

Faculty Senate Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
April 5, 2007

The minutes can also be found at: <http://www.utc.edu/FacultySenate/minutes.php>

Division	Present	Absent
President	Gavin Townsend	
Past-President		Richard Rice
At-Large	Jim Hiestand, Randy Walker, Michelle White, Cheryl Robinson, and Joanie Sompayrac	Judith Wakim
Adjunct	Jean Howard-Hill	
Behavioral Sciences	Fritz Efaw and Helen Eigenberg	Lyn Miles and Shela Van Ness
Business Adm.	Debbie Archambeault, Diane Halstead, hris Brockman, Beni Asllani	
Eng & Comp Sci	Claire McCullough, Kathy Winters and Ignatius Formunung	Roger Briley
Fine Arts		Stuart Benkert, Jillian Zwilling and Mac Smotherman
CHEPS	Dolly Gerregano, John Freeman, Michelle Vineyard	Kay Lindgren, Dana Wertemberger, and Linda Johnston
Humanities	Felicia Sturzer, Jennifer Beech, Rebecca Jones, and Bryan Hampton (for Matthew Guy)	Joe Wilferth
Library	Mike Bell	Jason Griffey
Math & Sciences	Sharon Brueggeman, Bob Marlowe and Manuel Santiago	Betsy Darken and Joey Shaw
Ex-Officio	Herb Burhenn, David Pittenger, Theresa Liedtka, Roger Brown, and Jocelyn Sanders	Richard Brown and Hugh Prevost

Among the guests present: Linda Orth, Charles Nelson, Fran Bender, Stephanie Bellar and Barbara Norwood

Summary: All curriculum proposals passed by a vote of 22-0-0. The Senate accepted a report made by the Ad hoc Committee on Heads Vs Chairs. The Senate voted to put a recommendation before the full faculty to reduce the quorum and introduce e-voting (with some modifications) as proposed by the Handbook Committee in Section 2.2 of the handbook. The Senate passed a motion by the Standards Committee to require students to maintain a minimum GPA of 2.0 in all UTC attempted hours, excluding developmental courses. Additionally, the Senate voted to support the Standards Committee in their recommendation that Admissions enforce the “no-rolling admissions” policy. The Senate also voted to delay implementation of the “3-repeat” policy until Fall of 2008.

1. Call to Order:

Meeting was called to order at 3:14 P.M.

2. Approval of minutes from March 20, 2007:

Minutes were approved by voice vote with the following changes: (1) Part 3, 3rd paragraph, change “the legislature” to “Governor Bredesen and Lt. Governor Ramsey, as well as Commissioner of Education Lana Seivers” (2) Part 5b, add “Jean Howard-Hill voiced concern that the Committee of the Non-tenured Faculty (of which she is a member) has not met for the 2006-2007 academic year”.

http://www.utc.edu/Departments/fcouncil/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2006_07/2006_07Minutes/2007Minutes_0320.pdf

3. Curriculum (Bruce Hutchinson)

- a. Women’s Studies Concentration, Interdisciplinary Studies, Approved: 8-0-0
- b. Women’s Studies 496: Senior Seminar, Approved: 8-0-1
- c. Cross listing African American Women’s History (HIST 424) as WSTU 424, Approved: 10-0-0
- d. FREN, GER, GRK, LAT, MLNG, SPAN: Change prerequisites, et al, Approved: 10-0-0
- e. Strategies for Success in Nursing, Approved: 8-0-0
- f. School of Nursing Curriculum Revision: Semester IV, Approved: 8-0-0

The Curriculum Committee recommended approval of the five proposals. Jim Hiestand wondered about Women's Studies 496 about the "him/her". Marcia Noe answered that male students were enrolled in these courses and some of the courses were taught by males. He also wondered about the FLG courses. Felicia Sturzer explained these courses are to give an option of courses (that don't have a current class code) to be taught at the 200-level. All of the proposals passed 22-0-0.

http://www.utc.edu/Administration/FacultySenate/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2006_07/2006_07Attachments/CurriculumProposals_040507.pdf

4. Report from the Ad hoc Committee on Chairs vs Heads (Bruce Hutchinson)

Bruce Hutchinson stated that the report has two parts: (1) the most popular choice was to use "chairs" for departments and (2) overviews the literature on the issue. Chairs are typically a 9-month position at UTC. Some people were concerned with how the chair is chosen. In terms of those issues, the committee did not feel that it was their responsibility to provide answers, but rather to provide research. There is nothing to be gained from resolving issues until a decision has been made. He pointed out that "one-size" does not fit all. It may be best to have three templates for the position that could be decided on by the dean and the department, together. In addition, there may have to be minor adjustments made to take care of accreditation issues. Finally, the issue of how a department chair is chosen must be resolved. He cautioned the Senate to not "bring the negative problems" to the table that have happened in the past. Some of the problems may be eliminated by the change to a new process. But, new problems may arise.

