

Meeting of the Faculty Senate of the Tennessee State University
March 22, 2018, Faculty Senate Room

- I. The meeting opened at 2:40 PM. Dr. Achintya Ray, Chair, welcomed Senators. Minutes from the February 8, 2018 meeting were approved unanimously.

- II. Chair Ray reviewed a Proposed Change in the Grading System (see below). The proposed grading scale is from the University of Georgia system.
 - a. Senator Bryant asked why a change in grading system is being proposed. She expressed concern about making something less than 90 be an "A-."
 - b. Chair Ray responded that faculty have complained about the rigidity of the grading system. There is a large discrepancy between 90 (4.00) and 89 (3.00), for instance. The proposed system is approved by the University of Georgia's Board of Trustees. The proposal aims to help some students without punishing others.
 - c. Senator from Math expressed concern that grading systems should be determined by the faculty member, as he/she states in the syllabus.
 - d. Senator Burks expressed concern about our Nursing program and its ability to predict success on professional tests when grades are inflated.
 - e. Chair Ray responded that he believes course grades and professional test performance is not strongly correlated. Chair Ray stated that the real issue is with curriculum rather than the standard grading system utilized. He further emphasized that the bigger concern is whether or not we move to a more graded system, and that the cut-offs used can be determined secondarily.
 - f. Senator Anderson stated that MTSU has an FW grade for differentiating between students who have stopped coming to class.
 - g. Senator Quick stated that public school children in Nashville earn a 50% for showing up. He expressed concern that this scaling system might reward lower standards.
 - h. Senator Kelly stated that using the same cut-offs (e.g., 90-100 = A = 4.00) would not lower standards.
 - i. Senator asked what system is used most commonly on a national level.
 - j. Chair Ray asked that we separate the issues into 1) moving to a +/- system, and 2) setting the parameters.
 - k. Senator Kilbourne asked that this issue be brought back to the departments for their feedback.
 - l. Chair Ray reminded Senate that it must be approved by April 19 in order for it to take effect for this Fall. He proposed pushing this issue back until a special meeting on April 12. Chair Ray will send a Qualitrics survey to all faculty for their feedback. Results will be reviewed on April 12, 2018.

- III. Chair Ray reviewed his draft of the Policy to Govern Faculty Participation in Extended Education and Training Programs. See document below for details.
 - a. Senator asked what happens if participants in these programs complain. Chair Ray responded that programs can be discontinued if they are not quality.
 - b. Senator Campbell asked if administrative costs would be taken out. Chair Ray responded administrative costs are not allowed. The University makes 30%.
 - c. Senator asked who is going to promote these events (e.g., copying costs, etc.). Chair Ray responded the Extended Education can assist with implementation.
 - d. Chair Ray stated that currently we have no system for providing faculty compensation for these types of activities.
 - e. Senator stated that currently faculty are only allowed to make up to 33% of their salary. Chair Ray responded that this is different because it is outside of our University contract, so there is no cap.
 - f. Senator Burks asked if faculty are contracting with the University. Chair Ray confirmed this. This is why the 33% is irrelevant.
 - g. Chair Ray made a motion to move the draft forward for the Administration's comment. This motion was seconded. Dr. Mirani opposed. Dr. Arwood abstained. Motion carried. Dr. Ray stated he would report back with any new information on April 12, 2018.

- IV. Chair Ray reported that Non-Instructional Assignment is almost ready to move forward. Nineteen applicants have been reviewed and ranked. Some are year-long (50% of base salary; no benefits will be lost); most have applied for one semester (100% salary; no annual loss of income). Chair Ray will work to get the maximum number of sabbaticals approved. He will meet with Dr. Mosley and President Glover. He aims to have decisions by April 10, 2018.

- V. Chair Ray reported in President Glover's email regarding University changes. VP of Administration has been removed as a position. Changes have been made in Enrollment Management and the Graduate School. The email implied this was the first announcement and there will potentially be more changes forthcoming.

