

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA
2005-2006 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
 April 6, 2006

<u>Division</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
President	Richard Rice	
Past-President		Marvin Ernst
At-Large	Cheryl Robinson, Jonathan McNair Joanie Sompayrac	Stephen Kuhn, Claire McCullough, Judith Wakim
Adjunct		Tim Parker
Behavioral	Shela Van Ness, Helen Eigenberg, David Brodsky	Fritz Efaw
Business	Debbie Archambeault, Chris Brockman, John Alvis	Beni Asllani
Engineering	Joe Dumas, Jim Hiestand, Kathy Winters	Roger Briley
Fine Arts	Gavin Townsend	Matt Greenwell, Jillian Zwilling
CHEPS	Burch Oglesby	Kay Lindgren, Linda Johnston, Dana Wertemberger, Ted Miller, Robin Lee
Humanities	Vicki Steinberg, Jennifer Beech Tony Steinhoff, Chuck Lippy	Elizabeth Gailey
Library	Mike Bell	Priscilla Seaman
Math & Science	Bob Marlowe, Betsy Darken, Gretchen Potts, Sharon Brueggeman	Henry Spratt
Ex-Officio	Herb Burhenn, David Pittenger, Theresa Liedtka, Jocelyn Sanders	Roger Brown, Richard Brown, Mary Lynn Williamson

Among the Guests Present: Sandy Zitkus, Deborah Parker, Linda Orth, Charles Nelson, Monty Wilson, Yvonne Kilpatrick

Summary

Associate Provost David Pittenger warned the faculty that a new record-keeping system, which is expected to be in place for fall of 2008, will rigorously enforce prerequisites. Departments who have been using “prerequisite” to mean, “we recommend, but do not insist, that you take this course first,” are hereby warned that they may wish to make changes to the 2007-2008 catalog.

The Senate elected President-Elect Gavin Townsend to be the UTC representative on the system-wide UT Faculty Council.

President Rice discussed the hot-off-the-presses 2006-2007 UTC budget report. The compression problem may—or may not—be addressed to a minimal extent this coming year.

The Senate endorsed a statement prepared by the Classroom Technology Committee urging that standard technology costs become a permanent part of the budget, so that Student Technology Fees, grants, and so on, can be used to fund innovations.

The Senate directed the Standards Committee to report back in two weeks with recommended revisions to the policy on courses waivers/substitutions or with a request for more time to study the matter.

The Senate approved curriculum recommendations from the Graduate Council pertaining to graduate education and business programs and a revived executive MBA program.

The Provost asked the faculty to participate in the Provost's Annual Report.

Minutes

1. Call to Order

The meeting came to order at 3:10 p.m.

2. Approval of the minutes of March 23, 2006

The minutes were approved with the corrections that Linda Orth and Burch Oglesby were in attendance.

Associate Provost David Pittenger, commented on remarks made at the last meeting that perhaps a lottery for free parking could be conducted for faculty who attended commencements. Dr. Pittenger said that it is illegal under state law to run a lottery like this. Using state monies would be “looked upon unfavorably” by state auditors. “What about door prizes,” asked Fritz Efaw. No state funds can be involved in such nefarious activities, implied David Pittenger. President Rice confessed to using his own money to fund door prizes in the past. Visions of free parking decals dissolved into nothingness....

3. Executive Committee Report

a. Representative to system-wide UT Faculty Council

President Rice reported that UT President Petersen seems to be receptive to meeting with the UT Faculty Council and seems inclined to meet with this body at the same

time as UT Board meetings. President Rice preferred that President Petersen meet with the UT Faculty Council separately in Nashville.

Discussion followed about the representative to be elected for UTC. There seemed to be a consensus that current or former Senate members would be most appropriate, as they would be abreast of the issues. The charter of the UT Faculty Council does not specify how the representative is to be elected; each campus is different regarding faculty governance. President Rice pointed out that this three-year position is important, especially for continuity. Most faculty presidents serving on this Council have one-year terms. Betsy Darken suggested that the about-to-be-former faculty president would be a good choice. The about-to-be-former president hinted that his predecessor, Marvin Ernst, who served three years in the president's job ("Bless his heart!") might also be a good choice. Joe Dumas moved and Jim Hiestand seconded the nomination of president-elect Gavin Townsend as representative to the UT Faculty Council. The motion carried unanimously.

