

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

University Council Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

9-10-2018

2018 September 10 - University Council Agenda and Minutes

University Council, East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/university-council-agendas-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University Council, East Tennessee State University, "2018 September 10 - University Council Agenda and Minutes" (2018). *University Council Agendas and Minutes*. 32.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/university-council-agendas-minutes/32>

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 University Council Agendas and Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

AGENDA

University Council

Monday, September 10, 2018

President's Conference Room –206 Dossett Hall

8:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Standing Items
 - 3.1. Approve minutes of the August 13, 2018 meeting (*attachment*)
 - 3.2. Review agenda
 - 3.3. President's Report
 - 3.4. Call for Voluntary Reports of UC-Essential Action Items from Governance Organizations
4. Action Items
 - 4.1. Old Business
 - 4.1.1. Research Data Ownership and Retention Policy – Dr. Duncan (*attachment*)
 - 4.2. New Business
5. Information Items/Presentations
 - 5.1. Update on Strategic Plan – Dr. Hoff
6. Announcements
7. Focused Discussion – Dr. Bishop moderating
 - 7.1. Overview of **ETSUAlert** situation on August 27, 2018 – Dr. Linville
 - 7.1.1. Walkthrough of process and rationale for actions taken – Mr. Ross and Mr. Smith
 - 7.1.2. Introduction of Chief of Police Nicole Collins – Mr. Ross
 - 7.1.2.1. Professional observations of campus-wide response – Chief Collins
 - 7.1.3. Evaluation of feedback concerning campus-wide response – Dr. Noland, Dr. Sherlin, and Mr. Smith
 - 7.1.4. Discussion and Next Steps – Dr. Linville
8. Adjournment

University Council
September 10, 2018 at 8:30 a.m.
Burgin Dossett Hall, President's Conference Room

1. Call to order

Dr. Wilsie Bishop called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call

Ms. Kristen Swing called the roll. Those in attendance were: Dr. Bert Bach, Ms. Bridget Baird, Dr. Joe Bidwell, Dr. Wilsie Bishop, Dr. Cheri Clavier, Dr. Dennis Depew, Dr. William Duncan, Dr. Susan Epps, Dr. Bill Flora, Ms. Megha Gupta, Dr. Michael Hoff; Dr. Keith Johnson, Dr. Jane Jones, Mr. Ed Kelly, Dr. B.J. King, Dr. Karen King, Dr. Claudia Kozinetz, Mr. Joseph Kusi, Dr. Angela Lewis, Dr. David Linville, Ms. Candy Massey, Ms. Stefanie Murphy, Dr. Brian Noland, Dr. Rick Osborn, Ms. Pam Ritter, Mr. Jeremy Ross, Dr. Joe Sherlin, Mr. Joe Smith, Dr. Ramona Williams, Dr. Randy Wykoff.

Those absent were: Dr. Debbie Byrd, Mr. Scott Carter, and Dr. David Roane

Others in attendance: Mr. Andrew Worley, Police Chief Nicole Collins, Ms. Mary Cradic, Ms. Kristen Swing.

3. Standing Items

3.1 Approve minutes of the August 13, 2018, meeting

This item was inadvertently skipped during the meeting.

3.2 Review Agenda

Dr. Bishop said Item 4.1.1 (Research Data Ownership and Retention Policy) would be deferred to the next meeting because of a new policy on policies that was approved in May that requires legal review and review by the Secretary of the Board of Trustees prior to presentation to the University Council for final approval. She also added an information item to the agenda – Item 5.2 – to allow Dr. David Linville to speak more about the process. Dr. Bill Flora made a motion to approve the change to the agenda, which was seconded by Dr. Randy Wykoff.

3.3 President's Report

As Dr. Noland began his report, Ms. Karen Mann came in with balloons and cookies for Dr. Bishop's birthday. The group sang "Happy Birthday" to Dr. Bishop before Dr. Noland continued with his report.

Dr. Noland thanked several people who, over the course of the past few weeks, helped to get enrollment numbers in a decent position. He noted that Sept. 9 was official census day and said the "drop for non-payment" number is at 62, compared to 104 at this time last year. He said that number looked a lot bigger last week and again thanked the many who made phone calls and helped get students taken care of last week. Although the enrollment numbers are still preliminary, Dr. Noland reported that the overall headcount was down by 39 students and the FTE count was up by 24. He noted that transfer numbers were up over last year while the number of first-time

freshmen and international students were both down. He said the takeaway is to start preparing for enrollment next fall right now.

