2012-2013 Faculty Senate

**MINUTES—November 5, 2012**

Faculty Senate—East Tennessee State University

|  |  |
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|  UPCOMING MEETING: |  FOLLOWING MEETING: |
| Date, 2:45 pmForum, Culp Center |  Date, 2:45 p.m.Forum, Culp Center |

*Present:* Dave Arnall, Jim Bitter, Sally Blowers, Wesley Buerkle, Doug Burgess, Daryl Carter, Bruce Dalton, Don Davis,, Mohamed Elgazzar, Susan Epps, Emmett Essin, Virginia Foley, Allan Forsman, Rosalind Gann, Evelyn Hammonds, Jill Hayter, Rick Hess, Ken Kellogg, Tom Laughlin, Lorianne Mitchell, Kelly Price, Susan Rasmussen, Melissa Shafer, Jerry Shuttle, Taylor Stevenson, Kim Summey, Jerry Taylor, Paul Trogen, Jennifer Vanover-Hall, Yue Zou, Ron Zucker.

*Excused:*  Randy Byington, Charles Collins, Kathryn Sharp, Jim Thigpen

*Guests:*

CALL TO ORDER: Vice President Foley called the meeting to order at 2:50 pm

Vice-president Foley announced that President Byington was out-of-town and therefore she will conduct the meeting. There was not a quorum at the start of the meeting. Senator Taylor suggested the senate vote to ratify decisions made at today’s meeting at a later time.

Vice-president Foley asked for approval of the October 22nd minutes. All approved.

Vice-president Foley then moved on to the first agenda item – selecting a member for the Faculty Handbook Committee. She asked for volunteers. Senator Arnall volunteered to be on the committee. The senate approved.

Vice-president Foley stated that the senate also needed to select a trustee for the Faculty Sick Leave Bank and that Laura Roberts has agreed to continue serving in that position. The senate approved Roberts continued appointment.

Senator Bitter asked the Sick Leave Committee to look into whether or not people on this campus can share sick leave for a spouse. Vice-president Foley said that there is a policy on that and that she will look into it and will report back about this next meeting.

She then turned the floor over to Senator Burgess to discuss the proposed Ombudsman Office. Senator Burgess explained that there are national guidelines that must be adhered to by ombudsmen. These include things like confidentiality and neutrality. Dr. Noland has given his approval and support for an ombudsmen office and indicated that it will be established as soon as he receives the proposal. The position could possibly be included in the 2013 budget, but it might be 2014. The committee is seeking Faculty Senate approval for a resolution to present to Dr. Noland requesting funding for the creation and implementation of an ombudsman service at the university as soon as it is made possible in the budget. Senator Taylor made the motion, Senator Essin second.

Vice-president Foley asked if this needed further discussion. Senator Zucker asked if the ombudsman office would have any legal power. Senator Burgess said that an ombudsman does not serve as a legal resource or a legal advocate; however, she or he will be able to direct people to the legal help that they may need. Senator Kellogg asked what the hierarchy of the position will be. Senator Burgess said that the ombudsman’s office will report only to the president for administrative purposes like budgeting; everything that goes through the office is confidential. Senator Blowers asked if it was going to be the same proposal as what was presented last year. Senator Burgess said that it basically is the same proposal, but a lot of details have yet to be worked out. Right now the goal is to get it into the upcoming budget. Senator Bitter asked how much it would cost. Senator Burgess estimated between 50 and 60 thousand dollars, but there are many variables that will affect the cost. Senator Bitter asked if ombudsperson contracts would be on a year to year basis. Senator Burgess said that it would most likely be multiyear contract. Senator Arnall asked why in academia people view an ombudsman office as a positive thing. Senator Burgess replied that it cuts down the number of fruitless lawsuits and there is evidence that it helps the morale of the university as a whole because it is a neutral resource where people can go for information or for potential help. It also cuts down on the number of formal grievances, complaints, and problems that people have with HR. All approved moving forward with the proposal.

Vice-president Foley moved onto discussion of the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook regarding the faculty evaluation process. She will ask that copies of the original document sent to the senate last May and the latest proposed revisions be resent to senate members before the next meeting.

Senator Bitter expressed that the last section about due process is especially important and needs to be looked at carefully.

Vice-president Foley wanted everyone to be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting and for senate members to think about this thoroughly.

