

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 1, 2004

Faculty Senate Members Present: Obasi Haski-Akan, Rich Allen, Mike Bell, Stephanie Bellar, Nicholas Boer, Roger Briley, 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, Robin Lee, Anne Lindsey, Terry LeMoyne, Claire McCullough, Gail Meyer, Greg O’Dea, Burch Oglesby, Gretchen Potts, Stacy Ray, John Trimpey, Judith Wakim, Randy Walker, Joe Wilferth

Faculty Senate Members Absent: David Ashe, Bill Harman, Sean Richards

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

Among the Guests Present: Deborah Arfken, Herb Burhenn, Jim Cunningham, Amy Davis, Yancy Freeman, Linda Orth, Verbie Prevost, Mike Russell, Joanie Sompayrac, Jack Thompson, Dan Webb, Harriet Wichowski, Cecelia Wigal, Sandy Zitkus

April 1, 2004

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:04

Approval of Minutes: By a voice vote, the minutes of the March 18, 2004 meeting were approved as submitted.

Executive Council Report: Given the length of the agenda Faculty Senate President Ernst deferred the report until the next meeting of the Senate. In deference to Dr. Thompson having a 4:00 class, the agenda was modified to allow Dr. Thompson to present his committee report first.

General Education Committee: Dr. Thompson presented an update on the programs that have requested 120 hour rule exceptions. Engineering is asking for a waiver of 6 credit hours in civilizations and cultures. COBA has asked for exemptions of 3 hours in General Education. The committee was asked to review the concept of waivers for general education, discussed the proposals and decided to make

recommendations: approve Engineering, approve Business, approve the concept that programs can seek waivers in general education if they need that for compliance with the 120 hour rule. The motion was presented in three parts.

1. Motion for allowing Engineering the waiver, without objections. Voting by a how of hands, the motion passed 28-0
2. Motion for allowing COBA the waiver with the understanding business students still have to take a non-western course. Voting by a show of hands 28-0, the motion passed.
3. Motion that other programs be allowed to make requests for exceptions to the general education committee. The process would be that the program would go to general education for approval and then to Faculty Senate.

There were several questions about this motion.

Is this limited to meet the 120 hour rule, or can be there to change general education? Should there be a template for what would be waived? Are the decisions being made by accreditation?

Current policy is that the committee does not have the power to grant exemptions to general education. They can grant exceptions to individual students. Is there a reasonable statute of limitations, say for the 2005 catalog so that we can comply with the 120 hour rule? If this motion passes, will proposals have to come back to Faculty Senate? Exemptions will come before the Senate, regardless of this motion either to confirm what the committee has said or as an appeal to the decision of the committee.

There was a general sentiment that departments should have the right to request exemptions.

The vote, in support of the motion that committee was empowered to review requests for exemptions in general education so that programs could seek compliance with the 120 hour rule, was 27-0-1

Administrative Reports: Chancellor Stacy informed the Senate that system contact on fee levels is underway, placing lab/studio fees under academic enhancement. Trustees set fees so it will be summer before we know how this proposal will fare. Work on refining the suggested peer group is going on. TBR is happy to have a reciprocal agreement for transfer students and we are still looking for options on history requirements. Budget hearings are on going; everyone is encouraged to attend the meetings.

Provost Friedl began his remarks by saying that the document addressing the issues of the THEC suggested peer list was a team effort. Summarizing the document, UTC argues that of the proposed new peers 8 out of 10 were bad choices. Therefore, UTC gave them 15 new peers to consider. UTC is the highest of all 10 (suggested group) with faculty with terminal degrees. Clearly, the number of faculty with terminal

degrees is a driver in overall instructional quality and cost. The one question I (Provost Friedl) cannot answer is “where is this all going?” What does this mean in relation to the formula? The change with their suggested peer list is detrimental to UTC.

In response to the question “Are we being “picked on” the Provost offered that the data make it clear, UTC changes more than any other school in the state.

Dr Efav opined that it is more than “picking on UTC”, it is a larger political issue. For example, MTSU has Georgia Tech as a peer group.

Two year institutions did much better. THEC has wanted the two year schools to grow—it is less costly to operate those institutions. If you look at the results you can infer what the instructions to the consulting group must have been.

Do we have anyone in Nashville who can help us? The administration is working through Bob Levy, who is the liaison with THEC. It may be premature to go to the legislature since it has not hit their desk yet. Should UTC faculty be involved in a grassroots campaign with THEC? Perhaps there should be a Senate Resolution. With the Senate’s permission, Faculty Senate President, Dr. Ernst, will draft a letter.

We commend the Provost and the Chancellor for their work on this issue.

Old Business: Ad hoc committee on administrative pay report: Dr. Prevost and Dr. Sompayrac provided a spread sheet trying to answer questions that emerged during their first presentation. One issue is that they used percentages of the number of raises—not dollar amount. Departments with strong advocates, business and operations/student development/chancellors office, do better than other units. There were some people who received raises from several classifications, i.e. promotion/increased responsibility/market equity.

A discussion developed over how these data fit with analysis from the Faculty Federation. This differs in that there is no base year. This study included all exempt staff as opposed to the top ten administrators. Across the board raises account for about 32% of the dollar amount.

What we were trying to understand was “Is there a clear process for how administrative raises are assigned”? There is a process but there are also gaps.

New Business: Dr. Russell presented the resolutions from the Standards Committee.

Revision to the Catalog “Retention and Continuation Standards” this motion includes changes about unexpected circumstances, change dates for applying for readmission. There were a few editorial changes. For example, correcting the language “they must explain why they can now be successful students using the supplemental readmission form available” ; there is no s on the end of admission.

Second page, first sentence “what other exceptions?” are there to incapacitating injury or illness. If either of those phenomenon occurred why wouldn’t the student withdraw? There is a mechanism for a retroactive withdraw for a student who has a major life event. Amend the last paragraph to read “...exceptions will be rare. In such cases the student should contact the Office of Records.”

The proposed changes to the catalog as edited were passed with a voice vote.

The second resolution from the Standard Committee was to raise the minimum ACT from 16 to 17. Last year 63 students admitted with scores lower than 17. The chances of success, defined as a six year graduation rate, are about 25% compared to better than 40% for the University about. This proposal would be like increasing SAT scores from 760 to a minimum SAT of 810.

There were several questions about this proposal. Such questions included:

- What is the connection of this to our current peer group?
- What is the trend line on these students?
 - 01-admitted 214 students conditional admit, 175 met the continuation requirement
 - 02-238-conditionals admitted, 192 met the continuation requirement
- It will adversely affect the admission rate for African American students. We don't have the success rate for specific students, but we do have the ethnic comparisons for low score students. Of the low score students, African American students have a better graduation rate.
- The scale is not interval, it is ordinal. The distance between 16 and 17 is bigger than the difference in 17-18 or 18-19.
- Red shirt discussion.
- Why and what happened when MTSU raised their rate to ACT 21?

The motion passed with a show of hands by a vote of 16-6-0.

Can this go to the full faculty for a vote? If it is declared as a major item, it will. That action requires 15 Senators who want it on the agenda. (email the Faculty Senate President)

Curriculum Committee: Dr. Novobilski presented the report on four items

Anth 305
Anth/Psy 315
BMGT 212
Comm 337

They were accepted as package motion with a report of unanimous approval from the Curriculum Committee. The Senate accepted to recommendation and voted to approve the committee recommendation by a show of hands, 22-0.

Faculty Concerns:

Do not forget Faculty Senate Elections.

President Ernst reminded the Senate that as a member of the University Budget Committee, he welcomes your input.

Meeting adjourned by voice vote.