

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 15, 2020 at 3:10pm.

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 3:11 pm via Zoom video conferencing. A video recording of the meeting can be viewed at: <https://youtu.be/P6s2JNzpH24>

Senators in Attendance: Charlene Simmons, Tammy Garland, Nominanda Barbosa, Jamie Harvey, Marissa Colston, Zibin Guo, Nicholas Boer, David Giles, Julia Cumiskey, Susan Thul, Natalie Owsley, Alexandra Zelin, Irina Khmelko, Erika Schafer, Sarah Einstein, Ethan Mills, Christopher Stuart, Jaclyn Michael, Joshua Hamblen, Cuilan (Lani) Gao, Eleni Panagiotou, Phil Roundy, Spencer Usrey, Stephanie Gillison, Ignatius Fomunung, Ron Goulet, Mengjun Xie, Liz Hathaway, Joanie Jackson, Barry Kamrath, Beth Crawford, Bernadette DePrez, Priscilla Simms-Robertson, Brian Rogers, Jodi Caskey, Hill Craddock, Donald Reising.

Senators not in attendance: Anne Swedberg, Wes Smith.

Approval of the minutes:

Approval of the minutes of the September 17, 2020. There were no revisions nor objections, so the minutes were approved.

Administrative Reports:

Chancellor Steve Angle

Did not have any specific report to add but took time to thank and show appreciation to all the faculty senators for their participation in shared governance with faculty senate in addition to their teaching responsibilities.

Provost Jerold Hale

Had three items to report:

- A. First, he wanted to give an update on strategic planning. Provost reminded that the strategic planning in being organized around subcommittees related with previous four goal from the about to expire strategic plan. The subcommittees will be revealing what went right and what perhaps was not achieved regarding that plan but will also encourage creativity to move beyond if find new targets of opportunities for us or related for general goals that were there. Those subcommittees will be submitting reports to what we are calling integration committee with the purpose of taking the work product from subcommittees and integrate them into a single cohesive document that we can then use as the basis for a series of listening sessions in the campus community in a larger Chattanooga community. From those listening sessions we hope to be able to revise the

draft document that came out of the integration committee and to proceed as follows. He mentioned that if he would of give the progress report to date, they had the initial meeting with integration committee where he charged them with tasks to be performed and they have also begun to have meetings to charge the subcommittees. The first meeting happened today with the subcommittee that will be working around issues of stewardship and resource alignment for the university. They hope to have a final report to the campus community by March 31 of 2021.

- B. The second report was about reappointment tenure and promotion. They have completed four meetings related to this item and those are the usual meetings that have been planned on a usual annual basis. This year they occurred with the assistance of Vicki Adkinson and Matt Mathews. One of those meetings was aimed at candidates for tenure and or promotion, one was aimed at RTP committee chairs and committee members, a third meeting was held for department heads and deans and the fourth was especially designed for tenure track faculty members considering the board of trustees tenure clock extensions so we could discuss their implications in the process.
- C. The third item Provost Hale reported was that at the time he did not have complete information on scheduling for Spring 2021 because he had not yet seen a preliminary report from phase two on it. He ensured that once he sees the report that tells him about proposed courses and course modalities, he would report to deans which in turn would follow up with the department heads. He would also follow up with the faculty senate executive committee and to faculty and staff in the Thursday morning forum. He ends by saying that they are anxious waiting so that they can see the degree at which they can accommodate people's requests for things like space and classroom outfitted technology

Donald Reising: during the full faculty meeting Dr. Brown had mentioned that there were surplus funds coming to the colleges. In the same meeting, you said that your office was going to be responsible for the management and disbursement of those funds. The faculty senate member wanted a clarification on what those surplus funds are, when will they be dispersed and whether the appropriate departments will know what amount are coming back them. Provost ensured that the departments and colleges will be able to know the amounts coming back to them. He also added that he knows the FNA's fees will be returned. Other fees may include fees such as a fraction of online fees that we collected in previous years. Whatever is collected, will be retuned using the same formula as previous years. Generally speaking, any money to be returned either to academic affairs and colleges and departments, the dispersant will be completely transparent. Dr. Brown added to provost Hale notes that those funds should be moved in the first quarter and the provost will get an aggregated report of where those funds are moved. They will be moving directly through the Deans office whether or not they are centralized in his office. Often some of the funds such as FNA's as well as Lab fees are moved straight back to the deans. He guaranteed that a full report will be made available. Tylor Forrest also confirmed that some of those fees mentioned have already been returned last month.

