural. What you haven't heard are the fourteen (14) hours of discussion that went into this policy. I have seen and heard many things for twenty (20) years.

Comment: Someone can always come up with a scenario that doesn't fit into the policy or that we haven't heard of presently. That's how policies evolve, but you have to have a starting point somewhere. If there is a particular issue the faculty member ends up in the provost's office with one or two of us saying what do we do about this? This is where we need to ensure everyone is treated fairly and this policy is fantastic to me. It will assure that faculty will be treated the same across the board which has been a problem on this campus since the day I set foot on campus. I am very grateful for those who put this policy together.

Motion to extend time for 15 minutes made, seconded, and passed

Questions:

Comment: We do have policies that would supersede this policy such as discrimination policies and the like that govern our behaviors anyway.

Q: What if I am acting in my capacity "outside the classroom" versus you might come to watch me at a soccer game on a Saturday and see me overly excited. Is this what you mean about, "outside the classroom?"

A: No. What we mean when we refer to, "outside the classroom" is just like the example of the faculty member going to a conference on APSU's dime, but not really going to the conference. We are not monitoring anyone's behavior in the local Target store and all that kind of stuff.

Comment: I will say this, I think the policy has good intentions and it is not to penalize you. Well, you have your stories, and I have my stories that include unnecessary drama. This is important for untenured faculty to know.

Comment: I have been on both sides of this. I have also been around for a while. The fact is, faculty have no recourse right now, whatsoever. This policy provides faculty an appeal process which other faculty get to judge whether our actions were above board.

Senate President Semler said that Dr. Rod Mills was instrumental in making sure the appeals process included a standing committee.

Comment: I am speaking on behalf of my colleagues. The consensus is that the discipline policy is normal in the business world, so this isn't surprising. Most of the feedback was about the first section in the policy. Many in my college would like A, B, and C in the *purpose of the policy* to be deleted. They feel it is overstepping in the way it is worded. In the next section under *Faculty members shall perform the following duties including, but not limited to*, faculty would like A, B, and C deleted there too.

Q: Is there a question there?

A: No, I'm just giving you feedback from my college.

Dr. Wadia said much of the wording is from our sister institution at ETSU through their discipline policy.

Comment: I'm just trying to reiterate some things that have been said. There is no policy at this time covering discipline and faculty at APSU. This policy doesn't exist, but we need a policy to provide us with guidance. There is freedom to do absolutely nothing and freedom to throw everything in the kitchen sink, but that doesn't work either. It's capricious in a way that is not comparable. The only way to have consistency is to have guidelines and a good policy. This policy just sets up a plan from a Level 1 minor infraction up to a Level 4. As somebody who has served on senate and cares about faculty, I think it is good. Is it perfect? no! We have opportunities to change the wording. I recommend that we move forward with this policy because we need to have something in place before we leave here today. This policy is a good start.

Comment: This sets up a hierarchy of policies that we know we have to abide by like anti-discrimination policies.

Comment: I thought the language of "should be referred" was "must be referred" in those situations.

Senate President Semler asked if there were other questions for Provost Cronley, Associate General Counsel Corey Harkey, or Chief Human Resources Officer JaCenda Robinson. Their time is valuable so I would be happy to let them leave unless we have any questions for them.

Q: Does this policy have any impact on RTP?

A: Yes, some parts of it could be placed in the e-dossier if you receive the high level of sanctions.

Q: Do we need to have an end date? If you correct the problem, does it go away?

A: You have one year to correct the problem.

Q: Does this affect just full-time faculty or will it include part-time faculty?

A: We wanted to start with the full-time faculty. Adjuncts are on a different kind of contract.

Comment: The part-time faculty would be if a former professor came back to teach a class and they are not emeritus, but maybe the only person who can teach a specific class. Where do they fall?

Comment: This is something that we will need to think about in the future.

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

Q: From a legal point of view, what is the expiration of the written reprimand?

A: Under the law, there is no expiration. They can go on forever.

Q: How is one's eligibility for merit pay affected with this policy?

A: Your merit pay is based on the Annual Evaluation, so you must get at least a three (3) in order to be eligible for merit pay.

Senate President Semler asked the guests to step out of the room while the voting process took place.

Motion to approve the Discipline and Performance Improvement Policy by paper vote made, seconded, and passed – 33 for, 7 against, 0 abstained

2. Policies for Review (10 minutes)

a. Action item

i. 2:016 Adoption of Textbooks and Ancillary Course Materials

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee questioned the open source resources in this policy.

Motion to accept Policy 2:016 for discussion made, seconded, and passed

Q: On page three (3) of this policy, Section B, in the last sentence it states

“Courses which utilize Open Education Resources will be listed in the Schedule of Classes with a ZCCM (zero cost course material) code.”

There could be a mistake here because I can use the free textbook, but be required to pay for the online homework system. More and more, these resources are going in that direction to charge their users. Just be aware that there may be an associated cost to using a free online textbook by charging for the other access.

Comment: Instead of focusing on the textbook, they would be looking at the entire cost of the learning package. Is this correct?

Comment: Just because the book store has the physical book and they advertise it as free, doesn't mean it's really free. There are other costs that aren't transparent.

Motion to table Policy 2:016 made, seconded, and passed

Senate President Semler said the following policies were either rescinded or had non-substantive changes.

b. Information items

i. 2:011 Membership and Responsibilities of UCC (rescind)

ii. 2:014 TN eCampus Participation

iii. 2:018 Substantive Change

iv. 2:020 Library Inventory Policy (rescind)

v. 2:026 Awarding Honorary Degrees

vi. 2:027 Academic Calendar and Student Registration

Adjourn: 5:00 pm

DISCIPLINE AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT POLICY

Faculty White Committee

Senate Special Called Meeting March 17, 2022

Chair: Dr. Mickey Wadia

WHY WE NEED THIS POLICY

- Provides much better due process for faculty
 - Prevents arbitrary and capricious application of discipline or sanctions
 - Protects the faculty member in cases of low stakes or minor infractions
 - Provides guardrails for faculty
-
- ❖ *The drafters believe that this is not a perfect document, but it is much better than anything we have now in this area, which is nothing. No policy is perfect. We sought to be diligent, fair, and thoughtful. This committee is not doing policing or enforcement.*
 - ❖ *The document has been vetted by multiple groups of people including Human Resources, General Counsel, and Academic Affairs. The drafters have spent between 12-14 hours preparing just these 6 pages.*
 - ❖ *Several faculty have told me that we definitely need this document and that it is a long time coming.*
 - ❖ *Individuals who have already received some form of punishment have expressed to me that they wished this document had existed before they received the sanctions.*

2021-2022 FACULTY WHITE COMMITTEE

- Mickey Wadia (Chair)
- Ellen Brown (library)
- Susan Cockrell (COB, drafter)
- Kristen Butler (COBHS, drafter)
- Emily Crane (CoAL, drafter)
- Rod Mills (CoSTEM)
- Bing Xiao (CoE)
- Jacinda Robinson (Human Resources) *ex officio*
- Corey Harkey (Office of General Counsel) *ex officio*

In order to bring you low prices and effective customer service, shoplifters will be apprehended.

Shoplifting is stealing.

It's not a prank, a joke, or a thrill. It's a crime. Even if it's your first offense, you could be punished with a lengthy prison term and a substantial monetary fine, plus a record that will haunt you for the rest of your life.

**We apprehend shoplifters.
Please don't risk it!**



Are you afraid of this sign when you visit your local Walmart?

If you answered "No," you're not a shoplifter. If you don't engage in misconduct at Walmart, then you should not have any concerns about the discipline policy.



WOULD IT BE A SMART IDEA TO SWIM IN THESE WATERS?

I HAVE FIRST-HAND KNOWLEDGE OF BOX JELLYFISH IN THE GREAT BARRIER REEF. BOX JELLYFISH CAN KILL A PERSON IN 2 MINUTES. NORMAL PEOPLE OBEY SUCH WARNINGS.





If your GPS device or your “fuzz buster” warns you of a red light traffic camera ahead, do you slow down or do you speed up? Note the sanction: a \$480 fine.

WHO IS COVERED BY THE POLICY?

- **Full-time (non tenure track) instructors**
- **Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty**
- **Coordinators**
- **Directors**
- **Chairs**
- **Deans**

THE LADDER OF DISCIPLINE



LEVEL 4

Sanctions

LEVEL 3

**Official
Written
Reprimand**

LEVEL 2

**Written
Warning**

LEVEL 1

**Informal
Discussion**

APPEALS



Examples of faculty misconduct may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- **Not uploading ADA-complaint syllabi in the LMS shell 48 hours before the start of classes**
- **Failure to post grades for evaluated work in the LMS so that an accurate recording of grades is available**
- **Failure to maintain office hours as required by the department**
- **Faculty not posting and/or grading any student papers throughout an entire semester**
- **Failure to post final grades for the course as required by the Office of the Registrar**
- **Failure to attend department meetings as required by the chair without good reason**
- **Failure to serve on departmental or university committees without good reason**
- **Faculty consistently arriving late to class or faculty dismissing class early**
- **Faculty not receiving permission to cancel a class or not filling out a report of absence**
- **Faculty making derogatory comments in class about other students or faculty colleagues**

Sanctions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **Reduction in additional duties (program director, administrative duties or appointments, etc.) with an associated reduction in compensation**
- **Loss of reassigned time**
- **Loss of merit pay**
- **Loss of privileges to interact with the community as a representative of APSU (community activities requiring an absence from teaching or other Area 1 or Area 3 responsibilities)**
- **Loss of summer and Wintermester teaching employment for those on less than twelve-month contracts**
- **Loss of financial support for travel and professional development**
- **Loss of teaching upper-level/graduate courses in the faculty member's specialty area.**

