

University Council
May 14, 2018
President's Conference Room

1. Call to Order

Dr. Wilsie Bishop called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call

Ms. Jennifer Hill called the roll. Those in attendance were: Dr. Wilsie Bishop, Mr. Scott Carter, Dr. Cheri Clavier, Dr. William Duncan, Dr. Susan Epps, Dr. Bill Flora, Ms. Megha Gupta, Dr. Mike Hoff, Dr. Keith Johnson, Mr. Ed Kelly, Dr. B.J. King, Dr. Karen King, Dr. Claudia Kozinetz, Dr. David Linville, Mr. Michael Luchtan, Dr. Robert Means, Dr. Brian Noland, Dr. Rick Osborn, Ms. Pamela Ritter, Dr. David Roane, Mr. Jeremy Ross, Dr. Janna Scarborough, Dr. Ramona Williams, Dr. Randy Wykoff

Those absent were: Dr. Bert Bach, Ms. Bridget Baird, Ms. Kristin France, Dr. Jane Jones, Dr. Angela Lewis, Dr. Celia McIntosh, Ms. Stefanie Murphy, Dr. Joe Sherlin, Mr. Joe Smith

Others in attendance: Ms. Mary Cradic, Dr. David Currie, Ms. Jennifer Hill, Mr. Joseph Kusi, Ms. Alicia Williams.

3. Standing Items

3.1 Approve minutes of April 9, 2018, meeting

Dr. Susan Epps made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

3.2 Review agenda

No changes or additions were recommended for the agenda. Dr. Bishop noted that this would be the first meeting for focused discussion, which has been moved to the end of the agenda to avoid limiting the time of that discussion further than the time allotted.

3.3 President's Report

Dr. Noland began his report with an update on the budget. A report on the Budget Advisory Committee's final deliberations has been sent to vice presidents and President Noland's direct reports. He noted that a couple of difficult budget issues were worked through and that requests for funds totaling more than \$5 million have been prioritized, with distribution correspondence having gone out to vice presidents. He anticipates the university will close the 2017-18 fiscal year with a balanced budget and with an element of the unknown in the area of fallout; he noted that this is the first year of the new budget model, and each college will be able to carry forward and retain 50 percent of its fallout funds, with the other 50 percent returning to the university. He encouraged University Council (UC) members to structure end-of-year purchases with that in mind. President Noland said one of the major budget variables for 2018-19 will be put to rest Thursday, May 17, when the Tennessee

Higher Education Commission (THEC) meets. He reminded UC members that the ETSU Board of Trustees met three weeks ago and approved fees for the university, making ETSU the first institution in the state to approve budget and fees. He said THEC retains the authority to set tuition caps, but he has not heard rumblings that the current cap of 3 percent might be lowered; if THEC lowers the cap, the university will need to adjust accordingly.

Dr. Noland provided a brief recap of the Board of Trustees meeting on April 27, noting that the Board's ability to quickly consider and approve the request for tenure upon appointment for an incoming department chair in addition to the regular annual tenure and promotion recommendations illustrates one direct benefit of moving to governance by an institutional board from the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR).

Dr. Noland reported that current enrollment projections for the fall semester keep ETSU within its budget confidence intervals for 2018-19. While freshman applications are flat, with the incoming freshman class projected to be within 1 or 2 percent of last year's entering class of 2,050, transfer numbers are up and housing numbers are strong. He encouraged UC members to continue to push on all yield-related activities.

Dr. Noland provided an overview of the 2018 Tennessee legislative session, which recently closed. He said it was a solid year for funding for higher education, with full funding of the formula, as well as funding for capital, deferred maintenance and special projects, one of which is ETSU's Center of Excellence to fight opioid addiction, for which \$500,000 was allocated. He said there were also some unique one-time and recurring funding elements that moved through the General Assembly. One recurring funding element about which Dr. Noland expressed concern was \$3 million in recurring revenues to support Tennessee Tech's engineering program, which came through supplemental appropriation and was on top of the \$700,000 the program received to reflect a change in its Carnegie classification; he said this flies in the face of the funding formula and that he and his peers across the state will question this when THEC meets later this week. Dr. Noland also expressed concern that the strategic research initiative (RISE) on which all of the former TBR institutions worked was removed from Gov. Bill Haslam's budget during the final week of the legislative session. In addition, Dr. Noland pointed out that the decades-long practice of funding capital projects according to a rising priority list provided by higher education governance was not followed this year, with Gov. Haslam skipping around on the list, which results in uncertainty relating to planning and fundraising for anticipated capital projects. Dr. Noland noted that it was not a quiet year for the University of Tennessee, which will change to a new governance system as of July 1, with an 11-member board without voting faculty and staff membership; each subsidiary campus will have an advisory board. He said that what happens with the UT system ultimately impacts other state institutions. Dr. Noland said that House Bill 2050, which provides excused absences for military reserve or National Guard personnel who are called to active duty, was written by ETSU student Devon Waldroff of Kingsport while he was participating in the Tennessee Intercollegiate

