

MINUTES

TENNESSEE BOARD OF REGENTS FACULTY SUB-COUNCIL

April 17, 2009

Present	Voting Representatives	Institution
X	Kay Harralson	APSU
	Will Benson	CISCC
X	Karen Siska, Chair	CoSCC
X	Mitchell Rhea	CSTCC
X	William Northcutt	DSCC
X	James Bitter	ETSU
X	John Koons	JSCC
X	Janice Harder, Secretary	MSCC
X	Larry Burris	MTSU
X	Howard Doty	NaSTCC
X	Eric Fish	NoSTCC
X	Dave Vinson	PSTCC
X	Sam Comer	TSU
X	Gretta Stanger	TTU
X	Jeffrey Burman	UM
X	Len Assante (substitute for Robert Moon)	VSCC
X	Janice Donahue	WSCC
X	Bruce Fisher	RSCC
X	Clark McKinney	STCC
	Nonvoting Representative/TBR Staff	
X	Jane Asamani	RODP/TSU
X	Robbie Kendell-Melton, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	TBR
X	Paula Myrick Short, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	TBR
X	Kay Clark, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	TBR
X	Treva Berryman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	TBR
X	George Malo, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Assessment	

Visitors

Ed Stevens (Faculty Regent, UM Professor); Chris Modisher

Call to Order

Chair Karen Siska called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

Comments from Chancellor Charles Manning

Chancellor Charles Manning reported that TBR is operating on a three-year plan by direction from Governor Phil Bredesen. By fiscal year 2011-2012, TBR institutions will be at Tier 2 budget reduction levels. Stimulus money must be used for maintenance of effort. The state must restore higher education funding to previous levels. Two major benchmarks to be considered are budget/amount of money to be spent and number of positions. Many institutions will need to have a lower number of full-time employees. One option is a buyout, which is much better than firing people. By the June 2009 meeting of the Board, institutions must have a plan for meeting the reductions by 2011-2012. The plan will be based on the assumption of 5% revenue increases per year.

TBR institutions are operating under two assumptions: (1) they will not receive any increases in state funds during that time period, and (2) they will not receive money from the state for salary increases. Institutions must address salaries in their three-year plans.

Directions from THEC for spending the stimulus money include one-time purchases for teaching students. The stimulus money should be used to fund items that have no continuing costs associated with them.

Chancellor Manning does not know anything about changing the governance of Tennessee higher education. He expects at least a study of governance change during the current legislative session. Any change will require the governor's leadership.

In response to questions from sub-council members, Chancellor Manning responded as follows:

- By the time the economy improves, we will probably have a new governor.
- Higher education does not enjoy the grass roots support from the legislature.
- Legislation to remove the word *Tech* from the names of four community colleges will probably pass; however, the mission of these institutions will not change.
- An employee buyout is a campus decision. Any plans for rehiring is dependent on the institution.
- While the previously proposed business model is not being considered at this time, the Chancellor encouraged the sub-council to consider what can be done differently to improve higher education.
- The Chancellor has received no requests from presidents to allow faculty to teach during summer school at a rate below the 1/32 rate. Faculty must be involved in the process to decide if there is an exception. The Chancellor will communicate directly with the Presidents about the policy, which must be followed.

A sub-council member reported the idea that all graduate programs will emanate from the University of Tennessee (UT) with no graduate programs within a 100-mile radius of UT. The Chancellor responded that two things influencing cost are the number of graduate programs across the state and the number of students who attend community colleges. Every regional university cannot be a "high research" university. East Tennessee State University has eleven doctoral programs, ten of those in the health sciences. The Chancellor does not think the idea of eliminating graduate programs will go anywhere.

Comments from Vice Chancellor Paula Myrick Short

Dr. Paula Short voiced her support for faculty and her understanding of faculty concerns. She reported that the Chancellor wants to hear the faculty's voice and encouraged the sub-council to communicate with Siska, Dr. Short, or the Chancellor. She continues to have concerns about adjunct pay and has tried to move forward an increased schedule for adjunct pay.