Committee reports:

President Charlene Simmons called the **faculty rating of administration committee** that had been meeting and hoping to bring some items to be discussed in this meeting. However, a member of the committee that was in the meeting confirmed that they in fact met but few things needed to be further discussed and therefore were not ready to report. But report would come soon.

Handbook committee: chair of the committee Ron Goulet said that the committee has met to revise section 4.7, NTTF. Looking at where we are and where the handbook committee was one year ago, we are converging on a draft that is remarkably similar to the one that was approved by the faculty senate in November of last year. Therefore, as the handbook committee we are wondering whether we might get some directions on what become the November 2019 of section 4.7 that was voted and passed unanimously but never advanced any further. Charlene assured that she would be sure asking Matt Mathews about the version referred on topic above.

A NTTF senate representative Jody Caskey brought a concern: there are NTTF members going up for promotion that would be counting on that language which has been approved but noticed that is not yet in the handbook.

The president Simmons answered that any time a handbook change is made the faculty senate votes on it, but we are far from the last group that approves changes. It must go through the UT system and then it must be approved by the board of trustees. Until the board of trustees approves a change, the existing handbook remains.

New Business:

Financial presentation by vice chancellor Brown and associate vice chancellor Tyler Forrest:

Dr Brown began by thanking Dr. Simmons and members of the senate and particularly all faculty members for all the work done Spring 2019 especially due to the COVID -19. The crisis was surprise to all and one of the things he worried about was business continuity, how to keep the university moving forward, how to keep the mission going, how to keep teaching students. The faculty stepped up in a great way, did a great work in moving classes online instructions and by doing so it helped create a positive outcome for this budget. He strived that he cannot thank faculty enough, deans, provost in terms of business continuity for the institution. He also took the time to commend Chancellor Angle for the great leadership during this period. He added that Dr Angle had two requirements, one make sure that the instruction remains the highest quality and the other, keep our campus safe. Because of all these, the financial results are stable. The overall financial position is healthy, stable and it is as good as it can be. All this was achieved due to good planning on prior years, keeping strong reserves, resisting the spending of all reserves.

He took time to thank Tylor Forrest in the budget staff who was in the meeting for their tremendous work in terms of making that we had a transparent financial accounting during this process.

Challenges and opportunities:

Enrollment fluctuations: given the fact that the State's economic outlook is not as solid as it has been in many years and COVID -19 will have an impact even though their revenues look pretty good. However, enrollment is important for this institution, we have to be very careful with it, it is about students, it is about instruction to the students and how they value the instruction.

SACSCOC reaffirmation and financial index score: reaffirmation and accreditation for the Institution and we are on a two track for another 10 years review and our financial index will be very critical. They will come and say how strong is the university financially. Can it really pay its bills in short at the end of the day and are our reserves in place in case something catastrophic happens? Right now, we are in a very good shape. However, we don't know what the future responses will be on COVID-19. We don't think this is lasting just one year. We think this could become our new normal for the next two to three years. We must determine how to respond, what are the costs associated with maintaining social distancing, PPE and all of the above with COVID-10.

Impact on athletes and auxiliary units: overall, and although they are beginning to allow crowds these are socially distanced crowds which means that revenues from ticket sales really has gone low and our athletics department is not immune from that. At the end, athletics is a very critical component of the institution which deals with over 350 paying students and very good students on this campus. Therefore, we must be concerned on how this institution makes sure athletics stay strong. Also, we must have in considerations the impacts on auxiliary units such as parking and food services and the book store. As an example, Aramark alone suffered almost a 4 million dollars loss as a result of COVID-19 because we really don't have that many people on campus every day. Currently we may have around 4000 people as compared to the routinely 12000 to 13000 a day on this campus.

Telecommunicating workforce: as we know, many are working from home still. We will be looking into this which could still be our new normal as we move beyond COVID-19 this Fall and Spring 2021 and ensure that campus remains safe.

