ASU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
3 p.m., February 27, 2019, Rassman 263

Matthew Gritter, Pres.	X	Crystal Kreitler, VP	X	Michael Burnett, Sec. - Randy Hall	X
Andrew Siefker, Parl.	X	Andy Wallace, Ac. Aff.	X	David Faught, St. Aff.	X
Jennifer Braziel, Un. Aff.	X	Matt Shipes, Ex. Aff.		Erin Ashworth-King, PPres	
Dick Apronti	X	You-jou Hung	X	Tony Bartl	X
Jackie Brown	X	Jay Brown	X	David Carter	
Kevin Garrison	X	Larry Hettick	X	Randy Hicks	X
John Kellermeier	X	Sarah Lynch	X	Flor Madero	
Vincent Mangano	X	Veronica Snow - Rozie McCabe	X	Nick Negovetich	X
Lopa Roychoudhuri	X	Marva Solomon		Anne Scaggs	
Twyla Tasker	X				

Call to Order @ 3:00pm

I. **Approval of Current Agenda**
   Approved

II. **Invited Guests**
   A. Dr. Brian May, President – not present
   B. Dr. Don Topliff, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs – present
   C. Dr. Javier Flores, VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management – not present
   D. Farrah Lokey, Staff Senate Chairperson – not present
   E. Shayna Mullen, Student Senate President – not present

III. **Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting**
   Approved

IV. **Standing Committee Reports**
   A. Academic Affairs (Dr. Andy Wallace)
      i. No report
   B. Bylaws and Standing Rules (Dr. Andrew Siefker)
      i. No report
   C. University Affairs (Ms. Jennifer Braziel)
      i. No report
   D. Student Affairs (Dr. David Faught)
      i. no report
   E. External Affairs (Dr. Matt Shipes)
      i. Not present, no report
   F. Committee on Committees (Dr. Crystal Kreitler)

i. No report

V. **Unfinished Business**
    A. Full Professor Merit Raise
        i. Presented Kraig Schell's original matrix as presented in 2017
            a) General idea is to divide the group of full professors into 4 individual groups, with order of merit raise being awarded based on seniority
        ii. Estimated cost is $32-35k/yr if eligible full professors are divided into 4 groups based on seniority
            a) LH – how would this attract/retain faculty?
                • DT – probably doesn't attract or help retain faculty
            b) CK – potential for merit raise may provide incentive for faculty and make them "more satisfied" at their job. It could also encourage faculty to be more productive, which would cascade down into the classroom
            c) LH – argument must be made from a business perspective
            d) VM – how are step raises addressed on the administrative side, such as department chairs and etc.? How are those factored into the budget?
                • DT – they don't really have step raises. Only way to increase salary would be to change departments or positions.
        iii. JH – would approval of this OP impact annual merit raises?
            a) DT – potentially, since budget would need to include both annual and full professor merit raises
        iv. Sent back to university affairs for creation of a bullet-point list stating why this is important. Committee also asked to generate 5-yr cost estimates and to review language of the OP.
            a) OP would be voted on by the senate, and the approved OP, along with the list and budget estimates, would be submitted to the provost's office
            b) DT – merit raise would be based on budget availability, so we need to determine how to address those years as it pertains to "4 group" classification
    B. OP 10.04 Regulations Regarding Coursework in English
        i. Recommends language to provost stating: "Academic coursework will be submitted in English unless the course requires a language other than English."
            a) AS motion, VM 2nd – passed

VI. **New Business**
    A. Drop Procedures
        i. No considering changing the date at this time
        ii. John Wegner sent a proposal what would not require the faculty member's signature
            a) The faculty member would be notified of the student's intent to drop the course, but the student could be able to drop without speaking to their faculty member
            b) 48 hour wait period will permit the faculty member to contact the student if they desire
                • Period could be shorter if the student drops within 48hr of the drop deadline
            c) Policy generally follows the procedure for dropping online courses
            d) Request to drop a course would be completed online
        iii. "Request for late drop" form was created and senate was asked to comment on it
            a) The onus is on the student to explain their justification, and the decision would be made by the registrar

b) The old method was the the faculty member makes the request to the dean, and there was substantial variability in likelihood of approval across the faculty

iv. SL – Asked if we could take the revised drop procedures to our constituents for their input

B. OP 06.04 – Appointments and Reappointments to the Faculty

i. Provost made some changes in the introduction essentially stating that we follow general guidelines as published by SACSCOC for credentialing of faculty.

ii. Senate vote to approve – passed

VII. **Roundtable**

A. MG – reminder about president's awards and military event by Bill Taylor at end of month

B. SL – Great War lecture on 21st of March on Influenza and the Great War.

C. SL – Why was there no discussion about expanding requirements of faculty to teach online courses for dual-credit prior to implementation?

i. DT – dual-credit courses were added to try to recover tuition money because we have an increasing number of incoming students with the 1000-level courses. This not only impacts faculty workload, but also the total number of courses that the student would be required to take while at ASU. The online-component also provides dual-credit courses in areas that are unable to attract SACSCOC credentialed faculty.

ii. DT – impact on faculty: may allow us to retain our instructors. ASU will not ask faculty with full teaching loads to teach online as overloads.

VIII. **Adjournment – 4:46pm**

AS motion, JB 2nd - Passed