

2011-2012 Faculty Senate Meeting
October 27, 2011
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Suzanne E. Ament, E. Kevin Ayers, Roann Barris, Maggie Bassett, Steven Beach, Candice Benjes-Small, Julia Castleberry, Joseph Chase, Lori Elis, Mary Ferrari, Jake Fox, Kim Gainer, Vince Hazleton, Rhett B. Herman, Blas Hernandez, Katherine R. Hilden, Margaret Hrezo, Pamela A. Jackson, Laura E. Jacobsen, Abhay Kaushik, Jerry M. Kopf, Mary LaLone, Laura E. LaRue, Kevin LoPresto, Michael B. Moore, Teresa O'Bannon, Richard A. Roth, Helen Roybark, Susan L. Schoppelrey, Bob Sheehy, Dr. Steve Corwin (sub for Neil Sigmon), Kenneth Smith, Andrea J. Stanaland, Lynne Taylor, Jonathan L. Tso, Edward Carter Turner, Erin L. Webster Garrett

Members Absent: Robert Boross, Timothy L. Channell, James E. Collier, Farrell Doss, Lucy Hochstein, Cathy Hudgins, Douglas Mitchell, Basel Saleh, Michael Sinclair, Lauren Smith, Joseph I. Wirgau

Guests: Dr. Sam Minner

I. Call to Order: 3:34pm

II. The minutes from the October 13, 2011 Senate meeting were approved.

III. Reports

- a. Senate President's report: Dr. Roth's comments included:
 - i. He explained the process for having the motions affecting the Faculty Handbook passed along to the Board of Visitors. After the Senate passes these motions they go through the University Executive Council, the Provost's office, and then to the RU President and the Board.
 - ii. The motion to change the submission deadline for the Faculty Annual Reports was withdrawn from going to the BOV. This is because this motion was really a stopgap measure. Now the Faculty Issues Committee is working on a more permanent motion.
 - iii. Dr. Minner is checking on the motion regarding the strengthening of academic freedom. Dr. Minner is seeking input from the Attorney General's office.
 - iv. The Internal Governance system still needs reform.
 - v. President Kyle will be a guest of the Senate on Thursday November 3. Mr. Roy Saville, Director of Facilities Planning and Construction.
- b. A motion was made from the floor to amend the posted agenda to add a report from Dr. Sam Minner, RU Provost. The amendment to the agenda passed.
- c. Provost's report: Dr. Minner's comments included:
 - i. NCI (New College Institute): Ru submitted a \$1.3 million proposal for several programs.
 - ii. Dr. Minner reminded senators that SCHEV makes recommendations but does not decide things at the state level.

- iii. SCHEV is pressing the 6-year plans that all universities submitted, emphasizing STEM-AH initiatives (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math and allied Health) for growth and enrollment growth in these areas.
 - iv. SCHEV has recommended a 2% increase in faculty salaries, with \$24.6 million from state revenues and \$22 million from tuition. SCHEV recommends that up to 2% could come from each institutions' own budget, if the institutions can do this.
 - v. SCHEV has recommended \$2.7 billion in capital projects.
 - vi. A proposed program in "Design Thinking" might have in the future a new faculty member who could be RU's first remote faculty member. Dr. Minner did not know much beyond this since it's not directly related to his office.
 - vii. Dr. Minner said that RU's research programs could go from 5% to 10% in indirect costs. PI's currently may charge 5% but he would like this to rise to 10%.
 - viii. The Virginia Citizens Defense League is a "concealed carry" group that is a Virginia Tech now and may come to RU in the future.
 - ix. RU is looking to see if it has the funds to give faculty a raise. If it's a 2% raise then one consideration would be a 2% across the board increase.
 - x. He addressed the academic freedom motion passed by the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate. RU's lawyers were not very positive due to the precedent set by the 2006 case "Garcetti vs. Ceballos." He does not agree with that decision about academic freedoms of state employees but he has to rely on the Attorney General's office for an opinion before this motion goes to the RU Board of Visitors.
 - xi. Dr. Hilden asked about the "Design Thinking" program. Dr. Minner responded that it would be within the College of Visual and Performing Arts. As far as he knew now this would involve all aspects of design and how it relates to people. However he emphasized that he was not an expert in this. She also asked about any dates for the NCI initiatives. Dr. Minner didn't know an exact date but answered "soon" was all he was told.
 - xii. Dr. Chase asked if it was still mandatory for RU to offer an NCI course, and that his department had been told to offer one for the past several years. Dr. Minner said that he would look into that issue.
 - xiii. Dr. Ament asked which committee was looking into RU faculty salaries. Dr. Minner answered that the Faculty Issues Committee was looking at this.
 - xiv. Dr. Hilden asked if RU faculty input had been pursued on the allocations of a 2% raise. Dr. Minner said that he would continue to meet with the Faculty Issues Committee on the question. He emphasized that the continuum stretches all the way from purely merit-based to across-the-board increases.
- d. Committee Reports:
- i. Campus Environment—Dr. Laura Jacobsen reminded senators of the accessibility forums to be held November 10 and 11 in The Bonnie, 3:30-5:00pm. She asked everyone to remind their constituents of these forums.
 - ii. Curriculum—Dr. Hrezo said this committee had no report at this time.
 - iii. Faculty Issues—Dr. Gainer gave the report which included the following:
 - 1. Dr. Minner and CFO Alvarez attended the committee's October 20th meeting to engage in a discussion regarding the FIC's first objective, which is to develop recommendations for a policy for the allocation of money for faculty salaries