State Legislature. He said the Tuition Transparency and Accountability Act will require ETSU to provide general, four-year predictions pertaining to tuition and fees to incoming students and parents in acceptance letters; he said the university will need to place broad parameters around that because the institution's ability to predict tuition is predicated on the state's ability to fund its portion of the commitment. He also noted some things that did not pass in the General Assembly in 2018, including the DACA bill, legislation that would have changed minimum hours required per semester for a student to keep the lottery scholarship, changes to general education course requirements, efficiency audits, moratoriums on dual enrollment, and linking state funding to teacher performance; he noted that these things might come up again in the future.

Dr. Noland provided an update on things happening across campus. In preparation for the D.P. Culp University Center renovation project, all offices have been vacated, and the building will be handed over to BurWil Construction as of May 25, after which the company has two and a half months to do major work on the third floor and prepare it for use when students return to campus in the fall. University officials will go before the state Building Commission in June or July to present ETSU's intent to acquire the Millennium Center, including the conference center, the Niswonger Digital Media Center, the parking garage and the bridge. The acquisition price is expected to be between \$5.75-\$6 million, with the bulk of that covering the purchase of the parking garage, which will provide the university around 470 parking slots. Dr. Noland said he plans to meet with Dr. B.J. King to discuss the structure of the acquisition, which could involve adjusting parking fees to cover the debt service. He said planning is under way to determine how to use the space in the Millennium Center, and the intent is for the Department of Computing to be housed there. Dr. Randy Wykoff asked whether the university would retain the use of the ballroom and large meeting areas in the Millennium Center or if those would be renovated; he pointed to the Culp Center renovation and lack of large meeting spaces throughout the city as evidence of the need to keep those. Dr. Noland agreed, and stated that the immediate intent is to acquire the building and then to determine the use of space afterward. Dr. Noland turned the floor over to Mr. Jeremy Ross, who reported that there will be "open parking" on campus over the summer, with faculty, staff, and students being allowed to park in any blue or gold parking space while numerous parking lots are closed due to construction work.

Dr. Noland encouraged UC members to spend time each week reading the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, paying particular attention to budget shifts taking place across the nation and to be wise stewards of the resources available now, as the university will eventually need to once again address stagnant state resources.

3.4 Call for Voluntary Reports of UC-Essential Action Items from Governance Organizations

3.4.1. Student Government Association

Dr. Bishop introduced and welcomed Ms. Megha Gupta, the 2018-19 Student Government Association president, who reported that the Homecoming cabinet

member would begin working on Homecoming preparations with faculty and staff over the summer.

3.4.2. Faculty Senate

Dr. Epps reported on the election of officers in April. Dr. Bill Flora was elected president and will begin his term on Aug. 21. Mr. Stephen Hendrix was elected vice president; Dr. Eric Sellers will continue as secretary; Dr. Nate Olson was elected treasurer; and Dr. Patrick Brown was re-elected as chief operating officer.

3.4.3. Council of Chairs

Dr. Janna Scarborough reported that the Council crafted guidelines for selecting UC membership for the future and will begin working on that process prior to July. The Council also designated short-term task forces to work on two recommendations: a step-down policy for chairs and an on-boarding policy for chairs, which could perhaps include the formation of a learning community for new chairs. She said the Council also expects some changes in the Executive Council of Chairs.

3.4.4. Graduate and Professional Student Association

Mr. Michael Luchtan noted that this would be his last meeting with the UC and introduced Mr. Joseph Kusi, the new vice president of the GPSA. Mr. Kusi reported that the organization will meet soon. Dr. Bishop thanked Mr. Luchtan for his service on the University Council and referred to a discussion regarding the Carillon during a previous meeting, saying the issue he brought up would not be dropped.

