

Austin Peay State University
Faculty Senate
Meeting of Thursday, February 24, 2022
Morgan University Center, 307 | 3:00 pm
Minutes

Call to Order: Senate President Jane Semler

Recognition of Guests: Soma Banerjee, Interim Senior Vice Provost Tucker Brown, Provost Maria Cronley, Kallina Dunkle, Uma Iyer, President Mike Licari, Donna Short, James Thompson, and Tim Winters

Roll Call of Senators: Senate Secretary Gina Garber

Absent Senators: Lisa Barron, Terry Damron, Tracy Nichols, Sen Sumen, Sarai Ward, and Jennifer Yantz

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

Approval of Minutes from January 27, 2022 Meeting: motion made, seconded, and passed to approve the minutes for January 27, 2022

Remarks:

1. Senate President Jane Semler (5 minutes)

Tennessee Legislative Bills: Faculty Senate President, Jane Semler addressed the two bills that are in front of the Tennessee state legislators that are concerning to many faculty members. Those bills are the HB2670 and SB2290. She said there is a third bill, but it has not passed; however, it could very easily be reintroduced at a later time. Senate President Semler said these bills seem to have a great deal of support. She said that unfortunately, there is not a lot that Austin Peay and universities across the state can do about the bills. Those who support these bills have the super-majority. She said although this is not encouraging, Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) is monitoring these bills as well as preparing a letter. The letter is not a formal resolution, but to create an open dialogue.

The bills address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Language in some of these bills is intentionally vague. Senate President Semler let everyone know that there is a group called PEN America.

PEN America stands at the intersection of literature and human rights to protect free expression in the United States and worldwide. We champion the freedom to write, recognizing the power of the word to transform the world. Our mission is to unite writers and their allies to celebrate creative expression and defend the liberties that make it possible.

PEN America monitors these types of education gag orders. Currently, there are 38 bills like the ones we are watching in over twenty different states,

Motion to extend the time by 1 minute made, seconded, and passed unanimously

Marketing and Communication Tagline: Mission, Vision, and Values: Charles Booth and Ellen Harmon asked Senate President Semler to share the new University tagline [See Appendix A]. The Public Relations and Marketing personnel believe their tagline,

*Experience Change. Experience Community. Experience Compassion.
The life you want begins at Austin Peay.*

encompasses APSU's identity and aligns marketing and communication with our Mission, Vision, and Values. There will be new stationary, but use the stationary that you currently have and then order the new design concept the next time you place an order. The Senior Leadership Team has already approved the design. If you have any feedback, Senate President Semler said she would be happy to pass it along to Public Relations and Marketing personnel.

2. University President Dr. Michael Licari (5 minutes)

Tennessee Legislative Bills: President Licari provided a few more comments about the bills. He said Austin Peay is watching SB2290, as this bill has the support of the Speaker of the House. Additionally, the President said this bill would prevent us from doing things that we are already not doing, for example, forcing students, staff, and faculty to believe certain things. He said there are other elements that are problematic for universities such as tracking complaints and surveying the student body every couple of years to read the climate on campus. President Licari thinks since it is early in the process, the bills will evolve and be amended. He believes that something will pass and wants the campus to be prepared. The current language in these bills is somewhat vague which makes them at greater risk for lawsuits upon passage.

Budget Hearing Presentation: President Licari had good news from the state legislature to report. Austin Peay presented to the House Finance Committee and to the Senate Education Committee regarding the budget. He said both presentations went well. We are getting budget dollars as a result of all the hard work everyone is doing at Austin Peay.

Vice President of Finance and Administration: President Licari reminded the faculty that Mitch Robinson is retiring this year. He said we are putting a search committee together and have asked Senate President Semler to serve on it.

Marvin Posey Jr. Scholarship: President Licari said the Marvin Posey, Jr. Scholarship is now fully endowed. The celebration is Friday evening with five students scheduled to perform. Harold Wallace has put together the celebration at the Wilbur N. Daniel African American Culture Center. He hopes to see many of us there.

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

Questions:

Q: I think the bill is the wrong number.

A: I think the bills are HB2670 and SB2290.

Q: After reading over the bills, I get the feeling that the interpretation is about privilege. What is your assurance that you can provide a campus that is a safe place for people to work? What is your position on this?

A: I'm not in favor of either of the bills. The vagueness of the language is, in some ways, an opportunity for us to continue to have arguments and discussions about what all of this means. We'll do what we can in order to push back on these bills where there is overreaching on academic freedom that makes it impossible to teach certain topics. At the end of the day, can I guarantee you that something is or is not going to pass? No. It will be up to us to figure out how to implement things in ways that will protect our faculty and the integrity of the course.

