

Austin Peay State University
Faculty Senate
Called Meeting of Thursday, March 29, 2018
Morgan University Center, Rm #307 | 3:00 pm
Minutes

Call to order – Senate President Mickey Wadia

Recognition of Guests: Sheila Bryant, Christine Mathenge, Karen Meisch, Bruce Myers, Costin Shamble, Ann Silverberg, Karen Sorenson, and Tim Winters

Roll call of Senators – Senate Secretary Gina Garber

Absent Senators: Christopher Bailey, Lisa Barron, Kell Black, Trevor Brooks, Mary Fran Davis, Taylor Emery, Kelly Jones, William Longhurst, John Nicholson, Justin Oelgoetz, James Prescott, Robin Reed, Margaret Rennerfeldt, Mary Eve Rice, Allyn Smith, and John Volker

Approval of today’s agenda – Motion made, seconded, and passed

1. Remarks

Senate President Mickey Wadia

- Advisory Comments: Senate President Wadia thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He reminded the Senate that everyone can have a voice. We need to hear one person speak at a time. One of the most sincere forms of respect is actually listening to what another has to say, so please give the person speaking the time and respect needed. Guests are welcome to speak freely today without asking for permission. Raise your hand, speak, and let’s move on. There has been considerable negotiation with the policies and documents that we are voting on today. I have been included in discussions about the content you will see today. Thank you to those who are presenting today.

2. New Business

- Anti-Bullying Policy: Dr. Marsha Lyle-Gonga, Sheila Bryant, Director EO/AA, Title VI/XI Coordinator, ADA Coordinator Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and Costin Shamble, University Attorney answered questions about the proposed policy.

Motion made and seconded to accept the Anti-Bullying Policy.

Discussion followed:

- Some of us were talking about the examples listed. “Excluding or isolating someone socially.” Who we interact with outside of the university is our business. We do not want the university telling us who we can have a beer with or who we are going to invite to dinner. Many of the Anti-Bullying Policy examples were discussed.
- Suggestion to add written reprimand – non-tenured faculty terminated

Motion to extend time by 10 minutes moved and seconded.

Additional discussion of the Policy.

Motion to extend time by 10 minutes moved, second, and passed

Additional discussion of the Policy.

Final motion to extend by 5 minutes moved, second, and passed.

Motion made and seconded to amend the language of the Policy to include the two suggestions from the Staff Senate. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion to accept the Anti-Bullying Policy - Passed as amended.

- 33/AAS Undergraduate Hour Requirements – Dr. Karen Meisch (5 minutes)

Motion made and seconded to accept the change to allow AAS students to pursue the appropriate BS degrees with the reduced requirement of 33 upper division hour requirements.

Discussion followed:

Getting Faculty Senate support to change the hours will only benefit our efforts moving forward.

Pros:

- Will allow students to progress and graduate at a pace consistent with their peers that have earned an AS.
- This move can be used as a potential recruitment tool for those that are thinking of pursuing a BS from an AAS (a clear pathway).
- Because this is a more technical degree there is no change or decrease of the learning base for these students.
- There are many instances of allowing this to occur already with our transfer students and are all approved individually starting at the chair level up through the provost. This would make it a degree requirement so that this would not need special approval.

Cons:

- Some students that do not understand what an AAS entails may not understand why they are also not allowed to have a reduced number of upper division hours.
- Potential confusion for students on degree requirements

Motion made and seconded to extend Dr. Meisch's remarks by 5 minutes.

During the February Faculty Senate meeting it was suggested that we change the overall degree requirements to 33 hours instead of just the AAS recipients. This benefits programs such as Sociology, Computer Science, and Engineering Technology. This would allow students who have earned a more technical degree the ability to have more flexibility and make a transfer from an AAS to a BS one that allowed them to receive their BS in a similar amount of time as an AS. Because an AAS student takes more technical classes and not as much core, they have to take more core. Even though their more technical classes are sometimes very similar to our upper division courses, we

cannot transfer them in as an upper division (UD) hour class that fulfills our upper division hour requirement.

Pros:

- No confusion for degree requirements if everyone has the same.
- Since this would be listed as a MINIMUM requirement, there would be no issues with any academic program requiring ABOVE the minimum. For schools where there was no UD policy for the university, some of them had degree specific UD hour requirements.
- Transfer pathways can potentially be even a bit smoother. For instance a student that takes organic chemistry can transfer that course in but it cannot count as an upper division hour requirement. This would allow them a bit more breathing room to take all other courses required if they have already taken a course at a community college that here is not a 2000 level course.

Cons:

- Academic programs may feel pressure to lower their standards and UD hour requirements.

Motion made and seconded to support the proposal for 33 upper division hours for all programs. Motion passed.

- Policy 1:010 Appeals and Appearances Before the Board - Senate President Mickey Wadia (5 minutes)

Motion made and seconded to accept Policy 1:010 Appeals and Appearances Before the Board

Discussion followed:

1:010 decisions will go to the University President, not to the Board of Trustees

Policy Statement

It is the policy of Austin Peay State University to allow a student or employee to appeal ~~the final~~ certain decisions of the president to the Board of Trustees (Policy 1:010, p. 1).

