

2008 – 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
January 15, 2009

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

Among the guests present: Linda Orth, Herbert Burhenn, Terry Denniston, Chuck Cantrell, Fran Bender, Jonathan McNair, Betsy Alderman, Charlene Simmons, Felicia McGhee-Holt, Stephen Kuhn, Matt Greenwell, Karen Adsit, Lyn Miles

1. Call to Order at 3:14.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 20, 2008.
3. Report from the Executive Committee – Dr. Campa
 - A. UT Board Committee on Effectiveness and Efficiency for the Future

Dr. Campa spoke on the results of the Effectiveness and Efficiency report. He said that they had a frank meeting with President Petersen, as well as the opportunity to discuss the budget crisis with their counterparts at other UT campuses.

Information regarding the Tennessee Higher Education Committee (THEC) report on programs with low productivity can be found at the following website:

http://state.tn.us/thec/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/productivity_ut/UT_Program_Productivity_Report_Jan_2009.pdf

4. Report from the Handbook Committee – Dr. Chris Stuart

See Attachment

Questions

Dr. Covino suggested that the word “senate” replace the word “council” in the second handbook change (2.3.5 Section 1) and that 17 be replaced with 10 on the third suggested change, since there are only 10 chapters in the handbook. Additionally, he asked why the undergraduate student grade appeal request used a paper form, when other campus committees had gone paperless.

Dr. Campa stated that such decisions were left to the discretion of the committee.

Dr. Potts thanked Drs. Kuhn and Ingraham for their work the year before.

Dean Burhenn asked who would chair the committee if the chair could not.

Dr. Potts said that there was no provision, but that it had not been a problem.

Dr. Burhenn stated that there was an inaccuracy regarding where records were kept, which are in the record’s office and not kept by the committee.

Dr. Potts stated that an amendment from the floor could correct that inaccuracy.

Dr. Covino moved that on line 4 “faculty grades appeal committee” be changed to “office of the dean.” Dr. Honerkamp seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

Dr. Simmons remarked that Section 2, Part D, was confusing in regards to the student failing to appear or fail to supply sufficient material.

Dr. Potts stated that the comment was in regard to the student missing the hearing without a legitimate excuse. Except in the case of an emergency, the Appeals Committee will not reschedule a hearing.

Dr. Simmons asked about graduate students.

Dr. Potts stated that another committee handled grade appeals for graduate students.

The handbook committee changes were accepted by acclamation.

5. Report from Curriculum Committee (Undergraduate) – Dr. Ed Rozema

See Attachments

- A. 09-001 Various SOC/ANTH Courses: Removal of Obsolete or Redundant course offering. Approved 11-0-1. Dr. Honerkamp
- B. 09-002 Change Departmental Honors to Departmental Thesis. Approved 11-0-1. Drs. O’Dea and Kuhn

- C. 09-003 COMM Modifications to the Department of Communication Courses to ensure accurate and clear course descriptions. Approved as a full proposal 12-0-0. Dr. Alderman
- D. 09-032 COMM Modifications to Communication 337 name, description; addition of prerequisite to the course. Approved 12-0-0. Dr. Greenwell
- E. 09-012 ENGR 170, Introduction to Engineering. Approved 9-1-2. Dr. Holder
- F. 09-007 ART Editorial changes to catalog language for Art 101 and 105. Dr. Greenwell Approved 12-0-0.
- G. 09-008 ART Drop the Studio Core Requirement for the BFA major in Art. Approved 12-0-0. Dr. Greenwell
- H. 09-009 ART Change in course requirements under Major and Related Courses for the B.S. in Art Education and B.A. in Art. Approved 12-0-0. Dr. Greenwell
- I. 09-011 ART Addition of 3 hours to the BFA Upper-Division Art History Listing. Approved 12-0-0. Dr. Greenwell
- J. 09-018 MUS Proposal to allow Music Majors and Minors to take MUS 111 for General Education Fine Arts Elective Credit and Proposal to add Pre-requisite to Music 315 and Music 316, History of Music. Approved 9-1-1. Dr. McNair

Questions:

Dr. Loomis asked why there was an abstention on 09-001 Curriculum Committee Proposal.

