

Unapproved Minutes of the Regular Meeting  
of the Faculty Senate, June 11, 1992

Senators Present: Asanbe, Christian, Fung, Glass, Gore, Gotcher, Mabry, Magrans, Rayburn, Richards, Shaffer, Tatham

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Tatham. Minutes of May 7 were approved.

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. Butler:

The budget was submitted to the Board of Regents about 3 weeks ago, and President Page has reviewed the budget with the Board staff. Most of the budget has been given verbal approval, although official approval by the Chancellor is still pending.

Dr. Page is currently attending the annual Aspen Institute on Information Technology. This is a major conference involving industrial leaders from around the country. Dr. Page was invited by Northern Telecom to participate in this conference.

Seventeen faculty positions have been filled. About half of these are truly new positions and about half represent positions which were frozen by TBR for the 1991-92 year. They are all considered new positions officially because the Board of Regents technically eliminated most frozen APSU positions.

Universities statewide are still prohibited from granting salary increases. There is, however, some money in the budget for increases if the state lifts the salary freeze. The amount of money in the budget for raises corresponds to 3% of the total amount currently being paid in salaries. Since this money is already budgeted, some salary raises may be possible in January even if the legislature appropriates no new money at that time. It is not known if there will be any effort statewide to provide across-the-board salary increases. At this point, promotion increases are the only increases begin permitted by the state.

The University administration has lobbied extensively for equity increases especially for nursing faculty as some of these salaries are extremely out of line with the salaries of more newly hired nursing faculty. Nursing salaries outside of academia are rising very fast, and it is very expensive to recruit new nursing faculty. It is assumed that other institutions are having this problem as well.

Question: Is there a new position in philosophy?

Answer: No, although this is a goal.

Question: When will merit increases which are one year overdue be granted?

Answer: As soon as the state will allow. It is possible that these raises could be granted in January. The money is budgeted.

Question: The merit process was suspended last year. Will the merit process be implemented this year?

June 11, 1992

Answer: No final decision has been made.

Travel budgets for faculty are back to normal; the ban on out of state travel has been lifted. Administrative travel budgets have not been restored, and administrators have had no raises for three years. The Faculty Development Budget has been restored.

Faculty Professional Development Assignments will be funded at 88% of full formula this year. This figure is up from 83% last year. The university may be able to involve 2 or 3 faculty in professional development assignments this year, although with increased enrollment it will be difficult to release people for this purpose. The eventual goal is to involve 6-10 faculty members per year in faculty development assignments.

The \$324,000 figure for equipment mentioned in the May faculty meeting by President Page is not in the final budget. This year the Board said that we did not have to appropriate funds from the overall fund in order to match the special legislative appropriation for instructional equipment. We have had to match this figure in the past. The actual figure in the budget for equipment is \$212,000 in addition to roughly \$40,000 for equipment in the Developmental Studies budget. This \$40,000 figure is mandated by the state and is calculated on the basis of enrollment and the number of students served by the Developmental Studies Program.

Renovations to Harned Hall have been funded at about 3.2 million dollars. The construction work is projected to cost 2.2 to 2.3 million. Nearly one million dollars is planned for the equipping of the building. It will be wired to permit computers in each office and in all classrooms. A writing lab is planned. Faculty involved will be asked to participate in spending decisions involving the equipping of the building.

The 21st Century Classroom Project is primarily funded outside of the regular budget. The state has appropriated money, and the university has received a major grant from Bell South Corporation. Dr. Page is actively seeking other outside money for this and other projects.

There is some computer equipment (primarily DecMates) in offices which is obsolete. Maintenance has become a problem since parts are unavailable. About \$90,000 has been set aside to replace these computers.

Question: Will we look beyond the DecMates to the AT's that are about the same age (approximately 8 years)?

