

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
Feb 17, 2004

On Feb 17, 2004, the SPSU Faculty Senate met in M-100, at noon. Prof. Tom Currin, Moderator of the Faculty presided, R. Dreyer, secretary.

	Senators		Ex-Officio/Visitors
P	D. Brani (MET)	P	D. Hornbeck (Int. VPAA)
P	L. Dollar (IET)	P	W. Barnes (Dean-ACC)
P	J. Duff (BCP)	P	A. Gabrielli (Dean-AS)
P	S. Edwards (Math)	P	M. Murphy (Dean-CSE)
P	W. Hodges (ECET)	P	B. Pearce (Int. Dean ETM)
P	G. Banik (Const)		
	J. Conn (Mgt)		
P	B. Nuhfer-Halten (SIS)	P	C. Bachman (chair-ECET)
P	T. Rizzuto (Arch)	P	J. Sweigart (chair-MET)
P	J. Rupf(CS)	P	V. Deagi (chair-CS)
P	J.A. Samra (IT)		
P	M. Stevens (HTC)		
P	W.Thain (ECET)	P	T. Rotnem (SIS)
P	S. Vincent (Lib)		
P	A. Wang (SE)		
	M. Wilson (CET)		

1. Welcome and comments: Moderator

1.1 Moderator immediately moved to agenda item 2.

2. Promotion and Tenure P&P Comments and Revisions

2.1 Senate continued discussion on motion to accept the IVPAA's draft Promotion and Tenure P&P dated Nov-6-2003.

2.2.1 Motion to amend was made, seconded and PASSED:

Senate does NOT accept IVPAA's Discussion Paper "How Much Teaching is Sufficient to Make One Eligible for Tenure?" letter dated 2-16-04. (See end of this document for a copy.)

2.2.2 Motion to amend was made, seconded and PASSED:

Amend page 2, item 2, first "bullet" = "A year of credit toward promotion and tenure...", to modify the phrase "... and a teaching load of at least 1/3 time for an academic year" to "and an average teaching load, per year, of at least six (6) hours over the period of evaluation (at SPSU)".

2.2.3 Motion to amend was made, seconded and PASSED:

Table the discussion of the motion until the next Senate meeting.

3. Other Business: None

4. Announcements: None

5. Adjourn

5.1 Next Senate meeting: Tuesday March 2, 2004, noon, M-100.

5.2 Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm

R. Dreyer, Secretary

T. Currin, Moderator

From IVPAA to Senators: 2-16-2004

Discussion Paper
How Much Teaching is Sufficient to Make One Eligible for Tenure?

Heretofore we have not had a standard that defined how much teaching would be required to confirm noteworthy achievement, and candidates have been tenured or promoted based on widely varying "volumes" of teaching.

If we are to require noteworthy teaching for every candidate (as stated in our current policy), then there needs to be some minimum quantity (sample size) of teaching on which to base an assessment of it, and the Senate supported that concept last week by recommending a 1/3 (averaged) teaching load.

However, if we establish a minimum "volume" of teaching, then it is only fair that it be applied equally to every candidate, not just the person who has a 2/3 administrative or research assignment. If we accept a 1/3 average teaching load as adequate evidence for faculty whose primary responsibility is in something other than teaching, then why should we require a greater standard of evidence for faculty whose workload is primarily teaching? After all, tenure is a University designation that transcends both discipline and teaching load that is, tenure is institution-based, not department-based, and a faculty member tenured with a T1 teaching load is still tenured even if they later opt for a T2 or T3 load. If faculty have this mobility after achieving tenure, then why should faculty members teaching a full-time load be required to present a more substantial volume of evidence of 'noteworthy' teaching than the faculty member who is half-time teaching with half-time administrative or research?

The proposal which I originally submitted to the Senate contains a requirement that candidates submit results of performance evaluations in all courses taught during the period of evaluation (this requirement was in the P&P approved by the Senate in spring of 2003). However, if we permit some faculty to gain tenure based on a 1/3-time load, it is inequitable to require another segment of the faculty to provide evaluations on all courses in a full-time teaching load.

Therefore, I am asking the Senate to consider revising the minimum teaching load to be a cumulative total of 40 semester hours, and making the following changes in the draft P&P:

In "Definitions", add a fourth bullet under

1. Tenure

-"Candidates for tenure must have taught a minimum of 40 semester hours of coursework at Southern Polytechnic State University."

In "Criteria Common to All Ranks", revise as follows

2. Noteworthy Teaching

(a) summaries of student evaluations in a minimum of 40 semester hours taught during.....

Advantages:

- The 40 semester-hour minimum is a cumulative total, so it eliminates the need to compute an average.

- It eliminates the need to make exceptions for temporary leaves or reassigned time.
- It is equivalent to 8 semester hours a year (1/3 of T2) over the 5 years normally required for eligibility.
- It could also define the minimum teaching to be promoted from any given rank to the next higher one.