3. University Provost, Dr. Maria Cronley (5 minutes)

HB2670 and SB2290: Provost Cronley said that she also is very concerned about these bills. Many of us like Carol Clark and our legal team are watching these bills closely. They are speaking to level-headed people about these bills.

Academic Affairs Announcements: Provost Cronley also thanked Senate President Semler for serving on the search committee for the next Vice President of Finance and Administration. Provost Cronley said she was chairing this committee and to let her know if anyone has specific questions about the position and the hiring procedure.

Govs Preview Day: Provost Cronley thanked everyone and their departments who participated in the Govs Preview Day. Austin Peay had over 100 students who attended the event with their families. In total, she said we probably had over 300 people in attendance. She also thanked everyone in advance of the upcoming March 19 event. Provost Cronley reminded everyone that these are really important events in terms of our admission cycle. This gives prospective students and families a chance to step on campus and experience what it is like to be a Gov.

Personnel Updates in Academic Affairs:

- Tammy Delvendahl is retiring after 31 years and seven provosts. Provost Cronley and Interim Senior Vice Provost Tucker Brown are already in the process with a new search. The position will be posted soon.
- Dean Barry Jones will be transitioning back to the Department of Art+Design as a faculty member. He had decided to return to the classroom. They decided to partner with a firm to conduct the search for his replacement. A committee is being formed right now and Dean Prentice Chandler has agreed to chair it.
- Library Director Joe Weber will be retiring this year after many years of dedicated service. Dean Chad Brooks has agreed to chair the search committee. Hopefully, that position will be filled sometime over the summer.

Shared Governance: Provost Cronley thanked everyone for their hard work on Senate. She acknowledges the really important work that goes into shared governance. She recognized the ambitious agenda set by Senate President Semler for this year covering topics such as course continuity, course evaluations, faculty performance improvement plan, and the annual evaluation tool. Provost Cronley said shared governance is really about shared responsibility. If we want our governance to work, we have to work together and share the responsibility.

4. Report from the Budget Advisory Task Force, Florian Gargaillo (2 minutes)
Senate Treasurer Florian Gargaillo reported that the Budget Advisory Task Force met February 2nd to discuss two main topics: Non-Mandatory Fees and Proposed State Appropriations. Under the Non-Mandatory Fees, the university would raise the Ready to Teach (FEDU) fee from \$25 to \$40, Business Course Fee from \$40 to \$55 to cover two new faculty lines, and the Aviation Flight Lab Fee from \$395 to \$425 to cover insurance and hanger rental. Additionally, there are seven proposed fees: Culinary Arts, Psychological Science, Master of Healthcare Administration, Master of Public Health, CoBHS Student Success, CoSTEM, and CoAL to cover advisors, recruitments, and technology. Under the Proposed State Appropriations, Health Insurance, Salary Pool, Outcomes Formula Growth, Outcomes Redistribution, and the Appropriations Increase for APSU are listed. Finally, the following Capital Projects proposed include a Campus Wide Elevator Modernization, Dunn HVAC & Electric Modernization Phases 2 and 3, and Kimbrough Classroom and Office Renovations. [\[See Appendix A\]](#)
5. Report from Provost Council Representative, Perry Scanlan (2 minutes)
Senate Vice President Scanlan reported that the Provost Council has been reviewing the same policies that have come before the Faculty Senate. His report listed each policy that had minor cosmetic or a non-substantive change, and reminded everyone that these policies can be found on the Documents for Review page. Additionally, there was another non-substantive change to Policy 2:001 Curricular Development and Modification Approval. The word “proved” was changed to “provided” (*...an annual report would be provided to the provost*). The policies were unanimously accepted by the Provost Council. [\[See Appendix B\]](#)

Old Business:

1. Course Continuity Policy Proposal, Academic Red Committee Chair, Dr. Amy Thompson (Action item) (10 minutes)

Dr. Thompson thanked the Academic Red Committee members (Kakali Chakrabarti, Sue Evans, Bill Rayburn, and Jennifer Yantz) for their work on this policy. She let the Senate know that this process is a group effort and that they were tasked with serving on this committee. She eloquently said, it could have been any one of you standing at this podium instead of her. Dr. Thompson reminded the Senate that this policy was created to ensure that there is course continuity in the unfortunate circumstance that an instructor would not be able to continue teaching. Therefore, faculty should use the Learning Management System to have an up-to-date ADA-compliant syllabus and gradebook to ensure the accurate reporting of grades.