Procedures

A. A student or employee of Austin Peay State University may appeal ~~a final~~ certain decisions of the president to the Board (Policy 1:010, p. 1).

B. Appeals heard pursuant to the TN Uniform Administrative Procedures Act (UAPA) ~~UAPA hearings~~, as outlined in APSU Policy 1:007, are not appealable to the Board. (Policy 1:010, p. 1).

- E. **5. Faculty promotions;**
- ~~5.6.~~ **Salary determinations;**
- ~~6.7.~~ **Student academic matters, e.g. grade appeals, failure to meet retention policies, etc.:**
- ~~7.8.~~ **Performance evaluations of faculty and staff; and**
- ~~8.9.~~ **Residency classification of student for tuition and fee purposes (Policy 1:010, p. 2).**

Motion made and seconded to approve Policy 1:010 Appeals and Appearances Before the Board – Motion unanimously passed.

- Rules Committee - Senate Vice President Jane Semler (15 minutes)

Motion made and seconded to accept the Bylaws.

Discussion followed:

Proposed changes:

- Added a Bylaws Definition
- Future agenda items should be suggested by members of the Senate to a member of the Executive Committee
- Limiting the Provost remarks to 15 minutes
- Moving part of Section C that requires the Senate President to meet with the President and Provost weekly to Section B.
- Attendance of Executive sessions requiring a vote for non-members of the Senate
- Defining the Nomination Committee
- Faculty Senate requirement to be a Full Professor
- Constituted areas Update

Vote on the proposed Bylaws’ changes will occur at the April 26, 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting.

- Study Abroad Policy – Drs. Karen Sorenson and Christine Mathenge (20 minutes)

Motion made and seconded to accept Policy 2:017.

Discussion followed:

Policy 2:017 - Development and Operation of Study Abroad Programs:

Students with Disciplinary Violation:

With input from the Dean of Students, the Committee updated the Application Procedures, Section D. Item a. regarding students who have had a serious disciplinary violations participating in the Study Abroad program.

No student with a formal disciplinary violation ~~within the past 12 months~~ or a pending formal disciplinary violation will be considered for study abroad. ~~Students who have been suspended from the~~

university for a code of conduct violation are prohibited from participating in any future study abroad program. Students who have been denied participation in study abroad may appeal the decision through formal procedures outlined the Code of Student Conduct.

(Policy 2:017, p. 5)

Motion made and seconded to accept the amendment. Motion passed.

State Department Travel Advisories – there is no travel to level 4 countries
If you go to the U.S. Department of State website you will see four travel advisories at the top right: Level 1: Exercise normal precautions; Level 2: Exercise increased caution; Level 3: Reconsider travel; and Level 4: Do not travel (Policy 2:017, pp. 7-9).
Low-Enrolled Study Abroad Programs: – the minimum student enrollment changed from ten to four students. We want more students to have a study abroad experience. We also want to increase opportunities from under-represented student populations to have a chance to travel abroad and truly have a global experience outside of Europe. Faculty teaching in the CCSA program will still need four to ten students (Policy 2:017, p. 12).

Travel Expenses: The faculty member can apply for funding. However, the decision is determined by time, location, and program (Policy 2:017, p. 13).

Motion made, seconded, and passed to accept the changes to include the title to Policy 2:017.

- Policy on Academic Promotion 2:063; Tenure Procedures and Guidelines - Elaine Berg (30 minutes)

Motion made and seconded to accept Policy 2:063 and the Tenure Procedures and Guidelines.

Discussion followed:

Policy 2:063: Changes to this document have been examined by many.

Appeals - The proposed change is for the promotion appeals to stop at the level of the President.

The purpose of this policy is to help ensure that promotions are made objectively, equitably, impartially, and as recognition of merit in line with the following policy guidelines. The President of APSU is responsible for the master staffing plan of the University. In developing such a plan, the President will consider the fiscal impact of each promotion ~~recommended to the APSU Board of Trustees~~, that is, resources allocated and distributed to the University. (Policy 2:063, p. 1)

The final decision stops with the Provost if e-dossier evaluations are positive.

Negative Promotion Decision:

Faculty members seeking promotion may only appeal a negative promotion decision by the Provost to the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Board. ~~recommendation as provided for in APSU Policy No. 1:025 “Policy on Academic Tenure.” and adhere to deadlines on the RTP Calendar for Faculty Personnel Actions.~~ (Policy 2:063, p.4)

Withdraw a promotion e-dossier (Policy 2:063, p.12)

Optional Written Responses (Policy 2:063, p.14)

Motion passed.

- APSU Tenure Procedures and Guidelines:

Preparing Your E-dossier

The link was updated (p. 4).

Direct Instructions to Faculty for Preparing the E-Dossiers for Personnel Review Processes

Faculty are no longer permitted to upload or remove documents from their dossier. The Academic Affairs Technical Support Coordinator will have this responsibility.

