

2008 – 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
April 2, 2009

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

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

Among the guests present: Linda Orth

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

1. Call to Order 3:13
2. Approval of the minutes of March 5, 2009
3. Tuition Increase Proposal – Economic Status Committee
Dr. Stuart spoke regarding tuition increase. See Attached

Questions:

Dr. Townsend suggested deleting “rather than promoting our program and institutional differences”. He also questioned the phrase “equitably funding,” and asked if it should be replaced by “proportional funding.”

Dr. Stuart said that the phrasing was intentional and was what the committee wanted.

Dr. Townsend withdrew his objection to the second part.
The measure was passed unanimously by acclamation.

4. Library Budget Cuts – Dr. Theresa Liedtka, Dean of Lupton Library
Dr. Liedtka spoke regarding proposed budget cuts.
See Attached

Questions:

Dr. Honerkamp asked if there were equity in digital and print collections, especially in regards to the field of art, since PDF documents were inferior.

Dr. Liedtka stated that they had not kept duplicate titles in print and digital format in most cases, which affects art in particular. She said that the library had composed their list, so that faculty members could suggest swapping titles to minimize these losses.

Dr. Honerkamp said that they would have their homework over the next 3 weeks.

Dr. Liedtka responded that the deadline was set at that time because everyone will be gone.

Dr. Townsend asked if UTC now ranked lowest in library staffing below Austen Peay, after the loss of 2 members this year.

Dr. Liedtka answered no, but that UTC was close to the least staffed library in the state university system. She further stated that the new library space needed to provide places where students could gather.

Dr. Honerkamp asked if the new library would only provide interlibrary loan requests and have big meeting spaces.

Dr. Liedtka stated that new library journals were going that way, but not books. She further commented that nobody likes to read books in electronic format, and books would not be completely electronic in her lifetime.

Dr. Becksvoort asked if the change in hours were just for the summer.

Dr. Liedtka responded that the academic-year schedule would also change. They felt that closing the library on Saturday was the least harmful option.

Dr. Campa stated that the biggest fear of the on-line materials is that libraries are massively de-accessing printed materials, which are available on microfilm. He listed an example of one of the largest microfilm collections, which has a bug in its microfilm collection, that replicates and creates big black holes. He commented that decisions regarding de-accessing print collects will have impact beyond the immediate decision.

Dr. Liedtka answered that there were 2 organizations, like Portico, which were non-for-profit services that archive scholarly articles in electronic form, which maintain stable access to many on-line materials. The library is concerned about the posterity of library materials, and maintaining journals in full form (without advertisements, etc. being omitted).

5. Administrative Reports

Economic Stimulus Package – Provost Oldham

Dr. Oldham said the library had not the smallest staff, but most productive staff. He further expressed his appreciation to Dean Liedtka and her staff not only the effort that they had clearly done to make cuts in the right way, which was the way that we should approach the sometimes difficult task of making choices. He said that he was doing all that he could to help and that the library was a very strong and important part of any university.

Dr. Oldham continued to talk about the current status of the budget. He had good news, which would be further explained in the news letter going out on the following day [April 3]. The big picture was that news is good, far better than even 3-4 weeks ago. However, he cautioned that all challenges had not been removed, and that some had merely been pushed back a year or two. Thus the analogy would be instead of jumping off the cliff at a free fall, UTC at least had a hang glider to determine the slope needed to get to that point. He reported that UTC would be given some significant one-time money, “whatever color it comes in.” The funds stem from a one-time stimulus package from the federal government, which would carry us through the next 2 years. Such a budget would restore university funding to the fiscal-year 2008 budget levels, before the most recent cuts. Dr. Oldham commented that that was good and that the management challenge was to come up with a plan to be at this same plan 2 years from now. He said it was prudent to assume we would be at the same place, although he certainly hoped the economy would improve. He cautioned that one could not expect such a development and that the university must plan based upon what would most likely happen. More information would come out in the next few days on the budget. He said the university would remain at reduced levels, and that they would continue cuts that they had been working on and program them into the base budget. He said they would use the large pot of one-time money to fund things that are necessary and strategic as UTC went forward. They planned to use some funds use to position UTC more strategically, to backfill some positions to support the ever-growing enrollment. He further said that many things that were going on were coming to play. He also said that there would be a very careful accounting of the one-time money, which was to be audited by the federal government, which had a tendency not to spend money on recurring things beyond two years. He also noted that there were some strings attached to these dollars, which were not all “green.” He was of the opinion that this process would give UTC a great opportunity to do what the library has already been doing, to determine what we need to look like and to identify those behaviors, that need change anyway. He said this was a challenge and an opportunity to look forward, which would give UTC a chance to more deliberately and conscientiously make changes. Thus, academic program reviews would go forward, because it was “the right thing to do.” He said that did not mean that those programs would be cut - just looked at, to get input.