Senator Arnall agreed with Senator Bitter. He stated that he was a part of the conversation early on and they were told that they had the liberty to redefine the evaluative tool to their department’s uniqueness. They were basically told that there needed to be a way to get rid of faculty. He was appalled by this. Senator Zucker said that in the computer science department they gave them the opportunity to create a spreadsheet. Much of the evaluation was subjective. He thinks that this is a very serious problem.

Senator Gann said that it is very reductionist. Her department used it, and it was proven not to be valid. She got 16/20 points for service, but she got the distinguished faculty award for service. She had a much higher score in other areas. Senator Bitter said that it also poses a threat with post-tenure review. There is no feedback. The only feedback is when the chair decides to do an evaluation process or if an issue comes up with students complaining. Non-tenured people will have access to mentoring. If there is a problem with a tenured faculty member, they should at least have access to what the non-tenured faculty members do.

Senator Burgess stated that the main body of the text emphasizes the business of each faculty member negotiating a workload with their department chair based upon the needs and standards of that department. There is another issue that comes up that I think we need to address at some point. We just had a grievance in which the chairman has decided to abolish the department workload committee so we need a change in the hand book to require, not give the option. The final half page of the document does set out a three year period of mentoring or remediation of senior faculty and does not give the dean the power to remove faculty without due process There are elements in this redraft that answer most of these questions We’re attempting to short circuit the idea that they could simply toss you out the back door.

Senator Zucker took offense to the statement that their teaching counts as 60% of a faculty member’s workload and 100% of that 60% was based on SAIs. Senator Zucker said that in his mid-tenure review, he put peer reviews in and was told to remove them. Senator Bitter said that it is a breach of TBR policy not to allow peer review. They are an essential part of evaluating faculty.

Vice-president Foley pointed out that there needs to be training for department chairs.

Senator Arnall was disturbed by the fact that after 6 months of getting the criteria to a point where everyone agreed on it, they go to the next level and they were told that there were too many choices. They tried to represent the faculty across all ways possible categories of scholarship, research, teaching, and service. They wanted fewer choices, which is problematic because not everyone has talents in all categories. All faculty are not represented.

Senator Foley said that everyone needs to commit to reading the documents that were sent and perhaps senate members should bring examples from the departments of what are being used.

Vice-president Foley stated that the only other announcement she had was Dr. Noland will come before the senate on November19th to share the plans for the green space.

She then asked, “Is there any other business we need to attend to today?” Senator Bitter responded that he wanted to talk a little bit about the 125 athletic committee. The committee is made up of a ton of different constituencies. There are 4 faculty on it. There are clearly some people there simply because they are friends of football and want to bring football back to campus. There are people there who are highly supportive of Title IX and a whole group of other people who are thinking about ways to get around it. There is a certain level of interest in elevating to a different conference other than the one we’re currently in. The president has sent out the message that we should dream big and worry about the money later. There is a finance subcommittee that he is part of and he wants the senate to know as much as he knows about it. There is not some large group of donors that are going to fund everything. Years ago, he remembered being told in this very body multiple times that no state dollars went to athletics. That’s not true. There is a certain amount that you can go up to and in our case it’s up to $400,000. That means that if that money is being spent in that way, it is not being spent in other ways. That’s just a choice the university makes and usually it’s made by the administration not by all of us.

Senator Bitter continued that if you decided to elevate basketball, the very first thing you would need to do is simply get a better place to play. It turns out not even the coach wants to show the new recruits the inside of the dome. He’ll show them the locker room, that’s apparently nice. He does not want them to see when they’re going to play because they see that every other A Sun conference has a better basketball arena than we do. So he loses good recruits that way.

So what would it cost to build a new stadium? About 40-50 million dollars of which you might get about half from outside donors. Where would the rest of it come from? No one knows for sure, but the discussion revolves around 2 things: 1 would be increased student fees for athletics, which just for basketball alone would be in the neighborhood of $350-400 increase per student per year, assuming that the student body stays at about the same size. If you added football, you’d need about another $16-35 million to build a new stadium. At the higher end, you’d be building a multi-purpose stadium that not only takes care of football and track, but also locker rooms etc., which would take care of tennis, volleyball, football all in the same complex. Now we’re talking around 1200-1300 extra dollars per year per student.