Motion to accept the edits to the proposed Course Continuity Policy made, seconded, and passed

Discussion:

Comment: I want to say that I appreciated this Committee going back and revising the language to the policy. The biggest concern in my college was that it limits faculty options to choose programs that may not marry well with our Learning Management System. Additionally, there may have been a survey that was recommended when this topic first came up, but it was never done.

Comment: Thank you for the work that you have done on this policy. Like Dr. Thompson said, it could have been any one of you up there representing this committee. There were many comments the last time we met. Some of those comments were strange and irrelevant to this policy. This is a policy about something you should be doing anyway. If we are going to discuss this policy then let's keep the conversation on task.

Comment: My concern is that some disciplines might have challenges to adhere to this policy because of external vendors and resources that they use. This is not the case for my discipline. I am in support of the policy.

Comment: You still have the flexibility to use the external software, you just need to manually input the grades if you do not have it synchronized with our Learning Management System.

Comment: At our last Faculty Senate meeting, I was not in support of this policy; however, I have changed my mind.

Comment: The School of Nursing uses an external software and we just transfer the grades into D2L for our students. It does not take very long and it's not very hard. I can do mine in a matter of minutes.

Comment: I heard from one faculty member that they were concerned about moving content from one system to another. I have experience in using D2L and external software and it doesn't take that much time.

Comment: I took a straw poll about faculty who don't post grades and it is a concern. If you haven't used the gradebook, it can be difficult at first. I will be willing to help you.

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

Comment: I want to say thank you for addressing the concerns that I had with the original language. Additionally, thank you for looking down the road for potential issues.

Comment: I just want to reiterate my concerns about some faculty having challenges with this policy and that I think its going to be hard work.

Senate President Semler reminded everyone in the room that only current senators could vote.

Motion to vote with a show of hands made and seconded - Vote: 42 for, 2 against, 0 abstained – The motion carried

2. Rules Committee, Perry Scanlan (Action Item) (10 minutes)

The Rules Committee has two charges that we are looking at today. The first charge is the Faculty Senate apportionment (information item) and the second charge is a change to the Bylaws (action item). Senate Vice President Scanlan suggested that we address the information item before getting into the action item. He began by thanking the Rules Committee (Pam Gray, Marsha Lyle-Gonga, and Tim Winters) for their work on the apportionment and the Bylaws.

Faculty Senate Apportionment: Senate Vice President Scanlan said the Rules Committee received the list of faculty members and their colleges from the Office of Human Resources. The Bylaws indicate that academic units are given one faculty representative per seven faculty (or major fraction thereof) which meets the definition of “faculty” in the Senate’s Constitution. The Rules Committee has determined the following representation and need for elections in the following areas:

- 3 Senators in CoB – 3 vacancies
- 12 Senators in CoBHS – 0 vacancies
- 15 Senators in CoAL – 10 vacancies
- 2 Senators in Admin/Lib – 1 vacancy
- 4 Senators in CoE – 1 vacancy
- 15 Senators in CoSTEM – 4 vacancies
- 1 Senator designated as Adjunct – 1 vacancy [\[See Appendix C\]](#)

Comment: Some people might have to serve on more than one committee because the apportionment is one faculty representative per seven faculty. This is why some of you are serving on more than one committee. Keep in mind that not every standing committee requires somebody from your college.

Non-substantive Changes to the Bylaws: Senate Vice President Scanlan presented the proposed changes to the Bylaws in two sections. The first section, numbers 1-6 were non-substantive changes that addressed document improvements.

Motion to accept the non-substantive edits to the Bylaws made, seconded, and passed

There was no discussion.

Motion to approve the non-substantive edits to the Bylaws made, seconded, and passed – 44 for, 0 against, 0 abstained

Substantive Changes to the Bylaws: Senate Vice President Scanlan presented Page 4, Section C, Line 188.

Academic committees shall consist of no more than “Seven (7)” members changing from Five (5) members.

This proposed change will allow up to seven members on committees. Keep in mind, it says, “no more than seven,” to provide the flexibility and ability to have seven if needed for certain types of committees.

Motion to accept Page 4, Section C, Line 188 substantive edit to the Bylaws made, seconded, and passed

There was no discussion.

Motion to approve Page 4, Section C, Line 188 substantive edit to the Bylaws made, seconded, and passed – 44 for, 0 against, 0 abstained

Senate Vice President Scanlan presented the next two substantive changes to the Bylaws to reinstate the president-elect system. Since the changes are closely related, they were presented together.

Page 3, Article IV, Section C, Lines 121-123

“Nominations for the office of President will only be accepted in the case that the current Vice President is unwilling to serve as President in the upcoming year.”

