

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

1-25-1988

1988 January 25 - 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, "1988 January 25 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (1988). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 338.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/338>

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

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

January 25, 1988

D.P. Culp Center, Forum 3:30p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. TREASURERS REPORT

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

University Council Meeting, Dec. 14 - Hougland
Presidents Council Meeting, Dec. 17 - LeCroy
Academic Council Meeting, Jan. 14 - Hougland

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

V. NEW BUSINESS

Promotion & Tenure Appeals Committee Membership

General Education Committee Report

Summary of Concerns - J. Taylor

Promotion Policy - D. Logan

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Please be prepared to discuss the Summary of Concerns and the Promotion Policy. This may be the last chance you will have to review the Promotion Policy before it is sent to the Administration for approval.



East Tennessee State University

Box 23534A • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING

January 25, 1988

D.P. CULP CENTER, FORUM

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by President Margaret Hougland at 3:35 p.m.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Minutes of the Dec. 7, 1987 meeting were approved as prepared.

TREASURER REPORT

William Fisher distributed a report showing a balance of \$3,107.00 as of December 31, 1987.

REPORTS

University Council Meeting - December 14, 1987 President Margaret Hougland reported that the major part of the meeting was devoted to the discussion of the function of the University Council. Dr. Beller expressed a desire for input to the University Council.

President's Council Meeting - December 17, 1987. Anne LeCroy reported several issues that were discussed. An advisory Committee has been appointed to review in-state residency issues. Dr. Manahan presented the equipment budget. Dr. Beller reported that the October revision of the budget was approved by the SBR.

Academic Council Meeting - January 14, 1988. President Margaret Hougland reported that several curriculum proposals were approved. Also, the name of the Department of Criminal Justice was changed to the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology. An Equality of Opportunity Committee was established as a result of Status of Women review. The committee will examine issues which concern minorities on campus.

William Fisher reported that the results of the Governor's survey shows that state employees prefer across the board pay increases instead of merit pay. Public school teachers are to get \$1,175 pay increase for next year.

Dr. Fisher was appointed as the faculty representative to an Early Retirement Study Committee.

Dr. Fisher reviewed the announcements for various positions at ETSU advertised in the Chronicle of Higher Education. He encouraged the faculty to attend the TIAA-CREF Seminar March 2, 1988 at the Sheraton.

NEW BUSINESS

Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee. President Hougland asked for the names of the representatives to this committee to be given to Dr. LeCroy. Members are selected by the Faculty Senate representatives of the Schools and Colleges. Persons selected to this committee do not have to be members of the Faculty Senate but must be tenured.

General Education Committee Report. Al Lucero reported that Dr. Alfonso's office distributed a document containing the preamble, assumptions, goals, implementation and management of general education to the University faculty. Feedback has been received and discussed by the committee. Dr. Lucero encouraged the Senators to submit any comments concerning the document.

Summary of Concerns. John Taylor compiled and distributed a summary of faculty concerns presented to the Faculty Senate by Colleges and Schools in 1986-1987. Extensive discussion followed on various items. A motion to forward this document to Dr. Beller was approved unanimously.

Policy on Faculty Promotion. Copies of the policy were distributed. Several revisions were suggested as the document was reviewed page by page. The senators suggested that the policy be returned to David Logan.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,


Alfonso Lucero

FACULTY SENATE ATTENDANCE
January 25, 1988

Present


Suzanne Smith
James Pleasant
Etta Saltos
Edwin Williams
Colin Baxter
Anne LeCroy
David Close
Eduardo Zayas-Bazan
Karen Renzaglia
Robert Samuels
William Fisher
F. Steb Hipple
Alfonso Lucero
Jean Frazier
John Taylor
Margaret Hougland
Mark Airhart
Betsy Williams
Brunhilde Tober-Meyer
Werner Waldron
Ruth Ketron
Carol Norris
Mitchell Robinson
David Chi
Don Ferguson
Linda Kerley
Glenda DeJarnette
Creg Bishop

Absent

James Fields
Frederick Waage
Paul Walwick
George Granger
Bill Campbell
John Stone
Charles Beseda
Don Jones
Clark Gillett
Richard Verhegge
Katherine Dibble
Joyce Bassham

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: • Distribution

FROM: • Richard Yount, Registrar 

SUBJECT: • WITHDRAWAL PROCEDURE - SUMMER TERM

DATE: • January 14, 1988

While somewhat premature in timing, I want to make you aware of a change in the procedure for processing withdrawals effective with this Summer term. In the past, each of the separate "terms" within Summer (Intersession, Term I, Term II) were treated as separate entities. For example, students were permitted to withdraw from Intersession but continue in Term I. When students were only taking one course, this totally bypassed the last day to drop and permitted great latitudes in "dropping" courses.

