

MINUTES

Interim University Council
Monday, March 13, 2017
East Tennessee Room
D.P. Culp University Center

Present: Bert Bach, Wilsie Bishop, Larry Calhoun, Bill Flora, Ranjan Chakraborty, Cherie Clavier, Bill Duncan, Susan Epps, Joy Fulkerson, Jane Jones, Mary Jordan, B.J. King, Celia McIntosh, Stephanie Murphy, Wendy Nehring, Pam Ritter, David Roane, Janna Scarborough, Fred Sauceman, and Joe Smith.

1. Approval of Minutes of February 13, 2017, meeting ([attachment](#))

Dr. McIntosh moved that the minutes be approved as submitted, and Dr. Nehring seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Information Items

a. Discussion of SACSCOC Governance Change Report and Timeline ([attachment](#))

Dr. Clavier announced that the upcoming campus visit by SACS will be held May 15-17 and that the team will consist of four commission members and one SACS vice president. The substantive change visit by SACS is necessary because ETSU is undergoing a major governance change. The schedule for the visit has not yet been finalized, and no chair has of yet been confirmed. Dr. Clavier indicated, however, that likely times for meetings will be from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on May 15 and from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on May 16.

ETSU's draft report to SACS is in process. Some minor changes to the report could be made in the aftermath of the first ETSU Board of Trustees meeting March 24. The goal is to have all final revisions in by April 3, so that the report can be mailed to SACS by April 10.

b. Budget Redesign Committee Update

Dr. Calhoun listed the organizations that have thus far heard presentations on the proposed new budget model: the Council of Chairs, Senior Staff, the Interim University Council, and the College of Education. Upcoming presentations include the Academic Council (March 23), the Faculty Senate (March 27), the Student Government Association (March 28), the Deans' Council (April 6), the Staff Senate (April 10), and the Student Affairs Council (April 25). Two open fora for the university community are scheduled for March 30 and April 5.

Dr. Calhoun reported that the opinions expressed by attendees at these presentations has generally been positive. One of the concerns that has been expressed, though, is the need for a "hold harmless" provision if the new budget model is adopted. The fact that the model does not reward previous growth is also a cause for some concern. The question of leadership readiness

for the new model at all levels was also raised. As Dr. Calhoun expressed it, the issue of campus cultural change that the new approach could create was raised frequently. Attendees at the campus presentations have also asked if the model would extend to the chair and faculty level. The committee's response has been that the model simply will not work if it does not have ownership by faculty and department chairs. Further, some attendees at the campus presentations asked about a possible negative, competitive environment that the model might cause. Dr. McIntosh added that she believes it is not clear exactly what percentage for each college would be going to the general fund. Dr. Calhoun responded that the intent is that no college will receive preferential treatment regarding what has been described as a "tax."

Dr. Calhoun said the next steps will be a series of some eight or nine campus presentations, along with a half-day retreat during the last week of April, followed by a final recommendation to President Noland.

The committee underscored the value of having someone present to explain the plan in person, as opposed to simply posting information on the web site. Based on a motion by Dr. Scarborough, seconded by Dr. Epps, it was decided, as a means to address public comment, that a list of [Frequently Asked Questions](#) should be posted on the [IUC website](#) to give constituent groups an idea of what has been and will be addressed at the various campus meetings. That motion passed unanimously.

c. Select University Policies for Review and Discussion

This item was dropped from the agenda because of a family emergency experienced by Dr. David Linville.

d. Discussion of IUC—Role, Bylaws, Structure, Terms of Appointment

In the absence of Dr. Noland, Dr. Bishop led a participatory session about the future of the Interim University Council. Dr. Bishop divided the council members into two groups and asked one group to consider what has worked well with the IUC and the other to consider what has not worked so well.

Participants stated that the most valued qualities of the IUC were: [diversity of membership](#); openness on issues; the opportunity for public comment on council business; access to the perspective of the university president; the opportunity to provide feedback to the president; the council's role in helping to build the culture of the university; the focus on the greater good of the university; a strong web presence for agendas and minutes; the opportunity for data sharing; and accountability.

Participants stated that the elements of the IUC that could be eliminated or altered were: an unclear charge; the fact that some members of the council are not consistently reporting information back to their constituent groups; limited discussion during meetings, which could relate to the type of rooms chosen for the meetings; the need to move beyond the interim role; an unclear role in the university decision-making process; and the question of ultimate accountability for decision making.

The council then identified several questions to be addressed as the review of its role on campus moves forward: Those included:

- Should there be bylaws?
- Who should chair the meetings?
- Who should run the meetings?
- How do/should the council's goals relate to the strategic mission of the university?
- Is the IUC the ultimate group to link strategic planning and budgeting?
- Where do IUC decisions fit in relation to other bodies on campus?
- What role should the council play in relation to operational issues and policies?
- How should work be distributed? Should there be sub-councils? Should they be standing or ad hoc or both?
- How frequently should the IUC be meeting?
- On what matters is the IUC the ultimate and final authority, if any?
- What is the role of the IUC in terms of institutional effectiveness?
- Should terms of membership be changed?
- Should the selection of student members be changed in order to improve attendance?

The council then began an item-by-item critique of the IUC "Scope of Responsibility" document, with the idea of condensing those 13 bulleted items to approximately six. Dr. Epps made a motion, seconded by Dr. Flora, that a sub-committee be created to revise the "[Scope of Responsibility](#)." The membership of that sub-committee will include Ms. Murphy, Dr. Duncan, Dr. Flora, Dr. Roane, Dr. McIntosh, and Dr. Bishop, with Dr. Bishop as convener. A target date of July 1, 2017, was set for the rewriting of the document.

The meeting then adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted—Fred W. Sauceman