

2009 – 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
September 17, 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	Jennifer Beech, Mike Bell, Rebecca Bromley, Rebecca Elliot, and Clair McCullough	Jim Tucker
Lecturer	Andrea Becksvoort	
Adjunct		
Behavioral Sciences	Nick Honerkamp, Barbara Medley	
Business Adm.	Jim Henley, Keith Richards, and Greg Thibadoux	
Eng & Comp Sci		Ron Goulet, Frank Jones
Fine Arts	Stuart Benkert, Patrick Sweetman, and Kenyon Wilson	
CHEPS	Deborah McAllister, D. R. Meece, Elizabeth O'Brien and Cheryl Robinson	Kay Lindgren and M.A. Mccoy
Humanities	Jennifer Beech, Ralph Covino, Lynn Purkey, and Vicki Steinberg	
Library	Beverly Simmons	
Math & Sciences	Hill Craddock, Irene Loomis, Lucas C Vandermerwe, and Li Yang	
Ex-Officio	Roger Brown, Phil Oldham, Richard Brown, and Jocelyn Sanders	John Delaney, Theresa Liedtka
SGA Liaison		

Among the guests present: Herbert Burhenn, Fran Bender, Matt Greenwell, James Hiestand, Phillip Lewis, and Linda Orth.

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

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

Dr. Campa called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

The minutes of the September 3, 2009 meeting were approved. (Townsend/Honerkamp)

Dr. Hiestand presented five proposals that were passed unanimously by the Curriculum Committee, except for the Political Science proposal, for which there was one abstention.

- 09-001 Chemistry modifies the catalog language to reflect that some courses are no longer taught.
- 09-002 Chemistry drops some courses that are no longer taught.
- 09-003 Political Science combines two political science courses.

- 09-004 Psychology is a catalog language change.
- 09-005 Art is a long proposal regarding the photography option of the art major.

All five proposals were passed by the Senate unanimously.

Dr. Craddock presented the Utilization of the UTC Aquatic and Recreation Center Proposal. This proposal has been endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate:

Whereas it is in the best interest of the University to promote the health and welfare of its faculty and staff, not only for their benefit but for the benefits that accrue to the institution in terms of increased productivity and reduction of absenteeism due to illness,

And whereas the Aquatic and Recreation Center would be one of the few campus facilities that faculty and staff would be unable to use without paying a service fee (e.g. we do not pay for the use of the library, or campus computer facilities, or the University Center, or even for taking courses)

And whereas the faculty and staff of this university are, on average paid well below the level of similar personnel at peer institutions, and have not received regular cost-of-living salary increases for most of the past decade, and in lieu of a pay increase this year are instead being asked to pay a portion of our salary back to the University just to use a University facility

And whereas the imposition of this new fee is counterproductive to the health of the institution, in that it is detrimental to the morale of an already underpaid faculty and staff, and fails to provide encouragement for them to use the new facility, which, as noted before, can enhance their health and wellness and increase their productivity,

Be it therefore resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga formally request that the fee for use of the new UTC Aquatic and Recreation Center be waived for all current faculty and staff members. Furthermore, we request that faculty and staff spouses and dependents be allowed to use these facilities at a substantially reduced rate. These dependents can currently take courses at the University at a 50% discount. We recommend a similar discount for use of the ARC. The University Echo (August 27, 2009) reported that memberships to the ARC are currently being offered to University alumni at a cost of \$150 per six-month period. We recommend a 50% discount on this rate for faculty spouses and dependents. [The current rate quoted for faculty and staff is \$125 per six-month period].

Dr. McCullough said that if we remind the Administration that they aren't charging us for other university services and facilities, they may start charging us!

Dr. Honerkamp said that the business model for ARC is in flux, and a concern about crowding may have influenced the rates set for faculty and staff. He wondered about the financial or use impact of Dr. Craddock's proposal.