3.4.5. Research Council

Dr. William Duncan reported on a crowdfunding initiative undertaken by several groups on campus with University Advancement and Information Technology Services. He said the contract has been reviewed by University Counsel and signed. Early applications have come in. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs will coordinate reviews. Dr. Duncan said the crowdfunding initiative covers a gap in funding for small research projects being done by faculty, staff or students. The funding will cover travel, and in response to a question regarding tax on the funds raised, Dr. Duncan said he does not believe there is a tax. Ms. Pamela Ritter said that the university pays a fee to have the crowdfunding site. Notice of the initiative has been conveyed campus-wide via the weekly email from the President's Office, and another informational push will be made at the beginning of the fall semester.

4. Action Items

4.1 Old Business

4.1.1. [Digital Research Data Storage and Backup Policy](#) – Dr. Duncan

Dr. William Duncan [discussed this policy](#), which promotes secure and reliable means to store and back up digital research data using ETSU network or ETSU-approved cloud solutions, reduces the odds of data loss or inappropriate release of sensitive data through various means, and may reduce overall purchases of incidental hardware storage devices.

Dr. Duncan detailed the public comment and revision process, which included additional work by focus groups. As a result of the public comments, the major revisions pertained to encryption, including how encryption works and when and how it is to be used. Other revisions dealt with how data is identified, OneDrive use, and clarity of definitions. Dr. Duncan said a new format was developed with policies and procedures, and Information Technology Services staff prepared a flow diagram making it easy for users to determine when to use which storage devices. He said the policy clarifies and simplifies procedures, and employees and students conducting research have enterprise-level support for research; they also have an enterprise option for data access from distant locations and easier data sharing for collaborations.

Dr. Duncan said two issues illustrate the relevance of the policy. He shared the story of a researcher who stored individually identifiable data on a password-protected external hard drive, which was stolen; the data had not been backed up and was completely lost, and the Institutional Review Board determined that participants should be notified of the loss which contained their information. He said the situation would have been better had the hard drive been encrypted, which is encouraged by the policy. The second issue is the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) recently developed by the European Union and its relevance to ETSU's data storage policy. The GDPR covers research and other data that could be collected on campus, which could include EU data sets or research components, information on students from EU countries participating in research in the U.S., and research conducted in EU countries. It covers all personal data, as well as online identifiers such as IP addresses and images. He said there are significant fines if this regulation is broken, which could total 20 million euros or higher. He said the university has a policy that could mitigate some of the potential issues if there is a breach, but most importantly, advises faculty, staff and students how to store their data and protect it to ensure that the privacy of individuals is maintained.

Dr. Epps moved that the policy be approved with the caveat that the editing team be allowed to make non-substantive changes. Dr. Wykoff seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

4.1.2. UC Process on Policy Approval – Dr. Linville

Dr. Linville presented the [draft of a Policy Approval Process for the University Council](#), which covers policies and procedures defined as university level. The policy covers the approval process for policies and procedures that would affect large segments or all of the campus community and would fall under the University Council or Academic Council for approval prior to going before the Board of Trustees for final approval.

Dr. Linville thanked the members of the *ad hoc* group that looked at how policy is dealt with and proposed the process for modifying existing policy and procedure and creating new policy and procedure. He said the proposed process deals with anything

that relates to the entire university, such as the entire student body, the entire faculty, the entire staff or the entire campus, but does not deal with policies that only affect a small segment of the campus population. He also said that the proposed process takes into account the new Board of Trustees governance structure. Two main councils – the Academic and University Councils – will consider policies and procedures for approval, and an outline has been developed to determine which council is to review what policies and procedures. Changes to policies must go through an approval process. If a procedure changes significantly, it must go through the council approval process, but if the change is minor, it can go straight to President Noland for approval, with information sent back to the appropriate council. The process allows for drafting, public comment/feedback, revision and approval in a timely fashion. Dr. Linville said an online system will be used in tracking the policy and procedure process from start to finish.

Dr. Bishop asked who would be the custodian of the policies and in charge of maintaining the website. Dr. Linville indicated that the Board Secretary's office would do that and related tasks.

Dr. Bishop said the policy presumes that existing governance structures on campus other than Academic Council would send their policies that affect the whole university through the University Council. She asked how policies would be handled that need to be developed for the entire university but do not come through an existing governance council, such as HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996). Dr. Linville said that would go to the University Council. In addition, financial items that do not go through a lower governance council would be directed to the Academic or University Council as appropriate on a case-by-case basis as determined by the Board Secretary's office and the vice presidents before going to either the President's Office or the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Ed Kelly noted that it is important to maintain records of policy and procedure development and approval in case that history is needed in potential future litigation.

