

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA
2005-2006 FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
 November 3, 2005

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

Among the Guests Present: Deborah Arfken, Ron Bailey, Mary Tanner, Linda Orth, John Graef, Clint Smullen, and Gregory Heath

SUMMARY

Several deans addressed questions about the balance within their colleges between teaching, scholarship, and service. The faculty continued to express concerns about the roles of teaching and service, merit pay vs. cost of living adjustments, and other issues. The Senate passed a proposal changing the grade appeal process in the Graduate School.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

The meeting came to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of October 30, 2005

The minutes were approved with several corrections: (a) faculty research grants are being funded through university reserves this year, not the UC Foundation; (b) Claire McCullough made the comment about 10 office hours per week; and (c) Jonathan McNair's grant was for \$15,000.

3. Executive Committee Report

Regarding the new logo, Professor Matt Greenwell, a graphic design artist, is working with Chuck Cantrell and the University Relations staff to make a few modifications. Mr. Cantrell held up a draft of a revised logo and commented that the purpose of developing the new logo was to reflect the traditions of UTC. He said that departments can certainly use up their supplies of stationery, business cards, etc., containing the current logo.

Regarding the status of Handbook revisions, Matt Greenwell, chair of the Handbook Committee, reported that due to a glitch, the revisions will not be considered by the Board of Trustees until their spring meeting. In the meantime, most of the changes can be approved through administrative channels and will be in place for next semester. The only exceptions are the new faculty categories, which will need to be approved by the Board.

President Rice reported on several items. First, UT President Petersen has responded to the letter sent to him by the Executive Committee. President Rice has made this letter available to the faculty. Second, the UTK faculty is developing a charter for a system-wide UT Faculty Council. Last week President Rice and representatives from other campuses made suggestions for this charter and the UTK Executive Committee accepted these changes. The modified document is being presented to the UTK Senate for a vote in November. If the UTK Senate approves it, then it will be brought before the UTC Senate. Fritz Efav asked who had initiated this idea and President Rice said it was UTK.

President Rice reported on a problem with the general education reciprocity agreement with Tennessee Board of Regents schools (TBR). TBR has told UTC that it cannot accept the package of general education courses from UTC transfer students as completely satisfying TBR general education requirements because TBR is required by Tennessee law to include two semesters of U.S. history or one semester of U.S. history and one semester of Tennessee history. When this law was passed, UTC obtained a waiver from this requirement. This matter has been referred to the General Education Committee. Registrar Linda Orth remarked that UTC has an agreement with TBR to accept a 60-hour module of courses from TBR transfer students; the acceptance of a

completed TBR general education module is not contingent on obtaining a TBR associate's degree.

4. Deans' Comments

President Rice commented on the system used this year for distributing merit pay. While this system provided about 50% of the faculty with so-called merit pay (about the same as at UTK but less than UT-Martin), it failed to address the chronic cost-of-living problem. This has had a serious effect on morale. The question is how to reward excellence without demoralizing the rest of the faculty. Both President Petersen and Chancellor Brown have said that guidelines for identifying exceptional performance and maintaining an appropriate balance among scholarship, teaching, and service need to be worked out at the departmental level; then reward structures can be based on these guidelines. But how can departments work out such guidelines without knowing what the view is from the top? We have been described as a comprehensive regional university. Departments need to know the missions of their colleges within this context before they can develop guidelines. Thus the Executive Committee has invited the deans to answer the following questions:

- a. What is the general philosophical view in your college concerning the balance between research, teaching, and service?
- b. How do you foresee promoting this in your incentives/rewards structure this year and in the future?
- c. Chancellor Brown (and President Petersen) has requested faculty input on these issues. How will you involve faculty in your college?

Dean Burhenn was out of town and will make his comments on the next Senate meeting. Dean Richard Casavant was not present.

a. Ron Bailey, Dean of the College of Engineering and Computer Science

Dean Ron Bailey first discussed the question of balance. The balance between scholarship, teaching, and service changes over time as we re-evaluate where we want to go. He emphasized the importance of flexibility, especially at the individual level. For instance there are times when individuals are rewarded for exceptional service for developing new degree programs, which is a lot of work. However, while there is flexibility at the individual and departmental levels, the college must also meet college and university goals. We cannot, for instance, have everyone ignore research.

The college is trying to come up with a document regarding exceptional merit, but there will be differences from department to department. Departments are engaged in developing their own guidelines. The college exceptional merit guidelines will require a faculty member to meet expectations in all three areas and exceed expectations in at least one area. Expectations for exceptional merit will be adjusted for rank, e.g., an associate professor's exceptional merit criteria will be like the criteria for a full professor's "meets expectations."

