

2008 – 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
November 20, 2008

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

<u>Division</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
President	Pedro Campa	
Past-President	Gavin Townsend	
At-Large	Tammy Garland, Linda Hill, Chris Stuart, and Jim Tucker	Mike Bell and Clair McCullough
Adjunct		Bob Schmidt
Behavioral Sciences	Helen Eigenberg, Nick Honerkamp, and Terri LeMoynes	Tom Buchanan
Business Adm.	Beverly Brockman, Jim Henley, and Kathleen Wheatley	
Eng & Comp Sci		Ron Goulet, Michel Holder, Frank Jones and Li Yang
Fine Arts	Stuart Benkert, Patrick Sweetman, and Kenyon Wilson	
CHEPS	Kay Lindgren, Deborah McAllister, and Dana Wertenberger	Linda Johnston, Elizabeth O'Brien, and Cheryl Robinson
Humanities	Ralph Covino, Lauren Ingraham, and Lynn Purkey	Vicki Steinberg,
Library	Colleen Harris	
Math & Sciences	Doug Kutz, Irene Loomis, and Henry Spratt	Hill Craddock
Ex-Officio	Theresa Liedtka Phil Oldham, and John Delaney	Roger Brown, Richard Brown
SGA Liaison		

Among the guests present: Linda Orth, Herbert Burhenn

1. Call to Order 3:12
2. Approval of the minutes of November 6, 2008.

Dr. Loomis moved to approve. Dr. Honerkamp seconded the motion.

3. Report from the Executive Committee.

Dr. Campa stated that Dr. Steinhoff, the chair of general education, sent a memo, in which he said that the General Education Committee had published a number of documents to their website. In September a number of issues were raised regarding course based assessment, including feedback from the university and comments upon the rubrics that they are using. If any one has any questions regarding this process they should contact Dr. Steinhoff.

Dr. Campa also reported upon the executive committee's meeting with Dr. Jesse Poore in reference to Banner, in which the committee represented UTC interests for classes, requirements, and prerequisites, etc.

Dr. Townsend followed up the meeting by writing Dr. Poore's assistant, Dr. Reeves, regarding a number of questions that they did not have answers to at the meeting. Dr. Townsend asked if Banner could accommodate the three repeats or "do-over" courses allowed at UTC and how difficult it would be to configure the computer that way. He also wanted to know if it would allow students to register for overlapping courses, and if it would allow faculty or department heads to wave prerequisites. Dr. Poore stated that he did not know and that his staff would find out the answers to those questions. Dr. Townsend sent the message on November 16th, but Dr. Poore's staff had not replied.

Dr. Stuart stated that the system could do everything that Dr. Townsend had asked.

Dr. Townsend stated that the system has this capability, but it is a matter of cost.

Dr. Stuart expressed the doubts that so many other universities would use the system if it were difficult to work with.

Dr. Townsend questioned at what level such changes to the system could be made.

Dr. Campa told the Senate that the executive committee would keep faculty informed, but that UTC must insist that Banner have some of the needed functions that are currently carried out by hand.

4. Administrative Reports

A. The director of facilities operation, Janet Spraker (in lieu of Dr. Brown): Campus Expansion, the Sim Center, the recent funeral home purchase, and Grote Hall renovation

See Attachment

Questions:

Dr. Spatt asked a question regarding the final version of the prints.

Dr. Spraker said that on the last version, the main changes were in the mechanical system and duct work, but that nothing had changed appreciably.

Dr. Kutz stated that the renovation process had been much slower than expected, and asked if it would also be behind schedule in the future.

Dr. Spraker stated that they would not begin until February 10, and the completion date would be moved back to next summer (a year from the "swap"), and that the construction time span of 420 days was over a year.

Dr. Townsend asked if they had to complete the abatement procedures before the bidding process.

Dr. Spraker commented that the Fire Marshall must approve everything before bidding can begin, which takes at least 3 weeks. Then it must be approved in Nashville, which takes 2-6 weeks. After that the university can begin the bidding process.