b. Extending Cheryl Robinson's term

Betsy Darken, the Faculty Senate Secretary, asked the Senate to approve extending Cheryl Robinson's replacement at-large term through next year. Professor Robinson was elected earlier this semester to temporarily replace an at-large member with a class conflict. Said member turns out to have class conflicts with Senate meeting times through all of 2006-2007. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Budget Summary (attached to the end of these minutes)

President Rice reported that weeks of budget talks have resulted in a plan for spending money obtained from a range of tuition increases. This plan includes a must-do list of items (e.g., salaries, increased electrical costs, rollovers and promotions, and a minimal faculty pay plan) to be funded by the first 7% of any tuition increase. This plan is based on the assumption that the state will come through and provide enough funds to cover at least 1% of its 2% mandated salary adjustment. Currently the legislature wants universities to fund this increase themselves through tuition increases.

Other items on the list will be funded according to the amount of tuition increase. For instance, it would take an 8% tuition increase to fund a "faculty pay plan" at a level of \$250,000. While this funding, which will address the compression problem, is well below the \$470,000 to \$1,000,000 necessary to fix the problem, it is more money than has been applied in the past.

It would take a 9% tuition increase to fund library acquisitions, graduate assistants, academic operating, equipment and travel; 9.9% to fund "Student Health," and so on down the line, with funding for "Student Info System Personnel for Implementation" last on the list, to be funded only if there is a 15% tuition increase. Apparently it is

very unlikely that the state will approve a double digit increase. Discussion ensued as to why some campuses are permitted higher tuition increases than other campuses.

d. Elections

Faculty Senate Secretary Betsy Darken apologized for being slow off the mark in arranging for at-large elections. These elections are to take place in the next week, followed by divisional elections. She asked ranking members of each division to meet with her after the Senate meeting to discuss how to conduct divisional elections immediately following the at-large elections. President Rice thanked the staff of the Walker Teaching Resource Center for their assistance in conducting the at-large elections electronically.

4. Committee on Committees

Professor Joanie Sompayrac, chair of the Committee on Committees, reported that no more volunteers were needed for either the Bookstore or Library Committees, but that other committees had many empty spots. She asked for more volunteers. The committee is staffing faculty committees before administrative committees.

President Rice reinforced Professor Sompayrac's comments, adding that service is vital to the university: if we do not have volunteers serving on faculty committees, "the place won't work."

5. Classroom Technology Committee

Joe Wilferth, chair of the Classroom Technology Committee, asked the Senate to endorse a statement recommending that various instructional technologies needs be made a permanent part of the university budget, thereby freeing special monies, including student technology fees (STF), grants, and so on, to be used for more innovative purposes. This was the original intent of the STF. The motion includes a five-year timeline for phasing in this funding. Currently STF are being used to fund salaries, routine maintenance, etc., instead of new and exciting projects that would keep us on the cutting edge.

Joe Dumas asked how much money would be involved in this shift. Associate Provost David Pittenger said \$1.6-\$1.7 million dollars. Professors Dumas and Brodsky pointed out that moving these expenditures out of the STF and into the regular budget would put them in competition with other budget items, such as salary increases and library funding. Dr. Pittenger explained that in the beginning, STF were intended to be used for time-limited innovative projects. However, due to budget cuts, we migrated to using STF for routine maintenance, etc., as the lesser of two evils. Now that the budget situation is somewhat better, we may be able to revert to the original purpose of STF. Professor Vicki Steinberg pondered aloud the relative merits of funding innovative technology at the expense of other needs. Currently, she

said, UTC is reduced to saving money by “painting over termites in the language labs” [thereby, we trust, killing them].

