

**2008 – 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.**  
**March 5, 2009**

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

<b>Division</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>President</b>	Pedro Campa	
<b>Past-President</b>	Gavin Townsend	
<b>At-Large</b>	Tammy Garland, Chris Stuart	Mike Bell, Linda Hill, Claire McCullough, and Jim Tucker
<b>Lecturer</b>		Andrea Becksvoort
<b>Adjunct Rep.</b>		Bob Schmidt
<b>Behavioral Sciences</b>	Tom Buchanan, Helen Eigenberg, and Nick Honerkamp	Terri LeMoyne
<b>Business Admin.</b>	Beverly Brockman, Jim Henley, and Kathleen Wheatley	
<b>Engineering &amp; Computer Science</b>		Ron Goulet, Michel Holder, Frank Jones, Li Yang
<b>Fine Arts</b>	Kenyon Wilson	Stuart Benkert and Patrick Sweetman
<b>CHEPS</b>	Linda Johnston, Elizabeth O'Brien, and Cheryl Robinson	Kay Lindgren, Deborah McAllister, Dana Wertemberger
<b>Humanities</b>	Ralph Covino and Vicki Steinberg	Lauren Ingraham, Lynn Purkey
<b>Library</b>	Beverly Simmons	
<b>Math &amp; Sciences</b>	Doug Kutz and Irene Loomis	Hill Craddock, Henry Spratt
<b>Ex-Officio</b>	Roger Brown, Phil Oldham, Jocelyn Sanders, Richard Brown, Theresa Liedtka	John Delaney
<b>SGA Liaison</b>		

**Among the guests present:** Linda Orth, Dr. Burhenn, Dr. Rozema

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

1. Call to Order 3:11
2. Approval of the minutes of February 19, 2009  
 Dr. Loomis moved to approve the minutes and Dr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which was approved by acclamation
3. Curriculum Committee – Dr. Rozema, Chair  
 09-039a SAG SOC 339  
 The Senate voted 24 in favor, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions, in favor of the curriculum proposal.
4. Report from the UT Council – Dr. Miles, Chair  
 Dr. Miles, who presides over the UT Council, attended the recent Board of Trustees Meeting in Memphis. Dr. Miles praised the Chancellor's presentation, which was the only presentation to begin with the university's commitment to maintaining its human capital.

See attached

Questions:

Dr. Rice asked if Dr. Miles's figures were in relation to money spent on faculty or faculty positions, to which she responded the former.

5. Report from the BOT Meeting – Dr. Prevost, UTC Representative to BOT

Dr. Prevost spoke regarding the recent BOT meeting, commenting that the June meeting would be the crucial meeting, in which budget cuts would be finalized. She said that there had not been many controversial issues at the past meeting. One important issue was the plan to review programs. UTC's plan was not yet approved, but the BOT approved a system plan, and she believed that our plan would be approved if it fit within the system plan, and did not foresee any problem with the plan or its approval. She also stated that she appreciated the system faculty council and the way that they worked with Bonnie Yegeedis to represent faculty interests. The most controversial issue discussed at board, as Dr. Miles mentioned, was the cut in UTK's social work program at Memphis. This cut was suggested before the plan was proposed and the decision was made to table the issue. It was a contentious issue between the trustees of Memphis and Knoxville, and was tabled in order to give everyone the opportunity to look more carefully at the program.

Dr. Prevost said that the most difficult moment for UTC came in the discussion of retention. She expressed her gratitude for how the Chancellor and Provost handled the problem and how the latter addressed the issue of retention rates. UTC was next to the bottom, after Austin Peay, in regards to poor retention rates. Dr. Prevost stated that they had discussed raising the minimum ACT scores, but since 2003, the average ACT scores increased, while retention rates decreased, which was indicative of other problems. She felt that one problem was the rate of rapid growth and the lack of support services. She further noted that UTC's average ACT score was above those of Memphis, but that they had a 13% higher retention rate. She also stated that all faculty members at UTC should be concerned. Dr. Prevost stated that she echoed Dr. Miles's remarks regarding how well represented the campus was by the administration at the BOT meeting.

6. Report on Varsity Football – Rick Hart, Director of Athletics  
2005 Football Report

[http://www.utc.edu/Departments/fcouncil/Archives/2000\\_2010Archives/2004\\_05/2004\\_05Attachments/FootballReport.pdf](http://www.utc.edu/Departments/fcouncil/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2004_05/2004_05Attachments/FootballReport.pdf)

Dr. Campa stated that there had been a great deal of faculty concern regarding academic cuts versus athletic cuts.