B. Provost – Planned Expansion of the Sim Center, Summer School

Dr. Oldham spoke in regards to the Sim Center and Summer School. According to him, a group of local foundations, Lyndhurst, Bentwood, and the UC foundation, have pledged a total of \$17 million to help elevate the Sim Center to national status. A national report generated approximately two years ago found a potential national need for such an enterprise in this community at UTC. The process has been “incubating along at a snail pace,” and is a unique multiple partnership with a wide range of expectations and all of the concomitant communication issues of multiple partners and expectations. This process has required a great deal of work on the part of many, and has provided a significant opportunity for the \$17 million investment. They are making good progress and have a plan, with great potential. The reality of this will be due to some leadership in the College of Engineering and Computer Science. Hiring Dean Sutton was very important. The notion of having the Sim Center and the College of Engineering and Computer Science is not workable for UTC and does not make sense. Instead, he would argue that an integrated effort, especially between the College of Engineering and Comp Science would make more sense. He would argue that other departments also have the potential for fruitful relationship with the Sim Center, in order to realize its complete potential and to further integrate departments. This is why Dean Sutton plays an important role in process of putting together plan for the college and Sim Center to access this one time investment of \$17 million. There is also the expectation that there is the potential for a commercial or business outreach component. There are many commerce opportunities, some of which have been highlighted in the papers, such as that of U.S. express. The latter cut fuel costs as a result of work with the Sim Center. U.S. Express at one time spent \$60 million per month on fuel as a result of work with the Sim Center on mud flaps and truck design, which gave them a potential savings of as much as 10% in added fuel efficiency. There is the potential for developing a business arm of the Sim Center, which could help local and national business ventures be more successful, and would help the development of the Sim Center and UTC as a whole. It is clear that to realize some of these goals, the scope of the Sim Center must increase, as it is not large enough to reasonably be considered a national center. These are goals that we would like to see realized, which is where the work of Dean Sutton comes to play. We are still in the development process, and are identifying some targets that we want to try to reach. We are close to having a financial model that makes sense. We would like to increase the scale of grant and contract revenues from the Sim Center with the investment from the foundations.

Questions:

Dr. Campa asked if the contributions from the university were likely to decrease.

Dr. Oldham responded that such an event was unlikely.

Dr. Campa stated that the Sim Center would cost us more rather than less.

Dr. Oldham admitted that was possible, and said that the university was looking at the potential benefit of the Center to the national economy, issues in this community, new age manufacturing and energy. The Sim Center can play a pivotal role in situating the institution and the state appropriately. Everyone must judge how much that is that worth. The Center also provides the potential for earning investment dollars outside of the university.

Dr. Stuart questioned the efficacy of the center, stating that the number of students in Sim Center classes (5 students per class) would be hard for the campus on the whole to accept. The rest of the campus is facing increased enrollment and larger classes than is pedagogically sound, while experiencing

diminished economic resources. At the same time the Sim Center is expanding, while only serving a handful of students and private interests outside of the university, rather than the university itself. For example, if one looks at the budget and pressure on the College of Arts and Sciences, which is the largest college and serves every student on campus, yet is forced to cut its budget drastically.

Dr. Oldham said that as far as salary and support are concerned, the UTC only provides the salaries of five faculty members.

Dr. Campa stated that the Center also received state funding.

Dr. Oldham stated that in return for this investment there are Ph.D. and Masters in Computational Engineering programs. There are 25-30 graduate students, and if put on par with other departments, they are “lean” in regards to graduate students. The five faculty members help generate \$2-3 million per year in external funding, and now that they are fully vested, they are graduating approximately 3 Ph.D. and 5 Master’s level students per year. These results were not as good as he would like, but not were also not “unhealthy by any means.” He also commented on the number of times the Sim Center has been published in local newspapers, and stated that the positive press has helped UTC.

Dr. Stuart asked how one puts a dollar value on the press. He stated that we have to enlarge and adjuncts only receive \$2000 per course. UTC’s name in paper is good, but it is not serving the campus directly.

