Administrative Council
September 29, 2021 - 3:35 p.m.
TEAMS Meeting
Minutes

Voting Members Present		
Dan Allcott	Michael Allen	Amy Brown
Debra Bryant	Jacob Cherry	Kristine Craven
Daniel Brent Drexler	Dennis Duncan	Joshua Edmonds
Mary Lou Fornehed	Scott Hagarty	David Hajdik
Kim Hanna	Madison Harris	Elizabeth Honeycutt
Samantha Hutson	Janet Isbell	Andrea Kruszka
Aaron Lay	Jane Liu	Mark Loftis
Chad Luke	Holly Mills	Joseph Ojo
Kristin Pickering	Elizabeth Ramsey	Richard Rand
Chuck Roberts	Bedelia Russell	Joseph Slater
Scott Smith	Sandra Smith-Andrews, Chair	Claire Stinson
Dan Swartling	Suzan Swartzentrover	Jennifer Taylor
Lenly Weathers	Angie Wells	Mark Wilson
Kim Winkle	Laith Zuraikat	
Voting Members Absent		
Sandra Bohannon	Steve Garner	Tammy Howard
Tony Nelson		
Resource Persons / Others Present		
Kevin Braswell	Lori Bruce	Sharon Huo
Jeannette Luna	Loren Morlote	Philip Oldham
Cynthia Polk-Johnson	Donna Schrock	Diane Smith
Matt Smith	Elizabeth Sofia	Mark Stephens
Kevin Vedder	Jerri Winningham	Lee Wray

Summary:

Approved agenda

Approved April 7, 2021 minutes

Approved new Faculty Workload and Overload Policy No. 208

Reviewed Revised Online and Distance Education Policy No. 223

Proceedings:

Chair Sandi Smith-Andrews called the TEAMS meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Dennis Duncan motioned to approve the agenda for September 29, 2021. Mark Wilson seconded. Motion APPROVED.

Wilson motioned to approve the April 7, 2021 minutes. Holly Mills seconded. Motion APPROVED.

Mills motioned to approve new Faculty Workload and Overload Policy No. 208. Wilson seconded. Mark Stephens presented and stated that the new policy was a required policy for the SACS review. Stephens indicated that Tennessee Tech operated under the TBR's workload policy until we became a Locally Governed Institution (LGI). Stephens noted that this new policy took Tennessee Tech's longstanding practices and put it into the policy format.

Stephens stated that he co-chaired a committee of 14 members that worked on the policy for several months, then COVID hit and it was pushed aside. Stephens indicated that in preparation for the Fifth Year Report for SACS, Dr. Sharon Huo recognized that this policy was needed. Stephens added that it went through several reviews and was presented to Faculty Senate on Monday. Stephens noted that Faculty Senate submitted minor editorial changes which were not the copies distributed to Administrative Council. Stephens noted the changes made were under section four, definitions; the word classwork in the second sentence was confused between student classwork or faculty working with students --the word student was removed and only classwork was used. Formatting suggestions were made and adopted.

Stephens noted that when the committee looked at what other universities had for workload policies, there were basically two approaches; one was to have a very descriptive detailed policy or 2) have a more flexible policy that each department or college could work based on its own professional standards and expectations. Stephens indicated that the committee took the approach of a general, relatively short policy to be used as a framework for the colleges and departments.

Dan Allcott noted the policy was a well written policy and asked how Dr. Stephens envisioned a faculty member, chair or director would use this policy, asking what would the result of the policy be? Stephens replied that it was based on the framework that each faculty member's workload would satisfy 15 credit hour equivalent workload. Stephens indicated it was written generally so that it could incorporate a wide-range of activities depending on the discipline. The chair and dean could help determine, based on the discipline's professional standards, how labs or one-on-ones, etc. would equate into the load.

Stephens added that the policy was set up so there could be time to do service and there could be time to do research, starting with 15 credit hours and working back, taking into consideration the type of courses that would be taught, the time doing research and service.

Stephens explained that it would vary from unit-to-unit, expectations for research could vary based on the number of journal publications or externally funded grant research.

Allcott asked others for their point of view on whether this policy was so different areas could defend their workload, does it clarify across campus, or could faculty go to Human Resources with a complaint and could this policy be used or their AOR? Would a director or chair use this policy to discuss something with a faculty member? Stephens acknowledged the importance of the AOR to specify the workload. Stephens indicated that faculty would work with the chair and with oversight of the dean. Stephens added there could be varying amounts of credit, dependent upon the time involved on the workload. Stephens indicated that the policy protects a faculty member by demonstrating the comparison to another faculty in the unit. Stephens stated the policy defines a full load and it could show if someone had an overload.