Page 4, Article V, Section A, Lines 144-147

“The Faculty Senate Vice President shall serve a one-year term and will automatically become the next Faculty Senate President. In the event that the Vice President chooses not to succeed the President, an election for both President and Vice President will follow Article IV Procedures for the Election of Senate Officers.”

Motion to accept Page 3, Article IV, Section C, Line 121-123 and Page 4, Article V, Section A, Lines 144-147 substantive edits to the Bylaws made, seconded, and passed

Discussion:

Comment: In Article IV, it is about what happens if a vice president is unwilling to serve and in Article V, it is about the vice president automatically becoming the next president. Both changes are needed because you wouldn't have one without the other.

Comment: Perhaps the word unwilling needs to be changed to unable.

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

Comment: This might be a logistical issue. This could be someone in their third year who would not be able to serve on Senate because they must sit out for one year according to the rules.

Comment: In order to change the length of senate terms, we would have to amend the Faculty Senate Constitution.

Senate Vice President Scanlan presented the following reasons to make the vice president the president elect:

- There currently is not a transition period between the president and vice president.
- There is a desire to form positive working relationships.
- There is significant potential for lost work and opportunities for faculty impact.

Why change to a president-elect model?

- To improve the transition at the end of the president's term (months vs. days)

- Allows the vice president to foster relationships and improve faculty representation (enhance vice president involvement and distribute/share workload).
- To prepare the department for reassigned time.

Q: I am not convinced that we need a president-elect system. Is there any evidence that the vice president was not able to do their job?

Comment: Senators need to choose the best person for the position. A few days vs. a few months doesn't solve the problem.

Q: What if the senate makes a mistake and the person voted in is not qualified enough?

Comment: It shouldn't matter if a new faculty member wants to serve on the Executive Committee. They may come from another university with experience as president or vice president.

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

Comment: I understand the rationale and I don't think it is necessary to have a president-elect model. Nothing negative about the former presidents. The vice president shouldn't automatically become president. What if they are a terrible vice president? We should have the option to vote them out of office if they are terrible. Additionally, it seems that one of the discussions is about the vice president being able to do more in preparation to be president. I don't understand why they are doing more. What is preventing them from setting in on those meetings and being able to do some of these things?

Comment: If someone is not the president-elect, you could have a situation where this person could have attended these meetings, but then they were not elected.

Comment: This is about being able to have advance preparation. Some experience is better than no experience.

Comment: After four terms as president and multiple terms as vice president, I can tell you that this has nothing to do with qualifications or trusting anybody's ability to do the job. It takes a ridiculous amount of time and this is all about saving time. When the Senate president comes in, there are always multiple ongoing situations that need attention. If they are not up to speed on the situation, it takes hours to prepare. If you have another person at the table, you have another mind to have better discussions. Again, after four times as president and numerous times as vice president, it would have saved me an incredible amount of time just to have that opportunity to be at the table.

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

Comment: It took me the first semester to understand and figure out how the university works. I was president for one term. The involvement of the vice president, as it stands now, is at the discretion of the president. This will only strengthen the Faculty Senate. I ask you to support these changes to the Bylaws.

Q: Because the president-elect would have a lot on his plate. Is there an allowance or release time for this position?

A: The vice president gets spring release time.

Comment: I would encourage that this person has extra time to work as the vice president.

Comment: This is a complicated matter and involves more than just asking for time.

Q: So what happens if you run for vice president, but you don't have any time left on Senate to serve as president?

A: If you run for vice president, but don't have any time left, then a vacancy would occur, at which time we would need to elect a president.

Senate President Semler announced that there would be a paper ballot for this vote. APSU Faculty Trustee Elaine Berg and Senate Guest Kallina Dunkle were appointed to count the votes.

Motion to approve Page 3, Article IV, Section C, Lines 121-123 and Page 4, Article V, Section A, Line 144-147 substantive edits to the Bylaws (president-elect) by paper ballot made and seconded – 31 for, 10 against, 0 abstained – The motion passes by more than two-thirds vote.

New Business:

1. RTP Policy Committee: Enhanced Peer Review - Drs. Uma Iyer, Kallina Dunkle, and Mickey Wadia (Action Item) (15 minutes)

Dr. Uma Iyer greeted the Senate and let them know the materials were posted on the Documents for Review webpage. The RTP Policy Subcommittee (Drs. Dunkle and Wadia) took the feedback that they received from January's Faculty Senate meeting and edited the process to make it easier. The RTP Policy Committee thanked the Faculty Red Committee for laying the groundwork for the enhanced peer review of teaching process. Dr. Iyer presented an overview of the enhanced peer review.

