

East Tennessee State University

## Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

---

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

---

3-30-1992

### 1992 March 30 - 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, "1992 March 30 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (1992). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 454.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/454>

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](mailto:digilib@etsu.edu).

FACULTY SENATE

NEXT MEETING: March 30, 1992  
3:30 P.M., FORUM

NOTE TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS: Please post or circulate among your  
faculty.

AGENDA  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
MARCH 30, 1992

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 16, 1992 (enclosed).
2. TREASURER'S REPORT - R. Nunley
3. NEW BUSINESS
  - a. Habitat for Humanity - M. Woodruff
  - b. Amendment to Policy 2.2, Sub-Section 2.2.18.16 (enclosed) - Academic Matters
  - c. Three Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty (enclosed) - Academic Matters
  - d. Draft, Professional Development and Formative Evaluation for Faculty at ETSU (enclosed) - B. Smith
  - e. Other
4. OLD BUSINESS
  - a. Discussion of the ETSU Honors Program
  - b. W/WP Grade (enclosed) - Academic Matters
  - c. Update on the Presidential Search - R. Riser
  - d. Other
5. ANNOUNCEMENTS
  - a. Resolution from the Faculty Senate of Middle Tennessee State University (enclosed)
  - b. Minutes from March 4, 1992 President's Council (enclosed)
  - c. Minutes from the March 5, 1992 and March 19, 1992 Academic Council (enclosed)
  - d. Other

## **MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE FOR MARCH 30, 1992**

Bob Acuff called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm, March 30, 1992, in the D.P. Culp Center Forum. A quorum was present.

**Approval of the minutes.** The minutes of the March 16, 1992 Faculty Senate Meeting were approved by voice vote.

**Treasurer's Report.** Rebecca Nunley (Dent Hyg) provided a treasurer's report listing expenses through February 1992. Expenses incurred during February 1992 included \$272.58. The remaining balance in the Faculty Senate budget is \$5044.57.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**1. Habitat for Humanity.** At a previous Faculty Senate meeting, an ad hoc committee was formed to help facilitate communicative relations between the University and the community that have become strained as a result of the presidential search process. As a response to that need, Mike Woodruff (Medicine) introduced three guests from Habitat for Humanity and suggested that faculty senators and their constituencies, might consider involvement in Habitat for Humanity as an expression of participation within the community. This would be personal involvement and not institutional involvement. The first guest, Carol Baird, VP of Board of Directors for the Johnson City & Elizabethton chapters, presented an overview of the history and current role of Habitat for Humanity. This is a non-denominational, ecumenical Christian ministry that builds low-cost housing for families and individuals who currently live in substandard housing. Mike Fink, the second guest and president-elect of the Holston Habitat for Humanity Chapter provided details on how individuals can participate in the process. Doug Dotterweich (Econ & Fin) is associated with Habitat for Humanity as a member of the committee that determines potential recipient eligibility. He was available for questions. Following their presentations, a short discussion followed.

A motion was proposed by Woodruff that the Faculty Senate take on a Habitat for Humanity project to assist with the construction of one house this year, by providing labor and/or funds, and secondly, to raise funds for the procurement of a building lot (about \$3000) for the potential construction of a home. This was seconded by Jim Odom (Hist), but with restrictions on the governance role of the Faculty Senate and that this project would be assumed on an individual basis by members. Odom did provide examples of other universities looking at this type of community service as important criteria for selecting students to scholarship programs. Following additional discussion, this motion was deferred until a resolution can be prepared for consideration.

**2. Amendment to Tenure Policy restricting membership of candidates for tenure.** The Academic Matters committee presented an amendment to the existing promotion and tenure policy that in effect, prohibits an individual who is applying for tenure, from serving on the P&T committee during the year in which they are an applicant. Action on this amendment was deferred until April 6, 1992 so that senators can consult with their constituents.

