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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Pedro Campa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past-President</td>
<td>Gavin Townsend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large</td>
<td>Jennifer Beech, Mike Bell, Rebekah Bromley,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebecca Elliot, Clair McCullough, and Jim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Andrea Becksvoort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Vic Bumhapus, Nick Honerkamp,</td>
<td>Lorraine Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>and Barbara Medley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Adm.</td>
<td>Keith Richards and Greg Thibadoux</td>
<td>Jim Henley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng &amp; Comp Sci</td>
<td>Frank Jones</td>
<td>Ron Goulet and Yan Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Kenyon Wilson</td>
<td>Stuart Benkert and Ron Ulen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEPS</td>
<td>Kay Lindgren, Deborah McAllister, M.A.</td>
<td>Elizabeth O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCoy, D. R. Meece, and Cheryl Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Ralph Covino, Lynn Purkey, and Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Beverly Simmons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Hill Craddock, Lucas Vandermerwe, and Irene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loomis,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Roger Brown, John Delaney, Theresa Liedtka,</td>
<td>Jocelyn Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan North, and Phil Oldham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGA Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other visitors included** Karen Adsit, Stephanie Bellar, Fran Bender, Herb Burhenn, John Garrett, Jonathon McNair, Lyn Miles, Linda Orth, Verbie Prevost, Richard Brown, Mary Tanner, Bonnie Yegidis

Senate meetings are open meetings to which all interested parties are welcome.

1. **Call to Order 3:11 p.m.**

2. **Approval of the minutes of 4 February 2010.**

   Irene Loomis moved that minutes of 4 February 2010 be approved; Nick Honerkamp seconded. No comments or corrections. Pedro Campa extended his thanks to Dr. Loomis for serving as acting president while recovered from surgery and to everyone else who helped out.

3. **Report on Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010—Bonnie Yegidis, UT Vice President for Academic Affairs**
Bonnie Yegidis: Thank you for the opportunity to be here. All of you know the governor approved a new bill called the Complete College Act and it has real implications for everything we do at the University of Tennessee. The Chronicle of Higher Education did an article about how Tennessee is one of fourteen or fifteen states nationally at the forefront in helping students graduate, and Tennessee is a finalist for the Race to the Top money. There’s a lot of attention on everything we’re doing in education, and it is very positive.

In the year 2000, the legislature approved a bill for a broad based-articulation agreement. As near as I can tell, we didn’t really do too much about it. I don’t think that we in the system office did a very good job in communicating to the faculty that there was legislation that required us to put in place a uniform general education plan and a policy to grant full general education credit to community college graduates. In 2008, we convened a group to look at this, and I was pleased to find out that a student who transferred in from a community college got general education credit at UT. Now every school’s general education is, in fact, different. We were asked what we were going to do at UT to make our general education curricula consistent. So we made the collective argument that general education is general education, but our position would be to fix our transfer policies but not go down the path of adopting a common general education curriculum. This most recent legislation has backed away from requiring a common general education curriculum, but the legislation does say that the general education curriculum would be 41 hours and lower division requirements should be 19 hours. Part of our work last year was to ensure full general education credit from the community colleges, and now we’re working on transfers between college campuses. Now we’re working on the articulation segment. You should know that most of our comparators already do this. The law requires that we work through what those 19 hours are for the majors that have most transfers. Essentially, we asked advisors from the three UT campuses to meet to determine what those 19 hours should be. In other words, what are the classes that students need to transfer in with an associate degree? What are those five or six pre-requisites? So we have a model in place. It was faculty driven. We started with the business major. The next most popular transfer major is Psychology. We’re working on that next and have a group of faculty from UT developing these major pathways. Our plan is to do about ten or twenty of these discipline-based transfer agreements within the next 12-15 months. I’ll stop now and let you ask any questions.

Claire McCullough: What about majors such as engineering where the community colleges don’t teach courses that are appropriate?

Bonnie Yegidis: We have to work that out. Either we have to have summer programs where our faculty members teach the courses, or our faculty will have to go to the community colleges to teach the courses. The other possibility is that they could be co-requisites. One thing considered is not creating an articulation plan for every single major in a discipline. For example in business we only did management. Engineering might be an example where we can’t articulate every single sub-discipline.

Nick Honerkamp: Some of the pre-requisites might be due to accreditation.

Bonnie Yegidis: Right.

Kay Lindgren: Where does nursing fit in?