Dr. Noland reported that the budget is balanced but some variability is evident across the colleges. ETSU's numbers look different than other institutions across the state, indicating that those organizations were in worse positions. He noted hearing some discussion that community college enrollment is up in Tennessee because of Reconnect. He noted that Dr. B.J. King would soon be providing a budget digest and more information how, and if, funds will be distributed. He emphasized the need to be cautious and have a deliberate approach with the dissemination of funds.

Next, Dr. Noland thanked individuals for their patience with all the construction taking place on campus. He noted that many offices led by individuals in the room have had to move, some even twice, over the summer, and some moves are yet to come. He said the Culp renovation is on time and on budget, thanking Mr. Ross and his staff for finding a way to make sure the Marketplace was operable by the time school started despite the delay due to a dynamite issue.

Regarding the purchase of the Millennium Centre, Dr. Noland announced that the transaction should close on Oct. 1. He noted that it is already hard to find parking in that garage and asked people to remind students, faculty, and staff that the first floor-and-a-half in the garage is for Carnegie Hotel. He also asked that those parking in the garage be reminded to use the pedestrian walkway over State of Franklin Road rather than trying to cross the road directly.

The Martin Center construction project is also moving ahead. A beam signing will take place on Sept. 21. Meanwhile, Building 60 will have its official ribbon-cutting ceremony soon, and leaders recently walked the Lamb Hall site in anticipation of the renovation/addition project there.

Dr. Noland reminded the group that the Board of Trustees meeting will take place Sept. 20-21. That Thursday, trustees will spend time at the College of Business and Technology and, on Friday, they will hold their full meeting where they will hear details on enrollment as well as an overview of the research structure and be presented with a new program matrix. Dr. Noland said the university's ability to hit enrollment goals is predicated on these new programs, and the matrix also allows ETSU to "put a stake in the ground" in terms of filling market gaps and asserting its dominant role in the region and state. The trustees will also hear a general update on budgets.

In continuing his report, Dr. Noland pointed out that colleges now have more control over their revenues because of the new budget model. He said the College of Clinical and Rehabilitative Health Sciences will soon announce investments in salary enhancements for its faculty and staff based on the dean's decision to adjust loads, start new programs, and utilize vacant positions to fund the increases. The new budget model affords this flexibility for deans, Dr. Noland said. Staying on the salary topic, Dr. Noland said ETSU leaders have been trying to decompress the work that was done at Austin Peay to move that institution from last in its peer set when it came to salaries to two steps above the median. He said APSU did this through freezing hires and increasing loads and activities while redistributing funds for the enhancements. While he does not foresee this being a university-wide method, he said deans could be looking at this at the college level.

Finally, Dr. Noland thanked everyone who came to Knoxville to cheer on the Bucs at the game against UT. He especially thanked Ms. Pam Ritter for what he called the largest alumni event he has been a part of at ETSU in his six-and-a-half years here. He said it was also a recruiting effort since the university receives more applications from Knox County than any other county in the state. He called the Marching Bucs “great ambassadors” for the university and said they stole the show on Saturday.

3.4 Call for Voluntary Reports

Dr. Bert Bach reported that the Academic Council will be bringing its new program matrix to the Board of Trustees next week and will hold a special meeting in less than three weeks to address moving beyond this fall’s enrollment and looking at opportunities for next fall.

Dr. Bill Flora reported that the Faculty Senate will hold its first meeting of the academic year this afternoon with Chief Nicole Collins coming to speak there.

Ms. Stefanie Murphy reported that Staff Senate will co-host, along with Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association, a Q&A forum with Dr. Noland at 2 p.m. on Oct. 27 in room 206 of Brown Hall.

Ms. Megha Gupta reported for the Student Government Association, noting that Welcome Week was a great success. She announced that Chief Nicole Collins would be coming to the SGA meeting this week to talk more about some safety concerns students had aired following the incident on the first day of class.

Mr. Joseph Kusi reported that the Graduate Students executive council met last week and has decided to focus on how students benefit from professors.

4. Action Items

4.1 Old Business

4.1.1. Research Data Ownership and Retention Policy

Deferred

4.2 New Business

None

5. Information Items/Presentations

5.1 Update on Strategic Plan – Dr. Hoff

Dr. Mike Hoff said he had received feedback on the print out of the Strategic Plan and plans to work with University Relations to shorten the text and get a background image. He believes displaying the posters on campus is a part of changing the culture.

