

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

4-6-1992

1992 April 6 - 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 April 6 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (1992). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 455.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/455>

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.

FACULTY SENATE

NEXT MEETING: April 6, 1992
3:30 P.M., FORUM

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

**AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 6, 1992**

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** March 30, 1992 Meeting (enclosed)
2. **NEW BUSINESS**
 - a. Promotion and Tenure Appeal
Procedure (enclosed)--Dr. Alfonso
 - b. Other
3. **OLD BUSINESS**
 - a. Student Assessment of Instruction--
Development and Evaluation
 - b. Amendment to Policy 2.2, Sub-Section 2.2.18.16
(distributed with March 30, 1992 Mailout)--Academic
Matters
 - c. W/WF Grade (enclosed)--Academic Matters
 - d. Resolution concerning Habitat for Humanity--M. Woodruff
 - e. Other
4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE FOR
APRIL 6, 1992

Bob Acuff called the meeting to order at 3:36 pm, April 6, 1992, in the D.P. Culp Center Forum. A quorum was present.

Approval of the Minutes. Two corrections to the March 30 minutes were noted. The sentence in section 3, *Three Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty* that read ". . . 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..." should read "...but was concerned about giving the faculty unreasonable amount of assurance that they are on track because the exercise does not simulate what can happen at the college committee level..." Under *Old Business, Discussion of ETSU Honors Program*, the sentence "Following a short discussion, it was assured that the proposed general education core curriculum was/is a separate issue apart from the honors program" should read "Following a short discussion, the Senate was assured that the proposed ..." With corrections noted, the minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Promotion and Tenure Appeal Procedure. Due to a scheduling conflict, Dr. Alfonso (VP Acad Affairs) was not able to attend this Senate meeting to discuss this matter. This business was deferred.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Student Assessment of Instruction--Development and Evaluation. Scott Beck (Soc & Anthro), Chair of Faculty Development Committee announced that the University does intend to administer the existing Student Assessment of Instruction instrument this semester. Assuming the forms arrive on time, this will be accomplished during dead week. As a second item of business, Beck ~~did~~ report on the inquiry and analysis of other assessment instruments that his committee, with representatives from the Student Government, accomplished. The findings and recommendations from this group were included in the ^{hand}out. Faculty are encouraged to review these materials. A recommendation as to the type of student assessment of instruction instrument to use in the Fall semester will be on the April 20, 1992 Senate agenda

2. Amendment of Policy 2.2, Restricting Membership of Candidates for Tenure on Promotion and Tenure Committee. This matter was discussed at the March 30, 1992 Faculty Senate Meeting. Anne LeCroy (Eng), Chair of Academic Matters Committee introduced the following proposed amendment as a motion:

Amendment of Policy 2.2, Sub-Section 2.2.18.16, paragraph 1 (page 21 of 24).
It is moved 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.

This motion was seconded by Mike Woodruff (Med). There was no further discussion. This

motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **W/WF Grade Reporting.** The current Catalog states "If a student withdraws following the eighth 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 1992-92, p. 36). Anne LeCroy (Eng), Chair of Academic Matters Committee introduced the following motion.

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

This was seconded by Mike Woodruff (Med). Discussion followed. Elizabeth Williams (Med) asked how this would affect the Medical School that used a different academic calendar. This applies only to the undergraduate catalog. Bob Riser (Comp Sci) suggested leaving off the phrase "assigned by the instructor" since this would no longer be a part of the process. This suggestion was put in the form of a motion to amend this proposal. It was seconded. Mary Lou Gammo (Acct) asked that if we approved this proposal, it would be implemented, or was this just a recommendation. This is just a recommendation that would be forwarded to Academic Council for action. This was an item that was discussed previously at the request of the Associate Deans and Dr. Cynthia Burnley. Ed Williams (Eng) spoke in opposition to the proposal because it in effect, removed the responsibility of assigning grades from the faculty member to the dean or associate dean. It may be the responsibility of a dean to grant a student permission to withdraw from a class, but it is the responsibility of the faculty member to assess the performance the student has made in the class up to that point. In extenuating circumstances, faculty members can be just as fair and compassionate as deans and indicate a withdrawal grade of "W." Kenneth Ferslew (Med) reported that his constituency desired that full information concerning the withdrawal of a student from a class be recorded. This is important should further evaluation of the student be required at a later time due to re-admission or transfer to another program. George Poole (Math) questioned the consistency of the logic that allows a faculty member to assess student performance before the 8th week, but not after if a student should withdraw. Faculty should be able to assess the student's performance at any time a student leaves the class, or not at all. The amendment to drop the phrase "assigned by the instructor" was voted upon. By show of hand, 18 favored dropping the phrase, 8 opposed dropping the phrase, and 2 abstained. The motion to drop the phrase "assigned by the instructor" was carried.