Capital outlay may become limited: we think we will become very limited in terms of planning for new buildings and new constructions as the state's economic outlook tightens. We don't think we will be seeing a lot of major capital outlay investments. I think we will see capital projects reduced in the order of 50 to 70 million. We will begin to look at a phasing of projects.

Philanthropy will continue to be important: one thing that we are noticing over the country is that philanthropy will continue to be an important part of financing a healthy university in terms of diversifying revenue streams. We believe that for most universities 33 to 35 percent of base budgets will come from development work and philanthropy. Therefore, we are all this together in terms of friend raising and fundraising. We are delighted that we have the UC foundation

working on our campus and supporting our efforts towards philanthropy and helping Dr. Angle and his team with fund raising.

Rightsizing and re-engineering the university: one thing that we might have to look at in the next two to three years is rightsizing and reengineering the university. How large should the workforce be? Or can we readjust and realign and re imagine working divisions around the university to save money and increase efficiency. We are all up to all public universities in the nation and right now we are beginning to look at those issues.

Our continuing competitive investment in scholarships will be critical for this university and all public universities around the state of Tennessee. As of today, we have a little more than 2.2-million-dollar deficit in scholarships. We can pay for some of that now but will talk about that more about what are challenges are with that when the state withheld funding under the governance of plans. Full scholarships will also be an issue for us as we move forward.

Financial considerations:

FY 20 financial impact: We need to look at the financial impact that we had from COVID-19. As a result, a from COVID-19 we had to issue refunds in 2020 of 5.94 million dollars. We refunded everything students left such as the remaining balance that they had paid for on residence halls, parking services, food services, meal plans and others. We were also empty of another 14 million dollars on football revenue. Therefore, you can begin to see the impact of COVID-19. In 2021 we went into the budget planning year very excited I thought we had a tremendous budget planning process very transparent, we had the projected revenue to come in and then came the COVID-19 and the governor and the legislature say we cannot fund the funding formula. As the result, we saw us loose a 1.5 % tuition increase which cost us 1.76 million dollars. Mandatory fees of 1.5% increase was another one that cost another 395,000 dollars. We had money coming from state appropriation and growth and almost two million dollars did not come. He added that his state appropriations are as result of how well we respond to the outcome-based funding formula and UTC has been in the top one to two position in the state for the last five years. State appropriation for salary pool of 1.56 million dollars was also withheld. Because we moved all these courses online very quickly, we had a huge push back from students about accessing the online fee. As a result, it cost almost 3.7 million dollars. As said before, athletics is also another critical issue and we lost around 1.5 million dollars as well.

The good news is that the federal government provided some stimulus fund, CARES act funding in two buckets of funding, the student CARES act funding of about 4.7 million, and an institutional CARES act funding at about 4.7 million dollars. The state also gave another additional 467 thousand dollars and then the THEC CRF came back with 688 thousand dollars. We were able to use these funds. It impacted 5137 of our students whose families were struggling to deal with COVID-19. These funds wee used to buy books, help pay for their rooms, help travel cost and even tuition costs. The student affairs did an outstanding job in developing a program to deliver these emergency funds to students. We also were able to prorate about 2 million back to auxiliary units in the housing to pay for some of the refunds we had to issue. We were also able to use these funds to purchase PPE, technology, cleaning services, cleaning solutions throughout the institution, etc. This Fall we were able to send two face masks to every

entering student. We mailed the masks with a letter from the Chancellor encouraging them to wear the mask saying you don't have to pay for this, we are providing that to you. We were able to help Vice Chancellor Vicki Farnsworth with putting technology inside the classrooms. There were some problems with supply chain, but I think we are in better shape now. We had to buy large cleaning machines to make sure we could disinfect the buildings and even over Fall when we had an incident with COVID-19 of a building we were able to clean the building overnight and have it ready for the next morning.

