

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

4-15-1991

1991 April 15 - 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, "1991 April 15 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (1991). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 376.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/376>

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.

Assistant Director of Reader Services
Sherrod Library
Box 22,450A
CAMPUS

FACULTY SENATE
NEXT MEETING:
April 15 at 3:30 pm
FORUM ROOM, CULP CENTER

Notes: TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS: Please po.

AGENDA

- 1) Approval of the April 1 minutes (enclosed).
- 2) Treasurer's report.
- 3) Announcements
- 4) Committee reports
 - a) Concerns and Grievances - Hugh LaFollette
- 5) Suggestion for "piloting" the new SAI instrument

The committee has two recommendations (enclosed). The first is to establish Faculty Senate bulletin boards to further inform faculty of issues before the Senate. The second proposes a change in the Senate Policy on Faculty Grievances.

- b) Faculty Development and Evaluation - Saralyn Gold

The committee has several recommendations (enclosed) for procedures to be included in the Standing Tenure and Promotion Policies.

- c) Elections - Ernie Beasley

Since implementation of the new SAI instrument has been delayed due to conversion to the new mainframe computer, Academic Council has discussed a suggestion to conduct a pilot of the instrument. Suggestions included allowing departments to volunteer to participate, allowing individual faculty to volunteer, and conducting the pilot during the summer terms. What do you think?

- 6) Report of ad hoc Budget Committee - Bob Acuff
 - 7) Other business
 - 8) Adjournment
-

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF APRIL 15, 1991

President Bob Riser called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. A quorum was present.

MINUTES. The minutes of the April 1 meeting were corrected as follows: 1) the date of the minutes in the heading should be April 1, not March 18; 2) under Old Business, paragraph #4, the first sentence reads: "Mary Nelson, education, stated that her constituents . . ." That sentence should read: "Mary Nelson, education, stated that a number of people. . ."

ANNOUNCEMENTS. Riser announced that Bill Fisher, business, has been awarded the Philander P. Claxton Award by the Tennessee State Conference of the American Association of University Presidents. Fisher thus becomes the first recipient of the award, which was established in 1986.

Riser announced that the April 29 meeting of the senate may be the semester's last meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS. ACADEMIC MATTERS. Ken James, applied science and technology, announced that the Academic Matters Committee will meet at 3:30 in Brown Hall, Room 131.

CONCERNS AND GRIEVANCES. Hugh LaFollette, arts and sciences, chair of the committee, reported on the two recommendations made by his committee. (See April 15 mailout for complete list of recommendations.) The first concerns establishment of Faculty Senate bulletin boards, while the second involves a change in the senate policy on faculty grievances.

The first recommendation proposed that senators from each college identify a Faculty Senate bulletin board in each building housing their college's faculty. As soon as the mailout for each meeting is available, a designated senator will post the mailout on the bulletin board. A motion was made to accept the recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

The second recommendation involved a change in the senate's concerns and grievance policy (Senate Policy 1.6 on Faculty Grievances). LaFollette pointed out that the senate's policy now is superseded by the university's grievance policy. Thus it is necessary for the senate's committee to establish a new policy to discuss faculty concerns, and perhaps to advise faculty on how to file a grievance. If the faculty member chose to file a grievance, the senate's concerns and grievance committee then would, in consultation with the senate's president, establish a five-member committee to discuss this particular grievance. This committee then would report its findings to the university's president. The committee's role will be advisory only, and the committee and discussions held before it could not become part of any future grievance filed by the faculty member.

Senators raised a number of questions about this proposed new role for concerns and grievances. Mark Holland, arts and sciences asked why the committee could not participate in the adversarial process. LaFollette stated that in essence the committee served a function similar to that of a grand jury. Thus it would be inappropriate for the committee to participate in the adversarial process.

Other questions revolved around whether it was necessary for a faculty member to go before the committee before filing a formal grievance, and on the availability of information about the committee's procedures. LaFollette stated that going before the concerns and grievances committee was voluntary only, and not a necessary step in the filing of a grievance. Jim Pleasant, applied science and technology asked whether the

IV. Small classes

According to available data there were 105 lower division courses with ten or fewer students during the fall of 1990. During that term there were also 95 upper division courses with ten or fewer students. This appears to be a serious problem. Certainly this demands further examination; however, it is difficult for us to unilaterally recommend that such courses be eliminated. We do not have sufficient information.