Jim Odom (Hist) reported that his faculty were opposed to this provision. Mike Gallagher (Hlth Sci) spoke in opposition to this proposal. Mary Lou Gammo (Acct) indicated her faculty desired to "leave the policy alone." Creg Bishop (Env Hlth) expressed his experience that students are typically allowed to withdraw with very little excuse. The current policy with the consequence of a W/F should be retained. Mark Holland (Eng) spoke against the policy, since the proposal takes away from the flexibility of the process. Eliz. Williams (Med) asked about the potential of an instructor not allowing a student to drop after the 12th week or so, and what the student would likely record on the student assessment of instruction form. Mike Gallagher (Hlth Sci) indicated that by not including the W or W/F on the drop request form, information the dean needed to make a decision was not being provided. After the question was called, a voice vote on this proposal was taken. This proposal failed by unanimous voice vote. There were no abstentions.

4. **Resolution Concerning Habitat for Humanity.** As a followup of the discussion in the Faculty Senate meeting of March 30, 1992, Mike Woodruff (Med) introduced the following resolution for adoption by the Faculty Senate.

The faculty senate of East Tennessee State University recognizes the need for affordable, decent housing to serve the requirements of the people of Northeast Tennessee. Further, it recognizes that Habitat for Humanity is striving to meet this need by building low cost, but quality housing for families that meet criteria

established by Habitat that include full-time employment and a reasonable credit record and no history of difficulties with police. For these reasons the faculty senate of East Tennessee State University resolves to support the new campus chapter of Habitat for Humanity and encourages active participation by all members of the university community including faculty, staff and students in the work done by both the campus chapter of Habitat for Humanity and the Holston Affiliate of Habitat.

Woodruff indicated that a chapter of Habitat for Humanity was being formed on the campus. He also indicated the community concern for housing as expressed in the series of articles currently appearing in the *Johnson City Press* about housing availability. Eliz. Williams (Med) indicated that ETSU does impact on the housing shortage in Johnson City because of student housing requirements. Mary Lou Gammo (Acct) asked what was meant by "support." This is to be interpreted as "one sees fit." Dan Johnson (Bio Sci) suggested that the Faculty Senate abstain from this proposal because there are many worthy causes that could fill up the Senate agenda and this was an inappropriate use of Faculty Senate time. Rebecca Nunley (Dent Hyg) spoke in favor of the resolution as being necessary to foster community relations. She indicated Habitat for Humanity was a broad enough organization to be accommodated. Ed Williams (Eng) indicated a precedent for supporting organizations has already been set since the Faculty Senate has endorsed other projects in the past. Following the call for the question, a voice vote was taken. The proposal was passed by unanimous voice vote with three indicating abstention.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. State Health Insurance Program. Bill Fisher (Mgt & Mkt) reported the following information:

a. As of April 1, 1992, the Preferred Provider Hospitals list has been changed. NorthSide Hospital was added to the list and Johnson City Specialty Hospital was removed.

b. The State contract with Blue Cross/Blue Shield ends January 1, 1993 and therefore must be renegotiated for another contract period.

c. Funding 1992-93. A consultant has recommended the insurance fund will need an increase in revenue of 24 to 29 percent to maintain same benefit schedule. The state will add \$8 million to help. Undoubtedly, a premium increase will occur. The current cost to the State is \$240 to \$250 per month for each employee -- the yearly cost of the program is \$2,880 of \$3000 per employee.

2. Higher Education Faculty Retirement Program. Bill Fisher (Mgt & Mkt) reported on the following:

a. On July 1, 1992, two new retirement program options will be available: Aetna Insurance Company with 10 investment fund options; and Valic Insurance Company with 10 investment fund options.

b. Problem areas include: (1) The need for a common state marketing policy that all vendors should adhere to; (2) Transferability arrangements from and to any of the four programs (TCRS/TIAA-CREF/AETNA/VALIC); and (3) a "Result Comparison" report that can assist the faculty member in assessing the different plans.