NEW PROCEDURE:

Withdrawal from the Summer term is to be treated as discontinuing matriculation for the entire Summer term. Grades earned in previous terms of the same Summer term would not be affected and the student would receive "W" grades (depending upon the time of the withdrawal) in ongoing courses and be dropped from courses which have not yet started and a withdrawal date assigned.

Please disseminate this new procedure widely, especially to department secretaries and anyone else who works with assisting students.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Distribution:

Dr. Alfonso	Mr. Kite
Dr. Stout	Mr. Johnson
Dr. Vaught	Mr. Taylor
Dr. Vavrek	Mr. Posey
Dr. Walters	Department Chairs
Registrar's Staff	Deans

(suwdpol)

REVISIONS OF FACULTY PROMOTION POLICY
January 14, 1988

- 2.3.1.1. added-underlined
"...to encourage scholarship, creative productivity, and research, and to..."
- 2.3.1.2. revised
"...and committee service...should be considered... qualifications for promotion, though they are insufficient..."
- 2.3.1.3. added-last sentence
"...the vice president and the president."
- 2.3.1.4. Semicolons inserted appropriately.
- 2.3.3. added-last line
"...individual concerned, and the uniqueness of the unit involved."
- 2.3.3.3. new paragraph inserted
All candidates for promotion to the ranks of associate professor and professor must meet departmental and college/ school expectations for above average performance in each of the three areas of teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities; and professional service. Successful candidates for the rank of associate professor should be judged as above average in two categories and excellent in at least one. To attain the rank of professor, candidates should be judged as excellent in at least two of the three areas and as good in the third. Candidates for senior rank should be expected to have both a greater quantity as well as quality of achievement in the three categories.
- 2.3.4.1. added
"...Evidence should be affirmed by peer review at the department or unit level."
- 2.3.4.3. added
"...Information regarding such abilities should be evident in student evaluations of instruction and may be verified by peer review of the candidate."
- 2.3.7.1. revised to conform to 2.3.9.1.
"...from a regionally accredited institution in the instructional discipline or related area."
- 2.3.7.3. revised to conform to 2.3.9.6.
"Evidence of high professional standards and behavior consistent with professional ethics."
- 2.3.8.1. revised to conform to 2.3.9.1
"...from a regionally accredited institution in the instructional discipline or related area."

2.3.8.5. added paragraph-to conform to 2.3.9.

"Documented evidence of professional service activities of a significant nature."

2.3.9.1 insert

"...from a regionally accredited..."

2.3.10.5 revised to clarify

"It is expected that no level of review is bound by prior judgement(s)."

2.3.10.12 semicolons inserted as appropriated

2.3.10.17 added-last line

"A copy of the committee recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate."

2.3.10.18 semicolons inserted as appropriated

2.3.10.19 added

"...will also notify the candidate, department chair, and college promotion committee in writing of..."

2.3.10.20 revised

"In the event the vice president's recommendation..."

2.3.10.23 added

"...the appropriate vice president's office, of the..."

"...the appropriate vice president's office, inform..."

"...for disapproval, and the chair will advise the faculty member within five days of said notification."

2.3 POLICY ON FACULTY PROMOTION

2.3.1. PRINCIPLES OF PROMOTION:

2.3.1.1.

The major responsibilities of the University are to provide the best possible education, to encourage scholarship and research, and to furnish significant service to the citizens of the State of Tennessee. Fundamental to this responsibility is the recruitment, selection, recognition, and retention of quality faculty members. Providing incentives and rewards for superior performance is a means of assuring the continuing existence of a high quality faculty. Advancement in rank is a recognition of accomplishments and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater achievements and of assuming greater responsibilities. The policy of East Tennessee State University is to grant advancement on the basis of merit. In accord with this policy, promotions are to be made equitably, impartially, and in keeping with the following guidelines.

2.3.1.2.