However, this is a reasonable basis on which to ask deans and department heads to re-evaluate class offerings. We are convinced that, for many of these courses, there is a reasonable explanation for the class size. For example, nearly 2/3 of these lower division courses are clinical courses in the health related areas (nursing, dental hygiene, and the Nave Center. Moreover, nearly one third of these are offerings in the department of Music. It may well be that small classes are inevitable if we wish to maintain these programs. There are others which, by our lights are suspect, although there may be perfectly reasonable explanations.

RECOMMENDATION

This data should be forwarded to all deans and chairs. They should evaluate class sizes for all courses listed. Moreover, they should regularly scrutinize class sizes and demand that chairs ensure that faculty time is used wisely.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

Academic Council 4/11/91

The following curriculum proposals were approved.

- 1) Physical Education and Recreation
 - a) new course (524-5330, Legal Issues in Physical Education & Athletics); additional requirement in MA/MED Teacher/Administration option
 - b) inactivate course (524-5180, Supervision of Physical Education); drop as requirement in MA/MED Teacher/Administration option
- 2) Curriculum & Instruction - degree requirement change; replace one professional education course in MA/MED program in Secondary Education with either 518-5600 (Principles of Instructional Design) or 518-5610 (Design & Production of Instructional Resources I).

II. Individual faculty release time

The phrase "release time" is misleading. It indicates faculty members are released from work, when, in fact, they are assigned to tasks other than teaching.

Recommendation

Drop the term "release time." Instead, give faculty instructional, service, administrative, and research assignments. This would reflect the practice of maximizing faculty members' contributions to the department by "playing" to their strengths.

As we noted earlier, we find the university average for faculty time devoted to instruction reasonable. However, that does not mean that, in each and every case, the time assigned for service and research is reasonable and productive. Therefore, we are currently gathering information on the non-instructional effort for all university faculty. Once we have completed this exercise we shall make this information available to you and to the respective deans.

Recommendation

Deans and chairs should scrutinize faculty assignments in service and research to determine that such assignments are productive. In the future, deans should expect chairs to ensure that all non-instructional assignments are justified.

III. Class size

There are two relevant questions: one are class sizes set artificially low? Two, can we increase the size of at least some classes without damaging the academic experience for our students? Three things seem clear: a) As a committee we cannot set class sizes for all departments; we do not have the requisite data. However, b) we do have data which might help deans and department heads evaluate class sizes. c) Although we think some class sizes probably can be increased, we cannot do so across the board without undercutting the uniqueness of ETSU. Finally, d) there are only a few large lecture halls on campus. Some Therefore, we are seriously limited in the number of large classes we can offer – unless we remodelled some of these facilities.

Recommendation

- 1) The data on student credit hour production per discipline (copy enclosed) should be sent to all deans. This will give them a sense of class sizes across the state. Moreover, Institutional Research should obtain data on national averages at regional state universities. Although this data will not dictate class sizes, it will give us some basis for beginning deliberations about class size.
- 2) All deans should ask departments chairs to explain class maximums for all their courses. Where appropriate, they should recommend that class sizes be increased. In particular, they should justify class size by citing relevant features such as: a) the importance of class discussion for achieving course aims, b) the nature and extent of course requirements, especially, the amount of written work required and the time instructors must spend evaluating that work; and finally, c) the time instructors spend preparing for class.

senate would get reports on the committee's deliberations. Reports would be given, LaFollette noted, but to ensure confidentiality, specific names would not be used.

Riser made a couple of observations. First, he pointed out that in the past grievances often were settled on a "low level," and did not reach the formal procedure state. The concerns and grievances committee's new policy could help fulfill the role of determining if a matter was subject to a formal grievance procedure. Riser also noted that information on specific cases brought before the senate could be available in executive session of the senate.

Friendly amendments were made to change part 1 of the recommendations set forth by the Concerns and Grievances Committee. Carol Gordon, nursing proposed the following change: Part 1, paragraph # 2, line # 3, delete "If they think the faculty member has grounds for filing a formal complaint or grievance." The second "they" then is capitalized and becomes the first word of sentence # 3. Further amendments resulted in the following changes: at the end of paragraph #2 add: "Deliberations will be confidential, unless all parties agree otherwise. The committee will maintain no records." Line # 3, paragraph # 2, member's becomes member's/members'.

