

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
January 15, 2004

Faculty Senate Members Present: Obasi H. Akan, Rich Allen, Mike Bell, Stephanie Bellar, Nicholas Boer, Chris Brockman, Linda Collins, Neal Coulter, Fritz Efaw, Marvin Ernst, David Garrison, Matt Greenwell, Jim Henry, Jim Hiestand, Lauri Hyers, Anne Johnson, Rick Keyser, Robin Lee, Anne Lindsey, Claire McCullough, Gail Meyer, Greg O’Dea, Burch Oglesby, Gretchen Potts, Stacy Ray, Sean Richards, John Trimpey, Judith Wakim, Randy Walker, Joe Wilferth

Faculty Senate Members Absent: David Ashe, Roger Briley, Parthansarati Dilepan, Terry LeMoyné

Ex-Officio Members Present: John Friedl, Jocelyn Sanders, Bill Stacy, Dan Quarles

Among the Guests Present: Deborah Arfken, Herb Burhenn, Jim Cunningham, Meg Farrell, Phil Kazemersky, Charles Nelson, Linda Orth, Tom Patty, David Pittenger,

January 15, 2004

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:05. Faculty Senate President requested the consent of the Senate to revise the agenda to include Dr. Trimpey who will speak to the 120 hour rule progress and Dr. Arfken who will present the revised 2003-2004 summer schedule and the 2004-2005 calendars for approval by the Senate. There was unanimous consent for the revision of the agenda.

Approval of the Minutes: There was a request to clarify the language of the minutes of November 20, 2003 on the third page in the section on *Standards for Graduation*. The 42 hour rule is in reference to required 300-400 level credit hours found in degree regulations which will now be reduced to the 39 hour rule. It was noted that the sentence in the next to last paragraph, last sentence, in fact is not a complete sentence. Noting these clarifications, the minutes were passed unanimously.

Executive Council Report: Faculty Senate President Ernst reported on several items.

1. Proposed policy on Sexual Harassment is still tied up in Knoxville
2. Implementation of the required 120 hour rule hangs over us, it is imperative t we get this done.
3. Like everyone, the Executive Council is concerned about the budget. There are many rumors about possibilities as diverse as a 5% reduction, mandate or fund a raise. Dr. Ernst urges the Faculty Senators to keep an eye on the news about the state budget.
4. Given the realities of fiscal constraints the faculty should have a leading voice in ranking priorities. This is a matter for the all of the faculty.

Administrative Reports:

Chancellor Stacy—no report

Provost Friedl: Chattanooga State has approached UTC hoping to establish an articulation agreement like the one we have with Cleveland State. This action alerts us to the need to develop a generic TRB agreement. Dr. Friedl has asked Dr. J. Sanders to investigate this possibility. Moreover, it would be most beneficial if we could have such an agreement worked out before the summer meeting of the Board of Trustees so that the policy will be in place in a timely way. Articulation has forced the issue of the 120 hour rule, general education, and University graduation requirements (three competencies) which all need to be scanned at the same time.

New Business:

Dr. Trimpey reported on a motion from the Council of Academic Department Heads which reads

“Council of Academic Department Heads recommends that there be affirmation from the Faculty Senate of no direct changes to general education or university requirements during this “transition” to 120 hours. Departments may incorporate within their programs modifications”. This prompted a vigorous discussion of actions taken towards resolving the 120 hour rule. There are a multitude of issues to consider. For example, what is the catalog deadline? How can departments begin to address the issue if they do not know what general education has in mind? What are the implications for the graduation requirements, that is, the competency based requirements, where do they fit in the mix? There is one strain of thought which suggests that programs will not be granted exceptions to the 120 rule if they have failed to roll university requirements into their curriculum. Are the graduation competencies in the purview of the general education committee? It seems there has been a difference of opinion from the Chairs of GE on this issue. What is clear is that if a general education class, one that is currently certified, is changed in response to rolling in university requirements that class will have to be recertified. Dr. Trimpey cautioned everyone to remember that the TBR schools had over a year to work on this plan. The UT system is playing catch up here.

Dr. Pittenger (wearing both a department head hat and chair of the Curriculum Committee hat) opined that we are walking in the wilderness without a map or a compass. The purpose of the motion was to create the crisis so that we would do

something. And, the Curriculum Committee as well as Faculty Senate will be overwhelmed if we have to treat all of the proposals separately. It was suggested that if possible some type of omnibus curriculum change bill should be passed.

Another question dealt with how will cutting GE affect the current articulation agreement with Cleveland and other TBR schools? Currently the core GE requirements are very similar.

There are several options. One is to take it all eight hours out of GE. Other options are to split it, take it out of major, or allow each College to have different GE requirements. It was noted that not all departments have electives. For example, Engineering already has a reduction in GE due to their heavy load of required hours.

There was a motion to charge the ad hoc 120 hour rule committee to consider the articulation agreement, university requirements, and general education. The motion was that they should report back to the Faculty Senate by February 19. The motion was seconded. There was a friendly amendment to have the report due on February 5, the Senator offering the second agreed to the friendly nature of the amendment. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Dr. Arfken and Mrs. Orth presented the academic calendars for the Faculty Senate to approve. There were changes in the Summer 2004 First and Second PM to even out the contact hours.

2004-2005 The major issue here is to manage when the spring semester starts. Spring works ok if there is no reading day in the spring. All grades due on the same day---no graduation grades due. There were a few questions about the timing of the 2005 summer schedule, if the contact hours were the same was the major concern.

It was moved and seconded that the Faculty Senate authorize Dr. Arfken and Mrs. Orth to make the changes necessary to even out the nights for summer 2004 and perhaps for the summer 2005.

With a voice vote, the Academic calendars, with the check of summer contact hours, for summer 2004 and academic year 2004-2005, passed.

Dr. Pittenger pulled the curriculum committee report until he and the Faculty Senate Secretary have an opportunity to compare information.

The presentation of the ad hoc committee on incentive pay was made by Dr. Jim Henry who will not be a member of the Faculty Senate the remaining part of this semester as he has a class conflict this term. Dr. Henry has provided the url to the presentation material to the general campus community through several emails. The committee moved the adoption of the policy.

In discussion Provost Friedl spoke to why he does not like this policy. It is the job expectation that faculty who work in areas that are “grant rich” will pursue those grants, this is discipline driven. Other points made were:

1. needs to be said this will not apply all over campus
2. because it is grant driven, disciplines will be treated unevenly
3. Academic Affairs loses some of its control over the ability to use cost saving to cover a wide range of activities outside of the departments that bring in the grant
4. he is bothered a bit by paying people for normal time worked.

There was a lengthy discussion on the issues involved in this plan. One Senator argued that we should keep in mind why the committee was formed, to protect a benefit we have enjoyed which is extra service pay. Another question was “how can you do more than a normal work week?” Use the grant to buy out time is the type of policy that the Provost wanted. Replace the class to allow time to do the research. The Provost has tried to steer the new grants to course release time. Older grants are being renewed as they were written. A different concern was that this incentive plan that rewards only one aspect of the job.

Then there was a procedural question about second readings “Do we have the permission of the Faculty Senate to do a second reading?” Dr. Efaw moved to table the motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Faculty Concerns: On graduation candidates should faculty vote? Standards will visit this issue.

Where is the \$100,000 base salary adjustment? Policy recommendations are waiting on the Governor’s budget.

Meeting adjourned by voice vote.