Highlights for the Year-End: we are in strong financial position and as a result of that, we have not laid off any faculty or staff member, we have going to furloughing any faculty or staff member. Dr. Brown said that the provost sent him an email he got, and the email was looking at budget cuts across higher education. Most universities have not been held harmless from budget cuts. Compared to these other universities and he listed several of them, we have been good Stewarts of our finances. Therefore, our fund balances are within what we call the THEC preferred ranges. The E&G (education and general dollars; these are state dollars) are required to be in the range of 2 to 5% and UTC range is 4.38%. On the auxiliary side, the recommend a 3-5% range and UTC is in the range of 5.07%. UTC auxiliary units continue to be stable. We worked with Aramark to scale back some of their offerings but still deliver a quality service. All notes and bonds payable have a dedicated revenue stream supporting their payments. We opened the new West campus housing with over 600 beds and a new parking deck. We assumed the huge capital outlay cost there and were able to pay that bill.

Carryover Policy:

We have closed the year in the black and we have left carryovers such as lab fees and F& As. These are sent automatically back to the academic units for them to continue their academic programs. We did not aggregate summer school incentives left, we sent them back so that summer school can remain strong. We returned a 100% of these balances back to the divisions/college units.

We funded non-recurring budget obligations with the net balances. We withheld 100% for institutional investments and developed a contingency fund for COVID-19 support, if needed.

Division Balances: a table with Divisions and Year End Balance (cumulative of all balances) , Approved Carryover (lab fees, F&As, summer incentive dollars and any other pre-approved adjustment) and Net Balance (which was returned 100% back to the institution and covers non-recurring obligations that were known in fiscal year 2021) was presented by Tyler Forrest:

Academic affairs had a Year End Balance of almost 4.2 million dollars and nearly 3 million dollars were returned to the colleges and units resulting in a 1.2 million dollars Net Balance back to the institution. Athletics had a negative Year End Balance of 471,361 dollars.

Mandatory Fee Balances: these are fees that assessed outside of the in state or out state tuition, but they are mandatory and require board approval. Tyler Forrest highlighted some of them mainly the larger balances. Facility fee of 1.4-million-dollar surplus that is always reinvested back into the campus through capital programming whether in maintenance or outlay projects. The debt service fee that also goes to capital as being saved for appending renovation of the university center in out years. He pointed the negative online access fee (-377,469) that was

largely driven by not assessing the online access fee in the summer semester in the previous summer semester and for not assessing that this Fall or more than likely in the Spring 2021. However, he added that UTC was able to use reserves to offset that deficit. He pointed several surpluses on the differential fee side. Most of these large balances are obligated to future capital build outs particularly in the college of business, engineering, and the rest covered operating throughout the year.

FY 16-20 E&G Fund Balance: Something Dr. Brown mentioned is continuing investing in the University fund balance. As Dr. Brown mentioned before, 20 years ago the university E&G Fund Balance was 7,000,000 dollars. Twenty years from there we were able to grow it to 8.25 million dollars and that is certainly a positive note and we did still manage to invest 250,000 dollars this past year in particular because of the accreditation coming up in the next couple of years.

FY 16-20 Auxiliary Fund Balance: remained strong and we added 25,000 dollars to bring that to 925,000 dollars.

FY 16-20 Notes & Bonds Payable: these are all funded with recurring revenue streams. We were averaging right at about 100 million dollars in outstanding debt for the campus. We certainly expect it to drop several million below 100 million but then we anticipate adding approximately 18.5 million dollars in new bonded debt in FY 2023 to account for the addition that is going on, Mackenzie Arena.

Dr. Brown added after the notes presented by Tyler Forrest that we must continue offering strong instruction on campus and that the quality of the instruction here has held the enrollment. He asked that we pay some attention to messaging from the students. For example, they asking to increase some face to face instructions, and we must look at it and see how to find some balance in that. In terms of advocacy, he thinks we must seek additional state funding support and a modest tuition and fee increase between one to three percent just to deal with general cost increases. Also, advocate for some compensation pool.

Questions from senate members/ faculty about the presentation above:

Don Reising posed a question to Dr. Brown: in terms of budget challenges presented here how is Covid-19 impacting hiring of new faculty and staff?

Dr Brown said that in the Spring, hiring freeze was not fully instituted. There was a selected hiring and we tried to move those positions forward that were critical to the operation of the institution. I think that faculty will need to make a business case to the deans and provost as to how critical that position is whether it will be supported and funded and at the end of the day that will come back to the leadership team and then finally to the chancellor of the institution. But we've not implemented a total hiring freeze at all. What we are saying is to be highly selective about those positions.