The college has developed specific initiatives that need attention. These include a number of ways to enhance learning, increase enrollment, develop partnerships, expand research, and enhance organizational effectiveness. As dean, Dr. Bailey is pragmatic about these initiatives: if he is the one who wants to pursue them, then they are not going to happen. Each faculty member is required to explain how their accomplishments at the end of every year related to these initiatives. Those that are not in the plan will not receive much weight. External funding is very important. In the future, there will be a tighter link between incentives/rewards and the EDO, along with additional incentives to encourage research.

It is critical for faculty to have a shared vision. UTC has come a long way in its 119 year history, but it will stall out at “good,” not excellent, and have a very uncertain future if the vision is “fuzzy.” The 1725 people on the faculty and staff Raven list, the UTC administration, the UT administration, the Tennessee legislature and the citizens of Tennessee need a shared vision. The dean will be optimistic about our future if we get behind such a shared vision. In his college, continued growth will be driven by research and partnerships, with more and more funding coming from external grants.

b. Theresa Liedtka, Dean of the Library

The 15 library faculty are neither fish nor fowl. Given their job requirements, emphasis is placed on non-research performance. Library faculty must be effective in collaborating with the faculty. Research expectations are oriented toward staying current. Last year the faculty defended its expectations for rank, including quantifiable expectations. This year they have a task force to work out a paradigm for exceptional merit.

c. Mary Tanner, Dean of the College of Health, Education, and Professional Studies

Dean Tanner remarked that her college is highly diversified, with seven separate academic units, 25 concentrations, and four degrees from bachelor’s to doctoral; 56% of UTC’s graduate students are in CHEPS. The 12 professional licenses offered by CHEPS can lose accreditation unless they meet high expectations from accreditation agencies. CHEPS is in the world of practice and the focus in CHEPS is on student learning.

On the question of balance: The weighting begins with departmental guidelines and by-laws. Last year all units reviewed and rewrote their guidelines, received a review from the provost, and are refining these guidelines now. The balance among scholarship, teaching, and service varies from program to program, with accreditation and other requirements taken into account.

On the reward structure: Departments have been asked to review their guidelines to see if they adequately address merit considerations. Department heads are thinking about EDO practices and how their handling of the EDO process might be made more transparent. Expectations are adjusted for rank. These discussions have focused on clearly differentiating between goals and basic job duties; individual EDO goals must have tie-ins with departmental goals.

On faculty involvement: The faculty creates and approves departmental guidelines, then uses them to plan their own activities for EDO, tenure, etc. The guiding principle for department heads is that the faculty in each unit determine the guidelines. The dean emphasizes the importance of clear and consistent administrative communication.

d. Discussion

Fritz Efaw asked the deans how they would feel if the administration told them that only one of them (20% of the deans) would receive a salary increase this coming year. Dean Liedtka responded that she would live with it, as she does not expect an increase every year. Dean Bailey said that of course he would not be happy but he believes in performance measures.

President Rice asked if the UT system is planning on disbursing raises (if there are any) this year as it was done last year. The Provost responded that no policy has been established as yet, but he expects the emphasis on rewarding merit to continue. How much money will be available for increases and how it will be split is unknown. Dean Bailey commented that in his college last year, 94.5% of the faculty received at least a 1.5% raise, with 55% receiving greater than 1.5%.

President Rice commented on an article in the newspaper about President Petersen's strategic planning goals. These seem narrowly focused and imply that resources will be focused on only a few departments. Provost Friedl responded that these are resources for growth, different from resources for merit pay, salaries, etc. Strategic planning will have an impact on how faculty lines are shifted, etc.

Betsy Darken asked the deans how much weight they placed on teaching and service. In particular, do faculty members in their colleges receive exceptional merit for exceptional service? Dean Tanner replied that the weighting of service, teaching, and scholarship is determined within departments, and that some faculty "absolutely" receive exceptional merit for exceptional service. Dean Bailey said that "a deal is made" for each faculty member and that faculty do receive exceptional merit for exceptional teaching and exceptional service. He also remarked that "people seem to hate the EDO process" but that he sees it as a lot better than evaluation systems he has experienced, where faculty members got letters from their department heads up front saying "...but I wish you'd done..." This problem is cleared up when expectations are put in writing. Dean Liedtka said that since she has only 3 slots for exceptional merit, it is a struggle to decide who gets it even when there is agreement on goals. What if more than 20% of her faculty exceed expectations? She is struggling to come up with an answer.