Answer: Most of the \$212,000 mentioned earlier has already been designated, but replacement of all obsolete computer equipment is a goal. The Information Systems budget (from student fees) is available for the upgrading of computers in labs across campus. It is possible that all the computers in two campus labs could be replaced this year. Computers which are removed from labs will be available for faculty offices.

Question: Has there been any effort to increase faculty research support?

Answer: We have the lowest research budget in the state. This situation will not change this year.

June 11, 1992

Question: Does TBR produce comparative statistics on faculty research?

Answer: Only in terms of money. Our productivity per dollar spent is good.

Question: Is it a goal to put computers in all faculty offices?

Answer: We have a goal of putting a PC in the office of every faculty member who wants one within the next three years. Any faculty member who wants a computer should be able to get one this year from one of the labs which is being refurbished. Within two years the entire campus (including dorms) should be wired with fiber optic cable.

#### OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Hutcheson (on behalf of the Committee To Review Faculty Personnel Policies/Procedures):

(Note: Dr. Richard Gildrie was also present, representing the committee.) Your attention is called to the memorandum (attached to these minutes).

In reference to Item 2: The Board Policy specifies that prospective faculty must meet certain criteria for appointment to the various ranks. These criteria usually refer to teaching effectiveness and/or public service and/or scholarly productivity (or in some cases, potential for same). What we have done is change and make more stringent the policy for Austin Peay as compared to Board policy. The instances of "and/or" in the policy have been replaced with "and," resulting in more stringent criteria. We want to be up front about this so that you are aware of the change that has been made.

In reference to Item 4.d: In the past the report has often contained few details other than the statement of the committee's recommendation. The personnel policy has said in the past, "reasons shall be given," but it has not happened. Another change is that the chairman (or dean) does not automatically have to leave during the vote. If any committee member requests it, he/she must leave. The vote will still be by secret ballot, with no committee member's individual vote on record. Currently, the dean may have to get up and leave many times during a meeting.

Question: In regard to Item 4.c, when a person is in his/her sixth year, the material in the dossier is cumulative through year one?

Answer: Yes.

Dr. Butler: In the past, a committee might cite certain weaknesses on the form. Then the committee the following year might not have that form to see if these weaknesses had been corrected. It has been quite difficult for the various committees to know what kind of professional development has occurred. This change in policy is an attempt to create for the personnel committees a sequence of the kinds of events that document a faculty member's development. I think that this (4.c) is an excellent decision on the part of the committee.

June 11, 1992

Dr. Hutcheson: In reference to Item 6, Examples of "uniquely organized departments" would be Developmental Studies and the Library.

The purpose of this report is to inform you of the major changes which have been proposed by our committee. We have purposely not gotten final approval of this. What we are asking for is your response.

Dr. Gildrie: When we went back and incorporated the Board of Regents criteria for the ranks, what that meant in part is more stringency, but in another part the minimum criteria have been in effect lowered, especially for the rank of Assistant Professor.

If you look at the statewide standards for Assistant Professor, a terminal degree is not required. Since 1976, the practice at APSU has been to require a terminal degree for the rank of Assistant Professor. Dean Nixon and I disagree with the lowering of this standard. We feel that in the College of Arts and Sciences, the more stringent definition of "Assistant Professor" has served us very well. I am not sure what effect this will have on the other colleges. This is something that I think the Faculty Senate should discuss, for it is a serious matter.

The rationale for the change reflected in Item 4.d is to move away from requiring the submission of signed majority and minority reports. The committee feels that this procedure generates unnecessary problems and hostilities. We were looking for a way to create a record that would be honest and clear without creating unnecessary problems.

Comment: Referring to Item 4.b, a personnel committee could be unduly biased by a negative evaluation in an earlier year. Perhaps that faculty member has addressed his weaknesses and subsequently performed in a scholarly fashion. Those earlier evaluations may haunt him.

Answer (Dr. Gildrie): There is also the opposite possibility. Improvement is likely to be viewed favorably by the committee.