He also noted that the shared folder with all strategic plans in it has been finalized and University Council members can access it. He pointed out that Student Affairs has several areas where they want to partner with others on campus and would like to look at other units’ strategic plans to see where there could be partnerships.

Dr. Hoff also said a lot of data has come in from surveys that he will do presentations on at a later date. He thanked the student intern working in his office who worked with others to develop a survey on wellness that will be going out to campus soon.

In terms of dashboards, Dr. Hoff said Academic Performance Solutions (APS) will launch in October and that if anyone wants training to let him know. He said APS will inform budget decisions, even comparing to peer groups. Among the peers are a medical school peer and a research aggressive peer, he said.

Ms. Mary Cradic pointed out that every University Council member should have access to the shared folder on the S drive as well as their assistants for those who requested that to be the case.

5.2 Review of [policy on policies](#) – Dr. David Linville

Dr. Linville reminded the group that the new process for reviewing and vetting university-wide policies and procedures was approved in May by University Council. It establishes that there are two main governing councils serving as the foundation for the shared governance process: University Council and Academic Council. The intent of the new process is to eliminate the editing being done inside University Council meetings. The process starts with the policy being drafted within a unit/area and then a feedback phase that culminates with the public comment period. Then, a review is provided for basic things like consistency before it shows up at either University Council or Academic Council. After that, it goes to the president, who typically would then submit it to the Board of Trustees. However, the Board of Trustees agreed at its first meeting that it did not need to receive every policy for approval. There are exceptions, such as policies with state requirements for Board of Trustees approval and policies that directly involve the Board of Trustees. Additionally, the Board of Trustees is willing to see any policy that the president feels should be seen by the governing board. This process allows for new or revised policies and procedures to be expedited, not have to be eligible for approval only four times a year. Dr. Bishop confirmed with Dr. Linville that all policies, even those going through Academic Council, should be being reviewed by Legal.

6. Announcements

Dr. Cheri Clavier announced that the contract with TracDat is expiring in February and will not be renewed. She asked that individuals with information in the program copy it over so it is not lost.

7. Focused Discussion

7.1 Overview of ETSUAlert situation on August 27, 2018

Dr. Bishop pointed out that we could not have staged a better tabletop exercise and are fortunate the incident turned out the way it did. Dr. Linville shared some of the infrastructure that exists behind the scenes. An Emergency Response Team has existed for the last 12 years; a Public Safety Team was created by Mr. Jeremy Ross when he took over Operations; and a Campus Communications Team that meets weekly to assess potential issues has been in existence since 2004.

7.1.1. Walkthrough of process and rationale for actions taken

Mr. Jeremy Ross explained that feedback received since the incident reveals there is certainly a difference in reality versus perception. He also noted that there was positive feedback as well as criticisms. He said he

believed it was the fastest response we could have had seeing as it was the first day of class and the Public Safety Team was already assembled as part of another meeting when the event unfolded. Mr. Ross was walking out of that meeting when he heard the dispatcher calling it out on the radio. He emphasized that there will be times when we won't have all the information immediately because the officers are in the middle of doing their jobs and can't stop for lengthy reporting, which was the case in this instance. In making a decision to sound the sirens, the group did not have all the information but felt the alarm was warranted based on what they had gleaned up to that point and opted to sound them. A message was also being crafted that was transmitted next, relatively quickly. The delivery of follow-up messages seemed to be delayed a bit, he noted, emphasizing the importance of getting as much information in the initial message as possible. Dr. Linville touched on the tools we have in place for communicating emergencies. In addition to the siren, we have a text message system that ties into emails as well and an alert to take over computer monitors on campus. Dr. Karen King noted that many people have asked to get their loved ones added to the alert system, but they have to have an ETSU email.

Mr. Joe Smith provided information regarding the themes of the feedback received. Much of the feedback centered on not knowing what to do in terms of the shelter in place directive. Other themes included: inconsistent experiences across campus; vetting process for construction workers; possibility of repeating the siren for those arriving on campus after the fact; and questions about the time sequence.

7.1.2. Introduction of Police Chief Collins

Mr. Ross introduced Police Chief Nicole Collins.

