

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

2-10-2014

2014 February 10 - Faculty Senate 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, "2014 February 10 - Faculty Senate Minutes" (2014).
Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes. 115.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/115>

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.

2013-2014 Faculty Senate

MINUTES— February 10, 2014

Faculty Senate—East Tennessee State University

UPCOMING MEETING:	FOLLOWING MEETING:
February 17, 2:45 pm	February 24, 2:45 p.m.
Forum, Culp Center	Forum, Culp Center

Present: Beth Baily, Katie Baker, Jim Bitter, Sally Blowers, Patrick Brown, Doug Burgess, Randy Byington, Kathy Campbell, Charles Collins, Bruce Dalton, Mohamed Elgazzar, Susan Epps, Virginia Foley, Allan Forsman, Tammy Hayes, Jill Hayter, Bill Hemphill, Ken Kellogg, Dharendra Kumar, Tom Laughlin, Mary Ann Littleton, Kurt Loess, Fred Mackara, Theresa McGarry, Lorianne Mitchell, Bea Owens, Thomas Schacht, Melissa Shafer, Kathryn Sharp, Taylor Stevenson, April Stidham, Bill Stone, Kim Summey, Jerry Taylor, Paul Trogen, Shimin Zheng

Excused: Robert Beeler, Evelyn Hammonds, Jerome Mwinyelle, Deborah Ricker, Jennifer Vanover-Hall, Teresa Wexler, Yue Zou

Unexcused: Sharon Campbell, Daryl Carter, Tom Ecay, Rosalind Gann, Keith Green, Nick Hagemeyer, Ron Hamdy, Kerry Proctor-Williams, Jim Thigpen, Meng-Yang Zhu

CALL TO ORDER: President Byington called the meeting to order at 2:48pm

President Byington called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the minutes from January 27th. Senator Epps stated that on page four of the minutes Dr. Bishop is quoted as saying instructor but she believes her intent was to use the title lecturer as lecturers are the ones that don't have a promotion avenue. The minutes do accurately reflect what she said, but the information is incorrect. President Byington asked to amend the minutes by placing the clarification in brackets. He asked if there were any other amendments to the minutes or a motion to approve as amended. Senator Brown moved to accept. Senator Epps seconded. The minutes were approved without dissent.

President Byington asked Senator Epps to report on the proposed changes to the bylaws and the constitution. Senator Epps began by stating that she and Senators Bailey and Burgess were the working group that took a look at the constitution and bylaws. They created a chart with the language from each one and looked for

inconsistencies. She said that there are two different processes for amending the constitution and the bylaws so we must take action on them independently of each other. Amending the bylaws is easier because it doesn't have to go to the whole faculty.

The first change involves clarifying the roles of the officers. The secretary is supposed to keep minutes of the executive committee meetings, but that was not stated in the bylaws. The proposal is to change the bylaws to reflect what is in the constitution. Another aspect of the proposal is in the make-up of officers. That's where the discrepancies seem to be the most glaring. Currently in the constitution, officers are listed as the president, vice-president, secretary, chief operating officer, and the treasurer. In the bylaws the officers are listed as the president, Tennessee board of regents' faculty sub council rep, web master, past president, vice president, secretary, COO, treasurer, president emeritus. We are proposing that the bylaws list the officers as president, vice president, secretary, COO, and treasurer which is consistent with the constitution.

The change that actually affects both the constitution and the bylaws is as follows, "The executive committee shall be composed of at least 8 voting members including: President, VP, Secretary, Treasurer, COO, immediate past President, and 3 at large members, then ex officio members would be the TBR Sub-Council Rep, the Web Master, and President Emeriti who are current members of faculty senate." Senator Epps continued that the discussion point was that the past presidents would only be included if they were currently members of faculty senate. She said when the working group met in the faculty senate conference room in the Campus Center Building there is a plaque on the wall listing the past presidents of faculty senate. They realized how many past presidents are still here on campus and it would take a meeting room as large as the Forum if all of those past presidents decided they wanted to attend the executive committee meetings.

President Byington explained that according to the rules to amend the bylaws, we are in the initiation phase. Bylaws amendments may be initiated by either a petition signed by 1/5 of the full time faculty members, or through a proposal supported by 1/3 of the faculty senate members.

Senator Stone suggested having a representative from at least each college on the executive committee, because there have been times where entire colleges have been left out. Senator Epps replied that is where the members at large came from. The at large members are supposed to be chosen after the other officers in order to find representatives from the unrepresented colleges. Senator Stone asked if that is explicit in the language. President Byington replied that it is in section 1.14.6.4 of the constitution.