Each academic rank represents specific qualifications, professional competencies, and a history of productivity; together with the promise of continued growth. Promotion to higher rank is neither an unqualified right nor an automatic occurrence. Having completed a given period of service or performed routine duties (such as carrying a normal course load, advising students, research to the degree needed for teaching courses, participation in departmental programs and governance, and committee service) though considered an affirmative factor in appraising a faculty member's qualifications for promotion, are insufficient in and of themselves to warrant promotion.

2.3.1.3.

The excellence of the faculty of East Tennessee State University is maintained in part through an appraisal of each candidate for promotion by colleagues and by appropriate administrative officers. This appraisal process must begin at the departmental level with a statement of the objectives and aims of the department, the college or school of which it is an integral part, and the university as a whole. Faculty members may be recommended for promotion to a higher academic rank based upon their demonstrated qualifications for that rank as evaluated by their peers in the department concerned, the department chair, the promotion and tenure advisory committee of the school or college, the academic dean, and the vice president.

2.3.1.4.

The appraisal of each candidate should incorporate a thorough review of achievements which are expected in teaching, research, scholarly or creative activity, and professional service. Specific criteria to be applied to the work of an individual faculty member will be clearly delineated on annual faculty activity plans, reports and evaluations. The department chair should submit evaluations of these activities, accompanied by evidence obtained through an evaluation process designed to insure that recommendations are predicated on substantive analysis.

2.3.1.5.

The criteria according to which excellence is defined will vary from discipline to discipline. The standards established by each discipline should be carefully documented and considered by everyone involved in the evaluation of members of that discipline. Certain areas, such as the fine, performing and applied arts, may justifiably require different criteria than do other disciplines. In these, evidence of creative or other significant productivity may be presented. Achievements of this sort, however, should be of such quality and extent as to earn for the individual that same recognition in the discipline that significant research earns in areas of study in which research is an important factor.

2.3.1.6.

Because of the importance and significance of the promotion deliberations, each faculty member must assume responsibility for insuring that pertinent information concerning teaching, research, scholarly or creative activity, and professional service is available to the chair and departmental committee. In addition to individual qualifications and performance, other special factors may also play a part in the recommendations eventually offered by the vice presidents. Consistent with State Board of Regents' policy, the University administration must consider such matters as departmental rank distribution, potential for continued staff additions, prospective retirements and resignations from the department, enrollment patterns, and program changes or developments.

2.3.2. RANK AT APPOINTMENT:**2.3.2.1.**

New faculty members will normally be employed, based upon their qualifications, at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or professor.

2.3.2.2.

Except under unusual circumstances, individuals lacking the terminal degree, as defined by discipline, will not be hired in one of the professorial ranks. The terminal degree does not necessarily qualify one for a professorial rank nor does receipt of the terminal degree guarantee promotion to a higher rank. When time in rank is a factor for promotion, years spent in that rank in some other institution may be counted as specified in letter or contract of appointment.

2.3.3. PROMOTION GUIDELINES:**2.3.3.1.**

Nominees for promotion will be judged on the basis of their performance in teaching, research, 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. Performance in these areas will be given different weights depending upon the assigned duties and responsibilities of the individual concerned.

2.3.3.2.

Requirements for minimum service in one rank are not absolute. Exceptions may be made on the basis of exceptional academic and/or other achievements of a particularly valuable nature.

2.3.3.3.

All candidates for promotion to the ranks of associate professor and professor must meet minimal departmental and college/school expectations of performance in each of the three areas of teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities; and professional service.

2.3.4. TEACHING:

Since the first responsibility of the University is the education of its students, excellence in teaching should be continually encouraged and rewarded. No nomination for promotion should be made without accompanying evidence of the nominee's effectiveness as a teacher. Inevitably, the rating of teaching ability is to some degree a value judgment. It is incumbent upon each department to develop a rating procedure whereby all factual information relative to a candidate's work as a teacher is available at the time s/he is considered for promotion. Evidence supplied by the candidate might include records reflecting performance above routine expectations in the following:

2.3.4.1.

Command of subject matter.

2.3.4.2.

Ability to organize and present subject matter in a logical and meaningful way.

2.3.4.3.

Ability to motivate students.

2.3.4.4.

Development of instructional techniques or teaching materials.

2.3.4.5.

Successful direction of theses, dissertations or independent research projects; and effective leadership of research projects which are intended in part to train students in research techniques.

2.3.4.6.

Textbooks or other published materials indicative of teaching interest and effectiveness. Such publications would also be considered as contributions to research, scholarly or creative activities.

