

Minutes of the Full Faculty Meeting

September 9, 2008

President Pedro Campa called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

The minutes of the April 22, 2008, meeting were approved (Fanning /Preble Niemi)

The new parliamentarian, Ralph Covino, was introduced.

Introduction of New Faculty

The Deans introduced their new faculty members.

College of Business: Gerald DeBusk and J. Christopher Levan

College of Health, Education and Professional Studies: Rebecca Elliott (Graduate Studies Division); Sarah Boykin (Interior Design); Carmen Plott, Barbara Ponder, and Carolyn Schreeder (Nursing); Craig Pressley (Social Work); Pamala Carter and M.A. McCoy (Teacher Preparation Academy).

Will Sutton, the new Dean of the **College of Engineering and Computer Science**, was introduced. There are three new faculty members: Stephen Craven, Sagar Kapadia, and Eric McFarland,

College of Arts and Sciences: Phillip Lewis and Jessica Westbrook (Art); Jennifer Boyd, Andrew Lee, and Jeremy Bramblett (Biology); Dennis Meinert and Harriet Hamilton (Chemistry); Sarah Knox (Criminal Justice); Michael Bonnal and Catherine Middleton (Economics); Jill Beard, Sara Coffman, Rowan Johnson, Justin Lewis, Catherine Meeks, Elaina Rieth, Charles Sligh and Susan North (English); Ji Chow (Foreign Languages and Literatures) Rochelle Angel, Linda Ballard, and Sandy Zuckerman (Math); Louis Netherland (Military Science), Erika Schafer and Nikolasa Tejero (Music); Todd Hibbard (Philosophy), Marcus Mauldin (Political Science) Lorraine Evans (Sociology) and Vivian Anderson-Barrera (Sociology), Steve Ray (Theatre and Speech).

President Petersen's Address

President Petersen has been talking with various UTC constituencies about issues such as the economy, which have necessitated difficult decisions and will necessitate more difficult decisions in the future, and the challenges to our campuses that will ensue. We need to figure out what the institution's mission is and not just cut a little bit from everywhere. We need to make sure that we can support our people by getting back on track with compensation. We backed off on our tuition increase and kept it as low as we possibly could because of the economy. We can't do that again.

Some important facts: we have seen substantial enrollment growth since the lottery scholarships have been instituted, the largest at the Martin campus. Given that substantial growth, we have seen also rising grade point averages for entering freshman. The Board of Regents has not seen this rate of growth. The University of Memphis has not seen this kind of enrollment increase. We've done an excellent job of painting a picture for the people of this region that encourages them to come to the University of Tennessee. We will get through this difficult economy. UTC's Strategic Plan was the most thorough and complete of any campus in the UT system. We focused on what is important for this campus and did a good job of putting it together. The biofuels initiative has been really helpful for the UT System; we are world leaders in a number of areas, thanks to Oak Ridge, and its assets are available to all of our campuses.

Questions and Comments

Q: Is there any talk about reserving a certain percentage of the revenue from the lottery scholarship money for improving university infrastructure, or is all of it going to students?

A: As far as I know, it will all go to students. There will not be much excess. The legislature does understand that while that lottery scholarship keeps Tennesseans in Tennessee, it really has no effect on our bottom line. It just substitutes money that parents pay out of their pockets with state money. Not that we want to get into a political issue by talking about the fact that education in Tennessee is cheaper than it was ten years ago but has had no positive effect on University--we will need to have that discussion down the road. Our Board is looking at whether we are spending our money as wisely as we can and that is why we are looking at a collective IT system for the UT system. These are the things we should be looking at to provide quality education in a difficult economy. In terms of compensation, all institutions are below peers. We will have to talk to the legislature about how we will manage in a bad economy with only reasonable tuition.

Q: How will planning be managed during this economic downturn?

A: We've asked institutions to look at different budget models. We're looking at a 5% increase for this year. Last year we got into the first of the year thinking we would get a budget increase and the bottom fell out, and we didn't have a lot of time to plan what we would do in the event of the \$50,000,000 shortfall. This kind of economic planning will start soon and will involve multiple groups within the organization. We will get a lot of feedback so that when we get to the point where we know what the economic situation will be, we will know what our options are.

Q: Should we push to get more and more students?

A: It's a difficult question that has to do with what is the right size for the institution. Last year we received board approval to do a deal on the contiguous counties' reduced out-of-state tuition and the additional infrastructure costs weren't very great. It was beneficial to keep metro students in the metro area. A lot will depend on a combination of budget issues and academic issues that the provosts are putting together to make certain that campuses don't stretch themselves too thin. Growth is not a necessity; it depends on the needs of the institution. In the long term, we don't want to cut programs because an educated workforce drives the economy. but growth is not the answer entirely because only a small percentage of costs are paid from tuition and the majority are paid from legislative appropriations.

Q: If and when the economy improves and the legislature mandates an across-the-board increase, is it your intention to deny the UTC faculty an across-the-board increase as you have in the past?