President Byington continued that for the initiation of this change in the bylaws we have to have a third of those who are present who are supportive of these changes.

Senator Bitter moved that the TBR Faculty Sub-council representative in both the constitution and the bylaws be made an official voting member of the executive committee. Senator Epps added that it is currently in the bylaws that the TBR Sub-Council Rep and President Emeritus are listed as ex officio. Senator Collins replied that ex officio by definition does not automatically mean non-voting, it just means they are a member of that committee by virtue of their office. We have a leeway of designating if ex officio members have a vote or not. President Byington remarked that the way it is laid out in this proposal though, it states voting members and ex officio. There is a motion to move the faculty senate TBR sub-council rep into the category of voting members. Senator Hemphill seconded the motion. The motion carried with no dissent or abstentions.

President Byington explained that what we are trying to clarify is when we are asked to produce a list of the officers, who those officers are. Senator Epps added that we addressed that in proposing that the officers be listed as the President, VP, Secretary, COO, and Treasurer. But we still have the motion to include the TBR Sub-council Rep. President Byington said that we have some discussion that may not be necessary. Senator Collins said yes, all you have to do is clarify it saying that the TBR Rep has a vote. The fact that if they're ex officio or not is somewhat irrelevant.

President Byington asked if we move the TBR rep above the line [on the document], would that clarify it? At that point there is no question that they have a vote.

Senator Collins asked is the TBR Rep now not ex officio - typically the ex officio members are appointed or a past officer. Senator Epps said she was just going on the language that was actually in the document.

President Byington asked if it would bring more clarity if we changed it to say voting members and non-voting members. Senator Loess suggested that if we move the TBR sub council above the line, then everybody above the line is currently elected. President Byington asked if that is a reasonable way to go forward and does that fit with the amended motion? There was general agreement in the room. Senator Bitter made a motion to on the amendment to move the TBR Faculty Sub council rep up to voting members. Senator Collins seconded. President Byington asked for the vote. The motion passed without dissent or abstentions.

President Byington said that we are now back to the original motion which is to amend the bylaws as they have been currently modified. Senator Collins seconded the motion. President Byington asked for the vote. The motion passed without dissent or abstentions.

Senator Epps stated that the change to the constitution is the change we just amended which would put the TBR Sub-Council Rep above the line as a voting member and that the executive committee would be composed of 9 voting members including President, VP, Secretary, Treasurer, COO, Immediate Past President, 3 at large members, TBR

Rep, and then the Web Master and President Emeriti who are current members of faculty senate as ex officio.

President Byington stated that the constitution specifies full time faculty will review and evaluate the proposed changes. There are about 750 full time faculty at ETSU, but the all faculty emails go out to 1349 people. His thought was to use Survey Monkey and question 1 would be “are you a full time faculty member,” if that is agreeable to the senate. Senator Bitter asked of the 1349 people if everybody else were adjuncts. President Byington replied yes and there are people also on campus who hold faculty appointments who aren’t really faculty, such as upper administration.

Senator Bitter moved to amend the constitution in this way. President Byington asked if there was any further discussion. Senator Epps stated that we have to go through next week’s meeting to actually approve both. Senator Collins seconded the motion. President Byington asked for the vote. The motion passed without dissent or abstentions.

Senator Epps said that she will make the corrections and send that back out through President Byington to be voted on. President Byington added that they will be voted on a second time then the bylaws will actually be amended by that point in time. Then the constitution would go to the faculty for vote.

President Byington continued that the next thing on the agenda is an information item regarding the governor’s “Tennessee Promise”. He said that there are 27 counties in Tennessee that already offer free community college tuition. Sullivan County is one. Sullivan County calls it their Educate and Grow Scholarship and any student who graduates from a Sullivan County high school can go to Northeast State tuition free. It has been that way for probably ten years. Sevier County has the same agreement with Walters State. There is a TBR Faculty President’s meeting tomorrow which was not a regularly scheduled meeting. President Byington said that he hopes to have more information from Dr. Noland after that meeting.

Senator Stone asked if this is going to decrease or increase our enrollment. President Byington said that we can speculate. He said he thinks there are two concerns. One is we should have already seen the impact from Sullivan County. There is a potential that it could decrease our enrollment. A student can go to downtown Kingsport or Johnson City and take classes for free, or he or she can come here and pay for them. Or, does this bring a lot more people into the system? If they bring them into the system and if they don’t do a good job of bringing them forward, does it dump more students on our doorstep who may or may not be prepared? Our hope is if they do come through that, they come here and be prepared to graduate with us.

