

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

9-28-2015

2015 September 28 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes

Faculty Senate, East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, East Tennessee State University, "2015 September 28 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (2015). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 89.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/89>

This Agendas and Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Agendas and Minutes at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Faculty Senate Agenda

September 28, 2015

Culp Center, Forum (Room 311)

I. Information session

Great Colleges to Work For Survey Results —Dr. Mike Hoff and President Noland

II. Old Business

Approval of Minutes for September 14, 2015

III. Action Item: Motion to approve the SAI items for 2015-16 academic year. See attached.

IV. New business

Lecturer raises to go with promotions

Faculty Profile

V. Updates

VI. Announcements/Other Business

VII. Adjournment



FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

Meeting Date:	9/28/15	Time:	2:45 – 4:25	Location:	Culp Center, Room 311
Next Meeting:	10/26/15	Scribe:			Eric Sellers
Present:	Leila Al-Imad, Fred Alsop, Robert Beeler, Patrick Brown, Doug Burgess, Kathy Campbell, Jackie Church, Joyce Duncan, Susan Epps, Lon Felker, Tavie Flanagan, Bill Flora, Virginia Foley, Nick Hagemeyer, Katherine Hall, Tammy Hayes, Bill Hemphill, Stephen Hendrix, Howard Herrell, Karin Keith, Mildred Maisonet, Anthony Masino, Tim McDowell, Theresa McGarry, Bea Owens, Timir Paul, Jonathon Peterson, Eric Sellers, Melissa Shafer, Bill Stone, Paul Trogen,				
Absent:	Dilshod Achilov, Jessica Bragg, Erin Doran, Dorothy Drinkard-Hawkshawe, Tod Jablonski, Koyamangalath Krishnan, Thomas Kwasigroch, Guangya Li, Mary Ann Littleton, James Livingston, Fred Mackara, Shunbin Ning, Peter Panus, Deborah Ricker, Darshan Shah, April Stidham, Liang Wang, Ahmad Watted, Robert White				
Excused:	Randy Byington, Lee Glenn, Lorianne Mitchell, Jerome Mwinyelle, Kerry Proctor-Williams, Sun-Joo Oh, Craig Turner				

Agenda Items	Responsible
Meeting called to order 2:50	
1. Information Session	
1.1 Great Colleges to Work For Survey Results	Dr. Mike Hoff and President Noland
2. Old Business	
2.1 Approval of Minutes from September 14, 2015	
3. Action Items	
3.1 Motion to approve the SAI items for AY 2015/2016	Dr. Foley
4. New Business	
4.1 Lecturer raises to go with promotions	Dr. Foley
4.2 Faculty Profile	Dr. Foley
5. Updates	
6. Announcements/Other Business	
7. Adjournment	

DISCUSSIONS

1. Information Session
1.1 Great Colleges to Work For Survey Results – Hoff and Noland Hoff - The survey was administered in March of 2014 and March of 2015; 600 people were invited to participate. - It consists of 60 statements grouped into 15 categories (see PPT for complete listing and ratings). - Of the 15 categories, our ratings were in the “warrants attention” range for only two categories; senior leadership and faculty and staff relations – however, these categories improved in 2015. - The ratings in 2015 were higher than the ratings in 2014 in all other categories. - The take home message is that we had a higher response rate this year and we improved; however, our response rate is still only 17% as compared to the national average of 37% – Next spring we all need to encourage our colleagues to participate - Response rate by position: Administration 12%; Faculty 58%; Exempt Professional 12%; Non-Exempt 8%;



DISCUSSIONS

Unspecified 6% (102 total responses)

- Beeler – suggested that everyone should be given the opportunity to respond
Hoff: The problem with this is that it would cost several thousand dollars to do so. Dr. Noland said he would find the funds if we feel strongly that more people should be sampled.
- Stone – we could administer our own survey to alleviate cost.
Hoff: This would not allow our results to be compared to peers.
- Maisonet – The faculty senate needs to be better informed and explain the importance of the survey to other faculty.

Noland

- Great Colleges to Work For Survey was conducted because faculty senate asked for it; now that we have the data, we can begin to determine how to use the data to inform future decision making. Take away message – despite of the low response rate, overall the responses are more positive.
- TBR employee giving campaign – From Mountain City to Memphis 240k was raised. ETSU raised 83k of the total amount.
- State of the University address this coming Friday (10/02/15)
- Approach (topics): Enrollment and comparison across state. ETSU budgeted for a decline of 200 students and we were only down 80 students, whereas most TBR institution enrollment is down by many more students. ETSU will continue to recruit from high schools and do so in a more aggressive manner. The Budget – as solid as it has been since Dr. Noland has been here and it is balanced.

Strategic Plan – 10-year plan that is linked to the budget.

Construction – Several projects over the next five years: Performing Arts Center; Lamb Hall renovation is on TBR funding list and is expected to be in the new budget in January; Building 6 at Quillen will have a new data center.

Arts – The final design is still in progress, no final decisions have been made in regard to space allocation.

Priorities – (1) Remain focused on strategic growth agenda. Over the next 10 years, we would like to expand to 18k students.

