

## Faculty Senate Minutes

Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.

19 January 2012

<u>Division</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
<b>President</b>	Victoria Steinberg	
<b>Past-President</b>	Pedro Campa	
<b>At Large</b>	Susan North, Colleen Harris, Mike Bell, Shela Van Ness, Lyn Miles, Richard Metzger	
<b>Lecturer</b>	Andrea Becksvoort	
<b>Adjunct</b>	TBD	
<b>Behavioral Sciences</b>		Barbara Medley, Zibin Guo, David Ross
<b>Business Adm.</b>	Katherine Karl, Marsha Scheidt	Greg Thibadoux
<b>Eng &amp; Comp Sci</b>	Jim Hiestand, Claire McCullough, Mbakisya Onyango	
<b>Fine Arts</b>	Kenyon Wilson, Gaye Jeffers	
<b>CHEPS</b>	Kay Cowan; Beth Dodd, Deborah McAllister	Barry Dale; Jamie Harvey
<b>Humanities</b>	Ralph Covino, Heather Palmer, Verbie Prevost,	Abbie Ventura
<b>Library</b>	Beverly Kutz	
<b>Math &amp; Sciences</b>	Sumith Gunasekera, John "Matt" Matthews, Hill Craddock	
<b>Ex-Officio</b>	Phil Oldham, Theresa Liedtka, Jocelyn Sanders, Richard Brown, John Delaney	Roger Brown
<b>SGA Liaison</b>	Evan Williams	

Also present were: Prof. Angelique Ramnarine, Prof. Mayme Kay Banasiak, Terry Denniston, Sam Nienow, Prof. Gavin Townsend, Prof. Sarah Boykin, Prof. Irene Loomis, Dean Herb Burhenn, Prof. Barbara Norwood, Prof. Teresa Lyle, Prof. Gene Schlereth, Prof. Bob Marlow, Dean Mary Tanner, Prof. Kay Lindgren

Meeting highlights:

- The body passed the resolution brought forward by the Budget & Economic Status Committee, with a vote of 23 yeas, 1 nay, and zero abstentions, which was:

“The Faculty Senate formally recommends that the Provost commit at least 1% of the annual budget for Academic Affairs (currently about \$600,000) to faculty raises. Of this 1%, at least \$150,000 must be reserved to annually adjust faculty salaries to address issues of salary compression and other inequities. These adjustments are to be made without regard to EDO outcomes and are to be distributed at a time of year, presumably winter, that would set the adjustment apart from performance-based raises. The precise method for distribution is to be determined in close consultation with the Budget and Economic Status Committee and/or the Faculty Senate.”

- The body approved the curriculum proposals brought forth, which included a new Bachelor of Integrated Studies degree (BIS) that will next go before the Full Faculty.

- 

### **1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:14pm

### **2. Approval of the minutes of 1 December 2012**

Dr. Susan North moved to accept the minutes as submitted, Dr. Ralph Covino seconded the motion. The minutes were accepted by unanimous voice vote.

### **3. Budget & Economic Status Committee – Dr. Gavin Townsend**

Dr. Townsend took questions on the materials posted for Senate review. Dr. Covino asked why the resolution asked that only 1% be set aside, Dr. Townsend noted that this was the number recommended by the Provost as doable. Dr. Townsend noted that when he last spoke with the Provost, he was interested in committing that 1%, and it was an intention, not a promise. Dr. Lyn Miles asked why the committee did not ask for 3%. Dr. Townsend answered that the committee was trying to ask the Provost to commit \$150,000 to salaries to meet the CUPA average on an individual basis. The Provost recommended the resolution to the committee to commit this money to the Faculty Senate, and to forward up through his office. Since then, the committee has been working with Human resources and the Compensation Analysis Team to figure out how to spend the rest of the \$600,000. \$150,000 represents one-quarter of the 1% allocation, which will enhance base salaries of full time faculty.

Professor Mike Bell asked if this allocation would be without respect to EDO and performance outcomes; Dr. Gavin confirmed that this was correct. Dr. Townsend noted that it made sense to get as many faculty as possible to that 85% CUPA mark for equity adjustments. Dr. Becksvoort noted her surprise that there was no mention of lecturers; Dr. Townsend said they weren't mentioned specifically but might be considered full time faculty. Dr. Graef asked if this allocation would be in addition to any state allocations, and Dr. Townsend said it was. Dr. Becksvoort clarified that this would include lecturers, Dr. Townsend said yes.