President Noland noted that previously, policies have been given up to 30 days of public review, and asked if the new procedure compresses that to 10 days. Dr. Linville said it could be a minimum of 10 days, but could be longer, with the length of review to be determined by the authors of the proposed policy/procedure. Dr. Noland indicated he liked the compressed review time, as it would allow the university to move faster on proposed policies. There was some discussion regarding how the time of year might affect the length of the public comment period, such as the end of a semester, when few people would be likely to participate.

Dr. Epps made a motion to approve the policy. The motion was seconded by Dr. Scarborough and unanimously approved.

4.2 New Business

4.2.1. Information Security Policy – Dr. K. King

Dr. Karen King presented an [Information Security Policy](#) that came through the Information Technology Council. This policy says that ETSU as an institution will implement information security and privacy programs aligned with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

Dr. King noted that adopting a national standard for security is in the Information Technology Services (ITS) strategic plan and provides an opportunity to be proactive with security instead of waiting until something happens. She said the hard part about the proposed standard is that it has 17 categories for security control, and under those are more than 300 controls; it would take several years to address all of the controls. She said that many of those would involve server-side applications or information security updates that could be pushed to computers that would not need to be addressed as separate policy, while others requiring end-user action would need additional policy review. Dr. King said the policy has been put out for public comment, but no comments have been received, possibly due to the time of year, so she recommended leaving it up for review for 30 days.

Dr. Wykoff asked about the cost implications of the policy, noting that “blanket approvals” of policies sometimes imply approval of associated expenses. Dr. King said many controls to be put in place would not cost anything, and some would involve things that have already been purchased by the university; some controls would involve costs, such as work by outside sources, which would involve budgetary implications that would be addressed in the future. She said not all controls would need to be put in place, but ETSU could choose those that are best for the institution. She also said that the financial implications could be more if ETSU does not institute some of the controls.

Dr. Epps asked for clarification of the statement in the policy that reads: “Risk management, information security, and privacy programs shall align with the University’s mission and its strategic goals” Dr. King replied that it means that ETSU needs to take into consideration all of those things that are aligned with strategic goals, and there may be controls that the university chooses not to implement.

Dr. King made a motion for approval of the policy; the motion was seconded by Dr. Epps.

In further discussion, Mr. Kelly said that as he first read the policy, he was concerned, but had less of a concern the more he read. He said that while it looks like a small policy, it indicates the university would be adopting 300 things in the policy without knowing whether they apply. He said it is good that it says the university will implement it as it aligns with NIST standards.

Additional discussion centered on the large number of controls in the standard, legal concerns pertaining to the standard, possible language revisions in the policy, and potential financial implications of the policy.

Dr. King made a motion to table this issue until the June meeting of the UC. She asked if the policy should be put back out for public comment, and it was determined that this discussion provided substantial comment and it would not need to be reposted. Dr. King's motion to table the issue did not require a second and was approved unanimously.

5. Information Items/Presentations

Dr. Mike Hoff addressed both 5.1.1. Status Report on College and Unit Level Strategic Plans and 5.1.2. Draft Process for Receiving and Reviewing College and Unit Level Strategic Plans together.

Dr. Hoff told members of the UC that he plans to meet with the vice presidents regarding their strategic plans by July, followed by a review of those plans by the Budget and Strategic Planning Committee for three things: areas of synergy, areas of divergence and identification of expanded measures. Afterward, he will make a presentation to the UC in August that will be a precursor to the presentation in November to the Board of Trustees. He said there will be a website where activities related to strategic planning at every mission level may be tracked; budget outcomes that were recently identified and sent out could also be tracked, as could academic outcomes. He said this would not require UC approval but would help the UC to fulfill its advisory role; this would also help the university fulfill its Southern Association of Colleges and Schools requirements.

President Noland said the August presentation would give the UC an opportunity to see how individual colleges' strategic plans align and integrate with the university's strategic plan and set the stage for the fall semester and the beginning of budget conversations.

Dr. Hoff noted that there would need to be adjustments, but the Budget and Strategic Planning Committee is committed to maintaining and pushing the university forward in the area of good stewardship of resources, and one aspect of that is to inform the strategic planning process. He invited UC members to speak or send him an email with comments, and said he would set up a website under the Office of Planning and Decision Support and begin rolling things out on strategic planning; this will eventually include more detailed dashboard items.

