

Senator Burks called the meeting to order at 2:46 PM

Senators were asked to sign in and check their contact information. A list of standing committees and members are now available. A copy for editing was made available and a final list will be developed.

Minutes

Dr. Dennis moved to accept the minutes. Seconded

Minutes accepted unanimously.

Announcements

LGBT training events will be held in the fourth week in October.

Standing Committees

Dr. Burkes asked each committee to meet once between now and the November meeting.

Dr. Brown has agreed to chair the nominations and awards committee.

Change in was noted for the curriculum committee representing Agriculture

We still need a chair for budget. Dr. Dennis agreed to Chair the Budget Chair.

Accepted committee reports will be posted on the faculty senate website. A version of the committees will be passed around for editing. We need a budget cuts. The Deans were asked to accept three sets of budget cuts. We need to be on top of this.

Dr. Lee moves Dr. Boadi seconds

Vote – unanimously passed

University ranking – An ad hoc committee is needed to understand how our rankings were calculated (components) and to strategically increase our rankings. The Senate asked if anyone present would like to Chair this committee—Dr. Chaires (Criminal Justice) volunteered to chair the University Rankings Committee-Drs. Williams, Coker, Raynes and Kampsuu will serve on this committee. This is an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate, not a Standing Committee.

Motion form to the ad hoc University Rankings Committee

Seconded

d. Dr. Dennis suggested that someone from the Academic Committee also be part of the rankings committee. Dr. Paynes was added to the ad hoc Rankings Committee

It was seconded as a friendly with the friendly amendment.

Vote. Unanamously carried.

The university has an interest of having the Handbook completed by December. We need more help on the committee. Dr. Coker volunteered to proof the handbook after completion.

RIF

Enrollments are down by 10%. There is an 8% reduction in FTE. These declines in enrollment would result in needs to reduce faculty. Looking at page 62 in the old Faculty Handbook, there is an order to RIF. We looked at the order for which faculty were to be separated from the university. We then looked at a later TBR directive, there #7. Dr. Burkes would like to propose an order to the criteria for separation. How do we want to handle the RIF?

d. Mark Hunter – advisory –raised the issue of subjectivity of evaluation; Dr. Hunter moves that we use peer review. Dr. Dennis – we can also consider publication records. Dr. Kilbourne wants us to look at time frame for evaluations. Do we have to use performance organizations? TBR regs are in place until the Board changes them. We discussed the validity of chair performance evaluations. Dr. Vogel. Performance reviews differ significantly across units. This is problematic for using as justification of RIF.

Dr. Jackson needs to include evaluation. Performance evaluation

YS -1989 highlights the importance of tenure. The 1989 states tenure and tenure track faculty are privileged over part timers or temps.

Burkes: How should we operationalize RIF: Is rank more important than experience? What does seniority mean? Curricular needs trump other consideration.

Dr. Jackson talks about SACS – match faculty to teaching to keep accreditation.

This will be the first part of the Handbook we tackle. SET up Dropbox or eLearn.

YS moves we create a Dropbox for RIF criteria.

Seconded.

Perhaps an eLearn space would facilitate discussion better than Dropbox. YS said that it might be more timely to use Dropbox. Many faculty may not like to use eLearn, but all would be able to access Dropbox. eLearn is not necessarily always available. Kilbourne will find points of correspondence and divergence in the suggestion for RIF. The differing rubrics will be presented at the November Faculty Senate meeting.

Vote – 17 aye, 3 nay.

Make sure you define what the appropriate terminal degree is in your area.

Dr. Ray – The Rif is a key component of the handbook. It needs to be considered as part of the handbook. RIF is an underlying issue. RIF can be the result of program termination. RIF can be because of financial exigency. We also need to have a pathway out of financial exigency. What will we be as an institution to remain viable. Before we go there, we should reflect on the need to be a full handbook.

Not only the handbook, but have a chair evaluation policy, sick leave bank policy, all policies up to date will be included in the handbook. We passed an extended education policy with financial terms finalized. RIF should be delivered in the totality of the handbook.

Jackson – Members will look at all the ways people practice informally. Exceptions will be included in the policy. There are disclosure requirements. Everything needs to be done to avoid faculty RIF. The authority rests with the President. The may and the shall are important. Review, advice and discussion.

Dr. YS the Handbook will protect faculty to standardize rules across units. The Senate needs to be the voice of the faculty. We should take the opportunity to create a document to protect faculty.

Transparency

Dr. Burkes – When is something common knowledge? When is it protected as secret? It had not been distributed to the faculty.

Dr. Jackson – This is an open records state. It's public record after 14 days. Everyone has a right to access.

Dr. Williams – 1955-2016, the state did not provide the matching funds. Dr. Dennis – The President now has a 1 to 1 match. We do not get the same match as UT. The 1 to 1 matched is with money from USDA. UT gets ten times the TSU match. In 2016, they began 1 to 1 match. There are many years we did not get our match.

Dr. Burkes – does faculty senate want to be involved. Is the lack of a match poor administration or illegal.

Dr. Jackson clarifies who would bring the case forward. It might be a strong case. We might need to find the right claimants. The issue is land grant given to the states. The state is the institution that makes the decision. This is an equal protection suit. This is a basic issue of fairness. DR. Dennis and Dr. Williams would like to look at this.

Ms. Sloss and Dr. Jackson talked about the library resources to support a post bac program. There was argument about how to obtain resource. YS former TBR institutions should work together. Sloss says that ETSU.

Motion: The curriculum committee will look into the post bac. Program

Dr. Raynes seconded.

Vote: 20 aye

Oppose

1 present but not voting.

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 Pm