

**Austin Peay State University
Faculty Senate
Meeting of Thursday, March 31, 2016
University Center, UC 307
3:00pm
“Called Meeting” Agenda**

Call to order – Senate President Tim Winters

Recognition of Guests: Dr. Lynne Crosby, Dr. Dan Frederick, Dr. Tim Leszczak, Dr. Meagan Mann, Dr. Mickey Wadia, Dr. Na (Linda) Zhu

Roll call of Senators – Senate Secretary Christina Chester-Fangman

Absent Senators: Kenisha Burke, John Byrd, Lesley Davidson, Mary Fran Davis, Mike Dunn, Dwonna Goldstone, Holly Hollis, Christophe Konkobo, Andriy Kovalskyy, Charmaine Lowe, David Rands, Noel Rennerfeldt, Adriane Sanders, Allyn Smith, Andrea Spofford, Cameron Sutt, John Volker, Lauren Wells, Charla White-Major

Approval of today’s agenda – Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve today’s agenda with the change that Policy 3:034 is a discussion item, not a voting item, and that Mercy Cannon will present the Ad hoc Nominations Committee information before Dr. Wadia begins the *Handbook* discussion

Remarks

1. Senate President – Dr. Tim Winters (5 minutes)

- Senate President Winters welcomed us to the meeting and determined the presence of a quorum so that we could proceed with the action items.

New Business

2. Ad hoc Nominations Committee – Senate Past President Mercy Cannon – Action Item

- Dr. Cannon began by talking about the process of putting together the Ad hoc Nominations Committee; the Senate Executive Committee discusses the list of outgoing senators and suggests members from that list, with the immediate past president serving as the chair;
- This year’s proposed nomination committee is Senator Camilleri, Senator Mathenge, and Senator Hulsart, with Dr. Cannon chairing;
- Once elected, they will put the slate of officers together so people can see it ahead of time; they usually only have about a week, because they need to review the list of newly elected senators; the officers to be elected are the President, Vice President, Secretary, Member-at-Large, Academic Council Representative, and Dean’s Council Representative; (the TBR Sub-council Representative serves for a two-year term and will not be elected this year, and the Parliamentarian is appointed by the President);
- The committee is interested in those who are “competent and willing,” looking at representation in the constituted areas, years of service, diversity, communication skills, where senators are in the tenure process, balance between experience and new vision, etc.; our role is first and foremost to be conduit of communication between the faculty and the administration; please note that there is a “substantial time commitment” involved; nominations are allowed from the floor; the vote takes place during the May meeting;
- Discussion:
 - Qualifications? The Committee will look at the number of people suggesting a person for an office, how well they communicate, where they are in the tenure process; higher rank is better for some offices because they will have been here long enough to know policies and history; for

some, like the Member-at-Large, that doesn't have specific function, there isn't a lot of experience required; they can use their voice to echo concerns of the faculty constituents; new people see things in a different way and can bring a new perspective;

- Is protecting untenured people a concern? No, it is more for the comfort level of the individual; some of that is the matter of the faculty member feeling confident; there have not been any issues of reprisals with the administration, but it could also depend upon the other faculty in their departments who have power over them as to whether it is a good idea;

- **Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve the Ad hoc Nominations Committee as presented (none opposed, no abstentions)**

3. Faculty Handbook and Policy Committee Chair – Dr. Mickey Wadia - Remarks (5 minutes)

- If you are new to a called meeting, you are “in for a treat;” our role is remarkable in that we have this relationship with the administration that allows us a measure of control over our Handbook; until just recently, TSU was not allowed to do anything with their Handbook since the 1990s;
- Members of the Handbook Committee are Dr. Crosby (ex officio), Elaine Berg, Chad Brooks, Daniel Frederick, and Linda Zhu, who is filling in for Sue Evans, who was unable to serve;
- The most significant change is that President White wanted 5:060 “chopped down” by separating the policies from the procedures and guidelines (P&G);

4. Form change – Proposed changes to RTP Form for College Committee – Dr. Mickey Wadia - Action Item

- Add department of faculty member being reviewed and add appropriate box for action report (retention or tenure); **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve additions (none opposed, no abstentions)**

5. Policy 5:029 – Proposed change to Chairs Policy – Dr. Mickey Wadia - Action Item

- Provides for rebuttals; there has been a lack of opportunity for a chair being evaluated to be able to respond to negative comments; rebuttal is filed with the Dean, but does not go into e-dossier; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve changes (none opposed, no abstentions)**

6. Policy 5:060 – Proposed changes to Procedures and Guidelines 5:060 – Action Items

- Add language to tie together the Policy Document and the Procedures and Guidelines Document; people will have to read and follow both; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve new language (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- Modify the probationary period to allow for scholarly work accepted/published when “the clock is stopped” to still be included in the dossier; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- Notice the new formatting style for all policies so they work on mobile devices;
- The tenure track appointment contract only needs to be uploaded one time; if there is a new contract, it must be uploaded in that review cycle; the old one is not taken out; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions); [For future discussion, questions have come up regarding when faculty responsibilities are defined and agreed upon, and whether they should be a part of the RTP process];**
- Any documents in support of a faculty member's appeal shall be clearly delineated as such; e.g. “Appeal Attachment A, Appeal Attachment B, etc.); **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- Organize documents for Areas 1-3 using academic year divisions, not calendar year divisions, for the overarching headings; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- All tenured faculty who are not fully ranked are required to include the annual post-tenure review during their personnel proceedings; place the post-tenure review after the Chair's report; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**