The senate member added an additional question as a follow up of the prior one and in response to Dr Brown answer: how does the highly selective hiring impacts the new programs looking to hire new faculty?

Dr Brown: I think that the dean of that college has to make a business case to the provost in terms of looking at that projected growth and what will be there for either returning or investment for adding those new positions whether or not that program is viable enough to sustain on its own. Provost Hale added a note to the answer: vacant positions and retirement positions have gone unfilled so far. Have in mind that at the beginning of summer we were concerned that the state legislator was going to do a reduction in their budget for the university and we were asked plan for potentially for what would amount to a 5 percent reduction in our operating expenses. So, what we asked of academic affairs for each of the colleges and academic programs to do is to plan for potential reduction. Each of the deans met with Allison Evans, analyst for academic affairs and they came up with a plan that would get us to that point. We are waiting for the legislators to come back in a session in January to see whether there is going to be a major course correction. If there is no major course correction, we will revisit those plans with the deans and department heads in January.

With regards to new programs, most are programs that at least in the beginning can be managed with current faculty until we get more information and find out what's the enrollment is going to be.

Don Reising followed up with a new question: regarding the five percent Provost Hale mentioned, is it referring to the past January or this upcoming January?

Provost Hale answered: confirming that the five percent reduction that UTC was anticipating, and the state legislator are revisiting is referring to this upcoming January.

Dr. Brown clarified that some programs and investments were stopped because of COVID-19.

Another senate member (Ron Goulet) posed a question to the Provost: he started by showing appreciation for the fact that the university has focused on quality of instruction and safety but to the idea of quality of instruction, is there any midterm measurement of how our students are doing in these emergency conditions?

Provost Hale answer: midterm grades were just turned in and I think they will give us one indicator. Also, I have had some preliminary discussions with the registrar and with vice chancellor Freeman about reaching out to students whose academic records is based on those midterm grades look especially challenging. I would ask that you indulge me to the next senate faculty meeting, and we should have probably better data.

President Simmons added that she has already reached out to vice chancellor Yancy Freeman and Matt Mathews and they are working to have a presentation at the faculty senate meeting of November of the topic above. They are working on the student success last Spring, Summer and midterm grades for this Fall.

President Simmons read a question from a faculty that came in as a text: where there any furloughs or layoffs for auxiliary contractors like Aramark or the bookstore?

Dr Brown answered the question: we had some carefully thought downsizing of some of those particular programs, based on the population we were serving here on campus

COVID Absence Statement

Senate president Charlene Simmons shared and spoke on the COVID Absence Statement. A survey was conducted, and results showed that 84% of faculty want a COVID-19 absence statement in syllabi for Spring 2021. We asked whether they would like to keep the current statement, the current statement with changes or start over with a complete new one. 65.6 % of the faculty that responded were okay with the current statement, 22.4 % were okay with the current statement with some changes. So, we put it together and the majority wants the statement with some changes. The faculty senate executive committee met and discussed how to proceed with drafting a new statement. We thought that because it only requires few changes and faculty are so busy dealing with this semester at hand, putting together another committee to look at this was not necessary. We thought that the first thing to do was to put together a first draft with revisions based on suggestions from the survey that has been sent to everyone. We can talk about it today and get further suggestions and edits then everybody can take couple of weeks to look at it. In November meeting, we can make any last changes and vote on it.

Some suggestions/revisions presented:

- 3 versions one for each (f2f, online, hyflex)
- Revise link/ language for self-check; to make it clear about self-check.
- Added requirement to attend f2f classes when clear by self-check app.
- Added requirement to fill out COVID-19 notification form
- Clarified that this applies only to COVID-19 related concerns
- Added some timeframes for communicating with instructors about make up work
- Required that a plan be created for making up work (student and faculty member)

A senate member Ron Goulet wanted to know if the dean of students was going to play a part in the process as he did in this past summer. Dr. Simmons added that she did run the draft by Brett Fuchs in that office and also by Yasmin Kian student health so that we can get feedback from them and make sure that we had our language right about the self-check and other things. They gave me of key comments and feedback, and I incorporated them into the draft.

Another member asked the president Simmons whether we know what percentage of students is filling out these forms before they go to classes. Charlene did not have the numbers, but she assures that she can ask. She added that few weeks ago someone asked the same question in one meeting and she thinks that Chris Smith had found a number of on average of 600 students filling out the self-check out but I don't think we've compared that to the number of students having face to face classes.