**3. Three Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty.** Academic Matters committee presented a proposal requiring a 3-year review of tenure-track faculty. The proposal was included in the mail-out. A number of points of discussion followed. Eliz. Williams (Med) asked about the effect of serving in the military during the tenure-track period. Johnson (Biol Sci) was in general agreement with the proposal, but was concerned about giving the faculty unreasonable amount of assurance that they are on track, but the exercise does not simulate what can happen at the university committee level or VP for Academic Affairs level. Ed Williams (Eng) was concerned that this proposal seems to address a change in existing policy plus institute a new policy. He suggested that the emphasis on a 6th year application versus a 5th year application is a change in policy and that this proposal should not endorse this apparent change in policy. Smith (Nurs) indicated that tenure-track faculty in Nursing prepare this dossier annually for re-appointment purposes, and this is a hardship. Riser (Comp Sci) suggested separating the change in policy from the 5th to 6th year from the proposal of a third-year review. Fisher (Mgt & Mkg) was concerned about official approval in the third year, but a different official is in place during the 5th or 6th year with different criteria. Gallagher (Hlth Sci) suggested that tenure-track faculty members would be better served if they spent time on research rather than on dossier preparation. Gordon (Nurs) was concerned about inconsistent terminology that suggests this process is not uniform across the campus, as it should be. Ferslew (Medicine) commented about the role of the FAP/FAR/FAE with the ratings of outstanding/good, etc., and the applicability of this to tenure. It was pointed out that FAE recommendations are only applicable to promotion, not to tenure. Woodruff (Med) pointed out that this proposal brings other tenured faculty into the process early. As it stands now, the only formal relationship of the tenure-track faculty is with the chair and dean through the FAP/FAR/FAE, documents not seen by other tenured faculty. In this way, the entire tenured faculty see the whole process as it is on going. Following the discussion, this action was deferred for two senate meetings to allow constituencies to discuss this matter.

**3. Draft, Professional Development and Formative Evaluation for Faculty at ETSU.** Smith (Nurs) presented this draft proposal which was included in the mail-out. Fisher (Mgt & Mkt) indicated certain faculty in the College of Business are formulating a petition to promote certain changes. Smith indicated a petition was not necessary, because this is a draft; comments are welcome. Gordon (Nurs) expressed concern that this proposal does nothing to protect faculty members, and that it can be a tool to "railroad" older faculty members. Lucero (Off Mgt) asked what percentage of faculty are currently rated as "unsatisfactory". Dr. Alfonso (VP Acad Aff) responded that last year 2 individuals were rated, overall, as unsatisfactory. Lucero further

indicated that he felt this proposal needed further work. It should be tied to the current evaluation system, as proposed it makes policy for the exception, the current policy should suffice, and shouldn't make policy for the hypothetical. LeCroy (Eng) reiterated this proposal should have an emphasis on development, and that all faculty members should be interested in their personal development. Ferslew (Med) asked about the interpretation of provision #9 with respect to serving a "special need" and the level of "support" provided. Woodruff (Med) indicated the need for a linkage between the FAP/FAR/FAE and the provisions for "dismissal with cause" in the Faculty Handbook, and this proposal serves as a device for identifying and helping individuals before the dismissal with cause provisions are implemented. This proposal serves two purposes: (1) provides a mechanism for faculty development; (2) answers specific charges of TBR with respect to linkage of the evaluation process with the handbook about dismissal with cause. Gallagher (Hlth Sci) suggested the tone of the current proposal indicates faculty development as "punishment." Rather, faculty development should be a "reward." Comments from constituents should be forwarded to Beth Smith, Nursing.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

