

2008 – 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
February 19, 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	Tammy Garland, Mike Bell, Chris Stuart, Claire McCullough, and Jim Tucker	Linda Hill
Lecturer		Andrea Becksvort
Adjunct Rep.		Bob Schmidt
Behavioral Sciences	Tom Buchanan, Helen Eigenberg, and Nick Honerkamp	Terri LeMoyne
Business Admin.	Beverly Brockman, Jim Henley, and Kathleen Wheatley	
Engineering & Computer Science		Ron Goulet, Michel Holder, Frank Jones, Li Yang
Fine Arts	Kenyon Wilson	Stuart Benkert and Patrick Sweetman
CHEPS	Linda Johnston, Elizabeth O'Brien, and Cheryl Robinson	Kay Lindgren, Deborah McAllister, Dana Wertemberger
Humanities	Ralph Covino and Vicki Steinberg	Lauren Ingraham, Lynn Purkey
Library	Beverly Simmons	
Math & Sciences	Doug Kutz and Irene Loomis	Hill Craddock, Henry Spratt
Ex-Officio	Roger Brown, Phil Oldham, Jocelyn Sanders, Richard Brown, Theresa Liedtka	John Delaney
SGA Liaison		

Among the guests present: Linda Orth, Joan Garret, Debbie Parker, Andy Novobilski, Greg O'Dea

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

1. Call to Order – 3:15pm
2. Approval of the minutes of February 5, 2009

Dr Townsend asked that typographical errors be corrected in the minutes of the previous meeting and that the section beginning “Dr. Townsend said that he did not want...” be replaced with “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 had their origins in 1997 as guidelines for Gen Ed certification. These guidelines were morphed somehow in the late 1990s to become ‘requirements’ for all courses seeking Gen Ed certification. Now we are asked to accept essentially these same course guidelines/requirements as the criteria used to assess in individual student projects. Is this sound? Dr. Townsend also wondered about the worth of the assessment data. What will it mean if 2 of 3 faculty reviewers assign a ‘2’, for instance, to a particular competency as

apparent in a sample student paper? Will the data be made available to the instructor? Or will it just be compiled into some database for SACS?"

The motion to approve the minutes as amended was put forward by Dr Loomis, with Dr Stuart seconding. The Senate approved the minutes as amended unanimously by voice vote.

3. Handbook Committee – Dr Stuart

The Faculty Handbook Committee moved that a single word be replaced in the “Grade Change Policy.” Where the Handbook currently reads “Changing of a semester grade, once it has been reported to the records office by the instructor, may be made only in cases of **computational** error or for removal of an incomplete. Students are *not* permitted to do additional work, or to re-write a paper, etc., after the end of the semester in order to receive a change of grade. Refer to Grade Appeals Procedure” it would be amended to “Changing of a semester grade, once it has been reported to the records office by the instructor, may be made only in cases of **instructor** error or for removal of an incomplete. Students are *not* permitted to do additional work, or to re-write a paper, etc., after the end of the semester in order to receive a change of grade. Refer to Grade Appeals Procedure.”

Following Dr Stuart’s presentation, Dr Campa highlighted the problems raised by the singular nature of the current handbook language. He indicated that the current way to change a grade often leads to faculty having to indicate that a computational error is present when, in fact, there is none. Other instructor-based reasons for change exist and, as such, the language of the handbook should be changed so as to assuage those uncomfortable with misrepresentation.

Dr Honerkamp, in response, indicated that he believes that it is OK for Dr Campa to feel OK about having to fib on the request form; Dr Campa replied that he felt OK about it anyway.

Dr Stuart then provided additional background as to how the proposed change to the Handbook came about, *i.e.* a discussion of a specific case brought up by a single member of the faculty who truly felt uncomfortable reporting a change as a computational error and who thusly fell afoul of the current policy’s rigidity. He pointed out that the recommended action emerged following a discussion of the issues raised by the case in question; however, he felt that the mechanisms which are already in place to deal with grade changes were sufficient to handle that particular issue. He was at pains to point out that affecting a grade change should not be easy so as not to open the floodgates to student requests for same.

