

Roane State Community College
Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the Faculty Senate
February 21, 2020

Location of Meeting: Roane County Campus, 2:00 pm Eastern

Attendees:

Deborah Miles, President	Elizabeth Lewis	Geol Greenlee
Sue Sain, Vice-President	Valerie Herd	Laura Vaughn
Pat Wurth, Secretary	Casey Cobb	Jala Daniel
Kathy Arcangeli	April Insco	Bryan Wilkerson
Pam Siergiej	Marianna Mabry	Jillian Miller
Michelle Jones	Robert Alfonso	Abby Schoolfield
Vickie Pierce	Ralph Monday	Guest, Steve Ward

- I. Established Quorum at 2:05
- II. Approved January 24th Faculty Senate Minutes
- III. TBR Faculty Sub-Council Update – John Brown
 - A. Address by Dr. Allana Hamilton, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 1. Working on Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Plan
 2. Making visits to all TBR Schools
 3. Looking at membership of Sub-Council
 - i. Currently representatives for 13 community colleges and 6 TCATs (two per each grand division)
 - ii. Majority of TBR Presidents support increasing TCAT representation to 3 – 4 representatives from each grand division
 - iii. 73% of TBR President want a 2-term commitment (2 years) from Faculty Subcouncil Representatives
 4. Achieving the Dream Costs
 - i. Originally grant-funded, now funded by pay-sharing programs
 - ii. 12 Community Colleges now in cohort
 - iii. TBR will continue to pay for membership including conventions, leadership coach, data coach visits, analytics, etc.
 - iv. Annual cost for 2018 cohorts is \$65,000/year; will go to \$28,000 per college after 3 years
 5. Course Alignment and Community College libraries:
 - i. Verifying that TBR Library is aligned with all programs
 - ii. Chief Academic Officers should complete by Fall 2020
 - iii. Only for technical degree programs; general education courses cannot be changed
 6. Accessibility Timeline
 - i. TBR working on system-wide accessibility training program
 - ii. Syllabi survey found most now in compliance with accessibility
 - iii. Complaints by faculty re: what was asked of faculty members with very little support
 - iv. TBR is currently working on system wide software for accessibility

7. D2L

- i. Contract ends December 2021
- ii. Moving toward potential new platform
- iii. Demos will include demonstrations of accessibility capabilities
- iv. Demo will be announced for Pellissippi or Roane State soon; everyone invited

IV. Vice President's Report – Sue Sain

- A. Motion made regarding amending rules for Benroth portfolios
 - 1. Faculty document two of the following: institutional service, community service or professional development.
 - 2. Late submissions will not be accepted nor will portfolios that do not adhere to instructions.
- B. Representatives for Benroth Selection Committee – Appointed by FS President
 - Health/Science: Sue Sain
 - Math Science: Jillian Miller
 - Humanities: Robert Alfonso
 - Social Science: Valerie Herd
- C. Dr. Ward is working on how faculty can be notified when a student drops.

V. AAUP Update – Kathy Arcangeli

- A. Survey Status
 - 1. Survey will be distributed on February 24th to all faculty teaching Spring 2020
 - 2. Surveys should be returned to AAUP mailbox in Oak Ridge by March 6th
 - 3. Results will be shared with administration, Faculty Senate, and on AAUP website
- B. Faculty Senate Resolution on the Adoption of the **AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities**: See Appendices 1 and 2, p. 4 – 11
 - 1. This was tabled until the March meeting.

VI. Faculty Senate General Elections

- A. The only FS President/Vice-President team to accept nomination for 2020/21 is Deborah Miles and Sue Sain.
- B. Adopted procedure will be followed this year with improvements made to process next year.
- C. The next step is to prepare ballots for election. Election committee needs to meet.

