

**2009-2010 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center
October 15, 2009**

The minutes can also be found at <http://www.utc.edu/FacultySenate/minutes.php>
Senate meetings are open meetings to which all interested parties are welcome.

<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, Clair McCulluogh, and Jim Tucker	
Lecturer	Andrea Becksvoort	
Adjunct		
Behavioral Sciences	Lorraine Evans, Nick Honerkamp, Barbara Medley	
Business Adm.	Jim Henley, Keith Richards	Greg Thibadoux
Eng & Comp Sci		Ron Goulet, Frank Jones, Li Yang
Fine Arts	Kenyon Wilson	Stuart Benkert, Ron Ulen
CHEPS	Kay Lindgren, M.A. Mccoy, D. R. Meece, and Cheryl Robinson	Deborah McAllister, Elizabeth O'Brien
Humanities	Ralph Covino, and Vicki Steinberg	Lynn Purkey
Library	Beverly Simmons	
Math & Sciences	Irene Loomis, Lucas Vandermerwe	Hill Craddock
Ex-Officio	John Delaney, Jocelyn Sanders	Roger Brown, Phil Oldham, Theresa Liedtka, Richard Brown
SGA Liaison		

Among the guests present: Vic Bumphus

1. Dr Loomis called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m., reporting that President Campa had gone under the knife earlier in the day, but that he was doing fine and expected to make a complete recovery.
2. The first order of business was to approve the minutes of the previous meeting; the motion to approve the minutes was put forward by Dr Townsend, and seconded by Dr Medley. The minutes were approved unanimously without emendation.
3. In a change to the agenda, Dr Loomis then called upon Anthony Haines, the UT System's legislative liaison, to address the Senate.

He reported that he was currently undertaking a series of campus visits; he has already been to UT Martin and is heading to UT Knoxville in the near future. The purpose of these annual visits is to meet with the Faculty leadership, including the various Senates, so as to discuss the needs of the System and our own needs. This is done primarily because Mr Haines feels that he only receives a filtered version of the *desiderata* from the administration and, as such, "wants it from the horses' mouth," to borrow his eloquent phraseology. In visiting with the Senates, he hopes to hear from us how to operate more efficiently, what our concerns are concerning the legislature, and so on. Mr

Haines was unable to recall whether this was his third or fourth year of making these rounds.

It was his desire to leave the Senate with a picture of what he expects will be the chief concerns for the next legislative session. While he noted that, obviously, there would be budgetary issues as well as the omnipresent fear of a major restructuring of higher education across the state, Mr Haines was largely unconcerned. His primary concern and what he views to be a major thorn in the side of the universities will be the issue of textbooks. It was noted that there is a legislator who wants to enact a law forbidding professors from assigning textbooks which they themselves have authored owing to conflict of interest reasons. It is obvious that this is something that the system will rail against. Updates on this situation as it unfolds were promised.

A second issue expected to be brought up during this session will be that of guns on campus, as there are several local legislators in favor of firearms in the classroom. He will be keeping an eye out for that throughout the term.

The last item on “our radar”, to borrow his technical parlance, concerns the aggressive nature of the for-profit schools in the state and what they’re trying to accomplish. Owing to Tennessee’s “favorable regulatory climate”, it is a great place for “these people” to operate, and they will do so in direct competition with UT. There are laws pending which would obligate legitimate universities to accept that their fly-by-night classes are as valid as those we offer which, if passed, would permanently cheapen higher education in Tennessee. Mr Haines provided a long and drawn out illustration of this problem, using Florida as an example; oddly given his profession, he also used the time to rail against the power of lobbyists.

Dr Loomis thanked Mr Haines on behalf of the Senate for his report.

4. In a further change to the agenda, owing to the Provost’s need to be elsewhere during his scheduled slot, Dr Loomis called upon Provost Oldham and Vice-Chancellor Brown to discuss the Stimulus Funding and some of the questions which have arisen concerning it and the projects which it is expected to fund.

The Provost reported that the Stimulus projects were compiled from recommendations received from all across the campus; he reported that he made multiple solicitations for potential projects, communicating to the various constituencies through the Deans. Some 200 requests for some \$52.2 million dollars were received and put on a “megalist”; these were merely the projects for which there were cost estimates. It is guessed that some \$70-80 million were requested overall; this represented an enormity of material to weigh and sort through.

The sortition was a multi-step process. The Executive Team did the initial sorting, dealing with duplicate submissions and overlaps, and attempted to form a preliminary priority list with a view to the long-game, i.e. the “pending storm” that is going to come financially once the stimulus money goes away. The operative question was how to best

use the \$10m so as to remain competitive and successful during the 2011 and onwards period.

