

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

1-25-2016

2016 January 25 - 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, "2016 January 25 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 85.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/85>

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 Agenda

January 25, 2016

Culp Center, Forum (Room 311)

I. Old Business

Approval of Minutes for November 23, 2015

II. New business

a. Debrief Open Forum

b. Discussion of FOCUS Bill

i. Legislation—what is there/what should be

ii. Opportunities move to local governance

iii. Challenges with move to local governance

c. Searches, question about funding sources for positions

III. Updates

a. December 12 Executive Committee Meeting with President Noland

b. Interim University Council

IV. Adjournment



FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

Meeting Date:	January 25, 2016	Time:	14:45 – 16:15	Location:	Culp Center, Room 311
Next Meeting:	February 8, 2016	Scribe:			Eric Sellers
Present:	Dilshod Achilov, Leila Al-Imad, Fred Alsop, Patrick Brown, Doug Burgess, Randy Byington, Kathy Campbell, Jackie Church, Erin Doran, Joyce Duncan, Susan Epps, Bill Flora, Virginia Foley, Nick Hagemeyer, Katherine Hall, Tammy Hayes, Bill Hemphill, Stephen Hendrix, Karin Keith, Koyamangalath Krishnan, Thomas Kwasigroch, Fred Mackara, Mildred Maisonet, Anthony Masino, Tim McDowell, Theresa McGarry, Lorianne Mitchell, Shunbin Ning, Bea Owens, Jonathan Peterson, Eric Sellers, Melissa Shafer, Bill Stone, Paul Trogen, Craig Turner, Ahmad Watted				
Absent:	Robert Beeler, Jessica Bragg, Dorothy Drinkard-Hawkshawe, Lon Felker, Tavia Flanagan, Howard Herrell, Tod Jablonski, Guangya Li, Mary Ann Littleton, James Livingston, Sun-Joo Oh, Peter Panus, Timir Paul, Deborah Ricker, Darshan Shah, April Stidham, Liang Wang, Robert White				
Excused:	Lee Glenn, Jerome Mwinyelle, Kerry Proctor-Williams				

Agenda Items	Responsible
Meeting called to order 14:55	Dr. Foley
1. Old Business	
1.1 Approval of Minutes from 11/23/15	Dr. Foley
2. New Business	
2.1 Debrief Open Forum	Dr. Foley
2.2 Focus On College and University Success (FOCUS) Act	Dr. Foley
2.2.1 Opportunities and Challenges with the move to local governance	
2.3 Faculty searches, questions about funding sources for positions	
3. Updates	
3.1 December 12 Executive Committee Meeting with President Noland	
3.2 Interim University Council	Dr. Foley
4. Adjournment	

DISCUSSIONS

1. Old Business

1.1 Approval of Minutes from 11/23/15

Motion: **Alsop** **Second:** **Masino** **Approved: Yes**

2. New Business

2.1 Debrief Open Forum

The forum was postponed due to the snow day. The meeting has been rescheduled for Wednesday, December 27 from 13:30 – 15:30 and will be held in Ballroom Left in the Culp Center.

2.2 Discussion of FOCUS Act

- The bill was introduced on Dec. 21 and President Noland feels there is an 80% chance it will pass.
- A smaller Faculty Senate group has been created [Byington, Epps, Alsop, Flora, Schacht, and Foley] and met



DISCUSSIONS

on January 15.

- ETSU will be accountable to the TBR or a local governing board. There are several entanglement issues: Banner, fees, D2L, other shared technologies, library resources, etc.
- Capital projects and management will be locally managed. It is unclear what will happen when our current contracts expire (i.e., how they will be renegotiated/renewed).
- Byington: When educational bonds are issued, the collective collateral is owned by the state. The bonds are co-collateralized across the state. If each university has their own bonds, they would need to be refinanced so it is not clear whether or not co-collateralization will continue or if it expires as the bonds are retired.
- Selection and training of the local board would be made in Fall 2016 and confirmed by the legislature in January or February of 2017.

2.2.1 Opportunities and Challenges with the move to local governance

Masino – TBR policies and procedures are universal across the board, which protects us from an “absolute power” mentality. Moving to a local governance structure will reduce oversight and too few people will have too much power.

Mackara – What will the changes cost – is the goal of decentralizing to save money? Byington – the budget/cost has not been made public.

Peterson – The Faculty Handbook has just been updated to refer to TBR policy where applicable. Should we update the handbook with the adopted TBR policies and disentangle the ETSU from TBR policy, such that our handbook will make no reference to the TBR?

Champouillon – Not in favor of such a policy because every time something changes on the TBR side our policy is affected. We can have it ready to go, but we cannot change the handbook until the FOCUS Act is approved.

Hemphill – TBR will be changing focus to community colleges and there are many issues to be resolved, some things may stay with TBR, others will be decentralized, and other issues will go to THEC.

Flora – The SWOT brainstorming process is essential because of the extremely short time frame. By March of 2016 the process will be completed and by February 2017 the local board will be in place. Thus, the policy manual will need to be in place and we have the opportunity to shape the new policies and procedures under the auspices of shared governance.

- **See Appendix A for brainstorming results.**

2.3 Faculty searches, questions about funding sources for positions

Foley – if we have been given permission for faculty searches does the dept. need to pay for it?

3. Updates

3.1 December 12 Executive Committee Meeting with President Noland

Not reported.