- When a long gap of time, such as ten years or more, has occurred between receiving tenure and promotion to any level, faculty are strongly encouraged to submit at least two recent peer reviews from within the most recent five years prior to the semester when the application has been made for promotion; request made to fix the wording for “between receiving tenure...”; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions); [For future discussion, please look at the issue of accepting external peer reviews instead of just those written by Austin Peay faculty for the dossier];**
- Add Wintermester and Maymester to the courses that are not routinely evaluated by the University; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- Regardless of the number of students completing a routine course evaluation, those evaluations must be included within the faculty member’s e-dossier; Dr. Crosby noted that department chairs advise Nicole [Roth] on combining evaluations or not and the new evaluation software will be piloted during Summer I, so any of those evals will not be a part of the e-dossier in working out the bugs; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- For instances in which documents not ordinarily part of the content have been introduced, all pertinent documents shall be included and, as an issue of fairness, the faculty member has a right to address the charge and is allowed one rebuttal to those documents; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- Re-voting = After the departmental committee acts on a faculty member's dossier and forwards it to the next level, the departmental action cannot be rescinded, unless authorized in writing by the President or his/her designee; in extraordinary circumstances, the departmental committee may be permitted to take a re-vote before the e-dossier moves forward; the departmental committee cannot re-vote unless authorized in writing by the President or his/her designee; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- Composition of College RTP Committee = Members of the college committee are not permitted to vote on candidates from their own department; when they complete the ballot, they should select “non-voting department member” or “abstain (non-voting department member); **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions);**
- Appeals section – appeals should be filed with provost; faculty member’s e-dossier will need to be unlocked to add appeal letter, supporting documents, and the recommendation of the appeals board; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, one abstention) [Correct, updated language is attached];**
- Composition of appeals board – only one appeals board shall be convened, and in the fall; will address appeals for anyone except those in the second-year; the dean of any faculty member who is appealing should not serve as chair; instead, they will elect a temporary chair and document the recusal; faculty member cannot participate in deliberations and must leave the room; any necessary adjustments to the appeals board shall be the responsibility of the president or designee; right now we have a problem with this, as the number of appeals has gone up; the dean is non-voting and must be outside the room; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions); [On page 39, the language referring to “university member,” should be changed to ‘faculty member’]**

7. Policy 5:061 – Proposed changes to Promotion Policy – Action Item

- Fixed-term faculty are those hired for a contractual time period (usually 3 years); there are no more tenure-track instructors being hired; these could be focused on clinical, research, etc.; they are contract bound, not adjuncts; annual review by the chair/director/supervisor is required for fixed-term faculty; advancement in rank requires a recommendation from the chair/director/supervisor, a departmental review committee, the dean, the provost, and the president; termination may occur at any point in the employment term with thirty (30) days’ notice; the University may terminate the employment agreement with seven (7) days written notice if said notice is given before August 1; please remember that anything about the current tenure-track instructors will be handled on a case-by-case basis by Provost Gandy; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve with the friendly amendment that we**

request that these termination periods be clarified in terms of what semester they relate to and when the August 1st period is defined (none opposed, two abstentions).

8. Policy 5:062 – Proposed changes to Faculty Appointments – Action Item

- Definitions of tenure and tenure track appointments; cannot be promoted if temporary appointment; describes criteria for fixed-term employment; must be evaluated for teaching effectiveness, professional growth, etc.; there are three levels = instructor, senior, and master; evaluation will be by the chair (there is no review committee for fixed term); issues of termination dates; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve with the friendly amendments that we 1) alter the language to have a master’s degree, not a PhD for the clinical assistant professor; 2) standardize the language (ex. clinical research vs. clinical associate); and 3) request that these termination periods be clarified in terms of what semester they relate to and when the August 1st period is defined (none opposed, two abstentions).**

9. Policy 3:034 – Proposed changes to Student Excused Absence Policy – Discussion Item

- This involves students going over the absence limit for one class due to involvement in another campus activity that is not on the list of sanctioned university events; who decides who has precedence?; the instructors cannot come to an agreement and the student is caught in the middle; “common sense should prevail,” but this has been a dilemma between those professors who are more lenient and those who are more “hard-line.”
- Issues:
 - Can a dean intervene?
 - Is this an issue of academic freedom? Could it be applied in this way?
 - “I can easily see how a student could manipulate this policy!”
 - Is it an academic policy or a student policy? It straddles both lines. We have a precedent in place for the way we handled the academic honesty policy; we wrote it but it still remains a student policy;
 - What about non-academic or non-institutional events that are still significant for the student (ex. if a student is an Olympic swimmer or an equestrian champion), what do you do in that scenario?

