

**Austin Peay State University  
Faculty Senate  
Meeting of Thursday, August 26, 2010  
University Center, UC 307  
3:00pm**

**Call to order** – Senate President David Major

Recognition of Guests: Mickey Wadia, Karen Sorenson, Joe Weber

**Roll call of Senators** – Secretary Mercy Cannon. Absent Senators: Lowrance, Salama, Stewart.

**Agenda for August 26, 2010 approved.**

**Minutes for meeting of May 6, 2010 approved.**

**Remarks**

1. Senate President – David Major

- Thanks to Senators for serving our faculty.
- Please note the changes to RTP forms
- Ombuds position will be discussed next month.
- Please remember attendance policy. After three consecutive absences, the seat will be declared vacant.

2. University President – Dr. Tim Hall

- Most important things were covered in faculty convocation.
- General budget conditions: Last year was the first of three years with federal stimulus matched by state monies. We had federal & state monies to cover the gap in our budget. Next year, the gap in state appropriations will become apparent. We took an \$8 million cut—this is the “hole”. 20% was a complete loss. Because of rising enrollments, we do not need to cut the budget. We did cut by 10% some of our operating budget. Much of the loss was covered by tuition. Our increases have been greater than predicted (10% vs. 4%).
- Budget money vs. money in the bank: Every year, we predict tuition dollars & state appropriation. Every year we have extra money, for two reasons. One, some of our budgeted positions have been vacant. Two, enrollment more than budgeted. We’ve increased much more, so we have much more money than we planned to spend. There are very strict rules about spending that excess money. TBR allows us to transfer money into our “plant funds.” Thus, we have much money there. It can be spent mostly on physical projects, like buildings. We have proposed to TBR to spend \$6 million on a new academic building. We are acquiring property and updating buildings. President Hall has felt we have had too much money left over each year. So, he has changed the way we treat lapsed instructional money, asking for depts. to spend on adjuncts or other instructors. Until we are allowed to give salary increases, it will sit there in the bank. This is the reason why improvements are happening while salaries are not increased.
- Question: where is the property that we acquired? Behind Church of Christ center.
- Are we more likely to see bonuses rather than raises? Hall expects that we’ll have a rough time convincing TBR to allow us to give money until all state employees get a raise.

- 21 new faculty lines? We are seeking from TBR, waiting for numbers from the fall. Doesn't think we will be told no.
- Update on fundraising initiatives? We raised \$3 million, average. Expecting more b/c of Hemlock. We've had two large gifts – agriculture = large Angus herd (\$150-250,000 worth); local developer – 30 acres of property (1 to 1.5 million).

### 3. Provost – Dr. Tristan Denley

- 21 faculty lines. Lines are paid for by last year's growth, but this year we must grow approx 3-4% to increase faculty. Allocations of these lines: Performance funding, academic affairs -- Three ways to determine: 1) New programs or requirements added (e.g., Chem Tech); 2) Delaware Cost Study (compare number of student credit hours in each discipline with other universities) ; 3) number of courses taught by adjunct. Size of classes in some disciplines doesn't change much from year to year. Predicts how many class sections will be needed. Determines which departments will feel more strain without additional faculty.
- Any consideration of new TBR reqs? For example, Biology needs to add a new course; students will have to take two more math courses. Denley: Yes, we will take into consideration changes, rather than simply depending on past performance.

### 4. Reports from Faculty Senate Representatives

- Dean's Council – Senator Bill Rayburn
  - No report given at this time; Dean's Council has not met this year
- Academic Council – Senator Fred Matthews
  - No report; Academic Council hasn't met yet.
- TBR Faculty Sub-council – Senator Loretta Griffy
  - July meeting, Senator Griffy became chair of the Sub-council
  - A100 guidelines had been changed, and TBR Sub-council voted to fail the guidelines, but the President's Council voted them through.
  - A100—students who used to be developmental. ACT/Compass less than 19 in any category.
  - We have a new set of rules, and we'll be examining them to see how we need to change to be compliant. Strongly encouraged to have them done by next fall.
  - Chancellor search:
    - June—TBR changed requirements to be Chancellor. This was tried through legislature, but failed. Dropped requirement for higher ed degree. President Hall expressed disappointment in the small pool, but agreed that Morgan was the best of the six candidates. The faculty regent (Barry Gidcomb) cast the lone dissenting vote, against the process, not the person.
    - Before the interview, the faculty Subcouncil asked to place a faculty member on the hiring committee, but was denied.
    - Chancellor Morgan lived in Archwood here on campus. Involved in state government & funding issues. Involved in Complete College Act. Job description specified knowledge of Complete College Act.
    - Hiring has been controversial, but he is our Chancellor & sub-council will support him to do the best job he can do. He can control our salaries.
  - Questions from floor: What are the controversies surrounding Morgan's hire? We will be dealing with this issue in "new business." TUFS does not represent the position of the Sub-council, which has to work with the Chancellor.
  - Question: are we looking at big changes as a result of A100 guidelines? No, mostly tweaking our existing programs, not a complete overhaul. Financial aid is

a consideration, as students cannot get aid for developmental courses. Nashville State will be integral to developmental courses.

