



FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

Meeting Date:	4/18/2016	Time:	14:45 – 16:30	Location:	Culp Center, Room 311
Next Meeting:	8/16/2016	Scribe:			Eric Sellers
Present:	Dilshod Achilov, Leila Al-Imad, Fred Alsop, Robert Beeler, Patrick Brown, Doug Burgess, Heidi Campbell, Jackie Church, Erin Doran, Dorothy Drinkard-Hawkshawe, Joyce Duncan, Susan Epps, Lon Felker, Tavie Flanagan, Bill Flora, Virginia Foley, Nick Hagemeier, Katherine Hall, Tammy Hayes, Bill Hemphill, Stephen Hendrix, Tod Jablonski, Karin Keith, Thomas Kwasigroch, Fred Mackara, Mildred Maisonet, Anthony Masino, Tim McDowell, Theresa McGarry, Lorianne Mitchell, Bea Owens, Peter Panus, Jonathan Peterson, Kerry Proctor-Williams, Eric Sellers, Melissa Shafer, Candice Short, Paul Trogen, Ahmad Watted,				
Absent:	Howard Herrell, Koyamangalath Krishnan, Guangya Li, Mary Ann Littleton, James Livingston, Shunbin Ning, Timir Paul, Darshan Shah, April Stidham, Bill Stone, Craig Turner, Liang Wang, Robert White				
Excused:	Randy Byington, Kathy Campbell, Lee Glenn, Deborah Ricker				

Agenda Items	Responsible
Meeting called to order 14:50	Dr. Foley
1. Information Session	
1.1 New Budget Model	Dr. Larry Calhoun, Dr. Mike Smith, Dr. Mira Girard, and Dr. David Collins
2. Action Item(s)	
2.1 Motion to adopt Faculty Senate procedures for election of Faculty Representative on Local Governing Board	
2.2 Code of Ethics for Faculty vote	
2.3 Amorous Relations Policy	
2.4 Free Speech	
3. Old Business	
3.1 Approval of Minutes	
3.2 Parking	
4. New Business	
4.1 Elections	
5. Updates	
5.1 TUFS	Dr. Schacht
5.2 Meeting with Dr. Collins	Dr. Epps/Dr. Foley
6. Announcements/Other Business	
7. Guest Comments	
8. Adjournment	



DISCUSSIONS

1. Information Session

1.1 New Budget Model

Calhoun: The budget redesign committee was formed from an ad-hoc review committee put in place by President Noland. The meetings have started in the Spring 2016 semester. In 2015, the original committee made some recommendations to the Interim University Council: (1) major revision of how the university conducts strategic planning must start before considering a new budget model; (2) identify a director of strategic planning and budgeting; (3) address campus communication – inform deans and faculty of what is going on, post meeting minutes on website, etc.; (4) gather information and start to develop a new budget model to recommend.

Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) is not really a single model; rather, each version of RCM is created specifically to serve the needs of the given institution. A more accurate description of the model is decentralization of decisions that occur in regard to budget at and around the college or departmental level. Ideally, the model will serve to reward growth and when growth does not occur decisions will be made at the college and department level.

Smith: The committee visited two programs that employ RCM models, Ohio University and Wright State University. Memphis and Tennessee Tech were also met with via teleconference on several occasions. Ohio University and Wright State University started their RCM programs at approximately the same time and Ohio has been quite successful; however, Wright State has had a good deal of difficulty.

The biggest lessons learned: (1) communication is vital and should continue throughout the rollout and beyond; (2) do not try to oversell the model it does not guarantee additional revenue in and of itself; (3) keep the model simple and transparent, do not start with a complex model because it is likely to be simplified.

There will be added costs at the college level. Additional personnel with the necessary fiscal planning skills will need to be added, which is something that most faculty lack.

The cultural change is more important than the model that is adopted. It is important for the university community at large to be on board with and embrace the changes.

Funds are allocated back to colleges based on a student credit hours/majors ratio that best fits the university. A ratio in the range of 85/15 – 75/25 is best ratio. Ohio uses an 80/20 ratio.

Another option is to use a flat tax and/or subvention. A variety of ways to redistribute the funds that come back to the university are available. The university will then delegate funds to service activities, etc. The university can also take the reserves built through the tax rate and redistribute the funds, i.e., subvention. A flat tax of the revenue generated by each college can also be used and applied consistently across colleges, or differentially across the colleges, which is a more contentious funding model.

Administrative support units should continue under a monitored incremental budget model. RCM does not generalize well to non-academic units of the institution. Entities that do not generate income such as registrar, security, etc. should receive appropriate funding.

Consultants may or may not be needed; eventually the model is likely to develop into something that was not originally suggested by the consultants.

We need a clear set of reasons for switching to a new model. There is dissatisfaction with the current budget model at all levels of the university. In the current ETSU model funds are generated by academic and other programs generate the majority of the money. The revenue goes to administration, which then reassigns the money back to the units in a manner that the administration determines. Under the current proposal, the program that originally generates the funds will pay a tax to the administration and the administration can then use those funds for subvention. In other words, only the amount of money that is taxed goes to the administration and the rest stays at the college level. Money above and beyond the tax stays with the unit that generated it; thus, the funds are decentralized to the deans of the respective colleges. The deans will then disperse the funds to the departmental level.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

McGarry: How would a faculty line be allocated? Does a faculty member sign a contract with the college instead of the university?