VII. President's Report

- A. Old Business
 - 1. Follow-up re: FLAC – See Appendix 3, p. 12 - 13
 - 2. Dr. Ward agreed to allow Dave Rath and Valerie Herd work with her on Student Zoom survey
 - 3. Response from Beth Martin, TBR lawyer, re: FERPA – See Appendix 4, p. 14 - 15
 - 4. Meeting with Lisa Steffensen, Dean of Students
 - i. Behavior Intervention Team reviewing policies and website
 - ii. New online form is about to be launched for reporting concerning student behaviors
 - iii. Steffensen expressed strong support for faculty in dealing with academic dishonesty
 - 5. Testing Center Options – Jala Daniel; No update
 - 6. Faculty Description update to include mandatory attendance at Academic Festival
- B. Work Group Updates
 - 1. Adjunct Representation on Senate – Jala Daniel and Geol Greenlee; No update

2. Advising – April Insco; Committee meeting scheduled during Spring Break; Will request reschedule
3. Availability of Committee Minutes – Deborah Miles – See Appendix 5, p. 16
4. Bookstore Issues – Jala Daniel and Steve Carriger; No Update
5. Email Integration – Steve Carriger; No Update
6. Faculty Workload – Sue Sain and Michelle Jones
Proposed Faculty Position Description Policy Revisions – See Appendix 6, p. 17 – 22
7. Syllabus – Ted Stryk; No Update
8. Zoom Room
Faculty Senate Resolution on Faculty Responsibility for Methods of Instruction – See Appendix 7; p. 23
9. Faculty Senate Constitution – Pat Wurth – Sue Sain, Robert Alfonso, and Elizabeth Weaver on the committee & are meeting next week.

C. Final Comments

1. Deborah Miles will create Google docs for faculty input on AAUP Resolution
2. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes will include appendices for documentation of agenda items
3. Deborah Miles will talk to Doug Wallace about adding links to approved resolutions on Faculty Senate webpage.

VIII. Adjourn 3:40 pm

APPENDIX 1:

Faculty Senate Resolution on the Adoption of the AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

Date Proposed: 02/21/20

Approved by the Faculty Senate:

Whereas, the AAUP **Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities** expresses the beliefs, understandings and desires of the faculty for the practice of shared governance principles at Roane State Community College;

Whereas, the TBR policy (1.03.10.00) on *Student & Faculty Participation in Development of Campus Policies & Programs* states that “faculty should have a primary interest in academic affairs, including curriculum, program changes and development, and admission and graduation requirements.”

Whereas, the RSCC policy (GA-23-01) on *Student and Faculty Participation in Development of Campus Policies & Programs* states that “provision is made for both student and faculty participation in development of campus policies and programs through standing and ad hoc committees, including but not limited to activities of the Student Government Association (SGA) and Faculty Senate, involvement in review of college policies and procedures, and input via surveys and meetings.”

Whereas, it is the intent of Faculty Senate that this statement shall provide a prospective reminder and accountability to their successors to support and strengthen the principles of shared governance RSCC.

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate adopt the AAUP **Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities** as a legacy and reference document to the future of shared governance at RSCC.

APPENDIX 2

<https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/shared-governance>

AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

The statement that follows is directed to governing board members, administrators, faculty members, students, and other persons in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution. The statement is intended to foster constructive joint thought and action, both within the institutional structure and in protection of its integrity against improper intrusions.

It is not intended that the statement serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components of an academic institution, although it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures. The statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example, the United States government, state legislatures, state commissions, interstate associations or compacts, and other interinstitutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.

Students are referred to in this statement as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators, and faculty. There is, however, no main section on students. The omission has two causes: (1) the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without thorough study might prove unfair to student interests, and (2) students do not in fact at present have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities; it would be unseemly to obscure, by superficial equality of length of statement, what may be a serious lag entitled to separate and full confrontation.

The concern for student status felt by the organizations issuing this statement is embodied in a note, "On Student Status," intended to stimulate the educational community to turn its attention to an important need.

This statement was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). In October 1966, the board of directors of the ACE took action by which its council "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the institutions which are members of the Council." The Council of the AAUP adopted the statement in October 1966, and the Fifty-third Annual Meeting endorsed it in April 1967. In November 1966, the executive committee of the AGB took action by which that organization also "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the governing boards which are members of the Association." (In April 1990, the Council of the AAUP adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.)

1. Introduction

This statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authorities, at all levels, play a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard for the

welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

a. *Preliminary Considerations*

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process. Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand, as developed hereinafter.

b. *Determination of General Educational Policy*

The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.

c. *Internal Operations of the Institution*

The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty.

Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part 5 of this statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well established.¹

d. External Relations of the Institution

Anyone—a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member of the faculty, or a member of the student body or the alumni—affects the institution when speaking of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An individual who speaks officially for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent. The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution.² There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board

The governing board has a special obligation to ensure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: for example, the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.

The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually, when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to ensure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation.

One of the governing board's important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the overall policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction.

The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty. When ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.³

4. The Academic Institution: The President

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership. The president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community. The president represents the institution to its many publics. The president's leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president's administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to ensure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly, the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities; is responsible for public understanding; and by the nature of the office is the chief person who speaks for the institution. In

these and other areas the president's work is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the general support of board and faculty.

5. The Academic Institution: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.⁴ On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.⁵

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4) membership of faculty members on administrative

bodies; and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

On Student Status

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

Notes

1. See the 1940 “[Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](#),” AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports, 11th ed.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 13–19, and the 1958 “[Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings](#),” ibid., 91–93. These statements were jointly adopted by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors; the 1940 “Statement” has been endorsed by numerous learned and scientific societies and educational associations. [Back to text](#)

2. With respect to faculty members, the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” reads: “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution” (ibid., 14). [Back to text](#)

3. Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, systemwide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP’s Council in June 1978.] [Back to text](#)

4. With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process. [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 2002.] [Back to text](#)

5. The American Association of University Professors regards collective bargaining, properly used, as another means of achieving sound academic government. Where there is faculty collective bargaining, the parties should seek to ensure appropriate institutional governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance in accordance with the “Statement on Government.” [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 1978.] [Back to text](#)

APPENDIX 3

Emails re: FLAC

From: Fearn, Odell

Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 3:40 PM

Please see my responses below.

From: Miles, Deborah <MilesDL@roanestate.edu>

Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 2:24 PM

During our Faculty Senate meeting last week, several questions were posed about the timeline for the acknowledgement of Faculty Leave and Compensation contracts. It seems that in some divisions these are available earlier than others. I acknowledged my Math/Science contract on January 24th but in Health Science, for example, the contracts were not available until January 27th, the beginning of the second week of classes. The following questions were asked regarding FLAC acknowledgement:

1. Is there a standard timeline for when these contracts should be available to faculty? If so, what is it?
There is no “standard timeline” on when contracts should be available. Academic Divisions release on their own timeline.
2. Is the timeline the same for both full-time faculty and adjuncts? **Yes.**
3. If the FLAC acknowledgement is not already required before classes begin, could that be adopted as policy? Specific concerns leading to this question are:
 - a. Some adjunct faculty have expressed concern that they are working the first week of classes without a contract.
It is my understanding that our adjuncts at a minimum have a verbal commitment that they will be teaching/compensated for the class they will be teaching.
 - b. Since workload varies in some divisions and faculty may receive a reduced load with no prior consult, faculty would appreciate adequate time to review their workload before classes begin.
That should be discussed at their division meetings; our office has no specific input into faculty workload.
 - c. Teaching with no acknowledged contract has a potential for legal ramifications if a student were to sue a faculty member for any reason.
Please elaborate on this further; I'm not sure about your inference.
4. If something in Raidernet or HR processes makes FLAC acknowledgement impossible before classes begin, could deans be required to make available to faculty their official workload before classes begin?
I believe this is should be an agenda item at division meetings.

Any answers you can provide to these questions would be greatly appreciated.

From: Miles, Deborah

Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 5:01 PM

Thank you for your responses. I am not certain, however, that they settle the concerns raised in Faculty Senate. The main question is whether or not administration would be **willing** to set a concrete timeline for acknowledgement of these contracts so that faculty have adequate time to review them and are not working without a contract during the first week of classes.

You asked for elaboration on the concern that someone posed regarding one's legal liability when working without a contract. No specific situation was mentioned. The speculation was more general such as what would happen *if* a student sued a faculty member while the faculty member was not under contract or *if* a faculty member was injured while not under contract. Certainly, having a verbal commitment is not as reassuring, or as legally binding, as having a contract.

Rather than leaving this timeline to the discretion of each dean, is there any reason that such an important aspect of one's employment cannot be subject to a college-wide policy?

