

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

- Faculty Senate Members Present:** Obasi Haki-Akan, David Ashe, Stephanie Bellar, Nicholas Boer, Chris Brockman, Neal Coulter, Parthansarati Dileepan, Fritz Efaw, Marvin Ernst, David Garrison, Matt Greenwell, Bill Harman, Jim Henry, Jim Hiestand, Lauri Hyers, Rick Keyser, Robin Lee, Anne Lindsey, Terry LeMonye, Claire McCullough, Gail Meyer, Gregory O’Dea, Burch Oglesby, Gretchen Potts, Stacy Ray, John Trimpey, Judith Wakim, Randy Walker
- Faculty Senate Members Absent:** Rich Allen, Roger Briley, Linda Collins, Anne Johnson, Sean Richards, Joe Wilferth
- Ex-Officio Members Present:** John Friedl, Jocelyn Sanders, Bill Stacy, Dan Quarles
- Among the Guests Present:** Deborah Arfken, Eugene Bartoo, Herbert Burhenn, Chuck Cantrell, Lloyd Davis, Maurice Edwards, Tony Lease, Kay Lindgren, Teresa McKinney, Ted Miller, Linda Orth, Timothy Parker, Vicki Petzko, David Pittenger, Mary Tanner, Margaret Trimpey, Sandy Zitkus

November 6, 2003

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:10.

Approval of the Minutes: There were two corrections to the minutes. The first correction appears in the report from Dr. Neufeldt. Dr. Fritz asked her what it meant for a university to be an “engaged, metropolitan university” to which she replied, whatever you want that to mean. The second correction is in the discussion of moving science faculty to the College of Engineering and Computer Science point 8 representative statements should include the word *like* between “don’t this”. With these corrections noted, the minutes were approved.

Executive Council Report: President Ernst

- With the consent of the Faculty Senate, President Ernst requested a revision in the agenda to include an item that was omitted from the agenda. The issue is a provision to exempt students who are seeking a second bachelors degree from the general education requirements. The Senate their consent to revise the agenda.

- Executive Council has talked with Chancellor Stacy and Provost Freidl about a “priority plan” of all units of the campus. President Ernst will continue to work with representatives from the exempt and non-exempt staff and the other campus Faculty Presidents as we work through the competing issues.
- Dr. Trimpey is chairing the committee that is charged with investigating how to comply with the 120 hour rule. Please convey your thoughts on this matter to him.
- Budget hearings are gearing up. Meetings are open and Faculty Senate members are encouraged to participate. Dr. Ernst and Dr. Farhad Raiszadeh serve on the committee. Share concerns and ideas with them. [The Governor’s budget hearings are being video streamed <http://www.state.tn.us/>]
- Reminder of the next General Faculty Meeting Wednesday November 12, 3:15 in the Benwood Auditorium

Administrative Reports: Chancellor Stacy

- Encouraged faculty to participate in the open forum for the presidential search November 11, 4:00-6:00 in the Benwood Auditorium.

Provost Friedl

- The draft policy document on sexual harassment was sent to Knoxville to the office of legal council. Ms. Davis has informed the Provost that the system seeks broader changes for the whole system’s policy on sexual harassment. She has sent the draft to the Human Resource Officers on all of the campuses for their input. There is some concern about the appeal process and about disciplinary action when the conduct is consensual. Ms. Davis will keep the Provost informed as she gathers information from offices of Human Resource Management, Affirmative Action, Legal Counsel, and the UT President’s staff.
- T.H.E.C. approval of the Doctorate in Physical Therapy now requires a substantive change from SACs. There will be a site visit November 24 and November 25. Dr. Freidl was asked what this will mean for Computational Engineering. He replied none; one program is a clinical degree while the other is a research degree.

Dr. Fritz had several questions for the Chancellor and the Provost. Dr. Fritz asked if the data the Budget and Economic Status Committee use can be made public? Dr. Stacy replied that the data are public and available. There are two sources of data. The AAUP and SREB salary figures are what are reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. These data are aggregated, by rank, across disciplines. More refined numbers are found in the CUPA report which presents salary information by rank and by discipline. There was a request that the url for the reports be included in the minutes. They are below:

<http://chroncile.com>

<http://wwwcupahr.org>

The CUPA report requires a password.

New Business: Item from Dr. Trimpey moved that the Faculty Senate approve statement from the implementation of General Education requirements:

“Post-baccalaureate students with bachelor’s degrees from regionally accredited colleges or universities who are seeking undergraduate UTC degrees are not subject to UTC general education requirements. They are subject to major requirements, including general education courses specifically required for the major. (Post-baccalaureate students who are not seeking a UTC degree also do not need to meet UTC general education requirements.)”

The motion was seconded, vote 25-0.

Graduate Council offered the motion that the Doctorate in Learning and Leadership be approved. The motion was seconded by Dr. R. Walker.

Dean Mary Tanner made introductory remarks, detailing the history of the proposal (three years in development) the consultants used (whose report is a part of the proposal) and the revenue stream projections that suggest when all costs are rolled over to the state budget this program will bring in excess dollars over its costs.

There was a probing discussion of the proposal. Comments involved concerns about the current ability of UTC to offer Freshman Seminar taught by full time faculty, humanities classes and a sufficient number of composition classes. One representative inquired if given the lack of resources UTC could take on more obligations?

Other concerns spoke to the issues of fiscal responsibility and whose task that was. Specifically, should we make program decisions based on the quality of the program or should we consider dollars in the Faculty Senate position? Another Senator reminded others that the Senate did just that last spring when it allowed a program, O.T., to die due to inability to fund the projected needs for growth.

The Provost said that a move to a MS in Learning and Leadership would not garner they same type of new revenue that a Ed.D. would produce as these students would be “new” students.

When asked about the adequacy of the library, Dean Tanner reminded the Senate that with the several MS in Education and the ED.S. degree, the resources of the library were sufficient for this program.

There was a question that if the estimates were wrong and the program did not pay for itself, would the program be allowed to die as O.T. was, i.e. is there a sunset provision?

The response to that question is that if the current estimate of 20 is correct, then the program produces a big surplus. If the numbers fall to 15 there is still a positive cash flow. Supporters of the proposal cannot imagine that the numbers will not be sufficient to support the program. The needs assessment has been done, focus groups conducted by the UTC Center for Survey Research confirm it. The program is more than “training principals” it is about developing the skills of *learning* and *leadership*.

The budget projections are conservative. They were developed with the assistance of Francis Gross. He used the current formula funding and followed THEC requirements.

When asked if the program does make money, will the money remain in the program or go to the university general fund, the reply was “it goes to the general fund”.

The Provost said that he would have the 1st draft of the academic budget ready to share with faculty at the meeting next Wednesday. If he thought the degree was going to cost anything he would not support it. His support is based on the assumption, belief in the numbers he has seen, that the program will pay for itself.

The discussion then shifted to a more philosophical stance of “where is the middle ground in under funding essential classes such as freshman composition while we are approving doctoral programs on the belief that funding will take care of itself”. There is a timing issue here that may be unfortunate.

The Faculty Senate was then informed that the commitment from the UC Foundation of \$280,000. may not be there if we fail to approve the degree. There is a limit on how long dollars can wait on a program.

Question was called. No objection. Motion for a secret ballot was made; it failed.

Vote on the main motion to approve the Doctorate in Education Learning and Leadership was passed 20-5-0.

The meeting was adjourned by voice vote.