7.1.2.1. Professional observations of campus-wide response

Chief Collins offered an overview of the incident, which began with a call to 9-1-1 about a construction worker being attacked by another construction worker with a shovel. The call also included word that a weapon was drawn and the accused had fled the scene. Chief Collins shared some of the next steps of the process for the officers. She said she has received very positive feedback from individuals across campus who have undergone training with Mr. Andrew Worley in the past as these individuals said they knew exactly what to do. She said she would like to see mandatory training so that we do not have people working here who do not know what to do.

Mr. Joseph Kusi asked how long it took to get the message out to campus. Chief Collins said the message was sent within 20 minutes of the 9-1-1 call. Dr. Bishop pointed out that the status and/or verification of the weapon played a significant factor in the decision for a campus alert to shelter in place and stated that a much different message would have gone out, and gone out sooner, if this had been an active shooter situation.

Dr. Randy Wykoff noted that many people could not understand what was being said on the PA system. Ms. Megha Gupta agreed and said it could not be heard at all inside the buildings. She also emphasized the lack of understanding regarding the term *shelter in place*. Mr. Joe Bidwell reiterated the importance of training and said he is supportive of making it mandatory. Chief Collins said they are looking at updating the website with definitions for terms such as *shelter in place*. She added that the police are going to be transparent in these situations and put out the truth so people can make informed decisions regarding their safety. Dr. Susan Epps noted that she was working a Welcome Week table outside when it happened and wondered what *shelter in place* meant for her situation.

Dr. Bishop said some of the responsibility for making sure people get the message lies within department chairs and building coordinators. Dr. Bill Flora said he believed GoldAlert should be opt-out, not an opt-in situation. Dr. Joe Sherlin questioned whether the system had capacity for that.

7.1.3. Evaluation of feedback concerning campus-wide response

Dr. Sherlin said feedback received at Student Affairs fell into four categories: systems, protocols, communication, and training.

7.1.4. Discussion and next steps

Mr. Ross said there is a need for faculty to review with their students what they would do in a time of emergency and put it in their syllabi. He said there needs to be a level of accountability and recognition that we all need to do our part in these situations. He also said adding more cameras across campus, and an additional employee to monitor those cameras, is the most efficient thing we can do to improve overall safety right away.

Dr. Noland asked that people continue to send their feedback. He noted that campus safety is among the top things that keep him up at night. He pointed out that new interior locks were placed on almost every classroom door over the summer, which Mr. Ross said was a \$213,000 project. Dr. Noland encouraged deans and chairs to have Chief Collins speak to their respective units. He asked that the campus use this incident as a learning experience and a benefit to our campus.

8. Adjournment

Dr. Bishop adjourned the meeting.



Research Data Ownership and Retention	
Responsible Official: Vice Provost for Research and Sponsored Programs	Responsible Office: Research and Sponsored Programs

Policy Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that research data is retained and available for review by the University, sponsors, and state and federal agencies.

Policy Statement

The University claims ownership of research data for projects conducted at the University, under the auspices of the University or using University resources by faculty, staff, students, post-doctoral fellows, scholars, and visiting scientists in the course of their scholarly activities. Principal Investigators and the University have rights and responsibilities for retaining research data.

- I. The University will:
 - A. Comply with all federal and state regulations governing data retention and access.
 - B. Comply with the terms of all sponsored project grants and contracts.
 - C. Maintain confidentiality of research data, where appropriate (e.g., HIPAA data, etc.)
- II. The Principal Investigator (PI), as the custodian of the data, has primary responsibility for:
 - A. Overseeing the conduct of research/scholarly activity, both extramurally funded and other
 - B. Retention of all data and records
 - C. Providing access to the University, sponsors, and regulatory agencies
 - D. Sharing Data as required by the sponsor
- III. Data Retention
 - A. Research data must be retained a minimum of three years after the submission of all required reports (i.e., financial, special reports), or for the period designated by regulation in special circumstances (i.e., research misconduct investigations, export control, audit, etc.), or after students have completed their thesis or dissertation, whichever is longer.
 - B. Research data must be retained as long as required to protect any intellectual property that was produced as a result of the research.
 - C. Research data involving human subjects must be maintained and/or destroyed as required by the University's Human Research Subjects Protection Program according to federal regulations (e.g. OHRP and FDA).
 - D. When students were involved in the research/scholarly activity, research data must

be retained until the student's degree is awarded, the student leaves the University, or the research is published.