- VI. Chair Ray stated he received an email from Dr. Mosley asking the Senate to review a proposal for Post-Tenure Review. The document states it is a draft. The current Faculty Handbook draft has no mention of Post-Tenure Review. Chair Ray opened the floor for discussion.
 - a. Senator Burks reported there are many inconsistencies in the document. He reported that if you receive 2 unsatisfactory ratings by the department chair in 5 years, then you go up for review.
 - b. Senator reported contradictory statements in the document. He also read from a letter he reported was dated from last year and signed by Dr. Hardy indicating that a faculty

performance improvement plan was given to faculty member and his tenure was revoked. This letter was submitted to Chair Ray for the records.

- c. Senator reported that the University has 80 fewer tenure track/tenured faculty than previously. The University is trying to shrink faculty and hire adjuncts.
- d. Senator raised concern about faculty who are not productive and the need to address these issues.
- e. Chair Ray requested that comments be restated for the record:
 - a. Senator Burks reported that you have to reapply for tenure if your department chair gives you two unsatisfactory ratings in 5 years.
 - b. Senator asked why this document is being proposed to begin with. Dr. Ray reported that he has heard many concerns about faculty not teaching their classes, not advising, etc.. Chair Ray stated he has been asked about his personal position regarding how to address egregious faculty behaviors. His consistent response has been that academic tenure does not protect against dereliction of duty. Not going to class for weeks, is a dereliction of duty. Academic freedom is not being fired for the content of your scholarship. We need to distinguish between what is a tenure policy versus a personnel issue.
 - c. Senator Kilbourne proposed that Faculty Senate reject this proposal and propose an alternative document that provides guidelines for addressing dereliction of duty issues.
 - d. Chair Ray raised concern about faculty workloads being too high and that faculty might not be able to perform their job functions if there workload is too high.
 - e. Senator stated that department chair evaluations are too subjective and that post-tenure review should not be triggered by chair evaluations. Instead of removal, evaluations should trigger faculty development.
 - f. Senator agreed that unsatisfactory reviews should trigger development, not removal. He also stated that personnel problems, like not holding class, should be reviewed and addressed separately.
 - g. Senator Armwood asked if administrators are reviewed. Chair Ray responded that Chair Evaluations are supposed to be submitted to Faculty Senate via the Chair Hiring Policy, but they have not but provided. Faculty evaluate deans, but these results are not seen either. Chair Ray stated that a policy should be implemented consistently across the staff and faculty and administrators.
 - h. Senator Kilbourne made the following motion: The Faculty Senate resolves to oppose the policies for post-tenure review document dated 1/30/18. As a viable alternative the faculty senate supports a personnel policy that allows for disciplinary action for dereliction of duty. Dereliction of duty will be clearly defined by a document published by human resources. Chair Ray tabled this motion and asked that we seek faculty input.

VII. Chair Ray proposed that we seek input from the full faculty.

VIII. Chair Ray adjourned the meeting at 4:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiesa Kelly, Secretary

In attendance:

Akbar, M.

Anderson, J.

Badamdori, D.

Baker, D.

Bryan, K.

Burks, G.

Campbell, D.

Fleming, R.

Jara, P. sub for Mirani

Kelly, K.

Kilbourne, B.

Kamssu, A.

Mirani, M.

Pleban, F.

Radcliff, J.

Thach, S. sub for Carrie Hurst

Taheri, Ali

Ray, A.

Van Dyke, J.

Triplett, K.

Quick, Q. (sub for Biology)

Williams, L.

Yao, F.

Zhou, S.

Proposed Change in the Grading System

Resolution: The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate Proposes the following grading system for full implementation from the Fall Semester of 2018.

Salient Features

1. Proposes a change to a +/- grading system.
2. No student will get adversely affected.
3. Students near the borderline of the letter grades stand to gain.

A	4.0
A-	3.7
B+	3.3
B	3.0
B-	2.7
C+	2.3
C	2.0
C-	1.7
D	1.0
F	0.0

Recommended classification of numerical scores into letter grades.

Numerical Score	Current System and Letter Grade	Proposed System and Letter Grade
90 – 100	A	A
87 – 89	B	A-
84 – 86	B	B+
80 – 83	B	B
77 – 79	C	B-
74 – 76	C	C+
70 – 73	C	C
67 – 69	D	C-
60 – 66	D	D
59 and Below	F	F

DRAFT

Policy to Govern Faculty Participation in Extended Education and Training Programs

A Proposal Presented By

Dr. Achintya Ray

Chair of the Faculty Senate

March 22, 2018

PREAMBLE

Extended education and training programs are important vehicles through which faculty members can engage in productive entrepreneurial activities to train and impart knowledge to a larger community, interface with the business world, and significantly boost the revenue stream for the university.