Dr. McCullough stated that UTK only graduates 4-5 students. She thought that we had decided it is worthwhile endeavor. The time and effort expended by faculty on Masters-level and Ph.D. students is “an order of magnitude” and a single faculty member cannot guide a dozen students at a time.

Dr. Stuart noted that the faculty members did not agree to the acquisition of the Sim Center, but presented with it as a fait accompli. Because of that, there is some resentment on the part of the faculty. In regards to the comment that UTC only funds five faculty salaries, he commented that those salaries do not resemble his salary; they total over \$1 million. He understands that different academic fields may make different amounts, but there is some grumbling regarding the Sim Center, how it became a part of UTC, and the salaries of faculty members there.

Dr. McCullough stated that the Center had been a part of UTC for five years. She does not work at the center, and has no special interest in the project, but the Center has met every target in regards to number of students and money that they have set.

Dr. Campa stated that the problem was that the Center was supposed to be self supporting in four years, but it has not done that.

Dr. Spratt stated that income fluctuated each year. For example, this year the Biology Department has received more money in grants.

Dr. Oldham stated that since the Sim Center arrived six years ago, it had brought in \$19 or 20 million, or an average of \$3-4 million per year.

Dr. Stuart stated that there was no proposal regarding cuts in the Sim Center and he would be interested in why that might be.

Dr. Kutz stated that Volkswagen might bring possibilities to the Sim Center.

Dr. Oldham stated that it should, although he was not aware of any deals. During the summer he made a presentation on behalf of UTC before the Volkswagen selection committee. Information regarding the Sim Center was requested at the “highest levels” of Volkswagen, although he does not know what bearing that had on their decision. Dean Sutton has studied Volkswagen’s relationship to Clemson. In that situation, Clemson had worked a great deal with Volkswagen during the last 2-3 years, but the plant had been there for 10 years and it took a while for such work to materialize. Nissan in Mississippi had a more immediate effect upon the university, but it varies from site to site. It is a tremendous opportunity, and Volkswagen’s approach to the automobile industry lends itself to simulation and design.

Dr. Cantrell stated that one must sort out what it is beyond manufacturing that Volkswagen will do, and that there may be peripheral things, such as brainstorming, that the company would be interested in coming to UTC for.

Dr. Townsend asked for clarification about an *Echo* article, regarding a new property at Renaissance Square for \$3 million.

Dr. Oldham stated that the asking price was \$2.7 million and that they think it would cost another \$500,000 to finish the project.

Dr. Townsend asked about using the Blue Cross Building.

Dr. Oldham stated that there was still no firm decision on where the Sim Center would be housed. In regards to the U.S. Pipe site, some property owners were willing to deed some land to UTC. There has been “talk” about using the Blue Cross Building, but that notion has fallen out of vogue for a few reasons, including the cost of retrofitting the building, which would be prohibitive. It would make greater financial sense to build new construction. In regards to the other site, there was some concern that the buildings would go vacant, which concerned “city fathers.”

Dr. Townsend asked where the money to purchase Renaissance Square would come from.

Dr. Oldham stated that it would come from two sources, the state, which has said they would fund \$1 million, and the foundations, which would pay for the other \$2.2 million. The UC Foundation has already committed \$5 million. One positive aspect would be that it is a nice piece of property and UTC may be able to purchase it for less than the asking price. The property on Martin Luther King Ave. could also be used for other things.

Dr. Townsend asked why the university had requested \$17 million be spent on the project.

Dr. Oldham replied that they would like to “scale up” the Sim Center. They are working on a six-year plan that would take \$17 million in private investments and are beginning to look at capital improvement, next generations computers, the “scale up” of personnel that go into such a project, which is much more than just real estate. One issue with the Sim Center or any kind of computational enterprise is the size and state of the art nature of the computer that one is using. It is an issue to have a top 20 computer system that can run the latest and best code. The Sim Center needs computers with the capacity to generate applications that solve cutting edge problems. Where such a computer comes from is uncertain. UTC has had some contacts with IBM, who are interested in the Sim Center. Another possibility is that Radiance Corporation lease some space in the Doctor’s Building, so that corporate

partnerships could be leveraged to a greater extent. The potential here is significant, but obstacles are also significant, which is one of the reasons that few do this type of thing. It requires investment, money, time, energy, etc.

