

Austin Peay State University
Faculty Senate
Meeting of Thursday, February 27, 2014
University Center, UC 307
3:00pm
Minutes

Call to order – Senate President Chad Brooks

Recognition of Guests: Dr. Ann Silverberg, Dept. of Music; Donna Price, Office of Student Financial Aid & Veterans Affairs

Roll call of Senators – Secretary Lynn Sims

Absent Senators: Cannon, Cervelli, Cockrell, Frederick, Goldstone, Gomez, Hock, Honea, Jones, Kitterman, Lowe, McCarthy, Nicholson, Pearson, Pitts, Reed, Ruiz-Aviles, Semler, Shipley, Starnes, Wells, White-Major, Woods

Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve today's agenda

- Prior to approval of today's agenda, Senate President Brooks stated that two items would possibly be added to today's agenda if time permitted: commencement schedule change and time structure of classes.

Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve the January 23, 2014 minutes

Remarks

1. Senate President – Chad Brooks

- Observed a moment of silence to recognize the passing of Dr. John Moseley (Dept. of Communication), and Blain Hodge (husband of Dr. Bonnie Hodge, Dept. of Mathematics)
- Discussed Distance Education, stating that the March Madness document is nine pages long and empowers staff/faculty to increase certain skill sets. Asked FS to be aware of this document. Also stated that Distance Ed. is creating an e-liaison mentoring program for distant learning. This program will pair a seasoned on-line mentor with a non-seasoned on-line educator. FS President Brooks will share documentation when it becomes more formalized.
- Stated that FS Team Red has finalized the Student Travel Form and this will be on the docket for the next FS meeting. This form should streamline student travel and all procedures associated with this process.
- Stated that requests for Standing Committees will be sent out soon. It is hoped that this process is finalized before the departure of President Hall.
- Discussed parking issues in the vicinity of the College of Science and Mathematics.

2. University President – Tim Hall

- Discussed funding, enrollment numbers, and tuition costs, noting that APSU is beginning to see the effects of Nashville State. Stated that it is unclear if tuition at APSU will increase next year, but based on enrollment numbers at other colleges, it is possible that we may have a 2% tuition increase. Also stated that enrollment and a less-profitable summer session have had a negative impact on us.
- Provided a broad synopsis of SACS, noting that he is still waiting on one report. Also discussed the general process and timeframe of reports and responses to reports.
- Question: Roane State has a budget number similar to ours. What does that represent?
Hall: Persistence and graduation.
Question: Regarding TN College of Applied Technology, can you say something about their success rates? Hall: The numbers for this institution are basically performance numbers but also enrollment.

3. Interim Provost – Jaime Taylor

- Discussed the role of a Provost
- Discussed SACS and acknowledged the response of Faculty to the various requests that they were asked to complete over the past few months. Stated that those items that we passed were critical to us not being put on probation in the next five months. Acknowledged and thanked the QEP writing team. Explained the areas that we got ‘dinged’ on: RODP, which we have no control over (SACS is dinging entire TBR for RODP; Financial Audit, which we have no control over.
- Discussed retention numbers for Spring 2014: We have been at about 85% for retention, but this year we jumped to 88% retention. This retention increase is because of deliberate actions that happened on campus, and we are trying to identify these specific actions so we can replicate them again. Looking at AA, retention went from 82% to 91%. Pell awards went from 83% to 88%. People in housing had to attend at least one activity on campus and this dramatically improved retention. Block scheduling in 2012 had an 85% retention rate but in 2013, it had an 88% retention rate
- Discussed Inside Track: Mid-point overview: 600 in coached group showed a 90% retention impact and 600 in controlled group showed an 88% retention impact. A 5% increase in Fall-to-Fall retention was needed for impact. Looking at various factors indicated that there was no statistical difference between the two groups. Also discussed Nashville States’ numbers concerning Inside Track, which show higher impact numbers.
- Discussed recruitment and impact of AP Day. At the end of last year, we had \$505,000 in Presidential and Deans’ scholarship money accepted. As of today, we are already at \$421,000. As of today, we also have twenty out-of-state scholarships accepted. Last year we had a total of fourteen. We are up in Ayers Scholarship acceptances. Initially we had two students with this scholarship, and last year we had twenty-six students with this scholarship. Stated that we are also up on transfer students (23 students), which is unusual this for this time of year. Also discussed the reputation of AP and how it is gaining positive traction across the state.
- Question: Since Inside Track didn’t make 5%, will we renew the contract? Taylor: No.

