

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

11-20-1989

1989 November 20 - 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, "1989 November 20 - Faculty Senate Minutes" (1989).
Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes. 391.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/391>

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 OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 20, 1989

CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Hugh LaFollette, President of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. A quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the November 6, 1989 were approved with the following addition:

Goals / Priorities of the Senate

Dr. Bill Stone suggested that the Senate might initiate a seminar/lecture series on the role of the University in the 21st century.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Because Dr. William Fisher, Faculty Senate treasurer, could not be present, Dr. Alfonso Lucero discussed the treasurer's report (See East Tennessee State University Faculty Senate Financial Report, submitted November 20, 1989, by Dr. William Fisher.). The total expense to 10/31/89 was \$1,628.91 with \$63.00 encumbered for travel, leaving a balance of \$3,165.49. The report was approved.

NEW BUSINESS

- (a) Presentation on Part-time Instruction at ETSU by
Vice-President Robert Alfonso

In response to the Senate's request for information concerning part-time instruction at ETSU, Dr. Robert Alfonso, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, discussed a number of issues related to this topic. He stated that part-time teachers are used for a variety of purposes, including (i) temporary replacement of faculty members who are ill or on leave and (ii) the addition of special skills (such as instruction on a particular musical instrument). Concerning the cost effectiveness of part-time instruction, he said that a faculty member with a salary between \$35,000 and \$36,000 (about average at ETSU) can be replaced by part-time instructors for about \$5,000 per semester (\$10,000 per year). Thus money is left over for other purposes. He pointed out that the use of part-time teachers is sometimes a protection against an enrollment drop. Concerning the quality issue, Dr. Alfonso said he does not know the answer, but pointed out that data from the student assessment of instruction process fail to distinguish between the quality of full-time versus part-time instruction, except in the area of availability, where part-time instructors generally score lower.

After making these general remarks, Dr. Alfonso discussed a handout containing data related to part-time instruction at ETSU ('Summary of Course Credit Hours, Enrollments, Student Credit Hours, Expenditures, and Dollar Cost Per Credit Hour For Part-Time Instruction at ETSU for Fall 1985 through Fall 1989'). He pointed out that student credit hour production by part-time instructors has risen from 8,969 in Fall 1985 to 19,456 in Fall 1989. On the other hand, the cost per credit hour for part-time instruction has decreased from \$18.26 to \$16.68 during the same period. He stated that the biggest factor in the increase of part-time instruction at ETSU is the existence of vacant positions, with other factors including released time for faculty research, administrative assignments, etc. Concerning teaching by regular faculty members, Dr. Alfonso discussed the gradual decrease of the average teaching load, and pointed out that only about 25% of our (regular) faculty teach 12 hours or more.

He stated that 'we are paying the price' by an increase in part-time instruction.

Following this presentation, Dr. Alfonso responded to questions from the floor. A basic concern expressed by senators was the question of when new faculty positions can be added to offset large increases in part-time teaching in some units. Dr. Alfonso responded that there is no single answer to this question and that one has to look at each department individually when trying to answer this question. Other concerns expressed included the question of the quality of instruction by part-time teachers.

(b) Presentation on Writing Across the Curriculum by

Dr. Anne LeCroy

Dr. LeCroy briefly reviewed some of the history associated with 'Writing Across the Curriculum', including ETSU's efforts in this direction. The original WAC Committee at ETSU was active during the period 1983-1985 and organized two workshops on this campus during this period. Dr. LeCroy reported on a workshop on this subject organized by The University of North Carolina at Charlotte which she attended in May, 1989. She discussed an effort currently underway by a committee in the School of Applied Science and Technology (the Committee on Teaching and Learning, chaired by Dean James A. Hales) related to improving writing by students in that school. In this connection Dr. LeCroy relayed some information concerning a workshop hosted at Austin Peay State University this semester which was attended by a member of that committee, Lee Danner, Department of Computer and Information Sciences. She said that upon the suggestion of the University Council, President Beller recently forwarded a recommendation to the Academic Council that a University committee be formed to study this matter and that the Council approved this recommendation.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Present

Jim Pleasant
Bob Riser
Carroll Hyder
Lattie Collins
Mark Holland
Scott Beck
David Close
Christa Hargate
Hugh LaFollette
Colin Baxter
Anne LeCroy
Edwin Williams
Alfonso Lucero
George Granger
Chris Ayres
Katie Dunn

Ernest Bentley
Mary Nelson
Bob Acuff
Margaret Rougland
William Stone
Carol Gordon
Virginia Adams
Rosemary Brown
Phil Scheuerman
Deborah Fortune
Saralyn Gold
Gene McCoy
Marie Tedesco
Robert Davidson

Absent

Nancy Gruel
Charles Johnson
Bill Fisher - ex.
Charles Beseda
Bill Campbell
Brad Arbogast
Sue McCoy
Clark Gillett
Richard Verhegge

REVISED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

I. Committee Membership and Selection Procedures:

- A. Where feasible, promotion and tenure committees shall be composed of 6 to 14 members who are tenured, full-time faculty at professorial ranks, with at least 3 years of service at ETSU;
- B. Members shall be elected or appointed for staggered 3-year terms;
- C. The membership shall represent the various disciplines of the college or school;
- D. At the first meeting the committee chair shall be elected from among the members of the committee.

II. Voting Practices:

- A. The use of secret or open balloting shall be decided by the college, school or division committee.
- B. Where feasible, members of the school or college committees who have already participated in the promotion and tenure decision for a particular faculty member, shall abstain from voting on a committee at a different level.

III. Minority Reporting:

A minority report shall be included in the committee report forwarded to the dean.