Dr. Honerkamp replied that someone in the department in question was on the committee.

The Senate voted to approve the first two proposals (09-001, 09-002).

Dr. Rozema noted that there was a mistake in description of 09-003, in regards to 230 Media writing, which should read 30 words per minute instead of 20 words per minute in the new version.

Dr. McCullough moved for the Faculty Senate to vote on the motions as a whole. Dr. Craddock seconded the motion. The Faculty Senate voted unanimously by acclamation and by ballot (26 votes in favor, Drs. Campa and Purkey did not vote) to support the Curriculum Committee Recommendations.

6. Quality Enhancement for SACS – Dr. Karen Adsit

Dr. Adsit gave an overview of the accreditation process for the QEP and future SACS review, noting that the new process was very different in many ways from the previous process. She introduced Dr. Linda Johnston as the new chair of the QEP committee, which was composed of 17 members from across UTC staff and faculty, including Faculty Senate representatives.

See the SACS Report at:

<http://www.utc.edu/Administration/SACS/documents/SACSooverview.pdf>

Dr. Johnston said that there would be a series of focus groups to involve the campus and that the faculty would receive a more in-depth email on this subject on January 29. She further commented that the committee would like as much faculty input and participation as possible

and that everyone was invited to attend the focus groups. The committee also plans to publish a monthly news letter.

Dr. Campa stressed the importance of this undertaking and lauded Dr. Adsit's diligence and hard work on SACS.

7. Report from the UT Council – Dr. Miles

Dr. Miles who is the president of the council spoke regarding recent meetings in Knoxville and Nashville, as well as face-to-face meetings with UT President Petersen.

See attached.

Questions:

The Chancellor clarified the difference in total reductions that had been given. The larger figure (8 million), included recent cuts that had just been submitted.

Dr. Miles clarified President Petersen's "sausage" metaphor. He stated that the process of making sausage was a messy process and resulted in a different product from what one is used to, but the end result is still "tasty," and would lead to the university receiving "more bang for the buck."

The Chancellor stated that the draft had not yet passed, and that it would be a campus-based process. He thanked Dr. Yegidis for her work.

Questions:

The Chancellor was asked if there was a copy of the draft.

Dr. Adsit asked if THEC had been targeted for budget reductions.

The Provost stated that those decisions had not been made.

Dr. Miles said that political moves had been made to remove to remove THEC.

Dr. Miles stated that she pledged to work with President Peterson to move forward, and that the council provided the opportunity to talk with her counterparts on other campuses and to develop a culture of the UT system.

8. Dr. Campa welcomed Dr. Simmons to the Faculty Senate, who is replacing Dr. Harris, who accepted a position in the UNC system.

9. Administrative Reports

Dr. Campa asked why there was a discrepancy between the information on budget cuts from Dr. Gettes and the Board of Trustees (BOT).

A. Chancellor Brown

Chancellor Brown agreed that there were discrepancies and that he was not satisfied with the process, but that he was still uncertain of how changes will effect UTC. He stated that psychologically uncertainty breeds anxiety, and that he understood why [the budget crisis] is causing faculty members to be anxious.

As of last Friday the administration did not contemplate any salary cuts or faculty lay offs at UTC. However, he cannot make that assurance regarding the next time that the governor asks for further financial cutbacks and he does not know how long and how deep the decline in state revenues will continue. The state has told UTC to prepare an additional 5% cut, but if that happens, he honestly doesn't know what will happen. The first commitment of the chancellor and his staff is to preserve jobs, since the preservation of faculty and staff is fundamental to recovering and managing when resources are more robust. The Chancellor reiterated that he and his staff are working as hard as they can to preserve every employee at UTC.

