



## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	9/25/2017	<b>Time:</b>	14:45 – 16:30	<b>Location:</b>	Culp Center, Room 311
<b>Next Meeting:</b>	10/9/2017	<b>Scribe:</b>			Eric Sellers
<b>Present:</b>	Al Balbissi, Kais; Al-Imad, Leila; Alsop, Fred; Anand, Rajani; Brooks Taylor, Teresa; Brown, Patrick; Byington, Randy; Chambers, Cindy; Cluck, David; Doran, Erin; Drinkard-Hawkshawe, Dorothy; Dula, Chris; Duncan, Joyce; Dunn, Andrew; Ellis, Jon; Epps, Susan; Flora, Bill; Foley, Virginia; Gentry, Retha; Gray, Jeff; Hall, Katherine; Hemphill, Bill; Littleton, Mary Ann; Livingston, James; Lowery, Ashley; Mackara, Fred; Marek, Greta; McGarry, Theresa; Mullins, Chrissy; Oh, Sunny; Olson, Nate; Owens, Bea; Panus, Peter; Pealer, Jennifer; Peterson, Jonathan; Ramsey, Priscilla; Sarkodie, Olga; Scheuerman, Eugene; Sellers, Eric; Stone, Bill; Trogen, Paul; Walden, Rachel				
<b>Absent:</b>	Burgess, Doug; Chakraborty, Kaniska; Masino, Anthony; Ning, Shunbin; Paul, Timir;				
<b>Excused:</b>	Campbell, Heidi; Elangovan, Saravanan; Hendrix, Stephen; Kostrzewa, Richard; Maisonet, Mildred; Mitchell, Lorianne; Short, Candice				

Agenda Items	Responsible
Meeting called to order	Epps
1. Introductions	Epps/others
2. Celebrations	Epps/others
3. Announcements	Epps/others
4. Approval of Minutes	Epps
5. Informational Items 5.1 Guests: Dr. Bill N. Duncan and Dr. Bill R. Duncan 5.2 TUFS Update – Byington 5.3 Board of Trustees Report – Alsop	
6. Action Items 6.1 Committee on Committees	Foley
7. New Business 7.1 Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee	Burgess
8. Old Business	Epps
9. Questions on reports/summaries from committees/working groups	Epps
10. Other Items	Epps
11. Comments from Guests	Epps
12. Adjourn	Epps

### DISCUSSIONS

#### 1. Introductions

Several new senators were introduced and welcomed to the Senate.

#### 2. Celebrations



## DISCUSSIONS

### 3. Announcements

3.1 Exec Committee meets with Dr. Bach on Thursday, Sept. 28 – items for discussion are due by noon on Tuesday, Sept. 26

### 4. Approval of Minutes

**Motion to Approve: Flora**  
**Second: Foley**  
**Minutes Approved**

### 5. Informational Items

5.1 Guests: Dr. Bill N. Duncan (Sociology and Anthropology) and Dr. Bill R. Duncan (Office of Research and Sponsored Programs). The proposed startup policy (see Appendix A) was described and the rationale for the policy was outlined. **Bill R. Duncan** explained that the policy resulted from an Administrative and Services Review Committee that was convened approximately two years ago. **Bill N. Duncan** noted that the newly formed Board of Trustees (BOT) may want additional metrics to track return-on-investment of start-up funds. Three specific recommendations are being proposed. First, departments should establish a way to track performance of startup funds in excess of \$25,000 and define expectations for the funds. The expectations should be in line with the departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion. Second, the metrics should be established by each department and the agreed upon outcomes should be explicitly stated in line 10 of the employment contract. Third, the information should be kept in an electronic database managed by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

#### Comments and Questions

5.1.1 Senator **Oh** inquired about how startup funds can be spent; a faculty member in her department was told only books could be purchased with the funds. **Bill N. Duncan** noted that the funds should be sent as specified in the contract and it should be decided upon by the department.

5.1.2 Senator **Littleton** asked about the duration of which startup funds will last and whether it is stated in the contract. **Bill N. Duncan** replied that the duration of startup funds and whether they are listed in the contract are not defined in a consistent manner across departments.

5.1.3 Senator **Walden** had concerns in regard to how startup funds would be reviewed for equity, gender bias, and other discrimination. **Bill N. Duncan** replied that this issue was not in the current form of the plan; however, there is a plan to track how the funds are being used, and this could be added to the plan.

5.1.4 Senator **Drinkard-Hawkshawe** asked if current faculty could receive startup funds. **Bill N. Duncan** replied that startup funds are only for new faculty hires. Dula added that mechanisms like RDC funding are already in place to support current faculty research and scholarly activities. It was also noted by **Bill N. Duncan** that David Hurley tracks the return on RDC funding.

5.1.5 Senator **Stone** inquired whether this policy would be applied to the COM. **Bill N. Duncan** replied that it has not been addressed. **Bill R. Duncan** explained that the COM is not currently under the purview of ORSPA; however, they do conduct return-on-investment analyses.