Smith-Andrews reminded the group that only voting members of the Administrative Council could vote. Motion APPROVED, four abstained.

Smith-Andrews provided background on the revised Online and Distance Education Policy No. 223. Smith-Andrews stated that the policy passed Academic Council last year. At University Assembly it was discussed that there could be further revisions made and the policy was tabled pending a review by Administrative Council with a return then to Academic Council. Smith-Andrews stated it was not an actionable item but the opportunity to review the policy per the motion at University Assembly. Smith-Andrews noted that following the University Assembly meeting in the Spring, the policy had been revisited by the chairs working group, several ad hoc faculty groups, Lori Bruce, Bedelia Russell and fully vetted by the entire Faculty Senate.

Russel stated that tracked and clean copies of Policy 223 were distributed on Friday, September 24th. Russell screen shared the policy with added highlighted notes from the Faculty Senate meeting on Monday, September 27th and from the University Counsel which were received the morning of September 29. Russell added that the policy would go back to Academic Council for a new vote. Russell appreciated all the feedback and noted that the policy was a required SACSCOC policy and had been due for review in 2019.

Russell added that the policy reflected Tennessee Tech's compliance with the NC SARA membership, a regional compact agreement in order to offer quality distance education across state lines. Russell pointed out that SACSCOC is interested in equitable resources for students. Russell highlighted the major changes to the original policy, stating: the policy was Distance Education and now it was Online and Distance Education; dual enrollment was added to the definition of distance education; defined online education; the policy now reflected the current infrastructure of online support; included operational definitions; included task force recommendations; the term traditional faculty was changed to faculty, policy numbers were updated as were the university units and the organizational charts. Russell stated these were the major revisions leading to the approval of the policy at Academic Council in the spring. Russell indicated that the memo received following when the policy was tabled at University

Assembly had close to 30 recommendations and each had been addressed and were incorporated as best she could.

Michael Allen suggested adding that faculty who taught online go through recertification, some training in ILearn, or if faculty use an LMS that were not on campus, he/she would show certification of the training and knowledge to use that LMS. Russell replied that there were three groups: those that have been teaching online education, those that rapidly transitioned to online education, and the courses and programs that still need to be developed.

Russell appreciated Allen's recommendation and acknowledged the work to be done in regard to operationalizing the policy. Russell indicated that she would like to have an online education advisory group that could come alongside and could determine how this could best benefit faculty and how to equip faculty so that the students benefit best. Russell supported Allen's points but was not sure she could add to the policy. Russell added that the team supports these points and plan on having annual training opportunities which will depend on support from the units. Russell added that the policy was framework to better launch those discussions.

Smith-Andrews added that she thought that there were provisions in the policy under number two stating that the way it was phrased, if a specific department needed something in coordination with the CITL, CAFÉ and the department, that would be available.

Rand asked why the word coherence was listed in Section IV – E. 2 and what the intent was. Russell replied that the CITL could not decide departmental goals. Russell stated that work would need to be done toward resources and evaluation methods in conjunction to be sure that the course setup would be successful. Rand stated he did not think coherence was a good word choice; in coordination was sufficient. Russell indicated she would review the word in relation to the NC SARA guidelines for language.

Jeannette Luna asked to clarify that individual departments could develop their own training procedures for ILearn under the operational procedures asking if individual departments could train on department specific softwares. Russell confirmed it would not conflict with the policy and that type of training was preferred.

Other such matters. Luna thanked Dr. Stephens and Dr. Russell for coming to the Faculty Senate meeting on Monday. Luna wanted the group to think about how policies are brought to the Councils. Luna motioned that policies put forward to Administrative Council with substantive changes be brought first as informational items. Holly Mills seconded. Luna explained that policies with substantial revisions be brought first as an informational item to Council for review and the second review would be for a vote. Luna noted that often the first Administrative Council meeting for the year was cancelled and that she did not think it would cause there to be additional meetings each semester; this would allow for a smooth path forward by allowing Faculty Senate to review.

Smith-Andrews pointed out this motion would only apply to Administrative Council, adding that this would also be a great way to onboard new members to the Administrative Council. Luna added the SACS definition of substantive change was any significant modification or expansion of the nature in scope. Scott Smith added there were a number of governing organizations that have a policy that states you cannot pass a policy on first reading. The second reading would be when you can vote. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Luna stated if anyone had agenda items coming up, to please contact her and the policies would be put to the Senate to talk about.

Richard Rand motioned to adjourn. Michael Allen seconded. Adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Diane Smith, recorder

Documents on file with minutes:

   Agenda of September 29, 2021

   Minutes of April 7, 2021

   New Policy:
      Faculty Workload and Overload Policy No. 208

   Reviewed Revised Policy:
      Online and Distance Education Policy No. 223