Dr. Oldham mentioned two other items, the brown bag lunch scheduled for the following week would be postponed a week, since Congressman Zach Wamp’s staff was coming to visit at that exact time. He also said that his newsletter would be coming out in the near future.

Questions:

Dr. Honerkamp asked if the back-fill would take the form of tenured faculty, adjuncts or lecturers.

Dr. Oldham said that it would be mixture of all three, and that some would be one-time hires for this coming academic year, for no other reason, than were no time to do searches. He has spoken with the deans, who have authorization to hire part-time temporary people so that UTC might be fully staffed next year. He further stated that early in the fall semester, the university would determine how many positions need to be made permanent, although there would clearly be a limited number. Some positions would clearly be permanent, aside from the one-time money and some tuition increases. He said that he did not know what the increase in tuition would be, but they would press for as large an increase as reasonable. He further noted that tuition hikes were a very political issue, and that they had previously been prepared to ask for a 9% increase. However, the language and intent of the stimulus bill were clear, that it was to help mitigate tuition increases. Thus, UTC would push for some tuition increase, which would be a permanent income source. The first use of such funds would be to support additional permanent faculty, which was why he and the deans needed to “get a handle” on critical hires, as some might be permanent, while others wouldn’t.

Dr. Steinberg asked if the university had made statements to quell fears. For example, she had four students who would not declare a French major, precisely because of the fear that the program would be cut.

Dr. Cantrell stated that he had responded about 5 times, and that there had been another statement from the Chancellor to the campus. He said that although he and Dr. Oldham had both been quoted, no one was listening, because it “frankly” did not feed into the hysteria.

Dr. Oldham noted that dealing with and managing the communication aspect of the issue was the most difficult. As hard as figuring out where cuts should be made, trying to communicate them were incredibly challenging. He also said that they spent a lot of time responding directly with emails, for example, the article regarding the governor’s comments in the last paper. He felt the misreported or misinterpreted comments had caused great anxiety.

Chancellor Brown said the governor’s staff had made a small statement that said that the press release was not exactly what he meant.

Dr. McCullough responded that the words seemed reasonably clear and that it sounded as if all of the smaller schools like UTC should give up their graduate schools for “the greater glory of big orange.”

Provost Oldham said that as far as he was concerned UTC would press forward with its graduate programs as appropriate for this campus.

Dr. McCullough responded that our graduate population would not be served at UTK because it had ties to the community, and work, and would not leave Chattanooga to attend graduate school in Knoxville.

Dr. Oldham agreed.

Dr. Honerkamp commented that the Governor was from a generation that went off to graduate school, which was not the case with our graduate community.

Dr. Oldham responded that the Governor’s objective was to improve economic development in Tennessee. He said that he had been in Nashville a week before, and the governor did have issues

with the structure of higher education in Tennessee, but had mentioned nothing regarding such changes.

Dr. Townsend asked about the money for the stimulus package.

Provost Oldham said there was no definitive answer, and that it was difficult to interpret the governor's statements with so many if/then statements.

Dr. Cantrell asked if there were a ballpark figure.

Dr. Oldham said that there was a link provided in his newsletter [<http://www.utc.edu/Administration/AcademicAffairs/documents/ProvostsPage409.pdf>] to the report on higher education. He stated that the stimulus package would bring funding at UTC back to the fiscal year 2008 state appropriation level. He speculated that UTC would receive 3-6 million dollars per year over 3 years, including this fiscal year.