A: The legislature has never mandated an across-the-board increase. Every year I've been here the legislature has been asked for flexibility and we've been given that flexibility. We have never violated any legislative mandate. We've also given flexibility to campuses and institutions to determine how they mix across the board and merit. It's a local issue. There are times when we will say that at least a minimum has to go into across the board, but the legislature has never mandated a number.

Q: If there were a local decision that there would be an across-the-board increase and a merit increase above that, would that be allowed?

A: Yes, but I don't think that's always a good idea. The only time I tried to impose a little bit of will was the second year we got the flexibility with a 2% and we went 1 and 1 on it.

Q: Are you aware that it's been more than 120 years since the faculty had a true cost-of-living raise?

A: Yes, that is probably true of most institutions. That's why the first year we got money, we held out for 5%. I am keenly aware that we are underpaid within all levels of the organization. You can raise the average in different ways: by raising everybody's or by raising the differential and

the average comes out the same. That's why it's a number one priority. Because we need to have good people and we need to do whatever we can to support them. If you talk to administrators around here they'll say there are a lot of units running on a shoestring.

Q: Are you aware that at this campus there was \$450,000 that was set aside for compression raises for faculty that did go to academic units that were running on a shoestring?

A: Thank you.

Q: Have we looked at teaming with Volkswagen?

A: Yes. There are some things that Volkswagen is very much interested in and the workforce is one of them. Huntsville is one of the fastest growing economic areas in the country and we convinced them to come here instead of there and the university is part of the reason they came here. Volkswagen is interested in Oak Ridge and our biofuels initiative and in working with the university as a partner.

Q: Have we discussed specifics?

A: No. We have not had much contact with them since they made that decision. We don't want to get in the governor's way until the contract is settled. Unless we drop the ball we will be the first-choice vender. Part of our strategic planning exercise should be looking to prepare the work force with our majors.

Mathematics Proposal (John Graef)

Rationale: The MS in Applied Mathematics will have a positive impact on our mission at UTC. The need has been there in the community for a long time. At his installation, Chancellor Brown called on the university to enhance its programs in science and mathematics so that our program will be the strongest in the state: the new degree is a response to that challenge. It is also a response to our Strategic Plan that calls on us to meet the needs of the community by developing new graduate program according to UTC's strengths. It also is a response to the THEC master plan to develop programs to enhance Tennessee's workforce.

Structure: The degree will have four concentrations: applied mathematics, applied statistics, algebra and discrete mathematics and education (alternative teacher certification).

Need: A demand for the program has been documented via three major surveys of potential students: teachers at the Hamilton county annual in-service day (strong positive response), UTC undergraduate mathematics students, (strong positive response), and employees at Blue Cross Blue Shield (strong positive response).

Cost: the program will be paid for by graduate teaching assistantships funded through the Department of Mathematics: according to SACs requirements, the students who come into the program with the requisite background can teach in the developmental program and this is how the program will pay for itself. Over 1100 students are enrolled in mathematics, 8% over where we were last fall. Graduates may become adjuncts or lecturers in the program. We will request a couple of assistantships from the graduate school. All this is based on savings to UTC, not the Department of Mathematics. A third type of support is graduate fellowships funded from some departmental endowments; we have over \$1,000,000 in endowments. Some of the money goes to undergraduate scholarships and there is still enough money to generate three \$5,000 fellowships for nonteaching graduate students in the program. We hope to find matching funds for three \$10,000 fellowships that will make the program competitive to underrepresented groups such as women and minorities.

Pedagogy: Our development courses are very highly structured. The concerns that Math will be bringing in people and turning them loose on the courses is unfounded. The TAs will not make out or grade any exams. They will be doing some lecturing and working with students,

individually and in groups, like super tutors, similar to what we do in Chemistry and in Biology labs. We also have a plan to prepare them for teaching, particularly for those who have not taught before, using a teacher training model for training graduate students that was used at another institution. This model trains students by taking short sections from the textbooks and having students prepare and present a lecture on the section and then videotape it and then have the large group of graduate students critique the presentation. They will also be mentored by the full-time faculty.

Enrollment: We expect as a conservative estimate that in the first year we will have four full-time students and nine part-time students; by year five we will have eight full-time students and sixteen part-time students. It costs a lot less to have TAs teach the development classes than lecturers. By year five, the cost savings to UTC will be \$34,087. This number takes into account library expenditures, tuition waivers, TAs from the graduate school, everything that costs money is built so that except for the first year, the program will support itself.

Questions and Comments:

C: There is nothing in the proposal about seeking external funding for research and publication that would be appropriate for a graduate program, yet math colleagues say that they are seeking external funding and publishing papers.

A: Money that would come from grants we don't yet have should not be built into this proposal. This doesn't mean that we won't seek external funding. We will apply to NSF. We aren't as dependent as other disciplines are on external grants to support research.

Q: This is a masterful proposal and the first time the program has been explained in terms of cost savings. Is there any applicability to other freshman and sophomore courses.?