Senator Stone asked if that potentially means we would just have Juniors and Seniors here. President Byington said in his opinion, no. He explained that there was a movement in the 1870’s that started with the University of Chicago that actually birthed the community college movement. The University of Chicago wanted to be the senior

institution. They wanted to develop affiliations and they would not teach any of the first 2 years. From the 1870's on it has not been a successful experiment. He said that his understanding is that community colleges are pushing the panic button, because they are not sure they can find enough adjuncts to teach.

Senator Hemphill stated that from his point of view this is cost shedding. They are going to lower the available Hope Scholarship for the first two years, which is really going to put a crimp on students who were thinking about coming here. Those students then go to that low cost alternative. We will see students who don't take the proper gen ed, and who don't have the gen ed courses to fill the curriculum in their senior and junior semesters so they end up going part time. When they go part time they lose the Hope Scholarship. He said the Governor's Promise is going to play havoc with what we're doing and we really need to look at it very hard. , We are losing tenured full time faculty members and replacing those with adjuncts so you don't have breadth within your programs, now we have single points of failure within particular programs. You lose one faculty member and your program is in a bad place.

Senator Brown stated that his students are also concerned that they are losing Hope Scholarship money, can you clarify that? President Byington said that he was not sure. He didn't know if current students would be grandfathered in, He didn't think the proposal had that level of detail. But, yes, someone graduating from high school this spring, if the proposal passes would receive 1000 dollars less to come to ETSU than if she went to Northeast State. President Byington stated that this is in the hands of the legislators now. Senator Foley commented that the Governor can't take Hope Scholarship money and use it differently without changing the law and he doesn't have the authority to change the law. These concerns need to be shared with our legislators. Our legislators need to be hearing from us and the people you live next door to and the people you go to church with, not just us.

Senator Stone said we have students who borrow a lot of money. He asked is it making a difference in their careers. Are they becoming indentured servants - they'll take any job available to help pay back their loans? President Byington said on the other hand, we graduate something like 50%. Community colleges graduate around 26%. If having an educated populous is your goal, where does society get the better value?

Senator Schacht stated that he would like to make a motion that this body authorize the executive committee to draft a resolution to be brought back at our next meeting. The substance of the resolution to be one, congratulate the governor for wanting to provide free education to citizens of Tennessee. Number two, pointing out to the governor that financial access alone doesn't address the issues of matching interests, aptitudes, and aspirations of students to the proper institution. Number three asserting that if the governor really wants to be of service to the citizens, this offer should be extended to all institutions of higher education, not just community colleges. Fourth, that assuming the body adopts this resolution after we draft it that it be disseminated to TUFs with the encouragement for them to act similarly and also that we send it to every member of our

legislative delegation. Senator Bitter seconded the motion. The motion passed with one negative vote and no abstentions.

President Byington opened discussion on the prioritization of senate issues. He stated that the number one priority according to his poll of the senators was workload issues. He said that we currently do not have a structure or an ad hoc group working on that so would someone like to volunteer to convene an ad hoc group to work on the concept of workload issues? As an example, developing an online class which you think is capped at 25 and the cap is suddenly increased to 75, those kinds of things across disciplines. Are there other aspects of workload that should be included?

Senator Schacht stated that for those in the College of Medicine, this is going to raise issues particular to that college, for anybody who is involved in professional practice. Senators Epps, Mitchell, and Bitter volunteered. President Byington stated that we have three – but there is a request for someone from the College of Medicine to be on it. Senator Schacht volunteered that if no one else wants to step up he will do it.

President Byington commented that at the end of this afternoon he hopes we will have some time for the working groups to meet. He continued that the second priority was Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Freedom and Faculty Ethics. He said that he had not talked to Senator Burgess yet, but would like to ask him to convene that. Although we don't have anything formalized, we have something that we have recommended that the current committee use in reviewing the work that they are doing now, so that might be a good starting point. Then it is a matter of deciding if those are the right rules and procedures, and if they are, bring them to senate so we can get it into the Faculty Handbook. He asked if there are other folks who would like to work with Senator Burgess on the Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Freedom and Faculty Ethics.

Senator Bitter asked if the same group that's looking at ethics also do this. President Byington said he hesitated to say yes because this matter is strictly procedural. The other charge is drafting a Code of Ethics. This one is adjudication procedures. Senator Bitter replied that eventually, what you have in a Code of Ethics includes how it is adjudicated. President Byington said that he was fine with rolling this charge into that committee's work.