5.1.6 Senator McGarry inquired about how much information in regard to startup would be included in the contract, what expectations are there, and whether there are consequences for not adhering to what is stated in the contract. **Bill N. Duncan** replied the contract would include the amount given but nothing related to expectations or if they are met, or not.

5.1.7 A concern in regard to legal issues was expressed by **Dunn**. The contract would state specific obligations; however, if the department chooses not to adopt the policy for tenure and promotion, how would this be dealt with? **Bill N. Duncan** replied that the departments should be guiding the process, and existing departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be used. In addition, the contract will not include anything



## DISCUSSIONS

that is over and above the departmental guidelines. **Bill R. Duncan** further explained that the guidelines for tenure and promotion would be determined at the departmental level and the contract should not influence tenure and promotion decisions.

5.1.8 Senator **Peterson** stated that it was explained at a previous meeting that if provisions are not included in a person's contract and it was not explicitly in the department's tenure and promotion guidelines, then the department would have no legal basis for denying tenure. **Bill N. Duncan** replied that this is his understanding according to HR.

5.1.9 Senator **Littleton** stated that there would be a grey area between the contract, departmental expectations for tenure and promotion, and college level criteria for tenure and promotion. **Epps** commented that there is not a grey area if department criteria are clearly defined and college committees should not use criteria that are not in the department criteria. Moreover, if college committees are using criteria other than what is specified by the department faculty would have grounds for appeal.

5.1.10 Senator **Dula** suggested there are two levels being dealt with. One is at the contract level and the other is at the tenure and promotion level. Until a faculty member receives tenure the contract can be terminated at any time. Thus, there is an appeal process once a faculty member goes through the tenure and promotion process; prior to that, a contract can be terminated without an appeal. Having specific deliverables in a contract could facilitate a departmental decision in regard to whether a faculty member should proceed to the tenure and promotion level.

5.1.11 President **Epps** stated that she is on a committee on university policy and they are trying to make the distinction between what is policy and what is procedure. She noted that the proposal includes some policy and some procedure, and it may be helpful to clearly delineate between the two.

5.1.12 Senator **Sellers** stated that having specific deliverables in a contract could be problematic because the deliverables may not be consistent with departmental policy for tenure and promotion. **Bill N. Duncan** replied that the proposed policy should not change departmental expectations - whatever is specified in the contract should be derived from pre-existing standards defined by the department.

5.1.13 Senator **Alsop** mentioned that many departments have a third year review process. More senior faculty provide feedback to whether they are on track, and where improvement is needed before the tenure and promotion process. **Alsop** also asked what percentage of incoming faculty receive startup funds. **Bill N. Duncan** replied that, currently, this data is not being tracked.

5.1.14 Senator **Ellis** explained that psychology has essentially been following the proposed policy for many years and assumed that all departments would also be following a similar model. **Bill R. Duncan** agreed that some departments have been monitoring startup expectations; however, they are not in the contract and it is not clear if they are enforceable. The proposed policy will make it easier to determine if the funds are being used wisely and if there is a high return on investment. **Ellis** followed with a question as to how return on investment is defined. **Bill R. Duncan** replied there are two things: (1) if you are required to apply for grants, were grants submitted and funded; and, (2) the number of presentations and publications. **Ellis** further questions if return on investment is equivalent to bringing in a certain amount of money in a given amount of time. **Bill N. Duncan** replied that it can be anything that is valued, such as presentations, performances, and publications. The spirit and language of the proposal are to increase the value given to non-grants.

### 5.2 TUFs Update – Byington

5.2.1 The UT Office of General Counsel foresee what would be “attacks on tenure” where agencies within or outside of the state push agendas. For example, last year interests outside the state pushed the “Milo Bill,” but a coordinated effort between Tennessee universities/legislators ultimately led to a better academic freedom bill. They also believe the guns on campus bill will return in some form.

5.2.2 Campus reports and updating the TUFs constitution were major topics of discussion. Constitution revisions are currently underway to remove references to TBR. A proposed change is to move to two in-



## DISCUSSIONS

person meetings and two virtual meetings per year.

5.2.3 It was also proposed that the secretary will be responsible for overseeing and redesigning the website.

5.2.4 Senator **Hemphill** inquired about the independence of the body and whether the constitution would specifically address remaining independent. **Byington** replied that discussion in regard to whether the body want to be incorporated will happen at the Spring meeting but there is no discussion of not being an independent organization. **Hemphill** suggested that TUFs not be formally associated with the state. **Alsop** further noted that Rich Rhoda from THEC also suggested that TUFs remain an independent body.

5.2.5 Senator **Walden** inquired about outsourcing. **Byington** replied that UTK and other institutions are still concerned; however, our stance remains the same, we will not be outsourcing.

5.2.6 President **Epps** reported that UTK has an “open mic night” for faculty to discuss research and we may want to consider a similar activity. They also hold a chili cook off event called “heating up the quad” and they donate the proceeds to local charities. There were also discussing the relationships between the boards of trustees and faculty. The relations at ETSU appear to be better than those observed at the other universities. TN Tech will be hosting the Spring meeting.

