

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
February 5, 2004**

Faculty Senate Members Present: Obasi H. Akan, Rich Allen, Mike Bell, Stephanie Bellar, Nicholas Boer, Chris Brockman, Linda Collins, Neal Coulter, Fritz Efaw, Marvin Ernst, David Garrison, Matt Greenwell, Jim Henry, Jim Hiestand, Anne Johnson, Rick Keyser, Robin Lee, Terry LeMoyne, Anne Lindsey, Claire McCullough, Gail Meyer, Greg O'Dea, Burch Oglesby, Gretchen Potts, Stacy Ray, Sean Richards, John Trimpey, Judith Wakim, Joe Wilferth

Faculty Senate Members Absent: David Ashe, Roger Briley, Parthansarati Dilepan, Lauri Hyers, Randy Walker

Ex-Officio Members Present: John Friedl, Dan Quarles, Bill Stacy

Among the Guests Present: Deborah Arfken, Eugene Bartoo, Herbert Burhenn, Chuck Cantrell, Cindy Carroll, Robert Duffy, David Lambkin, Tony Lease, Marcia Noe, Andy Novobilski, Linda Orth, Debbie Parker, Tom Patty, Valerie Rutledge, Mary Tanner, Margaret Trimpey, Sandy Zitkus

**February 5, 2004
Put Richard on the mail list**

Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 3:01.

Approval of Minutes: The minutes were approved as distributed.

Administrative Reports: Faculty Senate President Ernst said that the Executive Council has met and that the budget is top item of interest. Furthermore, the Executive Council has met with the ad hoc 120 hour rule committee who will be presenting their recommendations later in the meeting. Dr. Ernst urged the Faculty Senate to pay attention to and participate in the budget hearings.

Dr. Stacy and Dr. Friedl deferred to the agenda this meeting.

New Business:

Library Committee: Dr. Stanley presented the resolution that was distributed in the minutes for January 15, 2004. Essentially the committee requested that the Faculty Senate “resolve that Library funding should be given a top priority.” Provost Friedl offered he would interpret the passage of the resolution to mean that the Faculty Senate would consider this the top spending item after mandatory items are paid for from the academic affairs division. The motion carries on a voice vote.

Curriculum Committee: Dr. Andy Novobilski informed the Senate he will be completing the term of office now that Dr. Pittenger has new responsibilities at UTC. He asked that the Senate defer consideration of the curriculum proposals until February 19. Once it was established that this would not pose a catalog problem and given that the Senate received the proposals late, it was agreed to allow more time for consideration of the proposals.

There was an objection to delaying the consideration of one proposal, THSP 404. Dr. Noe explained as coordinator of the Women’s Studies program she had come to speak against proposal. Women’s Studies had been asked to approve the class. Dr. Noe read from minutes of the November Women’s Studies committee meeting suggesting that the overlap with the proposed course and current courses was a problem. Dr. LeMoyné and Dr. Gailey indicated the amount of overlap in each of their classes was substantial. It was not approved by Women’s Studies, although language in the proposal suggests there would be students from the program. Dr. Friedl noted he was not aware of the problem with Women Studies when he signed the cover sheet. Dr. Friedl moved to table the proposed course THSP 404. The motion passed on voice vote.

Dr. Potts spoke to her support of the request by Dr. Novobilski to postpone the remaining courses until the February 19 meeting. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Graduate Council presented three course proposals which had passed both readings of Graduate Council 14-0-0, 10-0-0 respectively. There was a discussion of postponing these proposals as well. However, the Graduate Catalog faces a different timeline and delaying consideration of these three proposals would present a problem with getting them in the next run of the catalog. The motion was passed by a vote of 28-0-0.

Ad hoc 120 hour rule committee report. Dr. John Trimpey presented the Faculty Senate with the recommendations of the 120 hour committee. Dr. Trimpey informed the Senate that this proposal was an alternative to the Feb. 5 deadline of departments culling the hours from their programs. That deadline had been given so that the committee could see what departments were willing to do. The Senate will remember that at the January meeting the Senate had empowered the committee to act as well. It is the hope of the committee this proposal will help departments work out the details of compliance. Clearly, programs which have already absorbed competency of these University requirements into their course work will receive less benefit. The text of the report is reproduced in the minutes.

“The 120 hour Steering Committee makes the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate. All were approved unanimously by the full committee.

