

2009 – 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
4 February 2010

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, Rebekah Bromley, Rebecca Elliot, Clair McCullough, and Jim Tucker	
Lecturer	Andrea Becksvoort	
Adjunct		
Behavioral Sciences	Vic Bumphus, Lorraine Evans, Nick Honerkamp, and Barbara Medley	
Business Adm.	Jim Henley, Keith Richards and Greg Thibadoux	
Eng & Comp Sci		Ron Goulet, Frank Jones, and Yan Li
Fine Arts	Stuart Benkert, Ron Ulen, and Kenyon Wilson	
CHEPS	Kay Lindgren, Deborah McAllister, M.A. McCoy, D. R. Meece, Elizabeth O'Brien, and Cheryl Robinson	
Humanities	Ralph Covino, Lynn Purkey, and Vicki Steinberg	
Library	Beverly Simmons	
Math & Sciences	Hill Craddock, Irene Loomis, and Lucas Vandermerwe	
Ex-Officio	Susan North, Theresa Liedtka, Phil Oldham, and Jocelyn Sanders	John Delaney, and (Secretary) Roger Brown, Richard Brown,
Other Visitors	Karen Adsit, Fran Bender, Herb Burhenn, John Graef, Dick Gruetzemacher, Linda Hill, Monty Mary Tanner Lyn Miles, Chris Smith, Felicia Sturzer, and Monty Wilson	

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

1. The meeting was called to order by acting president Irene Loomis at 3:12
2. Approval of the minutes of 21 January 2010.

Lynn Purkey moved that minutes be approved; Jennifer Beech seconded. Motion passed without dissent or abstention by voice vote.

3. Curriculum Committee — Jim Hiestand

Jim Hiestand: The Curriculum Committee considered and approved more than fifty curriculum changes, and I've provided a summary of all the proposals and the votes of the Curriculum Committee. The problem is that we got most of those in 2010. We weren't sitting on them; most came in since fall semester ended. One meeting was snowed out. We worked very hard to put these through. Most of changes are minor -- changes in

prerequisites, course numbers, etc. Almost all votes were unanimous. That doesn't mean we didn't have concerns. Some proposals were sent back for reworking or clarification, but there is nothing here that is, in my opinion, really objectionable. I will answer your questions if you have them.

Nick Honerkamp: On proposal 10-062, the word science is misspelled in the title.

Jim Hiestand: That will be corrected.

Gavin Townsend: I had a question about the Interior Design proposal, 10-033. There is a change in what is now a sophomore portfolio review class, after which they must get a laptop. According to the proposal:

This proposal is to change the current Interior Design continuation standards. The current continuation standards are comprised of a Sophomore Portfolio Review (INTD 290) that measures a student's ability to demonstrate competencies learned in the first two years of the Interior Design degree. Students must pass INTD to move forward into the program. Students who pass INTD 290 are then required to purchase a laptop computer to be used in 3rd and 4th year interior design courses.

I couldn't understand this proposal. What is involved here? It seems to be a means of accelerating the time by which the students get the laptop.

Mary Tanner: Dana Moody couldn't be here today, and I can't address the specific question. I don't think it was merely about accelerating the time when students purchased their laptop.

Jim Hiestand: I don't think it was merely about the computer. My impression is that this is a toughening of standards

Linda Orth: There is an admissions procedure. It is my understanding that the reviewers were outside practicing interior designers.

Gavin Townsend: In the paragraph where they discuss raising standards there didn't appear to be a description of the review process. We have the same thing in art. Everybody is pre-art until after sophomore review. The review process is very elaborate and involves the whole faculty. This seems to be moving away from that.

Jim Hiestand: Any suggestions?

Gavin Townsend: What is going to be catalog description?

Linda Orth: Isn't it attached to proposal. I know it was there or we wouldn't have accepted it. There are other programs that have early review.

Mary Tanner: It's on page ten.

Gavin Townsend: It says a review of a student's potential. Another thing is that the current review process is described in detail. Similar language doesn't appear anywhere in the proposal. I thought maybe Dana could answer that.

Jim Hiestand: Do you want to separate this proposal?

Gavin Townsend: No, I'm not saying that.

Irene Loomis: Do we have any other questions?

Vickie Steinberg: One of these music proposals, 10-055, had a couple of negative votes.

Jim Hiestand: We approved 9-0.

Vickie Steinberg: The cover sheet of that particular proposal had a couple of negative votes, and I just wondered the reason for that.

Jim Hiestand: On proposal 10-055 the department vote was 12-2. That was a minor problem. We changed the language of that for a minor clarification.

Kenyon Wilson: That had to do with the co-requisites and class sequences. We have some courses that are co-requisites for the Music major but not for the minor. There was some sense that they should be co-requisites regardless and that was the source of the dissension.

Irene Loomis: Anything else?

There being no further discussion, the question was called: Lynn Purkey moved to approve the proposals. Nick Honerkamp seconded.

The vote was conducted using iClickers: A approve; B disapprove; C abstain
The motion passed 23-0 with no abstentions

Jim Hiestand: If you're contemplating any proposals, please try to do it early in the fall semester, if possible. There's been an enormous amount of work for the Curriculum Committee to get these approved in a timely manner.

4. Report on Allocation of New Computers — Monty Wilson

I received a question about how we were allocating computers for replacement. First, Dr. Clint Smullen sent out a survey to the deans asking them to identify computers around 5 years old and needed to be replaced. The English Dept. and the Library did a good job of preparing complete and accurate reports. The remainder of the reports were not as complete as we would have liked. We needed to know the name of the person using the computer and UT tag number. Our goal was to replace as many of the oldest computers as possible. Charity Trillet did most of the work identifying computers that need to be replaced. Based on communication with Dr. Smullen, and knowledge we had from experience, we sorted computers purchased between 1999 to 2005 by college. We got the list together and provided a copy to each dean and department head, and they reviewed the results. There was less than a 2-3 % error rate. We got those back and are in the process of ordering those computers. We gave faculty the option of picking the computer that was best for them. Computers have been ordered and are coming in. We'll put the standard image on and then get some vendor support to get them out a bit quicker. We're thankful for the \$450,000 in stimulus money we got this year. If there's any funding left, we'll identify additional computers to be replaced. The intent is to do another round next year. In addition to this round of faculty computer replacements, we asked for recommendation to replace classroom podium computers. They have been ordered and will be replaced in spring semester. We are also building new podiums for a variety of places: Nursing, Grote, Holt. If anyone knows about podiums that need to be replaced, please let us know. Of the 280 new computers, about 220 are going to faculty, and will replace a lot of faculty computers purchased by Lupton funds in 2002 and 2003. We're pleased to be able to do this because you need new computers and because those old computers require a lot of maintenance.

John Graef: Two weeks ago I asked about this when the list came out, we are getting three computers in our department, which is the second largest, and English is getting 29. Many of our old computers are older than the ones English is having replaced. I'd like an explanation.

Monty Wilson: The information I have that came from your department was four computers.

Herb Burhenn: We sent a complete spreadsheet from the College of Arts of Sciences.

There was a package with spreadsheets from each department.

Monty Wilson: To my knowledge, that is all we got. We got one from the department of English. We got one from Art. But we did not receive a consolidated spreadsheet.

Herb Burhenn: It was sent to Clint Smullen.

Monty Wilson: I don't know.

Herb Burhenn: That was distributed to department heads for comments.

Monty Wilson: Our goal is to get rid of these old computers. We attempted several different ways to collect data.

Mary Tanner: I think that may actually have been part of the problem. We sent a list of all computers that needed to be replaced to Dr. Smullen. Then a survey and request was sent to individual faculty. That may be the cause of the confusion.

Monty Wilson: I think that may be right.

Darrel Meece: If there's a property number, shouldn't there be a list.

Monty Wilson: The property ID number and the department are listed in IRIS, but that information isn't connected to an individual.