**1. Discussion of ETSU Honors Program.** Bob Acuff (Med) indicated the honors program is still a draft proposal, certain funding assumptions have not been acted upon by the Foundation, and that Dr. Bach has not presented this proposal as yet to the ETSU Foundation. Dr. Jack Higgs (Eng) presented an overview of the current status of the proposed honors program. Pleasant (Comp Sci) asked about the status of the proposed general education core curriculum and the assumptions made by the proposed honors program. Following a short discussion, it was assured that the proposed general education core curriculum was/is a separate issue apart from the honors program. The honors program would utilize which ever core is in existence. However, the current honors program is closely aligned with the content of the proposed general education core curriculum. Woodruff (Med) asked about the specification of additional requirements of departmental courses that would carry an honors designation. Ferslew (Med) expressed concern about the lack of designating merit faculty members, about the lack of support for facilities, and supplies to support the course work of honors courses. It is this area that ETSU lacks and is given as a reason for students to apply elsewhere. Alfonso (VP Acad Affairs) summarized by indicating: (1), ETSU needs an honors program. It is perhaps the only school in the South that doesn't have a program; (2) Timing is important. The Interim President is very supportive of this program and is working hard to establish this program; (3) Funding is a real issue, but the belief is that things will get better. Pleasant (Comp Sci) expressed concern that a vote for this proposal should not be construed as a vote for the proposed general education core curriculum. Smith (Nurs) indicated the honors committee needs to specify what honors courses would replace current core requirements. Higgs asked for the endorsement of the Faculty Senate for this proposal so that President Bach could share with the Foundation, that the Faculty Senate is in support of the program. Lucero (Off Mgt) moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the proposal as presented and secondly, encourage the committee to

continue to develop the program as necessary. This was seconded by Fisher (Mgt & Mkg). The motion was passed on unanimous voice vote.

**2. W/WF Grade.** The Academic Matters committee provided the following proposal: "S/he receives a grade of W, assigned by the instructor. Action on this matter was deferred until the April 6, 1992 Senate Meeting.

**3. Update on Presidential Search.** It was announced that interview schedules are still pending, and that the original five finalists are still available and interested in ETSU.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**1. Robert Hauk op/ed article.** This article about a second interim president for ETSU and the clearing out of outspoken Faculty Senate members is pure speculation. Acuff contacted Dr. Rhoda for confirmation. He was assured that the Chancellor has the sole power to appoint interim presidents and that it is not even under consideration. Furthermore, it is apparent which Regent and which legislator is behind the rumor.

**2. Tennyson Wooten Endowment.** An endowment fund has been established through the Office of Developmental Studies on behalf of Tennyson Wooten. Further information and support to the family can be directed to that office.

There being no further business, the Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted

Kenneth D. James  
Secretary

## ATTENDANCE

### PRESENT

Terry Counterline  
Kenneth James  
Jim Pleasant  
Bob Riser  
Scott Beck  
Jeff Gold  
Mark Holland  
Dan Johnson  
Linda Lawson  
Anne LeCroy  
Jim Odom  
Ed Williams  
Bill Fisher  
Eddie Yasin  
Al Lucero  
Robert Davidson

Chris Ayres  
Bill Campbell  
Mary Nelson  
Marcellus Turner  
Bob Acuff  
Kenneth Ferslew  
Sue McCoy  
Eliz.Williams  
Mike Woodruff  
Sally Crawford  
Carol Gordon  
Beth Smith  
Creg Bishop  
Mike Gallagher  
Rebecca Nunley  
Phil Scheuerman

### ABSENT

George Poole  
Mary Lou Gammo  
Katie Dunn  
Chip East  
Rebecca Isbell  
Brad Arbogast  
Ahmad Wattad  
Virginia Adams

MINUTES - PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1992, 9:00 a.m., Reece Museum

PRESENT: Bach, Norment, Sauceman, Shelton, Manahan, Stanton, Acuff, Ostheimer, Hales, Borchuck, Bettis, Davidson (Essin), Hawk (Vaught), Osborn, Burleson, Lenz, Lanza, Nutter, Spritzer, Alfonso, Garland, Stout, Jordan, Landrum

GUESTS: Gehre, Collins

1. PRESIDENTIAL BUDGET HEARINGS

President Bach reviewed his March 16 memorandum concerning the presidential budget hearings. (enclosure #1 on file) He indicated that the hearings would begin April 1 and that he has scheduled a special President's Council meeting on April 22 to consider budget recommendations.