 In addition to that, you’re not just adding football and scholarships, you’re adding coaches and salaries and all of that. When we first upped football to a higher level and joined the Southern Conference, literally 27 faculty positions came out of the college of education and went to coaches. The money never got back to the College of Education when it went down.

Senator Essin replied that they were teaching for the College of Education, they never were with the College of Education.

Senator Bitter continued that, we are currently a model for the United States on Title IX equity. In fact, ETSU actually gives more scholarships to women athletics than the percentage of women in the university as students at this time. If we bring football back, we obliterate it. In order to keep up Title IX, you would have to add somewhere between 3-4 additional women’s sports or cancel some men’s sports. All of this also is with the anticipation that whatever we do, we’re going to envision winning teams. We want to envision excellence in what we do because if you have teams that are winning on a regular basis your student body goes up, the diversity in your student body goes up, the out of state people goes up. Just to keep that in perspective, over 60% of the student population comes from two counties in Tennessee. A really good sports program raises your visibility and helps define the university in many useful ways. It’s a door opener. Senator Essin continued that he thinks that the trend is toward football and that there are ways that it can be done without adding 12-1300 dollars to student fees. He said that a lot of conferences won’t even look at us because of the dome and because of we don’t have a football program. We were invited to Ohio Valley Conference without football 2 years ago and we turned them down. He doesn’t think they will reissue that invitation to us. Senator Essin said “I think that we are going to change conferences. I think we need to change conferences. I don’t want to keep playing that little school in Spartanburg, S.C. whose name I can even remember. We’re dreaming big. There are conferences that I’m sure we would like to get in to. Our subcommittee has been looking at such conferences as the Colonial Athletic Association with William and Marry and James Madison. We looked at the Atlantic 10, Rhode Island, Dayton, UNC, Charlotte, good basketball conferences. We agree with Jim that our big sport on this campus has to be basketball. The committee agrees it has to be basketball.”

Senator Bitter added that you can’t call the conferences up and say ‘hey, we want in’. You have to look good enough that somebody wants you in and comes after you. The conferences are all in flux at this point.

Senator Essin agreed that they are in a tremendous flux. As is our old conference the Southern Conference. The Southern Conference has lost University of Charleston. It went to the Colonial Athletic Assoc. The Southern might like to have us if we would commit to football in the future and we would do something about the dome.

Senator Price added that she and one of her colleagues are undertaking a research study about the mini dome. They will be focusing on men’s basketball specifically and are going to survey the people at the game and talk to them about the atmospherics (lighting, music, smell) of the mini dome. They plan to give it to the administration so they have the research background.

Senator Epps asked if that was happening before or after January 2nd because there is new lighting being installed for the games. Senator Price responded that she heard that was actually going to happen. Senator Essin added that there will also be a new concourse up above which is halfway decent.

Vice-president Foley stated that if anybody has any other comments that you want to make about the athletics, then we’ll entertain those. If anybody from other task forces wished to report on their task force, we’d like to hear those. She reminded everybody to go to the 125 website and give feedback on the Committee for 125 activities. Senator Trogen stated that he was concerned about the cost per student. He remarked that on January 2nd of next year after sequestration begins spending will be cut and taxes will go up. We had a speaker come in last Saturday, William Howard Consular and he was speaking on the economy and basically saying what we’re probably going to have is not growth, it’s going to be contraction. If we’re creating something that is going to require a lot of student fees to pay for it - we might not be able to pay for it.

Vice-president Foley asked for other task force news.

Senator Peiris stated that his committee did not meet this week.

Senator Epps stated that she is on the Student Life and Services task force which met at 1:30 today. As she left for senate before the task force meeting ended she is not sure what happened. The committee did end up dividing into three groups: facilities, success, and engagement. Again, the purpose is to dream big then to figure out what you can do with it. She stated that we’re talking about a welcome center for students who are visiting ETSU where they’ve got parking and easy access and they’re not driving around all over campus trying to find something. The current welcome center is which is downstairs on the second floor of the Culp Center at the back of the building. We’re talking about a one stop shop for academic advising, career services, financial aid, admissions, with a staff of people cross-trained so a student comes in, they don’t get shipped all over campus. We’re talking about a comprehensive first year program that would benefit beyond the first year. We feel like first year programs do a good job getting students acclimated to the institution but we don’t always do a good job on the tail end when they’re getting ready to graduate and trying to make life decisions. Another thought is education related to financial literacy. A lot of our students are graduating with a lot of debt and they come in not understanding what that means. This could eventually be a service to the community and include going and talking to high school students before they even get here.