A member of the senate Erika Schafer also had a question for the president Simmons about the same topic: she wanted to know whether students are supposed to do both notify their instructor of their absence within 48 hours but also fill out the COVID-19 notification form.

The president Simmons responded yes to the question. She clarified that for example if a student is showing symptoms and is told by the self-check not to come to class, the first thing we want as faculty is for that student not to come to class. But then we want them to notify the instructor within 48 hours to say at least they are not going to be in class. The second step is then fill out the notification form because it's the COVID-19 notification form that really triggers a larger university response. The form goes to student health, deans of student office and that begins a

larger process of faculty being notified but also contact tracing and others getting involved in following that student's case.

Another member wanted to know whether this will also apply to the students whose rooms are randomly assigned for isolation and quarantine that have experienced symptoms but have been randomly selected to remain isolated until test comes back negative. The senate president answered that yes if a student in the system has been placed in quarantine or isolation for a variety of reasons and triggered this notification form and is not to attend class in person then if the student if feeling fine then would need to participate in class using the other mechanisms being provided by the faculty member. Then if student becomes ill then a larger plan would be put in place for making up work.

Marisa Colston had a quick question about the topic: when asking students to contact the instructor within a week of recovering for make up work is that soon enough for part of term courses (have in mind that each week is about 13 and half percent of course work)?

The President replied that she would be happy to take suggestions for a different time period. The same member suggested perhaps 48 hours of business days and Dr. Simmons make a point to say that she would make the changes on the draft based on the suggestion.

Another member had a concern that some students are using COVID-19 as an excuse when they are fine and wanted some thoughts on that. Dr. Simmons responded that that's why a requirement to fill out the notification form to start limiting that. The current one is a little broad And we could have a student saying I am not feeling well, and we don't have documentation. With this changes, we will be very explicit that students need to fill out the notification form which then brings in other people who will do the checking for faculty. Students will need to fill out the form and then the rules will be followed.

The president Simmons encouraged everyone to continue looking the form and the changes and reach out and be ready to vote on it on upcoming meeting.

Senate Apportionment

No division changes required but we need to keep an eye on fine arts and business. Both divisions are very close to getting a senator added if they hire two people in either. The senate has no limit to the number of senators. So, if business hires two more faculty members, we will simply add another seat and it will not be at the detriment to any other division. There is a procedure in the bylaws for adding seats but right now we are coming in at the correct number of senators per division.

The senate apportionment is based on divisions and it's based on the number of assistant, associate and full professors in each of those divisions.

I also want to look at NTTF as a separate issue and see if they are getting the representation that they might be warranted and so I found out that full time NTTF make up 30 % of our full faculty and yet they only have 5.5 % of senate seats. So, I would like the senate to seriously think about that and whether we want to make adjustments to our bylaws to allow the NTTF to have more representative seats.

A question from a senate member on the topic above was posed: how does that break down by division when looking into NTTF?

The president answered that she did not and in part because the divisions according to the bylaws are based on tenure track faculty and not NTTF. She added that right now the only senate seats assigned to NTTF are the full time NTTF. This brought a follow up question from the same member wanting to know whether the president was suggesting that one NTTF be added per division. Upon the question, the senate president answered that she thinks there are different approaches that the senate can choose to do and that would be one (one NTTF per division); another would be open divisions up to NTTF. The bylaws are a little vague about whether they can actually be elected senators or not. It does not outright they can't, but it also doesn't say they can, and the way apportionment is done excludes them. Another option would be to potentially expand the number of at large seats they have (they have just two) and they are not by rank. Currently, we have ranks for NTTF so do we want to create a multiple seat? She added that she does not have an answer but thinks is something the senate needs to think about.

Stephanie Todd the chair of the NTTF committee added that this topic was discussed in a recent NTTF town hall and there wasn't an overwhelming consensus, but I think the most popular choice that I've heard would be probably adding representatives by college in addition to the at large senator that currently exist. A proposal has not been drafted yet we are in the early stages of discussions and getting feedback.

