

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

3-2-1987

1987 March 2 - 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, "1987 March 2 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (1987). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 323.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/323>

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.



East Tennessee State University
Box 23534A • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 2, 1987

Forum Room, Culp Center, 3:30 p.m.

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES
- III. SUBJECT: ETSU PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY**
 - ✓ 1. State Board Policies - John Taylor
Promotion and Tenure Handouts
 2. Tenure Criteria - Carol Norris
Tenn Tech - Gordon Ludolf
Middle Tenn - Bill Fisher
 3. Promotion Criteria - Elizabeth Williams
Tenn Tech - Gordon Ludolf
Middle Tenn - Bill Fisher
 - ✓ 4. Student Evaluation - Margaret Hougland
Tenn Tech - Gordon Ludolf
Middle Tenn - Bill Fisher
 5. Appeals - Arne LeCroy
Tenn Tech - Gordon Ludolf
Middle Tenn - Bill Fisher
 6. Promotion and Tenure Procedures - Al Lucero
- IV. ADJOURNMENT

**Please bring your 30 page draft copy of proposed changes in tenure and promotion (Logan document) to the meeting for information and review purposes.



East Tennessee State University
Box 23534A • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 1987 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

CALL TO ORDER and ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. President Fisher announced that Senate funds had been spent for certificates to be received by all senators after their three-year terms. Anne LeCroy reported that President Beller had written a letter recommending tenure for the Faculty member who had made an appeal. (See previous minutes.)

TREASURER'S REPORT

Gordon Ludolf submitted the January report.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

The minutes of the January 26, February 2, and February 16 meetings were approved by voice vote.

ETSU PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY

As scheduled, the main item for discussion was the draft of the proposed changes in the tenure and promotion section of the Faculty Handbook compiled by Dave Logan and his committee.

John Stone first raised the question why the items to be discussed were not "farmed out" to appropriate committees rather than having Executive Committee members discuss them. Both President Fisher and Dave Logan answered that time was a crucial factor. Logan also added that while it was not necessary at this time to cover the promotion policy revisions, it seemed logical to do so.

1. John Taylor had reviewed the SBR policies on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure and Faculty Promotion for discussion today. (Copies of both were distributed.) He stated that SBR policy indicates that each institution is expected to develop its own policy but be within the framework of SBR guidelines and not be in conflict. The particular task at this time is to incorporate our recommendations for the use of student evaluations in the tenure process.

Bill Fisher noted that the Tennessee Tech policy contains a resolution at the end concerning tenure by department. He also announced that the lawyer, Bruce Shine, is reviewing the ETSU draft and will present written commentary soon.

John Taylor stated that although there are some differences in terminology between SBR and ETSU policies, there is no real conflict. For example, where SBR states "earned doctorate" as one of the criteria for promotion

to associate professor or professor, ETSU revision states "terminal degree, as defined by the discipline". John stated that the President of each institution has always been able to make exceptions to the "earned doctorate" phrase in SBR policy. The SBR policy uses the phrase "research (and creative activities)" in describing one of the criteria for promotion. The Logan draft reads "scholarly and/or creative activity".

Betsy Williams pointed out that the ETSU draft had left out of the general requirements for the rank of professor (page 22) statement 4 which deals with ability in instruction. Dave Logan said this was omitted by accident and certainly would be corrected!

Gordon Ludolf asked whether we run a risk in not having our wording exactly the same as SBR wording. He noted that Tennessee Tech seems to follow SBR terminology very closely. Dave Logan answered that President Beller had felt that there was no problem with changing the wording somewhat.

John Taylor stated that there might be some conflict in one area in the draft dealing with appeals. The draft mentions appeals at two levels - one at the college level which goes to the Promotion Appeals Committee and one after the President's decision which goes to the SBR. Following the new SBR policy of Fall 1986, the latter is probably no longer possible. Dave Logan said that this had been pointed out to him and would require revision. Anne LeCroy said the procedure now depends on the reason for appeal.

President Fisher asked if the Senate felt that we should stick more closely to SBR terminology. John Stone stated that if we simply reiterate SBR policy there is no point in our making any of these revisions.

Betsy Williams said that the present policy was approved and was not identical to SBR policy; we should proceed with the revisions.

Dave Logan repeated that the Faculty Senate must proceed, especially in forming the wording for the procedures to be used in incorporating student evaluations in the tenure process.

Bob Samuels stated that we might actually suggest improvements to SBR policy.

2. Margaret Hougland presented ideas for discussion on the use of student evaluation in the tenure process. (The Senate decided to discuss this issue first because of its importance and postpone, if necessary, the discussion of tenure and promotion criteria, procedures and appeals.)

Margaret noted that in the draft policy, there are three times when student evaluation is mentioned:

- 1) Page 9 - Criteria to be Considered in Tenure Recommendations
I.1. "Sources of information which validate a candidate's teaching ability will include student evaluation of instruction, peer evaluation, and evaluation by the department Chair."
(This does not say that SAI is the only method of student evaluation.)

- 2) Page 23 - Criteria for Promotion
"Nominees for promotion will be judged on the basis of their performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity and professional service as evaluated by their peers and appropriate administrative officers. Evidence of performance is to be, to the extent possible, objective and documented."
- 3) Page 24 - Teaching
No. 2 "Student evaluations so formulated as to reflect competence rather than mere popularity."