The Provost reported that the debate over which projects to fund was healthy and spirited and that things “kinda sorted themselves out”. When this happened, the Executive’s suggestions were brought to UPRAC for their input and feedback; UPRAC was used as a sounding-board to see if there were any changes to be made. UPRAC endorsed the Executive’s priority list, and it was sent thence to the Chancellor who similarly gave it his approval.

The Provost wished to make some clarifications during his report. Firstly: of the 200 or so projects which were on the list, he wanted it known that some of them were bundled together and, as such, while individual requested items such as equipment at the departmental level may not appear on the master list, they may be listed under another heading. A \$900,000 fund has been earmarked for instructional equipment purchases; the Deans will prioritize them and they will receive funding in the order they determine.

Secondly: the Provost wanted it to be recalled that there was a one year window for the funding for this year and that there are many strings which are attached to the Stimulus money. Auxiliary Services, for example, are ineligible for the money, as is Housing – neither meet the guidelines. Similarly, projects which do not fit the time frame of the Stimulus are ineligible; the funds must be spent within this fiscal year. Ergo, if a project is not yet ready to go, then the University cannot move on it with Stimulus money and it must be deferred. The fact that a project is deferred is not a judgment on its merit but, rather, its ability to be implemented in the requisite time-span.

The Provost reported that nobody is 100% happy with the lists and that everyone would change some things and tweak others, but that overall he was pleased with the process as it yielded a number of projects which should bring about a significant impact.

Vice-Chancellor Brown then took the floor. He discussed the broad categories of operational items that the campus could and could not afford to do. He noted the \$0.5 million which has been designated for computer replacement for faculty and staff; he noted his desire to continue this program *ad infinitum*. He noted the current budget of \$5k for classroom furnishings and how the Stimulus would bring \$0.5 million towards improving classroom environments. Other topics such as improving health and safety as well as energy management were covered in his presentation.

Dr Loomis thanked the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for their input and opened the floor to questions.

Dr Townsend asked about instructional equipment purchases and whether the money for them had yet to be de-bundled and distributed across the departments; he further asked as to the time frame involved.

The Provost reported that he could not speak to dollar amounts for individual departments as the de-bundling process has not been completed. He noted that if there are and additional requests for equipment, they would be received and put into the mix for the Deans to prioritize. He further noted that additional funds are anticipated for next year from the Stimulus and, as such, if there is something not funded this year, it might stand a chance in the following year; however, we cannot bank on those funds being available.

Dr Townsend asked a follow-up question as to whether or not funds for makeovers for faculty offices had been approved.

The Provost responded, noting that Grote and Metro, because of their refurbishments, were slated to receive new furnishings as it would not make conceptual sense to bring the old stuff back into a new building.

Vice-Chancellor Brown reported that Grote and Metro have been allotted \$150,000 to this end.

The Provost also highlighted the concept of “budget dust” for the Senate, noting that as the Stimulus monies are rolled out in the quest to spend the \$10m, there will be some monies which are spent in full and others which are not and, as such, reapportionment will be an on-going process.

The Vice-Chancellor chipped in that the entire Stimulus project would be a massive reporting and accountability piece and that every dollar has to be justified and monitored; his team will be doing so on a monthly basis so as to make any reallocations that are necessary on the quick step.

Mike Bell asked whether in the funding allocations there was priority for the positions over the big-ticket items.

The Provost replied that there was none. They are on different lists because they were looked at differently.

Mike Bell followed up by asking whether or not the positions created by the Stimulus money would still be active after 2011.

The Vice-Chancellor responded that he did not know; the Provost echoed his sentiment and noted, further, that in some areas it is impossible to predict what our staffing needs will be in 2011 owing to such things as the implementation of Banner.

Dr Medley asked if there would be a window for additional project ideas to be submitted this year.

The Provost replied that as far as he was concerned, any time there is an idea, faculty should feel free to reach out and contact him.

Keith Richards asked whether Stimulus funds were available so as to support revenue-generating projects.

The Provost responded that this was a tricky area; the Vice-Chancellor responded by pointing out how a position in the Development Office was covered this time around and that in the next funding cycle there would be an attempt to expand upon this.

Dr Covino asked as to the nature of the monies earmarked for International Programs.

The Provost responded that the Strategic Plan called for an organizational structure for an Office for International Programming and that some space has been identified to house such an office in an old sorority house which is being sold to the University. It will be reprogrammed somehow for International Programs; however, what goes into the space and how it will work remains unknown at present. The \$90k earmarked will, thus, be flexible. It may be position money or money to renovate the house.

The Provost noted that the office would be restructured in accordance with the recommendations put forward by last year's Task Force.

Unrelated to the Stimulus money, Meece asked either party whether there was an update on the Equity pay situation so that he could report back to his constituency.