No Response as of 2/21/2020

APPENDIX 4

Emails re: FERPA

From: Beth Martin [mailto:Elizabeth.Martin@tbr.edu]

Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 2:34 PM

To: Miles, Deborah <MilesDL@roanestate.edu>

Subject: RE: Clarification Regarding FERPA

Professor Miles,

Thank you for your email below. In answer to your first question, TBR Guideline S-020 C.3. provides that a legitimate educational interest is “limited to an interest arising from the faculty/staff member's fulfillment of their assigned responsibilities, and disclosure shall be limited to such information as is necessary to fulfill those responsibilities.” I would prefer to come and meet with faculty senate or faculty members to discuss the issue of sharing information about students with their other instructors. There are a number of issues raised by “sharing” information about a student a faculty member believes is cheating including due process and defamation. These issues could possibly create liability for the college and for the faculty member individually. I would be happy to work with you and the administration on a process to address these issues.

While a FERPA waiver does allow a faculty member to discuss a student’s records with the student’s parents, there are other criteria which might allow a parent to request information. This is another issue that I would be happy to discuss but involves determinations made on a case by case basis.

Finally, while TBR does not have a FERPA FAQ page, Roane State has information regarding student records on its website.

If you would like me to come and meet with the Faculty Senate, please let me know and we will coordinate that.

Elizabeth Martin
Associate General Counsel
Tennessee Board of Regents
615.366.3919

From: Miles, Deborah <MilesDL@roanestate.edu>

Sent: Saturday, February 15, 2020 9:07 AM

To: Beth Martin <Elizabeth.Martin@tbr.edu>

Subject: Clarification Regarding FERPA

Hi, Ms. Martin.

I am forwarding the email I sent on January 25th in case it got lost in your inbox. I can’t imagine the number of emails you get each day.

Faculty Senate meets again this Friday, February 21st. If you would provide me with clarification regarding the questions below so I can share your guidance at that meeting, I would be very appreciative.

Regards,

Deborah Miles

From: Miles, Deborah

Sent: Saturday, January 25, 2020 12:42 PM

To: Beth Martin <Elizabeth.Martin@tbr.edu>

Subject: Clarification Regarding FERPA

Hello, Ms. Martin.

At Roane State's Faculty Senate meeting yesterday a request was made for written clarification of the term "legitimate educational interest" and how it applies to specific discussions between faculty about students who have been caught cheating in their classes. I've tried to research it online and there are varying opinions on whether "legitimate educational interest" would include giving a heads-up to other professors of a particular student who has been caught cheating. Is this spelled out in the law somehow or left to the interpretation of governing bodies and the courts? If it is left to TBR's interpretation, would you give us TBR's official stance on this matter.

Another question I've frequently heard and received conflicting information on is the issue of discussing a student's performance with his/her parents if the student is under 18, for example in Middle College or taking dual enrollment classes. FERPA seems to be more clear on this matter in defining an "eligible student" as one who "has reached 18 years of age or is attending an institution of postsecondary education" and stating that "When a student becomes an eligible student, the rights accorded to, and consent required of, parents under this part transfer from the parents to the student." Is it correct that if I am contacted by the parent of a 16-year-old student in a dual enrollment class, I cannot give any information about the student to the parent unless the student has a FERPA waiver on file with the college?

Finally, does TBR have a FERPA FAQ page where faculty can find clarification on similar issues any time or should guidance be sought on a case-by-case instance? Any advice you could provide in writing to lay these issues to rest would be greatly appreciated.

Deborah Miles

APPENDIX 5

Faculty Senate Resolution on Committee Minutes

Date Proposed: 02/21/20

Approved by the Faculty Senate:

Whereas adequate communication within the college is the foundation for effectiveness, and transparency, and trust; and

Whereas Roane State Policy GA-25-01 states that "Meetings of all committees should be held on a regular basis" and "Recommendations and reports of all committees are made known to the college community as relevance requires;" and

Whereas the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities states that "The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies; and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed;"

Be it resolved that Roane State's list of Standing Committees should be reviewed each year for relevance and performance. Standing Committees should meet regularly. Committee minutes should be taken at all meetings of any Standing Committee, approved within a one month time period, made available to all faculty with the redaction of any information which would violate an employee's or student's right to privacy, and archived in a designated area accessible to any faculty member at any time. Faculty should be notified via email when new minutes are added to the archive. Policy Number GA-25-01 should be revised to reflect these changes.