4. Director of Financial Aid – Donna Price, Office of Student Financial Aid & Veterans Affairs

- Discussed Guide for Faculty (Feb. 2014), which was accompanied by PowerPoint slides. Discussion areas included: Cohort Default Rate; Loan Indebtedness; What Faculty Need

to Know about Financial Aid; Current Default Prevention Initiatives; FA/FN Grades; Satisfactory Academic Progress; and Financial Aid and VA Students.

- Question: Is there a general guide to what happens if students drop/reduce hours. It will help me talk with them if I know what dropping a class will do to their Financial Aid. Students who fail aren't helping get toward graduation, but if they stay in this course, they're stuck and not going to pass. Price: Yes, this is a vicious cycle, and, yes, we are revamping our guidelines and information to help faculty and students understand what happens in this situation.
- Question: Is it important for us to know the rules for the VA benefits (F vs. FA)? Price: Students will ask for an F over an FA, but we should treat all students the same. If they don't meet your attendance policy, they should get the FA. If they never attend, should get an FN. It is good to know if one of your advisees is a veteran so you can guide them based on the VA requirements. But all you can do is guide them; they'll choose to do what they want to do.
- Question: Do we have students transfer in who are over the limit/number of credits for aid? Price: No. We can take into consideration different factors—did they change their major. If they change their major, they need to take only required course and not other electives they want.
- Question: Regarding summer classes and Pell money? Price: Summer usually isn't that impactful for them, especially if they use it in the Spring/Fall. This leads to a six-year graduation rate rather than a four-year graduation rate.

5. Reports from Faculty Senate Representatives

- Dean's Council – Senator Benita Bruster
 - Provided a brief restatement of information discussed by President Hall, Interim Provost Taylor, and Donna Price. Discussed the TRiO programs (Tri-Co Upward Bound, Veterans Upward Bound, Student Support Services, Educational Opportunity Center) that support low-income, first-generation, and adult students. Discussed grants (\$11.3 million to university each year). Stated that Honor and Awards Day is being moved to April 15th.
- Academic Council -- Senator Phyllis Camilleri
 - Stated that in the January meeting of the academic council, a revision to the special education concentration in the Curriculum and Instruction major for the Master of Arts in Education was approved. The revision involved inclusion of a new course in the concentration.
- TBR Faculty Sub-council – Senator Pat Perdew
 - Stated that Vice Chancellor Denley discussed course redesign, noting that 120+ applications have been received, but have funds for only 60. These are currently under review. Discussed completion rates of developmental student in-credit vs. prepare-for-credit courses. Discussed macro-majors: there are 7 categories and 'undecided' is not a choice.
 - Discussion items included: Using American Sign Language to fulfill the foreign Language General Education Requirement; Faculty summer pay, adding that Memphis has proposed a banded flat rate of pay; Instructional Faculty Career Ladder with 3 levels.

- Information items included: Report of New Lumina/Complete College America Grant; Library consortium update; adjunct pay and budget impact

6. Old Business – Senator Gina Garber

- Discussed RASI report, including funding and number of applications/proposals received.