Dr. Townsend Gavin asked if in effect we were pretending that we had a 13% cut.

Provost responded yes, and that in some ways it would be business as usual. In some units there would not be much difference, and in others they might see some kind of difference. He said it would be somewhat uneven, and that they were trying to keep "the whole ship balanced."

Grote Hall Project – Report by Facilities Planning

Mr. West, the project the manager for Grote Hall, reported that there was good news. He said they would advertise a bid next week, and that the bid date would be May 14. He reported that there would be additional abatement work and the project had a 365-day projected time. In the Fall of 2010, he said that all four floors of Grote would be ready to be reoccupied.

6. Report from the Executive Committee on the Meeting with Dr. Jan Simek – Dr. Campa

Dr. Campa said that the interim President of the UT system, Dr. Simek was here during the holiday. He reported that his impressions were very favorable, and he felt he was an open person. He underscored that he was a faculty member, and would serve for only 2 years, and then return to teaching duties, and as such he understood our problems more directly than past presidents. Dr. Campa commented that they had talked about communication, the verticality of the system, UTC's status as a satellite campus, the merger agreement, and the proposed change of the UT and the Board of Regents system. Dr. Campa stated that he did not think that Dr. Simek favored a merger, and that he cautioned that if UTC merged with the Regents System, it would have to compete with larger campuses like Memphis and ETSU.

Dr. Townsend said that Dr. Simek understood the need for schools within the UT system to have some autonomy. He asked him regarding the black and orange branding. He had asked to use our own school colors, and Dr. Simek seemed to respond well to his proposal. He said Dr. Simek was skeptical of moving to TBR system, feeling that we did not have sufficient political clout. Thus, Dr. Simek felt it would be to our advantage to stay in the UT system. Dr. Townsend also related that the board wanted Dr. Simek to reduce the number of system vice presidents. When Dr. Peterson became system president there were 5-6 vice-presidents, which increased to 22 vice-presidents. This was a clear indication, that Dr. Simek's number-one job, was to trim the system bureaucracy. He had one proviso that there would be a great deal of resistance to change.

Dr. Campa stated that Dr. Simek knew very well there would be resistance, and there were lot of stakes and perks that might have to go. The board wanted more substantial cuts on the system level.

Dr. Purkey said that Dr. Simek also said that he would like to return greater autonomy to the individual university chancellors.

Dr. Honerkamp asked if the issue of tuition came up.

Dr. Campa responded no. He said there would be greater access to the new president with fewer buffers.

Dr. Townsend said it was refreshing that Dr. Simek thought like a faculty member and not a politician.

Dr. Cantrell commented that the system will benefit from the time that Dr. Simek spent as a chancellor.

7. Retention, Advisement – Fran Bender

Dr. Campa stated that the faculty was concerned with the increase in enrollment.

Dr. Bender said, “I have the magic bullet” and that it would be interesting in the fall. She said that Drs. Sanders and Oldham had participated in this preparation process for the fall, and that they would try to put students in classrooms and fill courses, as well as trying their best to have sections available to the students. They have asked department heads what was needed for the fall to be ready when students come. She also indicated that the admission numbers were high, with many more students applying than the prior year, although one never knows how many will come. They speculate that there will be many students, because the economy, and because people were making decisions when they don’t have [extra] money to send their children off to school. She also said there were a couple of things put in place the fall semester, such as a June 1 admission deadline, which would go into effect right away. 96% of freshmen applicants are made by then, so there should be no severe negative effect. According to Dr. Freeman’s predicted models new enrollment would be at 2400-2500, or up by about 400 students. They also planned to defer admission of students admitted through the holistic review process to the spring semester, which would affect around 100 students. There was a lot of attrition between the two semesters, and they would look at other steps over the following few days. The standards committee took an aggressive stance regarding standards, and they would try to find ways to keep enrollment at a reasonable level, although there were not many aggressive tools. One other idea would be to charge an admission fee, which a number of universities had. They would look at issues such as the ACT, GPA. She said that the process would go through committees first.