3. Tennyson Wooten Endowment. Jim Odom (Hist) thanked the Senate and the faculty for their support to the Wooten family.

4. Status of Presidential Search. Bob Riser (Comp Sci) and George Poole (Math) reported

(Hubert Mc Callough)

that Chancellor Floyd indicated at the recent TBR meeting at Morristown that he was ready to go forward with final interviews of the five finalist candidates. It was expected that the interviews would commence just as soon as the scheduling arrangements could be made. Since that time however, the Chair (Governor of Tennessee) and Vice-Chair of TBR, have told Chancellor Floyd to delay. The reasons why are speculative only. It is interesting to note that the Tennessee State Legislature is working toward the passage of a law to benefit the candidacy of one specific individual previously rejected by the Presidential Search Advisory Committee as being non-qualified. A concern was expressed about the possibility of a second interim president being named. Existing TBR policy places the responsibility for placing and removing interim presidents ~~only~~ with the Chancellor.

5. Opposition to Landfill Proposal. Mary Lou Gammo (Acct) expressed concern about a proposed landfill to be constructed on county property adjacent to Johnson City. She requested all faculty to show their concern and become involved in the opposition to this proposal by signing petitions as they become available. This proposed landfill would service areas of Tennessee, North Carolina and Georgia. Besides being a traffic and hazardous nuisance, it would be located on the water shed that ultimately feeds the water supply of Johnson City.

6. Academic Matters. Anne LeCroy (Eng) announced that the Academic Matters Committee would meet on April 13, 1992, 3:30 pm, in the first floor conference room of Burleson Hall.

There being no further business, the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:49 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth D. James

ATTENDANCE

Present

Terry Countermine
Kenneth James
Jim Pleasant
Bob Riser
Scott Beck
Jeff Gold
Mark Holland
Dan Johnson
Anne LeCroy
Jim Odom
George Poole
Ed Williams
Bill Fisher
Mary Lou Gammo
Robert Davidson
Chris Ayres
Rebecca Isbell
Mary Nelson

Absent


Marcellus Turner
Bob Acuff
Kenneth Ferslew
Sue McCoy
Eliz. Williams
Mike Woodruff
Carol Gordon
Beth Smith
Creg Bishop
Mike Gallagher
Rebecca Nunley
Phil Scheuerman

Linda Lawson
Eddie Yasin
Al Lucero
Bill Campbell
Katie Dunn
Chip East
Brad Arbogast
Ahmad Wattad
Virginia Adams
Sally Crawford



East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: Dr. Robert Acuff, President, Faculty Senate
FROM:  Robert J. Alfonso, Vice President for Academic Affairs
SUBJECT: PROMOTION AND TENURE APPEAL PROCEDURE
DATE: March 23, 1992

Recently while talking with with some candidates for promotion/tenure, I discovered that the language in our University Promotion and Tenure Policy is neither clear nor accurate in one particular instance. I took this matter up at the most recent meeting of Academic Council and there was concurrence there that it needs to be changed and I have suggested revised wording. I would like the Faculty Senate, however, to be aware of the clarification I have proposed before the Academic Council takes final action. It is really a clarification of the procedure, rather than a change in procedure.

I have highlighted (on Attachment A) Section 2.3.11.2., which describes appeal opportunities that a faculty member has following the Dean's action. The same wording appears in our tenure appeal policy and it needs to be clarified in each. The troublesome wording begins in the fifth sentence which indicates that "Should the Vice President choose to reverse the Dean's positive recommendation, the candidate may request a pre-appeal conference with the President." As that paragraph currently reads, the candidate could appeal the Vice President's negative decision only if the Vice President had reversed the Dean's positive recommendation. I don't believe that was the intent of the appeals process. The candidate, obviously, should have the opportunity to appeal my decision regardless of whether I overturned the Dean's positive recommendation or if I also cast a negative vote following the dean's negative recommendation. I believe the intent of this section was to provide the candidate with two opportunities to appeal (exercising only one of them) before the President reached his decision. These opportunities were to be after the Dean's recommendation or after the Vice President's recommendation. The current wording would deny the second opportunity, unless I had reversed the Dean's part of the recommendation.

I would like to suggest the following new paragraph as a replacement for the existing 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 in favor of promotion, the candidate may request a pre-appeal conference with the Vice President. Should the Vice President choose not to recommend for promotion and the candidate has not appealed following the Dean's decision, 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.

I believe that this clarifies the intent of our appeal procedure. This wording should also be included in the tenure appeal policy. I would be glad to explain this issue at a Faculty Senate meeting if you would like me to.

RJA:ps

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 appropriate vice president's office, of the award of promotion. When a recommendation is disapproved by the president, s/he will, through the appropriate 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 within five days of said notification. 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 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. In the event the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee makes a recommendation on tenure and/or promotion, the chair of that committee will be informed of the final decision and its rationale, in writing, by the president or 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. (See TBR policy 1:02:11:00.)

Recommendation

To: Faculty Senate

From: Academic Matters

Re: W/WF 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."