In addition, Dr. Hoff said he would like to purchase a membership in the Society for College and University Planners. This would cover five people from ETSU; he said that he, Dr. Bach and Dr. B.J. King should fill three of those slots, and he invited recommendations from the UC for the other two. After discussion, it was determined that the remaining two slots should be filled by representatives of the Board of Trustees and Facilities Management.

6. Announcements

6.1 University Council Membership – Dr. Bishop

Dr. Bishop said that in June, the UC will need to finalize its membership for the 2018-19 year. The Academic Affairs deans will need to select a replacement for Dr. Celia McIntosh, whose term is ending, and the Health Affairs deans need to select a replacement for Dr. Wykoff, whose term is ending. The Council of Chairs will appoint both an Academic Affairs chair representative and a Health Affairs chair representative as terms are ending for Dr. Scarborough and Dr. Roane, respectively. Alternate representatives will be identified by the Student Government Association and Graduate and Professional Student Organization. Dr. Bishop also noted that a vice chair of the UC will be elected at the meeting June.

7. Focused Discussion – Dr. Bishop moderating

7.1 How do we prepare to meet the following Strategic Initiative: “Between now and 2026, ETSU will have 18,000 students enrolled on campus, online, or at a remote location”?

Dr. Bishop provided initial direction on the discussion, noting that the chosen topic might carry over to June. She said this 30-minute discussion would provide an opportunity for the UC to take one of ETSU’s strategic initiatives and talk about it from the perspective of the members, who could also provide information they have from their stakeholders; she said it would allow members to look at the university’s strategic assets, think about opportunities, and think about how ETSU will develop as a university over the next 10 years as it pursues the goal of 18,000 students. She pointed out that this strategic initiative has many implications related to facilities, curriculum, housing, students, faculty, diversity, budgeting, marketing, leadership, program development, delivery modes, international outreach, global activities and more. Dr. Bishop also prefaced the discussion by encouraging members to think about how many institutions across the country have 18,000. She said that 26.19 percent of all institutions across the country are comparable to ETSU – Title IV, doctoral/professional, degree-granting institutions – and that within that category, about 22 percent are smaller and about 50 percent are larger than ETSU. She noted that the 15,000-student mark seemed to be a “breaking point” that put institutions into a different classification. She invited Dr. Noland to speak before the discussion began.

Dr. Noland said a number of variables need to be examined if ETSU is serious about reaching its goal of 18,000 students, including scholarship policy, marketing, recruitment strategy, programming and more. The online area alone, he said, could yield multiple hours of conversation. He stated that if ETSU wants to make significant progress toward enhancing faculty and staff salaries, the primary way to generate the revenue to do so is to grow. He said that people automatically assume that if ETSU reaches 18,000 students, the additional 3,200 students would be on campus, which would require additional buildings, parking and more, but he noted that there is a combination of ways to grow to that level, and one of the primary growth areas to consider is online courses.

Points made during the ensuing conversation included:

- Dr. Wykoff said that to make the topic more workable would be to assign a small working group for each of eight market segments; those groups would meet and bring ideas back to the UC. The eight segments he suggested included four from the category of traditional students – high school students going to more competitive schools, those going to schools comparable to ETSU, those going to two-year institutions and those not attending college at all, and four from the category of non-traditional students – adults who have never attended college, those who attended and left, working professionals and international students. He talked about how money is an issue for students attending more competitive schools, but they ultimately choose better programming, and he said ETSU should focus on what's exciting here to attract those interested in comparable institutions. Later in the meeting, Dr. Wykoff noted that one untapped resource is local high schools where less than half of the students go on to college.
- Dr. Hoff pointed out that the segments Dr. Wykoff identified were largely undergraduate populations, and recommended focusing first on those populations.
- Transfer students and international undergraduates were also mentioned as important populations.
- Dr. Keith Johnson noted that retention in general, and particularly among African American students, needs to be improved.
- Dr. Wykoff said a whole strategy on retention, including student success and engagement, is needed.
- Dr. Linville said the university needs to think about programming to reach 18,000.
- Dr. Hoff replied that programming wouldn't necessarily mean new degrees, and pointed out that ETSU has about the same number of programs as the University of Memphis.
- Dr. Karen King pointed out that traditional-age students are different than just 10 years ago, looking for different options.
- Dr. Hoff said that ETSU could reach the 18,000-student goal by taking six programs and putting them online.
- Dr. Karen King noted that there are multiple barriers to online education at ETSU. She pointed out that multiple consulting firms have, over the past decade, recommended online programs in business, education and computing, and she said an online cybersecurity program, with a state-of-the-art cybersecurity lab, is one of her dreams. She said that improvements to ETSU's infrastructure are needed.
- Dr. Karen King also noted that improved collaboration across campus is needed in reaching out to prospective students. She said ETSU Online has received more than 100 inquiries since May 1; ITS staff respond to those inquiries immediately and forward to appropriate departments. Some departments, she said, follow up with the students quickly, while others prefer for students to take the initiative to contact them directly. Suggested a state-of-the-art cybersecurity lab for students.