10. For *Handbook*: Proposed change to Distinguished Professor Award – Action Item

- Proposed change to Distinguished Professor Award to require that the recipient shall be a full-time tenured faculty member; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve addition (none opposed, no abstentions)**

11. For *Handbook*: Proposed change to OUR’s Undergraduate Research Mentor Award – Action Item

- Proposed change is to include this award in the Faculty Handbook along with the Socrates Award, the Distinguished Professor Award, and the Richard Hawkins Award for Scholarship; **motion made, seconded, and passed to approve (none opposed, no abstentions); [Note: if there are any issues with the award itself, they will have to be discussed next year];**

Please remember, in reviewing the documents, that blue text is new language, red ~~strike-through~~ is deleted text and green text is text that has been moved.

Motion made, seconded, and passed to adjourn at 5:37pm.

New proposed change to Procedures and Guidelines 5:060 re Appeals and The Composition of University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Appeals shall be filed by the deadline outlined in the Calendar for Faculty Personnel Actions. The appeal shall be filed via e-mail with the Provost, copying the Assistant Provost and Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (AP/AVPAA), who will forward the appeal to the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board. All paperwork associated with the electronic appeal must be converted to PDF files and included within the e-dossier of the faculty member making the appeal before the e-dossier moves to the next level. At a minimum, the documents that should be included in the e-dossier are as follows: (a) the appeal letter (b) any supporting documents (c) the recommendation of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals board. The faculty member's e-dossier will need to be unlocked to include the documents related to an appeal. The Provost or his/her designee shall have the responsibility for unlocking an e-dossier to include post-upload appeals documents of faculty members appealing retention, tenure, or promotion decisions. The University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board shall provide a copy of its recommendation (to the Provost) to the faculty member making the appeal. The Provost or his/her designee shall have the responsibility for unlocking an e-dossier to include appeals documents of faculty members appealing retention, tenure, or promotion decisions.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Composition of University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board, which is constituted during the fall semester by dates prescribed on the Calendar for Faculty Personnel Actions shall be composed of one member from each of the college promotion committees (College of Arts & Letters, College of Behavioral and Health Sciences, College of Business, College of Education, College of Science and Mathematics,) chosen by election of college faculties from among the colleges' tenured Professors, one (1) University member designated by the President, and one (1) University member designated by the Faculty Senate. Even though it is not possible to know in advance which faculty members may file appeals in the fall and spring, only one University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board shall be convened in the fall each year. This appeals board will meet to deliberate on any appeals from second year faculty in the fall semester or any appeals from faculty in the following spring semester from anyone other than 2nd year faculty. The member representing each of the college promotion committees shall be a tenured Professor who must be elected by that college's faculty according to established procedures at the University.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

The Chair of the Appeals Board committee shall be a non-voting member, a college Dean, appointed by the President. The Dean of the College of the faculty member making an appeal shall not serve as Chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board for that appeal. In these cases, the committee members shall elect a temporary chair for that particular faculty member's appeal. Reports from the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board shall document the recusal of the specific faculty member and/or Dean should this circumstance arise. A faculty

member on any personnel review committee who has previously voted on a colleague for retention, tenure, or promotion in that same tenure/promotion review cycle may not serve as a member of the University Appeals Board to examine a retention, tenure, or promotion appeal that may be filed subsequently by that colleague.

To protect the integrity of the appeals process, it is vital that neutrality be an important component of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board and that a real or perceived conflict of interest be avoided. Faculty members who have previously served on a colleague for retention, tenure, or promotion in that same retention/tenure/promotion review cycle shall be permitted to serve as a member of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board to examine a retention, tenure, or promotion appeal that may be filed subsequently by that colleague. However, that faculty member shall not be permitted to actively participate in the deliberations and is required to leave the meeting room. If an appeal is made by a faculty member from a college under a Dean that has been appointed to serve as Chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board, then this Dean shall also not be permitted to actively participate in the deliberations and is also required to leave the room using the procedure noted above. ~~The Chair of the committee shall be a non-voting member, a college Dean, appointed by the President.~~ The Dean of the College of the faculty member making an appeal shall not serve as Chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board for that appeal. Any necessary adjustments in membership to this board and the subsequent eligibility to vote (based on the college of the faculty member making the appeal) shall be the responsibility of the President or his/her designee.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.58", Right: 0.07"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

~~If the University member designated by the Faculty Senate has previously served and voted on any personnel committee described above in the current review cycle, the Faculty Senate president shall name another appointee to serve as a member of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board. If the University member designated by the President has previously served and voted on any personnel committee described above in the current review cycle, the President shall name another appointee to serve as a member of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board. If any one of the members chosen from each of the college promotion committees has previously served and voted on any personnel committee described above in the current review cycle, then the college Dean, who is a non-voting member and Chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board, shall make a recommendation to the President to name another appointee. (Note from Dr. Wadia; this section has been recommended for deletion as making these adjustments is extraordinarily difficult when there are multiple appeals from different colleges. Problem: not enough tenured full professors available; inability to compel individuals to perform this service; and very time consuming to sort out who has served in what capacity. Original language worked well if there were just one or two appeals a year. These numbers have risen sharply across colleges).~~

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt