

2008 – 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
February 05, 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	Dr. Townsendin Townsend	
At-Large	Mike Bell, Linda Hill, Clar McCullough, Chris Stuart, and Jim Tucker	Tammy Garland, Linda Hill
Adjunct		Bob Schmidt
Behavioral Sciences	Tom Buchanan, Helen Eigenberg, and Terri LeMoyne	Nick Honerkamp
Business Adm.	Beverly Brockman, Jim Henley, and Kathleen Wheatley	
Eng & Comp Sci	Michel Holder, Frank Jones and Li Yang	Ron Goulet
Fine Arts	Stuart Benkert and Kenyon Wilson	Patrick Sweetman,
CHEPS	Linda Johnston, Kay Lindgren, Deborah McAllister, Elizabeth O'Brien, and Cheryl Robinson, and Dana Wertenberger	
Humanities	Ralph Covino, and Lynn Purkey, Vicki Steinberg	Lauren Ingraham,
Library	Beverly Simmons	
Math & Sciences	Doug Kutz and Irene Loomis	Hill Craddock, Henry Spratt
Ex-Officio	Theresa Liedtka Phil Oldham, and John Delaney, Jocelyn Sanders	Roger Brown, Richard Brown
SGA Liaison		

Among the guests present: Linda Orth, Herbert Burhenn, Burch Oglesby, Edward Rozema, Andy Novobilski, Terry Denniston, Mary Roland, Fran Bender, Linda Collins, Betsy Alderman, Elizabeth Gailey, Dr. Adsti Adsit, Mary Tanner

Senate meetings are open meetings to which all interested parties are welcome.

To presenters: If a document camera is needed for a presentation, please make arrangements with Media Resources.

1. Call to Order 3:13
2. Approval of the minutes of January 15, 2009.

Dr. Loomis moved to approve; Dr. Sweetman seconded the motion.

3. General Education Committee – Dr. Steinhoff, Chair

Dr. Steinhoff spoke on two main topics regarding the review of general education requirements. The first matter concerned the probationary period for classes that have been placed on probation, but not decertified. Currently classes on probation are checked after 1 semester. If, on the second revision, the classes do not pass, they are decertified. If they pass, the class is returned to normal status and checked again 5 years later. The Curriculum Committee would like to examine classes that have been put on probation, but not decertified more closely to ensure that the changes have indeed been made, and are not simply cosmetic. Therefore, they would like to check the class again after 3 years, instead of the normal 5 years. If the class

passes at the three-year mark, they can then change back to the normal five-year cycle for certification.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend asked why the committee decided upon a three-year instead of one or two-year review.

Dr. Steinhoff stated that it was roughly the halfway point between the one-semester and five-year review, and that such changes would not just be for show, but would have become a permanent change.

Dr. Steinhoff and the Curriculum Committee brought this item before the Senate, and Dr. Townsend seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

Dr. Steinhoff spoke regarding the Curriculum Committee's Progress. See attachment.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend said that he did not want to reiterate his previous concerns, but wanted to make an observation. The core competencies that were selected, their origins in guidelines, for the new general education criteria, the guidelines which courses allowed in gen ed require, have become requirements, now take guidelines and for these individual projects, worried original guidelines morphed into how we evaluate student work, what will we do with the data, if you read the student papers, looking for different core competencies demonstrated, 2 out of 3 may assign a 3 to 2/3 of the problem, what does it all mean, what does the data show, does it go back to the instructor, or in a data base that goes back to SACS

Dr. Adsit said that the criteria would not be evaluated by course, but by category, and that all of the courses selected for a category would be evaluated as the group through random selections, and the committee would come to a consensus regarding results. She further stated that felt it likely that approximately 80% of a given category would meet or exceed expectations. The committee would agree upon the criterion, measure their data, and then they would determine if the material agreed or disagreed with the data.

Dr. Townsend asked if individual instructors would have access to the data.

Dr. Adsit said that the information would be released to the entire campus and would become a part of SACS. While, she believed the campus had done well with General Education, there remained a need to refine UTC's assessment tools, gather data, and generate it.

Dr. Steinhoff said that we would see the assessment at the category level, and that the committee would share data backwards, but the information would be category not by individual instructor. He further commented that the process was essential for General Education, and not solely for SACS. The information would also serve as a means of feedback at the annual level to the Faculty Senate, if not general faculty. The university has had General Education requirements for 10 years. The committee believed that some elements of General Education should be fine-tuned, but they would not reassess the requirements without hard data, laying foundations for these changes.

Dr. Stuart said that it was not the “hardness” of the data that worried him, which was not anyone’s fault, but the fact such assessment might not be in one’s field of expertise, or that a committee is the best way to “grade” such issues.

Dr. Adsit said the process would not be “grading” General Education, so much as gaining a holistic view of practices at UTC.

Dr. Stuart stated that he used the same technique when grading, but he did not think it was the best solution to the problem, but acknowledged the importance of complying with SACS requirements for “hard data.”

Dr. Adsit stated that this review was only one component of the SACS review, and that judgments would not be made solely on the data produced by the General Education review. Rather this information would feed into the “big picture,” together with other items, such as senior exit exams, and other exams that address general education skills and competencies.

Dr. Stuart commented that he did not suggest that this body should interfere in the committee’s work, but he wanted to know how the information would be employed and what it meant for professors.

4. Curriculum Committee – Dr. Rozema, Chair

See attachments.

Dr. Campa suggested that anyone with questions regarding the curriculum committee changes ask Dr. Rozema.

Dr. Rozema stated that all of the measures passed the committee unanimously, with the exception that two had a few postponed, and a couple abstentions. One additional measure was waiting because it lacked the proper signatures, but all of the rest were signed by the provost or his designee Dr. Sanders.

Dr. McCullough moved that the Faculty Senate act on them as a whole, which Dr. Loomis seconded.

Dr. Townsend asked regarding two English proposals.

Dr. Rozema said that the two courses in question, 0930 and 0931, were English, courses which could be repeated for additional credit of up to 9 hours, and some committee members were not sure they should be repeatable. However, there was only 1 abstention, and the issue had not been terribly contentious.

A balloted vote was given out, with the following results:

23-0 in favor of: 09-004a, 09-005, 09-006a, 09-10a, 09-13a, 09-014, 09-016, 09-017, 09-020a, 09-021a, 09-022a, 09-023a, 09-024a, 09-026, 09-027, 09-028, 09-029, 09-030, 09-031, 09-033a, 09-034a, 09-036a, 09-037a, 09-038a, 09-040a, 09-041a, 09-042a, 09-043a, 09-044a, 09-046a

22 votes in favor and 1 abstention: 09-035a

22 votes in favor and 1 vote against: 09-10a, 09-15, 0919, 09-25, 09-45a

5. Administrative Reports

The Provost spoke to the Faculty Senate, stating that he had talked that day with Dr. Yegeedis, who was visiting UTC. UTC was the last campus to be visited in a series of campus visits, leading up to potential cuts. He said that everyone was aware of the potential cuts and that they were waiting to see what congress did with the stimulus package and how that would shape the state budget before making cuts. Most funds associated with the package would be disseminated through conventional funding processes and appropriate agencies, such as healthcare, commerce, and transportation. UT's strategy was to have people with experience deal with the appropriate agencies, and to depend on those with established relationships to seek appropriate funding sources. The largest benefit to the state would most likely take the form of block grants, a large portion of which might be spent on TennCare, since there were already funding mechanisms in place to quickly distribute TennCare funding. UT officials spoke with the governor's office, and if cuts were in the expected amount, it would bring about relief overall to the state budget, which would mitigate some planned cuts. Dr. Oldham further stated that everything hinged on congress, and that the university was trying to position itself for competitive funding.

According to Dr. Oldham, the ad hoc budget committee continued to meet, and he would solicit their advice. He commented that the deans were involved in this process and were remaining up-to-date in an effort to keep everyone informed. By the following day, he was required to provide the system office with a list of programs that UTC was examining for closure, consolidation, or review, which would be presented to the Board of Trustees at end of the month. Dr. Oldham said that no programs had yet been closed or consolidated, but programs were being reviewed, based upon the THEC list of low-producing majors. The administration has been working on misnamed and inaccurate data. Dr. Oldham commented that THEC had no authority to close any programs, but UTC needed to provide a public response to their identification of low-producing programs and submit a list of low-producing programs. Dr. Oldham, stated that he had told Dr. Yegeedis that the list of low-producing programs should not be construed as "cut in stone," but rather as a "living, breathing" list. Some other programs (not on the list) might be submitted, while some programs on the list did not actually require further review, but would show up publically on the list. He expressed the desire to discuss the list internally in greater depth, but because of time constraints was forced to turn it in without further review.