The Provost responded that the plan has been created and submitted to our systemic overlords and it awaits their review. Thus the plan is still pending.

Dr Loomis thanked the Provost and the Vice-Chancellor for their time.

5. Dr Loomis returned to the stated agenda and called upon Karen Adsit to update the Senate on the upcoming SACS visit and the QEP.

Dr Adsit gently reminded the Senate that SACS has not gone away and that the visit will be occurring in April of 2011.

She noted that the Committees are continuing to work on the compliance report. Jocelyn Sanders' committee has completed the initial audit; of the 79 standards, 51% are 'in compliance', 38% are 'probably in compliance', and 11% are non-compliant. This effectively means that there are 8-10 standards which will require cleaning, particularly in the areas of the University's mission statement, organizational charts, and so on. Dr Adsit was pleased with the progress thus far and noted that things are definitely moving along, with a number of people having been trained in the new institutional effectiveness monitoring software.

Regarding the QEP, she noted that focus groups were holding open sessions so as to determine what kinds of things we need to be doing so as to better integrate critical thinking into the curriculum and which programs need to incorporate it or be enhanced by

it, as well as how to best implement these changes. She stressed that any plans made do not need to be enacted on 8 April; they can be implemented over 5 years and, thus, there will be a number of pilot programs and so forth.

Kay Lindgren asked whether the QEP applied to only undergraduate programs or to both undergraduate and graduate programs.

Dr Adsit responded that the QEP is a plan for the campus. Some other QEPs are narrow in their population targets; it is yet to be determined whether ours will be that tightly focused or not.

Kay Lindgren followed up by asked why we do not measure critical thinking from the start of a student's university career until its culmination.

Dr Adsit responded that we currently only do exit examinations but that, in future, entrance examinations might also be something we wish to consider.

Dr Loomis thanked Dr Adsit for her update.

6. Dr Loomis then called upon Verbie Prevost to give her report from the UT Board of Trustees meeting.

Dr Prevost reported that the only significant thing that was voted upon was the change of entrance requirements; it passed without concern or problem.

Kay Lindgren inquired as to whether there was any talk at the meeting as to the graduate tuition and whether we'd be taking steps to advertise it.

The Provost responded that a plan for advertising it was in development, with the Deans having met with Chuck Cantrell and Joan Garrett from the Times Free Press. Billboards, radio spots, and other means of blitzing the relevant north Georgia communities are in the works.

7. Dr Loomis then read a prepared statement from Faculty Senate President Pedro Campa containing a report from the UT Council meeting. That statement is attached to these minutes for the record.

Dr Townsend asked whether UTC's colors would be available for use again on our stationary.

Dr Lyn Miles, who also attended, indicated that she did not know if such matters were even on the Council's radar as issues needing to be addressed.

The Provost responded that Athletics already employs the blue and gold in its efforts and that we are moving to a place where Development will begin to as well for fund-raising

purposes. He indicated that professorial letterhead is less of a priority; Development is the key.

8. Dr Loomis then called upon Dr Vicki Steinberg to report on an informational item from the GenEd committee. See attached.

Dr Steinberg reported that the committee had reviewed the changes to the catalog that had been requested by the Associate Provost's office and guaranteed that not a word was lost.

She also reported that we are in compliance with the recently issued memorandum about bringing in GenEd credit from outside; it will be an issue further addressed at the GenEd Committee's 30 October meeting.

Dr Steinberg had two other issues to bring to the attention of the Senate. She noted that the committee requires two more members, one from Social Science and another from Engineering. She recommended that if anyone had an enemy to throw under that particular bus that nominations would be welcomed.

She also indicated that the planned GenEd Assessment will be going forward in December and that a call for volunteers will soon be issued. The dates for the assessment exercise will be December 10th from 1-4pm and December 11th, from 9-4pm. Three teams of six will be needed for a total of eighteen people.

Dr Townsend queried whether the 18 reviewers will make \$500 for their trouble.

The Provost replied that they, indeed, would.

Kay Lindgren asked if there was any suggestion that a review of the GenEd curriculum was called for at this time.

Dr Steinberg responded that she was coming to appreciate just how important it is that the Handbook of 1997 be reviewed; she will begin working on this task with Dr Adsit, starting with the mission statement and going all the way through, amending what we want from the program, what is needed, and how current practices could be updated. This MAY bring about a more modern version.

She also noted that the committee is seeking to create a handbook for the teachers of GenEd courses because people teaching on them are often unaware of what they are meant to be doing; she attributes this to the fact that all of the information is located on the GenEd website which, naturally, nobody reads with any degree of regularity. A handbook which could be distributed would serve as a new Bible for GenEd teachers which could be kept under their respective pillows and keep everyone singing from the same hymn sheet for a change.