Policy Number: GA-25-01 Standing Committees

Active participation in committee work is considered part of the responsibility of all members of the institution, since an institution cannot operate effectively without the planning and ideas of students, faculty, and other staff.

The president appoints standing committees in the fall term to serve for one academic year (see list below). These appointments are based on the employee's request and the recommendations of the vice president or at the direction of the president. Generally, part-time faculty are not appointed as voting members of standing committees. Professional staff and students of the college are asked to serve on certain committees. All standing committees are advisory.

The chairperson of each committee is appointed by the president to preside for one academic year. The duties of the chairperson are to initiate, formulate, and report to the president suggestions and recommendations discussed by the committee. Meetings of all committees should be held on a regular basis. **Committee minutes should be taken at all meetings of any Standing Committee, approved within a one month time period, made available to all faculty with the redaction of any information which would violate an employee's or student's right to privacy, and archived in a designated area accessible to any faculty member at any time. Faculty should be notified via email when new minutes are added to the archive.** The president and other executive officers will attempt to be available for committee meetings, if and when a committee chairperson requests.

APPENDIX 6

Proposed Changes to Faculty Job Description

Roane State Community College

Policy Number: PA-24-01

Subject: Faculty Job Description

I. Faculty

The individual instructor is the key figure in the educational process of the college, and his/her attitude, personality, skill, character, and initiative will determine how well the college accomplishes its mission and the general education objectives. He/she plays a prominent role in curriculum development through constant evaluation of student, course and program outcomes. Refer to PA-22-02 for information on academic freedom. (Access the complete detailed RSCC Policy PA-22-02, Academic Freedom and Responsibility at www.roanestate.edu/policies/.)

A. Ten Month Full-Time Faculty (Allied Health Sciences Program Directors)

100% workload for 10-Month Full-Time Faculty is equal to a 37.5-hour work week for the contract year (includes fall and spring semesters) of which 30 hours will be reported on a faculty schedule (faculty locator) and include instructional and non-instructional responsibilities as outlined in the full-time Faculty/Program Director Job Description and as determined by the dean. The contract year for 10 month faculty is August through May.

B. Twelve Month Full-Time Faculty

100% workload for 12-Month Full-Time Faculty is equal to a 37.5-hour work week for the contract year (includes fall, spring and summer semesters) of which 30 hours will be reported on a faculty schedule (faculty locator) and include instructional and non-instructional responsibilities as outlined in the full-time Faculty/Program Director Job Description and as determined by the dean.

Teaching workloads for 12 month faculty in the summer are based on the scheduled courses and any non-instructional workload including Release Time and other duties as assigned by the dean.

Due to 12-Month Full-Time Faculty earning annual leave, they MUST follow the Campus holiday and closure schedule and report to work between semesters and at times when students are not on campus. If the 12-Month Full-Time Faculty member is absent from work, they must use annual leave (or sick leave when applicable).

II. Adjunct Faculty

Part-time faculty members are employed on a per-term, per-hour, or per-course basis. Terms and responsibilities of part-time faculty are determined on the basis of need at the time of employment. Part-time faculty are not entitled to rank or tenure. Refer to PA-27-01 for information on adjunct faculty credentials and to PA-26-03 for information on supervision, orientation, and evaluation of adjunct faculty. (Access the complete detailed RSCC policy PA-27-01, Faculty Qualifications, and PA-26-02, Faculty Evaluation, at www.roanestate.edu/policies/.)

III. Instructional Responsibilities and Procedures

The following list of responsibilities and procedures should not be considered as a complete list but as a guide for some of the activities that have been and are now being done in and through the college as an institution. These guidelines must constantly be evaluated, changed, and supplemented as needs become apparent.

