

2008 – 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
April 16, 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	Dr. Campa Campa	
Past-President	Dr. Townsend Townsend	
At-Large	Mike Bell, Tammy Garland, Linda Hill, Chris Stuart, Jim Tucker	Claire McCullough
Lecturer	Andrea Becksvoot	
Adjunct Rep.		Bob Schmidt
Behavioral Sciences	Helen Eigenberg, and Dr. Honerkamp 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	Roger Brown, Phil Oldham, Dr. Sanders Sanders, Theresa Liedtka	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 15:12

2. Approval of the minutes of April 2, 2009 Irene Honerkamp, acclamation

3. Faculty Involvement in Homecoming – Mr. Andrew Clark and Camile Ward, Student
Government Secretary and Homecoming Director

Mr. Clark and Ms. Ward spoke with Faculty Senate about involving faculty in homecoming. They would like to bring academics into the realm of homecoming. They were considering adding a lecture series, which some other campuses do, in which professors give their last public lecture. They also considered raising donations from items such as dinner with the chancellor. They encouraged faculty members to email them regarding any ideas they had.

4. Academic Program Discontinuance Procedures – Dr. Sanders

Dr. Sanders spoke on the Academic Program Discontinuance and the results of the “axe committee” (the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Program Discontinuance). The university received a directive from the Board of Trustees (BOT) to establish a set of criteria for examining programs for discontinuance, which include multiple reasons, including fiscal constraints, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) list of low producing programs. Dr. Sanders stated that they had worked with THEC to clarify criteria and to make sure it was accurate. Another means of eliminating a program might originate in the department itself. For example the Music Department initiated the process to eliminate the Sacred Music Program, which had become outdated. According to Dr. Sanders, academic deans were very concerned about input at the beginning of the process, and initially they discovered that some of the data was not accurate or sufficiently thorough. This is the reason for the first step of the program. The second step attempts to make the process as thorough as possible. Parts of the committee are determined by BOT, and they have added a few others that make sense for UTC. The BOT issued a directive to identify necessary resources, to indicate where one finds that information. For UTC, that meant that they needed to come up with a table (which was by no means comprehensive), and there might be other documents that would give us information as they consider a program for discontinuance. There is to be a consideration period before a program is discontinued. The committee also sought information from constituencies, and it should solicit input from them

before a recommendation is formed. The committee might recommend continuation, if the program is appropriate in size, and scope, etc., and has the capacity to hopefully grow. The program might also be placed on probationary status with specific recommendations and suggestions for continuance. The primary benefit of this program is how to advertise, to recruit, and to make the relevance of a program more obvious to the public and the BOT. They will look at curriculum and update or look at technology, etc., in order to come up with concrete ideas improving the program, and not simply cutting it. If the committee recommends cutting a program, they will bring deans into the process again, and keep them involved from start to finish, as well as people at the unit and faculty level, and then make their recommendation.

See Attached.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend: About step 5, you can read the faculty handbook that states when a program is discontinued the full faculty reserves the right to have a say in the matter. Not even the faculty can say that this stops at the deans. Is this a Board concern?

Dr. Sanders: That takes place at step 4. The idea takes place as the process is formed, not after, which is the most effective way to include everyone. It takes place by means of a broadly representative committee, instead of behind closed doors. If you all think there needs to be a more obvious point at which faculty have input at the end of the process, let me know.

Dr. Campa: It is my understanding that the present document is a draft.

Dr. Sanders: We worked with the deans to create the process.

Dr. Townsend: The Faculty Senate should be included in the 5th step.

Dr. Townsend moved that the Faculty Senate be included in step 5 in the draft.

Dr. Bell seconded the motion.

Discussion of the Motion:

Dr. Honerkamp: The function of the Faculty Senate should be considered like that of the deans.

Dr. Townsend: That was the intent [of the motion].

Dr. Stuart: In part 3 of step 4, it should be the entire Faculty Senate, and not just the executive committee.

Dr. Townsend: I would not accept that, because they are just getting advisory input at that stage.

Dr. Covino: I agree with Dr. Townsend. There should be more Faculty Senate involvement in step 4 and step 5, so that nothing comes as a shock.

Dr. Stuart: What is the benefit of reviewing the matter twice?

Dr. Sanders: There is no Faculty Senate input into the recommendation, so it can take place in step 5.

Dr. Stuart: Either way we're just giving input; we're just considering it. We can consider it before.

Dr. Townsend: Ultimately the administration can do whatever they want, but we are disagreeing.

Dr. Stuart: One is advisory and one is not.