Kathy Winters pointed out that STF brought us Blackboard and other advances. If STF is now used for maintaining existing technology, we lose out on innovative technologies. The STF is paying for what the state should be maintaining. Judith Wakim said that we need to go on record as saying that we regard new technologies as essential. President Rice remarked that the Senate has precedents for such statements. A few years ago we went on record saying that libraries are a good thing to fund at universities. [Laughter.] Professor Rice added that this can become a tricky budget game. Is the STF considered part of tuition, which is capped by the state? How can this be handled to benefit UTC the most? David Pittenger commented that there is really only one pot of money and added that UTK has cleverly instituted across-the-board increases on *all* fees. The STF has not increased in years. Jonathan McNair and others reiterated that point that we must stay up with the cutting edge of technology in order to stay competitive; “innovative” has become “essential.” Professor Van Ness suggested that since the Tennessee Legislature always has excuses for why higher education shouldn’t get any more money, we should put technology monies in a special fund—so parents and students will become aware of under-funding here and complain about it. Fritz Efaw reminded the Senate that the Budget and Economic Committee has already recommended that students receive itemized bills, so they know where their money is going. Vicki Steinberg suggested that students be given the choice of spending their money on technology or the “lazy river” swimming pool in the new wellness center. [And will the termites at this pool also be “painted over”?]

In response to a question, Provost Burhenn said that he doubted that it would make any difference where the money comes from. There is not much flexibility in the budget for next year, mainly due to substantial personnel commitments. The year after next may be better. Associate Provost Pittenger commented that the STF is not even covering current expenses; adjustments have been made using money from general funds. Gretchen Potts suggested that the technology fee be structured so that students have an incentive to enroll for 12 hours instead of just 9 hours. For instance, charge \$12 per credit hour, not to exceed \$100.

Vicki Steinberg moved that the Senate endorse the recommendation. The motion passed.

6. Standards Committee

Jane Brower reported that the Standards Committee has considered some issues related to the policy on course waivers/substitutions for students with disabilities and asked if the Senate wanted the committee to reconsider this policy. President Rice said that the Executive Committee has asked the Standards Committee to do so. Provost Burhenn said that the Senate is welcome to make suggestions. Further discussion indicated there was some confusion regarding the most current version of

the policy. Betsy Darken moved and Gavin Townsend seconded that the matter be referred back to the Standards Committee, with the directive that this committee is to report back to the Senate in two weeks, either to update the Senate on recommended revisions to the policy or to request more time to consider the policy. The motion passed.

7. Graduate Council

Joe Dumas, chair of the Graduate Council, presented the following recommendations:

- a. EDUC 591 information item: change of a prerequisite course EDUC 500 for M.Ed.
- b. EDSP 428 & 528: New Courses (Introduction to Autism)
- c. Change in course requirements for M. Ed.
- d. EDUC 503: change number to 518
- e. EDUC 503: proposed course addition
- f. Executive MBA program proposal
- g. Changes in College of Business course titles and hours

In response to a question from Jim Hiestand, Dr. Dumas commented that the Executive MBA program, which is driven primarily by company demands, had been discontinued around 2000 because of fall-off in demand. Demand is now on the rise. Professor Hiestand also commented that “urban” seemed to be used as a code word for “poorer” in the education proposals. President Rice asked how the cost of adjuncts would be covered; the response that this would be covered by program fees and adjustments in other areas. Betsy Darken asked for a clarification of the proposal regarding Education 500, 501, 504, and 515. The motion to approve the proposal passed, 19-0-0.

8. Administrative Reports

Provost Burhenn, supported by President Rice, urged all to participate in the Provost’s Annual Report—it’s good for bragging purposes.

Associate Provost Pittenger said that a new student information system could be in place by late 2007 or early 2008. It will be very flexible; for instance, it will be able to handle the grade replacement/course repeat policy. Unlike in the past, there will be no requests to the faculty asking us to change the curriculum to comply with software limitations.

However, Dr. Pittenger also gave a warning: this system will be very rigorous about enforcing prerequisites. Departments that have been using prerequisites as recommendations rather than requirements should mend their ways before this new system goes into operation. Using prerequisites to indicate the best way to proceed—rather than the only way—is going to cause trouble. Departments were advised to take appropriate modifications to their prerequisites to the Curriculum Committee no later than Reading Day of fall semester, in order for these changes to appear in the

2007-2008 catalog. Students who lack prerequisites will be blocked from registering, although accommodations can be made by instructors or department heads. Corequisites will also be enforced.

Registrar Linda Orth affirmed that the new system will conform to the rules we set. In addition, the new system should permit electronic reporting of final grades.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Faculty Concerns

None.