Faculty members who are assigned full-time to one of the instructional divisions are responsible to

the appropriate dean and the Vice President for Student Learning for fulfilling the following duties and responsibilities:

- A. A full teaching load will be 15 hours or the equivalent per regular semester unless the dean assigns other duties for the benefit of the college. Additional teaching load assignments may be made within the TBR Policy on Extra Compensation.
- B. Maintain current course syllabi, indicating course objectives and submit to the dean and students on the first day of class. Syllabi should follow the syllabus template recommended by Faculty Senate and approved by the Chief Academic Officer and President.
- C. Assist with student advisement and monitor student progress.
- D. Maintain accurate records of class attendance and grades. Refer to RSCC policies AA-09-01, AA-10-01, and AA-11-01 for related information at www.roanestate.edu/policies/.
- E. Submit accurate grade reports and other requested administrative information promptly according to institutional due dates.
- F. Propose curriculum development following RSCC policy AA-07-01 (access the complete detailed RSCC policy AA-07-01, Curriculum Development, at www.roanestate.edu/policies/). Revise instructional approaches, materials, textbooks, supplemental reading, and activities to maintain state-of-the-art methods for instruction and evaluation. (For related information access the complete detailed RSCC policy AA-13-01, Library Materials Selection Criteria, at www.roanestate.edu/policies/.)
- G. Each full-time faculty member is required to devote 37.5 hours per week to the college of which 30 hours will be reported on a faculty schedule (faculty locator). The 30 hours reported on the locator will include:
 1. Teaching time (classroom/lab/clinical instructional time required to meet assigned teaching workload of 15 hours or the equivalent per regular semester unless the dean assigns other duties for the benefit of the college).
 2. Teaching Workload Calculation: The following parameters will be used to calculate teaching workload for all full-time, temporary full-time, and part-time faculty on a 9 month, 10 month, or 12 month contract who teach on-ground (including multiple campus video technology), hybrid, and accelerated courses. Teaching workload calculations for web-based courses are presented in a different section of this policy, paragraph #7.
 - a. Lecture class—the calculated workload for a lecture class will be one (1) workload unit per hour of weekly class time. For example, a 3 lecture hour per week course will have a workload assignment of 3.
 - b. Lab or studio class—If a lab or studio contact hour of instruction is delivered without assistance from a lab assistant and/or teaching assistant, the workload value would be 1 workload unit per hour of weekly lab time (similar to the workload value of a lecture contact hour). In those instances where the primary instructor has a lab assistant and/or teaching assistant, the workload value would be .667 workload unit per hour of weekly class time.

In programs subject to accreditation and/or licensing agency requirements for lab (or other delivery method) ratios, in which the instructor:student ratio mandates fewer students per instructor than the generally accepted ratios, these requirements will not impact the 1:1 ratio for the WL of the instructor.

(rationale – if an accrediting/licensing agency, who are the content experts, deem that certain labs or skills require more individualized instruction, then the instructor should not be penalized for this by reducing WL due to lower number of students)

- c. Clinical course-- Clinical instruction is represented by 2 categories, direct instruction and preceptorships (indirect instruction).
 - i. Direct clinical/ external learning experiences Instruction—instruction provided by college faculty member in person for all students assigned for a particular clinical course/rotation. In this instance, the workload value of a clinical contact hour would be 1 workload unit per hour of weekly clinical time (the same as direct instruction for a lecture contact hour).
 - ii. Preceptor clinical/ external learning experiences Instruction--- instruction provided by a healthcare agency (hospital, clinic, alternate patient/client care service, etc.) employee (preceptor) for all students assigned for a particular clinical course/rotation. In this instance, the workload value of a clinical contact hour would be .667 workload unit per hour of weekly clinical time.
 - d. Independent Study—the calculated workload for Independent Study courses is based on the following
Workload credit for the supervision of independent study students will be considered only if the faculty member sponsors more than 2 students in a course, applying the following lecture course, enrollment-driven rubric:
 - 3 - 5 students= 1 workload credit
 - 6 - 10 students = 2 workload credits
 - 10 students = full course workload credit
 - e. Low enrollment – In the event of low enrollment in a class, should the College choose to hold the course with the low enrollment, the instructor shall receive full WL credit regardless of enrollment numbers. (Rationale-if Administration/the College chooses to let a low enrollment class make, then the College, not the instructor, needs to bear the ensuing financial ramifications)
-
- 2. Office time (faculty members will keep regular hours in their offices, in addition to their teaching duties, in order to be available to students and other faculty, and to fulfill administrative responsibilities)
 - 3. Work-related travel time. Work-related travel is defined as travel between Roane State sites or other travel in service of Roane State. Work-related travel does not include commute time (time equivalent to the round-trip travel time between the faculty member's home and their official station). Official station is defined in policy BA-01-01. (Access the complete detailed RSCC policy BA-01-01, General Travel, at www.roanestate.edu/policies/.)
 - 4. Teaching time and office/work-related travel time are related on a one-to-one basis with the possible exception of lab and/or other external learning experiences. Thus, a faculty member teaching a 15 hour load of traditional live classes (without laboratory or clinical components) would report 15