Calhoun: The university is still in charge of employees. Senior management would work with the deans to make sure the budget is adequate to cover all of the faculty lines. When the number of students changes the dean may need to reconfigure the local budget. As it is now, deans do not have the ability to do this.

Calhoun: The “Model” = Parallel Year. The parallel year would compare the current system to the proposed system to see how the proposal compares and if it is working.

Panus: What about the Indiana University model that delegates to the chair level?

Calhoun: We are going to start at the dean level and could delegate to the department level over time.

Peterson: What happens to left over funds?

Calhoun: The money would stay at the college level and it could be reallocated to a point of need.



DISCUSSIONS

Keith: What is the timeline for the parallel year and have the service areas been identified?
Calhoun: 2016 – 2017. Service areas have not been identified.
Keith: Will space allocation be a part of the RCM model.
Calhoun: It has not been determined; however, it is a possibility.
McDowell: Decisions are already being made at the Provost level that are based on the new model and the model has not been discussed at the level of the faculty.
1) I don't understand what the decision making structure is.
2) The design is founded on a double standard. It has been decided that the administration has its own budget model and its own accountability that is too complex to discuss and, on the other hand, we are going to have transparency and local accountability for departments and colleges.
3) The model based on percentages sounds really good and fair but it does not recognize that a lot of things that have costs that are not percentage based. Costs have a certain fixed level and when you increase the number of students in a class the faculty member does not get any more credit for teaching a larger class. For grounds keeping or registrar, or whatever, their costs do not increase or decrease in proportion to the number of students so the fundamental transparency of the model is based on a wrong assumption.
4) Where does the money from Nashville fit into the model?
Calhoun: No model has been determined and decisions are not being made based on new model. There will always be a double standard because there are only two ways to not have a double standard. Either administrators make all of the decisions, or all of the money goes to colleges and the administration has no responsibility in where the money goes. There is always going to be administration and college partnership through senior leadership because senior leadership is ultimately responsible for the university. Tuition matching dollars from Nashville is included as part of the tuition.
Smith: At Ohio U they tried to include both the locally generated tuition and fees and the state subsidy in their allocation formula, they found out that three things happened:
1) It complicated the model;
2) every year the state tweaked their formula requiring additional changes to the formula every year; thus,
3) they applied the same formula to the local and state funds.
Schacht: What would a proforma statement look like? Could a college go bankrupt? How does this affect institution wide strategic planning? How does this affect the balance between management and leadership?
Calhoun: These questions are all related to changing the culture at the university. The committee would be happy to come back and present to faculty senate at a later date.

2. Action Item(s)

2.1 Motion to adopt Faculty Senate procedures for election of Faculty Representative on Local Governing Board

Flora: Motion to adopt an amendment of the bylaws in section 1.5.4.5 as presented. Second Beeler DISCUSSION:

McGarry: I don't quite get how you are going to end up with three nominees and then two.
Brown: The proposal is to have no less than two nominees and no more than three nominees that will be presented to the entire faculty for the vote.
Foley: When the bylaw change is approved today (hopefully), faculty senate will send out an announcement to the campus as a whole stating that this is the process. For any faculty member who is interested in serving, the faculty member will be required to submit their name for consideration along with a statement describing their commitment to shared governance. Nominations will be accepted until the faculty senate retreat and at the first faculty senate meeting of the year the ballot will be narrowed down to two or three qualified candidates. The two or three names will be submitted to the faculty as a whole for a vote. As nominations come in, the faculty senate executive committee will vet candidates.
McDowell: The decision making by the executive committee is really going to be filtering of the nominees.
Foley: The executive committee will present the findings to the faculty senate for approval.
Maisonet: How is the process going to be managed in terms of who is going to be able to get information about what is uncovered about a particular nominee and the final decision on vetting the candidate?
Foley: The three candidates that get sent forward will have a bio sent forward before the vote.
Beeler: If we decide that changes need to be made when can change the document at a future date, correct?
Brown: Correct.
McDowell: I would prefer to not have just three, but say four, and have a voting mechanism that has instant run-offs. You vote once for your top four nominees. The top candidate gets four points, the second gets three points, etc.
Brown: Faculty senate was surveyed (Survey Monkey) as to what voting process should be used and the process selected by the majority of the respondents is what has been included in the bylaw.
Proctor-Williams: How was it decided that the nomination window would be open from the last faculty senate



DISCUSSIONS

meeting until the retreat? It seems that many people are not on campus in the summer and this may put some faculty at a disadvantage.

Foley: If the amendment is approved today it will be sent out immediately so that faculty will have time to determine if they want to run for the position before they leave for the summer.