Bonnie Yegidis: It’s a high priority; it’s a high transfer program.
Kay Lindgren: Our program looks a little different. What I’m hearing is that we need to get in line with that 42/19 hour requirements.
Ralph Covino: Who are the other nine programs?
Bonnie Yegidis: I didn’t bring the list, but I remember that it includes Business, Psychology, Communications, and the Health Professions.
Ralph Covino: History?
Bonnie Yegidis: Yes. I believe History is on the list. Let me just say a few more words about the legislation, which requires that 4-year institutions get out of the business of developmental education. You will have to look at what model is best for Chattanooga. The deadline is July 2012.
As for the funding formula, there are two ongoing initiatives. As regards the broad formula, THEC is making that more outcomes based. The funding formula has a number of bases, one of which is the working day census count. We’re going to be moving toward a formula based on the number of students who finish during the semester. There has been a lot of talk about enhancing the percentage points for performance-based funding, but it is still going to be about 5% to 5.8% and a high portion of that will be related to the number of students a college graduates. Each campus will have an opportunity to work with their board to get the mix right based on their mission. Here is where graduation and retention rates are going to count. I think rates and numbers are both going to matter. [To Roger Brown] Is that how you understand it?
Roger Brown: That’s how I understand it; they’ll look less at rates and more at raw numbers.
Bonnie Yegidis: Our work is going to start immediately, but the new funding formulas won’t be in place for a year or a year or so. But it’s a powerful motivator to revised our curricula to help students get through and graduate. So those are the major components as it affects UTC and UTK.
Claire McCullough: I am really concerned with the funding formula. UTC all of these years has had relatively low admission standards and a much higher proportion of minority students. UT has used us to say that the system’s numbers are good. We have lower qualified students coming in and are asked to keep them in and graduate them. It seems we are getting hit harder. If we raised our admissions standards by 7 or 8 points, we could graduate more students.
Bonnie Yegidis: I’m not going to answer that question, but I would say Inside Higher Education has an article that says that the greatest increase in graduation rates is at open admissions campuses. Having said that, I think all of our institutions, and this one in particular, has an excellent record of admitting and supporting minority students.
Keith Richards: Is it the size of the pie that’s in question, or how the pie gets divvied up?
Bonnie Yegidis/Roger Brown: I think the size of the pie will remain consistent and it will be divided up based on the graduation rates.
Nick Honerkamp: Do you think THEC will take into consideration grade inflation? Would that negate the stellar graduation rate? I think you’re going to see grade inflation. Is that going to be factored in?
Bonnie Yegidis: I don’t think that will factor into their determination. We had some members who recently went to the University of Alabama for a leadership program. In every faculty member’s office was the motto, “We put the students first.” There are ways
to shape and redirect some energy to help the culture of getting students through. Faculty were so impressed that everything at the University of Alabama was directed toward student success.

In closing I want to compliment UTC. As we’ve had discussions with the campuses, you are the only one that’s stepped forward with local implementation of goals. You deserve credit for taking that initiative.

4. Report from UT Board of Trustees Meeting—Verbie Prevost

   Verbie Prevost: This will be a very brief report because it was a very non-controversial meeting this time. From our standpoint it was noteworthy that our proposal for creating a School of Education went right through without controversy. The only thing that was of concern was the differential tuition that was put in at UTK, and that is something that we might consider in the future and we’ll probably want to use their plan as a model if we decide to do that in the future.

   Kay Lindgren: Was that differential tuition for engineering, nursing and business?
   [Yes.] Didn’t we do that?

   Roger Brown: We were asked not to do it at this time, but we let them know we will be doing it in the future.

5. Report from Budget and Economic Status Committee (B&ES)—John Garrett

   John Garrett: Tennessee is 37th among the states in per capita GDP, but 49th in per capita spending on higher education, and it doesn’t appear that is going up. If we’re going to survive, we have to be looking at tuition.

   Pedro asked me to report on the B&ES response to the recent distribution of equity adjustment funds. [Distributed handout contains a numerical example of what the B&ES committee sees as a problem. Handout will be available with minutes on website.]

   What’s an equity adjustment? Some people have been here a long time and their numbers fall well below market rates. Analysis (of market rates by rank and discipline within comparable institutions) indicates that we’re pretty good at the assistant professor level, we’re okay at the associate level, but we drop way off at the full professor level. This time, UTC didn’t distribute the adjustment on a pro rata basis to everybody. The administration identified the people who were lowest and brought them up to some floor. The result is that salaries become bunched together. Economists object to this strategy because we recognize that salaries are a positional good – people like to compare their salaries not in absolute terms but in relation to those around them. They like to catch up to those above, but don’t like those below catching up to them. B&ES recommend an alternative: don’t pick a floor and bring people up to that, but disburse money in a way that maintains these relative positions.