whenever there is an increase in the amount of money available for that purpose.

2. The subcommittee on the FIC's second and third objectives developed two motions. The first is entitled "A motion to amend the Faculty Handbook to require the development of written criteria to be used in the evaluation of faculty in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service." The second is entitled "A motion to change the reporting period and the starting date for the personnel evaluation annual timeline." Discussion of these motions will continue on November 10th, with the possibility of one or both of the motions being sent forward before the end of the semester.
 3. The committee chair has been in touch with the head of Human Resources with regard to Objective 5: Liaise with Human Resources in order to determine the need for a policy for faculty related to: (1) the birth, adoption, or pre-adoptive placement of a child; (2) the medical needs of sick or injured children, spouses, partners or parents; and (3) extension of the tenure clock for extenuating circumstances.
 4. Objective 9, Liaise with the Intellectual Property Committee, was on the agenda of the October 20th meeting, but we did not take any action and will return to that objective on November 10th.
- iv. Governance—Dr. Schoppelrey said this committee had not report at this time.
- v. Resource Allocation—Dr. Beach said that his committee was looking to see if RU was working more with the "6-year plan" or the "7-17 Plan." Dr. Wirgau is working to get together a survey on faculty workloads. This committee met with Debra Templeton and Richard Alvarez about Core Curriculum costs and faculty utilization. He said that Dr. Minner found in his experience at Truman State U. that it's very hard to create benchmarks that satisfy faculty members. And online courses are very hard to quantify. This committee is looking at the "133% Rule" and how this is based on a Governor's memo from a number of years ago. This committee said that Katrina Terry said that 990 forms are now posted online for the previous three years for the RU Foundation. [Secretary's note: See <http://www.radford.edu/content/foundation/home/real-estate/documents.html>]. The Foundation is working on getting an annual audit to this committee.
1. Dr. Kopf asked if "Schedule M" could be used as a model for faculty workloads. Dr. Beach responded that this was now called "BBA" ("base budget adequacy") and could be one way to look at productivity.
 2. Dr. Corwin said that the former Schedule M was supposed to account for differences between disciplines in work-related activities.
 3. Dr. Kopf stated that RU was always one of the most productive schools in the state under Schedule M.
 4. Dr. Ament asked about differences between the 6-year plan and 7-17. Dr. Beach responded that one thing he saw was enrollment growth differences.
- e. Report from RU's Chief Information Officer and Vice President for Information Technology: Mr. Danny Kemp delivered his report as a PowerPoint presentation that is included at the end of these minutes. Comments/questions after his report included:
- i. Dr. Chase asked if D2L could handle some emergency where faculty had to stay home and deliver their courses through D2L. Mr. Ed Oakes responded that it was more a

- question of whether faculty could deliver their classes through D2L instead of whether D2L could handle the load.
- ii. Dr. Schoppelrey asked the office to which CITL (RU's Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning) reports? Mr. Kemp said that CITL reports to Dr. Bill Kennan, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

IV. Old Business

- a. None.