Anne LeCroy, arts and sciences, brought up the question of part-time persons and graduate students having no avenues for filing grievances. The ETSU policy, she state, had no provision for part-timers or graduate students. LaFollette responded that perhaps the senate's concerns and grievances committee could hear the concerns of members of these two groups.

The question of confidentiality again came up. Marie Tedesco, library, questioned whether the committee's deliberations could be secret and whether a citizen should have access to the committee's records. LaFollette responded that because the committee will act in an advisory capacity, it will not have to make available its records.

After a short discussion of the function of the old concerns and grievances committee, the senate voted on accepting the amended recommendations of the Concerns and Grievances Committee. The vote to accept the amended recommendations was unanimous in favor of acceptance.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE. Saralyn Gold reported on recommendations the committee made to be included in the Standing Tenure and Promotion Policies. (See April 15 mailout for complete list of recommendations.) Part 1 concerns the content of promotion and tenure dossiers. Discussion revolved around the inclusion of the FAP, FAR, FAE forms and on whether all publications and reports of scholarly activities need be included in the dossier. Did F. "Publications and/or scholarly activities" mean inclusion of a list of publications, or the publications themselves? Should a faculty member include all publications/scholarly activities or only a selected number?

Margaret Hougland, medicine, pointed out that according to promotion/tenure guidelines, the applicant is restricted to including only those publications and the like which have been achieved during the tenure/promotion period under consideration. Beth Smith, nursing, suggested that F. be changed to read "selected" publications. F. then was altered to read: "Representative samples of publications and/or scholarly activities."

Hugh LaFollette then questioned why FAP, FAR, FAE' had to be included in the dossier. He thought this inclusion gave the department chair undue influence in the tenure/promotion process. Discussion followed on

inclusion of FAP, FAR, FAE in the dossier. Beth Smith pointed out that according to the revised promotion and tenure guidelines FAP, FAR and FAE had to be included in the applicant's dossier.

A motion was made to accept Part I as amended. The motion carried unanimously. A motion to accept Part II as written was passed unanimously.

Part III elicited significant discussion. Kenneth Ferslew, medicine, stated that he thought Part III was too zealous and placed too much of a burden on the chair of a department. Beth Smith noted that the responsibility for the accuracy of the dossier should reside with the candidate, not with the department chair or promotion committee. Jim Pleasant observed that it was difficult for a chair or committee to ensure the accuracy and highest possible quality of a dossier.

Gold stated that since the chair and department committee have to sign off on the accuracy of the dossier that it should be accurate. Houglund observed that Part III is an attempt to prevent incomplete dossiers from reaching the college level of the promotion/tenure process. Holland stated that some departments already have taken actions to ensure the high quality and accuracy of a candidate's dossier.

Senators made a number of suggestions about changing Part III. LaFollette made a motion to table Part III. The motion carried unanimously.

Part IV of the set of recommendations was amended as follows: line # 3, "the members of" was deleted. Part IV then was accepted by unanimous vote.

Riser then stated that at its last meeting Executive Committee had discussed recommending that schools and colleges hold spring meetings to inform candidates of promotion and tenure requirements. A motion was made to include this recommendation with Part II of the development and evaluation committee's recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE. Riser then reported that the Elections Committee, chaired by Ernest Bentley, education, had notified deans of the spring election of new senators. Senators should be elected by the April 29 senate meeting. The fall senate then will be in place by the end of spring.

AD HOC BUDGET COMMITTEE. Bob Acuff, medicine reported on the deliberations of this committee, which met with President Beller on April 10. The 2 1/2 hour meeting focused discussion on how the academic side of the budget was evaluated. Acuff noted that there are many discrepancies in regard to how data and statistics are collected.

Acuff reported that the committee thought the term "release time" was misleading, and would be replaced by "assigned time."

LaFollette reported that there will be some changes in the number of coaches paid from the academic budget. These changes will result in \$100,000 less being taken from the academic budget by athletics.