IV. Recordkeeping:

The chair shall retain committee records for a minimum of 5 years.

V. Reporting Forms and Standards:

- A. Dossiers should be put together with a clear understanding of guidelines established by departments and colleges, schools or divisions. Deans or their equivalents shall inform faculty of these guidelines in a timely manner.
- B. Inclusion of FAP/FAR/FAE documents in promotion and tenure dossiers shall be up to the candidate.
- C. At each stage of the process the candidate shall be informed of decisions made regarding his/her application for promotion and/or tenure, allowing the right of first appeal at the dean's level and second appeal at the vice president's level.
- D. It is recommended strongly that the deadline be changed: i.e., the promotion/tenure committees shall be allowed until January 31 to forward dossiers to the dean of the college.

VI. General Comments:

- A. Candidates applying for promotion and tenure simultaneously should only submit one dossier for both.
- B. The chairs of the 1990 promotion and tenure committees shall meet with the executive committee of the Faculty Senate for a discussion of procedure, criteria, and other matters.
- C. ~~Because~~ the Tenure and Promotion Policies of East Tennessee State University do not address non-tenure track appointments, it is recommended that a non-tenure track policy be established.
- D. Newly hired faculty should come to an understanding with his/her supervisors regarding his/her expectations in teaching, research, and service; this understanding and any subsequent changes should be included in the tenure and promotion dossier.
- E. Relevant administrators involved in tenure and promotion decisions should support, in writing, these decisions and communicate such to the applicant.

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

To: All Faculty Senators
From: Faculty Development & Evaluation Committee
Re: The Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI)
Date: November 15, 1989

The Faculty Development & Evaluation Committee is ready to consider the SAI and would like some input from the Faculty Senators. First of all, we would like to know what your general philosophy is regarding Student Assessment of Instruction. Secondly, we would like specific comments relating to the latest version of this instrument that was put together by the 1988-1989 Faculty Development & Evaluation Committee. This is attached (as well as the version revised by the English department). Please send all your comments to Saralyn Gold, Box 21,790A, by January 23, 1990.

Thank you.

STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTION

Please think carefully about your answers to these questions. Your answers provide guidance to instructors who wish to improve their courses; they also provide important information for evaluating faculty. We would appreciate any written comments you can provide.

Answers: Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Slightly Disagree; Slightly Agree; Agree; Strongly Agree

NOTE: 'Strongly agree' does not always indicate a positive evaluation of the faculty member -- please read the items carefully!

THE TRACHER:

1. Did not explain concepts in a way I could understand.
2. Stimulated me to think.
3. Found ways to help students answer their own questions.
4. Discouraged students from expressing their own views.
5. Was excited about the course material.
6. Was approachable outside of class.
7. Encouraged student discussion and questions.
8. Makes the subject interesting.
9. Did not provide helpful feedback on the quality of my performance.
10. Treats students with respect.

Too Easy About Right Too hard

11. The teacher's method of evaluations is: [] [] []

12. OVERALL, I would rate this instructor:
 Poor [] Below Average [] Average [] Better than Average [] Much
 better than average [] Outstanding []

STUDENT PROFILE: 1

Year: FR - SOPH [] JR - SR []:

Reason for taking course: Core course []: Elective []: Major or Minor []

Age: 18-25 []; 26+ []

Reports supplied by William Fisher
TIAA - CREF

As a result of TIAA-CREF's announcement of benefit program changes, the Tennessee General Assembly, Council on Pensions and Insurance convened on August 14 and 15th and proposed the following proposals to the 1990 session of the Tennessee General Assembly for action relating to the TIAA-CREF program.

1. Supervision of the program will be transferred from the State Board of Education to the TCRS Board of Trustees as well as the responsibility to authorize optional features (other than investment products) upon receiving recommendations from the U T Board of Trustees and the Tennessee Board of Regents. Such authorization shall be subject to the approval of the Council on Pensions and Insurance.

2. TIAA/CREF participants will not be permitted to accept lump sum cash payments at retirement or termination of employment except for "de minimus" account (\$2,000) balances. If a person has funds in their account from other sources, that institution and/or state will set those guidelines. This provision will only apply to Tennessee money.

3. There will only be two retirement vehicles for Tennessee higher education faculty - TCRS or CREF. The availability of any other programs such as VALIC or Fidelity Mutual Funds for retirement purposes will not be permitted nor the transferability of presently accumulated Tennessee funds to any other program.

Tennessee Consolidated Retirement System Board Meeting
Monday, November 20, 1989

At this meeting the 1989 Actuarial Report was presented for consideration and approval. It proposed reducing the state contribution rate from 9.86% to 6.85%. This reduction plus other group reductions would save the state a 68 million dollar expenditure until the next actuarial report is presented in 1991. Naturally, the question arose as to whether this was a logical decision or might cause larger contributions in future years by reducing the rate now. The actuary did not see this as a possibility because of larger state contributions during the past two years than was actuarially needed to completely fund the program and a greater investment return than was anticipated during that same period of time.

It should also be noted that on the same day Commissioner Manning, who attended the TCRS meeting and seconded the motion to reduce state contribution rates, announced that as of October 31st state tax collections were 53 million dollars below the projected 1989-90 budget income figures. This fact triggered some announced restrictions on state spending and employee hiring. Should this lower income situation continue, greater problems could develop for both this year and next. Undoubtedly, this situation will be watched by many people in state government and higher education as well.

It was also noted at this meeting that TCRS members now may have multiple beneficiaries for their retirement benefits but these named multiple persons will be limited to one time lump sum payments only. They will not be able to draw monthly income checks regardless of age.