

**Administrative Council**  
**April 7, 2021 - 3:35 p.m.**  
**TEAMS Meeting**  
**Minutes**

<b>Members Present</b>		
Dan Allcott	Michael Allen	Jeremy Blair
Debra Bryant	Wei Tsun Chang	Daniel Brent Drexler
Dennis Duncan	Joshua Edmonds	Mary Lou Fornehed
David Hajdik	Kim Hanna	Madison Harris
Alexis Harvey	Elizabeth Honeycutt	Tammy Howard
Janet Isbell	Brian Jones	Nancy Kolodziej
Aaron Lay	Chad Luke	Holly Mills
Lachelle Norris	Joseph Ojo	Sally Pardue
Richard Rand	Chuck Roberts	Jeffery Roberts
Vahid Motevalli (Proxy for Joseph Slater)	Sandra Smith-Andrews	Claire Stinson
Dan Swartling	Suzan Swartzentover	Jennifer Taylor
Lenly Weathers	Angie Wells	Mark Wilson
Jeannette Luna	Lisa Zagumny	
<b>Members Absent</b>		
Sandra Bohannon	Steven Frye	Tony Nelson
Steven Norris	Anthony Paradis	Mike Rogers
Bedelia Russell		
<b>Resource Persons / Others Present</b>		
Lee Wray	Michael Adduci	Sean Alley
Debbie Barnard	Kevin Braswell	Lori Bruce
Yvette Clark	Kerri Demeri	Sharon Holderman
Greg Holt	Sharon Huo	Jerry Keeton
Erika King	Raymond Peplow	Donna Schrock
Cara Sisk	Diane Smith	Mark Stephens
Holly Stretz	Emily Wheeler	Katherine Williams
Ethan Wyatt		

**Summary:**

Approved agenda

Approved January 27, 2021 minutes

Approved Constitution for American Foundry Society of Tennessee Tech

Approved Constitution for Double Reeds of Tennessee Tech

Approved new Textbooks and Course-Related Materials Policy No. 295

Approved new Gift vs. Sponsored Grants and Contracts Policy No. 538

Approved new Procurement on Sponsored Projects Policy No. 572

Approved revised Record Retention and Disposition Policy No. 113

Approved revised Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Policy No. 513

Approved revised Grants, Contracts and Cooperative Agreements Policy No. 516

Tabled revised Key Control Policy No. 561

Approved revised Compliance (Athletics) Policy No. 903

Approved revised Investigations of NCAA Violations Policy No. 905

Approved revised Amorous Relationships (Athletics) Policy No. 970

Approved Athletics annual report for 2020-21

- 1) Diversity Issues
- 2) Gender Equity

Received annual reports of committees reporting to the Administrative Council for 2020-21

Approved revised Student Financial Aid Committees Procedures

Elected Administrative Council Chair for 2020-21

**Proceedings:**

Chair Sandi Smith-Andrews called the TEAMS meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Smith-Andrews reminded the group that only members could vote on the upcoming polls; those who are resource personnel, presenters or guests should refrain from voting. Richard Rand made a motion to approve the agenda for April 7, 2021. Lisa Zagumny seconded. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Zagumny motioned to approve the January 27, 2021 minutes. Rand seconded. Motion APPROVED, three abstained.

Vahid Motevalli motioned to approve the Constitution for American Foundry Society of Tennessee Tech. Rand seconded. Students Ethan Wyatt and Raymond Peplow presented. Wyatt stated that the club would concentrate on establishing professional relationships and contacts within the Foundry Industry. Wyatt stated that the organization was vested with the Tennessee Chapter of the national organization. The organization was previously on campus and had a lapse in reporting so they were reapplying. Michael Allen mentioned that at the end of the constitution it states 'in the event of dissolution, all monetary assets shall be donated to the American Foundry Society', is that a requirement? Wyatt replied that their dues were in accordance with AFS National dues, so the dues would go to the national organization and then a portion were returned to the Tech Chapter, so any monies remaining must be returned to the national office. Mark Wilson had researched the committee for NCAA regulations and stated that everything was appropriate from the aspect of recruitment and student athletes. Katie Williams confirmed that it was allowable by policy that student organizations could designate to a charitable organization, national organization or any Tennessee Tech fund. Tammy Howard asked if elections every semester were standard on campus; do most organizations elect once a year? Wyatt replied they have elections every semester to make sure that every position is filled. Dr. Fred Vondra was the faculty advisor. Motion APPROVED, one abstained.