- E. Research data must be retained in the department or unit where it was generated (in the case of multiple departments, data should be retained by the department in which the PI of the study resides).
- F. Upon conclusion of the period of retention, the PI may destroy the data in accordance with applicable federal regulations or sponsor requirements.

IV. Transfer of Responsibility When a Researcher Leaves the University

If a staff member, student, post-doctoral fellow, scholar, or visiting scientist other than the PI, departs the University, she/he may retain copies of all research data at the discretion of the PI, but the original data must remain with the PI. The PI's decision can be appealed to the Vice Provost for Research and Sponsored Programs. If the PI leaves the University, the original data may be transferred to the new institution on approval by the University's Vice Provost for Research and Sponsored Programs and through a formal agreement that the new institution accepts responsibility for retaining the data, maintaining appropriate confidentiality, and providing University access in order to fulfill its responsibilities under the terms of award, including allegations of research misconduct.

Authority: Policies from federal sponsors including the [National Institutes of Health](#) and [National Science Foundation](#) regarding data management, retention and sharing, and as directed in the Office of Science Technology Policy Memorandum, [Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research \(February 22, 2013\)](#).

Definitions

Research data	All recorded information in any form (e.g. laboratory notebooks; electronic data collected using laboratory instrumentation; computer software; videos; qualitative data (interview transcripts and coding); survey data; memoranda; research resources, including synthetic compounds, cell lines, microorganisms (bacteria and viruses) cloned nucleic acids, DNA sequences, plants and animals (e.g. knockout mice)). For clinical studies, research data includes case histories, clinical protocols, case report forms, and supporting documentation.
Principal Investigator (PI)	Faculty or faculty sponsor/mentor with the primary responsibility of retaining research data and following the data management requirements of the University and the sponsor.
Research/Scholarly Activity	Systematic investigation with the purpose of developing or contributing to knowledge.

Policy History

Procedure (s)

Procedure History

Effective Date: TBD

Revision Date:

Related Form(s)

Scope and Applicability

	Governance	
X	Academic	
X	Students	
	Employment	
	Information Technology	
	Environmental Health and Safety	
	Business and Finance	
	Facilities and Operations	
	Communications & Marketing	
	Advancement	

Update on SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report

Presented to University Council

October 8, 2018

- The Fifth-Year Interim Report was developed to respond to the U.S. Department of Education's requirements (1) that accrediting bodies continuously monitor institutions to ensure compliance and (2) that accrediting bodies have a mechanism for reviewing multiple sites initiated since last reaffirmation.
- The compliance certification portion of ETSU's Fifth-Year Interim Report is due to SACSCOC in March 2019. Staff across campus have been working on this report, which addresses a select number of standards on Administration and Organization, Faculty, Student Achievement, Educational Program Structure and Content, Academic and Student Support Services, Financial and Physical Resources, and Transparency and Institutional Representation, since May. A template of the report is available at [http://www.sacscoc.org/fifth%20year/Template\(Fifth%20Year%20Interim%20Report\).2018.docx](http://www.sacscoc.org/fifth%20year/Template(Fifth%20Year%20Interim%20Report).2018.docx). A committee consisting of five experienced evaluators with experience in institutional effectiveness, student services, academic programs, and finance will review ETSU's written report next summer, but will not conduct an on-site visit. This team will also review ETSU's QEP Impact Report.
- A separate committee will review ETSU's off-campus instructional sites that were initiated since our last reaffirmation in 2013: the Kingsport Center for Higher Education, which houses a Bachelor of Science in Nursing program and the Master of Social Work (MSW); the Center for Graduate Studies of Asheville – Lenoir-Rhyne University, which houses a MSW cohort; and the Southwest Virginia Higher Education Center in Abingdon, which houses both the Bachelor of Social Work and the MSW. The areas of evaluation as applicable to the off-campus instructional sites include: (1) faculty qualifications and access, (2) qualifications of administrative and academic officials leading activities and programs at the sites, (3) student services, (4) library/learning resource accessibility and sufficiency, (5) physical facilities supporting the programs, and (6) student learning outcomes compared to similar programs offered on the main campus. This team will review a written report, due by March 1st, and will visit ETSU and these sites April 8-11, 2019.
- The SACSCOC Board of Trustees will review recommendations from the two committees noted above and will make a decision regarding ETSU's continued accreditation in June 2019.