

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

3-23-2009

2009 March 23 - 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, "2009 March 23 - Faculty Senate Minutes" (2009).

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes. 291.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/291>

This 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.

MINUTES—MARCH 23, 2009
Faculty Senate—East Tennessee State University

UPCOMING MEETING:	FOLLOWING MEETING:
April 6, 2009 2:45 pm Forum, Culp Center	April 20, 2009 2:45 pm Forum, Culp Center

Present: Arnall, Bitter, Brown, Buerkle (proxy for Dorgan), Burgess, Byington, Campbell, Champouillon, Cherry, Creekmore, Drummond, Ecay, Fisher, Fitzgerald, Franklin, Glover, Govett, Grover, Hamdy, Hemphill, Horton, Kortum, Metts, Michieka (proxy for Elhindi), Morgan, Mozen, Mullersman, Mustain, Price, Roach, Schacht, Scott, Shafer, Shuttle, Smurzynski, Stuart, Tarnoff, Zhu, Zou

Excused: Alsop, Crowe, Dorgan, Elhindi, Gerard, Granberry, Horton, Kaplan, Loess, Martin, Peiris, Stone, Trainor

Guest: Dean Linda Garceau, College of Business and Technology

CALL TO ORDER: A quorum being present, President Trogen called the meeting to order at 2:50 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the February 23, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

CONTINUING BUSINESS: **Dean Garceau explained that the Proposed Evaluation Policy would seem familiar to senators of 2007-2008, for it is based on and contains many elements of an earlier draft presented to the Senate by then Senator Chris Dula.**

President Elect Champouillon , noting that the policy cites evaluations of faculty to include departmental chairs, said that deans and other administrators should be included. Garceau answered that the Evaluations Subgroup was charged with developing criteria and procedures for evaluating those whom she cited and no more.

The subgroup took a year to develop the policy and is taking another year to tweak it. Ten departments are undergoing it now. The processes differ according to the criteria each department chooses to include.

The philosophical basis for the Policy is that each faculty member, tenured or non-tenured. non-tenurable, clinical or research, has a right to an equitable, transparent evaluation. It should provide clear guidance for progress toward tenure or promotion or toward contract renewal; it may be used in distribution of rewards made available by the University, college, or department.

Criteria are based on guidelines for teaching, research/creative activities, and service as described in the *ETSU Faculty Handbook*, with specifics from departmental documents. Criteria are weighted according to the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the department, college, and University. Weights given to each criterion may change as the direction of the units change.

The process involves development of criteria at the departmental level. Each department further develops an evaluation matrix that articulates each level of performance for each criterion defined in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Levels, such as excellent, good, acceptable, poor, and actionable, are defined. The criteria should be objective and clear.

Senator Schacht commented that the performance levels are presented as if they are a continuum, but they are not. Excellent, good, acceptable, and poor may describe qualities, but actionable denotes a consequence of performance rather than a quality of it.

Senator Franklin said he questions the categories; some may not be applicable. Garceau responded that department faculty, in conversation with the chair, determine which categories are applicable and weight them accordingly.

Senator Mullersman asked if the criteria and weighting can be changed in light of shifting circumstances. Garceau said yes.

Senator Arnall asked how differences in evaluation standards between a faculty member and a chair or other faculty members can be resolved. For example, the faculty member may conduct research according to the goals and criteria of an external evaluating agent, but a chair may rate it down because it is not research he/she wants done. The faculty member may choose animal research although the chair wants human research. Garceau said each college and department briefly defines its research goals, but all kinds of research should be valued.

Senator Stuart added that critical theories of teaching also differ. Garceau suggested that if disagreements arise, the faculty and chair should try to reach a consensus; they could ask for a review by other faculty.

Schacht commented that such disputes sound like issues of academic freedom and can be grounds for appeal. Garceau said if there are grounds for appeal, jurisdiction must be determined: gender, diversity, academic freedom? Senator Burgess added that disputants might need to take different parts of issues to different agents—for example, diversity to Mary Jordan.

Garceau said members of the Subgroup hope evaluations of the proposed policy will be affirmative, but they are also looking for guidance.

Trogen asked if there is any assurance that a person kept from fulfilling agreed-upon criteria by circumstances beyond control—for example, made unable to do planned research because he/she is asked to teach an additional class—will not be penalized. Garceau agreed that such circumstances must be considered in all transaction between chairs and faculty.

Garceau thanked senators for their attention to the policy and asked that suggestions for names of evaluative categories, problems with the appeals process, or any other concerns be forwarded to her. She will return to the Senate as the policy further evolves.

Senator Hemphill said he and Senators Govett and Shuttle were still working on the proposal to extend the Senate presidency to two years. He still has questions about what senators want. For example, do we want to have a maximum of two consecutive terms for a president? He wants to avoid a dynasty. An alternative is to have a vice president, who may serve a year, especially the first year or a president's two-year term, without wanting to become president elect or president.

Schacht commented that the question of how long a term should be is related to the means of limiting terms. Hemphill answered that if the Senate impeaches a president, there is still a vice president to take over. Past President Alsop wanted a two-year term for the Senate president, but it is unwieldy to have a two-year term for president elect.