### 5.3 Board of Trustees Report – Alsop

The next meeting will be in November. The Finance Committee and the Executive Committee will be meeting before the November meeting.

## 6. Action Items

### 6.1 Committee on Committees – Foley

Bethany Novotny has agreed to serve on the ETSU Commission on Women.

**Motion to Affirm: Foley**

**Second: Duncan**

**Motion Approved**

## 7. New Business

### 7.1 Promotion and Tenure Appeals committee – Burgess (Burgess was not present)

7.1.1 **Epps** explained that Burgess chairs the committee and it should be staffed in a similar way to that of the Faculty Grievances Committee. The main difference of the Tenure and Appeals Committee is that it is not required to be staffed by senators. **Epps** asked that senators from each college meet and determine a member and an alternate to serve on the committee.

7.2 Senator **Drinkard-Hawkshawe** expressed concerns related to grade appeals and suggested that the current procedures should be reviewed by a committee composed of senators to make suggestions for change where needed. One issue is that students do not always consult the professor before they appeal a grade. Moreover, the committee should examine the SAI's and how they are used to determine tenure and promotion.

7.3 President **Epps** noted that Dr. Noland has requested a committee be formed to review current policy. The committee will consist of Susan Epps, David Linville, and Marsh Grube. Marsh has met with the units in charge of each area, Virginia is working on the handbook with Bill Kirkwood, and Jeff Howard is coordinating student policy review. Tammy Hamm is coordinating employment policy and B.J. King is coordinating for business and finance.

7.4 (related to 7.2) **Peterson** shared that the policy states that the student first go to the professor in a grade dispute and inquired as to what happens if the policy is not followed. **Epps** agreed that this is the policy;



## DISCUSSIONS

however, the student does not need to notify the professor if they are going to move forward with an appeal.

7.5 Senator **Littleton** noted that departments have tenure and promotion guidelines; however, they are not consistently followed all the way up to the level of the BOT and training or more information may be needed. Also, faculty only have one week to appeal a tenure and promotion decision, which seems like too short a time. **Epps** responded that this would be a question for Burgess and the issue can be addressed at the next meeting.

### 8. Old Business

None

### 9. Questions on reports/summaries from committees/working groups

9.1 Senator **McGarry** asked for additional information in regard to the refurbished computer policy. **Epps** stated that Karen King will be at the next senate meeting and will be able to provide more information at that time.

### 10. Other Items

10.1 President **Epps** will send out working group assignments and breakout notes from the retreat.

### 11. Comments from Guests

None

### 12. Adjourn

**Motion to Adjourn: Brown**  
**Second: Flora**  
**Meeting Adjourned**

Please notify Senator Eric Sellers ([sellers@etsu.edu](mailto:sellers@etsu.edu) or 9-4476, Faculty Senate Secretary, 2017-2018) of any changes or corrections to the minutes. Web Page is maintained by Senator Doug Burgess ([burgess@etsu.edu](mailto:burgess@etsu.edu) or 9-6691).



## **Appendix A**

### **Start-up Funds Policy - Draft**

**September 2017**

Start-up funding is provided to new faculty to support the development of their research programs at East Tennessee State University. Often, no formal expectations of research outcomes is included in their contract. This lack of explicitness is problematic for two reasons. Currently, we have no centralized database connecting the start-up funds provided to new faculty with the research is produced in part from those funds. This makes assessing (and maximizing) the institution's return on investment (ROI) from start-up funds difficult. This will help the institution begin to track data regarding start-up funds and use them in strategic ways in the future, which will likely be important in the face of changing budgetary models and new oversight by a local governing board. The second reason is that faculty and departments cannot currently cite such expectations in their evaluation of tenure and promotion cases, respectively.

### **Proposed Policy**

1) Departments should establish an agreement with new faculty members receiving start-up funds of over \$25,000, with approval of the appropriate dean and Vice Provost for Research, regarding what the expected outcome of those funds should be.

The nature of the requirements will vary considerably from department to department and thus, the discussion of what is expected must be driven by the faculty on a departmental level. The requirements could reference the number of publications (or other creative activities, such as performances), application for external funds or application for a specific amount of external funds. It is not recommended that departments establish expectations of a specific quantity of external funding. Start-up funding of under \$25,000 would not require the establishment of such outcomes, though some departments may find it useful to do so.

2) The start-up funding agreement should be included on Line 10 of faculty contracts.

This will benefit faculty by delineating explicit requirements they can document that they have fulfilled in tenure and promotion cases. Similarly, departments and colleges will be able to consider these requirements in their evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion. This will increase transparency and accountability regarding evaluation of tenure and promotion cases.

3) The start-up funding agreements will be maintained in a centralized location in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs Administration (ORSPA) in the interest of tracking and developing a rationale to use start-up funds strategically.

This will help the institution begin to track data regarding start-up funds and use them in strategic ways in the future, which will likely be important in the face of changing budgetary models and new oversight by a local governing board.