Dr. Miles: Plans are somewhat variable. At UTK the cut committee was composed of 100% faculty, plus the provost. Recently they selected 10 programs, and the provost only chose 6.

There is a great deal of variability in programs, and we need to find what suits us the most.

Dr. Honerkamp: This is not for this April or June; it is not that fast.

The motion carried with 18 in favor and 3 opposed.

5. Business Administration Articulation Agreement – Dr. John Fulmer

Dr. Fulmer gave an informational briefing, commenting that state law, House bill 4140, requires a universal articulation for undergraduate courses among Tennessee colleges. The first program to be articulated is business. Deans and associate deans of business schools in the two systems and/or department heads met. 19 hours had to be accepted among institutions, including accounting 1 and 2, a statistics course, calculus, and a computer applications course, which left 4

hours of guided electives. All of the schools have differences in requirements at the freshman and sophomore levels, for example UTC requires 2 statistics classes at the sophomore level. The idea is that if a student wants to transfer, he or she would be guided to take a second statistics course, which UTC would accept. Chattanooga State and Cleveland State, which are UTC's two main feeder schools, already do this. If there are concerns about the quality of instruction, UTC can put in a readiness test, for example for accounting 1 and 2. MTSU and UTK have already done that. However, if the school does it for transfer students, it must also do it for its own students. Another thing that UTC can do is to specify the entrance GPA, but Dr. Fulmer did not think that UTC's Business School would do that. He said that he was simply presenting information to the faculty, which had been state mandated.

Questions:

Dr. Rozema: You pointed out a few things. The statistics course is calculus-based, but no one except MTSU does that, at least not in business.

Dr. Fulmer: Theirs is not [calculus-based], they require calculus first. We talked about this. All of us agree that the statistics courses that we teach are quite frankly not calculus-based. I was against this [concession], but did not argue strongly against it in the spirit of congeniality. We would accept the courses from any program that requires statistics and calculus, as long as it included Math 2150. In essence we will take their courses and the other schools will take our statistics courses.

Dr. Rozema: If it is not 2050 from Chattanooga State, they don't have it.

Dr. Fulmer: They will have it. We are happy with the statistics course that they have.

6. Committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee – Dr. Rozema

09-047a FLNG Creation of Foreign Languages 211 and 212

Dr. Campa: This program is created for exotic languages. The courses have an instructor, but perhaps he or she does not have the required qualifications (18 hours in the field). Nevertheless, they are native speakers with college degrees, and they are supervised in our department, in this case by Dr. Steinberg. They are usually good students with no problems with grades or class management. What the curriculum is doing is establishing a rubric, so we can teach these courses.

The motion carried with 20 votes in favor and 1 opposed.

B. Faculty Handbook Committee– Dr. Stuart

Dr. Stuart issued a verbal report for the Faculty Handbook Committee, stating that the committee did not do anything that the Faculty Senate did not already know. Most of the changes were clarifications to wording. They made one change that instituted a recommendation from the grade appeals committee, changing the wording from “computational error” to “instructional error,” which is broader.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend: These changes presumably go to Bonnie Yegeedis.

Dr. Stuart: Yes.

C. Mediation – Dr. Bradley

Dr. Bradley was scheduled to come, but could not attend the meeting.

D. Academic Standards – Dr. Sompayrac

i. Dr. Sompayrac reported that they put forward the proposal to exclude developmental courses from the three-repeat policy. A limit to the number of repeats was recently implemented, which would in effect count repeating developmental courses against the new three-repeat policy.

Since developmental courses were not at the college-level, the committee voted unanimously not to count developmental courses against the three-repeat policy.

Questions:

Dr. Honerkamp: Is there a limit to how many times they can take developmental courses?

Dr. Sanders: No. They don't count in their GPA or towards graduation.

Dr. Loomis: It doesn't count towards continuance, so they could take math 20 times in theory?

Dr. Sampayrac: Yes. I had a friend in college who took 10 years to graduate because of math 106.

The motion passed with 15 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention.

ii. Proposal to Change the Name of Work Experience Credit from IEP to Practical Training Credit.

When students receive credit for "work experience for credit," it goes in as individualized education plan. This process is also used for special education students. The committee felt that a better name for this process is "practical work credit." This change does not address the policy which is in effect, just its name.