Questions:

Dr. Sanders stated that they had worked to clean up names of degree programs and to make an accurate list, and that it had been sent to the deans for further review.

Dr. Townsend noted that there were 14 programs under review at UTC, and asked if the UT system had dictated how they wanted further data collected, and if there was a systematized process.

Dr. Oldham responded that there were no specific requirements for internal reviews and that it was left up to individual campuses, although the system administration has told UTC what it would like to see.

Dr. Townsend asked if information beyond quantitative data would be examined.

Dr. Oldham answered that the review process included having a committee structure in place, ensuring that the hard data was relevant and accurate, and that they would bring in any qualitative information as they saw fit.

Dr. Townsend commented that 49% of UT Martin's programs had been identified as low producing. He commented that low-producing programs must be a problem at a number of other system schools, and asked if the administration had examined what other system schools were doing to address this issue.

Dr. Oldham stated that some schools had similar problems, such as low-producing secondary education concentrations or foreign languages. According to Dr. Oldham, Martin had even more severe problems [than UTC], because of separate designations and low graduation rates. He questioned if there were a better structure or better way of organizing things, so that it would be more easily understood and managed more effectively. Part of the process, he said, was "how you count the beans." He also noted that there might be a good outcome of the potential review process, in that the university was examining ways to make the campus more productive.

Dr. Lindgren noted that some programs only graduate 2-3 students a year and wanted to know if professors teaching those classes were still considered teaching a full load for the faculty.

Dr. Oldham responded that in actuality there were very few classes with few students. He said that a number of such units were heavily involved in General Education, so most of low-producing departments taught relatively large classes, even though in some classes the number of majors were low, which added to the complexity of the problem. He commented that most units were multiple units, with majors, General Education, and service-oriented classes which balanced low enrollment. Physics was an example of this phenomenon, even at UTK, which had a very large physics department. He said that, although low-producing in regards to majors, physics provided a tremendous portion of general education courses on each campus. He further commented that graduation rates were only one measure, by no means the only measure of low productivity, which was why there was a review process.

Dr. Lindgren stated that many faculty members did not understand that.

Dr. Stuart said that he was impressed with administration's effort to save jobs and that he was surprised at the extent that they had been able to retain jobs. He also said he was even more profoundly grateful not to have Dr. Oldham's job this year. However, that being said, he asked how the ad hoc committee had worked, what kind of real power they had, and if they had actually voted or if it had simply been an advisory committee. He further commented that the ad hoc committee had not met for 2 months, but [budget] decisions had been made. He also asked if decisions had been made that the committee did not have input on. He also questioned, if it was an accurate representation to say that UTC, not the UT system, determined how cuts would be made.

Dr. Oldham responded that he strongly reiterated that the campus had considerable autonomy regarding campus budget cuts. There had been concern that if UTC made cuts in certain areas, there might need to be system involvement, since some areas were more sensitive. In such a

case the system wanted to be informed and to participate. He stated that the administration still did not know how deep cuts would go.

Dr. Townsend asked if there were some hope last week with the stimulus package.

Dr. Oldham replied that if the stimulus package passed, UTC's cuts might be half of what they were otherwise projected. He also said that he hoped UTC could avoid hard decisions that "could, should, and would be made" if there were deep budget cuts. Dr. Oldham said that they had been asked to give prospective cuts of 9%, with a rationale of infusing any saved money back into academic affairs. Given the speed that cuts were requested, some proposed cuts were made in a much less strategic light than they would like. The UT administration received their proposals well. In regards to how the committee functioned, the provost supposed that they had been as frustrated as he had, and that they had not received as much information early in the process as he would have liked. He felt the committee worked very hard to wade through a great deal of information, and that it was fair to say that most committee members had come to the conclusion that the budget was more complex than they had realized. However, he felt that the better the campus understood what and how resources were used the better. He stated that the committee had examined a number of ideas on the table and many things showed up in a tangible form on the list of possible cuts. He did not recall the committee ever taking a vote, which "would not be like me [the provost] anyway." He noted that minority opinions had been expressed at various times, some of which had been included in the decision-making process, and some of which were not considered in the final version of cuts that he put forward. A hiatus took place for several reasons: the committee had gotten to a point in which it had discussed everything it knew about and was not able to make more progress except to "rehash" arguments. As the holidays approached it was harder to get everyone together, and he decided to take a break, to let things "evolve" and to see where the campus stood afterwards. He was facing some deadlines over the break and early in the semester and made some decisions with which everyone was not completely happy, although some people were happy with some aspects and not others. He called on the senate to ask Drs. Campa, Tanner, and Sanders to verify this statement.

