

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

9-21-2009

2009 September 21 - 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, "2009 September 21 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (2009). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 156.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/156>

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
MONDAY, September 21, 2009
2:45 PM FORUM

NOTE TO SENATORS: Please share the Senate agenda, minutes, and any other enclosures with your colleagues prior to the scheduled meeting. Senate meetings are open to ALL faculty. Agendas, minutes, and attendance rosters are available on the Faculty Senate website at <http://www.etsu.edu/senate/>.

Call to Order: President David Champouillon

Approval of Minutes:

Continuing Business: Committee memberships and forms;

Discussion and vote on the proposal to restructure the Academic Council (Champouillon);

Report of the 2009 Faculty Senate Legislative Affairs Committee (Senator Fisher);

Discussion and vote on the TUFS position paper.

Announcements:

.

Adjournment:

Please Note: Next meeting is October 5, 2009, at 2:45 pm, in the Forum, Culp Center.

Please send information and notices of non-attendance to Kathleen Grover (grover@etsu.edu or 96672), Secretary, Faculty Senate 2009-2010.

MINUTES—September 21, 2009
Faculty Senate—East Tennessee State University

UPCOMING MEETING:	FOLLOWING MEETING:
October 5, 2009 2:45 pm Forum, Culp Center	October 26, 2009 2:45 pm Forum, Culp Center

Present: Alsop, Arnall, Bartoszuk, Bates, Bitter, Brown, Buerkle, Burgess, Byington, Calhoun, Campbell, Champouillon, Crowe, Dorgan, Emma, Fisher, Gerard, Glover, Granberry, Grover, Hamdy, Harker, Kaplan, Kelley, Kellogg, Kortum, Morgan, Mullersman, Mustain, Odle, Price, Reed, Roach, Schacht, Scott, Shafer, Shuttle, Smurzynski, Trainor, Trogen, Zhu, Zou

Excused: Creekmore, Ecay, Hemphill, Horton, Loess, Martin, Peiris, Stuart, Trainor

CALL TO ORDER: President Champouillon called the meeting to order at 2:50 pm.

CONTINUING BUSINESS: **Champouillon asked that the Faculty Affairs Committee meet to formulate its charge;** he announced that Senator Mustain would be its Health Sciences representative. He asked that senators keep in mind their expertise and interests as they submit requests for committee assignments and urged them to send in their ID forms quickly.

Past President Trogen moved to endorse the proposal to restructure the University Academic Council; Senator Alsop seconded.

Senator Bitter presented a motion for a friendly amendment, that a representative of the administration (registrar, financial aid, etc.) be removed from the proposed list of members. Alsop seconded.

Senator Shuttle requested postponement of the proposal saying that senators needed more time to consider it. Senator Dorgan agreed and asked that Champouillon step aside since the proposal is his. Champouillon recused himself from the discussion and turned management of the discussion over to Vice President Schacht.

Senator Mullersman commented that some categories seem arbitrary. He thinks there should be a representative of a category of administrators that includes elearning, etc. Champouillon said he worked on the proposal for six weeks and distributed it September 14th; he felt it should be acted upon. Alsop said that as Senate president he found the Academic Council hard to work with. Many members knew little about issues of concern to faculty. Most of its members already report to the VPAA and therefore do not need this particular forum. The proposal is not perfect, but it is better than the current Academic Council. Dorgan asked if there were a deadline by which the proposal must be enacted. Champouillon said no, but he felt the Senate should deal with it now since it

has been discussed with administrators.

Senator Kaplan asked if there is a downside to including a representative of infrastructure administrators. Bitter answered that most are irrelevant to the functions of the AC—for example, accreditation, course approval, and changes in curricula.

Senator Grover moved that the vote be postponed; Dorgan seconded. The motion failed by 16 to 15.

Trogen called for the vote on the proposal; Alsop seconded. The 29 ayes carried the vote.

Senator Fisher reported on the Legislative Affairs Committee. He presented several handouts, among them information about different benefit programs and the numbers of participants in each, and the names and emails of members of the Insurance Committee. He reviewed information he provided on the state legislature's actions, one of which was to approve either world or American history to fulfill higher education core requirements. The insurance surcharge on smokers will begin January 2011; there are still questions about verification procedures and the legality of testing dependents.

Fisher said he believes no action will be taken to reorganize higher education this year. Matthew Hill is secretary of the House Calendar Committee, and Rusty Crowe is on the Senate Education Committee. Fisher suggested we strengthen relationships with Hill, Crowe, and other legislators to help them know us and our concerns.

Trogen reintroduced the TUFs Position Paper. Senator Kellogg asked about the votes from other universities. Trogen reported four acceptances and three rejections.

Bitter said that as ETSU's representative on the TBR Faculty Subcouncil he has come to believe that its primary function is "to keep revolution at bay." There are several subcouncils, but they report only to the Presidents' Council; nothing goes beyond. The idea for a 120-hour BS core passed because TBR contains twice as many community colleges as four-year schools, but the latter did not see the standard as an improvement over the more autonomous standards that preceded it.