The motion passed with 21 in favor, 0 against, and 0 abstentions.

iii. Proposal to Remove Hour Limit on Individual Summer Terms

This proposal deals with the regulation that limits the number of hours students take in summer school. There are now 5 terms: 3 A.M. terms and 2 P.M. terms. There are a number of "quirky" rules in place that Banner will not recognize. The committee recommended a cap of 20 hours for the entire summer in place of individual term limits, in part because of Banner and in part because it is hard to take more than a few classes because of the way they overlap. The committee voted unanimously to recommend this proposal.

Questions:

Dr. Simmons: The proposal states they can take 20 hours for entire summer.

Dr. Townsend: How many students actually attempted to take 20 hours?

Dr. Orth: Enough that we run a weekly or biweekly report from March until the end of summer to catch students who register for 28, 26 or 27 hours.

The motion carried with 19 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

iv. Proposal to Permanently Change the UTC Application Deadline

The committee voted unanimously to move the August 1 deadline for applications to the June 1 application date. There are a number of issues that have contributed to this: students exceed housing capacity and there are issues with late student orientation, when most classes are already full. The university is “bursting at the seams,” which would affect the issue of quality if not controlled. The earlier deadline will help manage growth, housing, classes, and other logistical issues.

The motion was approved with 17 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention.

v. Proposal to Change Admission Requirements to UTC

Beginning in the fall semester of 2010, the committee voted unanimously in favor of a new policy. This policy would make any changes of major effective (if made mid-semester) the following semester after grades have been posted. Scholarship students who decide to change their major mid-semester sometimes cause a problem [for major-specific scholarships]. This policy would provide better tracking for auditing purposes, and veterans and athletes are also certified for progress towards degree. Such a system would prevent mid-semester mishaps.

Faculty need to be able to see a student’s rap sheet in the proper major. In the new system they

can, and students can also change their major on Banner to see what it would look like, even though the change is not officially made until the following semester.

Questions:

Dr. Novobilsky: Does this also apply to students who are dropping majors? We had student with a number of majors who wanted to graduate and had to drop some of them.

Dr. Sampayrac: Now it is still at the end of the semester.

Dr. Novobilsky: So they could not change it?

Dr. Orth: At that point they would not change it; they would simply correct it. The records office has override capability, and most majors stand alone. We could address this issue even without the override capability in the Banner system.

Dr. Garland: Would this apply to students who fail to correct their major until last the last semester?

Dr. Orth: Yes, and you would be able to see the changes for advisement purposes in future terms.

The motion was approved, with 18 votes in favor, 0 against, and 2 abstentions.

The Proposal on Academic Warnings

The committee voted 5-0-1 to reinstate academic warnings. The warning would be carried out in the form of an email to students with an institutional GPA of less than a 2.2. The committee and Dr. Bender have pledged to work together on this process. The measure is necessary since advisors do not always know if a student has a GPA of less than 2.2. The email would also provide resources and advice to students. Some students are not aware that there is a minimum GPA for graduation. An academic warning is one more step towards reminding students that there are academic standards that must be met in order to receive a diploma.

Questions:

Dr. Covino: Why was the process removed in the first place?

Dr. Sompayrac: I was not part of that decision.

Dr. Bender: There was no email before; it simply appeared on the rap sheet in words like “in good standing.” Before it was changed, the minimum requirement was 1.0 for freshman, and we posted “in good standing” if the student’s GPA was 1.2, which simply meant that you were not dismissed. This was removed because it was sending a poor message.

Dr. Covino: So this is a new policy, not an old warning.

Dr. Townsend: Can Banner make automatic emails?

Dr. Orth: I think so.

Dr. Townsend: If Banner cannot do this, are we getting ourselves into something that Banner cannot handle bureaucratically?

The motion carried with 18 votes in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Proposal to Raise Admission Standards

Dr. Sompayrak stated that there were an exceptionally high number of students accepted for fall admissions. In the past the university discussed changing admission standards. The current minimum standards were an ACT score of 21 with a GPA of 2.0 or an ACT score of 18, with a GPA of 2.75 or higher. The committee proposed raising the minimum GPA from 2.0 to 2.3, a relatively small increase. They reported that Dr. Freeman looked at the impact such a change would have proportionally, based upon who was accepted by race, etc., and found that such a change would not have a great impact on these statistics. Currently UTC has a process of holistic admissions, and they examine other standards in evaluating if necessary. Although UTK has higher admission standards, they were not raised overnight, but incrementally and this change could be a first step towards improving standards at UTC and limiting the number of students at UTC.

Dr. Oldham stated that UTC was “the school of choice” for many students, and that there was a record number of applicants in the honors program. The university’s infrastructure is such that administrators have to find a way to limit high enrollment numbers.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend: Dr. Freeman, 2 years ago, this issue passed strongly in the Faculty Senate [but was not instituted]. Is this new policy different?