Felicia Sturzer asked how the templates would operate and if there would be a fiscal impact. Bruce Hutchinson answered that the campus must choose to define the position. There would probably be a fiscal impact. A chair on this campus performs many duties that are administrative and could be completed by competent administrative assistant. Removing these responsibilities from the head of the department would then allow for reduction in salaries, and a savings. Kathy Winters asked if the committee proposed that duties (such as scheduling) should be delegated to an administrative assistant. Bruce Hutchinson answered that it was his personal opinion; it was not a committee proposal. She also wondered if the faculty would determine the type of governance specific to their department. Who would have the ultimate decision? Bruce Hutchinson felt the choice of word (chair/head) does not define the position, but rather the dean and the group of faculty should define the position. He would hope that consultation between the dean and the department's faculty could work out issues. If the dean and the faculty could not agree, the issue would go to the Provost.

Gavin Townsend wondered if in the literature search the committee found other universities that had a mix of chairs and heads. Bruce Hutchinson answered that it depended on the size of the university. The committee did not look at UTC's specific peer-schools.

Jim Hiestand wondered what would have happen if someone refuses to become chair. Bruce Hutchinson felt that strong views on this are based more on a historical basis. Jim Hiestand reasoned that someone who did not prefer to be chair would be a sub par chair. Bruce Hutchinson knew of situations where even though people did not want the position, they performed well.

Claire McCullough wondered about the "department loose cannon". Bruce Hutchinson answered that this would be resolved in some by-laws.

Randy Walker wondered that if we, as a Faculty Senate, thought the system was broken. Gavin Townsend answered that this was an information gathering process. Randy Walker also wondered if the positions were 9 months, who would run the university in the other 3 months. Bruce Hutchinson asked if there were really duties that needed to be completed in the summer. What do department heads do in the summer that could not be done during the other 9 months? Also, one should not have to become a department head to receive a pay raise.

Felicia Sturzer commented that situations could be worked out where even though someone is supposed to work for 9 months, some people do work some in the summer. This is balanced by leaving early during some days. Helen Eigenberg questioned what the Senate is being asked to do with this information. Gavin Townsend stated that this was a report from the ad hoc committee. Claire McCullough stated that she had been at another university with chairs and it was her observation that the chair position was a lot more difficult.

Bob Marlowe moved that the Senate accept the report; this was seconded by Diane Halstead. Michelle White asked that the gender laden terminology be changed to gender neutral before it has been posted. This was accepted. Kathy Winters

wondered if accepting the report is an agreement in the report. Diane Halstead stated that the report is informational; it is not agreement with the report. **This was approved by voice vote.**

http://www.utc.edu/Administration/FacultySenate/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2006_07/2006_07CommitteeReports/2007ChairsHeadsCommitteeReport.pdf

5. Faculty Handbook Committee: Discussion on full-faculty meetings and quorum (Joe Wilferth)

Joe Wilferth had to have emergency surgery and could not be here. Gavin Townsend asked if the Senate would like to look at the items the committee suggested. Gavin Townsend reminded the Senate of the results of the survey on Blackboard: 77.1% of the respondents wished that the Senate would modify the quorum issue.

The motion from the committee was to reduce quorum to 1/3 of the full faculty, Section 2.2.5. Claire McCullough felt that this was a major issue and it should go to the full faculty. Randy Walker agreed with this. Gavin Townsend asked if then the Senate recommends that this issue be before the full faculty at the next meeting. Felicia Sturzer wondered if this was already covered in the Blackboard vote. Gavin Townsend said that the Blackboard vote was only a survey, not an official vote.

Kathy Winters was concerned that later in the document electronic balloting is suggested. So, if this exists, what is the purpose of reducing the size of the quorum when a traditional quorum could occur with e-voting? Randy Walker said that e-voting does not currently exist so therefore this does not enter the issue at this point. Kathy Winters reminded the Senate that at the last full faculty meeting, the vote to change the quorum did not pass. Gavin Townsend reminded the Senate that the vote did not occur with a quorum and therefore was not official.