Dr. McAllister stated that some low-producing programs [on the THEC list] produced licenses at the graduate level, such as art education, which the state cannot license without meeting undergraduate requirements.

Dr. Oldham said that he and Mary [Tanner] had discussed restructuring education programs to address that issue.

Dr. Townsend commented that the Chancellor had said that Dr. Petersen had instructed him to make strategic rather than across the board cuts, yet the information that had been presented suggested that there were 11.5% cuts across the board and asked how that might be reconciled.

Dr. Oldham responded that that was a topic of considerable conversation among vice-chancellors, and that a few things were responsible for that state of affairs, such as timing and the magnitude of budget cuts. He stated that a great percentage of the budget was made up of salaries, and the administration was trying to protect positions, so they were limited in how to make cuts in a timely manner. It was a very complex process to work through and there were difficult decisions to be made that were not as clear-cut as one might think. The administration decided to prorate cuts out to divisions for the first iteration in this process. All vice-chancellors

and directors did their best to make those cuts strategic within their divisions. He commented that in the case of academic affairs, tenured faculty consumed a huge portion of the budget, and unless UTC declared a finance emergency, or closed programs, it was limited by what it could do. He stated that the discretionary aspects of the budget were in vacant positions, which made cuts look to be nonstrategic. Most divisions had to respond quickly. The strategic part [of budget cuts] would be in how money was replaced. This process did not take into consideration tuition rate increases. He anticipated a fairly large amount of new money going back into the system. Such funds would not necessarily go back to where they were cut.

Dr. Townsend asked if the worst case scenario for the campus would be an 11.5% cut, or if it would be less as the money went back into the system.

Dr. Oldham said he thought that was correct.

6. Report from the Executive Committee

Dr. Campa commented that he would attend the Board Meeting in Memphis, and later report to the Faculty Senate.

He brought up the issue of cutting the football team to increase money for academic affairs. He questioned why the football team had not been brought up for review in light of budget cuts. He noted that for the faculty this discussion was a morale issue, although the faculty was powerless to effect changes against the administration's wishes. Dr. Campa said that UTC just hired a new coach, although the football provided a number of scholarships to students. Dr. Campa said that the Senate had no power to make policy, but it could nevertheless begin a discussion and vote to abolish football. He expressed the opinion that whether or not the administration would support such a move was unclear. He stated that he had heard positive reasons that the university should keep the team, such as increased contributions, or contributions falling in the event that the football team was abolished and that he did not want to second guess the Senate or the full faculty.

Dr. McCullough stated that in the past the Faculty Senate had made a recommendation to abolish the team, but did not believe that it was brought to the full faculty for a vote. In addition, a thorough study of the problem was made.

Dr. Campa stated that we should look at the old report and asked the Senate if they thought he should pursue it or remain silent.

Dr. McCullough said she was not suggesting that the Senate not look at the situation. She believes the executive committee should look at what was done the last time, and suggested that Dr. Townsend do it, since he remembered what had happened the last time the issue was discussed.

Dr. Townsend recommended that Dr. Campa continue to question athletic spending, and that it might be better to cut more deeply into athletics in order to preserve academic affairs.

Dr. Campa agreed that it was an obvious choice, commenting that if programs were "sacred cows," it was time to examine them, and decide if they should continue to be "worshiped" or if they should be "slaughtered."

Dr. Bender noted that the issue was brought up before the senate in the Fall of 2004, and that the records are posted on the faculty senate website.

7. Other Business

8. Faculty Concerns

Dr. Steinberg suggested that trading football for baseball would provide some scholarship money for students, and would not be as expensive or require as much infrastructure as the football program.

Dr. Campa stated that at one time the Faculty Senate voted against keeping the baseball program for a trivial reason associated with a conflict in schedule, despite the fact that they had one of the best academic averages among sports teams on campus.

Dr. Covino noted that we currently have a successful club team, and expressed the hope that it would not end up like the football team.

9. Announcements: There were no announcements.

10. Adjournment 5:10. Dr. Loomis moved to adjourn and Dr. Covino seconded.