   Two other points before I leave the floor. We recommend something called an age gradient. It means that the longer you are employed. Because the longevity bonus was added to the base salary when the computation was made, employees were penalized for longevity. Professorships were also included as part of base pay, so anyone who had a professorship was also penalized.
Keith Richards: Was there any consideration given to . . . there are probably to big components in salary over time. One is COLA, one is performance based. So why don’t we consider who are our best performances.

John Garrett: I think the way we did the distribution was dysfunctional.

Phil Oldham: This was an equity adjustment. It had nothing to do with performance. There are other drivers. There have been changes in our compensation over the years. For example, in the past, some people who got promotions didn’t get pay increases.

Keith Richards: To what end was the report today?

John Garrett: The committee would prefer that next time the salary increases be calculated differently.

Keith Richards: What do you want the Faculty Senate to do? Do you want us to pass a resolution?

Pedro Campa: The committee serves at the pleasure of the Faculty Senate and periodically they report. I asked them to report on this matter.

John Garrett: The committee is not directing this; the Senate can take our work and do with it what it will.

D. R. Meece: There was a discussion of merit and COLA and I think equity goes more to the COLA side. The assumption is that people who start off making more money are the more productive in the beginning, but it doesn’t account for dead wood.

John Garrett: The current way we do it rewards people with the lowest salary. We prefer an approach that preserves the distribution.

D. M. McNeese: This doesn’t address everything.

John Garrett: This is not the only part of our compensation structure. It’s only one facet.

Claire McCullough: These things are handled by Provost. Is the Provost willing to work with the committee?

Phil Oldham: Yes. We met with the committee early and didn’t take all their advice, but we did incorporate some of their suggestions. There were constraints that led us to make the decision to do what we could. It wasn’t an easy task to get the funds to do it. In the end, we thought this was the best thing we could do.

John Garrett: Phil has been communicative within this whole process and we didn’t agree with the decision, but he heard us out and he made it clear why the decision was made.

Lynne Purkey: As an assistant professor, I think we’re losing sight of the fact that full professors are the ones losing the most here. I think this effort is an effort to address this inequity for people who are not, perhaps, as mobile as younger faculty. I don’t think it’s made with an idea of not rewarding people who work hard.

Andrea Becksvoort: Let me say as an lecturer who is hired annually that those of us who received adjustments appreciated it.

5. Executive Committee Report — Pedro Campa

Pedro Campa: I wanted to talk about bill 3542, but that has been dropped. Regarding the Student Success Committee meeting during the Board of Trustees meeting, there was some interesting discussion from Trustees about distance education and I don’t think they have the full idea. I think Verbie said, if you’re looking for money for this, you’re
digging in the desert. Trustees were concerned about the quality of distance education. I think we’re going to have to get our act together about this.

Kay Lindgren: I’m interested in this because we do a lot of it, but I think more can be done at the University. Other universities are doing it—Harvard, Princeton. Some of our students have had distance education and they seem to be just as qualified as our on-campus students. And if you look at the best practices, it is not cheap. I think we ought to look at it as a campus.

Pedro Campa: The one thing notably absent is consideration of faculty time and misunderstanding of the time it takes from faculty. Harvard isn’t a good example. They teach three hours, sometimes six.

Kay Lindgren: I don’t mean that it’s easy. It takes a lot of time up front. And it’s one of those unknowns we have to work out.

Karen Adsit: I think it goes back to what Claire said. If our mission is access, how are we making our programs accessible to students? The bottom line is that we need to make evening, Saturday, and distance learning available.

6. Administrative Report — Phil Oldham

Phil Oldham: What we did at the Board of Trustees meeting was to give a report on where we were on program review. We had fourteen programs and developed a process, which the Board approved, for reviewing those programs. That’s what we’ve done. Many of you put in a lot of time and effort and have done a great job on what was not an easy task. It was technically and emotionally challenging as well. My goal was to get all fourteen programs off that list, and I think we need to understand up front that, although there’s an implication that there’s a cost savings, this is more a political than economic consideration. As long as any program shows up on that list, we’re under attack. I’d prefer to get programs off the list through increased productivity. There are a few programs that are seen as problematic for no good reason. About a third are education-related program that have been arbitrarily petitioned off by discipline, but what it’s done is petition them off to make them vulnerable to these considerations. We can serve these students better by pooling them. Some of them are music programs, which the newspaper has focused on. I gave them as much information as I could. The best thing we can do is vet these programs as quickly as possible so we can articulate to the public how we’re proceeding.

Kenyon Wilson: Since you brought up the music, we keep having the discussion about the BS in music. We get questions from teachers about our canceling the music education degree. They’re concerned about whether to send their students here.