Claire McCullough also agreed with Kathy Winters on the fact that if e-voting passed, the reduction of a quorum would be a moot point. Jim Hiestand disagreed because the preference is to have an assembly of the faculty, rather than an online vote. The Handbook Committee separated the two issues on purpose because e-voting is a separate issue from the quorum. **The Senate voted to put a recommendation before the full faculty to reduce the quorum and accept the language as proposed by the Handbook Committee in Section 2.2.5 of the handbook.**

Claire McCullough moved that the Senate study the e-voting issue. This was seconded by Joanie Sompayrac. Because there were no objections, the Senate moved on to discuss the issue of e-voting.

Discussion on Section 2.2.6: E-voting was designed with the assumption that the meetings of the full faculty would go to one per term.

Under Part 6: Jim Hiestand made a motion to amend Part 6 to state "Once the voting starts it should proceed with only periodic reminders about the deadline to vote." This was seconded by Fritz Efaw. Fritz reminded the Senate that the problem with e-voting does not allow for amendments. **The amendment passed by voice vote.**

Under Part 5: Kathy Winters made a motion to amend Part 5 to change the three days of voting to five days of voting. This was seconded by Jean Howard-Hill. **This amendment passed by a vote of 12 – 10 – 2.**

Under Part 8: Jim Hiestand wanted a clarification on Part 8 that states "the success or failure of a motion, is therefore determined a simple majority". He moved an amendment for this to be changed to "affirmative vote of at least 40% of the full faculty." This was seconded by Fritz Efaw. This means that it must be 40% of those eligible to vote. Claire McCullough stated that by accepting this amendment the number of those required to vote affirmative on an issue would be increased. Jennifer Beech stated that she did not agree with the amendment. Randy Walker felt that this amendment would make it more difficult for the full faculty to pass votes. **This amendment failed by voice vote.**

Under Part 3: Ignatius Formunung wondered why part 3 did not allow for amendments. Gavin Townsend indicated that using e-voting makes amendments difficult.

Under Part 8: Randy Walker moved an amendment to add "**of those voting**" at the end of the phrase. This was seconded by Kathy Winters. Fritz Efaw wondered if the full faculty would have an opportunity to discuss the 40% amendment. Randy Walker and Claire McCullough clarified that the full faculty can amend anything that is brought before them. **The amendment passed by voice vote.**

Joanie Sompayrac called the question on the e-voting issue. **There were no objections, so the Senate voted to present the Handbook Committee recommendations (with modifications) to the Full Faculty.**

Jean Howard-Hill voiced concern that adjuncts currently do not have input in matters before the full faculty. She asked that the Senate discuss this at a later time. Gavin Townsend stated that the Executive Committee would look at this issue and make a suggestion to the Senate.

http://www.utc.edu/Administration/FacultySenate/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2006_07/2006_07Attachments/2007E VotingQuorumRecommendations.pdf

6. Standards Committee (Fran Bender)

a. Continuation Standards

Fran Bender stated that the Standards Committee recommended a change in the continuation standards that require students to maintain a minimum GPA of 2.0 in all UTC attempted hours, excluding developmental courses. A handout provided (Appendix A) tabulated the impact of the change. The handout illustrates that the problems that UTC has with retention. Felicia Sturzer moved acceptance of the proposal; it was seconded by Jim Hiestand. Jim Hiestand asked what happens to a student who received two successive semesters of 1.8 GPA. Fran Bender answered that the student would be on suspension. Randy Walker asked if this includes summer school. Linda Orth stated that it would. Kathy Winters wondered if UTC has the resources to deal with 100+ more students in this situation. David Pittenger stated yes. **The motion passed by voice vote.**

Admissions statement on rolling admissions: Yancy Freeman stated that rolling admissions has caused quite a problem with students and within offices across campus. The Standards Committee proposes that the Faculty support Admissions' Office and the enforcement of the catalog regulations for admission into UTC. Jennifer Beech asked if the students missed the Dec. 1 deadline would the students be prohibited from summer school. Yancy Freeman stated that students would be allowed to enroll in summer school. He also stated that the "rolling admissions" issue was instituted at a high administrative level. Yancy Freeman wanted the support of the Faculty Senate to enforce the rule. He stated this would affect 50 students who had applied, but the students did not necessarily enroll. **This resolution passed by voice vote.**

http://www.utc.edu/Administration/FacultySenate/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2006_07/2006_07Attachments/2007Standards_Continuation.pdf

b. Implementation of "3-replacement" policy

The students felt that they did not receive enough notice of this policy. The committee proposes that this be implemented in Fall 2008. The motion passed by voice vote.

http://www.utc.edu/Administration/FacultySenate/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2006_07/2006_07Attachments/2007Standards_RepeatImplementation.pdf

7. Report from Executive Committee: None

8. Administrative Reports

Chancellor Brown: He thanked the Provost Search committee, specifically Fran Bender. Dr. Odham is eager to join UTC on July 16, 2007. He also expressed his appreciation to Dr. Herb Burhenn for serving as the interim Provost. This was met with generous applause.