Dr. Roger Brown said that John Delany oversees this facility, and the fee structure was set by the students. In part the faculty/staff fee structure was devised as a way to avoid overscheduling.

Chancellor Roger Brown and Vice-Chancellor Richard Brown would be happy to take this proposal back to the Executive Team and to the student leadership.

Dr. Honerkamp wondered if there were any use statistics since the Center opened.

The Chancellor said that he has not seen any.

Dr. Honerkamp reminded the Faculty Senate that the students pay for the Center and that he understood the reasons for the faculty/staff fee structure.

Dr. Beech asked if the Committee researched fee structures for comparable wellness centers at other universities.

Ms. Denniston said that it had and stated that there was faculty representation on the Committee.

Dr. McCullough stated that it is not completely accurate to say we have access to all other facilities [a clause in the proposal that was subsequently deleted by friendly amendment]. We pay \$15 a month for the healthy MOCS program.

Dr. Loomis asked who is paying for the maintenance of the facility.

Dr. Richard Borwn stated that part of it comes from student fees and part of it from the budget.

The proposal passed. Yes: 18; No: 3; Abstention: 1 (Craddock/Honerkamp)

Dr. Campa reported on the work of the Executive Committee: The visit of the UT interim president, Jan Simek, was profitable. UT's perception of itself is changing. It was not an imperial visit, and he said he would come back at any time. He wants more independence for our campus, but he will be in office for only one more year, so we don't know if this will be a permanent attitude shift or if we will return to being a small province of the empire. He sees the advances UTC has made, and some of the faculty who came to this meeting asked about preserving our graduate programs and cooperative programs with UTK and there were a lot of yesses. A lot of this may have to do with his perception of the TUFs resolution about the future of higher education in Tennessee. He sees that change is in the air. There was a subtext to his remarks. He said that if we become a small fish in a pond with several larger fish, we would not do well. He knows that the campuses are talking and sees what The University of Memphis, The University of Middle Tennessee, and The University of East Tennessee have done in a very short time. The latter now has twelve doctoral programs, soon to be fifteen. These schools have grown by leaps and bounds within the shadow of each other. Why have we not done as well when we have the talent, the faculty, the increased enrollment, the urban support basis? He knows we are asking this question. We need to have a very important voice in the decisions about the future of higher education in Tennessee and we need to have choices, for once.

Dr. Honerkamp asked if the current bifurcated state higher education paradigm (i.e. TBR and UT) would continue.

Dr. Campa said that a very competent and savvy Republican state legislator, spoke to them, and she said that UT is not going to lose any power; there are too many legislators who are UT alumni. However, there will be a change and entities are jockeying to see who ends up on top.

In the TBR there is a lot of resentment about the preponderance of UT. They resent UTC because they see us as getting crumbs from the big table and perceive us as close to the source of wealth and power, although if we look at the salary lists, and compare our salaries here at UTC to salaries in the TBR, they have done better. What is the end game?

Dr. Townsend asked if Dr. Simek explained more about how he would trim the UT administration. Dr. Townsend noted that previously Dr. Simek said he would eliminate five UT vice presidents, but no one has been fired; these the former vice-president have now been moved into other positions (e.g. Directors) with their vice-presidential salaries intact.

Dr. Campa said that Dr. Simek said that these people have been temporarily moved laterally until they get another job with their salaries remaining the same.

Dr. Purkey noted that the average parent income at UTK is \$120,000 per year and wondered if Dr. Simek seems to be under the impression that our students' parents have the same income level. She said that it's doubtful that this is true and this discrepancy affects how much we can raise student fees compared to how much UTK can raise them.

The Chancellor said that he agreed with her.

Dr. McCullough was concerned that Dr. Simek talked about going to outcomes-based funding based on the percentage of students who graduate, but didn't understand that we admit students that UTK wouldn't admit. Using this logic, the only way we can increase graduation rates is to raise our admission standards and deny access to UTC for these students.