Senator Schacht said "scary ideas," such as the centralizing of research, were circulating about higher education in Tennessee. TUFs tried to get someone on a rumored gubernatorial commission but were told there was no such group. The pressure to act came from an influential legislator who said that if TUFs members wanted to be heard, they had to take a stand.

Senator Mullersman asked if anyone knows why those who voted against the

Paper did so. Schacht reported that the UT-K Faculty Senate said they were afraid TBR, four times the size of the UT system, would take over higher education in the state.

Trogen moved that we vote to endorse Recommendation 9, which establishes a separate system for community colleges and technical schools and merges TBR universities with the UT system. He stressed the final sentence: "University faculty senates should be involved in all stages of the development of this new system."

Bitter said he represents various opinions in his college, from lack of interest to support and a sizable number who oppose the Paper. The latter see no difference between #9 and the governor's proposal. Unification will benefit UT-K, which is highly esteemed by legislators, and hamstring other schools' research and graduate programs; it will force an uncomfortable conformity of curriculum on schools that need to fulfill different missions for their students. It could weaken higher education in the state rather than strengthen it.

Dorgan said her department is also split. Her concern is with the false choice between #9 and nothing, with no consideration of other options. "This document does not prevent ETSU from being subsumed" by other schools that want to control our interests and resources.

Mullersman agreed on the possibility that ETSU might come out on the short end. In Florida, U of F is the flagship, but other schools have their strengths. In California, however, the two-tier system puts those schools in the second tier at a distinct disadvantage. We may put ourselves in the position of becoming a second-tier school.

Senator Burgess said that history and physics faculty oppose the Paper. He said the Paper is based on unwarranted assumptions, such as that something must be done now to avert disaster, or that our creating a voice will have the effect we desire on legislators.

Senator Kortum said that in the Executive Committee's meeting with President Stanton, Stanton expressed support for a unified system, but he favors one like Georgia's, not like those in several other states: "This document is hopelessly silent on the matter" of what model we want, Stanton pointed out. According to Kortum, members of his department, philosophy, consider the Paper unendorsable.

Senator Kellogg quoted Senator Hemphill's comment that "This one recommendation is so intrinsically flawed that it alone could be considered the 'silver bullet/giant killer' in recommending voting against the whole thing." Grover added that members of her department oppose the Paper 14-1 for the reasons already cited.

Schacht said he is impressed by the role of fear in the dialogue—are we more afraid or more interested in advancing opportunity? Whatever our role, we will send a message to legislators that we are able to express a voice. “There is not bad publicity except an obituary.” He feels the particulars do not matter, for the Paper is a starting place.

Grover responded that she felt the whole Paper arose from fear, that it has propelled TUFS toward precipitous actions that may play into the hands of those who want to restructure higher education in Tennessee to the advantage of a few schools and at the cost of others like ETSU.

Senator Arnall said we may be “voting ourselves out of a voice at the table.” He is optimistic and agrees with Alsop, who has asked for support of the document not as an end, but as a means of creating a voice.

Bitter posed two questions: How much does this imperfect document result from attempts to get votes? and, If other groups expressed support for some but not all points, could we not also? Alsop repeated that attendees at TUFS were charged to present it for an up or down vote. Memphis supported the Paper’s objectives but not its recommendations.

Champouillon called for the vote on Recommendation 9.

Senator Hamdy said he saw nothing in the Paper to protect ETSU and its specific missions. We are voting on an initiative that may be interpreted differently from what its creators and we have intended.

Arnall said the fear is that we will become no more than a community college. But even in second-tier universities in California, faculty have a voice; resourceful faculty get what they need. Bitter responded that faculty in California are unionized, giving them a voice faculty in Tennessee do not have. To imagine our future condition, we should consider the status of UT-Chattanooga and UT-Martin. Alsop said that UT-Martin is “in lockstep with” UT-K, but UT-C would rather be a TBR school, according to TUFS representatives.

Trogen called for the question on Recommendation 9. Ayes carried the vote 24 to 11.

Kellogg asked if it would be worth our while to express our opinions on the other points in the Paper.

Trogen moved that the Paper as a whole be endorsed; the motion was seconded. Bitter called for paper ballots. Bitter and Schacht were asked to count the ballots.

Champouillon asked if there were any announcements. Byington said he is concerned that we communicate with legislators. Fisher repeated his urging that Rusty Crowe be brought into discussions, especially those concerning the reorganization of higher education in Tennessee. Alsop called for continuing the Legislative Round Table begun by Trogen in spring 2009, and Trogen assented.

Bitter and Schacht announced the vote to endorse the TUFSS Position Paper: 34 for, 10 against.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Champouillon adjourned the meeting at 4:45 pm.

Please notify Kathleen Grover (grover@etsu.edu or x96672), Faculty Senate Secretary, 2009-2010, of any changes or corrections to the minutes. Web Page is maintained by Senator Doug Burgess (burgess@etsu.edu or x96691).