2.3.4.7.

Considerations other than hours of classroom contact should include such matters as the total number of preparations per semester, the number of courses per academic year, the level of difficulty of the courses, the number of students assigned to the classes, and time and location of courses.

2.3.5. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:

Research, and scholarly and creative activities are important areas of faculty involvement in the University. Clear evidence of the quality of work should accompany each application. Evidence supplied by the candidate might include records reflecting performance above routine expectations in the following:

2.3.5.1.

Publications: These include textbooks, books or chapters in books, articles in refereed journals, articles in non-refereed journals, monographs, refereed and non-refereed conference proceedings, abstracts, book reviews, and other related items.

2.3.5.2.

Papers presented: These include those papers presented at local, state, regional, national, and international professional meetings. The significance of content and selection process should be considered in the process of reviewing such presentations.

2.3.5.3.

Performances or exhibitions: These include performances or exhibitions that are invited or juried by internationally, nationally or regionally recognized members or groups within the discipline.

2.3.5.4.

Research in progress: Verification of stages of development is mandatory.

2.3.5.5.

Other items such as funded or unfunded research proposals, computer software development, or audio-visual media may also be considered.

2.3.6. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

Evidence of the candidate's contributions in the area of professional service which includes service to the University, to the candidate's discipline, and to the larger society of which the University is a part should be offered by the candidate. Documentation of all service activities is required. Service should include participation in organizations and on committees although more significance will be attached to leadership roles therein. Evidence supplied by the candidate might include records reflecting performance above routine expectations in the following:

2.3.6.1.

Service to the University and to affiliated institutions. This category includes departmental, college/school, and University committee participation and leadership roles therein; participation in University governance; administrative service; advisement of students; recruitment activities; service to student organizations; and other related activities.

2.3.6.2.

Service to one's discipline. This category includes memberships and leadership roles in professional organizations at international, national, regional and state levels.

2.3.6.3.

Service to the larger society of which the University is a part. This category includes making presentations related to one's discipline; providing professional advice and counsel to groups or individuals; and providing other types of service, particularly in the University's service area.

2.3.6.4.

A faculty member's contributions in the area of service are subject to evaluation based on criteria uniquely applicable to this aspect of his or her work. As is the case with teaching, it is difficult to evaluate service; however, it is the responsibility of the peer review committees and administrative officers recommending candidates to develop criteria and to document performance. Among the criteria on which the evaluation of service should be based are the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University, and its effect on the development of students and other faculty members.

2.3.7. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: Those faculty members promoted to or hired at the rank of Assistant Professor should meet the following criteria:

2.3.7.1.

Possession of an earned terminal degree, as defined by the discipline, from a regionally accredited institution.

2.3.7.2.

Evidence from academic records, recommendations, interviews, or other sources that the individual is adequately trained in the discipline and is otherwise competent to carry out the duties and responsibilities of a member of a university faculty.

2.3.7.3.

Evidence that the individual can maintain good professional relations with students and colleagues.

2.3.7.4.

Evidence of effective teaching if the individual has taught at the college level. If the individual has not taught at the college level, evidence should be obtained that satisfactory teaching performance can reasonably be expected.

2.3.7.5.

Promise of productive creative and scholarly research and service.

2.3.8. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: Those faculty members promoted to or hired at the rank of Associate Professor should meet the following criteria:

2.3.8.1.

Possession of an earned terminal degree, as defined by the discipline, from an accredited institution.

2.3.8.2.

At least five years of academic experience in the rank of assistant professor. Only one year of a leave of absence for scholarly recognition, such as significant scholarship awards, will be credited toward satisfying the experience requirement for promotion.

2.3.8.3.

Evidence of high professional standards and behavior consistent with professional ethics.

2.3.8.4.

Documented evidence of teaching effectiveness, and professional service.

2.3.8.5.

Documented evidence, as accepted within the discipline, of scholarly productivity in research or creative endeavors.

2.3.8.6.

Participation in the activities of state, regional or national professional organizations related to the candidate's discipline.

2.3.9. PROFESSOR: The highest rank to which one may be promoted is that of Professor. Those faculty members promoted to or hired at the rank of Professor should meet the following criteria:

2.3.9.1.

An earned terminal degree, as defined by the discipline, from an accredited institution in the instructional discipline or related area.

2.3.9.2.

At least six years of academic experience in the rank of associate professor. (Time spent on leave may be counted as indicated in the requirements for associate professor).