Dr. Loomis questioned why the Sim Center originally left Mississippi State University?

Dr. Oldham stated that there had been a change in leadership at Mississippi State, and the Center was considering moving. The Center had a few inquiries, one from Oakridge. It was suggested that they stop in Chattanooga on a trip to Oakridge. He did not feel that the Center wanted to move, but felt that there were enough changes, that they had some concerns regarding the direction that MSU was taking.

Dr. Campa noted that ad hoc committee on budget cuts was still working on recommendations and asked Dr. Oldham to address the issue of cuts to summer school.

Dr. Oldham responded that he would like to dispel any myths and that summer school had not been cancelled. At that time, the summer school budget had not been “touched.” He foresaw no significant changes, but would like to decrease the “over-expenditure” of last year, which exceeded the budget of \$1.2 million. Last summer \$1.6 million dollars was spent on summer school and UTC was allowed to overspend its budget, resulting in a deficit of \$.4 million. This took away some of UTC’s flexibility during the academic year.

Dr. Loomis stated that she thought that summer school made a profit.

Dr. Oldham responded that it did. Total revenue after discounts was approximately \$5 million, of which academic affairs, including salaries and benefits, spends approximately \$2 million. The use of all facilities (utilities, campus maintenance, etc.) cost another \$1 million, which leaves a profit margin of \$2 million. The problem is that the \$2 million in revenue is build into UTC’s annual budget, so if it is spent on summer school, that money is taken away from what spent during the school year. Dr. Oldham expressed that he was not happy with that model, and he would like to put summer school on an entrepreneurial model of “pay as you.” For now the situation is that UTC does not have enough money budgeted to do what it has done in the past.

Dr. Loomis stated that if summer school were cut back, income would decrease.

Dr. Oldham proposed that such a process was not always linear and that some courses cost more to teach and some generate more revenue than others. A number of courses are far from self-supporting. He further noted that Dr. Loomis was correct in regards to cuts have the potential to decrease revenues.

Dr. Eigenberg asked if UTC would reduce current overspending, or if there would be more cuts.

Dr. Oldham stated that there would be no more cuts.

Dr. Eigenberg asked how cuts would be determined.

Dr. Oldham stated that he asked the deans to prioritize cuts. He proposes a cap on summer school faculty and would look more closely at enrollment minimums. He would require more justification for low enrollments. He did not feel that it would have a significant impact from student’s point of view. There was some sense in some circles that summer school was more of an entitlement for faculty income than a program intended for student academic success.

Dr. Eigenberg asked if there would be a longer calendar for on-line courses.

Dr. Oldham said that he was loathe to create another summer term, but that if there was not a term that made sense for on-line courses, it would probably be necessary to create one. He noted that there was a need for greater evaluation of the possibility of restructuring summer school.

Dr. Townsend stated that he shared Dr. Loomis's difficulty in understanding the problem with summer school, if it in fact generates a surplus of \$2 million.

Dr. Craddock expressed a similar lack of understanding.

Dr. Oldham stated that the \$2 million is already invested in the academic budget and can only be spent once.

Dr. Robinson asked if the committee were considering a cap on faculty salary during the summer.

Dr. Campa stated that currently the formula for summer school pay is 3/32 of one's salary. The committee is considering a cap per course rather than per faculty member, that would not affect 90% of faculty members. The deans tried to push for adjunct to teach during the summer to save more money rather than full faculty members, who are paid more.

5. Other Business

There was no other business.

6. Faculty Concerns

There were no faculty concerns.

7. Announcements

There were no announcements.

8. Adjournment 4:11 P.M.

Dr. Covino moved to adjourn, and Dr. Loomis seconded the motion.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Lynn Purkey
Faculty Senate Secretary
November 20, 2008**