Dan Allcott motioned to approve the Constitution for Double Reeds of Tennessee Tech. Zagumny seconded. Student Erika King presented and stated that she played the obo at Tech and was surprised to find that the community she found within the double reed ensembles on Tech's campus had no unified club name or stated purpose on paper anywhere. King stated that the organization's purpose was to encourage knowledge and appreciation of double reed instruments on the Tech campus and in the surrounding community. The organization would promote music education in primary and secondary schools in our region both in general and also specifically in relation to obo and bassoon. The organization's goal was to increase interest in both double reed instruments and Tennessee Tech. Dr. Michael Adduci is the faculty advisor. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Rand motioned to approve the new Textbooks and Course-Related Materials Policy No. 295. Holly Mills seconded. Smith-Andrews pointed out that the Procedures were included for information only. Sharon Huo presented that this policy was a Tennessee State law required policy. The policy and procedures were developed by a textbook policy committee with representatives from each college and the Director of Auxiliary Services. This policy contained the law language and current practices of Tennessee Tech. Motion APPROVED.

Mills motioned to approve the new Gift vs. Sponsored Grants and Contracts Policy No. 538. Dennis Duncan seconded. Claire Stinson presented and stated this policy provided guidance for

gifts, grants and contracts as well as definitions and information on how each of these were structured and accounted for at Tennessee Tech. The policy also identified the related policies. Jeannette Luna commented that this policy was postponed last year to give time for the new Vice President of Research, now Jennifer Taylor, to be included. Taylor confirmed that she worked with Stinson and Kevin Braswell on this policy. Stretz asked Stinson to summarize what the gift policy said about taking 42% out. Stinson asked if Stretz were referring to indirect costs, and Stretz confirmed that was the case. Stinson clarified that this policy did not include indirect costs. Motion APPROVED.

Rand motioned to approve the new Procurement on Sponsored Projects Policy No. 572. Wilson seconded. Emily Wheeler presented and stated that the new policy was intended to clarify procurement on sponsored projects and accompanied the policies listed in Section One. Wheeler noted that it included all goods or services purchased with project funds should comply with the conditions of the sponsor, the applicable federal and state laws, and Tennessee Tech procurement policies. Motion APPROVED.

Rand motioned to approve the revised Record Retention and Disposition Policy N. 113. Jeff Roberts seconded. Sharon Holderman presented and stated that it was an update to the records retention table in response to the RDA's the state had passed. The policy also added that syllabi go to archives at the end of the academic year. Allen asked if the videos at the end included video lectures. Holderman replied that it did not, that was university sponsored videos like promotional videos and athletic events, etc. Rand also asked if there would be any type of effort to educate the faculty at large on record retention and disposition. Holderman commented that on the Library website there was a records management link that had the information that included a contact person in each college or department that was to facilitate the information. Holderman added that she was happy to speak with any department on how to do, if requested. Holderman added that any questions can go to that department contact or be sent to her. Motion APPROVED.

Duncan motioned to approve the revised Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Policy No. 513. Rand seconded. Wheeler presented and stated that the State asked that Section 5-a under Due Diligence section E. be clarified. Wheeler indicated that nothing in the policy or how Tech operated had changed; just the language was made clearer. Wheeler pointed out that under the statutory period, G-1, the maximum period is now three years vs. five years, per state law. Motion APPROVED.

Wilson motioned to approve the revised Grants, Contracts and Cooperative Agreements Policy No. 516. Zagumny seconded. Wheeler presented and stated that the revisions surround all the references to what was formerly the OMB Circulars and are now the Uniform Guidance 2 CFR 200. Wheeler stated that Business Office Staff had worked with the Office of Research to confirm all of the definitions aligned and also removed obsolete language. Zagumny

questioned since the policy included grant accounts and cooperative agreements, why one of the reviewing officers was not the VP for Research. Zagumny added that she agreed with the three listed but suggested adding the VP for Research. Wheeler referred to Stinson. Stinson agreed to the friendly amendment to add the VP for Research as a reviewing officer. Motion APPROVED.