Dr McCullough objected to Dr Stuart’s reading of the particular case mentioned, specifically that the faculty member in question could have gone to the Grade Appeals Committee. As a member of the committee, she reminded the Senate that it operates only in a select range of cases, specifically those where the grade was felt to be unfair, arbitrary or malicious. The case which was being discussed, in her opinion, fell into none of those categories and, as such, would have been rejected by the committee for consideration. Dr Stuart rebutted that “unfair” seemed to qualify, which Dr McCullough negated. Dr Stuart indicated his disagreement with Dr McCullough and discussions resumed.

Dr Townsend enquired as to whether alternatives were discussed at the meeting of the Handbook Committee which might have resolved the case. Dr Stuart replied in the negative. It was the committee’s decision to not amend the Handbook so as to deal with a unique case but to instead deal

with the host of other issues surrounding that particular part of the Handbook. The committee did not want to open a can of worms by dealing with phrases such as “error of judgment”, “mistake”, *etc.*, or to open the floodgates, as he already had indicated. In cases where a student has missed the submission of a piece of work, *vel sim.*, the mark of Incomplete should be awarded and thus problems such as the one mentioned are solved easily.

Linda Orth pointed out that if an error of any sort is discovered during the grading period itself, even if a faculty member has submitted a grade sheet, it can be resolved quickly without rigmarole. All one needs to do is to call her, and she can pull the grade sheet and amend it prior to processing. This method would eliminate the need to fill out a grade change form. It can be accomplished via this means up until the Thursday or Friday morning prior to graduation while there is still a window of opportunity to deal with last minute issues arising.

Dr Townsend jumped back in so as to clarify that where he was going with his previous point was to ask whether amending the Handbook’s language to “with the written authorization of the instructor” might be a possible solution to all problems under discussion. Dr Stuart replied, indicating that such language could lead to an influx of students begging for a grade change and that “softies” might cave to such demands. Dr Loomis pointed out that the written authorization of the instructor comes with the grade change form in any case and, given this, such language would be tautological.

Dr McCullough pointed out that the proposed new language still did not address the issue of lying on the grade change forms. She was of the opinion that a grade change mechanism ought to exist which would allow for a grade to be changed without the instructor having to lie. Dr Stuart reiterated his point that mechanisms do exist that allow for this; one might go to the Grade Appeals Committee or appeal to the Chancellor. Dr McCullough repeated that the Grade Appeals Committee will not accept appeals stemming from certain errors. Dr Stuart suggested that such would certainly be the case so long as Dr McCullough remained on the committee; however, Dr McCullough asked Dr Stuart not to shoot the messenger in this instance as she was merely reporting how things are. Dr Stuart concluded that the Grade Appeals Committee is made up of subjective individuals and that, in any case, one might still appeal to the Chancellor and, as such, a mechanism does exist. In his ten years of teaching, he has never once had to lie on a grade change form or experienced anything like the situation which started the discussion in the first place.

Dr Townsend indicated that his proposed amendment to the amendment’s language was phrased as an inquiry only.

The motion, having been exhaustively debated, was then brought forward for a vote. The votes were as follows, 15 ayes, 3 nays, 1 abstaining. The votes having been tallied, the motion passed and the Handbook will be so amended.

4. Administrative Reports

Dr Campa introduced the Administrative Reports portion of the meeting. He indicated that with the Board of Trustees meeting coming up at the end of the month, he thought that it might be a nice idea for our administrators to tell the Senate what they intended to present, especially where the budget presentation was concerned. To this end, he asked Vice-Chancellor Brown to address the Senate. The substantive data presented by V-C Brown is appended to these minutes.

A. Vice Chancellor Richard Brown

V-C Brown presented what we would be sending as an institution to the Board, covering 1) how to deal with the reductions, 2) the planning process and its transparency, and 3) the tuition and fee projections from the campus.