The senate president added that changes to the bylaws can come from a lot of sources so she would encourage that the NTTF committee work together with the handbook committee draft the proposal and bring it forward for further discussions and changes to the bylaws.

Stephanie Todd brought a concern: her only concern is if we look at having NTTF senators by college, if we look into the ones that have only 10 or 15 full time NTTF it might be tough to find senators to fill those seats every year. For this we may consider going rather by at large senators than by college.

About the concern above, another member suggested that we could also have a NTTF across the university vote and appoint and treat them almost as their own division and allocate seats to them based on those numbers. That would work kind of like in ECS we determine how many seats we get based on the total number of tenure track in the college. He suggested that this could also determine how many ranks to fill those available seats.

The senate president then encouraged the NTTF committee and others interested to take this issue up and hopefully have a proposal soon.

Faculty survey results:

The senate president proceeded to say that the faculty survey was sent out, results were collected, and she wants to get it in the record for the archives. The results of the survey were sent out multiple times and are available to faculty, but the floor is opened for any discussion here in this meeting today before we are able to archive it:

A member asked the president what are some of follow up is going to be from the findings of this survey? Will there be things coming from maybe from the Provost or in general what are we going to do we the results of this survey?

Dr. Simmons answer: I know that at least IT as well as the Learning Environment Committee are going through the survey and will be using it trying to solve some of the challenge's faculty teaching face to face classes related to technology and the learning environment. The provost and I have been talking about some of the issues that have emerged from it related to work load and stress. It's also starting to spark a few conversations at the state level, so I was able to share with them the survey and survey results to the Tennessee University Faculty Senates. Conversations are particularly about the workload and the increase of workload especially over the summer and is probably going to generate a statewide survey to grasp how much work faculty do over the summer. It will be looking in an average non-pandemic year how much work faculty do over summer, how much of that is compensated and how much is not. Then, try to track how much COVID has impacted faculty work, and type of work, how much has it shifted. For instance, for faculty that do research how much has it shifted away towards teaching etc. The results of the survey then can be shared with our own university and boards but also with the larger legislator and THEC.

President Simmons ended by saying that for her the results of the faculty survey is guiding her on the conversations she has with the Chancellor and the Provost. This will allow us to highlight some of the areas that we need to focus on.

Unfinished Business:

No Unfinished business

Faculty Concerns:

Stephanie Todd brought a concern about the timeline of when book orders are due and the fact that this might particularly affect adjuncts and staff who may not get their schedules until the last minute. She added that it looks like Spring schedule is not even live yet (by this meeting day) but book orders are already due.

A senate member Donald Reising, noted that some of the issues that he wanted to add to the concern above is that some sections were added late or there is no evidence to show that they've been added officially to the schedule and when faculty go into order the book it does not show in the drop down as a selection.

President Simmons took note of the concerns and agreed to follow up with the book store with the concerns expressed above. She added is of her knowledge that book orders deadline is done based on buybacks. The bookstore buys books back from students, so they need to know in advance what books they're going to buy from students before students start selling back books.

Stephanie Todd made a note to add that she thinks that all the above is regulated by the state but then Matt Mathews and Beth Crawford both clarified that it is a federal requirement. The Matt

Mathew then suggested that Kelly from the book store would probably be happy to explain in more details.

A follow up question from Stephanie Todd was what in this case would be a solution for faculty who does not know what their schedule is until schedule goes live?

President answered that in theory their department head knows what was put into the scheduling system and should be able to report at least the drafts and be able to tell a faculty member what has been proposed to be their schedule. However, she would want to follow up with the book store, the Provost and others and get an answer.

Another member brought a concern from another faculty that has a course to teach but does not have a CRN for the course.

The president Simmons then read a chat note from Amanda Clark who had spoken to Holly Scott in the bookstore concerning the issue above discussed. Holly Scott said that the bookstore system does talk to the scheduling system but sometimes it takes up to 72 hours for changes in CPI to get to the bookstore. Holly suggested that faculty regularly check for updates.

Hill Craddock presented a concern, he proceeded to say that he had a peculiar problem this semester with textbook selection for general biology. He explained that there was an opportunity to adopt the first day program. However, the deadline to adopt first day was before the date of the textbook selection and that faculty teaching those courses had not met to decide on the textbook. When text book was decided it was too late to use the first day program. He wanted to know to whom would he appeal that decision and is it really to late to get first day for the textbook in question? He strived that getting the first day program would've resulted in a significant savings for the students.