Dr. Hart said he felt it was appropriate given the current economic and political climate that such questions were brought forth.

See attached presentation

## Questions:

Dr. Campa stated that he told Mr. Hart when he invited to speak to the Faculty Senate that the body was not opposed to varsity athletics, but was asking specifically about football. Dr. Campa said he had been in the Faculty Senate, when baseball was disbanded, despite the fact that their students were among the best teams in terms of academic and athletic performance. He also said that the Senate was specifically concerned with the football team and not the entire athletic program.

Dr. Hart said he regretted that UTC did not have a baseball team. He also said that it was important during difficult economic times not to make short term decisions that would have long-term effects, stating that it was his position that football was integral to the success of the entire athletic program at UTC.

Dr. Townsend stated that he wondered what factors had contributed to improving the APR from 05 to 06-07.

Mr. Hart stated that the athletic program had been in such trouble, that an improvement plan was mandated. In response, the athletic department created a committee through an inclusive process, with members from faculty, staff, and athletic staff. The committee took a holistic approach and identified where there problems lay, examining issues such as transfer students, advisement, academic support, and recruitment. Everything impacted the improvement plan, including attendance, coaches checking academics, and better relations with faculty. One new aspect of the plan was that coaches expected athletes to talk with faculty members during office hours. Recruited athletes were another issue. They added an academic advisor for the first time, and 2 full-time staff members. There had been no full time compliance director. The program was losing 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> year athletes. They were retaining them, but these students were not graduating at a high rate. Transfer students were one issue. They came in as part of a culture that have not been at the institution for a degree and typically have not persisted. Mr. Hart welcomed any ideas that the faculty had to please communicate them to Dr. Ingram, the chair of the athletic committee. He further stated that he and his staff would like to know if any athletes were not attending class, and that they were trying to partner with the faculty and administration. He also felt that they should “tap into” more support systems in place on campus, such as the writing center.

Dr. Rice thanked Mr. Hart for performing a very difficult job, stating that he had inherited a historic situation with budget deficits. However, he said that the fact that Mr. Hart described football as an economic engine scared him. Commenting that there were only about 20 or 30 programs, but that there was a net income negative overall for athletics. He noted that when Chancellor Brown came on campus, the committee looked at the deficit, and there was an effort to improve this. However, he felt that this issue would never be solved, adding that the problem has been around a long time. He stated it was a good thing that UTC did so well at other sports, although GPAs still had some outstanding. For example, wrestling had a bit of a problem, but basketball was successful. During his 35 years at UTC, he remembered several problems. For example, the stadium was a white elephant. Even if UTC got a winning team, there is now a professional team in Nashville, and there is limited time to go to sports. He wondered if it would be a ripple effect, if they raise fees to fund women’s golf. Now like in other institutions, 60-62% of students are women, and women pay fees, but the most expensive sport is football. He expressed the opinion that there was a gender inequity in spending on sports and in leadership.

He further noted that women were almost half the workforce now, but approximately 80% of layoffs were men, and that there was a growing trend, which should equal that of men by 2020. He stated that UTC was increasingly beating a dead horse, and that this type of spending would lead to increased student fees and that the campus needs to look long and hard, not only at the benefits of the sports program as Mr. Hart described them. He further suggested that UTC's football spending could be spent on more sports, and bringing back baseball, instead of trying to keep the football program going.

Mr. Hart thanked Dr. Rice for his comments and said that he understood why he felt that way, and that his opinion might very well be the case. As the individual who is trying to lead all 17 sports, he reported that he sought to achieve a vision for the entire program. He stated that the university was fortunate that the football program was efficiently operated, and that it did not spend very much more money than the basketball program did. However, he felt that UTC received its money's worth in terms of student athletes. He agreed that in the short term other sports would benefit by such a move, but in time costs would continue to rise, and travel costs could be phenomenally more expensive. Other sports would not provide an opportunity to generate the same type of funds that football would. Other institutions in our football subdivision have shown that they can generate revenue and that football can be a part of the solution.

Dr. Stuart said that both Mr. Hart and Dr. Rice made very convincing arguments. He said he was unclear on the impact of the program. He asked why UTC persisted in its program, if ETSU abolished the football program and they are doing well. Dr. Stuart said that Mr. Hart's point of view is that the football team has suffered, and he asked what the ramifications of going to another conference were.