V-C Brown indicated that UTC is facing the toughest budget year in the last twenty. He thanked the members of the Senate, President Campa, as well as other faculty such as Council Chair Lyn Miles for providing him with feedback throughout the process of bringing balance to the University, as well as the executive team under the leadership of the Chancellor and the Provost. UTC is not immune to the statewide trauma resulting from falling revenues; said trauma will impact all state agencies and institutions. Dealing with the issues arising from the budget situation will be chiefly the responsibility of UPRAC, a committee with a broad base that provides a feedback loop for every budget allocation on the campus. The committee includes faculty, ex officio members, the chair of the UC Foundation, as well as people external to the University. Over the next 3-5 years, he indicated, the challenge which will be faced will be one of thinking longitudinally, with the goal of holding instruction in a quality position as the University moves through the planning process.

V-C Brown then described the planning process itself, the budget, and where our money has been going. He indicated that state appropriations count for 44% of the budget, with 50% coming from tuition and fees. This situation, he felt, is only likely to get worse as the University moves from a state-supported to a state-assisted model of finance. It is V-C Brown's sincere hope that the state will choose to put more resources towards higher education in future; however, he accepts that the 60-70% of the past coming from the state is unlikely to reoccur. In this, the Chancellor is in agreement.

V-C Brown praised the University for being one of the largest employers in Hamilton County, and then discussed the range of issues which pertain to UTC in that respect, such as the \$20m spent on benefits which place us in a much better position than our counterparts and peer institutions.

Regarding spending, V-C Brown indicated that some 45.7% of revenues go directly to instruction. He recognizes that this sum is insufficient and it is his goal to reach a target of at least 50% if feasible. In 07/08, the percentage was 44.8, and as such the budget is being slowly pushed in the right direction towards this end.

V-C Brown pointed out that UTC's enrollment continues to grow as we strive towards the 10,000 student mark. There are over 2,000 incoming freshmen, representing 3-4% growth; however, he noted that with growth comes cost as well as extra tuition dollars. It is his goal to find the right mix of growth, cost, and quality. He noted that one-time funds, which cannot be used to redress lingering salary concerns, are being spent wisely, such as with the \$604k spent on computers, start ups, accreditation issues, and graduate assistants. He pointed out that issues requiring such funds will continue to arise, such as with the 100 podia which are out there with no funds earmarked to replace and/or update them, or with the bulbs in the overhead projectors across UTC which cost \$500 each to replace. Some other items he mentioned in this regard included funds utilized for flood repairs to Frist and other buildings which were necessary prior to the advent of mold.

Real revenue, the Vice-Chancellor indicated, can only come with growth. The growth experienced between 07/08 and 08/09 resulted in another \$1.6 being added to the budget. \$250k was spent addressing the shortfall in academic budgets; this was a stop-gap solution as it is estimated that \$400k is required to totally redress the balance. Operating dollars were provided to other areas;

however, the ratio was not nearly the same as that which was given to the academic side. Some of these other areas which benefited were \$100k for V-C Delaney's orientation scheme and \$50k in funds for Development. V-C Brown echoed the mood of many when he pointed out that it is criminal that UTC fails to put out a quality alumni magazine even annually as a result of a lack of proper funding. Steps are being taken, but nothing like enough.

One particular budget item was discussed at length, the purchase of the Funeral Home on McCallie Avenue. V-C Brown indicated that the funds to acquire said property had been earmarked prior to the budget shortfalls and that the University has been actively seeking its purchase for at least the last 15 years so as to use it to address parking and housing issues. The state put in money for UTC to use to address the parking issue when the building became available. Its acquisition represents a good buy as the property could be valued at over \$1m more than what was paid. The breakdown of the funds used to purchase the site were as follows: \$340k from the UT System, \$193k from the Lupton gift fund, and \$300k from institutional non-recurring funds. UTC now owns the site and in 4-5 months there should be parking taking place there for which student demand exists. In the long term, it is the V-C's hope that the site be redeveloped so as to include parking and housing. The site closes a quadrant of the campus and will be critical in the long run. As UTC would have to acquire it eventually, it is just as well that the purchase happened sooner rather than later.

Dr Townsend asked about the non-recurring \$300k used and its source. V-C Brown indicated that it came from institutional non-recurring funds accrued through savings across the university. Anywhere that savings were made contributed to the fund. As the funds are non-recurring, they cannot be spent on raises, he said. Approximately \$100k remains from these funds left over.

