

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA  
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
March 18, 2004**

**Faculty Senate Members Present:** Mike Bell, Stephanie Bellar, Nicholas Boer, Chris Brockman, Linda Collins, Neal Coulter, Parthansarati Dileepan, Fritz Efaw, Marvin Ernst, David Garrison, Matt Greenwell, Jim Henry, Jim Hiestand, Lauri Hyers, Anne Johnson, Rick Keyser, 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:** Obasi H. Akan, Rich Allen, David Ashe, Roger Briley, William Harmon, Robin Lee, Terry LeMoyné, Randy Walker

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** John Fridel, Jocelyn Sanders, Bill Stacy, David Pittenger

**Among the Guests Present:** Rob Baily, Herb Burhenn, Dawn Ford, Allison Miller, Charles Nelson, Andy Novobilski, Linda Orth, Richard Rice, David Uchiyama, Sandy Zitkus

**March 18, 2004**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00. Minutes were approved by a voice vote.

**Executive Committee Report:**

- a. Non-exempt staff resolution. The non-exempt executive council has passed a resolution requesting a work week of 37.5 which is in line with Chattanooga State and many other state offices. This would result in what amounts to about a 6 percent raise. It was moved and seconded that we consider this as an endorsement. There was a general discussion on the motion that included a number of issues.
  - What does this mean for the staff who work late? Overtime.
  - Does this mean that offices will not open until 8:30 or close at 4:30? That would depend on the administrator who is in charge of the office.

- Why is this before the faculty before it went to the non-exempt staff? Trying to get this done as soon as possible.
- What does this mean for offices that have a full 40 hours a week work, what will it cost departments that will have to approve comp. time?
- Can we make endorsement contingent on the approval of the ERC? Why does our endorsement matter?
- If we decide to pull this item, what we are saying is that this is beyond our purview. There was a request for a show of hands to postpone this resolution until ERC has had a chance to review this.

There was a motion to postpone this item until we have heard back from ERC, motion to postpone action on this item passed by voice vote.

- b. Resolution on non-discrimination based on sexual orientation. It was moved and seconded that we endorse this resolution at UTC. Other units in the system have endorsed the proposal.
- Is this already covered by statute?
  - Is this a fairly common statement across universities? Yes.
  - Amendment offered to drop the “whereas clauses” died for the lack of a second. Endorsement of the resolution passed by voice vote.
- c. UTC Peers. The need to be attentive to this issue has been brought about by recent communications with a consultant who offered that MTSU, APSU, UTM and UTC were similar. On the 17<sup>th</sup> a new letter was received dealing with funding comparisons with suggested peers. Provost Friedl provided background on the redefinition of peer institutions. THEC was asked by the legislature to come up with a new formula. This request may have been made because the current formula is hard to comprehend and seems to be unfair. THEC was slow on the report, and the General Assembly told them to pick it up. This consultants’ report seems to accomplish the intent of justifying under funding higher education. State and local appropriation is 81.6 % of the group median based on 2000-2001 data. The “New Peer Group” gives us a better percent of group median (111) 2000-2001 without an increase in spending. The four year schools are all coming in above the peer groups, compared to the two year schools which are all coming in well under the reference group. The result is clear, two year schools will be better funded while the four year schools will be underfunded. The 2000-2001 data do not reflect who we are; it includes schools with no professional programs, no doctoral work, and they under represent the extra mural funding UTC brings in by a large margin. Twenty percent of our new peer group is from LA, another is Brownsville TX, a school right on the TX Mexico border. Moreover, these schools do not have the same level of accreditation we have with programs such as COBA or Nursing. Drs. Friedl and Gruetzemacher are working on a justification for why this is not the relevant peer group. Following Dr. Friedl’s presentation there were a number of questions
- What is the THEC rationale? We haven’t seen it. THEC was told to revise the formula, instead they revised the peer group.

- Who did the work and can they be sued for gross incompetence? National Council on Higher Education in CO did the work and without seeing the contract, it is hard to know if they were incompetent.
- Is there anything that the faculty and staff can do? Dr. Levy asked for good data and they (Dr. Friedl and Dr. Gruetzemacher) are working hard on pulling the data together.

We need to get this community involved in advocating for the University and protecting our reference groups. What will be the consequence of this? Share with the community what this will cost us. We can do it if we know how the legislature will fund the formula. Or, we can give the community a series of “what if” statements showing what it will mean if we are funded at the new peer group level and what that will cost us from the old peer group.