11. Adjournment

The Senate adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Darken
Faculty Senate Secretary

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
 FY 2006-07 Budget & Planning Summary
 1% = \$282,692

Net of Scholarship Cost

USES OF FUNDS	7%	8%	9%	9.9%	10%	11%	12%	13%	14%	15%
Computational Engineer Graduate Faculty	\$1,978,844	\$2,261,536	\$2,544,228	\$2,798,651	\$2,826,920	\$3,109,612	\$3,392,304	\$3,674,996	\$3,957,688	\$4,240,380
Utility Increase	520000	520000	520000	520000	520000	520000	520000	520000	520000	520000
1% cost of Potential Salary Increase	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000
Faculty Rollovers & Promotions	565000	565000	565000	565000	565000	565000	565000	565000	565000	565000
Faculty Rollovers & Promotions	120000	120000	120000	120000	120000	120000	120000	120000	120000	120000
Doctoral Program in Education Rollover	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000
Additional Faculty for Gen Ed Courses	150000	150000	150000	150000	150000	150000	150000	150000	150000	150000
Development Officer (Including Benefits)	60000	60000	60000	60000	60000	60000	60000	60000	60000	60000
Faculty Pay Plan	163844	250000	250000	250000	250000	467000	467000	467000	467000	467000
Nonfaculty Pay Plan		196536	250000	250000	250000	250000	250000	250000	250000	250000
Library Acquisitions			50000	50000	50000	50000	100000	200000	200000	200000
Graduate Assistants			50000	50000	50000	50000	50000	50000	50000	50000
Academic Operating and Equipment & Travel			129228	200000	200000	200000	400000	400000	400000	400000
Student Success Center				65000	65000	65000	65000	65000	65000	65000
Student Health				60000	60000	60000	60000	60000	60000	60000
Student Life Issues				50000	50000	50000	50000	50000	50000	50000
Building Maintenance				8651	36920	50000	50000	150000	200000	300000
Chancellor's Discretionary Fund						40400	40400	40400	40400	40400
University Marketing						12212	44904	27596	150288	207980
IT Security & Equipment								60000	135000	200000
Student Info System Personnel for Implementation								40000	75000	135000
TOTALS	1978844	2261536	2544228	2798651	2826920	3109612	3392304	3674996	3957688	4240380
Zero Test	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$0)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Footnotes:
 One time funds needed for Searches for Key Positions
 One time funds needed for Student Information System
 One Time funds needed for University Marketing
 One Time funds needed for Women's Center
 Plan to increase Faculty Equity & compression by 1 Million over 5 year period
 Plan to increase nonfaculty equity & compression by 1 Million (\$500,00 exempt, \$500,00 Nonexempt) over 5 year period
 Potential \$15 to \$40 Debt Service Fee Increase for Student Wellness Center

**Statement from the Classroom Technology Committee
Endorsed by the Senate, April 6, 2006**

We, the faculty at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, recognize the problem of using grant resources, gifts and endowments, and/or the Student Technology Fee to fund recurring technology expenses, i.e., through deferred maintenance or replacement, for instructional technologies that are now as essential to UTC's mission and infrastructure as water and electricity. Recognizing the importance of such instructional technologies – both in the classroom and online – and recognizing the evolution of and historical changes in our institution, we therefore support permanent funding for the University's instructional technology needs.¹

We believe such instructional technologies are essential to the success of the University's mission and daily operations, and as such require appropriate permanent funding. Additionally, whereas classroom technologies and instructional resources continue to be funded by grants, endowments, or the Student Technology Fee, little/no funds remain to initiate new resources/projects on our campus. Toward moving such items to the E&G budget, i.e., Blackboard licensing and support, support staff salaries, library databases, and more, we request a 5-year timeline. Such a request, we understand, requires that we collectively evaluate and potentially revise the way we currently operate both programs (e.g., Media Resources) and positions.

¹ As of academic year 2005-06, we have 106 of Lupton/smart podia in the classrooms across campus. Whereas installation began in 2002, some of these podia are now four years old. Others, indeed the majority, were installed in 2003-04 academic year and will need key maintenance and updating in the coming semesters. VCRs, computers, computer screens, document cameras, etc. included in those podia either need replacement already or will need replacement in the near future. Additional examples of technology infrastructure that is maintained annually by one-time money: Blackboard licensing and support, library article database subscriptions, ITD Help Desk and Network Services personnel (nearly half of whom are funded by the Student Tech Fee), and more.