The following would remain the same as our current policy:

- All peer reviews will be in the e-dossier.
- Faculty can choose to have additional peer reviews above the minimum

The following are the changes from our current policy:

- There is an increase from 1 to 2 evaluations per cycle = enhanced
- There is an increase from 1 to 2 evaluators per evaluation = best practice

The faculty member and the faculty member's department chair will *mutually* agree on the two evaluators who will come to your class whether in person or online. Faculty in years 1 - 3 will have two reports consisting of both a formative and a summative evaluation approximately four to six weeks apart. Faculty in years 4 - tenure and promotion will only get summative reports. Those faculty will have the same two evaluators coming to their class at two different times. It could be the same course or two different courses. It could also happen during two different semesters. The bottom line is that everyone will get four reports.

Senate President Semler hoped that everyone had a chance to review the language in advance of today's meeting. She reminded everyone that she took a straw poll during the last Faculty Senate meeting and, at that time, we were all in support of the change. The

minutes reflect this outcome. Nothing has changed since then. Today, we are voting on the language that has been written into the RTP Policy.

Motion to accept the RTP Policy with the Enhanced Peer Review new language made, seconded, and passed

Discussion:

Q: What is the rationale for including the formative evaluation in the e-dossier?

A: The formative evaluation is included in the e-dossier so you can see one's improvement from the first (formative) evaluation to the second (summative) evaluation.

Q: How will you know if faculty show improvement? If someone performs poorly, it could color the opinion of the other evaluator.

A: In order to see an improvement or a decline, ideally there needs to be some type of documentation.

Q: How do you know the formative evaluation happens if you don't document it?

Q: I have a question about the reviewer selection process. Is there a limit on vetoes if the faculty member and the chair disagree on who is selected as the reviewers?

A: It is up to the faculty member and the Chair to work together to mutually agree on the reviewers.

Q: What if that isn't possible?

A: If the faculty member and the Chair cannot agree on the reviewers, then the Dean would need to step in.

Comment: I do not think this would have to be written into the policy. The Dean would step in if there were any problems between the two.

Comment: It is also written in the language on what to do if you are in a smaller department and you do not have enough faculty. Again, you would go to the Dean.

Motion to extend the time by 7 minutes made, seconded, and passed

Q: Can the chair be an evaluator?

A: Yes, chairs can conduct the evaluation.

Comment: Keep in mind that tenure-track faculty are not all new faculty. I came to APSU with ten years of teaching experience. I think providing a formative evaluation would benefit the new instructor, but not as much for the experienced instructor.

Comment: I understand the need for formative assessments, but I think this is excessive. I get having two evaluators at the same time, but not four evaluations. It just seems unnecessary.

Comment: I am hearing that having four evaluations will create too much work for everyone. It's just more work!

Comment: We shared the proposed Enhanced Peer Review of Teaching with our college and I am going to read their comments:

- Overall, the College of Business (CoB) is against the Enhanced Peer Review.
- Logistically, this is going to be very difficult for our tenured faculty to complete the evaluations. We have a faculty member from CoB who completed eight evaluations last year. Essentially, this year she would be required to complete sixteen evaluations.

- This seems like a mediation process for faculty who cannot earn acceptable student evaluation scores. This is not a process that every faculty member may need.
- This process put a lot of weight on tenured faculty because if we do not have enough in our departments/college, we may have to leave our departments/college to get an evaluator. Who decides which college we get the evaluator from? Is it Academic Affairs or our Dean?
- Will the evaluator have access to the gradebook and student names? Will a separate shell be needed?
- The evaluator will actually have to provide two reports per evaluation in years 1-3 which is too much work.
- The expectation of coordinating two evaluators to ensure that both evaluators are there at the same time causes a real problem because of class schedules.
- This new process could be a culture slayer if not implemented correctly. We are not sure that we can trust people if we don't have any say on the faculty doing the evaluations. Again, for the CoB, it is a logistic issue.

Comment: I agree there are some logistics behind the policy that we will need to work out.

Comment: The online evaluator will have student access only. They will not see the gradebook. This process is to mimic what they will be seeing in a face-to-face class.

Motion to approve the RTP Policy with the Enhanced Peer Review new language – 12 for, 24 against, and 1 abstain – The motion failed

Comment: The RTP Policy Committee did our work. Just like Dr. Amy Thompson said, it could be anyone of you up here and on this committee. We looked at everyone's interests, and you know we did our job, so no worries.

2. Academic White Committee Report: Student Course Evaluations, Dr. Jeffrey Williams (15 minutes)

Senate President Semler introduced Dr. Williams and provided background about the student course evaluations. She said this is a redesign of the current course evaluation form, as well as new language for the P & G that we can consider.