V-C Brown proceeded to discuss the massive problems occasioned in the field of utilities. There, the University, as with many, had to scramble to deal with rising costs from the EPB. Luckily, some of the costs were transferred to users on campus such as Aramark who helped to offset the balance (in their case by *c.* \$100k). Changes in the way the university purchases natural gas helped save some money (*c.* \$100k again), as did savings gleaned from energy management devices having been installed. He noted the longstanding problems on campus, such as a lack of a central energy management system, the age of our buildings, particularly where windows are concerned, as well as leaks.

Despite the problems with our existing infrastructure, V-C Brown pointed out that the University continues to expand, citing the example of the Engel Stadium site, gifted to UTC by the city. Comprising 28.8 acres, it represents the next growth area. The Chancellor is working with a donor so as to use a portion of the land for a track and field stadium which would be of assistance to our nationally ranked teams. To build this, some 10 acres were required which had been owned by the railroad. Using the last piece of the Lupton gift fund, ½ of the requisite territory was purchased, the balance was gifted by the railroad.

Dr Townsend asked if there was an objective difference between the Lupton gift fund and Lupton funds for land acquisition. If there was, how much was left in each. V-C Brown did not have the details to hand, but offered a rough estimate of \$2m remaining, some of which has academical strings attached. Thankful that any of it is there at all, V-C Brown promised to post details to his ever expanding web presence.

Regarding access and diversity funds, V-C Brown noted that they were reduced this year. These funds come from the Geier settlement and the state. This year \$648,000 was realized for projects relating to non-race-based diversity, broadly defined.

Dean Liedtka informed the Senate that these funds' availability was not announced publicly last year. She wanted to know why they were divvied up only by a certain portion of the UTC community. She further requested assurance from the Vice-Chancellor that such a sorry state of affairs not continue and that all members of the UTC community seeking to address diversity issues be allowed to apply instead of a select few. The Vice-Chancellor gave the excuse that the funds arrived late in the game last year and that there was only a limited amount of time to disperse them and assured the Senate that Yancy Freeman will put a request for proposals out there this year.

Regarding reduction planning, V-C Brown discussed the ongoing programmatic review and the establishment of benchmarks for all operating units across the University. All units, all of the V-Cs as well as the Athletic Director were required to recommend 3-20% reductions. The goal of all has been to protect human capital and, at least for now, this goal has been met. The core business of the University, instruction and research programs, will be what is vital to keep, as will be a broad support for student support services. Cuts, where they have been made, have not been of the across-the-board variety – nor have they been, to this point, strategic. They have come principally from recurring expenditures, not from one-time money. Details of the cuts as well as the impact statement, which has been shared with the Senate before, have been sent to Knoxville.

V-C Brown indicated that the project for the future will be to “rebalance” the University and, in doing so, to be transparent about it. All data is posted to the internet for the UTC community to peruse. As is indicated by the impact statements, there will be strain on existing faculty brought about by the loss of colleagues, further strain brought about by strained budgets, as well as changes regarding Chadek, the Challenger Center, and the Children’s Center. He further indicated that he may not run any more tractor pulls out of the arena and that Dr Townsend may not be able to enjoy the delights of Disney on Ice in the future. “Raise enough to pay your way” will be the motto of the future where such programs are concerned.

He then proceeded to talk about cuts which were explored and rejected. Included among these were across-the-board reductions, layoffs, tuition caps, furloughs, and penalty fees for students who over-enroll and then drop habitually. Now that the cuts are slowing down and in the face of possible receipt of stimulus money, it is time to slow down and start thinking strategically instead of trimming, streamlining, etc.

He outlined his plans for any stimulus money. He hoped that some \$600k could be used for faculty positions; however V-C Brown expressly pointed out that positions would not necessarily come from those places where they were removed from initially. He would like to use some money so as to provide for breathing room in the utilities budget, to replace losses in security, to augment the meager development budget, as well as to restore equipment and operating funds in academic affairs. Capital maintenance and shovel-ready projects, energy management, Metro, Frist, Holt, Stagmeier, could also proceed. The Board is aware of the problems in these respects.

