

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

Faculty Senate Members Present: Rich Allen, David Ashe, Mike Bell, Stephanie Bellar, Roger Briley, Linda Collins, Parthansarati Dileepan, Fritz Efaw, Marvin Ernst, David Garrison, Bill Harman, Jim Henry, Jim Hiestand, Anne Johnson, Robin Lee, Anne Lindsey, 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: Obasi Haski-Akan, Nicholas Boer, Chris Brockman, Neal Coulter, Matt Greenwell, Lauri Hyers, Rick Keyser, Terry LeMoyne, Sean Richards

Ex-Officio Members Present: Richard Brown, Jocelyn Sanders

Among the Guests Present: Karen Adsit, Ed Foster, Philip Kazemersky, Andy Novobilski, Cliff Parten, Kathy Winters

October 16, 2003

With a quorum established, the October 16 meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.

The minutes of the October 2 meeting were corrected. Dr. Efaw moved the substitute during the discussion of the main motion on the Provost, not President Ernst. Minutes were then approved by voice vote.

Executive Committee Report: President Ernst requested the permission of the Senate to allow a reordering of the agenda. There were no objections.

Presentation by Dr. Ellen Neufeldt on Student Support Groups. These groups developed out of the SACS 2000 Student Satisfaction Survey which led to the Advanced Connections Seminar-that was focused on “moving quality services beyond the basics” Focus Groups in November 2002 recommended the Establishment of a Task Force. A major lesson learned is that *Process is as important as greeting students*. Based on results from focus groups and student recommendations about process, the Student Support staff visited four campuses to review their best practices. Those campuses are Appalachian State, UNC Charlotte, University of Richmond and James Madison. What they learned was that access, convenience, and process transparency are important. Students like to have “24-7” support services with one stop shopping.

A next step is to examine why students stay and why they leave. Dr. Neufeldt invites the faculty to provide input on this issue. There was a general agreement the Faculty Senate should appoint a committee to review the Advisement Policy. Some of the concerns are:

- Mid semester advising for regular and at-risk students
- Transfer and Freshman Advising
- Faculty Training for Advising

There was a general agreement the Senate should charge the Committee on Committees to form an ad hoc committee to review advisement.

When asked about the privacy problems with grades on line for classes on Blackboard, Faculty Senate was assured that we are in compliance with current regulations.

Dr. Neufeldt concluded her presentation by requesting that if faculty have suggestions for Student Support Services, please send her your ideas.

Dr. Efav had several questions for Dr. Neufeldt. Specifically, he was interested in other than teaching and advising what does “serving students mean?” Dr. Neufeldt replied it was about being a good mentor, helping students reach their college goals: graduation or transfer to the appropriate professional school and helping students find the right office is important as well. In other words, being a part of a good community where students and faculty alike have a sense of ownership of the success of the student and the institution

Dr. Gruetzemacher presented an overview on “Who are our freshmen?”

Over past 10 years increase about 45% percent 1993 57 % were freshman 2003 70% are freshman. This is our largest freshman class on record. The proportion of African American students has doubled, 15% to 31%. And the graduation rate has been the highest in TN.

Academic quality: 94-03

GPA	Act	Development	Conditional Admits	Year
3.13	22.	43.7%	21.6%	1994
3.20	21.6	56.6	19.6	2003

Our ACT is not as high as in Knoxville, but higher then other public institutions in TN. Faculty asked “What about students on the high end? Has that number increased?” Dr. Gruetzemacher replied that he did not know-Mr. Cantrell thinks the number of scholarships of ACT 30+ increased.

The area feeder high schools are:

Ooltewah
Soddy
Notre Dame
Hixson
Red Bank
Central
East Ridge
CSAS

There has been little change in the freshman who entered with college credit—about one fifth of our students which is what it was in 1994.

President Ernst thanked the recruiters and what they've done to grow the freshman class. African American students are graduating at a higher rate than other groups, students who live on campus graduate at a higher rate.

Executive Council Report: Committee on Incentive pay for external funding has met twice already. They are learning there are many alternative plans used at different universities.

UTC has representation in the UT Presidential Search process. Serving on the Advisory Committee are James Armour, (student) Vic Bumpus, (faculty) Roger Dixon (alumnus) and John Thorton-Board of Trustees. Serving on the Search Committee is Stephanie Bellar.

John Trimpey will chair the committee charged to recommend how to implement the 120 hour requirement. Also on the committee will be representatives from Standards, General Education, and Curriculum. Dr. Trimpey suggested department should begin to review their programs to see if they need a waiver from the rule and how to best respond to the reduction in hours.

Administrative Reports: Associate Provost: J. Sanders gave a brief presentation, primarily bar graphs and pie charts, on the percentage of the E & G budget in comparison to the rest of the budget. President Ernst will have Faculty Senate Budget Committee review this data as well.

Vice-Chancellor Finance and Operations: R. Brown reported that people in operations and maintenance are far over worked. If you can't get work done, call him to see if it is possible to use an outside contractor.

