

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

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

1. Call to Order 3:12
2. Approval of the minutes of November 19, 2009. Corrections from Marcia Noe already entered. Minutes with these corrections were approved.
3. Curriculum Committee Report (Dr. James Hiestand, Chair) Dr. Hiestand said that although the summary of near unanimous votes might seem to indicate the committee acted as a rubber stamp, that was not the case. The proposals that were voted on by the committee and presented to the Senate for approval had been considered and problems resolved before being brought to the Senate for approval. Some had previously been sent back for revision, and others were removed and will be resubmitted when questions are resolved. There is not much in the way of controversy about the proposed changes. Proposal 10-017, "Math Prerequisite Changes," was necessitated by discontinued courses. Proposal 10-023 was a change to require sophomore standing for Acc 201. Four proposals (10-024, 10-025, 10-026, 10-026) were considered together because they deal with a course that is double listed. A number of proposals that are in the pipeline but not yet approved by the committee will be considered in the next semester. There being no discussion, Dr. Campa moved to vote for approval. Dr. Honerkamp seconded. The vote was conducted using clickers: A approve, B disapprove, C abstain. The motion passed with 19 approvals and 1 abstention.

4. Report from General Education Committee: Dr. Vicki Steinberg.

Dr. Steinberg said that the General Education Committee has taken care of all the probationary courses from the Spring semester and all have been removed from probation. Assessment is proceeding apace and we have identified enough people to perform the assessment, though there are differing ideas on how to proceed. The next step is to revise and confirm a process for assessing the general education requirements.

Several questions that are apparent from the results of the faculty survey sent out have led us to start to think about how to do general education. One question that comes across in the survey is whether general education is a roster of courses that need to get done or a set of skills that we want kids to walk away from general education with. Other questions are: Is it broken? Does it need to be fixed? How does it need to be fixed? Students are completing a similar survey, in which they are asked how many hours they have and how many general education requirements they have completed. We are also looking at data from CAP and MAP, and have begun a literature review as well. A lot of members on the committee, some of whom were there from first iteration of the green book, have noted that the original plan was written and then shelved, which was not supposed to be the case. We have not met and conducted periodic, ongoing assessment as the plan required. We also have determined that we should ask people who are teaching general education course what needs to be fixed, and to think about how to go about matching our curriculum to the THEC standards.

In the course of this, I wondered whether we needed to appoint a task force for this assessment, or whether the committee should be doing work. I decided this needs to be an on-going process that lives in General Education Committee, and General Education should assess how it accomplishes outcomes. If we aren't succeeding, it's the responsibility of the committee to turn to teachers to ask them to help it fix it. The General Education Committee will keep assessment under its purview as it was mandated in the handbook.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend: How is this related to SACS?

Dr. Steinberg: There is an effort to stitch these pieces together. General education is a curriculum every undergraduate student needs. If every undergraduate needs it, how are we going to achieve the SACS QEP if the foundation isn't solid? Do all the general education requirements have to be completed immediately, or are some foundational and some more integrative? And do we want to look at how they're distributed across a student's academic career? There are also logistical issues about how to schedule general education courses. Could we identify the number of courses needed and help departments decide how many sections to teach?

Dr. Adsit: The other part of SACS compliance is that we look at the general education curriculum.

Dr. Steinberg: I also have to say that that general education isn't about any particular course. We want to revise how assessment is done so it doesn't appear we are looking over anyone's teaching or course design.

Dr. Townsend: You know that general education at UTC formula is dictated by THEC. How much leeway is there to fix general education? What do you envision to be possible to fix it?

Dr. Steinberg: The articulation agreement comes out as a list of classes. According to the articulation agreement we are obligated to accept general education courses taken at other institutions. But we do not feel we have to be limited by those agreements in our own curriculum. We can envision a great curriculum that may not necessarily match THEC's formula, and while we'll accept other schools' courses, those schools may or not accept our syllabus.

Dr. Townsend: But we can't, for example, institute four quantitative analysis courses.

Dr. Steinberg: No.

Dr. Bromley: I need clarification. I sat on Curriculum Committee. And I sat on a pilot committee. Are you saying that the pilot study is set up wrong, or were you talking about how the General Education Committee reviews courses every 5 years? Are you talking about outcomes assessment?

Dr. Steinberg: We're going to do two things at once. We collected data longitudinally across classes, but we're not going to go after a particular class or teacher. We're going to look at skills, and we'll ask different teachers, how do you teach this skill?

Dr. Bromley: What I don't understand is when the pilot project was developed it was never intended to look over anyone's shoulder.

Dr. Steinberg: No, that wasn't the intent, but the outcome was that the question that was asked made it seem that way. If we ask about outcomes, we can gather different more useful data. I wouldn't participate if it were looking over shoulders.

5. Report from Executive Committee:

Dr. Campa: We had conversations with chancellor and provost about a faculty lunch room as a place for faculty to meet and for new faculty to meet older faculty. But the provost will talk about that and the meeting of UT Council in Jan 25. (Dr. Campa will attend.) The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees' Committee on Effectiveness and Efficiency for the Future will meet Monday, Dec. 7, in Chattanooga to discuss program discontinuation. This ongoing process is very enervating. The meeting is open to the public and some of us should attend.