2.3.9.3.

Documented evidence of teaching effectiveness.

2.3.9.4.

Successful research, scholarly and/or creative activity, as evidenced by such accomplishments as published scholarly books, articles in professional journals in one's discipline, presentation of papers before regional, national or international professional groups, receipt of major research grants, and/or a record of significant exhibitions or performances.

2.3.9.5.

Professional service of an outstanding nature, usually of such kind as to make the individual regionally or nationally known in the discipline, or, alternatively, as a leading figure in service efforts promoted by the institution.

2.3.9.6.

Evidence of high professional standards and behavior consistent with professional ethics.

2.3.10.**Initiation and Processing of Promotion Recommendations.**

The formulation of recommendations concerning the promotion of a faculty member is a cumulative process occurring at three levels; departmental/divisional, collegial, and executive or presidential. The faculty member eligible for consideration also has a significant role by assuming responsibility for timely submission of pertinent materials to the department chair for review at each level.

2.3.10.1.

The director of personnel, by May 1st of each year, shall provide department chairs, deans, the appropriate vice president, and the president with lists of faculty members eligible for promotion through length of service. The action by the director of personnel does not relieve the department chairs of the responsibility of determining eligibility for promotion.

2.3.10.2.

Department chairs, during the succeeding 15 days, will verify the lists through departmental and other administrative offices.

2.3.10.3.

By May 15 each faculty member eligible for promotion shall be so notified by the department chair. A department chair may initiate a promotion recommendation at any time; but unless there is special need for earlier processing, subsequent steps will be taken according to the established schedule.

2.3.10.4.

Applications (dossiers) on forms provided by the appropriate vice president's office will be completed by each faculty member applying for promotion. These applications will be submitted to the department chair no later than October 1. All promotion applications must be complete at that time. No additional documentation may be added after October 1 except at the request of the reviewers and with the permission of the candidate, or vice versa.

2.3.10.5.

Promotion applications will be reviewed at each level of the process. It is expected that each level of review is independent of prior judgment. At each level in the process, the cumulative recommendations and statements of rationale recorded by committees and administrators will be forwarded as integral parts of each candidate's dossier. Each reviewing official or committee has the responsibility to remand an application to any preceding level if that level's review is found to be incomplete or otherwise unacceptable. Consistent with Board of Regents' policy, all peer committees have qualified privilege of academic confidentiality against disclosure of individual promotion votes unless there is evidence that casts doubt upon the integrity of the peer committee.

2.3.10.6.

In some cases, such as small departments or unique fields of study, outside expertise may also be necessary in the evaluation process. The chair and the candidate must agree on the individual(s) selected from departments or institutions other than the candidate's own. Department chairs will call formal meeting(s) of all senior faculty within their respective departments (those holding academic rank equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate) and such outside experts as are required to review pending promotion applications. Applicants must be given at least one week's notice of such meetings and shall have the opportunity to bring to the participants' notice any material which may be helpful in determining the applicant's fitness for higher rank.

2.3.10.7.

In addition to any other evidence that the candidate might choose to provide, the candidate must furnish student assessments of instruction drawn from at least eight classes taught while holding current rank. These student assessments should be representative of a variety of classes that the candidate has taught. A university-approved assessment instrument will be used for this purpose. Student assessments must be included with all applications for promotion and will be considered as one important source of information concerning effective teaching, although not the only one.

2.3.10.8.

A separate peer assessment of teaching effectiveness will also take place. This will include a review of student assessments of instruction with consideration given to the type of courses involved. For purposes of this peer review candidates should include additional items such as course syllabi, study materials, assignments, information on assessment and grading practices, assessment of classroom observation by peers, and expectations relating to the candidate's particular responsibilities. All such factors will be considered in order to obtain a comprehensive view of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2.3.10.9.

Proposed changes in the process for student assessments of instruction will be submitted to the ETSU Student Government Association for consideration and reaction. The SGA will review the uses of student assessments of instruction on a regular basis and will bring its questions, concerns and suggestions to the Faculty Senate and to the Academic Council.

2.3.10.10.

Complete and accurate documentation of all research, scholarly and creative activities, including complete bibliographic listings of publications, status of journals (refereed and non-refereed), role in jointly authored articles and papers, and complete descriptions of professional service activities as outlined in Section 2.3.6. should be included in each application to provide evidence of and support for these activities. Copies of published items and other reported research and creative activities must be available for examination by reviewers.