Provost Phil Oldham noted that what kills us is the years of no raises, which creates issues of COLA and equity. He has lobbied that even when state has no raise dollars to give that each institution should have some nominal power to increase pay so we can make necessary adjustments even in years with no state money. Dr. Hiestand noted that there had been talks of cutting work weeks to 37.5 hours, which raises the pay rate, but not income, and implies that either we are not working hard enough or we will have to work even harder. Dr. Verbie Prevost noted that this is one recommendation for something that will build into a complete compensation plan, and she thinks there will be a genuine attempt to create a workable plan so we know where we are going, as opposed to deciding this year by year.

Dr. Susan North asked how long it would take to address compression, and whether there was any sense of where in the faculty this attempt might start. Dr. Townsend noted that equity is a separate issue from that of compression; the recommendation addresses market equity adjustment, and that it would take about a decade, in addition to it being a moving target. Dr. Shela Van Ness noted that this is a nice precedent to set, but it should be noted that COLA keeps riding. Dr. Townsend noted that was next on the committee's agenda. Professor Beverly Kutz clarified that this proposal did not adjust for cost of living, Gavin confirmed that. Vice-Chancellor Brown noted that he chairs the compensation advisory board for all of UT, and that this may be a model for a much larger comprehensive plan. The vote to approve the resolution was 23 ayes, 1 nay, and no abstentions.

Dr. Townsend noted that HR said \$150,000 was not sufficient, and laid out the outline of a plan for the entire 1% (or \$600,000) where \$200,000 would be used for adjustments to market, \$100,000 for compression adjustments, \$100,000 for mini-COLA equally distributed, and \$200,000 for EDO-based meritorious performance. Dr. Townsend noted that the committee would recommend these happen at different times of year so as not to conflate raises with cost of living and equity adjustments, with four understandings: 1) that this model does not preclude additional state money, 2) that the deans will have the authority to exempt certain faculty from certain raises, 3) that these raises are adjustments to base pay and not bonuses, 4) that these allocations will not come at the cost of the University's mission, and 5) that this may be frozen in catastrophic financial times.

#### **4. Administrative report – Provost Phil Oldham**

Enrollment has held up well, and we are off to another good semester. We retained 91% of freshmen from Fall to Spring semesters. Enrollment pressure continues for next fall; today as many freshman have accepted as we had through last May. We will have a record May graduating class – our enrollment balloon is now generating graduates. There will be no more summer commencement exercises, though students will still be able to get their degrees in August. Students with a certain number of hours may walk in the May graduation, criteria will be posted to the University website. August graduates will appear on both the May and December programs.

Searches are currently ongoing. Dean Burhenn is stepping down as Dean of Arts & Sciences after 14 years. Dean Dooley is chairing that search with good representation from within Arts &

Sciences. The University is in the process of initiating the search for the founding dean of the Honors College, and the University is working on an RFP for an external consultant, which is being done with private funding.

There have been a few administrative shifts, particularly in the Division of Lifelong Learning, where Dr. Karen Adsit is now serving as Dean. She is doing restructuring to separate noncredit continuing education from online credit bearing courses, and the initiative is to grow the online programs. We have three new support staff positions to support the QEP, and we have successfully managed the SACS reaffirmation process. We will implement the ThinkAchieve QEP project over a three year period, and the three positions to support that are the experiential learning support, assessment coordinator, and a learning and faculty development specialist.

### **5. Curriculum Committee Proposals – Dr. Ed Rozema**

Math proposal 12-035 removes all pre-requisites for MATH1010, 2150 and 2100. Dr. Claire McCullough expressed concern over MAT12-035, and moved to separate that proposal from the rest for discussion, with Dr. Shela Van Ness seconding the motion. The motion passed by voice vote. Dr. Jim Hiestand has a question about the bachelor of Integrated Studies proposal, and noted he worried about statements that people from other schools with lots of hours can complete an easier degree this way or that students may look to cobble together easy courses, generating concerns about the coherence and academic integrity of the program. Dr. Covino noted that it is not possible to come in with a smorgasbord of credits, as the plan of study must be approved and the capstone project requires that students successfully integrate two disciplines and not be duplicative. The vote was called on all proposals minus the 12-035, and passed with a vote of 24 ayes, 0 nays and 0 abstentions.