At this point, I want to interrupt the meeting to confirm Dr. Susan North from the English department as secretary. Dr. Prevost has agreed to grant her a course release. I move that we appoint her secretary. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote without out opposition or abstention.

Provost Oldham's Report:

The Provost said that he is putting finishing touches on a newsletter to go out this week. It is longer than usual and covers a lot of ground. He said that the idea for a Faculty lunchroom was a great idea and they been able to come up with a space for next semester. It was tricky finding a room that would satisfy initial requirements, close to the food court on the ground floor and available Monday through Friday at lunchtime. They have designated the Cherokee Room, which has a capacity of about twenty, for a faculty lunchroom from 11:15 to 2:00 Monday through Friday. Hopefully it will be well used and before the end of next semester we'll get back together to talk about how we need a bigger space.

Academic Program Review. The committee is scheduled to meet later this month. The committee reports that a substantial amount of progress is being made. Provost Oldham says he appreciates the hard work and knows it's not a pleasant job. Department heads and deans are being given plenty of opportunity to respond and participate constructively. THEC has recently updated its website with the latest low-producing programs. We were able to remove one program, Economics, from the preliminary list by correcting the numbers and that leaves us with only fourteen (14) low-producing programs according to THEC criteria. The column on the right hand side of the table has a space for campus response, and right now, unfortunately, that column is blank only for UTC. UT-Martin and UT-Knoxville have responded with plans. We deferred this conversation since last year because we felt we needed to develop a process, and we are attempting to adhere to the process. However, THEC gave us a December 22 deadline to respond to this latest list, and it puts us in a dilemma because I am fully committed to fulfilling process that we've laid out, and it will not be completed by December 22. However, I'm fearful that if we report nothing or say we're still reviewing, it will give us a black eye in the public. I think this will require finesse, and I would appreciate your patience with our balancing these conflicting pressures. I'll approach THEC that we're continuing to review and that we'll have something more definitive in the first of the year, but I may be required to give them some preliminary response.

If you look at the fourteen programs, roughly one-third of them are secondary education programs (math, foreign languages, etc.). Most other campuses have had similar issues and they have consolidated them to get them off the list. That's the kind of thing we're looking at now. Substantial progress has been made between department heads, so roughly one-third of these will be taken care of relatively painlessly. Another one-third of the programs are closer to the cut-off of ten. In my opinion, those are close enough that we can get them taken off the list by increasing number of graduates. These are programs such as Foreign Languages, Math, Philosophy & Religion. That leaves us with only three or four programs in the middle that are problematic. But reducing the list from thirteen to

three or four is a good accomplishment, and I have no problem defending those programs if they are critical to our mission. However, the fourteen programs represent about thirty percent of our total programs and that isn't good.

Questions:

Dr. Benkert: I'm interviewing people and I'm envisioning my music majors disappearing as they see these articles. I'd like to be able to assure students they can come audition and still be sure they'll have a program.

Provost Oldham: This is one of those programs that is very close. If Music Education and Music are combined, that will allow them to meet the required number

Dr. Townsend: For the December 22 report, your report will anticipate these changes?

Provost Oldham: I hope I don't even have to do that. I'm going to negotiate with them. I don't know why they need this information now.

Dr. Townsend: Where do we stand on the compression plan? We don't need to make any programmatic cuts, but we want to give compression pay.

Provost Oldham: We finally got the go-ahead to cut that list I think this week. We talked about it in executive team yesterday, and letters are being finalized and possibly going out by tomorrow. Campus-wide, the total amount is about \$400,000; for faculty it was close to \$300,000. I think everybody on the executive team understood that it was going out on a limb here in this economic environment to try to come up with an equity compensation plan in the midst of budget reductions. But we all felt it was incredibly important for us to do, and so we supported it.

We've talked a lot about the budget cutting side, but we haven't talked enough about the revenue generating side. We need to talk about the ways that we can position the university for the future. We hope this is a conversation we will continue. The legislative season is beginning and there will be a lot of disconcerting stuff. In regards to our economic situation, we're in a good place. We're improving our position by any metric you can name. I think that will continue and it puts us in a pretty strong position.

Dr. Townsend: Thanks again for giving us the Cherokee room.

Dr. Campa: To add a comment, I think a lot of the problem is that UT Martin and UTK do a better job of impression management than we do. I think we need to stress that this is a matter of how one department affects the others. It isn't just a matter of getting rid of one department at a savings of \$80-90,000.

8. Faculty Concerns

Dr. Steinberg: I was approached by a faculty member who was concerned about two things about the schedule. One is that the mid-term reports were moved to a week before the drop deadline. The other was that in spring semester, the Tuesday-Thursday schedule lost a Tuesday, so we're a week short. We're losing contact time.

Dr. Townsend: Dr. Noe made the point last week. But you're right that the early warning date is difficult.

9. Announcements

The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees' Committee on Effectiveness and Efficiency for the Future will meet Monday, Dec. 7, in Chattanooga to discuss program discontinuation. I don't know if they'll be taking comments, but it's worth attending.

10. There being no additional business, the meeting was adjournment at 3:58.