

**MINUTES  
MEETING OF THE FULL FACULTY  
17 February 2014**

**1. Call to Order**

Faculty Senate President Deborah McAllister called the meeting to order at 3:16 pm.

**2. Moment of Silence for Dr Tom Jones**

A moment of silence was observed.

**3. Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes were approved by acclamation.

**4. Administrative Reports**

Chancellor Angle

The Chancellor apologized that the Residential Scholar Awards would be distributed at 4pm and that he had to leave following his presentation for Student Development to attend along with the Provost.

The Chancellor discussed his concerns with the University's policies and procedures regarding the high number of cancelled days owing to snow. He noted that the University policy on cancellations does not take into account faculty need to be in their offices and labs during time of closure and that such was of particular concern to those running lab-work such as chemists. He expressed his desire to see such matters clarified and promised to investigate.

The Chancellor invited the faculty to attend the upcoming sessions on the budgeting process. He noted that the UPRAC Committee was functioning as it had in the past but that a major difference to this year's process was that the Deans and other academic leadership were being included in the process from the start rather than at the end. He told the faculty that going forward he would like to see the budgeting process start earlier so as to be able to engage not only the leadership but also the wider faculty in the process.

The Chancellor invited faculty to his first State of the Campus address, during which he said that he would discuss the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan, where the University is within it, and what he perceives to be the challenges and opportunities for the future – in addition to the expected development of a new plan which he anticipates having ready by the end of the calendar year. He stated that with no plan in place for that which is to come, there are no budget priorities established beyond student success and excellence, broadly defined. Given this, he did not anticipate major changes to the budget as there was not much extra money to spread around. He noted that at that point the State was expected to cover 55% of a 1% salary increase for faculty and that the University would have to fund the balance of 45%. He expressed his belief that the Governor was treating

universities in Tennessee well as it appears as though there will be no major reductions in university budgets; however, he also noted that there were no major infusions of new capital either.

The Chancellor then briefly addressed the Governor's plan entitled the "Tennessee Promise", namely free community college tuition for those who go from high school to community college. He viewed this plan as being a good one in that it is very supportive of higher education in the state, widely construed. He did note that coupled with the free tuition for community college would be a decrease to Hope Scholarship money for freshmen and sophomores at four year institutions; however, this is off-set by a one thousand dollar increase for juniors and seniors. He expressed his desire for the faculty to truly engage with and think about UTC as a four-year educational experience and the value thereof. He particularly asked the faculty for help with marketing and selling UTC as a place to attain a four year degree.

#### Provost Ainsworth

The Provost reported to the faculty on some of the groups which have been operating throughout the year. The first of these is the Lupton Repurposing Group, established to determine how to most effectively utilize the space in the building. He reported that the repurposing project had advanced to #2 on UT's list of building priorities and #5 on the statewide list. He noted that the UC Foundation assisted with getting the 25% funding needed to advance the project so as to not allow it to drop off of either UT or the state's radar. He anticipates that the study which will be prepared by the group will be completed by the next budget cycle – with the caveat that to get things approved by the system, any repurposing would have to convert the building to classroom space primarily. Given this, he made certain to make the Group faculty-heavy as faculty will be the ones utilizing the space to teach and, therefore, would best know how to divide and arrange the available space. The first report of the Group should be available by June or July, following planning trips to look at other similarly repurposed buildings elsewhere.

The second group which the Provost discussed was the Collocation of Student Services Group. The aim of this group is to investigate the feasibility of a one stop shop for campus services and end the absurdity of the trans-Cardiac Hill gamut students must run to get from Records to the Bursar and back. The group will look at how, and where, to put all student services offices in a central location. Following a day trip junket to investigate how this works elsewhere, this Group is expected to make its report to the Provost by the end of April or May.

The Provost noted that the CCTA draft was 2-3 weeks from completion, following which he promised to circulate a rough draft to the campus. Each of the CCTA committees were still working on their prose, but outline in their responses priorities, assessment, and costs which need to be figured out. From these, the Steering Committee will create a list of the top 10 priorities where efforts will be focused in future. These will be high-impact issues, the things which will really make a difference on campus.

The Provost noted that the International Programs External Review was still on-going and that groups were putting together a self-study. The first week of March would see visits by the off-campus teams who would be meeting with constituents on campus; he noted that he was trying to get things together so faculty could interact with the two assessment teams. The Provost noted that the campus could easily support 1,000 international students and that the current number was a third of that.

The Provost expressed his understanding that the faculty was tired of hearing about Curriculum Mapping; however, he deems it to be critically important. For more information on the process, he urged the faculty to see his latest newsletter. He expressed his thanks to the people who worked on the project the previous semester as well as this semester.