7. New Business

- Information Item: Report on SACS – Dr. Loretta Griffy
Discussed additional details about the SACS report that were not addressed by Interim Provost Taylor, specifically the items that require our response.
- Action Item: Vote on modification (for clarity) to Department Committee Retention and Tenure Recommendation Form, p. 2 of form – Senator Wadia
Discussed background of form and explained the timelines on the form. Stated that form is now clearer. President Brooks asked if further discussion was necessary. Vote to accept language as presented here: For: all; Against: 0; Abstain: 0.
- Action Item: Vote on modification to Post Tenure Review Form – President Brooks and Senator Wadia
President Brooks explained what was changed on the form and discussed ‘radio’ boxes in Part 2 of Form. Pointed out that we might need to change buttons 2 and 1 and how the form looks with a 5-button choice and a 3-button choice. Stated that FS must decide on either a 5-button format or a 3-button format. Motion made, seconded, and accepted to accept the 5-button format.
Question: Why not a 4-button form—exceeds vs. far exceeds? What are the criteria here for fourth and fifth buttons?
Dr. Griffy: Permission to speak: You have a good point. If we have these 5 areas, our departments must establish criteria for these.
Question: If someone has been here thirty-five years, why is this relevant? What is the penalty of getting straight 1’s on the form?
FS member: Some of this is used for summer employment and this form impacts that.
FS member: Ultimately your Chair is responsible for filling this out. As a faculty member, you might have some say for 1 to 3, but not much for 4 or 5. That’s the Chair, basically.
Senator Wadia: Reminded the FS that we are not here to vote on the merits of the form because this was already done in a past Senate meeting. Stated that our purpose today is to focus on the changes in bullets.
FS member: Briefly discussed goals of the form.
Senator Wadia: Stated that FS has already done that and has eliminated the goals.
President Brooks. Asked if we should vote and fail first motion. Move made to call question. Decision made to vote on voting. All in favor in calling the question: For: majority. Next, need to vote on keeping a 5-button format: Vote for keeping a 5-button format: For: majority. Vote against keeping a 5-button format: Against: 4. President Brooks added that a person who voted in the affirmative can bring up this issue in the next FS meeting and we can then address bullets if you don’t like them.

- Action Item: Straw Poll on University Anti-bullying Policy – President Brooks and Senator Wadia

President Brooks first asked who is in favor of an anti-bullying policy: In favor: 14; Not in favor: remaining FS members. Next, President Brooks explained Oregon State's policy and said there are various reasons why Austin Peay might want to adopt a similar policy. Stated that it would be wrong if we do not have at least a discussion about this policy, where it should go, pros and cons. Discussion followed focusing first on the pros: Senator Wadia provided a context for why we are considering introducing an anti-bullying policy. Discussed research he has done on this type of policy around campuses across the U.S. One question is should it be a stand-alone policy or should it be worked into an Affirmative Action policy. Indicated that we are in the front stages of this; consequences of bullying, etc. have not yet been considered

Question: How is this as far as protecting the institution legally? Is it beneficial in a legal sense? Wadia: We're not there yet and it would have to go through the legal office. But, we have to get it through the Senate first.

FS member: One positive is that it tells us how we should be treating others. It's one thing to be a jerk/bully and another to disagree with a co-worker. This helps with that.

FS member: Will this impact the RTP process? Bullying might be a subjective thing – a comment might be taken as bullying but it isn't. Wadia: Policy 5:060 – it's already there.

FS member: I think it should stand alone, defining what people think they might be able to get away with and this backs it up.

FS member: While I agree with a policy and what it says in principle, with paragraph 2, students would say that exams are bullying or new faculty might say that RTP is bullying. Wadia: This Oregon statement is just a guideline. But, we want to keep the statement short.

FS member: Positive statement when working with grievance procedures. This is good because it gives us something to refer back to.

President Brooks discussed several positive examples where this would help.

FS member: Stated that different policies already in place have a similar type of language and drawing on language from those would be good.

President Brooks: Moved to a discussion of the cons: May be difficult to enforce.

FS member: This might make you a better bully because you can find loopholes in the language.

FS member: I don't know if it can be defined to the point where it would be useful. We've already got policies. If we can't define what bullying is, how will this policy work? We're all seeing different things and could describe it in different ways.

FS member: Right now, only protected class groups are covered in policies. This will cover everybody.

President Brooks discussed more possible cons: having a policy on bullying causes more bullying; chairs' & supervisors' suggestions to others may be considered bullying; being given morning/evening classes may be considered bullying. Also discussed President Hall's thoughts on having a policy like this.

Senator Wadia: Noted that language is important: work-place bullying / anti-bullying.

President Brooks took another poll:

- a. In favor of anti-bullying policy: 10
 - b. Need more information: 11
 - c. APSU does not need a policy: 0
- Motion made, seconded, and approved to postpone remainder of agenda till next FS meeting.

Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20.