Mr. Hart stated that the Southern Conference was a good fit for UTC. It had no other Tennessee schools, but is a good fit geographically, and mixes public and private schools well. He also said that ETSU was trying to bring football back and that the decision had had a bad effect upon the whole institution. They were in the Atlantic Sun Conference and had to travel to "crazy" places, and other conferences sometimes required one to change some things that you did not think about. UNC Charlotte, South Alabama, and Pembroke are adding football. It may not always be good to do what others do. He could not quantify and prove that football was a good investment, but he believed it would prove to be beneficial to the entire athletic program.

Dr. Craddock asked why the Southern Conference would kick us out if we drop the football program.

Mr. Hart said that they wanted 9 football teams playing.

Dr. Craddock said he thought it was "just dumb" that other sports would be expelled because of that.

Mr. Hart said that it would not align with the Southern Conference mission.

Dr. Cantrell said that there were automatic bursts in other sports.

Dr. Craddock commented that it sounded like blackmail.

Dr. Oldham replied that it would be devastating to be out of the Southern Conference for women's basketball.

Hart said that the media coverage and reports from Knoxville and in the student paper about dropping football and cutting athletics have negatively impacted the program. He has received calls from the Southern Conference asking what was going on and from recruits, who were reconsidering attending UTC because of the press. The issue came up on a regular basis and made his job harder.

Dr. Prevost said that she agreed that it was blackmail and that it existed everywhere.

Mr. Hart responded that it messed everyone up.

Dr. Bender asked if a winning football team drove the machine, what the consequences were for having a losing team, which UTC has had for 20 years. Stating that she was a huge football fan, she asked how long the university could tolerate such a tradition.

Mr. Hart admitted that the university's "engine" needed some maintenance. In its current state, he believed, the football program had value and merit, but he was not complacent. He said he had no interest in maintaining the status quo, since UTC had not tapped into football's full potential. He suggested that UTC could have a winning football team. He said that the program had a long way to go; however, he was not ready to give up and he has tried to summarize why the program should be maintained.

Dr. Townsend asked what kind of benchmarks they would look for.

Mr. Hart stated that they had goals, such as raising the APR and revenue projections. He said that each manager had 5-6 leads into their strategic objectives. New members of annual giving were up 15%, and one of his goals was to increase broad participation, including major gifts. Last year there were 7 major gifts and this year there have been 12 gifts of 10,000 or more. As the campus does not currently have Banner, they have had some problems reaching people, in part because they have had trouble getting reports, and have lost track of people, including former football players, who might donate. The Athletic Department has not had a roster and has had to dig through old media, building data in order to measure attendance and track attendance.

Dr. Townsend asked how they would spend a \$.5 million gift,

Mr. Hart said they would work with donors, with a needs list for football, and request funds for a few areas, such as a football practice field, a piece of turf that cannot be walked on, flooded, or have grass can't use, talk new turf, could our football use that instead of drive to Finley every day, could soccer use it also, no where to practice to compete, also look at academics, try to figure out how to do this, not comfortable with academic support, never real comfortable that we are quite there, fund a position over 3 years, 1 year assignment for 3 years, change culture and get football system up, new coach thinks once he gets his system up we won't have the same problem when they are up, now done with football, will they finish their degree,

Dr. Rice commented that many schools take tutoring out of athletics and put it in academic affairs. He noted the potential for a conflict in interest when it is in athletic affairs.

Mr. Hart said that he would love to do that, and would like to talk further about academic support as long as he felt that our campus would support the unique mission of sports. However, he did not feel that our advising model would work for athletics.

Dr. Rice stated that it was fact, and not his opinion, that every year there were deficits in athletic spending, which affected accessibility. The latter was driven by fees, which increase when the program has a deficit, resulting in a certain number of students who cannot attend because of the deficit.

Dr. Campa thanked Mr. Hart for his report.

7. Administrative Reports

No Administrative Reports

8. Report from the Executive Committee

Nothing to Report

9. Other Business

10. Faculty Concerns

Bender email about appointing people from the volunteers to that would like to serve on the ad hoc group to look at ideas for improving advising. Drs. Vann Ness, Steinberg, Robinson, and Johnston volunteered.

11. Announcements

12. Adjournment 4:45

Respectfully Submitted,  
Lynn Purkey  
Faculty Senate Secretary  
March 5, 2009