1. The University requirement of 2 hours of physical education be dropped. Departments that wish to retain any part of this requirement are free to do so. They need to know that the hours taken will be considered part of the 120 hour limitation for their major.
2. The University Requirements of Intensive Writing, Oral Communication, and Computer Literacy be dropped. Departments may feel free to keep any of all of these courses as requirements for their majors, but the hours will be considered part of the 120 hour limitation. The skills addressed in these courses must be acquired by all students per SACS suggestion. Thus, programs that integrate the courses into their major will need to demonstrate compliance with SACS. This compliance will be monitored in the 5 year Program Review process.
3. The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga adopt the articulation agreement previously approved with Cleveland State Community College for all TBR institutions, conditional upon receiving a reciprocal agreement from the TBR Schools.

The Committee feels that these changes will assist many departments which are struggling with the need to reduce hours required in their major and recommends Faculty Senate approval and will be in compliance with Tennessee laws concerning Transferring students.”

There was a motion to divide the question which was seconded and passed on voice vote.

There was considerable discussion on all three components of the motion.

One question that was repeated throughout the full discussion was: Why is General Education protected from being considered from cuts?

Taking the remaining components in order, the issues Faculty Senate debated were:

Component One: Given the state of poor health in TN why cut PE? If that is so why exclude students over 25? If we drop the physical education requirement, when does it go into effect? We need to discuss the impact of this. How many people will this affect? What will be affected is 021, there will be fewer sections offered. Provost Friedl suggested that what this means is that there will be a fiscal impact particularly in regaining the tuition dollars from part time students. As far as instructors, it will hit the part time faculty. There was a lengthy discussion on this issue with the general agreement that exercise is important. Call the question. No objections. There was a voice vote, then a vote of show of hands. The motion to drop University Requirement for 2 hours of physical education passed 23-5-0.

Point of information: does this go to full faculty? It may require a special called faculty meeting. Full faculty did not approve this as a University Requirement so it may not have to happen. Faculty Senate President Ernst will investigate this issue.

Component Two: Does this leave it up to departments to define the appropriate level of oral communication and the like? If it goes through the curriculum committee it should be acceptable. There was a long discussion about the role of SACS in requiring these as competencies or actual courses. It was suggested that if accreditation is driving the issue, we should check the guidelines for specificity. If SACS issues suggestions rather than requirements can we ignore suggestions if they do not monitor their suggestions? It is difficult to speculate on what SACS will monitor. Twelve years ago they accepted oral communication in the departments. Provost Friedl said the notation of the student having acquired the competency will have to be validated by some type of assessment. In a course that tests over these criteria it will be a class requirement hence it is a graduation requirement. Therefore, we can assert that the student has met the competency. Currently, General Education is the committee that approves these courses for exceptions to the rule. The Chancellor who is a member of the SACS executive committee said that SACS requires that we must show that we do what we say we will do. Must statements are gone, it is mission driven. Let us remember that SACS is only one constituency we have to think about. We must also think about what is needed for our students. There were side discussions about the role of outside departments in teaching the substance of the courses, i.e. Computer Literacy. Some members of the Senate opined that we could trust our colleagues to make sure their majors could speak, write, and think well if these skills were necessary within the discipline. It was in discussing this component of the motion that there were the majority of questions about why the committee chose to review University Requirements and not General Education. There was a motion to amend the component to strike the language after the first sentence. The amendment passed by voice vote. The question was called on the main motion. It passed by a vote of 28-0-0.

Component Three: What does this mean for the articulation agreement? The big difference is in the math class where TBR requires one and UTC requires two. A central question was “Why do this if it causes a problem or cannot be done?”

- One it puts the ball in TBR schools hands;
- two it shows that we are willing to meet them halfway;
- finally it is for the students, even those who leave UTC for a TBR school.

Programs that require additional math will lose flexibility of one class. There is a problem of the reciprocity of our general education core with TBR schools. TBR is going to an interchangeable course general education. Therefore, we need to look much more closely at the requirements of general education. TBR schools have one speech class in their general education which we just took out of the University requirements for graduation. TBR requires two semesters of American History. This is based on statute and exemptions can be provided. UTC has one and some programs at Tennessee Tech have exemptions to the American History requirement. If the Tennessee General Assembly really wants ease of transfer they can make the process happen. It was argued

that UTC should use whatever means possible to have UTC general education match TBR general education. Question was called. The motion passed 29-0-0.

Point of information: discussion of whether or not this goes to full faculty will be delayed.

In light of the need to both cut hours and reach an articulation agreement with TBR schools, there was a motion from the floor that the Faculty Senate charge the General Education committee to reconsider general education requirements. The motion was seconded. The motion was passed on a voice vote.

Due to the lateness of the hour the ad hoc Incentive committee will wait until the February 19 meeting to present.

Faculty Concerns: none

Adjournment: Seeing and hearing no objections, Faculty Senate President declared the meeting adjourned.