2. SACS COMPARISONS: EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTION

As an information item, President Bach reviewed information received from SACS which compared ETSU E&G expenditures in functional areas with other institutions. (enclosure #2 on file)

3. ETSU CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

Dr. Manahan reviewed the status of the campus master plan document and indicated that the plan was to be presented to the Board of Regents at its June meeting. He referred to the October 15 Norm Johnson letter to Sasaki Associates which requested response to five remaining issues. Dr. Manahan indicated that the plan, as it was prepared by Sasaki Associates, would be presented to the Board and that the five remaining issues will require resolution by the university. Copies of the master plan and the Norm Johnson letter were distributed. (enclosures #3, #4, and #5 on file) Following discussion, President Bach indicated that he would appoint a task force to consider concerns mentioned today and any others identified. There was consensus of Council for the plan to proceed as outlined.

4. TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICIES

This item was returned to the agenda. Ms. Ginger Hawk reported that she consulted with Ms. Burleson, Dr. Stanton, Dr. Spritzer, Dr. Alfonso, Mr. Collins,



and Mr. Landrum and that the policies were modified to include recommended changes. (enclosure #6 on file) Ms. Hawk recommended that the policies be adopted and included in the appropriate financial procedures manual. A motion to adopt the policies as recommended was approved.

5. EXPANSION OF ACADEMIC WORK SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

President Bach reviewed the Dr. Garland March 12 memorandum concerning work scholarships and the Budget Office data which projected the costs of increasing the number of work scholarship awards. (enclosures #7 and #8 on file) Following discussion, President Bach indicated that while it would be possible and desirable to reach the maximum 10% allowed, he would advise an increase at this time not to exceed 8%. With the guideline of 8%, Dr. Garland was to provide additional information and analysis to assure that awards would be utilized to attract new and highly qualified students.

6. ATHLETICS REVENUE SOURCE: PIRATE CLUB AGREEMENT FOR PURCHASE OF SCOREBOARDS/SCORING TABLES FOR THE MEMORIAL CENTER

As an information item, President Bach reviewed the February 27 Landrum memorandum concerning the Pirate Club agreement for purchase of scoreboards/scoring tables for the Memorial Center. (enclosure #9 on file) He appealed to Council for assistance in assuring the public and interested persons that the project is a result of Pirate Club activity and support, that there was no state revenue utilized in the purchase, and that revenues in excess of the cost will be utilized to support athletics.

7. ATHLETICS SPONSORSHIP PACKAGE

As an information item, President Bach reviewed the February 27, 1992 Shelton memorandum concerning an athletics sponsorship package. (enclosure #10 on file)

8. AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE/E&G COST SUPPORT AUDIT REPORT

This item was returned to the agenda. Dr. Manahan/Mr. Collins reviewed a statement of funds and dedicated reserves from auxiliary enterprises. (enclosure #11 on file) This report is in response to the January 21 Ostheimer memorandum concerning the economics of cost centers at ETSU.

## 9. ASBESTOS TESTING AND REOCCUPATION OF DOSSETT HALL

As an information item, President Bach reviewed the March 12, 1992 Chancellor Floyd letter concerning the monitoring of the asbestos abatement process conducted in Burgin Dossett Hall. (enclosure #12 on file) The Chancellor's letter reported that all clearance air tests met the specified acceptance criteria, and that ETSU should proceed to occupy the building without further hesitation.

## 10. 5-YEAR PROJECTED REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES: UNIVERSITY ATHLETICS

As an information item, President Bach reviewed his March 18 memorandum concerning the 5-year projected revenues and expenditures for university athletics. (enclosure #13 on file) Dr. Shelton also discussed the document and indicated that, as required, ETSU will add women's golf as an additional varsity sport next year.