Senator Bitter asked if we are back to a series of one-year terms. Senator Buerkle asked if the proposal eliminates the position of president elect. Hemphill said changing the office from president elect to vice present gives a person the option of running for president instead of committing him/her to the office a whole year earlier.

Bitter commented that the president elect gets valuable experience in the year in that office; a vice president might not get the same experience. If there is to be a two-year term, we need to take it seriously. At this time of the year senior staff may stop taking the Senate president seriously, assuming he/she is stepping down. We need to shorten or end the lame-duck period. Champouillon asked that we either support the original proposal or come up with another.

Stuart asked that senators be given two proposals and the opportunity to choose between them. Shuttle said he can support a two-term presidency but not re-election to a second two-year term. Hemphill said it would be simpler to re-elect a president. We shorten the lame-duck period by electing a vice president or present elect in the spring and having him/her come aboard during the summer.

Bitter said her favors a two-year presidency. The president elect voted into office this spring should follow current President Elect Champouillon, who will serve a

one-year term as president. That person will become president in 2010-2011. We need to get this proposal into the Constitution.

Senator Fitzgerald said he disagrees with a two-year term. A president may want to step down after a year. He fears fewer people will run for either president or president elect because of the commitment required. He likes the option of re-electing a president.

Senator Campbell said she likes the two-year presidency with a vice president. Then the vice president can choose to run for president elect but does not have to make that commitment until after one year in office.

Hemphill asked for an informal vote, resulting in 14 voting for a two-year presidency and 14 for a one-year renewable term. He said he will formulate both options and bring them back to the Senate. He suggested we recommend one or the other to the faculty in a vote on changing the Senate Constitution.

Mullersman asked if the president elect can ramp up activities to mitigate the lame-duck period. Bitter answered that the entire Executive Committee has become more active, meeting in the summer as a body and with administrators. He supports the two-year presidency so the president can keep working on his/her agenda. Mullersman said it all comes down to cooperation: we need to elect people who cooperate on carrying out agendas.

Senator Martin agreed, adding that perhaps we should have the Senate determine and commit to goals, perhaps for periods of five years; then those ideas can remain to guide actions despite changes in presidents. A president would be elected to serve the will of the Senate, not to use the Senate to fulfill his/her will.

Hemphill said we need a mechanism for fulfilling the intent of a two-year cycle. He will work on it and get it to senators before the next meeting.

Schacht said we need to work on strengthening our relationship with administrators so they reach out to us preemptively instead of our being primarily reactive or trying to anticipate adversarial interchanges in order to waylay them.

Champouillon said he likes Martin's idea of a three- to five-year plan. It promotes vision.

Schacht reviewed the history of the Ethics Code drafts, explaining that the Senate asked ETSU President Stanton to charge the Faculty Academic Freedom and Ethics Committee with the task of developing an Ethics Code when problems relating to developmental governance revealed that none existed. He asked that we deliberate carefully, saying that whichever one we choose will become the basis of the committee's adjudications in specific cases.

Bitter said he prefers no code to one that has no teeth. He works in a field loaded with codes, but even with them it is hard to keep people from doing unethical things.

Mullersman said QCOM is working on a code currently longer than the longer of the two options Schacht has presented. He is concerned that we will have a number of codes but still lack a clear framework addressing the major issues; he wants a document that can be consulted by anyone in the University. Schacht said the issue of potential conflicts between this code and others has been discussed; this one in no way exempts people from any other code.

Champouillon said he likes the specificity of the longer draft, especially the portion dealing with integrity. He knows of people writing untruths but not being called on them.

Senator Byington asked if we should try to cover all areas or put confidence into the committee with a more aspirational policy.

Campbell moved that consideration of the drafts be continued and a vote be postponed to permit more time for senators to study them.

Shuttle said he originally supported the longer draft, but it covers much that is already in other policies. For example, strictures against cruelty to animals are already in the policies of the Animal Care Committee.

Mullersman said due process might need to be strengthened and polished more than particulars in the policy itself.

Senator Burgess seconded Campbell's motion, which passed on voice vote with one or two nays.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Schacht said that because he will be in Nashville April 6, Shuttle will lead any discussion of the Ethics Code that occurs on that date.

Senator Roach said faculty have expressed concern that seniority is not being considered in Voluntary Buy-Outs. Trogen said that members of the Budget were concerned that applications might put people in a bad light if RIFs become necessary later.

Trogen reminded members of the Executive committee of their meeting with Dr. Bach on Wednesday, March 25, 2009.

Trogen asked if Senator Mozen planned to meet with other members of the TN AAUP who were consulting with legislators that week. She said ETSU AAUP President Ken Silvers would be meeting with them and would report to her; she will share his report with the Senate.

Election of 2009-2010 Senate officers will take place April 20th. Nominees are needed for vice president (or president elect if the presidential term remains unchanged), secretary, and treasurer.

Volunteers are needed: one or more for an ad hoc committee dealing with faculty reporting of attendance, ESPRs, etc.; one or more for the Enrollment Enhancement Task Force; one for the Food Service Contract Selection Committee.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:52 pm.

*Please notify Kathleen Grover (grover@etsu.edu or x96672), Faculty Senate Secretary, 2008-2009, of any changes or corrections to the minutes. Web Page is maintained by Senator Doug Burgess (burgess@etsu.edu or x96691).
wordsmithing*