Dr. Freeman: We are closer to where we were. There was no GPA requirement, but this one does have such a requirement. It is a balance of providing access to students and receiving the best students. Raising standards by increments allows UTC to continue affording access to students, while meeting the need to increase standards. The goal is to better shape enrollment, and [improve] retention.

Dr. Townsend: Do you anticipate an increase next year?

Dr. Freeman: Over the past 2 years, there has been an increased change in our academic profile. If we look at demographics and what is happening with the student body, to reinforce what Dr. Sompayrac said, this year we admitted 1000 more students than we did last year at the same time. The change in deadline will help. Students will adjust and apply earlier. We need to keep access in place and to put programs in place to improve grades. There was a jump in fall to spring retention rates this year. We are admitting better groups of students. There is no instant answer to what will come next or how to get students to commit to us earlier, or to shape the class in a better way. We are considering asking them to send us a commitment card, which will be likely for the freshman class of 2014.

Dr. Townsend: Is it possible that minimum ACT scores will be raised to 19 in the future?

Dr. Freeman: That is a possibility.

Dr. Campa – I would like a brief statement from the Standards Committee to explain the measure, which will have to go before the full faculty.

Dr. Sampayrac: In essence this measure would raise the minimum GPA with an ACT score of 21 to 2.3, and raise the minimum ACT score with a GPA of 2.75 or higher to 18.

The motion carried with 19 votes in favor, 2 opposed, and no abstention.

7. Administrative Reports – Budget Stimulus Package, Chancellor Brown

Dr. Brown spoke on the Budget Stimulus Package.

Dr. Brown: Thank you, Dr. Campa. There is an additional report to come, but we know a little more now today about funds coming to UTC and the schedule from the budget office in Knoxville. UTC is to receive approximately \$11 million of federal stimulus funds. However, there were strict restrictions on how they can be used. Previously, Dr. Townsend had asked why such funds could not be used for faculty raises. This was the first prohibition placed upon the funds. The accounting logic behind this stipulation was sound, since these moneys are only for two years. If UTC awarded the funds as faculty salary increases, they would also accept an obligation to continue paying when the funds were at an end. That and the dire economic predictions in state revenue made [not raising salaries] a sound decision. UTC had received a broad guideline from acting President Simek to plan reductions in a more humane way in respect to layoffs. The reduction to UT's base budget remains on the table, but the system has been given more time to develop plans on how to make permanent cuts. The good news is that \$11 million is a lot of money, but UTC cannot use it in any permanent way. UTC still expects to plan for cuts. The university's top priority is to protect the student experience, to protect classes, and to protect employees. Our goal is to keep fees as low as possible, but it might be necessary to have some level of fee increase. The funds are subject to final approval of a bill being passed in the house. It will come as part of the government's regular budget and replace part of UTC's share of cuts. The funds will first be used to put the budget back where it was, including back filling some temporary positions. Although they have replaced all of the lost funds, this will

come to a halt in two years, which is the real caveat in this plan. Last week the administration had to submit a tuition proposal. They backed off of the 9% [tuition hike]. If the students' reaction is positive and Knoxville agrees, UTC will request a 7% increase. The reason for this increase in the face of the budget stimulus package is that those funds are temporary money, which will go away in two years. Some cuts, for example, of staff, are desperately needed positions, that can be brought back if there is a permanent source of revenue. The only other permanent source is student tuition. Although we do not yet know what that might be in the second year, the increase for students and their families will be moderated in a way that is helpful. By June 5, we must submit a three-year budget plan, which explains how we will spend this money over the next three years. We must indicate what we will do the following year, based upon the assumption that we will still have all of the permanent cuts. Who knows what will happen with the national economy, state tax revenues, business revenues, etc. If the economy rebounds sharply, one must assume that cuts will be less severe. UTC's best hope is that permanent cuts are smaller than they would be. These funds cannot be used for salary increases. However, the guidelines did not say that you cannot use tuition revenues to do that. We will explore this issue with other chancellors. These funds cannot be used for capital outlay, but they can be used for modernization, renovation, and repair. They can carry on important projects, but any such requests must go through state approval with THEC and the state building commission. Each campus will account for funds separately. Every expenditure must be accounted for to the state and federal government, which requires an incredible amount of book keeping. Once again, it is true that there is no free lunch. There is the chance that your grandchildren will curse us for this. It will be around for a long time.