Zagumny motioned to approve the revised Key Control Policy No. 561. Rand seconded. Chuck Roberts presented the policy and stated that it was a refinement of the current policy and that the focus was on clarity, security and accountability. Chuck Roberts stated that the revision clarified that only permanent full-time employees could request keys adding that the key holders were responsible for the keys and their return. Chuck Roberts indicated that the individual and their department were accountable and responsible for when a key was lost or stolen noting that if it were a master key, it would have to be rekeyed and paid for accordingly. Roberts noted that Section E allows adjunct, temporary employees, and students to be loaned non-master keys from permanent employees. Chuck Roberts added that there was also a change in how the keys were accounted for in the system. Chuck Roberts noted that he had reviewed all of the major changes.

Wilson indicated that his understanding was that when keys were returned to Facilities after an employee left, that those keys were then to be destroyed. Wilson asked if the department would be responsible for the cost of having new keys cut? Chuck Roberts indicated he would check on this but that that he thought there was a possibility of reutilizing and reassigning those keys. Chuck Roberts indicated that Facilities did not want to hold on to them too long so the keys might get destroyed after a month or two. Wilson commented that it sometimes took more than a month or two to conduct searches and hire employees so that for efficiency, departments should be able to put them in a lockbox to save and reissue them adding it would be more cost effective for departments, if possible. Chuck Roberts indicated he would check with staff to see if the keys could be held for longer but knew they were limited in resources. Allcott suggested putting a length of time on it, i.e., four months and Chuck Roberts agreed to look into it and that these were procedural items not included in the policy.

Stretz asked if this policy applied to slide keys. Roberts indicated it addressed only the hardcore cylinder keys. Chuck Roberts will check on what the policies would be for the card keys.

Debra Bryant asked if the keys needed to be turned in from the department to facilities in a certain length of time or if it could be handled internally by allowing the department to keep the keys. Chuck Roberts mentioned they would like to have the keys returned for accountability reasons; in the past, those keys tended to be lost.

Lori Bruce questioned Section E, and asked how an Instructor was defined or impacted by this policy because this always comes up whether we are talking about temporary, part-time, or

permanent employees. Bruce added that as it reads, they would have access to a non-master key for internal building access. Bruce interpreted the policy to be that an Instructor was not able to have a key to a building. Chuck Roberts indicated he was not sure on the terms of Instructor in the policy and added that normally permanent employees have a key to their office space and stated that only a few select people get the master keys. Stinson stated that she could answer the definition of Instructors and stated that Instructors, during their one-year contract, are considered permanent employees. Bruce wanted to let others know that she had received complaints from some faculty that are not able to access supply cabinets and photo copiers, their departmental resources, after hours noting that some faculty were expected to be on campus after hours to teach. Bruce indicated she did not understand in the policy where it indicated "non-master", asking what that meant in the context of accessing departmental offices. Chuck Roberts indicated that was worked out with the key folks when the request was received but that usually non-masters are typically to the individual office and he would think it would be to cabinets and such, but would not be permitted to department head offices or other areas where files were kept, mechanical rooms, etc.

Allen questioned Section V part D, '...lost, stolen, or refused to be returned before (or at) termination...' and asked why the department would pay for the key, why wouldn't the terminated employee be responsible for the cost of the lost key? Chuck Roberts replied that traditionally when someone out processes they would return the key adding if not, Facilities would hold the department accountable. Allen replied that he did not know of any process that the departments had for asking for retribution for lost, stolen or non-returned keys. Chuck Roberts commented that they worked with HR on this process and HR agreed that was how the accountability process should be handled.

Allcott disagreed with the agreement between Facilities and Human Resources (HR). Allcott stated that HR had the monetary hold on a former employee, then they should be responsible not the department. Allcott noted that it should be treated the same as a student; if a student in my department checked out a piece of equipment, we could put a hold on their account; the department doesn't do that. Allcott indicated that it went with the framework of new efforts of the university toward people over process and this smells a little bit like some laws in search of a crime. Allcott pointed out that when he came here, he was provided a large ring of keys without his asking, he didn't know what they went to, they were kept in a box until he arrived here from his predecessor and the paperwork was processed and he was able to go about his business. Allcott suggested that his whole thing sounded like a process not people, as you're hearing from a lot of faculty, how's that going to work, how's this going to work, or that's not going to work, who's going to be responsible, how do we hold people responsible; that's why.