Dr. Betsy Darken offered the Senate arguments as to why math proposal 12-035 would have a negative effect on the university [the memo Dr. Darken distributed is attached as an addendum to the minutes]. In particular, she noted that 47% of UTC freshmen place into developmental math, that many of these students may have trouble in college level math courses, and that UTC has not revisited in some time what exactly faculty want students to learn in general education courses. She noted that these questions and the proposal must be considered in light of SACS requirements, the elimination of developmental math at the university level, options considered at other Tennessee universities, and wanting to keep high academic standards.

Dr. Pedro Campa noted that he appreciated Dr. Darken's memo and presentation but that this proposal comes with the advocacy of the math department with 14 ayes, 3 nays, 2 abstentions, and two members absent, and that it would be inappropriate for the Senate to overturn what the department had approved.

Dr. McCullough asked if we are not here to make comments or provide guidance, then why is the Senate here? She noted that she was asked to mention that her college signed off on this proposal as not affected, but since then the college has withdrawn their support of the measure.

Dr. Hiestand noted that the Senate has the right to comment on and overturn curriculum proposals. He presented an amendment to the proposal [see Proposed Amendment addendum to minutes.]

**Amendment:**

Students with ACT Match scores below 19, except those who have credit for developmental or college-level mathematics courses deemed appropriate by the Mathematics Department, are required to enroll in special sections of Math 1010, 2150 and 2100. These special or “enhanced” sections are to provide additional learning supports, including but not limited to additional weekly attendance hours, regular deadlines, integrated tutorial assistance, and instructor supervision. Secondary diagnostic tests may be developed to determine students’ readiness for these college-level courses, with test content based on general education outcomes for mathematics and statistics.

Dr. Campa stated that this sort of radical amendment was unprecedented, and that we should consider that the math department has subject expertise lacking in the Senate. Dr. Susan North agreed with Pedro but added that since Math has a general education course, this has implications for other courses across the curriculum outside of Math, so the Senate has an obligation to speak. As one of the few people who has had to deal with students who were previously in developmental courses, part of the English program was voluntary self-placement, and 41% of students are signing up for the enhanced sections out of the total number of students believed to need it.

Dr. Norwood, the chair of the General Education Committee, noted that we can agree on the obligation to students, parents and scholarship providers to provide a quality UTC education. She stated that this legislation preventing universities from offering developmental math is not in the best interest of students. All students who graduate from UTC should have a level of quantitative literacy. Before we make decisions of this magnitude, we should first decide what students need to know in math, as Dr. Darken pointed out. Dr. Norwood stated that Dr. Darken pointed out several relevant issues, that the English department has faced this in their program and are currently gathering data. SACS, QEP, and outside accrediting agencies are aware we need data and assessment. Dr. Norwood noted that Math’s answer is “We think it will work,” and this proposal flies in the face of Dr. Bender’s freshmen retention program, university values, and state dollars with respect to retention. As General Education chair and a faculty member, she noted she will not support this proposal.

Dr. Covino noted that the body had voted to approve enhanced section models for English, and with similar situations, are we requiring different models? He noted that keeping coherence is the job of the Senate with regards to guardianship of the curriculum.

Dr. Graef of the Math department noted that the motivation for looking at the issue came from the Provost asking the department to look into it. The department looked closely at the content of the courses under discussion, and what students really needed to know to pass. Students remark that passing 1010 is easier than passing 105/106. 1006 is an algebra course that they should have received in high school. The model of enhanced courses may work for English, but math is a

more linear subject. Dr. Graef said that the Provost asked that there be a college-level math course that student could go "directly into."

Evan Williams from SGA noted that the national ACT average is 21, and Tennessee's is 19. Current Math courses require a 21, but if you don't have that score, and there is no developmental option, students will just fail.

Dr. Matt Matthews noted that with respect to Dr. Darken's question of what should students know, the proposal does not change the content of the courses. As for the second issue of enhancements and adjustments, English is considering changes since their implementation of enhancements, should Math not be allowed the same opportunity? He noted his preference is that students should have to meet a hurdle before this course, but students are already making poor choices in terms of prerequisites.