Vote: All in favor 1 abstention

2.2 Code of Ethics for Faculty vote

Motion to approve; Beeler: Second; Peterson

No discussion

Vote: all in favor 1 abstention

2.3 Amorous Relations Policy

Foley: We believe that we should do nothing at this time because our current policy covers amorous relationships. Is this correct?

Masino: Correct. The subcommittee asked the administration to speak about amorous relationships and there are policies in place on campus to deal with many situations in regard to conduct issues. There is a policy that deals with amorous relationships and there are three explicit items and a fourth that can be implied. They want to change the policy and each draft of the new policy has not been acceptable. To simplify the issue, the US Supreme Court had two cases in the last two years. In both cases it was determined that you cannot prevent consenting adults from having amorous relationships. The current policy states: 1) you cannot have a relationship with a student in your class; 2) you cannot have a relationship with a student that you are supervising; 3) you cannot provide a recommendation letter for anyone you have ever had a relationship with. The implied item is that you must use good judgment. For example, it would not be a good idea to date a student that was in a 2000 level course if it is possible that the student could be in another upper level course you would teach in the future.

McDowell: Does our policy reference the TBR policy?

Masino: Our policy is based off of TBR policy.

Motion to keep the current policy without changes; Foley: Second; Hemphill

Vote: all in favor

2.4 Free Speech

Tabled

3. Old Business

3.1 Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve; Epps: Second; Brown

Vote: all in favor

3.2 Parking (Trogen)

Trogen: A survey was sent to CAS. Six people responded in favor of a new parking garage and 16 were not in favor of a parking garage. Are faculty in other departments willing to pay more for a parking garage?

Peterson: One maybe, depending on where it would be located.

Motion to oppose a new parking garage and pay more for parking stickers; Beeler: Second; Trogen.

DISCUSSION

How much is more money?

Trogen: A good estimate would be about \$80 more per year.

Epps: What is the timetable for the new garage? It would not be a good idea to vote now when we do not even know when the garage will actually be built.

Maisonet: Is the parking garage independent of the removal of other parking areas? If so, where will faculty park without a new garage?

Trogen: 650 parking spaces have been decommissioned for the new sports stadium.

Alsop: we have no timetable and no information in regard to fees. Perhaps Robert would withdrawal the motion. We do not want to be in the same situation we were a few years ago with the University Woods fiasco and we should not vote on something we know nothing about. (McGarry: Would like the minutes to reflect that characterizing what was done in regard to University Woods was not a fiasco; rather, faculty senate did the right thing.)

McDowell: Trogen made it clear that we are going to be away for the summer and there is a possibility that the administration might try to do something preemptive and he asked for guidance in regard to what should be done over the summer if the administration makes a decision.

Peterson: The administration is moving forward with removing South Dossett parking and there is a concern that the parking will not be replaced.



DISCUSSIONS

Beeler: Withdrew the original motion.

**Motion to allow executive committee to represent faculty over the summer; Panus: Second; Al-Imad
Vote: all in favor**

Mackara: staff and faculty senate should work together on the parking issue.

Peterson: Request that executive committee gathers more information in regard to S. Dossett closure and long term plans.

4. New Business

4.1 Elections

President – Susan Epps

Vice President – Bill Flora

Secretary – Eric Sellers

Treasurer – Melissa Shafer

Chief Operating Officer – Patrick Brown

Motion to accept all nominated officers; Alsop: Second; Al-Imad

Vote: all in favor

At large members of Executive Committee and TBR Subcouncil Representative are elected at the retreat in August.

4.2 CAS Elections

Trogen: Dean Anderson decided to hold the CAS meeting at the same time as the faculty senate meeting. Faculty requested that senators be allowed to vote for the college elections via absentee vote and Dean Anderson denied the request. **Therefore, an arts and sciences election committee should be formed to determine if the arts and sciences election is representative and proper and whether it would be the people elected to faculty senate were appropriate: second; Al-Imad.**

DISCUSSION

Trogen: Approximately 10 CAS faculty are at this meeting and if the election is close, not allowing 10 faculty members to vote could invalidate the results of the election.

McDowell: It could be meaningful because CAS does not always fill its quorum of senators. So if the dean is going to undercut the participation of the faculty senate it will not help get more people nominated.

Alsop: In the dean's note to the CAS senators, he mentioned that other members of the college have not been able to vote in the past due to teaching or other obligations. In this case, we are asking for an exception for faculty senators.

Trogen: The dean should not decide who is elected to faculty senate and it is important that the college has a representative election. Some decision should be made before the faculty retreat.

Shafer: We could ask the dean to move the college meeting back to Wednesday, which is the way it has been in the past.

Vote: all in favor

5. Updates

5.1 TUFS

No report.

5.2 Meeting with Dr. Collins

6. Announcements/Other Business

6.1 Faculty Senate Retreat – Tuesday August 16, 2016

6.2 Foley: NIAs will be revisited. The executive committee will be crafting a draft of a resolution in regard to NIAs.

6.3 Foley: Request for information from senators in regard to whether or not faculty lines are being replaced in the respective colleges as they are vacated.

7. Guest Comments

None.



DISCUSSIONS

8. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn; Brown: Second; Epps. Meeting adjourned 16:30

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).