Motion made and seconded to approve section one, pages 1-20 of the APSU Tenure Procedures and Guidelines. Motion passed.

Faculty Awarded Years Toward Tenure and/or Promotion

Past work can be counted towards tenure (TP&G, p. 24).

Removal of the Abstain vote and the option for recusals

Signing reports (TP&G, p. 34)

Optional Two-Page Written Response (TP&G, p. 34)

Motion made and seconded to approve section two, pages 21-41 of the APSU Tenure Procedures and Guidelines. Motion passed.

Calendar

We have a four-page RTP Calendar. There is another issue with the calendar so it is not ready for review at this time. The Provost developed a new calendar for us to consider.

Motion made, seconded, and passed to extend Dr. Wadia’s remarks by 5 minutes.

Additional discussion of the RTP Calendar.

Motion made, seconded, and passed to extend Dr. Wadia’s remarks by 10 minutes.

Motion passed.

- Faculty Handbook
New Participation Requirement for Online and Hybrid Teaching – Senate President Mickey Wadia (10 minutes)

Online and hybrid courses must abide by all institutional attendance reporting responsibilities. Please refer to the following online and hybrid attendance definitions in order to assist with the reporting of attendance in online/hybrid courses.

Online Attendance Definition & Expectations

Online course content and interaction (instructor-to-student, student-to-student) is delivered 100% online via a learning management system. Student attendance in online courses is defined as active participation, which will be characterized by the student's timely submission of assignments. A student is expected to complete all such assignments by the appropriate due date. Faculty should employ mechanisms for tracking active participation.

Hybrid Attendance Definition & Expectations

Hybrid courses have required on-campus meeting and online attendance requirements. Student attendance in hybrid courses will be defined as active participation, which will be characterized by attending class and the student's timely submission of assignments by the appropriate due date. Faculty should employ mechanisms for tracking active participation. Additionally, students enrolled in a hybrid course will meet with their instructor on the first day of the class. The syllabus should include the instructor on-campus course meeting expectations for which students are required to be on campus.

Guidelines for Online or Hybrid Active Participation Requirements

- Students simply logging into a learning management system and viewing an online or hybrid course will NOT qualify as active participation.
- Instructors in online and hybrid courses are responsible for providing students with clear instructions for how they are required to actively participate in the course (i.e. specify in the course syllabus, calendar, meeting dates/times, etc)
- Online/hybrid Instructors should incorporate periodic mechanisms for documenting student's active participation in a course and a student's timely submission of graded assignments (weekly discussion, assessment, course activity, etc).
- Students who fail to meet active participation requirements within the first 14 days of the course should be given an FN (Never Attended). If a student meets active participation requirements during the first week of class, and then subsequently fails to actively participate, students should be given an FA (Failure to Attend).

Departments and programs governed by accreditation or certification standards may have different attendance policies. Instructors may further refine these requirements to fit a particular course. Such additional requirements should be clearly stated in the syllabus and should not contradict active participation requirements outlined above (Faculty Handbook, p. 38-39).

Minimum Technology Requirements: Syllabus documents for courses should provide minimum technology requirements related to required hardware, software, online proctoring or instructional technology. In addition, the syllabus should provide clear instructions for students on how they may obtain, install or use instructional technology (Faculty Handbook, p. 82).

FA/FN Statement for Web-Based Courses

~~Students should receive a grade of FN for a web-based course if they fail to log in to the course D2L site during the first two weeks of a regular semester or the equivalent percentage for classes which meet less than a full semester. A grade of FA is awarded when the student stops attending the class as evidenced by consecutive failure to participate in the course via the D2L course site. The instructor's policy for awarding the FA grade should be a part of the course attendance policy and clearly stated in the course syllabus. The level of participation constituting "attendance" will be different for each course depending on the instructor, but it must be more than the student simply logging in the course D2L site.~~

Students will receive a grade of FN (Never Attended) for a web-based course if they fail to meet active participation requirements ~~the first week~~ within the first 14 days of ~~of~~ a regular semester or the equivalent percentage for classes which meet less than a full semester. A grade of FA (Failure to Attend) is awarded when the student stops attending the class *as evidenced by consecutive failure to meet active participation requirements in the course via the learning management system*. The instructor's policy for awarding the FA grade should be a part of the course attendance policy and clearly stated in the course syllabus. The level of participation constituting "attendance" will be different for each course depending on the instructor, but it must be more than the student simply logging in or accessing the course via the learning management system. For more information on what constitutes active participation and online and hybrid course attendance please refer to Class Rolls and Attendance Report Rosters in the Faculty Handbook (Faculty Handbook, p. 83).

Motion made and seconded to accept the Faculty Handbook with the edits. Motion passed.

- Socrates Award:
The Socrates Award description is not included in the Awards To Faculty section of the Handbook.

Motion made and seconded to include the Socrates Award in the Faculty Handbook.

Motion passed.

Adjourn 5:58 p.m.