

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA  
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
March 4, 2004**

**Faculty Senate Members Present:** Obasi H. Akan, Rich Allen, Mike Bell, Stephanie Bellar, Nicholas Boer, Chris Brockman, Linda Collins, Neal Coulter, Parthansarati Dileepan, Fritz Efaw, Marvin Ernst, David Garrison, Matt Greenwell, William Harmon, Jim Henry, Jim Hiestand, Anne Johnson, Rick Keyser, Anne Lindsey, Claire McCullough, Gail Meyer, Greg O'Dea, Burch Oglesby, Gretchen Potts, John Trimpey, Randy Walker

**Faculty Senate Members Absent:** David Ashe, Roger Briley, Lauri Hyers, Robin Lee, Terry LeMoyné, Judith Wakim, Stacy Ray, Sean Richards, Joe Wilferth

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** John Friedl

**Among the Guests Present:** Deborah Arfken, Gene Bartoo, Herb Burhenn, Linda Orth, Tom Patty, Sandy Zitkus, David Pitteneger, Mary Tanner, Dorrie Turner, Charles Nelson, Fran Bender, Phil Kazemersky

The meeting was called to order at 3:02. Minutes of the February 19 meeting were approved by a voice vote.

**Executive Committee Report:** Senate President Ernst reminded the Senate members of the importance of attending the budget meetings as they show how a unit prioritizes their programs and how it relates to other units in the university. Budget meetings are scheduled for every Monday afternoon at 2:00.

**Administrative Reports:** no report

**Old Business:** The additional report from the Budget and Economic Status Committee will be presented later in the semester.

**New Business:**

Curriculum Committee Report: Bio 460 Motion passed with a vote of 23-0.

Graduate Council Curriculum Proposal: MEd. How can you argue there will be no impact with so many new classes? Specialist degree is in a state of change now that the doctoral program has been approved, the number of students in the program is declining requiring a shift in the current distribution of course offerings. Motion passed, 25-0.

Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Incentive Pay: Jim Henry: Professor Henry provided refresher background on the policy stating that UTC could accept policy 010 or another alternative. His committee has worked out an alternative scheme for four different extra pay types of situations. They are:

1. released time
  2. other duties in addition
  3. outside of duty hours and in addition
  4. base pay
- 
1. 1/5,1/5,1/5,1/5,1/5 faculty teaching 6 hours or more per semester, small impact under a limited vision---net gain if the program redoubles release time (bonus is to compensate for the work done to bring in the grant).
  2. Limited to 20% in line with Faculty Handbook
  3. Outside of Duty Hours limit 14% during the academic year, 33% during the summer payroll procedures
  4. Pay and more

There was a thorough, lengthy discussion of current policy and practices compared to this proposal. When asked how this alternative is different Dr. Henry suggested that this proposal is specified for faculty who teach 6 hours or more, this speaks to the Sim Center faculty. There is no release for research---only release for teaching --not from other duties. Consulting work is covered by the Faculty Handbook, 20 percent of your time no conflict with the University. If we bring in money, is there a policy that guarantees it will stay in our College? No formula, but a good faith effort is made to keep it in the College, this is of course separate from the proposed alternative which requires that a portion of the extra money stay in the department and the college. There was a long discussion about replacement funds and many sub-questions. If you buy out your time how does that get covered? Is 100% buy out typical? (No) And, are they replaced by other full time folks? (Not lately) Release time and buyout are approved by the Dept. Head and Dean.

Provost argued that faculty know he is philosophically opposed to this but if it is the wish of the faculty, he will send it up. Dr. Friedl argued I am opposed to paying a faculty member twice for doing their job. One concern is this proposal has an underlying assumption that faculty have to have a financial incentive to engage in extramural funded

research. I don't think that is true. I don't think this expresses the spirit or the letter of policy 10. It is out of line with what other schools do. I think it will have negative consequences for academics on this campus. This policy proposal has derived from a footnote from Huron Report. Current legacy practice violates policy 10. Comparisons with Agriculture Extension agents is misleading as research expectations were never part of their job description as it has been for professor.

The Provost further argued that this report distorts the reality of how the money is actually distributed. At the end of the fiscal year, I want a zero balance. The money goes to the Deans. How many people will really benefit from this policy? How many will now plan to write a grant? Does this plan increase outside funding or does it change the way we reward those who get grants? SimCenter faculty have changed things. The 5 tenured faculty need to bring in 75% of their salary. They do not have a 3 hour teaching load, they teach graduate students and have a 9 hour load. If they do not bring in the grant for their buyout time then they will teach.