There are some outstanding questions regarding the budget crisis. Chancellor Brown did not know if tuition could be raised to offset the budget losses. In this political environment elected leaders are posturing on the issue of tuition, which leaves the university in a "catch 22," slashing appropriations, which are not replaced with tuition increases. A more favorable interpretation is that the BOT and members of the legislative government have silently reconciled themselves to tuition increases. However, this morning the chancellor heard that the campus should not think about uncapping, which is considered a "hidden tuition increase." He had never heard this before. In fact, President Peterson clearly suggested that was what he wanted to do, to ask students to pay for extra hours between 12-5 credit hours. He does think that there will be a tuition increase that exceeds that of last year, but it cannot be in the double digits, perhaps of 7-8%. The negotiation between THEC and the legislature will help resolve this issue.

Another important question which is totally unpredictable is if the federal government will provide a stimulus package that flows to individual states. We have expressed our desperate need for money to our congressional relations office. The governor has said that he wanted that money [stimulus funds] to pay for TennCare, which would also help UT. If less money were needed to bailout the TennCare system, it was the Chancellor's hope that there would be more money for higher education.

The chancellor doubted that the university would expand voluntary retirement, although it might be negotiated on an individual basis.

There were new updates regarding hiring, equipment, and travel funds. Recently all new hiring, equipment purchases, and travel funds have had to go through Knoxville. This has been changed, so that the UTC Chancellor may approve all faculty appointments at the campus level, any general administration positions of less than \$75,000, travel expenses, and equipment purchases of less than \$50,000. The Chancellor must send monthly reports, which are reviewed at Knoxville and he is accountable for these expenses. Appointments greater than \$75,000 annually, and equipment purchases in excess of \$50,000 must still be approved by Knoxville. The Chancellor stated that this was a movement in right direction, and preferable to having every action approved at the system level.

The Chancellor also commented that UTC went through the recent budget cut through the 2009-2010 academic year without the pain of losing employees. He had not been confident that they would be able to do that, but was extremely happy that it was possible. He stated that he would

continue to make retaining employees a top priority, although some areas might be reorganized, and at the staff level, there might be changes in job titles, and some employees might be moved to other departments, with retraining in some cases.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend asked how the 13.9% cuts would be distributed.

Chancellor Brown stated that every division had prorated cuts, including sports. UTC has established functional categories for cuts. Positions that are not filled would be deleted, equipment purchases have been postponed. After yesterday's meeting, that Richard Brown attended at the board, they would like more details regarding cuts. The Chancellor plans to consult department heads regarding cuts, and ask them to provide further information. The administration does not yet have the necessary details to make its final decisions, but hopes to know more about the great questions facing the university.

Dr. Townsend asked if it were possible to see initial, abstract plans.

Chancellor Brown said that they are preparing a list of cuts and their consequences in such a way as to leave the BOT with the understanding that they did not come cheaply or painlessly.

B. Provost Oldham – Academic Affairs

Dr. Oldham spoke to the Faculty Senate on budget cuts in relation to Academic Affairs, stating that despite the difficulty of the situation, it was not “the end of world.” He believed there were still many positive things taking place at the university, such as the work on SACS, and Dr. Bender's work on freshman retention. He has seen improvements taking shape, and it was a matter of prioritizing resources in regards to the 13.9% budget cuts slated for next year. Dr. Oldham said that he would email a handout regarding cuts in the near future.

In summary, there was a 13.9% cut of \$43.5 million in state appropriations, including the \$1.5 million cut at mid year, and a \$4.5 million cut they must find between now and the next fiscal year. Cuts have been taking place across all divisions at UTC, resulting in \$2.9 million in cuts in Academic Affairs. The Provost asked for help from department heads, and others on how to target reductions. At the same time, the administration did not know if there would be a tuition increase. He would like to make cuts that are strategic and do not adversely impair UTC's ability to carry out its mission. This matter has been approached through an ad hoc committee established in the Fall [2008]. The committee has been examining academic progress and reviewing all support units. They have met a number of times and discussed a number of issues. Although they have identified low producing programs, no decisions have been made at this point regarding individual program cuts. The committee had a great deal of data to review. Dr. Gruetzemacher's office is participating in the data collection process.