2.3.10.11.

The departmental review by the committee of senior faculty will be completed using appropriate criteria, as established by the department and consistent with university criteria, in reaching its decision.

2.3.10.12.

After formal discussion, the committee of senior faculty within the department will vote to recommend, or not to recommend, each candidate within the department. A written, composite statement explaining the recommendation shall be signed by each reviewing faculty member and forwarded to the chair. Included in that statement will be an explicit evaluation in each of the areas of teaching, research, creative and scholarly activity, and service.

2.3.10.13.

The department chair, by November 1, will forward to the school or college dean, and to the candidate his/her own decision to recommend or not recommend the candidate for promotion. Included in that recommendation will be a written rationale explaining the recommendation, with an explicit evaluation in each of the areas of teaching; research, creative and scholarly activities; and professional service.

2.3.10.14.

The chair will inform the dean of the senior faculty members' vote. Should the chair elect to act contrary to the vote of the senior faculty, the dean will meet with the chair of that department to discuss the matter.

2.3.10.15.

All recommendations reached at the departmental level will be forwarded to the dean who will forward them to that college or school's promotion and tenure committee for its review.

2.3.10.16.

Prior to or during the fall semester of each year the dean of each college or school will implement procedures to establish a promotion and tenure committee. This committee shall take its membership from professorial ranks of the school or college with equal numbers appointed by the dean and elected by the faculty. Faculty members being considered for promotion or tenure and department chairs may not serve on such committees. The size of the committee should not exceed fourteen (14) members. The committee shall function in the role of advisor to the dean from November 1 until December 15 of each year. More specifically, this committee will perform the functions of review as follows:

- a. Receive and review promotion and tenure recommendations of the chairs and departmental committees for transmittal to the dean. In formulating its recommendations for promotion, the committee should consider the broad perspective of the philosophy and objectives of the school or college.
- b. Review all dossiers to assure that criteria for promotion and tenure are being correctly and uniformly applied to all members of the school or college.
- c. Review the completeness of the information presented and question any omission in criteria or variations in procedure. Where discrepancies or misapplication of criteria are noted, the committee will attempt to correct the errors through direct consultation with those involved.

2.3.10.17.

The school/college review committee will, by December 15, forward to the dean its recommendations and a written, composite statement for each faculty member being reviewed. These written statements will include an explicit evaluation in each of the areas of teaching; research, scholarly and creative activity; and professional service, and will be signed by each committee member.

2.3.10.18.

The dean's recommendations, together with all written documentation, will be forwarded to the appropriate vice president by February 1. This report must also include an explicit evaluation of each candidate's record in the areas of teaching, research, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

2.3.10.19.

The dean, at the time the candidate's application is forwarded to the vice president, will also notify the candidate and the department chair in writing of his/her decision to recommend or not to recommend. In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate may initiate an appeal to the University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee. (See 2.3.11.)

2.3.10.20.

The vice president will hold a meeting with the dean concerned prior to a final recommendation. In the event his/her recommendation is negative s/he will so notify the candidate, the chair and the dean in writing. The candidate has the option at this point in the process of initiating an appeal of the recommendation to the University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee. (See 2.3.11.)

2.3.10.21.

Upon reaching a decision regarding each application for promotion, the vice president will forward the dossier, together with all recommendations relevant to it, to the president by March 1.

2.3.10.22.

All promotion applications which are initiated will be forwarded to the president regardless of the recommendation made by any intervening administrator or faculty committee; unless the candidate chooses to withdraw his/her application. Only the candidate has the right to withdraw an application that has been filed.

2.3.10.23.

Final action, prior to consideration by the Board of Regents, on each promotion recommendation will be taken by the president. When a recommendation is approved by the president and subsequently by the chancellor and the Board of Regents, the president will notify the faculty member, by letter through the vice president's office, of the award of promotion. When a recommendation is disapproved by the president, s/he will, through the vice president's office, inform the department chair of the faculty member involved, in writing, stating reasons for disapproval, and the chair will so advise the faculty member. Any appeal to the Board of Regents must be made in accordance with Board policies. Appropriate administrative officers will be advised by the president of the action taken on all promotion recommendations; whether approved or disapproved.

2.3.10.24.

A list of faculty members who are recommended for promotion will be forwarded to the chancellor and to the Board of Regents.

2.3.10.25.