Senator Forsman reported that the Academics committee subdivided into many different groups last week and were given some homework to do. The committee meets again tomorrow. They have been discussing massive online open courses and Senator Forsman reminded everybody that there is a speaker coming from Harvard University Thursday evening who is going to talk about MOOCS at the Millennium Center Ballroom 2 at 7pm.

Vice-president Foley added that it was also going to be live-streamed and the link would be on ETSU’s home page. She then asked if there were any other task force representative reports.

Senator Bitter asked if he could take a quick straw poll. He wanted to know if the money could be worked out somehow, how many senators would want football, how many don’t care, and how many definitely don’t want football.

He asked, “If we were dreaming big and all this other stuff could be worked out, would you want it or not?”

Senator Kellogg replied that “If a little leprechaun walked in the room right now, put down a huge pot of gold, I think it would be stupid of us to not say, “thank you little person, we will take that gold, and we will make a shot at improving football or basketball” because like you say, if you can become a name, then the whole university becomes well known.”

Senator Shuttle said that he would like to know where we’re going to put a new basketball, football stadium, and if we’re going to sacrifice say soccer fields for that.

Senator Bitter replied that none of the fields would be sacrificed in the most current speculation. The most current place they’re talking about locating an arena is on the corner of University Parkway and State of Franklin right across from University Physicians, and to work a deal out with the city so that all of Walnut Street would become like a pedestrian mall leading straight down into town. That’s all speculation because nobody is doing anything other than dreaming at the moment.

Senator Epps speculated that it means people and students are going to go and we’re not just going to have a football stadium with a football team that nobody comes to see. Senator Bitter responded that is the great question. Last time we had football on our best day we had around 7,000 people coming to the game, of that, about 1800 actually paid. The rest were all students or sponsors. It brought in about $300k/ year. That’s nothing compared to the overall cost of things.

Senator Gann stated that the pot of gold can also be used for a performing arts center, salaries, and scholarships, so before you vote for football, remember that there are other uses for a pot of gold.

Senator Davis questioned whether the higher profile for the university with a great sports team (we hope), does that mean more money coming towards our university from places or does it just mean people know we have a good team? Senator Bitter replied that in certain ways it does mean more money comes in. One way is that there is an increase in out-of-state tuition paying students.

Vice-president Foley asked “What does that do then to the students that you do accept?” Senator Bitter stated that it elevates everything. And it’s not just us, the same thing happened to James Madison University. They put a lot of energy into athletics last year and suddenly they turned away almost 9000 people because they didn’t have room in their freshman. The second thing that happens is you get on television, and if you get on television, you get nationally known and it actually increases your likelihood of getting grants. It just does everything. Vice-president Foley added one more point, athletics creates experiences that you can have on a campus that will help us remain viable when people can choose those other options.

Senator Bitter continued that it’s a circular thing. If your team gets better, more people live on campus. If more people live on campus, more people go to the games. If more people go to the games, you need more buildings to build things so that the students can be on campus.

Senator Zhu asked “How do you know the football team will be successful?”

Senator Bitter responded that you don’t know. He continued that he has no hope for a football team at ETSU for being a gateway to recognition but the basketball team possibly could. We have a terrific basketball coach actually. If he can recruit well, he would get on a regular basis of winning. But no, we’re in the vortex of the ACC, the Big East, and the SEC. They get all the great athletes. After that, we can go pick what is left. The problem is you can’t recruit nationally if you don’t even have the facilities to get yourself out to recruit nationally.

Senator Epps said this is not directly related to that but she got an email from the president at NCAA and the men’s basketball team, women’s cross country, and women’s soccer team ranked in the top 10% of all squads in the NCAA in these sports on the APR this year. They’re doing well.

Vice-president Foley called for the straw vote. 5 senators indicated ‘yes’ to Football yes, 8 indicated ‘no’ and the remainder indicated that they did not care.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

**---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

*Please notify Senator Melissa Shafer (**shaferm@etsu.edu* *or 9-5837), Faculty Senate Secretary, 2012-2013, of any changes or corrections to the minutes. Web Page is maintained by Senator Doug Burgess (**burgess@etsu.edu* *or x96691).*