In the May 2007 commencement, UTC will be awarding an honorary doctorate to Ruth Holmberg. The speaker for the commencement is Dr. Wendy Purifoy (sp?).

Also, as of today, the funding for the UTC library is still alive in Nashville, but it has not been approved, yet.

A proposal will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees that asks for discount tuition for students in the seven counties that touch the southern border of TN.

"Be positive" about all the good things that we enjoy at UTC.

9. Other Business: None

10. Faculty Concerns:

Manuel Santiago asked if the Standards Committee was still looking at admissions standards. Fran Bender stated that it would be covered at the next meeting.

Fritz Efav had two concerns:

- (1) Leadites: he wanted to point out that they did not oppose technology.
- (2) Also, he would like his concerns on the Budget proceedings heard:

Fritz Efav stated: *"This note is provided as a correction to some inaccurate and possibly misleading information presented by Vice-Chancellor Brown at last week's budget hearings. Although I attended the hearings on Thursday and Friday, I was unable to attend the hearings on Wednesday when Dr. Brown made his presentation. My comments are based on the summary made available online by Mary Scott. They do not necessarily represent the views of faculty senate, the Budget & Economic Status committee, the United Campus Workers, the UTC department of economics, or anyone else that might take umbrage at my usual political incorrectness. I hope they will be accepted as an addendum to the notes previously circulated on the budget hearings. If not, I will read them into the record so that they will be kept in the minutes of faculty senate.*

On p.10 of his slide show, Dr Brown presents a table stating that salaries of UTC professors grew at an annual rate of 3.6% between 2001 and 2006, while the national average rate of growth for "Professor Salary" was 2.6% over the same period.

On the face of it, this is puzzling. In a table immediately following this he states that faculty salaries did not increase in 2002, increased by 2.0% in 2003, by 3.0% in 2004, between 2.0% and 3.0% in 2005, and between 1.0% and 2.0% in 2006. [In fact, the correct numbers for 2005 were between 1.5% and 3.0%.] From the numbers in this table, faculty salaries MUST have increased in nominal terms by between 1.5% and 2.0% annually.

*Any non-recurring bonus, as in Oct 2004, will of course have no impact on the annual growth rate since it is not incorporated into base pay. If it is counted as increasing salary in 2004 it must be seen, *pari passu*, as decreasing the RATE of increase in 2005 by an equivalent amount. Of course, longevity raises are incorporated into the salary base, but for someone with an average annual base pay of \$50,000 the \$100 for longevity increase would add only 0.2% to annual rate of salary growth. This would be slightly less for those with salaries over \$50,000 and slightly more for those with lower salaries, but the notion of a 3.6% rate of growth is evidently impossible.*

Other figures in Dr Brown's first table are likewise suspect. The numbers for "Peer Average Professor Salary Increase" are notoriously bogus because it is well known that THEC can and does manipulate the constitution of peer institutions in ways that make UTC appear better by setting it next to increasingly run down institutions. Dr Brown does list the peer institutions on p.11 of his slide show, but there are problems with that page as well.

No doubt there are some perfectly innocent explanations for many of these discrepancies. For example, Dr Brown's figures may include compression adjustments that took place a few years ago, but if this is the case he doesn't say so. Probably he is viewing salary numbers from the perspective of the employer, as outlays, rather than from the perspective of the employee, as income.

It may be, also, that he arrives at increases by including a few extremely high salaries that have been assumed by the academic affairs budget when they were previously listed elsewhere. This would be the case for a handful of SIM center professors who are now paid out of the academic budget, having run through their Foundation funds ahead of schedule. These have impacted the academic budget to the tune of a quarter million a pop for several years running recently.

This sort of thing may also explain some odd-looking numbers on p.11 of Dr Brown's slide show. Is it really credible that NCA&T cut salaries of full professors by almost eleven percent last year? One plausible explanation would be that NCA&T managed to shed some burden that had been their equivalent of the SIM Center.

A larger problem with Dr Brown's numbers, however, and one that may explain some of the problems, is that he uses numbers from AAUP, which are averages across disciplines for entire institutions, instead of figures from the CUPA data base, which breaks these out by discipline within institutions.