3.2 Interim University Council

The meeting was held on January 11. Mike Hoff led a SWOT (strengths weaknesses opportunities challenges at ETSU) activity, and will be constructing a survey from the activity. He will be conducting a second SWOT with a group of students. Hoff is the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee that will be meeting for the next 16 months.

Lorianne Mitchell, Bethany Flora, and Wally Dixon are faculty members of the committee. A short term plan is due to TBR in March. The plan is based on the committee of 125 and the surveys that are currently being generated. The Cornell University strategic plan is being used as a template for the process.

President Noland stated that faculty will not be asked to work for less in the summer.

- Mitchell: strategic planning update – SWOT analyses from students, staff, IUC, athletic community members, faculty. Faculty senate should have a report for the Council meeting in February. The faculty senate will have a break-out session on Monday, February 8, 2016.

4. Adjournment

Motion: **Brown Second:** **Epps** **Approved: Yes**

Please notify Senator Eric Sellers (sellers@etsu.edu or 9-4476, Faculty Senate Secretary, 2015-2016, of any changes or corrections to the minutes. Web Page is maintained by Senator Doug Burgess (burgess@etsu.edu or x96691).



APPENDIX A

Results from Faculty Senate Brainstorming session on challenges and opportunities available with the separation from TBR Governance to local board governance

- Curriculum Process- too long
- Standing curriculum committee reporting to board
- Look @ holistic system
- Opt for more flexibility in IT hardware purchasing
- More opportunity for faculty input in budgetary processes
- University council - who does he/she work for?
- Capital projects
- Process for reviewing/approving "local" fees (parking lot)
- Transparency in budget process/ faculty have a part of Out of state tuition decisions
- CoM policies (unwritten that need to be written)
- Impact of long term vision for higher education and sustainability over time.
- Become part of backroom conversations
- Tenure/promotion decisions
- RDC funding (loss of)
- Diversity Grants (loss of)
- Plans for dental school
- Representation from Qcom/GCofP
- Admissions requirements (opportunity to drop ACT requirement)
- Calendar/summer school
- faculty committee on program review making recommendations to local board
- Workload (Undergraduate, Graduate, online)
- Human subjects research – payment to subjects, opportunity for more flexibility
- Role of adjunct faculty in decisions (stipends for extra duties when involved beyond classes)
- Cap on adjunct pay (or not)
- Stipend for graduate students
- Equity/Merit Pay
- Employment Categories
- Employment Contracts
- Faculty Lines
- Definition and number of faculty
- Faculty Profile
- Faculty grievance process
- Duplication of programs
- TUAPA
- Money on table for adjunct in spring (flexibility for adding classes with adjuncts)
- Better/new system for managing research funds
- Opportunity for rollover of funds (versus use or lose)
- Collection development budget for library
- Program fees going to departments



- Equipment funding mechanism
- Class size (as response to course load)
- Tying faculty lines to enrollment
- Expectations for T, R, and S workload
- Graduate faculty status (stipend, recognition)

Concerns about the Legislation

- Faculty rep on board - look @process for selection, length of terms, etc.
- Input in selection process for board—concerned about Governor appointing and possible instability with change of governor
- Tenure/promotion decisions
- No TUAPA

Additions from emails 1-26-16

From the faculty perspective, would be very appropriate to

- move oversight of major institutional financial issues—particularly the declaration of financial exigency (TBR Policy 5:02:06:00)—*UP* the chain of oversight (i.e., from TBR to THEC) as opposed to “down” (i.e., to the local board level) and
- retain the need for any declaration of financial exigency to be only at the institutional level.

Such a policy shift from TBR to THEC would serve as a firebreak to ensure that a local board cannot decide to selectively financially starve one particular program or unity by simply changing the rules for the declaration of financial exigency to apply at the college or department level. The local boards would retain oversight of local programs and will control what academic programs need to be phased out in accordance with a viable exit strategy (e.g., a 3-year phase out for an existing undergraduate major to be terminated.) But requiring THEC oversight would retain the current high bar of triggering the wholesale and sudden termination of tenured faculty based upon an institution-wide crisis. It would therefore prevent targeted mischief by local board members “with an axe to grind” within only one academic area.

Institutional Code of Ethics (Institution-wide, not just for the local board members):

In the proposed legislation, each local board needs to create, adopt, and follow an official Code of Ethics for appointed(?) members of that local board. This provides us with an excellent to wordsmith and propose a more universal Code of Ethics—applicable to all non-student members of the academy (i.e., administration, faculty, staff, graduate assistants, etc.)—with all the appropriate mechanisms, levels of enforcement, appeals, and responsibilities thereto appertaining*.

A code of ethics for a governing board is different from a code of ethics for faculty.

Personally, I would hesitate to invite top-down direction of a code of ethics for faculty, whether from the legislature or from a governing board. Indeed, an administrative top-down approach was adopted at UT Knoxville a few years ago in response to some federal requirements and it did not go well with respect to campus harmony. If memory serves me, federal sentencing guidelines for certain types of violations (fraud?) allowed penalties to be mitigated if there was evidence that the institution had adopted certain ethical rules. Notwithstanding the compelling logic for adopting ethics rules to meet the federal situation, UT's faculty were not included in the process of adoption, and this unfortunate procedural fact resulted in faculty unhappiness, some mistrust, and pushback. I think the controversy could have been avoided if faculty has simply been consulted and involved from the beginning, as opposed to being presented by the administration with a new set of expectations as a *fait accompli*.