V. New Business

- a. None.

VI. Announcements

- a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 4:43pm

Division of Information Technology

www.radford.edu/it

Radford University Faculty Senate

October 27, 2011

Agenda

- Division of Information Technology
- Governance & Advisory
- Recent Highlights
- Top Ten IT Issues, 2011
- Future Plans
- Common IT Myths
- Questions

Division of Information Technology

- Academic Technologies
- Auxiliary Services
- Electronic Engineering & Communication Services
- Enterprise Systems
- Information Security
- IT Infrastructure
- Printing & Vending Services
- Project Management & Audit Compliance
- Technology Assistance Center
- Web Communications

Governance & Advisory

- Information Technology Advisory Committee
- Student Information Technology Advisory Committee

Recent Highlights

- Completed the multi-year Banner Project
- Upgraded IT Infrastructure
- Established Web Communications
- Launched new RU Website
- Implemented CMS to support new website
- Migrated student email to Microsoft Live@EDU
- Technical support for the WebCT to D2L migration
- Upgraded Technology in Classrooms
- Upgraded Security Alarms and Surveillance Systems

Recent Highlights... continued

- Implemented a new Housing Management System
- Formed the Banner Operations Committee
- Implemented an Intrusion Detection System
- Implemented an IT Knowledge Base
- Implemented a Centralized Copier/Printer Management Program
- Enhanced the MyRU Portal
- Aligned WVRU Radio Station with the Division

Top-Ten IT Issues, 2011

Source: EDUCAUSE review May/June 2011

- 1.** Funding IT
- 2.** Administrative/ERP/Information Systems
- 3.** Teaching and Learning with Technology
- 4.** Security
- 5.** Mobile Technologies
- 6.** Agility/Adaptability/Responsiveness
- 7.** Governance, Portfolio/Project Management
- 8.** Infrastructure/Cyberinfrastructure
- 9.** Disaster Recovery / Business Continuity
- 10.** Strategic Planning

Future Plans

- Continue to Enhance Features and Functionality of the ERP Environment
- Continue to Enhance and Upgrade Network and System Infrastructure
- Enhance Technology Training and Support for Faculty and Staff
- Implement an Identity and Access Management System
- Enhance email and messaging systems used by Faculty and Staff
- Continue to Upgrade Technology in Classrooms
- Deploy Campus-wide Wireless Encryption

Future Plans... continued

- Launch a Mobile Application
- Develop a Mobile Website Strategy
- Continue Development of Radford.edu
- Migrate IT Security Awareness Training from MOAT to a Locally Maintained System
- Remain Current on all Vendor Supplied Software Upgrades and Patches
- Maintain Vendor Supported Infrastructure
- Establish Mobile Computing Support Strategy

Common IT Myths

Email is searched or monitored

Circumstances where email is searched:

- Court Order or FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) request
 - AG Office consulted about any sensitive requests before complying
 - IT searches mailboxes and provides results to appropriate RU office
- Delivery confirmation requests and troubleshooting
 - Log files that do not contain body of message are searched
- Phishing attempts to steal sensitive information
 - Searches performed to determine who received and possibly who responded

Faculty have no choice in their computer

Typical Replacement Process:

- Faculty are notified when their computer is due for replacement.
- In the spring of 2011, all faculty due for a replacement were allowed to choose between five comparably priced systems.
- Both Windows and Mac laptops and desktops were included.
- An open house was held allowing faculty to view each model and make their selection.

iPads & similar devices are not supported

Current Status:

- Departments are asked to justify the business need for an iPad when making purchases.
- IT is currently working to define a procedure to allow App purchases with university funds.
- The current wireless infrastructure supports iPads.
- IT is working to build the skill set of support staff.
- IT recognizes the need for a support strategy.

Questions?