Tony Steinhoff pointed out that it is incorrect to refer to last year's 1.5% or 3% salary adjustments as "raises" since they were below last year's cost-of-living increase of over 3%. These salary adjustments are cost-of-living adjustments (COLA). The 3% across-the-board increases that administrators and staff received were COLA. How did they become merit raises for faculty? President Rice commented that he was glad that a five

year period was used to determine salary increases, so that about 50% of the faculty's raises matched the 2005 COLA. However, the salaries of "meets expectations" faculty who received only 1.5% went down in effect since this was below COLA.

Claire McCullough wants to know the rules of the game ahead of time and affirmed that faculty receive exceptional merit for service in her college (Engineering). Jim Hiestand said he is not primarily concerned with money but with the quality of teaching. He is concerned that the increased emphasis on scholarship will mean less emphasis on teaching. He went to the economics talk given by a Nobel prizewinner at UTC recently and "it was one of the worst talks I've ever heard." Teaching requires a lot of interaction. He himself went to a near world-class graduate school and while "playing with the pros was useful," he prefers to teach at a place where good teaching is valued. Can we no longer afford to be such a place? He added that at the University of Virginia, 8% of their budget comes from state funds, while at the University of Michigan it is 18%.

Kathy Winters commented on the advantages of a merit pay system. She worked at TVA when it transitioned from across-the-board raises to merit pay: while there were problems, people became more focused on what TVA was trying to achieve. The competitive element was OK. She believes that merit pay may help UTC set and achieve goals. It may be painful in the beginning but it will get better. Beni Asllani addressed the matter of the balance between teaching, service and scholarship. In his college (Business), it is necessary but not sufficient to earn merit in all 3 to be eligible for exceptional merit. Joanie Sompayrac had no compunction about merit pay but wants to know the rules of the game ahead of time. She also reported that among people at a UT meeting on academic affairs, it was taken for granted that UTK is the research flagship while UTC and UT-Martin are for teaching. Our students have lower ACT scores than UTK and we need to spend more time on teaching. Shela Van Ness added that the idea of merit pay is wonderful, but we're not getting merit raises. For 15 years, our salary adjustments have been below COLA. Real faculty income has been going down steadily. Compression is a big problem, with new faculty making more than older faculty. These problems must be addressed or faculty will leave.

Steve Kuhn said that when it comes to a reward structure, the devil is in the details. The evaluation of teaching, for instance, is not just a matter of looking at student evaluations. This isn't even close. Richard Rice said that merit systems tend to reward research because it is easier to measure. Provost Friedl commented that to a certain extent, everyone at UTC is a good teacher—if we do not enjoy teaching, we get out. Thus there is a very narrow margin of difference. He tells the new faculty every year not to expect tenure or promotion unless they're good teachers and if there is no record of scholarship. Evaluating teaching is a problem because there is no external validity. He described how he had checked out ratings for UTC professors at ratemyprofessors.com, which is presumably "invalid equally across the U.S.," and found "not a whole lot of difference" between UTC professors and professors from a mixture of other institutions. Overall, UTC is in the bottom half. It will take some work for UTC to be the "premier teaching Matt Greenwell commented teaching should be measured in terms of what creates

excellent students. He also said that if the administration assumes that we are all good teachers, this implies that they will just reward research.

5. Graduate Council

Joe Dumas, Chair of the Graduate Council, presented a proposal for modifying the grade appeals process. Matt Greenwell moved and Tony Steinhoff seconded approval of the proposal. A friendly amendment was accepted for the following change: "...grades available *to him/her*," for the purpose of clarifying that some students are not on RAP and do not receive their grades electronically but through the U.S. mail. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Blackboard

Due to the lateness of the hour, the discussion about Blackboard was deferred.

7. Administrative Reports

None.

8. Other Business

None.

9. Faculty Concerns

Shela Van Ness expressed concern over matters related to the alleged rape. She has heard that possible defendants have been speaking to potential witnesses. She is also concerned that the Chancellor was not notified in a timely fashion. Chuck Cantrell agreed that this affair has been an embarrassment to the University. In regard to a student's complaints about not being able to distribute a flier, Mr. Cantrell remarked that only representatives of campus organizations can distribute information inside the University Center. Anyone can distribute information on the sidewalks and streets as long as they are not causing a public nuisance or blocking traffic.

10. Adjournment

The Senate adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Darken
Faculty Senate Secretary