hours of teaching time and 15 hours of office/work-related travel time. Full-time faculty teaching in laboratory and/or external learning experiences would report the same total number of hours on the locator as do faculty without lab/clinical responsibilities. However, teaching time may represent more than 50% of the hours reported for faculty with lab/or external learning experiences. (This example applies when faculty with or without lab/clinical responsibilities have credit hour loads containing the same mix of live and web-based hours. Additional guidelines for reporting requirements specific to web-based instruction are included below.)

5. Faculty who are granted release time for a given semester will not be required to report the teaching release time or associated office/work-related travel time on the faculty locator.
6. If a faculty member is teaching a paid overload, the faculty member will not be required to have office time scheduled beyond that associated with their full-time load. If the faculty member is teaching an overload in one semester with the intent of teaching an underload in the following semester, one additional hour of office time for each overload hour should be scheduled. During the underload semester, the hours reported for office/work-related travel time, should equal the hours of teaching credit hour load (except as noted above for laboratory and clinical instruction).
7. In order to accommodate the needs of students enrolled in web courses, faculty will have the option of arranging for one hour of “virtual teaching time” for each credit hour of web-based teaching (this does not apply to web-enhanced teaching). Additionally, one hour of “virtual office time” may be arranged for each credit hour of web-based teaching (again, this does not apply to web-enhanced instruction). Faculty will not be required to be on campus for these virtual teaching and office hours. Regardless of the mix of live and web-based classes in a faculty member’s schedule, however, faculty locators will report a minimum of 10 hours of combined teaching time and office/work-related travel time. The following table provides details about the relationship between faculty credit hour load in an online format and total time reported on the faculty locator.

Teaching Hour Load: Live	Teaching Hour Load: Web	Reported Teaching Time*	Reported Office/Work-related Travel Time	Sum of Reported Teaching & Office/Work-related Travel Time
15	0	15	15	30
12	3	12	12	24
9	6	9	9	18
6	9	6	6	12
3	12	3	7	10
0	15	0	10	10

Teaching Hour Load: Live	Teaching Hour Load: Web	Reported Teaching Time*	Reported Office/Work-related Travel Time	Sum of Reported Teaching & Office/Work-related Travel Time
* Time in a face-to-face class setting (contact hours)				

8. All faculty members are expected to maintain office hours (representing the major portion of the broader office time classification) and provide normal tutorial assistance to their students. Under no circumstances will a faculty member charge any student enrolled in the college for assistance in matters related to his/her teaching duties. Faculty will also be available to students for advising purposes during office hours.
9. It is possible that for faculty who teach classes with laboratory or external learning components the sum of teaching time and work-related travel time may equal or exceed 30 hours per week (i.e., the faculty member fulfills the 30 hour reporting requirement on the locator without the inclusion of any office hours). In this circumstance, the faculty member would, nonetheless, report a minimum of four office hours per week (meaning that the total hours reported on the locator would exceed 30).
10. Teaching time and office/work-related travel time will be rescheduled each term to correspond to the new schedule for that particular term. Faculty locators indicating hours of availability (defined as teaching time, office time, and work-related travel time) must be posted in the immediate vicinity of each of the faculty member's office/workspace location(s) and filed with the appropriate dean and the Vice President for Student Learning. It is the responsibility of the deans to see that new faculty locators are posted promptly each term.
11. Faculty locators will list the faculty member's Roane State email address and Roane State extension. Locators will also provide information on the total number of credit hours being taught in a web format by the faculty member. Additionally, faculty locators will include a statement indicating that office hours may be arranged by appointment.