## 11. OLD BUSINESS

### A. TQM Proposal

Dr. Alfonso reported that Academic Council is developing a proposal regarding total quality management and that this item will return to President's Council agenda.

## 12. NEW BUSINESS

### A. SACS/Presidential Search

President Bach reported a conversation with Chancellor Floyd regarding SACS concern with possible undue political interference with the presidential search. SACS executive secretary Rogers is to provide a letter today.

Recommendation

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Sub-committee  
Academic Matters

RE: Amendment to Policy 2.2, sub-section 2.2.18.16, paragraph  
1 (page 21 of 24)

That the following be inserted after "Department chairs may not  
serve on such committees" (College/School Promotion/Tenure  
Committees).

No person who is an applicant for promotion in a given  
year may be an elected or appointed member of a  
College/School Promotion/Tenure Committee during that  
year. A person who may have been elected to serve a  
two or three-year term, should s/he apply for promotion  
during that term, shall recuse her/himself from the  
College/School Committee in that year.

To: Faculty Senate  
From: Sub-committee  
Academic Matters  
Re: 3-year review of Tenure-track faculty

The current stated policy on tenure (2.2.4.2) allows application for tenure in the fifth year of employment (under ordinary employment agreement).

The probability of tenure upon such application is unlikely, unless the applicant shows very strong support in fulfillment of listed criteria.

The University has, subsequent to policy, increased the level of expectation for tenure and the fulfillment of criteria listed in the Policy (2.2.7.1). Faculty may, thus, be discouraged from fifth year application and depend upon sixth (and terminal) year application.

We, therefore, urge that there be instituted a third year tenure track review, conducted in a manner similar to that for regular tenure review.

Such review should follow these broad guidelines:

1. During the autumn of the third year of tenure-track appointment the faculty member shall be apprised by department chair/division head of review process.
2. The faculty member shall prepare a dossier essentially identical to that prepared for tenure application.
3. The department/division members who are tenured shall review this document, evaluate the person's record of teaching, research/creativity, service, and other tenure criteria (policy 2.2.7.1) and make recommendations to the chair, involving potential for tenure, what further is needed for tenurability, and other relevant matters.
4. The chair shall consult on these decisions with the faculty member, make specific recommendations on the person's future activities, and advise of tenurability.
5. The chair, applicant, and dean will also consult on the record and the potential for tenure.
6. All recommendations discussed and agreed upon during the third-year review, as well as subsequent FAP/FAR/FAE reviews, shall be agreed upon by chair, faculty member, and dean, and fully documented in writing.

Addenda: (to guidelines)

- a. A newly-appointed tenure-track faculty member should receive clear directions, based on criteria stated in the Promotion/Tenure Policy (2.2) plus department/division criteria (if such are available) for future activity--within 90 days of employment. Such information may be supplied by Chair, Division Director, or a senior faculty member/mentor.
- b. Sample successful dossier packets should be available for newly appointed tenure-track faculty to study so that procedure is clear to them.
- c. When seminars on dossier preparation are offered, newly appointed tenure-track faculty should be urged to attend and participate.

D R A F T

Professional Development and Formative Evaluation  
for Faculty at  
East Tennessee State University

The following draft of a statement of beliefs and recommendations about professional development and formative evaluation for faculty is presented for review, discussion, and revision within the university.

Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation  
and Professional Development  
Programming

Don Bailes  
Saralyn Gold  
Anne LeCroy  
Norma Nutter, Chair  
John Ostheimer  
Beth Smith  
Jon Smith  
Mike Woodruff

Revised 3/24/92

Professional Development and Formative Evaluation for Faculty  
at East Tennessee State University

Beliefs

- 1.) Investment in developing its human capital is one of the most powerful and productive expenditures an organization such as East Tennessee State University can make.
- 2.) As professionals, faculty should seek constantly to improve their ability to teach, engage in productive scholarship, and serve the institution and its constituents. The university, for its part, must strive to provide an environment that is conducive to improvement, including appropriate resources and procedures to assist faculty in their efforts to improve.
- 3.) Faculty members should be expected to take the initiative and to make substantial investments in their own professional development throughout their careers. The individual faculty member bears the main responsibility for remaining current in his/her field and for developing and maintaining competence in teaching, research, and service. The institution's responsibility is to facilitate and support the process for groups and individuals.
- 4.) Resources must be available to provide opportunities for faculty to travel, read, engage in experiments and other research/creative activities, procure appropriate materials, and carry out other activities related to becoming better scholars and teachers.
- 5.) Faculty should be involved in determining criteria and effective procedures for allocating resources for professional development.
- 6.) The institution has made a beginning in providing some resources to support research/creative work, for example, the Research Development Committee. These resources should be expanded, and the same supportive environment should be created for improvement of instruction.
- 7.) Faculty who are not performing satisfactorily overall or in specific areas should be required to undertake a planned program of improvement.

Beliefs - continued

8.) Available resources for professional development and assistance with planning should be open on a voluntary basis to any faculty member who feels a need for extra professional development, receives a radically different assignment, or needs to prepare for a new role or development in his/her field, as well as to faculty who are required to undertake a planned program of improvement.

9.) Faculty who have been performing well and who undertake development to serve a special need of the department/college should receive relatively more support from the institution than those who undertake remedial activities or who are pursuing their expected professional growth. The university should recognize and provide appropriate resources to support all three types of professional development--that which is part of the normal development of active professionals, that which goes beyond normal expectations and is undertaken to serve a special objective of the institution, and that which is undertaken to remediate some significant deficiency.



## Recommendations

1.) The central administration will set aside a fund annually to support expenditures for professional development (required and voluntary) which are beyond the capabilities of individual faculty, departments, and colleges.

2.) The central administration will coordinate the development and maintenance of a directory of resources for professional development available on campus or at other accessible locations.

3.) The central administration will establish one or more groups authorized to plan and develop "a university center for the multidisciplinary exploration and application of approaches to effective human learning by ....c. Improving teaching via a comprehensive faculty development program." (Turning Toward 2011, Commission on the Future of East Tennessee State University, 1989, p. 14). This center would serve all faculty seeking to improve their teaching.

4.) Formative evaluation and a developmental process will be incorporated into our current process for evaluating faculty. The FAE form will be rewritten to indicate if a development plan is required or undertaken voluntarily.

5.1) If a faculty member is evaluated as less than "Satisfactory" overall on the FAE, or if a faculty member has a deficiency in any one of the three areas which appears to have serious ramifications for the program/department/college, or if a faculty member's performance has declined over several years to a level which causes concern, then the faculty member, chair, and dean will conduct an in-depth conference and develop a written statement that includes

- (a.) a statement and clarification of the problem(s) and ramifications,
- (b.) clear notice of a probationary status,
- (c.) a one- to three-year plan of specific actions and timelines for alleviating the problem(s),
- (d.) specific resources (if any) to be provided by department, college, or university (after consulting the office of the appropriate Vice President) to assist the faculty member in pursuing the plan of professional development. (Chairs and deans should consider the faculty member's financial situation as the plan is developed.)
- (e.) specific outcomes expected and the nature of evidence to be presented by the faculty member to demonstrate both compliance with the plan and that the expected improvement has occurred.

Recommendations continued

The written plan will be sent to the appropriate Vice President, along with the faculty member's FAE for the year.

5.2) The faculty member required to complete an improvement plan may request to have a neutral member of the faculty outside his/her college appointed to participate in developing and monitoring the plan in item 4 above and/or to serve as a mentor. Normal university processes for appeal and review will be available to the faculty member. The institution may choose to incorporate these appeals into an existing process, e.g., appeals process for promotion and tenure decisions, or to establish a standing committee to review such appeals.