The budget cuts have been more substantial than one might have supposed and have been misleading in some regards, because of some heavy acquisitions, such as the library. At least 90% of the budget is dedicated to salaries, and there is no way to absorb greater budget cuts without reducing faculty positions. At this time the administration has made no plans to lay anyone off, instead planning to absorb losses through attrition. They have disapproved and cancelled searches in this effort. Approximately 16 faculty lines have been eliminated, although

UTC still has about 10,000 students. The university needs to find ways to provide opportunities for them with fewer faculty members. UTC should address this situation creatively, for example by having larger class sizes with fewer sections. The largest piece of this may be in looking at academic program majors that are low producers. Some of the programs on the table are fairly obvious and appear on the THEC list of low-producing programs across the state. Out of 72 academic programs at UTC, 14 appear on the THEC list, all of which are undergraduate B.A. or B.S. programs. Undergraduate programs that graduated fewer than 10 students per year over a five-year period were listed.

It was the Provost's view that just because a program had fewer than 10 students did not mean that it should be closed. There might be a variety of reasons for low production, and some programs might be viable with steps, modifications, better resource management, etc. Low production does not mean a program should be eliminated, but it is an indicator that it should be examined for further review.

The Provost said that the system was developing a draft procedure for program discontinuance at the board level, however, a draft did not tell how to arrive at a recommendation, simply what to do in the case of discontinuance. He stated that UTC needed to come up with a procedure of how to handle recommendations to the BOT locally. He asked Dr. Sanders to work on this process. Tomorrow or early next week there would be a working draft, which would be vetted by the Faculty Senate and the Deans Council. The goal would be to have a legitimate process in place to show the BOT, which has requested specific information on how individual campuses are handling the situation. He further commented that it made sense to determine how UTC would handle such a situation and that it needed a mechanism to determine it. If a program fell below a certain level, the university needed to take a look, which is built into the draft. If a program survives the vetting process, his guess is that there would be no recommendation to eliminate it.

The Provost said that in reference to the issue of academic programs, a relatively small number have been targeted, and it was difficult to assign an exact cost to those programs, and how much will really be saved. Part of the plan consists in reducing non academic units, such as Cadek, the child center, and units subsidized in recent history, like the Sims Center. He emphasized that this was not a choice between good and bad, but good and better. There would also be some cuts to the library, which they hoped to recover through funds from the UC Foundation. He also commented that he would not like to see the library loose funds (a 6-8% deficit), in the face of escalating costs.

Dr. Oldham said that department heads were concerned with how to put the Fall [2009] schedule together, as the university did not know if money to hire instructors would be available or not. He has been working as quickly as possible to identify vacant positions, and that he would ask Dr. Richard Brown to find funds to fill gaps. No one at this point is losing their job; however, if UTC finds itself strategically in a bind, they would shift resources appropriately to rebalance the institution.

Questions:

Dr. Campa asked where the Sim Center was on the list of budget reductions, pointing out that the ad hoc committee recommended that its funding be substantially reduced. As such, he felt it would show up near the top of the list.

Dr. Oldham stated that about \$17 million is potentially going to Sim Center. The timing for cuts could not have come at a worse time. He said that he preferred not to talk about the Sim Center at that time, and that he was not trying to hide anything. However, he felt there was more than one way for them to provide a reduction in cost than in the E and G budget, which goes primarily to faculty positions.

Dr. Campa stated that approximately \$1.1 million annually was spent on tenured faculty positions, and that there were no vacancies, it would be more difficult to deal with the E and G budget.

Dr. Honerkamp asked about the status of phased retirement. He also stated that uncapping tuition costs would mean that many students would only take 12 hours and it would take even longer for them to matriculate, which would increase costs in the long run.