Dr. Williams greeted the Senate and thanked the Academic White Committee (Eva Gibson, Cheryl Lambert, Michelle Robertson, and Saeid SamadiDana) for working on the course evaluation tool and weight in the RTP process. He also thanked Donna Short and Melissa Kates for their contributions. Dr. Williams said Dr. Short did much of the front-end work.

Dr. Williams provided some background information about the current tool. For example, he said the bulk of this tool was created in 1975, with little or no edits. He pointed out that much of the world has changed during the past fifty years and that our student evaluation tool should reflect those changes. Dr. Williams pointed out the following issues with the current tool:

- Our current student course evaluation tool comes across like a customer satisfaction survey. [Dr. Williams said that isn't what we are about. We want a tool that is actionable and provides instructors with helpful feedback.]
- The tool is very old and there is a lack of attention placed on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI).
- There are no questions that address student participation and responsibilities in the course.
- The current tool does not provide relevant actional feedback to the instructor. [Dr. Williams provided some examples.]

The current evaluation tool is based on a six-point Likert scale (excellent, very good, good, fair, and keeps going down from there). Dr. Williams said the Committee does not believe we need all of those points. They also did not want a number that would be neutral, because a student can select everything down the middle and that doesn't help the instructor. Another change is that there are comment sections next to each area. They added the comment section to each area so that students would not wait until the end of the evaluation tool to have an explosion of comments.

There are major changes with the new questions. The current tool has twenty-five questions. Our proposed form has four sections with a total of eight questions:

- Presentation of Content (four questions and one comment section)
- Class Environment (four questions and one comment section)
- Open Questions (four open-ended questions not included in the e-dossier)
- Student Self-Evaluation (four questions that are not about the instructor and will not be averaged)

Dr. Williams said with this new model, the instructor is getting eight questions. Comments from the four open-ended questions, according to our current RTP Policy, would not be included in the e-dossier. The Committee believes that the new open-ended questions are much more engaging than the current open-ended questions. Also, the Student Self-Evaluation will not count towards the instructor because this section is not about you. The order of the four sections can be reordered. The Committee thought about placing the Student Self-Evaluation first. This way, the student must reflect on their own performance in the class before evaluating the instructor.

There are big changes to the evaluation tool. The big buzzword that is an outcome from our work is, "practitioner." It doesn't matter if it is your first year of teaching or your fortieth year, we want you to continue to think about your teaching methods and how you can possibly make them better. It's not about the score, it's about being honest with ourselves and looking at ways to improve our pedagogy from the student feedback.

Additionally, the new instrument may inherently contribute to course improvements and faculty development initiatives coming from Austin Peay's CAFÉ. Dr. Williams read the proposed language for the RTP P & G:

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.

This Committee is proposing that this new tool would be used in every course whether it is a lecture course or a lab course. The Committee wanted just one evaluation form, not two; however, they want to hear from those who teach labs.

Senate President Semler said that we can be in favor of the updated form separate from the proposed RTP language. She said if we decide we need more time to discuss the proposed changes, we can do that. There is nothing that says we cannot bring this back for another discussion. Senate President Semler wanted us to remember that this is not in policy at this time, it is just a recommendation.

Motion to accept the proposed Student Course Evaluation Report made, seconded, and passed

Discussion:

Comment: This is all loosey-goosey.

Comment: In the section where the instructor is required write a narrative about how they are going to improve, I think it would have more meaning if you could include something like evaluating the performance of the class. What I mean here is that I have had late assignments turned in, and many times, the students will say they didn't look at the schedule. So, if you have a class that does this and they get upset, you can easily get a bad or negative evaluation because you took points off for the late assignment. The instructor should have a way to report how the class performed overall--late assignments, project success, one-on-one meetings, and the like. Just something that will alert the RTP committee member to be able to read what happened in the class.

Senate President Semler tried to summarize the above comment by saying that a faculty member should be able to respond to the negative comments that might get put into the e-dossier. Is that right?

Comment: No, not necessarily to respond to negative comments, but to be able to provide context for the class. For example, only 50% of the students handed in the assignment on the due date and 50% of the students were late submitting their assignments. Students did not ask for an extension or have an excuse. This gives the reader context to know what is going on in the classroom. There must be a metric to assess the class that everyone sees.

Comment: You can get your questions and comments to Dr. Williams.

Motion to extend the time by 7 minutes made, seconded, and passed

Comment: We should evaluate the form. This is a nationwide initiative here and a new form is not going to fix all of our problems. We do want to have a better form than the one we currently are using. That is a goal.

Comment: Evaluate the form separately from the end statement.

Comment: I've been reading about this topic, not that I am well-versed in it. I'm absolutely not. The average student revels to evaluate faculty; however, they can better evaluate their own learning experience. My concern with the questions, is that each one of them starts with *the instructor...*

Comment: That was intentional.