Dr. Campa said that Dr. Simek knows this because minority enrollment is counted for the whole system, not campus by campus. If it were the latter, UTK would fail the diversity criterion.

Dr. Townsend noted that it was a stated objective to dismantle the athletic program from the UT system and give it back to the Knoxville campus and wondered how much progress has been made on this front.

Dr. Campa said that he believes that Dr. Simek plans to do this. The two most radical proposals are to move the UT system to Nashville and to give UT athletics back to Knoxville.

The Chancellor stated that Dr. Simek has a task force studying the impact of moving UT athletics back to Knoxville, that he wants to do this, and that the Board of Trustees will make this call.

Someone asked what this will mean for UTC.

Dr. Campa stated that our destiny is linked with UT and UTK so the idea of a university not having a football team and having the football team as a personal fief of the president of the UT system is an outrage. Also, the granting of athletic scholarships is traditionally a faculty province; once it's removed from the campus, who oversees it?

The Chancellor noted that our system president could be distracted from academic concerns when he's concerned about the win/loss record of his football team and that he would like him paying more attention to academic issues.

Dr. Benkert noted that if it's not coming out of his budget, it would at least be clear what monies could be used for other projects and activities and we could get a clearer sense of where their priorities lie.

Dr. Campa stated that the money coming in from football could be funneled to other things, such as academics, but that financial situation is hard to penetrate.

Vice-Chancellor Brown reported on Banner and on the stimulus funds.

Banner started in 1999 and we got the Financial Aid module up and then we hit a brick wall. Our current system was written here and the company will not support it any more; if we made one change, it would crash. Eight years ago we began to plan for a full implementation of Banner but we had no money, so we began squirreling away money in an account for Banner: We now have \$4.9 million dollars in nonrecurring funds to be used to implement Banner. Clint Smullen and Debbie Parker are managing the Banner team. Much of the Banner costs are in personnel. \$1,824,000 will be spent in the next two years on nine positions for Banner, which are scheduled to be phased on to the state budget. \$240,000 has been allocated for operating dollars, \$750,000 for equipment, software and maintenance, \$525,000 on the Luminis Portal Solution, \$1,250,000 on an enrollment management solution, \$263,442 for third-party support. The broader Banner solution will affect every UT campus. We are the test campus because of our hardware problems. UT will pay over 4 million dollars.

The first go-live date will be October of 2009
Financial Aid will go live in February of 2010
Registration will go live in March of 2010
Accounts Receivable will go live in July of 2010
Graduation will go live in July of 2010

We will hire an external consultant to review our entire IT system, including Banner. Baseline Banner will come in Fall 2010 and pre-requisite checking on Banner will begin in Spring 2011. The consultant will be here in January of 2010. In the budget cycle coming up, the consultant's recommendations will be presented. UT is also examining its IT structure.

Dr. Townsend noted that last year we were told that Banner would cost \$3,000,000, and now it has been ratcheted up another million, hiring nine new people with average annual salaries of over \$200,000.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that we are going to ask the consultant to look at the core competencies of the IT staff, and that the average salary may not be over \$200,000.

The average salary will be something over 200,000?

Dr. Townsend asked if we will need these nine people, each making about \$200,000 annually for two years only, or if these positions will move on to the state budget.

Vice-Chancellor Brown said that about half of them will move on to the budget.

Dr. Townsend commended the Vice-Chancellor for his foresight in saving \$4,000,000 but was concerned about burdening the state budget with so many people.

Vice-Chancellor Brown said that we have done a good job of getting rid of silos and getting the people in Records, Admissions, and Financial Aid to work with faculty throughout this process.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that allocating stimulus funds is schizophrenic budgeting. We started looking at a 20% cut to the budget, which was worrisome. Our goal was to save faculty jobs. We jumped off the cliff early, made the tough choices, and did some strategic things (hiring freeze, purchasing freeze etc.), so we are able to deal with the 6.1 million dollars we had to cut and our challenge now is to rebalance the budget and rebalance Academic Affairs to make sure we have enough instructional faculty to get the job done. We had a 7% tuition and fee increase that generated 2.5 million dollars, 1.7 million of which went to Academic Affairs. Other monies went to instructional support, ROTC scholarships, and an equity pay plan. We have a base budget of 96 million dollars. We are not broke, but we're challenged.