Acuff noted that Nashville seems to be pressuring ETSU to replace the turf in the Minidome, but that President Beller did not want to replace the turf. Tedesco questioned the value of making it appear that not replacing the turf is a budget-cutting measure, since the money is not being applied to budget givebacks.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

PRESENT

Ken James	Ed Williams	Jim Pleasant
Charles Parker	Marie Tedesco	George Poole
Bob Riser	Virginia Adams	Margaret Hougland
Gene McCoy	Charles Johnson	Kenneth Ferslew
Carol Gordon	Beth Smith	Rebecca Nunley
Sue McCoy	Phil Scheuerman	Sally Crawford
Christa Hungate	Bill Campbell	Saralyn Gold
Anne LeCroy	Mary Nelson	Mark Holland
Bob Acuff	Hugh LaFollette	Mary Lou Gammo
Ahmad Wattad		

ABSENT

David Close	Robert Davidson (ex)
Bill Fisher (ex)	Ernest Bentley
Scott Beck	Al Lucero
Dan Johnson (ex)	Brad Arbogast
Chris Ayers	
Katie Dunn	
Rebecca Isbell	
Eliz Williams (ex)	

**Faculty Complaint
Under Senate Policy 1.6**

Name _____

Department _____

College _____

Immediate supervision _____

Nature of the complaint: _____

Proposed resolution: _____

I understand that the meetings with the Faculty Senate Concerns and Grievances Committee are governed by Senate Policy 1.6. Thus, all the discussions with the committee are advisory only and cannot become part of any future grievance I may choose to file under the University "Employee Grievance/Complaint Policy."

Signature _____

Date _____

Nelson then made the following motion: "Faculty Senate recommends that ETSU investigate the possibility of having the university's spring break coincide with that of the Johnson City public schools." The vote on the motion was unanimous in favor of the motion, with one abstention.

Ed Williams, arts and sciences then moved that "ETSU return to the practice of having a two-day fall break." Discussion on this motion centered on whether a two-day break would decrease the number of contact minutes to a level below the necessary minimum. A Thursday-Friday break would reduce the number of minutes to ten below the minimum; but these ten minutes could be made up throughout the semester. It then was pointed out that if the break included a Monday and reduced Monday sessions from 14 to 13, the number of contact minutes still would be above the minimum. In addition, comments reflected the view that both students and faculty benefit from a short fall break roughly in the middle of the semester.

The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

The next item of concern in regard to the calendar was the proposed beginning of the Fall 1993 semester. As proposed the semester is slated to begin on August 30. Saralyn Gold moved the following: "Faculty Senate recommends that the Fall 1993 semester begin on August 23 instead of August 30." She noted that an August 30 beginning shortens Christmas break by one week, thereby decreasing the amount of time that many faculty members in the School of Public and Allied Health use for uninterrupted research time. Gold pointed out that this time is especially important to those up for tenure and promotion, and to those in her school who have clinicals which are very demanding of their time during the semester.

Ed Williams noted that one reason the Fall 1993 semester begins so late is that the spring semester actually is 17, not 16, weeks long. If spring semester was 16 weeks long, then fall semester could begin on August 23.

Other discussion on this issue focused on the concern that having the fall semester begin on August 23 will not allow enough time for faculty orientation and the like.

The vote on the motion was: 17 in favor; 5 opposed; and 2 abstained.

TAX REFORM. Riser reiterated that at the previous senate meeting the University of Tennessee-Knoxville (UT-K) resolution on tax reform was introduced, but action on it deferred until senators had time to consult with their constituents on this issue.

Discussion on this question covered many aspects of tax reform. Both Mary Nelson and Bill Campbell noted that their constituents opposed the governor's tax reform plans, in part because of suspicion over what would be done with the funds obtained from such an increase. Both senators noted that their constituents distrusted promises to use money for education because such promises had been made and broken in the past.

A number of senators spoke to the question of having a tax system which is fair, not regressive as is the sales tax system. An income tax, a number pointed out, is fairer than a sales tax which takes a higher percentage of lower income wages and salaries than higher income wages and salaries.

David Close, arts and sciences, pointed out that the legislature has to have a new budget and cannot finish in the red. It is unlikely, he noted that tax reform would not help in the current crisis, but might be considered again in the fall. Riser agreed, and noted that it is possible that a temporary increase in sales tax may be

[REDACTED]

Recommendations of Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee

The following are recommendations for procedures to be included in the Standing Tenure and Promotion Policies.