Two years ago the Budget & Economic Status Committee of faculty senate went to a great deal of effort to develop figures that were truly comparable in most cases for use in determining the size of salary gaps that needed to be addressed in awarding compression adjustments. These efforts turned up many unexplained errors in figures the administration had been using. Those of us on the B&ES committee THOUGHT we had reached an understanding with the administration

about how to compare UTC salaries with national averages. Now it seems that the administration is prepared to return to its old unreliable ways when it suits them.

The problem with the administration's habits in these matters is that they are insidiously misleading. Dr. Brown's slides state that in 2004-05 assistant professors were paid 96% of the national average, associate professors 99%, and full professors 95%. The B&ES committee's work in the same year found the correct numbers to be 95% for assistant, 94% for associate, and 85% for full professors.

Furthermore, these numbers are getting worse for UTC, not better. A recent article from Inside Higher Ed (Mar.12, 2007) states that faculty salaries increased by 3.8% last year, based on CUPA data. It went on to state that faculty salaries had increased by 3.4% the previous year and 3.2% the year before that. Dr Brown's numbers either directly contradict these or else become all but impossible to reconcile over a five year period.

Anyone reading this is asked to watch any press statements coming from the administration in the weeks ahead. The numbers in Dr Brown's slide show are not his alone. If they are left unchallenged they will enter the record and will be quoted authoritatively by spokespersons for UTC. They are the official politically correct line the administration will stick to, and they are WRONG."

Response by Richard Brown (in absentia): "I make a point to seldom, and almost never respond to such e-mail messages as the one you just sent to the entire campus. Yet, the tone and content of the message makes serious allegations of misleading" information and/or "inaccurate information" as presented during one of my budget summaries. I shall not get into an open debate with you on these matters, yet, there remains an issue of respect, collegiality, and integrity which compels me to respond to your concerns. I wish you would have just called me for an audience of explanation and I could have reasonably explained the issues for you.

The summary information regarding salaries and compensation were taken directly from financial data as compiled by the University of Tennessee System [2006-07 Facts and Figures} document as aggregated by the Vice President for Administration and Finance. The additional information was taken from the official University of Tennessee Budget Document as compiled by the University of Tennessee System for the UT Board of Trustees [2006-2007]. Both are public records/documents and available for all to see. While you may not like or agree with the data, methodology, or the messages as presented therein, please don't "shoot the messenger." I have not compiled or editorialized the data as presented.

For the record, I remain one of the strongest advocates for improved faculty and staff compensation. I have also publicly stated that I do not fully agree with the method of compensation comparisons that are based solely on average salary benchmarks. I have also requested that the Office of Academic Affairs, with support of our Chancellor, provide a more definitive, discipline and market driven specific compensation study for our faculty. At the core of any effective and quality driven university, one will find an outstanding teaching and research faculty. We are fortunate to have such a faculty serving UTC and this community. I see my role as working as a resource administrator for that faculty. Each day I am here finds me advocating, planning, and leveraging all available resources to assist this teaching faculty to do the core business of the university...TEACH! In the future, would you please give me the benefit of professional respect, and collegial decency not to cast an unwarranted shadow of doubt and cynicism on my work efforts? As a member of this faculty and university community, you have my utmost respect...I trust that over my 22 years of service to this university, I have earned your respect."

11. Announcements: None
12. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Gretchen E. Potts
Faculty Senate Secretary
April 8, 2007**

All regularly and conditionally admitted students between 2000 and 2004, inclusive. For all cells, N represents real count for population, Mn represents average year estimate, M_{gpa} represents the earned GPA for the population, and SD_{gpa} represents the standard deviation of the GPAs.

Semester 1	Semester 4	Grand Total	
0.0 >= GPA < 1.0 N = 651 M _n = 130 M _{gpa} = 0.34 SD _{gpa} = 0.35	0.0 >= GPA < 1.0 2 1.0 >= GPA < 2.0 5 GPA >= 2.0 5		
1.0 >= GPA < 2.0 N = 1098 M _n = 220 M _{gpa} = 1.57 SD _{gpa} = 0.28	0.0 >= GPA < 1.0 1 1.0 >= GPA < 2.0 46 GPA >= 2.0 50		
GPA >= 2.0 N = 4664 M _n = 933 M _{gpa} = 3.05 SD _{gpa} = 0.59	0.0 >= GPA < 1.0 0 1.0 >= GPA < 2.0 45 GPA >= 2.0 656		