Extended education and training programs are important components that can help the university diversify its revenue streams, alleviate some of the budgetary constraints, and make additional earning opportunities available for the faculty members completely in line with the core mission of the institution.

Extended education and training programs are also significant vehicles that help the university showcase its pedagogic excellence and superior facilities to a wider world and thereby facilitates an improvement in the brand image of the institution and potentially helps in the recruitment of talented individuals to the university.

This policy fills an important gap by developing a framework to foster an entrepreneurial environment to incentivize the faculty members to develop and deliver creative extended education and training programs. The policy provides for measurable ways to implement a comprehensive and cohesive extended education and training program policy that does not overlap with any of the core functions that a faculty member is expected to perform during the course of regular employment.

DETAILED POLICY

ARTICLE 1. Faculty members are encouraged to create extended education and training programs that (a) leverage the expertise of the faculty members, (b) contribute positively to the community, (c) help the university fulfill its outreach missions, and (d) result in augmented revenue flow for the university. These extended education programs can also be viewed as bridges connecting the academic expertise of the university with the greater business community.

ARTICLE 2. **Faculty members shall not be entitled** to any release time during the development and delivery of the extended education or training programs unless they are already funded by external grants for that purpose. Furthermore, faculty time spent in developing and delivering the program **shall not be reimbursed** using any university funds. **Faculty participation in the extended education and training programs is entirely voluntary.** Participating faculty member **shall not be eligible for any release time** while developing and offering the extended education and training program. The schedule of the extended

education and training program **shall not overlap** with any other responsibility that the faculty member is normally expected to discharge during the course of regular employment with the university.

ARTICLE 3. A faculty member who takes the primary responsibility in the creation of an extended education program will be designated as the lead faculty member. To be eligible to be a lead faculty member, one must hold a tenured or tenure track faculty rank at the university. A tenured or tenure track lead faculty member may include a temporary teaching or research faculty member or members from other outside community in a group responsible for the development and delivery of the program. The lead faculty member shall contribute no less than a third to the overall program.

ARTICLE 4. A detailed proposal regarding the program shall be prepared by the lead faculty member (in collaboration with the other group members, if any) and presented to the Director of Extended Education Program in a format prescribed by the Director. Since the participation in the extended education and training programs is entirely voluntary and designed to have no conflict with the regular and customary responsibilities of the faculty member, the proposal **shall require no special permission** from the supervisor(s) of the faculty member.

ARTICLE 5. The Director of Extended Education Program shall review the proposal and consult experts if necessary before deciding on the suitability of the proposal. Before the extended education or training program is approved, the Director of Extended Education Program must ensure that it is of high quality and makes targeted contributions to the generation of actionable knowledge and skills in the business community.

ARTICLE 6. If more than one faculty member are collaborating on a program then one faculty member shall be designated as the lead faculty member. In such case the proposal shall include the contributions of each participating faculty member.

ARTICLE 7. If an external member is included in the team then that external member must be sponsored by the lead faculty member who must certify that the

external member is substantially prepared to participate and able to deliver a portion of the program without compromising the overall quality of the program.

ARTICLE 8. The proposal must include detailed cost estimates and revenue projections. The cost shall include cost of materials, royalties, food, beverages, transportation, rent, etc. but shall not include any charges for the university facilities and technology but can include costs of appropriate documentation like issuing non-academic credits and certification.

ARTICLE 9. Twenty percent of the net revenues from the extended education program shall be transferred to the university general fund to cover expenses for university facilities, technology etc. This transfer shall take place even if university facilities and technology are not used and the program is conducted entirely outside the university.

ARTICLE 10. Ten percent of the net revenues from the extended education program shall be transferred to a student scholarship fund. Accumulated amounts in that student scholarships fund shall be spent to award scholarships to deserving students.

