

Faculty Senate Meeting
7-9 PM, Pamplin 32
Tuesday, December 14, 2010

Senators Present: L. Abbott, D. Agud, L. Cooper, L. Dalgren, M. Ellerbrock, J. Floyd, B. Jones, S. Karapanty, G. Lawson, D. Liu, G. Long, M. Maycock, K. Niewolny, M. Paretti, D. Parker, B. Pencek, H. Quesada-Pineda, W. Reed, H. Renard, E. Satterwhite, D. Smith, C. Stovall, J. Tokuhisa, E. Vance, B. Viachos, J. Wilkins, A. Zajac

AGENDA

1. Introduction

The meeting was called to order by President Mike Ellerbrock at 7:00 PM.

2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

A motion was made to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and passed. A motion was made to approve the minutes from the November meeting. The motion was seconded and passed.

3. Campus Phone System & Fee Structure

Guests in attendance: William Dougherty – Exec. Director, VT Network Infrastructure & Service, Joe Huston – Director, Voice & Mobile Technologies and Project Manager for Unified Communications Upgrade, Richard Hach – Assoc. Director, Network Admin. Special Projects and Initiatives)

A presentation on the forthcoming phone and data systems was given by Joe Huston. His presentation focused on the expansion of the campus network infrastructure in order to accommodate the growing bandwidth needs of faculty, staff, and students. He spoke of the flexibility, agility and affordability of the new system. However, neither fee structures nor details on the phone and data systems were shared with the Senators.

Comments from the Senators were centered on the absence of critical information and on costs to departments. While the presentation described the affordability and agility of the new system, the Faculty Senators reminded the presenters of the unaffordability and inflexibility of the current CNS system.

Questions to the presenter from the Senators dealt with assessment studies, costs, communication with department heads over the cost of the system, how the new system will affect off-campus groups, and how other universities are working with the growing issues of campus phone and data systems. The responses are summarized below:

- Assessment studies – The Council of College Deans has been informed.
- Costs – Rates are not yet known.
- Department Chairs – No formal contact, except through Dean's office.
- Off Campus Groups – No information.
- Campus Survey – None.
- Other Universities – Looked at Penn State, BYU, and Texas A&M.

William Dougherty responded to several of these posed questions. He noted the new system would:

- Remove the per unit desk cost from the departmental rate.
- Departments will have a single cost (1 phone per FTE, staff and employee).
- Long distance charges will cease.

In terms of data usage, Dougherty noted students are responsible for 78% of the current usage. However, they pay very little for this bandwidth (\$142/yr technology fee, on-campus pay \$350/yr for cable, phone, and 2 ethernet ports). Hence, the university needs to charge students more for their data usage.

The Faculty Senate urged the communications and network group to conduct a survey of department heads, as well as faculty, to better learn of campus needs. The Senators also stressed the group should talk to the IT staff in each department.

IV. Clarification of Leave Policy

Deborah Smith, Chair of CFA and VP of Faculty Senate, spoke to the Senate on the issue of Research Leave. The language in the Faculty Handbook is being clarified on the time required to accrue leave.

The current CFA Resolution states a faculty member must accrue 6 years of active service before becoming eligible for leave. The leave would be taken in the 7th year.

V. Future Business

Mike Ellerbrock, President of Faculty Senate, discussed topics from the current 6-year strategic plan, which will expire in 2012. A slide from the current “check-sheet” from the Provost’s office was presented to the Senators. Ellerbrock spoke of the need for substantial Faculty Senate involvement in the 2012-18 plan.

The issue of departmental mentoring for Promotion and Tenure was also discussed. The Senators were queried on the effectiveness of the process in their departments. A large percentage of the Senators indicated their displeasure with the current mentoring process, citing ineffectiveness or wholesale absence of the process. Similarly, the connected issues of yearly reviews are lacking in most departments.

VI. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was offered and seconded. The Faculty Senate adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary L. Long 1/11/11