- TBR is looking at making Academic Alert system-wide.

### Old Business

- Update on Staff Service Award – Faculty White
  - We had nine staff that were nominated in April. Award was given to Donna Liverett at the May meeting. There are suggestions for future committees' procedures.
- Update on Compensation Plan – Senator Griffy
  - Senator Griffy is chair of the committee; Senator Winters is also on the committee.
  - Philosophical issues: address position or person; inversion/conversion; merit.
  - Next step: current plan with updated CUPA data. Want to see what that looks like before creating something new.
  - Strings attached to CUPA data – cannot be copied & distributed.
  - Updates will happen soon.

### New Business

- Senate Committees – President Major
  - Asks Senators to look at the committee lists and to let him know if there are any problems with it.
  - Motion to accept the list approved.
- TUFs report – President Major
  - Complete TUFs agenda on Senate website.
  - TUFs meeting with Senate Education Committee
    - "Each senate should propose to the TUFs Executive Committee discussion points, concerns, and strategies for the anticipated presentation to the Tennessee Senate Education Committee."
    - Asks Senators to send concerns to the Exec Committee. He will compile & send those issues to TUFs.
    - Motion to accept the proposal approved.
  - TUFs response to time-sensitive issues
    - TUFs meets only twice a year, making it difficult to respond in a timely fashion to rapid developments.
    - Asks Senate to consider "In matters that are time-sensitive, after consulting with the Executive Committee of TUFs and the faculty senate presidents of all of TUFs member institutions, the president of TUFs is authorized to communicate to the public the consensus of those consulted."
    - Motion to accept proposal approved.
  - 3% bonus issues
    - Motion to accept: "TUFs supports the legislative plan that the one-time bonus be based on longevity."
    - Discussion: What other criteria were discussed, besides longevity? Possibly 3% across the board, or flat amount. Is this going to be seen as equal to a raise? Concern: this is a done deal, voted on in June, concern that this will be used for next year's plan. Isn't this a device to cap spending on bonuses? More would be spent on a 3% bonus.
    - Motion to accept proposal rejected.

- Senate response to THEC Master Plan (Public Agenda) legislation
  - Motion to accept proposal:
  - Discussion – Glad that it doesn't say "only" TUFs can speak for the faculty; this allows us to speak as a university or as a citizen. If we have a true consensus, this would be fine. Yet there are two different systems, so it is important that we are allowed to express our own needs.  
The intent – TUFs can say that they are getting this information from the faculty senates. (Major)  
Concern that the individual faculty senate's voice will be dampened, cannot speak against the TUFs vote.  
We still have to vote to ratify the points presented by TUFs.  
But if the majority of faculty senates vote for something we vote against, would they present that something. Speaking for a majority? Yes.  
No reason why we cannot dissent.  
Concerns about TUFs clashing with Sub-council, leading to a diminished position for faculty as a whole.  
Believes that the intent was to give us a stronger, united voice in certain situations, rather than everyday business.  
Yes, but it is easy to see that control of TUFs agenda might yield problematic results. Agrees with potential for clash with Sub-council. Will the community college system make it more complicated?
  - Motion to accept proposal rejected.
- Selection process of TBR Chancellor
  - Motion to approve: "TUFs should contact the national office of the AAUP regarding the procedures used in the selection of the TBR chancellor and for possible investigation and evaluation."
  - This is not an objection to the Chancellor, but to the process of selection.
  - Discussion: Urges that we proceed with caution. It's a done deal, and we are in a delicate position.  
Believes that AAUP will act without our involvement.  
Concern that support will backfire & embarrass us.  
Chancellor is asked to speak at next TUFs meeting—a gesture to show that we do not object to the person.  
Wondering about the degree requirements as the "process" problem, which would become more personal toward Morgan.  
Can we leave off last part ("investigation and evaluation")?
  - Independent motion to table the proposal.  
Discussion: this is only a "contact," not major action.  
Motion to table approved, with two objections.
- Policy 2:018 – International Programs – Karen Sorenson
  - Karen Sorenson speaking in lieu of Tina Rousselot.
  - TBR has given us a policy to govern International Education. Much of it has to do with safety and travel. APSU has a robust program, but many TBR universities do not. Policy designed to strengthen programs. We had input into this process, and were told to implement the policy.
  - Section I.A – regarding SACS accreditation—is significant.
  - Concern from floor: Worry about "Student Conduct" section.  
Reply: There is some interpretation that faculty are responsible for students at all times.

Motion that this policy be assigned to one of the Senate committees. There should be someone experienced with International Studies on the committee, left to discretion of the Senate President.

More discussion: The Student Code of Conduct can help protect faculty.

Motion approved.

- Title III redesign plans – Loretta Griffy
  - RASI = Revitalization of Academic Success Initiative
  - Turned over to faculty senate. The process will begin quickly.
  - Forms are available on Senate website.
  - Encouraging faculty to try new approaches, will receive a stipend if proposal is approved.
  - Statement of Intent to be turned in by September 15. Timeline available on “Call” document.
  - The Provost is providing funds to supplement Title III monies used for this project.

**Adjourned at 4:50 pm.**