Questions:

Dr. Eigenberg: Will there be input from below?

Chancellor: Yes, there will be a great deal, including that of unit heads, deans, and department heads. We will speak with unit heads to discuss what is necessary. Then we will look at again. We want to know what you think.

Dr. Novobilsky: Is it \$11 million total or per year?

Chancellor: It is a one-time fee.

Dr. Novobilsky: What if state revenue falls and it is not sufficient to carry us?

Chancellor: Back-filling compensates for the drop.

Provost: When the state gets the money, they accept criteria [attached to it]. They must maintain funding at fiscal year 2008 level. The state is subject to return the money, if they do not comply with this policy.

Chancellor: Dr. Oldham is correct. The state must put back money at the 2008 level.

8. Constitution of the Association of Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) – Drs. Campa and Miles

Dr. Campa stated that there was some discussion that Dr. Bender's attendance policy was compulsory, but this was not the case. He mentioned that Dr Bender would talk also with the Faculty Senate on how to improve retention and advising.

Drs. Miles and Campa went to the recent TUFS meeting, whose purpose was for campuses to get to know each other. They met with political leaders and the organization for fair taxation. They also discussed what would happen if the TBR and UT systems combined. They do not know if that will happen, but they would like faculty input in making the decision.

See Attached.

Questions:

Dr. Bell: Are we a formal member of this group?

Dr. Miles: No. Five campuses have ratified the constitution, but UTC and Tennessee Tech have not yet ratified it, although we expect that they will soon.

Dr. Novobilski: Is this a prescriptive voice going forward or an advisory group going back?

Dr. Miles: Both. We hope to generate issues and make recommendations, or we could hear some of the issues coming from the joint communication. We can bring these issues back to individual Faculty Senates for their consideration. It is always nice to see institutions “play nice.”

Dr. Tucker: Is there is a disproportionate constitution between TBR and the UT system since we just get one vote?

Dr. Campa: We just sat at the table and talked. There were very few turf wars. We should be real players in this, if there is a role to play. We might fare better on the other team. In some instances it is a less autocratic system. ETSU’s teaching load is much better than ours. We need to find out more and get our foot in the door on any commission or ideas out of Knoxville.

Dr. Miles: Not all ideas work well on every campus. There are good models of strong cooperation, and UTK is a particularly good model of how to work well together.

Dr. Campa: At least at this meeting we learn things. For example, guess what the medical school wants to get rid of in academic cuts - their dept of medical ethics. What does that tell you about the tenor of reform?

Dr. Miles: There are models and options that collapse with UTK at the top. Another option would be to flip Martin and UTC to the regent system, while another is to make UTC, UT Martin, and UTK at the top tier. A lot of things are up for grabs. We are one of the last two schools to join this organization. It is better that we are in the know and have fewer surprises.

Dr. Liedtke: Why are we one of the last?

Dr. Townsend: UT was just brought in during the last year.

Dr. Campa: I will send out the document, so that we can get going on this issue.

Dr. Miles: It is not only coordinating the UT System. All libraries would cooperate like in Georgia and North Carolina. Now we are behind near neighbors. We have the talent to do it, and things could move quickly once Dr. Oldham's task force makes its recommendation. One thing that everyone knew is that UTK has a lot to gain from this. The governor plans to bring it up into the top 20-25 institutions in the nation, which could be at our detriment. Should there be an advantage, it would be that the regent system has far less control of individual administrations. If we get defined as the dental campus, we want to be the best dental campus, to develop an idea that would explode us within our mission. California is one of the strongest systems. It had doctoral and joint programs at state schools. San Diego State has 16 joint doctorates with UC San Diego. Even California probably does not have enough masters and doctorates in education, but they were put back in to the system to meet the needs of local principals and school superintendents. We stress in our letter that we want the government to envision what would be the best for this state.

9. Other Business

Dr. Campa: I have a quandary. The Faculty Senate passed a resolution to increase tuition to 9%, which was going to be presented to the faculty at large. What should we do with that issue? Should we shelve it, forget it, or amend it? What is your advice? I lost the quorum.

Dr. Townsend: Withdraw it.

Dr. Campa: During the full faculty meeting all we will do is raise the ACT scores [the minimum requirement for admission], and the TUFS constitution. I will ask the chancellor to talk about the stimulus package, and we will have elections and committees. It will be a quick meeting to get these things done if possible.

10. Faculty Concerns

There were no faculty concerns.

11. Announcements

There were no announcements.

12. Adjournment 5:06

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynn Purkey
Faculty Senate Secretary
April 16, 2009