Plans were also discussed regarding a 7% increase in tuition; a 9% raise is what he will be asking for, double-digits being eschewed for access reasons, and will generate enough with a touch to put back strategically as a part of his rebalancing act. Included amongst these plans were \$400k in scholarships for transfer students so as to put students into the alleged vacant upper-level seats, as

well as \$15k for ROTC scholarships which we owe them anyway. \$50k will be earmarked for the SACS accreditation review. Other funds could be used for summer school faculty salaries, part-time instructors, the Library, utilities, promotions and rollovers, and the maintenance on UTC's additional square footage.

"We're calling it rebalancing." V-C Brown concluded by pointing out that where funds were removed from the budget will not necessarily govern where they are replaced. He indicated that the System seems to think this to be the right strategy in terms of forward planning.

Questions were taken from the floor regarding the refurbishment of Grote (Kurtz), which V-C Brown indicated is moving forward "dead on target" despite the Fire Marshal's review process, broadband support, which V-C Brown indicated is "fixed now", and how many positions with Chadek and the Children's Center get cut (Garrett). To this, the Provost replied that between 12 and 14 positions were on the block, with some 60 children possibly displaced.

Dr Campa called the interrogation of V-C Brown to a close at 4:30 p.m.

Dr Campa then invited the Chancellor to address the Senate on the same topic, albeit on a more thematic line.

B. Chancellor Roger Brown

The Chancellor thanked V-C Brown, Debbie, the budget staff, and all who have worked hard on the plan. He expressed his sincere hope that the stimulus package, while primarily targeted at K-12 education, might still yield some funds for the University. He indicated that the governor's office will not let the University use it to solve financial problems as it will be a 2 year measure only. The Chancellor hopes that in those 2 years the tax revenues will have increased to a stage where permanent cuts to our budgets can be avoided. In the short term, his fondest hope is that the final 5% of the cuts could be avoided as a result of stimulus money.

Regarding the Board in Memphis, the Chancellor believes that the Board will want to see how the University has changed the way in which it does business. He feels that they may have the impression that the University is overburdened with resources at present or that we have mismanaged our funds. He pointed out that it is his job as Chancellor to indicate that we have not done so and that even with limited funds we will continue to teach, research, and do service at the highest level.

When pressed at the last Board of Trustees meeting about why UTC continues to grow, he responded that it is out of financial need coupled with a more philosophical reason concerning access to higher education in Tennessee. He will continue to emphasize to the Board that UTC fills a critical niche in public higher education in Tennessee because we are not exclusively an undergraduate institution. Important research, he indicated, comes out of Education, Health, and Engineering which serve the state's needs. The message which the Chancellor feels obligated to take to the Board will be one of a success story and of amazing efficiency in terms of what we spend versus what we as a campus accomplish.

Ms Garrett asked the Chancellor whether he thought a 9% tuition hike would be a hard-sell to the Board. The Chancellor expressed his view that the Board and THEC would probably deem 9% too

high for us (though not for UTK); however, he would argue that each campus needs more than the 7% and that our needs are just as urgent as those of our systemic brethren.

Dr Campa thanked the Chancellor for his remarks and invited the Provost to address the Senate. In particular, he asked the Provost to address the great deal of apprehension on campus as a result of the THEC short-list.

C. Provost Phil Oldham

The Provost indicated that in Memphis the Academic Affairs and Student Success sub-committee will be meeting; it is rather full and will be exploring how we are going to measure ourselves and hold ourselves accountable vis-à-vis success. He expected that the issue which will be of greatest interest there will be regarding articulation and transferability across the TBR/UT systems.

He also indicated that the Board's Effectiveness and Efficiency committee is very interested in acquiring benchmark data on programs and that he and the other chief academic officers will be helping Vice-President Bonnie Yegedis to establish these benchmarks, including retention statistics by campus, such as the first year statistics as well as 6-year graduation rates.