**Administrative Reports:** none

**New Business:**

Curriculum Committee Report: Dr. Novobilski presented the course proposals as a group. All of the courses had passed the Curriculum Committee with unanimous votes.

*Biology and Environmental Sciences 121,150*

*Religion 366/WSTU366, 369*

*Music 226-326*

By a show of hands the proposals were passed 27-0

Handbook Committee Report: A recommendation for a revised EDO Appeal Process was presented to the Faculty Senate by the committee. There were a number of questions about the proposed policy.

- This proposal seems to give the Dean a lot of influence on the committee. The reason for not including faculty on the committee was that these are administrative decisions.
- What is the opportunity for the department head to speak to the committee?
- Does the process overload the influence of the Dean in the case of the “below meets expectations for rank”. This will allow a faculty person to appeal the first negative rating. Also, under the new tenure guidelines there is a statement that there will be an EDO review committee. This is about the EDO, not retention, promotion and tenure. This changes what would trigger a remediation action.

There was an amendment offered that the department head be a non voting member of the committee. The amendment died due to lack of a second. There was a friendly amendment accepted by the committee and the second that the “committee be advised to take a statement from the department head.” A question was raised “Whatever happened to the idea that the person who is appealing an adverse ruling on tenure be allowed to nominate a member of the committee?” That provision is still there for tenure, this would kick in a lot earlier. Another question was “What about including a faculty member who had received exceptional merit evaluations to the counterbalance department head dominance?” No action was taken on that question.

The motion with the friendly amendment was voted on by voice vote, the results were indeterminate. Voting by a show of hands, the vote was 15-10 the motion carried.

Resolution Lab/Studio Fee Proposed by L. Collins, second by G.Potts There was a supportive discussion of the need to help provide resources to classes that need extra supplies. Sciences, art, have no current structure for funding the “wet” classes. Fees are an administrative difficulty but the dollars are necessary. Dr. Collins informed the Senate that “sometimes we resort to raiding the restrooms for paper towels”. Knoxville has a fee structure even though Dr. Johnson does not like this and has rejected the idea for UTC in the past. . This proposal would have that the fee is imposed on students who are taking the class, not all students. We tried it once before with all students paying a smaller fee, it failed at the system level; EHLS and Human Ecology have similar needs. This raised the question of “What are the “lab” classes?” UTK has been swimming along for years with these fees and we need some help down here. It is time we put something in place that recognizes that some classes are very expensive to offer. The motion to request fee support for classes with lab expenses passed with a voice vote, no opposition

Resolution Football Study Committee: Resolution to study the costs of football at UTC, moved by G. Meyer seconded by R. Rice. There was a general discussion of the need to understand the costs of providing this service. Based on the report in the paper today it seems that the way to get things done is to go to the Student Government Association. We need to be aware that the students have been asked to put some serious money on the table with very little notice. We have an “old” report floating around authored by Professors Helms and Finch. One of the conclusions of their report was that losing football may also mean losing other things, like the marching band. We may want to find that report. The athletic committee has requested that this resolution be sent to them. They were informed that the resolution was properly sent to the full body of the Senate. We need to make sure that some students are on a committee like this one, someone from music, and any other impacted group. Dr. Meyer reinforced that the proposal is for a study of the costs with no prejudice about the outcome of the results. Accounting professors opined that we need to think about comparisons, what about if we are in another division with a smaller number of scholarships, not offering it at all, lost students, and the like. J. Hiestand offered that the current proposal is really a two part motion. An amendment was offered by Professor Hiestand to cut the last part at the end of the first sentence, seconded by J. Henry. That amendment passed with a voice vote. Athletic folks a little concerned that if we send this signal now we may be muddling the water for students who are being asked to raise their own fees. R. Rice argued there is another group to think about. A few years ago, THEC requested that schools review their athletic budgets and we did not. B. Oglesby moved to table, C. McCullough second, the motion failed on voice vote. The question was called, the motion as amended carried on a voice vote.

Ad hoc committee on Administrative Pay Report: Verbie Prevost and Joanie Sompayrac presented the conclusions of their review of salary increases. They concluded most of the raises were across the board raises. In the case where raises were given outside of the

state mandated increase, their major conclusion was that raises are dependent on your advocate. If you have a strong advocate, you are more likely to get a raise. They were very careful to acknowledge that nothing appeared suspect. Simply put, some supervisors are more vigorous in pursuing raises for their staff. However, it did appear that a few raises were justified after the fact.

They had one major recommendation: HR on this campus should report to Knoxville HR. It will be a cleaner system, avoiding even the appearance of impropriety.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55.