We will have \$11, 513,810 in stimulus funds coming in this year, and over the next two years we will receive 24.1 million dollars. There are many restrictions on the use of these monies, e.g. we cannot hire permanent people, although we can hire part-time people, and A committee of the Executive Team is looking at the Big Ideas list submitted by the deans. To date we've received \$52 million dollars in requests for the 24 million dollars.

The state revenues are 2.8 million dollars below projections, so if we have another budget cut, the state may be asking for some of this money back, so we are planning year by year.

Dr. Townsend asked which projects the Vice-Chancellor is most excited about?

The Vice-Chancellor replied that the Math Lab, sustainability projects, energy projects (e.g., light sensors in rooms), and academic support projects will have great return on investment. We hope to buy laptop computers for all faculty and upgrade existing Lupton podiums.

We want to look at what programs are not central to the core business of the institution and make sure that we continue the high quality of the institution, rebalance the budget, and transition into employee issues rather than do them all upfront.

Dr. Vandermerwe asked if there are any plans to improve the parking situation and infrastructure situation regarding cars coming in and out of campus.

Richard: We're consulting with the city engineer about the going in and out (e.g. on Douglas Street onto Fourth Street). Dr. Medley will put together a focus group of students to look at our parking situation and we will bring in a consultant and look at best practices. Certainly we need

to build structured parking but the state of Tennessee does not give us one dime for parking. If we built a deck today, each parking spot would cost \$20,000.

Dr. Oldham stated that there is a proposal to a federal program for 20,000,000 for a state of the art parking facility.

The Chancellor reported that he hosted a luncheon for Interim President Simek to welcome him and honor him but also to show him the how much support UTC enjoys from our local elected officials and that Dr. Simek noted the legislators, the board members the business leaders that were present and saw how much support we have among these constituencies. We delivered a message to our community as well as to Simek ; the five students who made presentations blew everyone's socks off speaking about why they came here, what they have done here, and how they feel about their experience here. Dr. Campa captured the mood of the Interim President's visit: Dr. Simek proved to be a very open and accessible presence and offered to come back and talk to us. The Chancellor saw the only down note in Dr. Simek's failure to articulate his familiarity with our Strategic Plan and the progress we have made in implementing it. We communicated many times about our Strategic Plan and it was reviewed by the Board of Trustees and approved this past June, but Dr. Simek has been on board only for five months and has been inundated with responsibilities and he will follow up to see Dr. Simek knows what we are doing with the Strategic Plan and how we are benchmarking ourselves. The Chancellor stated that Dr. Campa is exactly right about restructuring. The political opportunity of this governor to restructure higher education in Tennessee is diminishing quickly and the legislature does not have the same drive to restructure. The Chancellor believes that there will still be two systems and that the legislature needs to know that we are operating with different input than UTK and if this is not what they want us to do, we need to have a conversation about this. If we are going to be the access university in Tennessee, we can't be required to have high graduation rates as a condition of funding level. Our campus is viewed very positively by our community as evidenced by the fact that virtually our entire state legislative delegation, showed up along with the mayor, congressmen, and business leaders at the luncheon honoring Dr. Simek

In other business, Dr. Campa stated that we need a representative on Graduate Council from a department that does not have a graduate program. He also urged faculty to work on the Quality Enhancement Program [chaired by Linda Johnston] for SACS accreditation; to serve if they are asked to, to attend focus groups, submit suggestions; the QEP needs as much help as they can get.

Motion to adjourn (Honerkamp)

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Recorded by Marcia Noe
Volunteer Faculty Senate Secretary for a Day