About Dr. Craddock's question, Matt Mathew intervened but said he was not aware of who sets the deadline. He proceeded to say that his understanding is that we have a partnership thought the book store to provide service but not who sets the deadline. He suggested that maybe this is an opportunity to invite the bookstore manager to come and discuss these concerns with faculty senate or simply meet with faculty senate executive committee to discuss them and then bring them to the senate. Dr Brown promised to Dr. Craddock to make an inquiry to see if we can get a solution next day.

Charlotte Ellington said that she had an adjunct faculty from the history department reached out to her with a question after Dr. Brown's excellent and very detailed explanation of finances. The question is as follows: has there been any discussion at UTC regarding increasing adjunct pay?

To the question, Dr Brown's answered: a broad answer to that is yes. I think that when we open the budget shortly, this item will be on the agenda. We will have some direct conversations with the deans of every colleges about the matter.

This last question brought about another question from another member on whether this would also apply to NTTF (lectures) and Dr. Brown answered that he was sure that they would be all on the list as they looking at all classifications of faculty classification and that all are part of the overall compensation plan and therefore they would take a look at all of them.

On adjunct salary, Felicia McGhee-Hilt was concerned that adjuncts salary sometimes differs and are paid by colleges. She suggested that maybe there should be a steady payment that is the

same for every adjunct whether they are in business, engineering or arts and sciences. Dr. Brown reminded her that that does not hold true for regular faculty. There is compensation differentiation for faculty members in the business school, in the accounting, in chemistry and so on. Therefore, we will find variations even with adjunct pay. The issue becomes whether or not it should be competitive, and market driven. Dr. Brown added that they were engaged in an external consulting group to do a deep dive into faculty compensation. He promised to follow up with the concern and make sure that the adjunct pay is market drive.

Stephanie Todd added a last concern associated to the related to the full time NTTF: when the third rank of lectures was created, those that were at the rank of senior lectures got a little bit financially disadvantaged (essentially, now there is an extra pay raise); there are now two opportunities for raises in the new structure and the most senior faculty were disadvantaged financially by missing out in that opportunity. She wanted to bring that concern and may be find ways to look at it and make it equitable for senior lectures. Dr. Brown took note of the concern and said that's the old compression issue and at the end of the day we will take a look at compression factors too.

A member reached out to Dr Brown with a concern: some of my students who are having class have reported being in quarantine and isolation are reporting that the food they are receiving is non-sufficient. Can we discuss what funding for student health is looking like? This seems to be an ongoing issue. Dr. Brown answered that he was sure that the student help model table would move forward with the budget and planning. They have been so critical to the ongoing business continuity on the campus. I've heard some of these issues and I am sure will be raising some of those issues such as food, delivery and so on to make sure that students get what they deserve.

Another r question was posed to Dr. Brown: a faculty/senate member heard that students were charged 300 dollars when in quarantine and she wanted to express her concerns on that. Dr. Brown again offered to investigate that concern.

For food delivery: a faculty/senate member said that he has heard that the delivery of food delivery operates as a rule "slid under the door" he wondered if that was true. To cover that, Matt Mathew made it clear that they use the same rule offered to faculty.

A concern related to the safety of students working in the dorms and campus was also brought about by a senate member. She wanted to make sure that these students stay safe and are secure in their positions. Thee have been some conversations and concerns that some of them do not feel safe (In terms of COVID protection but also compensation and others) in their current roles on campus.

In face of all these concerns brought about here and related to COVID-19, Dr. Brown then suggested that the senate president invite doctor Freeman in to really talk about them.

An option was suggested by Matt Mathew and that was suggesting that faculty and staff offer to help out with the delivery of food. The senate president added that volunteering opportunities are available and have been discussed but it was not clear how to do it. But his morning she found out through the QA morning sessions with the Provost that if you email Val Sample, she will hook you up.

Announcements:

No announcements

Adjournment:

At approximately 4:51 pm Don Reising put a motion forward for adjournment. The call was seconded by Beth Crawford.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully,

Nominanda Barbosa, Senate Secretary 20/21