Dr. Oldham stated that there had been no developments in phased retirement, and that it was still available, but he had taken steps to “throttle back” on it. He stress that the program was never designed to be a faculty benefit program, but on the contrary, to the institution’s benefit. UTC would continue to negotiate with individual faculty members. The university has a commitment to \$300,000-4,000,000 in phased retirement over the next 2-3 years. In some cases they are beneficial to the institution, in others there is little return for the money.

There has been some talk of retirement incentives, which the Provost would consider if he thought UTC had been overstaffed across the board. However, the student faculty ration is 17:1, which is healthy rather than low. Some disciplines and colleges do not fit this profile, and the institution might want to realize some retirements over the future in pockets that are overstaffed, but it should be a selective process.

In regards to uncapping tuition [making students pay for credits in excess of 12-15 credit hours], the provost stated that he did not know what the effects might be, since it would change the entire paradigm of the financial structure for students. Presently the average is 13 credit hours per student including part-time students, meaning that it is greater than 13 hours for full-time students. The cost increase would be 1 credit hour per student per semester, or approximately \$4 million annual, if that assumption is correct. However, he was unsure how this would change student behavior and retention rates. Dr. Oldham said that the 6-year graduation rate was at 40%, and he doubted that it would decrease. The greatest problem facing student retention was the fact that a huge number of students work far more than 20 hours per week.

Dr. Craddock stated that no one would graduate if the biology department could not hire additional faculty members.

Dr. Oldham stated that such issues were why it was important to make strategic cuts and that any new tuition money should be put back into critical areas.

Dr. Stuart asked if the administration had considered outsourcing janitorial work.

Dr. Richard Brown stated that he felt the custodians were working for much less than market value and that UTC had already made drastic cuts to the janitorial budget. He also said that UTC did not currently have enough custodial workers, who clean 60,000 square feet each.

Dr. McCullough asked if the THEC information would be made available.

Dr. Oldham stated that it was posted on the website, but that THEC was difficult to navigate, and he would ensure that a copy was emailed.

Dr. McCullough asked if low student enrollment was the only means of judging productivity, or if other factors were taken into account, such as research and funding.

Dr. Oldham stated that THEC was based only upon graduation output and that student numbers were easier to use as hard benchmarks. He understood that many factors came to play in regards to productivity. For example some departments had greater expectations of external funding, publication numbers, or produced graduate degrees.

Dr. Greenwell noted that if the library budget were not increased, it would not be sustained. In the same way, he felt that each academic unit was losing ground, as costs had increased dramatically, but there had been no increase in departmental budgets over the past 15-20 years. He asked if it would be possible to work the foundations to backfill needs. He also asked if the earlier spread sheet identified amounts in each division based upon the proportion that each takes up on campus, and if a decision would be made to protect certain areas, if there are further cuts.

Dr. Oldham stated that this issue had been brought up by the executive team, and that it was his view that a prorated share, not strategic cuts had been discussed, although it might not end up that way. The Chancellor would look at specific numbers. Academic Affairs must take some budget cuts, since 64% of the budget is dedicated to it. Therefore, it is almost impossible not to make such cuts.

Dr. Richard Brown stated that resources were already so thin, that it would be difficult to make more cuts in those areas.

Oldham stated that all of the vice-chancellors were talking about how to arrive at specific numbers, and that it was a “balancing act” across the campus.

Dr. Parker asked if there would be cuts to scholarships, and if they were restricted and unrestricted funds, or if it just came out of the E and G Budget.

The provost stated that institutional scholarships came from unrestricted funds.

10. Other Business

There was no other business.

11. Faculty Concerns

There were no faculty Concerns.

12. Announcements

There were no announcements.

13. Adjournment.

Dr. Loomis moved to adjourn and Dr. Covenor seconded the motion, which was accepted by acclamation at 4:46.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Lynn Purkey
Faculty Senate Secretary
January 15, 2009**