Senator Schacht said that he had a broader suggestion which would be to expand this mission to create a common set of fundamental procedures that would create consistency and fairness across any kind of an adjudicatory committee - whether its tenure committee, ethics committee, grievance committee, or any other committee. For example, there could be common rules about how evidence gets submitted to these committees and about how evidence is to be shared.

President Byington restated that issues 2 and 3 on the agenda are developing a Faculty Code of Ethics and the procedures to guide them. He asked if we were in agreement to roll that into the charge of the current ad hoc group that is working on developing a

Code of Ethics or do we want to keep those two things separate? After general agreement in the room, President Byington said that Senator Burgess will forward to the ad hoc committee what has been recommended to be used in this one instance and the group can modify it.

President Byington stated that the next agenda item is the effectiveness of Course Intensives. Currently the folks who administer that process are the Writing Intensive Committee, Oral Intensive Committee and the Technology Intensive Committee. The question is do we want to bring them to the senate to discuss with us the issues related to course intensives.

Senator Schacht asked as a point of information, when the intensive process was created, did it include a built in mechanism for evaluating the success. Senator Epps said that she teaches all three, and she gets an email from somebody on those committees, typically the writing one on a regular basis, that they want copies of one paper written by each of the seniors in my writing intensive class. That's it. She never hears anything back from them. They don't ask for the instructions, they just want the papers. Senator Schacht said what she was describing wasn't an evaluation of the success of the program, it is an evaluation of compliance with the program.

President Byington said that he will ask one of those three committees to come and talk about how they evaluate effectiveness and if they've looked at other methods of doing this.

President Byington said that the next item is Fitness for Duty which relates to a colleague who is currently suffering some addiction or affliction. Currently we have no mechanism for dealing with that from a disciplinary process other than start a revocation. So if that person could be helped by an Employee Assistance Program rather than an automatically proceeding to revocation of tenure, we don't have that process in place.

Senator Schacht said that he would like to make a motion to get that off the ground. He suggested we ask President Noland to charge the university attorney with drafting a first draft of such a policy. Then we could use that as a starting place to get the conversation going. It was pointed out that ETSU doesn't have a "university attorney". Senator Schacht replied that we ask Dr. Noland to ask our legal counsel.

Senator Loess seconded the motion. President Byington asked if there was any further discussion. The motion passed with no dissent or abstentions.

President Byington introduced the last item on the priority list, the Ideas Forum. He asked if the senate wants to pursue it this year and reminded everyone that it was cancelled this spring due to a lack of appropriate proposals. In the last couple of years, several ideas have been successfully implemented from the Ideas Forum. For example there was a proposal last year to develop a science/botany teaching opportunity on the

trail being developed from campus to downtown Johnson City. Dr. Noland has worked with the folks at Tupelo Honey and they'll be committing money toward that project.

Senator Bitter said that when we first did the Ideas Forum, we actually put posters up in all the buildings. We also told people what it was for. Now we send out an email that gets deleted at the same rate that all the other administrative emails get deleted. The purpose of the thing was, if you have an idea that cuts across disciplines, across colleges and could be useful for the entire community, then you go to the ideas forum because there is no way to work it out through normal channels. If you're going to do something like Kelly Price's recycling thing across the campus. There is no way to run that through a single college; it has to go to the university.

President Byington added that another reason we did not do it this year was that there has never been a budgeted amount of money associated with the ideas. This year the probability of getting funding from unencumbered money was about zero. President Byington asked if there are folks who would like to work on a sub-committee to look at a better way to do the Ideas Forum.

Senator Bitter recommended that get put off until the fall semester. Senator Foley said that if it gets put off until the fall, she would want us to have a working group to help take responsibility for crafting what that should look like. Senator Schacht said that he would speak in favor of that, but also suggests that we not limit it to just the Ideas Forum as its been conceived but broaden its mission to explore what is the best way for this institution to identify that portion of its capital that consists of people with good ideas and how do we make sure that we cultivate that and invest that capital. President Byington concluded that we will defer work on the Ideas Forum until fall.

President Byington stated that concludes the business for today. Those who are working on various ad hoc committees, now is a good opportunity for you to spend 30 minutes getting together.

Senator Epps moved to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:00p.m.

Please notify Senator Melissa Shafer (shaferm@etsu.edu or 9-5837, Faculty Senate Secretary, 2012-2013, of any changes or corrections to the minutes. Web Page is maintained by Senator Doug Burgess (burgess@etsu.edu or x96691).