Dr. Bender also said that there was some very brief news regarding freshmen. During this academic year freshman English composition courses took attendance, which they plan to institute for all 100-level courses. They planned for all people who teach 100-level courses to take attendance and report the data. Department heads were already aware of this, although faculty might not be. They started talking about it back in the fall semester, and some say they cannot do it, but the answer is yes, you can, we’re going to work it out.

Dr. Campa responded they would try to work it out.

Dr. Bender said that they would [work it out], and that at the Arts and Sciences meeting someone suggested requiring freshman to buy clickers, which would work with large classes of 250 students.

Dr. Loomis asked how attendance would be handled larger classes, in which students text message. She commented that taking attendance was not the answer.

Dr. Bender commented that at universities that took attendance, retention improved by 17 % and the graduation rate by 10%, with no other difference.

Dr. Loomis said that taking attendance would not be effective, unless student grades were penalized for absences.

Dr Bender explained that the procedure was that if a student missed two classes, the instructor enters the students' absences. Emails would be automatically generated to housing, and to Dr. Bender's office. The student receives a personal visit from an RA in the dorms, telling them that they've missed classes and that they need to go to class if they want to succeed academically, as well as instructing them about resources, such as the writing center, the math lab, etc. If the student lives off campus he or she receives a phone call. She summed up the matter, by saying that "it works."

Dr. Loomis asked if faculty had to take attendance and enter information.

Dr. Oldham said that when they did this at his former institution, he was skeptical. However, within 2 years, it was clear that it made a significant difference. The culture changed and students' habits changed. Students made better grades and persisted at a much higher rate.

Dr. Bender said that they cannot isolate it a the reason for improved performance, but it is an important part. The English department was currently carrying out this policy. The fall to spring retention rate was formerly 83-4%, but this year was 90.8, meaning that 6% more students were coming back the spring semester than the previous year. In addition, she said they had had a freshman success seminar for those on probation, and they think that may have made a difference in retention rates.

Dr. Sweeney recounted an anecdote, stating that he did not do it in the fall, and he did in the spring, and students had higher grades. He said a percentage of students continued to text, but they were in class and had greater opportunity for contact opportunity with the professor.

Dr. Covino stated he had a contrary story to Dr. Sweeney's. He stated that many high achieving students were not remaining, because they felt that UTC was a sequel to high school sequel, and that they were not challenged as they would like to be. He feared that this program would drive the message "welcome to the 13th grade," home. He said this policy was very much like high school, and that it let our high-achieving students down. Thus, while improving Cs to Bs, it was driving away As.

Dr. Bender said they did not have the full data. However, when she was younger people took attendance, and it did not make one want to go to another school. She felt that taking attendance and feeling challenged were two different things.

Dr. Oldham assured the faculty that no punitive action would be taken against absent students.

Dr. Covino said this was a culture issue. One of his students wrote in his evaluation that he was “still loving” the lack of an attendance policy. “Dr. Covino respects my time, and I respect his.”

Dr. Oldham stressed that it was not a policy, but a reminder that students who did not come to class perform poorly.

Dr. Campa stated that the faculty needed to discuss the issue at greater length.

Dr. Bender said that this semester they would hire 4 professional advisors, which were advertised on the UTC web page. She commented that the college of business, Education, and Nursing already had professional advisors. Eventually they would like to have about 12 professional advisors. They planned for all freshman to be assigned an advisor from orientation through their freshman year, and then as sophomores they would be handed off to their major department. Currently they do not have sufficient cadre to fully implement the plan, but they were working on an orientation.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend asked if instead of hiring professional advisors, they had discussed using the money to provide incentives for faculty to be advisors.

Dr. Bender said that it would be mainly for freshmen.

Dr. Townsend said that some departments insisted upon advising freshman themselves.

Dr. Bender responded that the professional advisers would be trained and would find out the nuances. She further commented that they were used all over the country and that it was an advising model that has great promise.

8. Other Business

There was no other business.

9. Faculty Concerns.

There were no concerns.

10. Announcements. None.

11. Adjournment 4:35

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynn Purkey
Faculty Senate Secretary
April 2, 2009