- H. Maintain classroom discipline appropriate for the learning objectives of course(s).
- I. Administer appropriate evaluations and tests to demonstrate achievement of general education and course objectives. Final examinations or evaluation plans must be filed with the appropriate dean for each course of instruction.
- J. Attend division, faculty, committee, and other institutional meetings for the welfare and support of the college.
- K. Maintain participation and memberships in coursework, professional organizations, and community programs to promote timely professional growth and contribution.
- L. Utilize the college library for personal growth, class instruction and research, and assist in maintaining appropriate library collections for courses taught.
- M. Participate in commencement ceremony.
- N. Assist with faculty and student organizations, public relations, and recruitment.

IV. Non-Instructional Responsibilities

In addition to the instructional responsibilities, faculty members are expected to perform other duties that contribute to the welfare and support of the college. Among these are academic advising of students, committee assignments and mentoring. Assignment of non-instructional duties will be examined to assure that faculty members will not be asked to assume additional responsibilities which might prove detrimental to teaching performance.

The Vice President for Student Learning will appoint faculty to serve on standing committees in the fall term to serve for that academic year. Faculty members are given the opportunity to indicate preference for committee assignments. Although every person may not receive their first choice, an attempt will be made to honor the requests. Efforts will be made to limit the faculty member to no more than two standing committee assignments per academic year. Occasionally, faculty members may be asked to work on a special task force or temporary committee assignment. If any faculty member is asked to serve on more than two committees and that faculty member thinks that the additional assignment would be detrimental to teaching performance, the faculty member can ask to be relieved of the additional assignment. Refer to RSCC policy GA-25-01, Standing Committees, at www.roanestate.edu/policies/.

Faculty members who have other Roane State responsibilities may be relieved of additional committee assignments.

V. Release Time

Release time is release from a percentage of the faculty member's teaching workload to perform defined services for the College. Release time provides a course load substitution for work on special assignments or projects. and is based on a hypothetical 3-credit hour lecture course equivalency.

Defined services warranting release time may include, but are not limited to, program director, lead instructor, ????

Release time assignments shall be assigned by the appropriate Dean and approved by the college VPSL. Release time will be part of the standard workload units and will be loaded into FLAC.

VI. Notwithstanding the requirements defined in this document, other arrangements may be developed by the mutual agreement of a faculty member and their dean in unusual circumstances. Such agreements must be in writing.

(Originally posted as RSCC policy AA-03-01)

Revision History: 07/01/1990, 07/01/1995, 11/08/1999, 12/17/2007, 04/11/2011, 05/08/2015

TBR Policy Reference: 5:02:01:00

Revision Date Effective: 11/19/2018

Revision Approval By: Christopher L. Whaley, President

Original Date Effective: 01/11/1988

Original Approval By: Cuyler A. Dunbar, President

Office Responsible: Vice President Student Learning

Reviewed: 11/19/2018

APPENDIX 7

Faculty Senate Resolution on Faculty Responsibility for Methods of Instruction

Date Proposed: 02/21/20

Approved by the Faculty Senate:

Whereas, it is the role of the Faculty Senate to express the collective opinion of the faculty to the administration of the college on any matter of concern to the faculty, and to provide for the administration a significant avenue for the dissemination, discussion, and evaluation of all matters of concern to the faculty; and

Whereas, the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities states that "*The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process*" and that the faculty should have the final decision on such matters in all but exceptional circumstances; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate Zoom work group survey conducted fall 2019 reported that two-thirds of respondents expressed less than positive attitudes towards teaching in Zoom Rooms; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate Zoom work group survey conducted fall 2019 reported that 44% of respondents indicated they would be unlikely or very unlikely to recommend a Zoom class to their advisees; and

Whereas, prioritizing class delivery utilizing Zoom technology as number one for Manly and Summer Instruction Grants without faculty input on this decision disregards the faculty's role in shared governance; and

Whereas, the installation of Zoom technology in all classrooms on the Scott Co. campus and removal of white boards without faculty input on this decision disregards the faculty's role in shared governance.

Be it resolved that, the priorities for Manly and Summer Instruction Grants be determined by a committee whose majority is made up of faculty. The current priorities should be re-evaluated by this committee.

Be it resolved that, all future classroom, lab and other instructional facilities modifications require approval by a committee whose majority is made up of faculty.

Be it resolved that, the assignment of particular courses to the Zoom room method of instruction should be determined by the faculty teaching the courses in all but exceptional circumstances.