Comment: I would prefer it didn't begin with *the instructor....* It doesn't mean the student is not evaluating the instructor's contributions to the course if you could say it in a different way. For example, *I understood the outcomes in the course*. If the students don't understand this, there was a disconnect somewhere in what the instructor was trying to do in the course. Then this tells us something without saying you've done something wrong.

Comment: I think what people are describing is what our Committee was trying to get away from. Because someone doesn't like your course, doesn't mean that someone didn't teach it well.

Comment: If the wording was something like, *the course was organized in such a way that it facilitated my learning...*, it is more informative to the instructor on some level.

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

Comment: Adding a section about what grade a student thinks they will receive is important as well.

Q: Is this strictly for e-dossiers or is this for every faculty member? Is this for the annual evaluation process?

A: We are not changing anything about the annual evaluation process. This is just a new form. We are just looking at the proposed language and the form.

Comment: What about technology questions? Some technology issues can affect whether or not the instructor represented the outcomes. I have a separate technology evaluation form that students complete.

Q: Is this college specific?

A: This is across the board for everyone.

Comment: I want to talk about the language for the RTP Policy. As a senior faculty member...I've been here forever. So do you think I'm going to write that narrative if I don't have to?

A: So, this language right here is only for people that are still going through the RTP process.

Comment: We have the form which will replace the 25 questions that we have now. That is not going away and the Provost will not agree to that. For faculty still going through the RTP process, they will be required to write a reflective piece for their e-dossier. It doesn't specify how long it needs to be.

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

Comment: I like symmetry in the form. My only concern is if I am sitting as a student completing the form, and if I read the instructor's presumed outcomes of the course and I'm already angry at the instructor, I'm just going to go straight down the list and mark: strongly disagree. If the wording was different and we didn't start with "*the instructor...*" I'm not going to think my instructor is such a jerk.

Q: Since we didn't pass the Enhanced Peer Evaluation, and this is supposed to be a

recommendation to Academic Affairs, can you give us some clarification about this?

A: Academic Affairs will not allow us to put this through without having the Enhanced Peer Review completed.

Comment: The form is separate from the policy.

Comment: I like anything that makes me do less work.

Comment: I just want to remind everyone that the P & G prohibits including comments. There was a real battle in the Senate to remove student comments but everyone agreed in the end.

Comment: You still get the comments, but they are not going into your e-dossier.

Comment: There will need to be a procedure to block the comments out.

Comment: I encourage you to think about what we may do with the Enhanced Peer Review. We can revisit this this again if we have some good ideas and suggestions. Please send them to me [Senate President Semler] and we can keep working on that.

Motion to table the Enhanced Peer Review until the March meeting made, seconded, and passed

3. Policies for Review (5 minutes)

a. Action items

- i. 2:056 Grant Proposal, Application Preparation, and Award Policy

Motion to accept the edits to Policy 2:056 made, seconded, and passed

- ii. 2:059 Sponsored Research Incentive Program

Comment: This policy addresses external spending in that the administration reserves the right to restrict or recollect professional development funds in the event of financial exigency.

Comment: If they declared an emergency, you wouldn't be able to stop it anyway.

Comment: They can fire us, if that's the case.

Comment: These funds may not all be federal funds.

Comment: Nothing we pass at the university could surpass the federal or state law.

Q: Who is the new director?

A: Tim Atkinson is the Director of Grants and Sponsored Programs.

Comment: Indirect costs are university expenses like lights, space, and the like.

Comment: That's what they are saying here. If the university needs the indirect costs that they gave you, they can take them back in an emergency.

Comment: The word that bothers me the most is "recollect."

Motion to table Policy 2:059 made, seconded, and passed

b. Information items

- i. 2:002 Research (Faculty, Staff, and / or Student) Involving Human Subjects
- ii. 2:003 Continuing Education Units
- iii. 2:004 Non-Credit Activities
- iv. 2:019 Misconduct in Research and Other Creative Activities
- v. 2:034 Faculty and Academic Staff Abroad
- vi. 2:038 Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions Policy
- vii. 2:039 Minors on Campus
- viii. 2:045 Definition of Faculty
- ix. 2:058 Grants Management: Budgeting, Spending, and Responsibilities

Motion to approve the non-substantive edits to the list of Policies: 2:002, 2:003, 2:004, 2:019, 2:034, 2:038, 2:039, 2:045, and 2:058 made, seconded, and passed

Adjourn: 5:43

**Budget Advisory Task Force
Summary of February 2, 2022 Meeting**

Presiding: Mitch Robinson, Sondra Hamilton

Present: Kito Aruh, Carol Clark, Notashia Crenshaw-Williams, Maria Cronley, Florian Gargaillo, Gerald Harrison, Walter Lord, Eric Norman, Jane Semler, Jerica Swiger, Dannelle Whiteside.