Concerning budget restraints and what is going on on the academic side of the review process, the Provost discussed the information which he has submitted on programs which might be subject to mergers and consolidation as well as review or possibly discontinuance. He indicated that UTC will not be seeking to discontinue any programs in the next academic year. That said, programs will be reviewed. The review process is currently being drafted and is with the System's lawyer who will propose changes and amendments. These have not yet been received. The Deans have had input into the draft. The Provost wants to give the Senate an opportunity to review the draft process before the procedure is finalized.

The University is operating with a revised version of the THEC program list which contains those programs which may be subject to review; this list is not finalized and, as the Provost pointed out, there is not a procedure to handle the reviews in place. It is his hope that all will come together in the next few weeks. As for what will trigger a program for review, the Provost said that the THEC low-producing programs will be a reasonable starting point, though recommendation from a department or a dean may also trigger the process. There is a 5 year review cycle for all programs anyway currently in place. Outcomes of the reviews will vary; elimination will not be the sole outcome. Positive outcomes exist, at least in potential, such as the identification of ways in which resources can be better utilized to ensure a program's success.

Dr Townsend asked the Provost how UTC will appear compared to UTM, which is proposing a major change such as disbanding physics, geology, geography, anthropology, etc., given that we are not proposing to discontinue anything at present. The Provost replied that a sampling of local trustees will meet on Monday so as to discuss UTC's presentation and that it will be amended as needs be. UTC will take a UTC-based approach to the financial struggles. What works for Martin may not work for us in terms of budget targets.

Dr Honerkamp asked whether anyone would care about what we cut so long as the targets are met. The Provost replied that the Board does not expect to be surprised at its meeting and that it similarly does not expect cuts which have not been subjected to adequate scrutiny.

Ms Garrett asked how many programs were on the review list and what they were. The Provost replied that roughly 12 programs were on it, depending on how certain things were counted, i.e. divisions within majors. The programs come from across the campus and are on average producing fewer than 10 students a year graduation-wise over the last 5 years. He declined to name the programs in question.

Ms Garrett asked how many tenure-track or tenured faculty members would be affected. The Provost anticipated that no lines would be cut unless an entire department were to be shut down, which is rather unlikely. He further pointed out that no department could be cut until after its programmatic review, which is likely to take at least one semester, pushing a time-table well into next year. Thus, there would be almost a full year before any action like that could happen even in theory.

Dr Townsend asked how the figure of \$250k as seen on the spreadsheet was arrived at. The Provost replied that it was a conservative estimate of what could realistically be achieved in terms of reductions. Dr Townsend followed up by asking how he got to the \$250k specifically. The Provost replied that it was a guesstimate based on figures for part-time instruction, retirements, vacant lines, etc.

Dr Miles asked whether the Provost felt that savings could be realized through the consolidation of departments or divisions. The Provost replied that while some might be, quite a lot of work has been done in this area already, despite the fact that UTC possesses a fair number of relatively small departments. Across campus 'marriages of convenience' already exist in a number of places, but often what is found is that any further amalgamation would result in fields which are too diverse being linked. One possible merger which he has been considering, though, and one he feels is worth exploring, is that Economics might be brought back under the auspices of the College of Business along with Finance and Accounting.

Dr Campa thanked the Provost for his remarks and noted that reasons do exist for the current arrangement vis-à-vis Economics' positioning which have deep roots. In his characteristic way, Dr Campa made an aloof reference to the "Great Terror" as being nothing when compared with the previous saga.

5. Report from the Executive Committee

Dr Campa discussed the forthcoming Board of Trustees meeting in Memphis. While he cannot himself attend, UTC will be represented by the Chair of the Faculty Council, Dr Lyn Miles, as well as our Trustee, Dr Verbie Prevost.

Following this, Dr Campa informed the Senate that having received positive feedback from the membership as well as the Faculty at large, he would be adding to the agenda for the next meeting of the Senate the issue of Athletics. He felt that it was time to revisit the Dumas report and its findings. To that end, he would like to schedule an opportunity for the Athletic Director to come to the Senate to discuss matters arising.

6. Other Business

There was no other business arising.

7. Faculty Concerns

No concerns were noted.

8. Announcements

No announcements were made.

9. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Dr Loomis, seconded by Dr Covino.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Ralph Covino for Lynn Purkey
Faculty Senate Secretary
February 19, 2009**