The external review of Computational Engineering is complete. Year one begins in 2004-2005. There are 13 students although they are enrolled at Knoxville since we do not have the program yet.

THEC is planning the budget for next year. Dr. Johnson has met with them to emphasize:

- Compensation for faculty
- Compensation for staff
- Research funding

Mr. Brown reminded the Senate that budget hearings will start soon. They are open meetings; we have representatives, come to the meetings and use your voice.

Also, remember the United Way Campaign is underway.

New Business: There was a lengthy discussion of revitalizing the ROTC program at UTC. They are summarized below.

- a. ROTC: Director of the Challenger Center, Col. Patty said that civic interest in reestablishing the program is high. To say that Army wants this is preliminary. Some of the people who have indicated interest are Jr. ROTC participants, Elder Scholars, Prof. of Military Science at Knoxville,
- b. Dr. Ernst sees this as a new program; therefore he is seeking guidance before we go any further. If we go this way there does have to be a program but it could be a satellite from Knoxville or MTSU. It is not a degree program however; it will commit some university resources, secretary pay and benefits, some operating money.
- c. Do we know about interest outside of the groups mentioned? Not too much but 60% of respondents from Jr. ROTC programs said they would be interested in UTC due to the program.
- d. Dr. Trimpey pointed out that retention of these students is high. There are many positive things about the program. When asked about the other branches of service, Col. Patty was unsure of their level of interest. The Senate requested he ask around to ascertain their interest in a program at UTC.

Discussion Points of Merger of Hard Sciences in Arts and Sciences with College of Engineering Computer Science memorandum from Provost Friedl August 19.

This was initially slated to be a preliminary discussion of the idea. However, the Senate was able to come to a resolution after a thorough review of the major issues involved. The discussion began with several questions:

- do we want to talk about this? (yes)
- what is the rationale for doing this?
 - i. it will even out the numbers between Colleges
 - ii it will strengthen both science and engineering, collaborative research
 - iii representation of faculty

There was a general sense that if the numbers of faculty are uneven by College and that skews votes in the Dean's Council, it is a math problem, easily solved. What prevents faculty from collaborating now? If science faculty does not move over to the building, how will they build teams?

What will be the impact on the remaining departments in the new College of Liberal Arts? There has been no impact study on that issue.

At one point it was suggested that there needs to be a series of conversations. Conclusions now are speculative until there are better numbers attached to what this move means.

Other members of the Senate urged the Senate not to throw the idea back without the discussion. Two issues began to emerge. On the one hand is the issue of the move. On the other hand is the issue of the process. Representative statements were:

1. Is it fair to ask the faculty to generate the data necessary to make a good decision?
2. Faculty should be able to ask for that information.
3. No faculty input in the development of the idea.
4. Perhaps the faculty affected should have been talked with before it came to Faculty Senate.
5. The Senate hasn't done this before. This is real different---we're not interested in doing this thing.
6. Economics was moved, a whole College was disbanded.
7. This appears to be a part of the Provost's style to include faculty in what is usually considered an administrative position—and we should take it up.
8. Engineers have talked about this. They have a long list of why they don't this and few advantages.
9. Worst outcome would be for the faculty senate to refuse to participate.
10. Have senators talked with faculty in their divisions are we close to an educated vote from their perspective.
11. Not all of the departments have talked about this.
12. What are the effects on the students?
13. This issue is already outside of the university and many stakeholders are unhappy with what they perceive as change they did not buy in to when they made commitments to the program.

Dr. McCullough said she had asked her students to provide input. She read into the minutes a statement from a student

“It is the responsibility of the person/group proposing the change to provide compelling reasons for the change. You don't just start making changes if something is working fine as is. This proposal seems to be based in politics, not pragmatics. Unless it will provide clear and certain benefits to the students it should not enacted. If it will cause the students to receive lower standards of education it should be rejected. It seems to me that the College of Eng. And CS would most likely suffer by being encompassed into a larger group. Instructors will be bogged down with even more meetings, meaning less time to spend with students.”

She further expressed her concerns for what this would mean for accreditation. Show cause was given to a program for this very reason. Dr. McCullough, who has served as a reviewer, explained that if your program is not already accredited all they have to do is say no.

There was a general question posed “Does anyone know of a definite positive?” Following more discussion there was a question of how this move could revenue neutral if for no other reason than changing stationary and the like.

A motion was made and seconded to reject the reorganization. The questions was called, vote was by show of hands. The vote to end debate was 19-2. A voice vote was made on the main motion, motion carried. The reorganization of the colleges failed.

Faculty Concerns:

There was an expression of concern by Dr. Trimpey regarding the 200 or so students who could not get into Freshman English this term. No one had firm numbers on the numbers of students turned away from the math classes. This is related to retention.

Faculty Senate will ask Dr. Gruetzemacher to follow this cohort. He is currently working on it.

There remain some issues related to transfer students and general education credit as well as requirements for second degree students. It appears that Faculty Senate has never passed that those students are covered. This is being sent to Standards Committee.

Motion to adjourn was passed by voice vote.