Jeannette Luna commented about the issuing of master keys noting that during the renovation of Kittrell Hall, they were encouraged to try to have as few keys as possible. Luna indicated that they currently have one master key for the whole building. Luna pointed out that there will be

adjuncts that would be teaching after hours that would need access, they would not be able to open a copy room or open the GIS lab after hours. Luna suggested that the policy be revisited with the Faculty Senate before the Administrative Council approved it. Luna indicated that the Council wanted to make sure it was inline with all of the renovations on campus stating that she felt that if Kittrell was told this, then probably Bartoo was as well adding that other buildings would have some of these same issues. Chuck Roberts added that there may be some confusion as to what was being termed as a master key. Roberts stated that a master key would get an individual into multiple facilities and multiple areas on campus, and that's what Facilities was trying to keep in mind and keep from happening. Roberts thought that Luna would be allowed within her area to have other keys that would get them into different areas besides an individual office. Chuck Roberts again stated he thought there was some confusion on what was being termed as a master key. Luna stated that she could use her key to get into her Chair's office, which she would never do, but we were encouraged to key the building with one master, which is a challenge.

Stretz commented she was confused and felt this policy needed more review because if this deal was made between Facilities and HR and the departments were to be held responsible, the departments were not in that conversation. Stretz noted that some departments had significantly fewer financial capabilities than others adding that if the Chair approved a key, they needed to know what the consequences were and how much money would be on the line and how much money would be at risk. Stretz stated that some departments would not be able to pay the consequences. Stretz expressed that Facilities sent out the keys and were responsible for taking back the keys but planned to charge the department if something went wrong in the process, that it sounded like accountability and responsibility were not connected. Roberts asked if Stretz were proposing that the cost goes back on Facilities and Stretz responded that we needed to think that through because if this was approved and the departments had to pay for a loss, they needed to at least know that. Roberts indicated that now they would know if they approved the policy. Stretz responded that she did not know how much it cost to rekey her department. Chuck Roberts stated that they now know the risk and he would provide the cost.

Smith-Andrews spoke on behalf of someone not in the room; stating there had been issues with adjuncts, Dr. Lori Maxwell, Chair of Political Science, and she had judges and attorneys and various respected members of the community teach adjunct in her building and she expressed concern that she was not allowed to issue building and/or room keys to those individuals. Chuck Roberts indicated that was a misunderstanding, that she did not realize that we could issue those keys to her to give to those employees. Chuck Roberts discussed this issue with her the previous day and it seemed like she was fine with the outcome after the discussion.

Smith-Andrews pointed out to Chuck Roberts that if the policy were not passed today that it didn't mean it was gone forever, it just meant that the Council wanted it to be revisited and there had been some of those discussions in the room.

Dr. Bruce added, on the subject of Item D about if a person was terminated without the return of the keys, that she wanted to point out that sometimes the department didn't even participate in the termination, sometimes that was done with HR and the University. Bruce stated that she understood that someone had to pay to rekey but commented that it was a little disconcerting that Facilities and HR discussed this when sometimes someone is terminated by HR appropriately but the department was not a part of it, so there wasn't a chance for the department to get the key back, there was no negligence or anything on the departments part. Chuck Roberts argued that it was not always negligence but the cost had to come from somewhere and stated that it was the department's employee. Bruce pointed out that it was the University's employee. Bruce clarified that what she wanted to point out was that the termination was often through HR, especially when it was an abrupt termination where you were less likely to get a key returned, and the department might not play a role in that.

Allcott motioned to table this policy for further discussion. Allen seconded. Motion to TABLE unanimously APPROVED.

Smith-Andrews suggested that Chuck Roberts get further input from Faculty Senate or Academic Council to obtain a shared governance perspective. Luna, as incoming Faculty Senate President, invited Chuck Roberts to their first Faculty Senate meeting in the Fall to discuss and would follow-up after the meeting to do so.