Verbie Prevost: Every department is supposed to have the inventory.

Monty Wilson: But we don't have that.

John Graef: Have computers been ordered?

Monty Wilson: Some have.

John Graef: Seems to me the only thing to do is reallocate.

Monty Wilson: I'll have to talk to Dr. Smullen about that.

John Graef: I've got a 1999 computer.

Hill Craddock: Are we sure the consolidated list didn't make it to your desk?

Barbara Medley: What about if you have a center where you actually have older computers or you need additional computers. Is there any provision for that in stimulus funds?

Monty Wilson: The stimulus money was to replace as many computers used by faculty and staff as possible. We have about 2000 computers and can replace about 280 computers. So we did not broaden out to include computers used by students.

Gavin Townsend: For the second round, let's assume we can't do the reallocation this year. What system should we use to collect information?

Monty Wilson: Our original system was to ask faculty individually using the survey. Martin has a recycle program they go through, and we got the form from them. We went with the information we got.

Gavin Townsend: A lot of people didn't reply thinking the department had collected info.

Hill Craddock: The same thing happened in our department. We were told not to respond to the request about what equipment we had.

Vicki Steinberg: I did both on-line form and sent the information to the department head and I still didn't get a computer.

Monty Wilson: With your guidance for next year, what would be simpler?

Liedtke: Can't you use IRIS for this?

Monty Wilson: IRIS doesn't list the individuals associated with computer. Sometimes old computers are replaced but haven't been turned in. So there are old computers that aren't being used or turned in. We want to get old computers that are being used.

Gavin Townsend: Verbie, what did you do?

Verbie Prevost: We made a list of every department member along with the ID number of the computer. We put that on a spread sheet and sent it to Dr. Smullen.

Jennifer Beech: The more people it goes through, the easier it is to get lost.

Verbie Prevost: The key was to associate the ID tag with the individual faculty member.

Mary Tanner: If you want deans to help you manage technology, you should let them have input.

Monty Wilson: We'll work with deans next year.

Phil Oldham: This is a pretty large project. I don't know the error rate, but I guess it's pretty low. We're replacing 280 computers and we have fewer than 400 full-time computers. We'll fix the errors next time, but this is a good thing.

Darrell Meece: I move that faculty senate recommend that all spreadsheets be reviewed carefully by department heads and deans. Vicki Steinberg seconded.

Vote using iClickers: A approve: B Disapprove: C abstain

18 approve; 5 disapprove 0 abstain; motion passes

John Graef: Putting that discussion behind us. We got the Lupton money several years ago, and the stimulus now. Who knows when the next windfall will be. Can we institute a system such as Martin has for regularly recycling computers?

5. Report from Tennessee University Faculty Senates — Lyn Miles

Lyn Miles reported on recent activities of the UT Faculty Council and Tennessee University Faculty Senates in regard to the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010. The UT Faculty Council consists of two representatives from each campus who meet with UT president and Vice President for student success. The purpose is to allow faculty to meet directly with the UT System president so that faculty input is not filtered solely through campus administrations. Miles presented a power point that will be archived with the minutes. The power point includes a link to the UT Faculty Council website so that any faculty member in the UT system can see at any time what the Faculty Council is doing. [Power point and link will be available on Faculty Senate website.]

According to Miles, the UT Council charter calls for council membership to be President of the Faculty Senate plus one additional member elected from each campus on rotating basis. The selection process should be included in faculty by-laws. Miles said that all campuses are in compliance except UTC. At the other campuses, the Faculty Senate Executive Council includes officers of Faculty Senate and the UT Council representative. We've had this for four years and we're the only campus that hasn't included this representative on the executive team for Faculty Senate.

Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) is one step up from the UT Council and includes members from the Faculty Senates of all the state's public colleges and universities. We meet twice a year. John Nolt is president. Lyn Miles is secretary. TUFS also has website. [Link will be posted on Faculty Senate website.] One of TUFS goals is to represent 10,000 faculty members to the governor. We've learned an enormous amount about how Faculty Senates across the state work. TUFS has a legislative liaison. We've

met with several senators and are working our way through education committee. There is some interest in creating a national organization (NUFS) and AAUP has supported that.