A: We have a unique situation in that some faculty teach development courses as well as in other parts of our curriculum. By adding the TAs, the full-time faculty can move up and spend more time teaching upper-level courses. Every one of our fulltime faculty members is teaching at least one and some time two courses at the 100 and 200 level.

Q: What about the English speaking ability of the TAs? My daughter's first math course was taught by someone who couldn't speak English very well.

A: We don't have a large number of international students, but that is something we have to be very careful about. We also use tutors in our developmental lab, so if we do have international students who might not have the language skills for the classroom, this person could work in the lab.

Q: In this graduate program, how many people will be teaching graduate classes and how many will be getting time release?

A: There will be a filter up effect. Full-time faculty will be able to move out of developmental and into upper level courses.

C: I'm impressed by the proposal and surprised that it failed in Faculty Senate. In English almost always graduate students teach freshman or developmental English. I taught for seven years while getting my doctorate and for two years while getting my masters. At my doctoral institution, graduate students took a pedagogy course similar to what Dr Graef has proposed in the way of teacher training. This program is similar to programs that operate all across the country and it will be strong because it offers a tuition waiver. Some of these graduate students will be strong teachers and some will not. This is also true of senior faculty.

C: I strongly support the proposal for three reasons: students need it, if I were from Volkswagen, I'd be dismayed if this program were turned down, and lastly, there is more supervision offered for the teaching assistants than is now offered for current adjuncts.

Q: The proposal cited graduate programs that have fallen short in attendance. Is there a plan to grow the undergraduate math program to support the graduate program?

A: This program will bring more and better applicants for faculty positions. In the past the graduate programs in engineering have not been very large and they often have had to waive their math requirement because they don't have enough students to fill a course. With his program, the mathematics graduate students together with the engineering graduate students will yield enough students to fill these courses.

The Mathematics Proposal passed: Yes:141 No: 12 Abstain: 7.

Chancellor's Report

We are up 2.6% in headcount and 3.4 % in FTE; the graduate headcount is up 2.8% in head count and 3.75 in FTE. We are working harder and I hope we can find some ways to reward you. Hope to see you at Convocation on Monday, September 15.

Report from the President of the Faculty Senate

It is unfortunate that we did not get a salary increase, and it is beguiling that the administration does not see its way clear to change, amend, or otherwise re-allocate the budget to give us at least a modest raise, let alone a cost-of-living increase, or address the issue of compression. The casual observer who visits our campus and sees our beautiful landscaping, new construction, new graduate programs etc. must wonder: where do these people get the money? Last time I looked, the faculty certainly did not get it.

I must reluctantly conclude that it is clear that UT does not represent the interests of the faculty to the legislature, and that the University is more interested in impression management and empire building than adequately compensating its people. If teachers are reputedly the most important people in our society, as we surely must be since we hold in our hands the minds of the next generation, why are we the last priority in this budget?

As one of my colleagues in the social sciences says, "Watch what they do, not what they say." This advice brings to mind a famous observation from a colleague in humanities three years ago about our former chancellor (not Roger Brown): "I do a good job, and I get a letter; the Chancellor does a good job and he gets a \$28,000 raise." What can faculty governance do about salaries? That remains to be seen. What can we do personally? Talk to alumni, write legislators, express your displeasure. What can the faculty do collectively? JOIN THE UNION. It is a known fact, that year after year, in institutions of higher learning with collective bargaining the faculty have better salaries. We have had no significant improvement to our salaries in a decade or more. Is having a union going to make a difference? I don't know but not having one certainly has not helped us.

In spite of set backs, we still have a loyalty to this profession; a commitment to our discipline; and a responsibility to our students. We are defined by our academic personae, and by the reputations that we have in our fields inside and outside the University. As important as it is, teaching is not the only thing we do, and as loyal as we may be, this University does not define our academic identity. We are not lucky to have our jobs; the University is fortunate to have this faculty.

The most important mission of this faculty, next to teaching, research and creative activities is to safeguard the integrity of the curriculum. General Education, the approval of courses, new academic programs and the intellectual direction of this institution, which is the collective responsibility of this faculty. As much as it would save time and effort, we cannot

delegate curriculum decisions to others, no matter how well intended. I know that University service is often not rewarded by administrators, but somehow we all must share the workload.

I know there is a lot of pressure about retention; the best formula for retention is to admit academically superior students. Since we do not live in Paradise, it is our duty to create a model to foster the unprepared to meet the challenge of a college education. This does not mean however, that we have the obligation to dumb down the curriculum to achieve our goals. Neither does it mean that we have to create a tailor-made General Education Curriculum to satisfy the needs of students who should be in remedial courses. I am certain that as a faculty, and as individual instructors we will have the support of our administration to maintain the integrity of academic programs without having to make sacrifices to expedience.

The Executive Committee of Faculty Senate will be glad to discuss any of these concerns with you and will consider any issue that you would like to bring before the faculty senate. Good luck and my best wishes for a productive academic year

Motion to adjourn at 4:45 p.m.

Recorded by Marcia Noe, Secretary of the Faculty