- Maisonet – State of the University Address should focus on the success of our students in addition to total numbers.

Noland: This year’s freshman class has a higher GPA and ACT scores are up half of a point over last year. Thus, we are not sacrificing quality for quantity.

- Peterson – How will the number of faculty grow along with the increase in students?
- McDowell – Faculty will want to hear about maintaining (or increasing) tenure track faculty lines and filling vacated positions as opposed to taking the line away from a department (e.g., biology lost two faculty and was only allowed to replace one position).

Noland: The strategic plan will focus on addressing this type of issue.

2. Old Business

2.1 Approval of Minutes from September 14, 2015

- Motion to approve: Paul Trogen Second: Bill Flora - Motion Approved

3. Action Items

3.1 Motion to approve the SAI items for AY 2015/2016

- Motion to approve: Susan Epps Second: Patrick Brown - Discussion
 - McDowell – suggested that it should be clear to students that they may leave questions blank and it will be reported as unanswered. The motion was amended to include a modification of the instructions.
 - Beeler – can faculty add their own questions? Foley and Epps indicated that departments will be able to modify questions in the future.
- Motion Approved

4. New Business

4.1 Lecturer raises to go with promotions

- TBR changed the policy to allow lectures to be re-hired without a job search.
- Lecturers can now be promoted from lecturer, to senior lecturer, and from senior lecturer to master lecturer.
- The committee suggested the raises should match the percentages as received by assistant professor to associate professor, and from associate professor to full professor.
- Also made a motion to approve a raise of 8% for a promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer and 10% for



DISCUSSIONS

a promotion of senior lecturer to master lecturer. The motion was seconded by Trogen.

Discussion

- Duncan – Will the university begin to rely more on these positions and hire fewer tenure-track faculty?
- Foley: This was not part of the charge of the committee; however, it has been made clear that faculty senate wants a commitment from the university to continue hiring tenure-track faculty.

Motion Approved

4.2 Utilization of Great Colleges to Work For Survey Data

- Flora – proposed that we get the 2014 and 2015 data and put forth a statement in regard to how we would use the data.
- Foley – response rate is too small for us to take any action at this time.
- Trogen – the administration promised that if the response rate is high enough they will act. It is our responsibility to document the increase in response rate and make sure the administration honors their promise.
- Foley – we need to determine what response rate is going to be high enough for the administration to use the data.
- Herrell – in order for any analyses we conduct to be meaningful, a representative and large enough sample must be collected.
- Maisonet – suggested a goal of 37%, which matches the national average.
- McDowell – medical school faculty may be over represented because there are more faculty on the medical school campus
- Trogen – Can we split the survey data into med school and main campus?
- Stone – in general, the questions are too vague to be helpful.
- Virginia suggested We will generate questions for Mike Hoff once we see the additional data that he will provide.

4.3 Faculty Profile

- Not Discussed

5. Updates - None

6. Announcements/Other Business

- Foley – Faculty Senate Dinner at Shelbridge Wednesday 09/30/15 – only for senate members
- Epps – Welcome week had an exceptionally high volunteer turnout
- Foley – BLUE Weekend (Bucs Living University Experience) pairs student mentors from the health sciences with high school students to encourage them to come to ETSU. The students have a sleep-in and attend informational courses.

7. Adjournment

Motion to Approve: Brown
Meeting Adjourned at 425.

Second: Epps -

Motion approved

Please notify Senator Eric Sellers (sellers@etsu.edu or 9-4476, Faculty Senate Secretary, 2015-2016, of any changes or corrections to the minutes. Web Page is maintained by Senator Doug Burgess (burgess@etsu.edu or x96691).

SAI Questions

Instructor Evaluation questions: (This section is required for Tenure and Promotion processes.)

- Responses for each item in this section are Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)
1. The instructor made course expectations clear (e.g., objectives, policies, and assignments).
 2. The instructor was well prepared.
 3. The instructor managed course time effectively.
 4. The instructor clearly explained course content.
 5. The instructor showed interest in my learning.
 6. The instructor helped me increase my knowledge and/or skills in the content of this course.
 7. The instructor provided me with meaningful feedback.
 8. The instructor was helpful when I had questions and sought assistance.
 9. What suggestions do you have to improve the instructor's effectiveness? (Comment box)

Course Evaluation questions:

1. The course content was consistent with the course description. SA A D SD

Comment boxes for the following:

2. Please identify what you consider to be the strengths of the course:
3. Please identify areas where you think the course could be improved:
4. What advice would you give to another student who is considering taking this course?

Self-reflection questions:

1. I expect to earn the following grade in this course: A, B, C, D, F
2. I devoted ____ hours per week either in class, online, or preparing for this course. 0-1, 2-4, 5-7, 8 or more
3. I completed the assigned preparatory class activities (readings, videos, discussions, etc.): All of the time, Most of the time, Some of the time, None of the time
4. How satisfied were you with your effort in this course/section? *Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Unsatisfied, Very Unsatisfied*
5. I could have done the following to improve my performance in this course:

Optional questions: (to be added in the future)