Zagumny motioned to approve revised Compliance (Athletics) Policy No. 903. Jeff Roberts seconded. Wilson presented and stated there were only editorial changes, no substantive changes, in Section III – 6, from a specific position title to a more generic title of a senior Department of Athletics staff member. This policy had been approved by the Athletics Committee. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Zagumny motioned to approve revised Investigations of NCAA Violations Policy No. 905. Jeff Roberts seconded. Wilson presented and stated there were only editorial changes, no substantive changes, in Section III – 6, from a specific position title to a more generic title of a senior Department of Athletics staff member. This policy had been approved by the Athletics Committee. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Zagumny motioned to approve revised Amorous Relationships (Athletics) Policy No. 970. Jeff Roberts seconded. Wilson presented and stated there were only editorial changes, no substantive changes, in Section III – 6, from a specific position title to a more generic title of a

senior Department of Athletics staff member. This policy had been approved by the Athletics Committee. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Zagumny motioned to approve the Athletics annual report for 2020-21, 1) Diversity Issues, 2) Gender Equity. Jeff Roberts seconded. Wilson presented and stated they report on the ratio of student athletics compared to the general student population in relation to diversity and gender equity. Wilson indicated he was very proud of our student athletes through this environment specifically related to diversity and the social injustice and what they have been doing in creating CODE (the Center of Diversity Education) so it had been a very good year for us in terms of diversity and gender issues and stated that we continued to meet all the requirements set forth. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Zagumny motioned to receive the annual reports of committees reporting to the Administrative Council for 2020-2021. Smith-Andrews noted that we had received 100% from the committees reporting to Administrative Council. Wilson seconded. Hearing no questions, motion unanimously APPROVED.

Zagumny motioned to approve the revised Student Financial Aid Committee Procedures. Mills seconded. Deborah Barnard presented and stated that the new procedures serve the campus community better and enabled the committee to serve as a liaison between Financial Aid and the campus community. The revised procedures reflect discussions had with different advising centers and the Faculty Senate and the procedures help to facilitate communication and understanding of financial aid procedures. The previous procedures had the committee basically responsible for policy and these procedures had us more in line as to what we should be doing as a University Committee. Motion unanimously APPROVED.

Smith-Andrews opened nominations from the floor for Administrative Council Chair for 2021-22 stating that she had previously sent an email to the members requesting nominations and she had received no responses therefore, she was opening the floor to receive nominations from the floor. Jeff Roberts nominated Sandi Smith-Andrews. Zagumny seconded. Smith-Andrews asked if there were other nominees and none were received. Rand motioned to accept Smith-Andrews by acclamation. Allen seconded. Motioned unanimously APPROVED. Rand and Zagumny thanked Smith-Andrews for her service.

Other such matters. Stretz pointed out that Academic Council had passed a new Policy No. 223 that defined hybrid. Stretz wanted to point out because it would not come before Administrative Council until University Assembly. Stretz asked that everyone look at the definition of hybrid and make sure it worked for everyone. There were some issues with the definition and how it would work within Banner and how it would communicate to the students what modality we would be operating in. Rand asked how to obtain access. Smith-Andrews suggested that Stretz could post it within the chat and Diane Smith could make it available to

everyone in the TEAMS files for Administrative Council. Stretz indicated she would email to Diane Smith and she would make it available.

Allen motioned to adjourn. Rand seconded. Adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

Diane Smith, recorder

Documents on file with minutes:

Agenda of April 7, 2021

Minutes of January 27, 2021

Constitution for American Foundry Society of Tennessee Tech

Constitution for Double Reeds of Tennessee Tech

New Policies:

Textbooks and Course-Related Materials Policy No. 295

Gift vs. Sponsored Grants and Contracts Policy No. 538

Procurement on Sponsored Projects Policy No. 572

Revised Policies:

Record Retention and Disposition Policy No. 113

Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Policy No. 513

Grants, Contracts and Cooperative Agreements Policy No. 516

Compliance (Athletics) Policy No. 903

Investigations of NCAA Violations Policy No. 905

Amorous Relationships (Athletics) Policy No. 970

Tabled Policy:

Key Control Policy No. 561

Annual Reports:

Athletics – Diversity Issues

Athletics – Gender Equity

Committees reporting to Administrative Council

Revised Procedures:

Student Financial Aid Committee