Upon final action taken by the Board of Regents, the president will so notify the candidate and recommendation forms will be filed in the Personnel Office.

2.3.11. APPEAL PROCEDURE:**2.3.11.1.**

An appellate procedure stands as a basic and important part of the overall promotion granting process. The responsibility of evoking the appeal procedure must be assumed by the candidate.

2.3.11.2.

Two appeal opportunities follow the dean's action and precede that of the president. The candidate may opt to utilize either one, but not both, of these opportunities. Should the dean opt not to recommend, the candidate may request a pre-appeal conference with the vice president. Should the vice president choose to reverse a dean's positive recommendation, the candidate may request a pre-appeal conference with the president. In either event the pre-appeal conference must be requested within seven days of receiving written notice of the negative recommendation.

2.3.11.3.

The University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee will be composed of one faculty senator elected by the Senate who will chair the committee, and one member from each college or school (who was not a member of that body's promotion and tenure committee when the candidate's dossier was evaluated) as elected by faculty senators from that college or school. Terms of appointment shall be for two-year staggered terms with the exception of the committee chair who will serve only a one year term. All members will be tenured and will hold professorial rank. Deans, department chairs, and other administrative personnel directly involved in college or school-level promotion decisions (such as associate or assistant deans) are excluded from membership on this committee.

2.3.11.4.

After the pre-appeals conference, if the candidate has decided to proceed with the appeal, s/he must file an appeal in writing with the University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee within one week or forfeit the right to appeal at that level. When the appeal goes forward, the vice president will submit the candidate's complete promotion dossier to the chair of the University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee. The Committee shall review information relevant to each appeal in accordance with procedures developed by the Committee for all such appeals and incorporate its recommendations as a part of each candidate's dossier to be returned to the vice president or the president for consideration. The Committee will also send a copy of its recommendation(s) to the candidate, the department chair, the dean and the appropriate vice president.

2.3.11.5.

The final appeal opportunity is after the president's decision is made known. The appeal is directed to the Board of Regents in accordance with Board policy.

PROMOTION AND TENURE SCHEDULE

- May 1 Director of personnel informs chairs, deans, directors, and appropriate vice presidents of faculty members' eligibility for tenure and/or promotion.
- Next 15 days Verification of personnel officer's records.
- May 15 Department chairs notify eligible faculty members.
- October 1 Completed application dossiers forwarded to department chairs.
- November 1 College and school promotion and tenure committees must have been formed by this date.
- Department chairs forward all applications to office of the dean or director.
- December 15 Promotion and tenure committee's recommendations forwarded to the dean or director.
- February 1 Dean's or director's recommendations forwarded to the vice president.
- Promotion appeals may be filed at this time.
- March 1 Vice presidents' recommendations forwarded to the president.
- Promotion appeals may be filed at this time.
- April 1 President's recommendations.
- Tenure appeals may be filed at this time.

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY
 PERIOD/TIME CHART
 Effective Fall 1988

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>MONDAY, WEDNESDAY, FRIDAY</u> (55 MINUTES)		<u>TUESDAY, THURSDAY</u> (85 MINUTES)	
	<u>BEGIN</u>	<u>END</u>	<u>BEGIN</u>	<u>END</u>
1	8:00	8:55	8:00	9:25
2	9:05	10:00	9:35	11:00
3	10:10	11:05	11:10	12:35
4	11:15	12:10	12:45	2:10
5	12:20	1:15	2:20	3:45
6	1:25	2:20	3:55	5:20
7	2:30	3:25	-	-
8	3:35	4:30	-	-

PERIODS 9 - 18 ARE THE SAME TIME EVERY DAY OF THE WEEK

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>BEGIN</u>	<u>END</u>
9	4:30	4:55
10	5:00	5:25
11	5:30	5:55
12	6:00	6:25
13	6:30	6:55
14	7:00	7:25
15	7:30	7:55
16	8:00	8:25
17	8:30	8:55
18	9:00	9:25
19	9:30	9:55

1. A standard, 3 credit hour, one day per week course will meet 175 minutes.
2. Use an evening section number for classes which begin 6:00 p.m. or later.
3. Courses beginning 9th, 10th or 11th period should use a "7" as the middle number of the section code.