- I. **Dossiers for tenure and/or promotion should be limited to the following materials:**
 - A. Tenure and/or promotion forms;
 - B. FAPs, FARs, and FAEs for the appropriate time periods;
 - C. Complete curriculum vita;
 - D. Reference letters;
 - E. Support of Teaching, for instance, Peer reports, SAs, results of other individual or department activities related to teaching evaluations;
 - F. Publications and/or scholarly activities.

 - II. Tenure and/or promotion materials should be sent to candidates by April 1st of the semester prior to application.

 - III. Department committees and department chairs who are making decisions regarding the tenure and/or promotion of a candidate should verify a dossier's authenticity and accuracy and so state on a form in the dossier. In addition, department committees and department chairs should ensure a candidate's dossier is of the highest possible quality before it leaves the department.

 - IV. The standing policies require "relevant administrators and committees involved in tenure and/or promotion decisions to support, in writing, these decisions and communicate such to the candidate." The same courtesy should be extended to the members of the school/ college/division committee members so that they may determine if they are making reasonable/appropriate decisions.
- [REDACTED]

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

Presidents Council 4/4/91

The following report, from the Council's Executive Committee, was presented and approved.

ROLE & SCOPE OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

Inasmuch as the University Council is the only University governance body with broad representation from all constituencies within the institution -- faculty, staff, academic administration, non-academic administration, graduate students, and undergraduate students -- it is incumbent upon the Council to be proactively involved

Recommendations of Concerns and Grievances Committee

I. To ensure that all faculty have the opportunity to know about and participate in the Senate's deliberations, the Concerns and Grievances Committee recommends that the Senators from each college identify a Faculty Senate bulletin board in each building housing their college's faculty. As soon as the mailout for the Senate meetings is available, a designated Senator will post the mailout on said bulletin board.

II. The Faculty Senate Grievance Policy 1.6 has been superseded by the "East Tennessee State University's Employee Grievance/ Complaint Procedure" which was formally approved by the Tennessee Board of Regents in November 1990. This new procedure sets out specific guidelines for the resolution of faculty grievances and complaints. However, the policy effectively eliminates one of the important functions of the old policy: an opportunity for faculty to discuss their concerns with their peers -- without having to become mired in formal accusations and hearings.

Therefore, we propose the adoption of the following as the Senate Policy 1.6 on Faculty Grievances:

All formal complaints and grievances by faculty are now governed by the "East Tennessee State University's Employee Grievance/ Complaint Procedure." Any faculty member wishing to formally challenge an administrative decision should carefully follow the procedures outlined there.

However, faculty occasionally want an opportunity to discuss their concerns with their peers and to obtain their peer's advice, without becoming mired in formal grievance procedures.

Therefore, we recommend that the Senate Committee on Concerns and Grievances will serve two functions in addition to those specified in the Senate By-Laws 1.5.1.3.

1) The Committee will discuss concerns filed by individual faculty members. A concern is defined as any matter which could be subject to a complaint or grievance as outlined under the University's Complaint and Grievance Policy. In addition, the committee will have the discretion to discuss any other matters it deems appropriate.

Prior to meeting with the committee, the faculty member will submit a brief statement of her/his concern. In discussing such matters, the Committee will not function as an adversarial hearing board. Rather the committee members will listen to the faculty member's complaint and advise her/him as they see fit. If they think the faculty member has grounds for filing a formal complaint or grievance, they will advise the faculty member about the proper way to proceed. However, the committee's deliberations, since they are merely advisory, cannot become part of any formal grievance the faculty member chooses to file.

2) If the faculty member chooses to file a formal grievance, the committee, in conjunction with the President of the Faculty Senate, will select a five member committee who will formally hear the grievance in accordance with university policy. This committee will report its findings to the University President.

In response to questions concerning the plus/minus grade system that was approved at the previous meeting, the following clarification was provided. This will go into effect in Fall 1992.

UNDERGRADUATE
GRADE GRADE PTS.

A	4.0
A-	3.7
B+	3.3
B	3.0
B-	2.7
C+	2.3
C	2.0
C-	1.7
D+	1.3
D	1.0
F	0.0

GRADUATE
GRADE GRADE PTS.

A	4.0
A-	3.7
B+	3.3
B	3.0
B-	2.7
C+	2.3
C	2.0
F	0.0

DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES
GRADE GRADE PTS.

A	4.0
A-	3.7
B+	3.3
B	3.0
B-	2.7
C+	2.3
C	2.0
F	0.0