Having in mind that the task of the Senate (and especially of the committee working on FAP/FAR/FAE process) is to produce ETSU's policy on the role of student evaluation in the tenure process, Margaret reminded the Senate that since 1982 several resolutions have already been forwarded to the administration regarding student evaluation. In September 1985 the FS Development and Evaluation Committee proposed 8 resolutions which were approved and forwarded. In February 1986 the same committee proposed guidelines for interpreting the SAI to be distributed to departments and colleges. These guidelines were sent to Academic Council. In April 1986, John Taylor, then president of Faculty Senate asked John Stone to prepare a paper clarifying or substantiating the need for the guidelines. The paper supported the need for student evaluation to be corroborated by other evidence of teaching effectiveness and recommended that the SAI should be used as an indicator of whether teaching practices should be reviewed, not as an indicator of effectiveness.

Margaret said that the three Faculty Senate members on the FAP/FAR/FAE committee met last week and discussed which recommendations should be made. These members decided that the Senate reiterate those positions as reflected in the resolutions. Student evaluations should be looked at over the long term and should be used for growth and improvement.

Dave Logan said that we are still faced with how to use the SAI for the non-tenured seeking tenure and there is no "long term". Others disagreed, saying that 4 or 5 years is "long term".

John Stone stated that the guidelines which were to be discussed by the FAP/FAR/FAE committee do not seem to be seen as part of that committee's assignment.

Al Lucero stated that the SAI has been misused. In the College of Business, professors who have upgraded their instruction have noticed their student evaluations being lower.

Margaret Hougland and John Stone noted that the guidelines are meant to solve the misuse.

Don Jones, who was on the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee when the survey about the SAI was made, said that one of the most frequent complaints about the SAI was that it was a popularity test.

Anne LeCroy mentioned that the quality and content of the statements on the current SAI are questionable.

Richard Verhegge asked Dr. Alfonso how much weight the SAI's are given when they reach the upper administrative levels. Dr. Alfonso stated that SAI's are looked at more at the college and department level, that he may not even have copies to look at as part of an individual's dossier.

Al Lucero repeated that there are many problems with the evaluation process, that it is too subjective.

Margaret Hougland stated that the issue now is not the instrument or the mechanism, but the inclusion of a statement about the use of the SAI in the new policy. Dave Logan reiterated that we are interested in a description process, not the form. The SBR asks for a calendar or schedule of the review process; each institution must address types and frequency of student evaluation of instruction each should describe provisions for insuring a student advisory role in defining the uses of student evaluations. SBR policy says nothing about form.

A discussion ensued about how to describe the process. Some senators felt that the statements in the draft are sufficient. Dave Logan said that there is still no process described. He gave the example that the Art department uses student evaluations as part of their peer evaluation process. Another discussion about the frequency of evaluations occurred. Originally, according to Anne LeCroy, the evaluations were to be done each semester for five years, then less often. The instrument itself was to be looked at after five years. It was again noted that a particular form need not be decided at this time. The general agreement was that ETSU policy and process regarding student evaluation must be decided upon now. Further work on the instrument and mechanism should follow in the near future. The policy and process should consider the incorporation of resolutions already put forth by the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee and Faculty Senate. However, in order to satisfy the requirement for a statement to the SBR, the Senate informally agreed to suggest as a part of the statement that faculty being considered for tenure should conduct student evaluations in two classes per semester for one to four years (depending upon whether the candidate received credit toward tenure upon employment at ETSU). The Senate did not at this time address the other SBR requirement (5;02;03;00, page 9, section 9C.) about the student advisory role.

Because the agenda for this meeting was not completed and the hour was growing late, another Senate meeting continuing this discussion will be held March 9, 1987.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol B. Norris

Carol B. Norris

CBN/kja

Faculty Senate Meeting
March 2, 1987
Attendance Record

Senators Present

Mark Airhart
Greg Bishop
Peggy Cantrell
David Chi
Carole Connolly
Glenda DeJarnette
Betty Edwards
James Fields
William Fisher
Pat Flaherty
Lester Hartsell
F. Steb Hipple
Margaret Hougland
Don Jones
Linda Kerley
Arne LeCroy
Al Lucero
Gordon Ludolf
Joseph Mattson
Carol Norris
James Pleasant
Etta Saltos
Bob Samuels
John Stone
John Taylor
Gwen Thomas
Richard Verhegge
Frederick Waage
Betsy Williams

Senators Absent

David Close
Katherine Dibble
Don Ferguson
Ruth Ketron (excused)
Paul Monaco
Carol Pullen
Karen Renzaglia
Mitch Robinson (excused)
Bob Stout
Paul Walwick
Eduardo Zayas-Bazan

Guests

David Logan
Wilsie Bishop
Robert Alfonso

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE FINANCIAL REPORT

Budget Categories and Items	Budget 1986-87	Expenses January 1987			Total Expenses To Date 1-31-87	Remaining Balance 1-31-87
I. Travel (3009) In-state travel (3150) Encumbrances	\$2090.00	\$289.00			\$1227.00	\$863.00
II. Operating Expenses (4000) Duplication-Off Campus (4140) Printing by E.T.S.U. (4110) Postage (4230) Data Processing (4420) Supplies (4500)	2100.00	50.00 57.00			782.00	1318.00
III. Scholarships-.RWSP (1410)	1000.00				375.00	625.00
TOTAL	\$5190.00	\$396.00			\$2384.00	\$2806.00
<p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p><i>Gordon W. Ludolf</i></p> <p>Gordon W. Ludolf Treasurer</p> <p>February 16, 1987</p>						