The Chancellor and Provost then fielded questions from the Faculty.

The Chancellor and Provost were asked about the projected impact of the Tennessee Promise plan on UTC.

The Chancellor replied that the System President had asked the same question and that nobody had an answer that was based on any solid evidence or predictor model. The Chancellor asked Yancy Freeman to give his best guess; Yancy estimated that the number of students impacted would be around 300, basing that on the assumption that the Tennessee Promise would appeal to students from middle-income families who currently receive the Pell/Hope who would be tempted to go elsewhere rather than enroll at UTC. It was suggested that the University might create additional scholarship money or financial aid so as to entice these students as well as to tout the four year university experience in marketing. Regardless, the need to improve relationships with both Chattanooga State and Cleveland State is obvious.

## **5. Election for Faculty Secretary**

No nominations were received by the appointed day. No volunteers were forthcoming from the faculty in attendance at the meeting. The matter of the vacancy will be addressed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

## **6. Election of At-Large Senators**

Two nominations were duly received by the appointed day and hour for the respective vacancies. Alleene Pingnot (of the School of Nursing) was nominated for the Assistant Professor vacancy and Gavin Townsend (Art) was nominated for the full Professor vacancy. No other nominations having been received, they were elected by acclamation.

## **7. Election of the Faculty Senate President**

One nomination was duly received by the appointed day and hour - for sitting Faculty Senate President Deborah McAllister. As President McAllister was currently serving, in order to proceed to election a 2/3 vote of the Full Faculty would be required in order to suspend the rules. A motion to suspend the rules was made by Prof. Hiestand and seconded by Prof. Oglesby. A quorum was then called following an objection by Prof.

Hutchison who expressed his belief that the election of the Faculty Senate President was too important to be dealt with so cavalierly.

The matter of the election was then opened for discussion.

Dean Adsit asked what a re-election would mean for the composition of the Executive Committee – would it mean that Prof. Steinberg would have to remain as the Past-President on the Executive? The Handbook has no guidance on this matter. The Parliamentarian expressed his belief that matters would be better if the Handbook was followed, but that it was an inescapable fact that nobody came forward to serve owing to a lack of interest in faculty governance. Given this, he had nothing else to suggest but to suspend the rules and allow a re-election.

Prof. Hutchison suggested that the office be left vacant and another faculty meeting be called to deal with the issue and have nominations be opened again.

Prof. Rogers asked how more interest in service could be provoked and whether the elections process itself was to blame or faculty apathy.

The question on suspending the rules was called and the requisite 2/3 was not achieved.

Prof. Townsend moved to hold the election online; such was seconded by Prof. Hiestand. The motion carried.

Prof. Hiestand moved that the Executive be directed to run the election, call for nominations and carry out the online voting process; such was seconded by Assoc. Dean Wilferth. The motion carried.

## **8. Report of the Faculty Senate President**

President McAllister reported that online voting was utilized to approve the changes to the Faculty Handbook discussed at the last meeting. A total of 98 votes were received in advance of the 6 February meeting of the Faculty Senate. She noted that the votes were overwhelmingly in favor of the changes proposed (85-6-7) and that there had been some difficulty getting people to vote online. The Faculty Senate approved the changes and the vote of the Full Faculty.

She reported that the Faculty Senate had approved as of the 16 January Faculty Senate meeting over 50 curriculum proposals and that there would be an update forthcoming from the General Education Committee at the 20 February Faculty Senate meeting to provide an update on their process and timeline.

The Faculty Senate has approved a proposal from the Academic Standards Committee. The Senate directs the Honor Court that the removal of eligibility for Latin Honors is an available sanction for Honor Code violations. This has yet to be implemented.

The Faculty Development Grant Committee has piloted a new mechanism for accepting, reviewing, and tracking proposals. This will be extended to include the Faculty Research Grant Committee's proposals.

President McAllister reminded faculty that textbook orders are due for summer on 24 February and for fall on 17 March, that nominations for the Carolyn Thompson/Roger Brown Community Engagement Award would be sought, and that she along with Profs Steinberg and Curran would be representing the faculty at the University Faculty Council meeting the following week to be held at UT-Martin.

#### **9. Faculty Concerns**

None.

#### **10. Announcements**

The Faculty Senate President expressed her thanks on behalf of the faculty to the Faculty Secretary for his service to the University. (He would have preferred tenure but was certainly touched by the unexpected gesture and hearty applause thereafter.)

#### **11. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Recorded by Ralph Covino, Faculty Secretary