Dr. Hutcheson: The old and new policies (Part XI) state, "All those who participate in personnel processes are expected to evaluate all materials in the faculty member's dossier."

Comment: But you are adding additional information to the dossier. Some of that additional information may be negative. One negative statement will outweigh many positive statements.

Comment: Here is an alternate suggestion: Previous personnel forms that have been submitted by personnel committees, department chairs, and administrators should be available if the committee requests them, but they should not be present in the dossier. The committee should focus on the supporting materials in the dossier, and not previous personnel actions. These supporting materials should provide the committee with sufficient knowledge to proceed. The personnel committees should be autonomous, they should not be influenced by prior personnel actions submitted by the dean or the vice-president.

Question: What is public service?

June 11, 1992

Answer (Dr. Hutcheson): Those activities within the general community that are uniquely related to your discipline. Civic organizations like Rotary and Civitan and church memberships do not fall into this category.

Comment (Dr. Gildrie): The point is that good citizens find some way to get involved in the community. Why should we be rewarded by the taxpayers for doing those things that we are expected as decent citizens to do anyway?

Question: Where does advisement fall?

Answer (Dr. Hutcheson): Into the category of teaching effectiveness and academic assignment.

Question: Are the areas of evaluation given equal weight?

Answer (Dr. Gildrie): We have not addressed the idea of weight at all. Traditionally a rough guideline in practice has been 50% teaching, 25% scholarly activity and 25% public service, but this varies depending on the circumstances.

Question: Is coaching Little League considered public service?

Answer: Only if your discipline is physical education.

Comment: I think the idea behind public service is to put out a positive image of the university in ways that are perhaps beyond our academic area. Some of us are restricted in what we can do in those areas much more than other faculty members in other disciplines.

Answer (Dr. Hutcheson): The Policies and Procedures Manual (Part IV.B.3.a.) reads "This category includes presentations related to one's discipline; providing professional advice or consultations to groups or individuals; and providing other types of service related directly to the discipline, particularly in the University's service area."

Question: Does paid professional consulting count?

Answer (Dr. Hutcheson): I don't personally think that there is any conflict with paid professional consulting being considered as service to the community.

Question: Regarding the Memorandum, Item 4.d, who will have the fortitude to ask the dean to leave?

Answer: It is asking a lot.

Comment: Voting may not be a problem, but discussion may be. A committee member should have a right to say what he/she wants without being intimidated by a dean or chairperson.

Answer (Dr. Hutcheson): Would this solve the problem? What about having a secret ballot prior to each discussion and vote to determine if the chair or dean leaves?

June 11, 1992

Question (Dr. Tatham): What is the procedure for approval of the new policies manual? Is a Faculty Senate recommendation required? What is our deadline?

Answer (Dr. Butler): We hope that the Faculty Senate will ratify these changes by this committee and recommend them to the president. A Faculty Senate recommendation is not required for approval, however. We want the policy to be representative of the best thinking of the faculty as a whole and have faculty support and administrative support as well. I would prefer that we have a support action from the Faculty Senate at whatever time is appropriate. We would like to have a new manual in place for the upcoming academic year. The Faculty Senate could act upon it in September and it could still be utilized for that portion of the process except for second-year retention. The other actions take place later in the year.

Dr. Tatham: Anyone who disapproves an item in the draft may send me a counter-proposal for Senate vote. All such correspondence should be received by about two weeks prior to the next Faculty Senate meeting which will occur on September 3, 1992.

#### NEW BUSINESS

##### Invitation to President Page and Vice-President Butler:

It was pointed out that the By-Laws do not permit a blanket invitation of the President and Vice-President for the entire year. The wording of the By-Laws makes it necessary to extend an invitation at each meeting.

The organization of the agenda was discussed and the executive committee was charged with the task of arranging the agenda for individual meetings in such a way as to foster faculty discussion.

All other items on the agenda were postponed due to time constraints and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nell Rayburn, Secretary