Dr Loomis thanked Dr Steinberg for her report.

9. Dr Loomis called upon the Provost to pinch-hit for Vice-Chancellor Delaney on the subject of the new aquatics center.

The Provost provided a comparison sheet (see attached) which contained data from peer universities vis-à-vis similar centers and costing; he noted that the fee which the faculty is asked to pay is quite reasonable by way of comparison and certainly in line with what other universities are doing. He further noted that only 20 members of the faculty and staff have signed up for membership.

10. Dr Loomis then called for the election of a new member for the UT Council, Dr Lyn Miles' term having expired.

Three candidates were duly nominated: Dr Lyn Miles (Anthropology, incumbent), Dr Tony Steinhoff (History) and Dr Joe Wilfreth (English). No other nominations were received from the floor.

Voting was conducted by iClicker in the first round with the results as follows: Miles 9, Steinhoff 4, and Wilfreth 8. There being no clear victor, the candidate with the fewest votes was eliminated and voting was moved to a second round.

Voting was again conducted by iClicker in the second round with the results as follows: Miles 12, Wilfreth 9. Dr Miles was declared the winner; she encouraged those present to express any views or concerns for the UT Council to her so that they might be communicated.

11. Dr Loomis then called upon Dr Gavin Townsend to present his resolution on the South Stadium building. See attached.

Dr Honerkamp asked if it would be possible to re-point and restore the structure rather than demolish it.

Dr Townsend responded that it would be possible if there were buttresses to brace the building which, whilst ugly, would serve to preserve the key element of the University's irreducible historic core.

Dr Honerkamp agreed that Dr Townsend presented a compelling case and that he had some qualms about using federal funds to demolish a structure which would be eligible for the National Register.

Dr Townsend responded that we have already lost, during his time here, many buildings such as North Stadium, the old Math Building, which would seem to indicate that the administration's priority has not traditionally been preservation.

Dr McCullough stated her disbelief that she found herself in agreement with Dr Townsend, which was perhaps a first. She reported that she had just returned from an

accreditation visit where she saw another university spending millions redoing an historic building; she was envious. She would hate to lose the beauty and history in that part of campus.

Meece took a contrarian stance and advocated that it would be more aesthetically pleasing to approach the new Library compound via a green space rather than passing by a buttressed/condemned structure. He also indicated that the structure was not, in his opinion, of sufficient merit so as to be preserved on an architectural basis alone.

Vice-Chancellor Brown interjected at this point so as to point out that all that could be done to save the structure has been done and that he is, in fact, an ardent preservationist. There are problems with the existing structure that cannot be overcome, most notably that when the structure was erected in the 1920s, they made a sloppy job of it, used very porous brick and mortar with deficiencies which allow in moisture. It is not the same situation as was faced by the Patten Chapel; if the mortar were to be scraped out for re-pointing, the structure would collapse.

The Vice-Chancellor then promised to save the architectural features of the building for repositioning in Chamberlain Plaza, whose East End will have pre-cast elements which will incorporate them into entrances.

Dr Townsend inquired as to whether the \$0.5 million designated for the demolition included the saving of the trim.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that we would find out in the fullness of time, as lots of funds are going to the plaza, and that the cost of fire damage, asbestos, and other concerns yet unknown will impact the demolition works.

Dr Honerkamp asked if it would be possible to include Andy Smith as a part of the last inspection tour, as he is a local architect we ought to consult before proceeding with the demolition.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed that he would be an excellent addition to the team.

Discussion of the matter having concluded, the motion was seconded by Kay Lindgren and brought forward to the vote. With a vote of 16 to 5, the motion carried.

12. There were no Administrative Reports, as the Executive team had spoken earlier at the meeting.

13. There was no other business.

14. Dr McCullough expressed a faculty concern. She accepted responsibility for the fact that, as a result of her previously voiced concern over smokers at the entrances to buildings, the facilities people had taken away the ashtrays and thus created a new problem. As a result of intolerance coupled with short-sighted solutions, now the entries

to buildings, previously serviced by ashtrays, are now littered with cigarette butts. As a result of this, Dr McCullough called upon the administration to actively enforce the 25ft rule.

Vice-Chancellor Brown reported that he was aware of the situation and that it has been passed on to the Safety Officer who is seeking to implement an education program so as to make students and others aware of the alleged dangers of secondhand smoke and our policies about smoking on campus. He reminded the Senate that the tobacco lobby is powerful within the state and that, as such, it was unlikely that the world would be completely smoke-free in the foreseeable future.

15. There being no other business, the motion was made by Dr Steinberg to adjourn, which was seconded by Prof. Honerkamp. There being no objections, the meeting adjourned at 4:48pm.

Respectfully (if belatedly) submitted,

Dr RJ Covino