What happens when we hire additional faculty for that program? What about a split appointment between Computational Engineering and Electrical Engineering? The Provost argued he wanted to make sure that everyone understands the opportunity costs of this proposal.

Finally, he suggested that much of his opposition to the proposal is that it reflects an era that is on the way out.

The ad hoc committee recommends that the proposal be taken as a package.

There was a more general discussion of the issues imbedded in this policy directive. Policy 10 makes it clear that research is a primary responsibility of faculty. At the system level the policy was implemented in October. Diane Miller served as a resource person to the committee.

What is the role of research at UTC? Dr. O'Dea asked the Provost to speak to the issue. He replied that new hires understand the importance of the significant increase in activity to gain extramural funding. As the faculty changes, the commitment to funded research will increase. Whereas a small school like UTC used to make hires in the local market, that has changed. We now compete in the national market where research and grants are part of the ethos of new professors.

There was considerable discussion on the difference in opportunities as to who can avail themselves of these dollars. There was a sense this may create a layering of faculty, those who bring in money "more important"

Do you think it affect collegiality?

Dr. Henry pointed out that type 3 speaks to the need to work cooperatively citing workshops for teachers.

Is there a difference for research and writing grants? In other words, are we more like the Agricultural Center than we might think?

It was argued that if economic incentives work in other areas of the university community—athletics—than maybe we should consider more of this.

Dr. Potts called the question. The motion failed.

Dr. Hiestand moved to split the question Dr. McCullough seconded the motion, motion failed on voice vote.

There was further discussion on teaching load. Who counts it? What gets counted?

Dr. Henry reminded everyone that as it is presented here, this policy is for people who have actual 6 hour teaching load. Who determines the load? Is it by contract, by practice? Dr. Henry replied that the intent for this policy is to be a bonus for those of us who teach “full loads”

Dr. Pittenger suggested there will need to be a lengthy discussion about how we count the load of people who are supervising a dissertation. As we moved to an institution that offers doctoral work, the Graduate School is specifying requirements for committee members to serve on dissertation committees or guide dissertations.

There was a voice vote, results unclear. Voting with a show of hands, the motion failed with a vote of 11-13.

Ad hoc committee on graduation. Fran Bender Co-Chair thanked her committee and offered the recommendations for changing the graduation procedures. Dr. Meyer moved and Dr. Collins seconded that the report be accepted. There was a general discussion on the different proposals for the students. Regarding the prepared statement, the intent is to keep it brief and still meaningful for the students who are graduating. With respect for the line and getting students through in a timely manner, photography is a big driver of the process because of the time constraints. We don't know the history of the additional picture and then there is the issue of the family photos. How do we enforce this (that faculty participate in the ceremony) in light of the Faculty Handbook that says we are expected to be there anywhere? The Committee thinks it is not too much to ask of the faculty to show up. One Senator offered that the times for commencement makes it hard on some families. What was the purpose of reversing the order of entrance? It was reversed was to control for the need for the seats. Why can't faculty say if they are going to come? The problem with the correct number of seats is easily solved if they will tell us if they are coming. There was agreement that commencement is for students not for faculty. Decorum is so important it helps all of us remember the ideals of an education. How much discussion went into the possibility that the location, a sporting and entertainment venue, is partially responsible for the behavior? Actually, it was considered but the only other alternative is to have it in a place that we have to rent which we cannot afford. The motion passed on a voice vote, no opposition. Since graduation ceremonies are the responsibility of the Chancellor's office, the resolutions will be sent to Chancellor Stacy for his office to implement.

Given the lateness of the hour, Dr. Collins requested that the lab/studio fee item be

delayed until the next meeting and the resolution would be distributed electronically.

Faculty Concerns: Dr. Efav asked if it was true that raising tuition would decrease what the state puts in. Is it really the case that increasing tuition has no effect on state funds? Dr. Friedl attempted to answer the question but reminded the Senate he was operating without having had the opportunity to refresh his memory on all of the details. But the general process is this. THEC calculates the formula,  $8514 * x$ . Subtract from that number unrestricted funds, balance is the THEC recommended amount. The TN General Assembly then tells THEC to apportion it out. If we increase tuition this year, will it reduce it dollar for dollar, no. There is a one year lag. Also, we raise our tuition in percentage with the other UT schools. The question I have not looked at, did TBR schools suffer from their rather large jump (14%)? I don't know if there is an adverse effect.

Dollar for dollar, I don't know. I do think there will be an effect given a time lag. Perhaps the best thing to do at this point is to charge Dr. Pittenger to draft a document to help us understand this process.

There was a sentiment that the Faculty Senate should send a letter of condolence to the family of Jack Freeman.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Stephanie L. Bellar