5.3) Examples of resources which may be provided to assist a faculty member in completing a required improvement plan include released time for research or for study, travel for professional development, time and support for academic study at another institution, assistance with critiquing and improving instruction, equipment and materials, mentoring support, etc.

5.4) The faculty member, chair, and dean will be responsible for reviewing the plan each year at evaluation time, making any revisions needed, and evaluating the faculty member's progress--all to be recorded in writing and attached to the FAE. If needed, the development period may be extended.

5.5) If the faculty member does not comply with the plan or if the faculty member complies with the plan but does not show satisfactory improvement in performance, the chair and dean will determine what course of action to recommend. If it is appropriate in their judgement, they may recommend that the faculty member be reviewed under ETSU policy 2.2.17 (ETSU Faculty Handbook).

Recommendation

To: Faculty Senate  
From: Sub-committee on Academic Matters  
Re: W/WP Grade

If a student withdraws following the eight week of classes in a regular semester (adjusted accordingly for Summer terms), s/he receives a grade of W or WF assigned by the instructor (Catalog 1991-92, p. 36).

The Committee supports a proposal that this be amended to read "s/he receives a grade of W, assigned by the instructor."

## RESOLUTION

- Whereas - the Tennessee Board of Regents has established an effective procedure for selecting presidents for Tennessee Board of Regents institutions, and
- Whereas - that procedure is generally consistent with the letter and the spirit of principles, procedures, and policies articulated by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the American Association of University Professors, various program-specific accrediting agencies, and the Tennessee Board of Regents, and
- Whereas - that procedure is in compliance with state and federal Affirmative Action guidelines and the stipulations of Geier vs McWhirter, and
- Whereas - that procedure assures that Chancellor Otis Floyd and the members of the Board of Regents will receive maximum advice from all internal and external constituencies of each college or university, and
- Whereas - that procedure has been utilized successfully at many different institutions, with particularly happy results at Middle Tennessee State University, and
- Whereas - that procedure has been initiated at East Tennessee State University and endorsed by the faculty assembly of that institution, and
- Whereas - Chancellor Floyd, the Board of Regents, Governor McWherter, and members of the Tennessee General Assembly have been asked to subvert that procedure in the case of East Tennessee State University and to accommodate certain parochial political considerations, and
- Whereas - Chancellor Floyd and the Board of Regents have, to date, resisted those pressures, and
- Whereas - the introduction of political considerations into the presidential selection process jeopardizes university and program accreditation and risks legal interdiction should there be allegations of violation of Affirmative Action guidelines and Geier stipulations, and
- Whereas - the introduction of political considerations into that process nullifies advice given to Chancellor Floyd and the Board of Regents by other constituencies of each institution, and
- Whereas - subversion of appropriate due process, assured by current procedures, would seriously injure faculty morale, subject East Tennessee State University and the State of Tennessee to national ridicule, undermine the authority of the Tennessee Board of Regents, and otherwise distract TBR institutions from the performance of their mission, and
- Whereas - we are confident that Governor McWherter and members of the Tennessee General Assembly want the Tennessee Board of Regents to appoint the most qualified person available as President of East Tennessee State University, and
- Whereas - we are confident that Governor McWherter and members of the Tennessee General Assembly are, in this matter, determined to assure the interests of all Tennesseans, especially those served by East Tennessee State University,
- Now Be it Resolved that the FACULTY SENATE OF MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY urges Governor McWherter and members of the Tennessee General Assembly to support Chancellor Floyd and the Tennessee Board of Regents and to resist pressures which would undermine the Tennessee Board of Regents' responsibility to appoint college and university presidents. We further urge the governor and legislators to affirm their support of the principles of due process, of delegated authority and responsibility, and of appointment based on merit rather than political consideration.

Resolution passed unanimously, March 9, 1992

  
Faculty Senate President  
Middle Tennessee State University