1. Non-Mandatory Fees: Proposed Increases & Proposed New Fees

a. Proposed Non-Mandatory Fee Increases

Fee Name	Current Fee	New Fee	Purpose
Ready to Teach (FEDU)	\$25.00	\$40.00	Cover Master Clinicians, voucher fees, and other training costs.
Business Course Fee	\$40.00	\$55.00	Cover two new faculty lines and help to meet accreditation rules.
Aviation Flight Lab Fee	\$395.00	\$425.00	Cover insurance, hangar rental, and additional equipment.

b. Proposed New Non-Mandatory Fees

Fee Name	New Fee	Purpose
Culinary Arts Fee	\$60.00	Replace existing textbook fee and fund food and equipment purchases.
Psychological Science Advising / Lab Fee	\$10.00	Support undergraduate program (including new instructional faculty), as existing faculty have gravitated towards graduate program.
Master of Healthcare Administration Fee	\$30.00	Cover program director's travel to annual conference, adjunct pay, and costs associated with advisory board, as program seeks accreditation.
Master of Public Health Fee	\$30.00	Cover student travel to conferences, sending program director to conference, bringing public health speakers, certification fees, and equipment for new program / new courses. (New program starting Fall 2022.)
CoBHS Student Success Fee	\$5.00	Cover health professions coordinator, professional advisors, and staff to assist with recruitment and social media.
CoSTEM Fee	\$5.00	Cover additional advisors, technological equipment, and staff to assist with recruitment and social media.
CoAL Fee	\$5.00	Cover additional advisors, technological equipment, and staff to assist with recruitment and social media.

Note: Academic Affairs will control the use of the CoBHS Student Success Fee, CoSTEM Fee, and CoAL Fee in accordance with a strategic enrollment plan.

2. Proposed State Appropriations

Gov. Bill Lee released the following proposal for state appropriations and capital projects on Feb. 1. The state legislature will meet to finalize the budget proposal.

a. Appropriations Proposal

Health Insurance Premium Increase	\$515,100
Salary Pool	\$1,993,900
Outcomes Formula Growth	\$4,306,600
Outcomes Redistribution	\$1,733,000
Appropriations Increase for APSU 2022-23	\$8,548,300

b. Capital Projects Proposal

Campus Wide Elevator Modernization	\$1,000,000
Dunn HVAC & Electric Modernization Phase 2	\$1,000,000
Dunn HVAC & Electric Modernization Phase 3	\$1,000,000
Kimbrough Classroom and Office Renovations	\$9,175,000

Provosts Council Report

Provosts Council met on 2/11/2022

The following policies were discussed at the provost council meeting:

- 1) 2:001 – Curricular Development and Modification Approval
- 2) 2:006 – Faculty Professional Development Assignments
- 3) 2:007 – Research Involving Animals
- 4) 2:015 – Experiential Learning Credit
- 5) 2:022 – Posthumous Degree
- 6) 2:024 – Reverse Transfer: Policies, Procedures and Guidelines
- 7) 2:025 – Limitations on Enrollments
- 8) 2:029 – Components of Articulation Agreements
- 9) 2:030 – Learning Support
- 10) 2:035 – APSU Bulletin Policy
- 11) 2:037 – Use of Copyrighted Materials
- 12) 2:042 – Allocation and Recruitment of Faculty
- 13) 2:044 – Emeritus Faculty, Professionals, and Administrators
- 14) 2:051 – Faculty Appointments
- 15) 2:052 – Academic Freedom and Responsibility
- 16) 2:054 – Employment of Graduate Assistants
- 17) 2:055 – Research and Scholarly Activities
- 18) 2:057 – Grants Award and Declination Policy
- 19) 2:012 - Faculty Retention of Unreturned Student Work
- 20) 2:021 - Articulation with Proprietary College (merged into policy 2:029)
- 21) 2:028 - Articulation among Community Colleges and APSU (merged into policy 2:029)
- 22) 2:023 - Awarding of Credits Earned Through Extra-Institutional Learning to the University (merged into policy 2:015)

Dr. Perry Scanlan (Faculty Senate Vice President & Provost Council Rep.) offered a non-substantive change to policy 2:001 – Curricular Development and Modification Approval. Changed the word “proved” to provided. This section of the policy noted that an annual report would be provided to the provost.

The policies were unanimously accepted.

[illegible]