During the remainder of her talk, details of which are included in her power point presentation, Miles discussed the ramifications of the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010.

Irene Loomis: Bonnie Yegeedis, UT Vice president for Student Success will be attending the March 4 senate meeting to discuss this act.

Gavin Townsend: Was what you handed out the latest version of the law? [Miles: Yes] Does it include language that a graduate from a state community college is guaranteed admission into any program in a state college or university?

John Graef: I think that sentence that was removed. But it was assumed that any student who had completed an associate's degree at any state school could be assumed to have completed general education requirements for any state university.

Question: Does this mean that THEC will set requirements and we will have to have some proof of outcome?

Phil Oldham: At THEC meeting last week, they described generic funding formula that included transfer students, adult students, a lot of outcome metrics would be factored in. They'll weight that differently depending on the type of university. We're in the Carnegie Master's Granting Large category the same as Tennessee Tech and MTSU.

Question: So this effectively creates a competition between us and large schools like MTSU to find students who will stay and finish?

Phil Oldham: There are a lot of unknowns at this point. Formula funding will be adjusted.

Question: So access is going to be less at UT and we'll have a better shot at better students.

Phil Oldham: Maybe.

Lyn Miles: I'd recommend that Senate create a legislative committee.

Gavin Townsend: Regarding general education, it's my understanding that UTC made changes in its general education to be more in line with other institutions. The only campus grossly out of step is UT.

Phil Oldham: They're not grossly out of step; they have a 42-hour general education program, much like ours. The real issue is not general education requirements, but disciplinary requirements that are integrated within general education. This is a problem for students who change majors. We need to make sure the difference between those two is articulated.

6. Executive Report — Phil Oldham

I have just a couple of comments to follow up on what Lyn said. We have to up our six-year graduation rate. There are a lot of midterm issues to deal with. We have to push on first-year retention. That's a substantial goal to raise our six-year rate 18 percent in six years. We're going to have to find a balance point in those years. We have to modestly grow enrollments for fiscal stability, but we can't grow through ever-larger freshman classes; we have to grow through increased retention, transfers, and by growing graduate program. I'd recommend a book called *Crossing the Finish Line: 2009*. It's a comprehensive statistical treatment of what leads to success at college level.

I've laid out for my purposes a rough blueprint of what we have to consider and implement to address this. We're going to continue to admit students. About half of our incoming students are required to take at least one developmental course. We're going to have to adjust our admission standards, and look for additional ways to help these students. I've put together a kind of university wide committee to start putting together recommendations for how to flesh out these changes. There are a lot of things about this legislation I personally don't agree with; a lot I do agree with. At this point, it doesn't really matter. This is not going to be business as usual to raise our graduation rate to 60%. We all need to understand that and urge the entire campus community to be part of the solution.

Nick Honerkamp: What is going to be the net effect of getting rid of developmental and trying to increase enrollment?

Phil Oldham: That's one of the things I disagree with. Whatever our admissions criteria are, I want to be consistent with our goals. I don't want that filter to be any greater or less than what it needs to be. According to *Crossing the Finish Line*, the cohort that starts in a community college is 30 percent less likely to complete a 4-year degree than those that start at a 4-year. But the students who finish the AA are slightly more likely than 4-year freshman to graduate. I had been working toward increasing transfer retention rate before decreasing freshman class size. We're not going to be able to do that now.

Question: But aren't community college graduation rates generally very low.

Phil Oldham: Yes. That acts as a substantial filter for us.

7. Executive Committee Report — Irene Loomis

Irene Loomis: I'll wait until next time to do an executive committee report.

Question: How's Dr Campa?

Irene Loomis: He's doing okay. He's begun a rehab program and so he's tired, but he'll be back right after mid-terms.

8. Adjournment

There being no additional business or announcements, Lynn Purkey moved that the meeting be adjourned at approximately 4:55.