ARTICLE 11. Seventy percent of the net revenues shall be distributed among the contributing faculty member(s) and non-faculty member(s), if any in accordance to the proportion of effort expended by the individual members. The proposal prepared and presented by the lead faculty shall list the names and designations of all contributing member(s) of the extended education program as well the percentage contribution of the each contributing member.

ARTICLE 12. For faculty members, the distributions shall be placed in flexible special accounts that shall have no expiration. Balances to that flexible special account shall be maintained by the Vice President of Budget and Finance. The Faculty member shall be entitled to receive regular updates regarding the balance in that account in the same fashion as the faculty member is made aware of the balances in the sick leave account.

Faculty members shall have the right to use the accumulated sum in their flexible accounts for approved purposes including but not limited to (a) augmenting their salaries and cover the associated benefits, (b) avail for themselves a reduced teaching load, (c) hire teaching and research assistants and associates, (d) fund academic travel to attend conferences, (e) buy technology and laboratory equipment, (f) award student scholarships, (g) finance summer salaries, (h) buy academic materials like datasets, books, manuals, etc., (i) finance academic conferences, (j) hire consultants to support teaching and research activities, (k) cover travel expenses for academic collaborations, (l) finance additional studies, coursework, programs, and degrees, and certifications that will significantly improve the competence of the faculty members and make them more valuable to the university, (m) donate to the university, etc. Any other reasonable usage must be approved by the President of the university in writing.

ARTICLE 13. Net revenues earned by the extended education and training programs shall be treated in the same manner as external funding for promotion, tenure, and merit pay considerations.

ARTICLE 14. Ancillary general materials like lecture notes, lecture videos, handouts, assignments, and other intellectual property developed and used by the faculty members for the purpose of the extended education programs shall remain the as the properties of the faculty members.

ARTICLE 15. If a faculty member becomes deceased or incapacitated then the remaining balance in the flexible faculty account shall be transferred to the rightful nominee(s) recorded in the personnel files of the faculty member. In such cases, remaining balance shall be treated as unpaid salary and benefits.

ARTICLE 16. A retiring faculty member or a faculty member who is leaving the university permanently shall be entitled to entirely withdraw the sum from the faculty account.

EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 1: Professor Smith develops a weekend program on creative writing. Each program participant pays \$100 to attend the program and 50 participants sign up. Participants bring their own books, notes and materials. University provides space and technology like computer for the instructor and projector etc.

Total Program Revenue: \$5,000

Total Program Cost: \$0

Net Program Revenue: \$5,000

Transfer to the General Fund (20% of the NET revenue): \$1,000

Transfer to the Scholarship Fund (10% of the NET revenue): \$500

Transfer to flexible Faculty Account (70% of the NET revenue): \$3,500

EXAMPLE 2: Professor Mathews develops a two hour webinar on agricultural marketing. 200 participants join the webinar and each participant pays \$100. Each participant is issued a certificate of completion and two continuing education credits. The certificate and credit allocation costs \$20 per participant. The technology cost for the webinar is \$500.

Total Program Revenue: \$20,000

Total Program Cost: \$4,500

Net Program Revenue: \$15,500

Transfer to the General Fund (20% of the NET revenue): \$3,100

Transfer to the Scholarship Fund (10% of the NET revenue): \$1,550

Transfer to flexible Faculty Account (70% of the NET revenue): \$10,850

EXAMPLE 3: Professor Smith and Professor Mathews collaboratively develop a three day program on analytics and data science. Professor Smith is

designated as the lead faculty who develops and contributes 60% of the program and Professor Matthews develops and contributes 40% of the program. Seventy five participants join the program and each participant pay \$400. Each participant is issued a certificate of completion and 10 continuing education credits. The certificate and credit allocation costs \$50 per participant. Materials and food costs another \$50 per participant.

Total Program Revenue: \$30,000

Total Program Cost: \$7,500

Net Program Revenue: \$22,500

Transfer to the General Fund (20% of the NET revenue): \$4,500

Transfer to the Scholarship Fund (10% of the NET revenue): \$2,250

Transfer to Professor Smith's Account (42% of the NET revenue): \$9,450

Transfer to Professor Matthews' Account (28% of the NET revenue): \$6,300