- Dr. Karen King said the university might also think about changing the support model for online education, which now includes a \$3,500 stipend for faculty teaching online courses and a \$12,500 per-semester grant for program development. She said she has “no takers” for the program development grant, and said one possibility to improve might be to have ITS staff build the courses, with the faculty responsible only for the content.
- Dr. Flora said increasing online offerings for graduate students would be good, but for the university to truly grow, online offerings for undergraduates must improve. He noted that 15 years ago, Liberty University’s primary student population was on campus, but today the school has 80,000 undergraduate students online.
- Dr. Noland said he has cross-referenced ETSU’s offerings with Liberty and Southern New Hampshire, which have similar program offerings, but with better program titles. He said ETSU could improve packaging of its programs. He questioned why ETSU does not have its M.B.A. online, and suggested as an example an M.B.A. in health care administration with a business-related concentration.
- Dr. Karen King pointed out that some programs, including Management and Marketing and Logistics and Supply Chain Management, lack one course each being 100 percent online.
- Dr. Karen King noted that online course development is hard and involves a lot of heavy lifting, taking approximately one year.
- There was discussion regarding the uncertainty of return on investment for growing through online course/degree development, and questions on how to better incentivize that development. Physical facilities to accommodate growth and additional flexibility in adjusting faculty pay were also mentioned as needs.
- The additional work required of existing faculty in offering more online courses was discussed, with heavier loads in the areas of advising, grading and other responsibilities that would accompany the placement of more students into online sections. Dr. Karen King said there is “a disconnect between the growth agenda and the grassroots.”
- Dr. Linville pointed out the “linear thought” in the discussion but noted that the university is not in a linear process. He noted that the university needs to take a “disruptive approach” to make this work by growing existing programs, increasing retention, creating new programs and doing things that are uncomfortable quickly as opposed to one step at a time.
- Dr. Noland reiterated that four groups of consultants have made such recommendations as an online M.B.A.; an abbreviated, eight-week mini-term that would conform to the needs of business and industry; and more. He said there are probably six recommendations from the consultants that could be re-examined for synergies.
- Dr. Karen King pointed out that a certificate in genetic counseling was recommended by consultants; she said all the coursework was already available at ETSU, but nobody wanted to provide the certificate program. She

said that after the consultants left, the university should have put a certificate program together on its own.

- Dr. Flora said that allowing people to say, “I like it where it is,” reflects a culture of complacency, and he recommended saying, “These things are going to happen.”
- Dr. B.J. King supported the idea of certificate programs, noting that it speaks to the state’s workforce development initiative. She said that the common philosophy of intellectual development in higher education is good, but the people the university serves need to be able to get jobs and raises.
- Dr. Karen King added that Northeast State Community College has added programs to tie in with the aerospace facility that is being developed near Tri-Cities Regional Airport and pointed out that ETSU could have opportunities to build on that but needs to be developing those opportunities now.
- Ms. Ritter said that economic development is important, as well, and pointed to a new cybersecurity company that is locating in Abingdon, Virginia, and plans to hire hundreds of people. The company has inquired about assistance from ETSU, and one suggestion brought forth is to have a teaching unit from ETSU to teach the company’s employees on-site.
- Dr. B.J. King noted that the TBR recently received a grant to take a mobile educational unit to Mountain City and other areas of the state that do not have the resources to sustain brick-and-mortar facilities. She pointed that from a legislative perspective, it is all about workforce development.
- Dr. Johnson asked if a copy of the recommendations from the consultants mentioned could be made available. Dr. K. King and Dr. Noland indicated that the reports could be made available.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.