Dr. Tracy Hughes from Math noted that the courses listed in the proposal are not algebra courses, and they are taught what they need to know during the course of the class. A high school diploma qualifies them for the class. She noted there is no data on enhanced sections because the proposal is new. Dr. Belinsky of the math department stated that students who attend at 100% tend to pass the class, and that the problem students have is attendance and homework and that they come into the class after they have forgotten their math skills. Students who take 1010 should have to do so in their first semester. He noted that Dr. Darken should have gone to the department with her concerns, and asked that the Senate pass the proposal and ask the department to come back in a year with data on the results. Dr. Van Ness noted that we have a lot of students that are good in all areas but math. Professor Angelique Ramnarine said that most of her students are successful and explained her teaching techniques, including pretests for each of her tests, and stated that most of her students are passing.

Dr. McCullough asked if they don't have to know anything about math going into the course, is that really a college-level course? She also stated that she thought it had been implied that Dr. Darken was unprofessional to bring her concerns to Senate, and noted she did not agree, that the Senate is a place of last resort for this conversation and it should not be considered unprofessional to take advantage of the forum.

Dr. Matthews noted that what Dr. Belinsky is saying is that students need to have a mathematical mindset, but do not need to know algebraic equations. Dr. McCullough noted that expecting that students who did okay in high school math to perform well in college is problematic.

Dr. Fran Bender said we all know UTC students have problems with math, it is a huge problem. And distressing. 72% of students who take their math requirements early graduate, otherwise the graduation rate of those who take it late is 38%. This is not a Tennessee problem but a national one. She respectfully disagreed with the Math faculty who stated that the courses are easy, noting a 47.296% DWF rate for MAT1010 from 2008 through 2010.

Dr. Miles noted that a goal of the Complete College Act was to shift all developmental work to the community colleges, and asked why we did not focus on collaboration, or if increasing the

ACT score requirement for admission would help, to focus there. Dr. Verbie Prevost said she was inclined to think the Senate should support the department's unamended proposal.

There was a discussion about the appropriateness and/or legality of the Senate considering the amendment proposed by Dr. Hiestand. After some discussion, Dr. Hiestand stated that it was in accord with Robert's Rules of Order. This assertion was supported by Dr. Gene Schlereth of the Math department. Professor Colleen Harris noted that she was uncomfortable with having the Senate making radical revisions to curriculum proposals and then holding departments responsible for unfriendly amendments to their proposals.

Professor Lyle of Nursing noted that she had been working on the math progression for Nursing, and that though Math faculty were stating that students do not need algebra in the introductory course that her students most certainly need basic algebra skills. Dr. Darken noted that we need to articulate what we are expecting students to learn from our math courses, and that she had in the past recommended that 106 was not an appropriate prerequisite for 1010. But what is appropriate is a mathematical mindset as mentioned earlier, to take what they know and apply it in context. Dr. Darken said that as her colleague in nursing noted, our students are weak in K-8 math, and we need to create standards to make our students more quantitatively literate.

Dr. Hiestand noted that several people expressed a desire for curricular flexibility, that the curriculum committee vote had been 5-2-3 and not overwhelmingly supportive, and that in addition to MAT1010, faculty want a certain level of competency in math which many students don't reach.

Claire McCullough seconded the amendment motion.

Professor Meg Keissling of the Math department said that Math 2150 deals with basic math. She added that the root of many students' difficulties with math was their complete dependence on the calculator.

There was discussion of the new math lab, which is too new to have much data attached to it. Dr. Metzger stated that in his experience he has not seen that 105/106 make any difference to what he teaches in statistics. He will vote against the amendment and for the proposal, especially since his colleagues in Math gave two years of thought to it. Dr. Kay Lindgren asked if the Math department says you don't need 105/106 to take 1010 or the other courses, why are those courses listed as pre-requisites? Dr. Graef's responded that these were the prerequisites that were in place when he became department head, and now that his attention has been drawn to the question of prerequisites for these courses, he and the department have concluded that the current prerequisites are not necessary. When asked by Dr. Lindgren how long he has been department head, he said 13 years.

The vote was called on the amendment, which failed with 7 ayes, 12 nays, and 2 abstentions.

The vote was called on proposal 12-035; Dr. Deborah McAllsiter called for a written ballot, Dr. Marsha Scheidt seconded. The 12-035 Math curriculum proposal passed with 13 ayes, 9 nays, and 1 abstention.

**6. Other Business**

None

**7. Member Concerns**

None

**8. Announcements**

None

**9. Adjournment**

Dr. Steinberg adjourned the meeting at 5:07pm.