Phil Oldham: We do have to communicate better. One thing we need to clear up is the language we use on campus to describe majors and those that are officially on file with THEC. For example, we commonly talk about having a Women’s Studies major, but what we have is a Humanities degree with a Women’s Studies concentration.

On another subject, a memo went out regarding a Task Force to implement the Complete College Tennessee Act. The Deans Council is the core group, along with the Associate Provost; Pedro Campa and Victoria Steinberg, present and future presidents of the Faculty Senate; the Department Heads Council, Debra Arfken, head of Strategic Planning Initiative; Richard Brown; John Delaney; Chuck Cantrell; and Tyler Forrest
(SGA). The overall goal of the task force is to begin to explore what we’re facing from this changing paradigm. Fundamentally, we have to strike new balance between access and student success. We found a balance, now we need to find a new one. We’ve identified some areas we need to discuss:

- Create campus culture of student success (everyone’s job)
- Raise freshman admission standards (Increase HS GPA; national data suggest we should look more at HS GPA than SAT/ACT scores)
- Modify general education curriculum in Math and English
- Expand Step Ahead Math opportunities
- Create computer Math lab (MOCS Learning Center)
- Expand center for advisement and student success
- Refocus orientation transition programs
- Create Honors College to expand honors opportunities
- Increase Summer School, On-Line, and Alternative Course Delivery Options

This is not an exhaustive list. I expect it to be expanded as this group begins to meet. I expect the group will divide these things up, break up into sub-committees, and involve as many of you as possible. This is how I’m proposing we proceed at this point. This is an evolving process. Some of the answers to questions about how to proceed are not readily available at this moment.

John Graef: You may want to refer to this to Bonnie [Yegidis]. Has any progress made about convincing the State Legislature to let Hope Scholarship be used for summer school?

Phil Oldham: There was discussion of this at the Board meeting. All the colleges want this to happen. But many legislators are saying to leave that alone. There are many demands on that money and it’s difficult to predict how such a discussion might turn out. We are, however, looking for alternative models.

Ralph Covino: If we’re going to begin discussion of opening an Honors College, where are the people from Honors on your committee?

Phil Oldham: This is just the core group. We will be involving other people in this group.

Bonnie Yegidis: Regarding low producing programs, whenever we request new programs, THEC is pulling out that list of low producing programs and saying how are you fixing this before you put in a new program?

Phil Oldham: The only way THEC has to control us is to deny new programs. They can’t force us to cancel old programs.

Jonathan McNair: Regarding music, we keep getting calls from people concerned because they’ve heard we’re doing away with degree programs. We’d like approval for some kind of op-ed column that allows us to explain that degree programs are still available in music. I’m pleading for help in communicating with the public.

Phil Oldham: I understand your situation more than you know. I’ve had conversations with Chuck Cantrell. He’s willing to help.

7. Other Business / Faculty Concerns
**Victoria Steinberg:** I have some comments as chair of General Education where there was a discussion of coding and approval for on-line education. I have a list of questions:

- Is it in the faculty’s interest to address online education?
- Who should approve a course going online?
- Who should be informed?
- Should there be equalization of pay for online courses? (In summer, Continuing Education does not pay at the same rate for the same course.)
- Should it be required that instructors are trained?
- Should we codify what “observation” means online?
- Is a course just a course just a course?
- Shouldn’t faculty get out in front of this instead of leaving it to an ad hoc committee?

As Faculty Rep I’ve had the bug put in my ear about Banner. Faculty wonder why they’re informed about being “required” to take the Banner training by Diane Welch instead of someone higher up. Also, is there an interface with Banner and Blackboard for those of us who already use Blackboard to keep our students informed of their grades?

**Pedro Campa:** We’ve scheduled a discussion of Banner for the next Senate meeting.

**Kay Lindgren:** I’m concerned about adjunct faculty. Some of our adjunct faculty cannot take the training by the times specified. I don’t think we’ve thought through that.

**Phil Oldham:** What’s the problem?

**Kay Lindgren:** In order to enter grades on Banner, you have to have taken the training. Not all our adjuncts can do that.

**Phil Oldham:** We can get this worked out.

**D. M. McNeese:** I’m from the School of Education. You know we have two children’s centers. We operate on the UTC schedule, not on the Hamilton County schedule. I get a robo-call that says school is out, but that creates a problem for parents who aren’t on our system.

**Richard Brown:** We can fix that.

**Pedro Campa:** We should also do something about cancellation of classes mid-class. People getting up and leaving mid-class is disturbing.

**Richard Brown:** We generally try to cancel between classes. In the current case, conditions were getting worse quickly we couldn’t wait.

6. Adjournment

There being no further business or announcements, Lynn Purkey moved to adjourn at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Susan Giesemann North, Secretary