Registrar 1/13/88
 (timeperd)

Summary of Concerns Presented to the Faculty Senate 1986-87

by Colleges and Schools

The synthesizing of this information was made more complicated by the differing formats used by colleges/schools to present concerns. Three units (business, education, and nursing) indicated priority by the order of their concerns. Other units did not indicate priority in such a fashion. The following summary of concerns does not indicate absolute priority of concerns either in terms of categories of concerns or the listing of concerns within categories, although both frequency of mention and emphasis given were used to devise the structure.

The areas into which concerns seemed to fall were Faculty Welfare, University Governance, Student Programs, and Facilities and Equipment. Additionally, separate headings were established for Parking, Summer School, and the Bookstore. It would have been possible to subordinate these three headings to other areas but the commonality of concern in these areas seemed to warrant special attention. Additionally a miscellaneous heading was established. Items in this category sometimes related to specific units rather than to the University as a whole. No argument is made for the mutual independence of the areas: some items cross boundaries.

A. Concerns related to Faculty Welfare

1. The Faculty Evaluation process. Many aspects of this process received attention. Student ratings, lack of objective criteria, inadequacy of feedback, use of peer evaluation, and adjustments to differing responsibilities were areas mentioned.

2. Items related to faculty salaries, including merit pay adjustments thereto. Comparison of College of Medicine with other elements of the University, possible salary discrepancies, inconsistencies in merit adjustments among colleges/schools, minor differences in performance resulting in significant salary differences, and changes in process for and availability of merit salary adjustments were areas mentioned.
3. Benefits. Sabbaticals, dental insurance, and optical insurance were the areas mentioned.

B. Concerns related to University governance.

1. Decisions related to personnel, travel, purchasing, and grants seem unnecessarily complicated and often time consuming.
2. Communication. Is the University Council fulfilling expectations in the area of information and decision sharing among students, faculty, staff, and administration?
3. Centralizing of decision making. Departmental prerogatives seem to be eroding.
4. Processes for awarding rank and tenure to administration personnel. Should policies and procedures be different for deans and other administrators than for faculty?
5. Inclement weather policies. Which classes should be affected when weather conditions result in a later opening of school on a particular day? How about clinical faculty who might be on duty early in the morning?

C. Student Programs

1. General Education. Is it too much, too little, or does it contain incorrect elements.

2. Student communication skills. There are concerns with abilities of students to write and with the reward system which provides limited incentives (some contend disincentives) for instructors to require extensive written work of students.
3. Coursework based graduate degrees. Such programs seem to downgrade the importance of writing and research for graduate students.
4. Quality Control. Given enrollment-driven funding formulas and the role of student evaluation of instruction, how can we deal with quality control?
5. Honors programs. There was an expressed desire for the redevelopment of honors programs with significant administrative support.
6. Placement. Are placement programs for ETSU graduates, current and past, adequate to help them acquire appropriate positions?
7. Measurement. How can we improve our assessment of student competency?

D. Facilities and Equipment

1. The libraries seem to be underfunded. They are receiving a smaller percentage of operating budgets than was the case a few years ago.
2. There is a need for replacing and modernizing much of ETSU's equipment, especially laboratory equipment.
3. Faculty offices are often too small to enable faculty to operate at optimal levels.
4. There is a need for expanded computer laboratories.
5. Maintenance problems in terms of equipment, furniture, and buildings.
6. Space allocation is still a problem in some areas, nursing in particular.

E. Parking

This section could have been grouped with other elements of facilities; however, it received so much attention that it seemed to warrant a category of its own. In addition to a concern in general about the adequacy of parking facilities, there were special concerns about post office area parking, parking for faculty whose jobs takes them to and from campus during the day, and evening parking, especially during athletic events.

F. Summer School

Concern was expressed with the need for establishing schedules as early as they are called for. The major concerns regarding summer school, however, are budgetary in nature, with the effects of budgetary considerations on academic programs being seen as a severely limiting factor.

G. Bookstore

Concerns about many aspects of bookstore practices and policies were expressed. Areas mentioned included pricing policies, reductions in orders which seemed arbitrary, and inadequate communication about problems with specific texts.

H. Miscellaneous

1. Public/University relations. How can we be more effective in getting news items to local media? How can we develop a more positive relationship with news media?
2. Liability factors. Need clarification for various kinds of liability issues.
3. Phone calls. What kind of monitoring takes place?
4. THRC moritorium^{UM} on master's degrees in nursing. Why was the moritorium established in nursing and how does it relate to other graduate degrees?
5. University School. The University School could be used more widely for research and service activities.