Comments from Karen Siska, TBR Faculty Sub-Council Chair

Siska reported that she has studied Roberts' Rules of Order thoroughly and has asked questions about some issues. The sub-council agenda is set by Dr. Short and the chair with input from the members. She encouraged the sub-council members to talk about some of the issues through e-mail, using the TBR Faculty Sub-Council e-mail distribution list. Many questions can be answered by e-mail, thus eliminating the need for discussion at the sub-council meetings.

Approval of Minutes of January 9, 2009 Meeting

Jim Bitter moved and Clark McKinney seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the January 9, 2009 meeting. Motion was approved unanimously.

Election of Vice Chair

Howard Doty moved and Clark McKinney seconded the motion that Gretta Stanger be elected vice chair by acclamation. Motion was approved unanimously.

Action Items

Proposed TBR Guideline on Teaching Quality Initiative. A task force has been working the last three years to rethink the teacher education program. This task force and working groups had representation from the colleges of education from all six universities to test parts in pilot programs. Education students will work with master teachers much sooner. The legislature provided some funding to run pilots at MTSU and ETSU. Ongoing work continues on a mentoring model and with TEA to develop a process for identifying distinguished teachers. Representatives from community colleges with AST programs will be involved to work on problem-based learning models. The State Board of Education provided its support of this proposal on Thursday, April 16. This initiative is presented as a guideline rather than a policy so changes can be made more easily.

The following answers were given in response to questions from sub-council members:

- Institutions will decide how they implement the quality initiative as long as the program has the required components.
- The staff will work to insure that evidence-based best practices are being used so as not to perpetuate bad practices already in place in the schools.
- The staff is working with the State Board of Education to make a budget request to the BEP that funding be set aside for mentoring teachers.

Bitter moved and Bruce Fisher seconded the motion to approve the guideline with the insertion of specificity of evidence-based practices being the foundation for training and interaction with the mentor. Motion was approved unanimously.

Proposed TBR Policy 2:09:00:00—Research and TBR Guideline—Institutional Review for Research. Proposed TBR Policy 2:09:00:00—Research and TBR Guideline—Institutional Review for Research were not considered by the sub-council because legal issues must be reviewed. The revised policy and guideline will be considered for approval in a conference call of the sub-council, possibly around May 7. The impetus for writing this new policy and guideline was requests from outside people (students from the University of Tennessee or other colleges besides TBR institutions) for data. The concern is for protection of TBR data and the open records law. No process is in place at the Board for an Institutional Review Board.

Universal Articulation in Business Administration. Dr. Kay Clark explained the background of the initiative for universal articulation of lower division courses required for baccalaureate majors in programs between community colleges and universities (both TBR and UT). The amendment to TCA 49-7-202 specified that THEC would begin implementation of universal articulation agreements for programs showing the highest transfer rates. Therefore, business administration was chosen as the first program because it involves the largest number of transfer students statewide.

In March, a task force of UT and TBR system representatives (nine TBR and four UT representatives) developed a community college curriculum for students in business administration. The following changes are proposed for the ***general education*** requirements:

- UT is willing to accept American History as the history requirement for students in the College of Business.
- The six-hour social sciences requirement will be met by Principles of Economics I and II.
- MATH 1630 will meet the mathematics requirement.

The following changes are proposed for the area of emphasis requirements:

- A three-hour computer applications course is added. Institutions will decide on the computer applications course best for their programs.
- MATH 1830 and MATH 2050 will be required. Since MATH 2050 is a calculus-based statistics course, MATH 1830 is the prerequisite.
- Four hours of guided electives were added. “Guided” refers to whatever elective is appropriate.

The sub-council had much discussion about the requirement of a calculus-based statistics course. Members of the sub-council who teach statistics questioned the need for calculus in an applied statistics course. The suggestion was made that teachers who deliver these courses should be involved in these decisions.

Bitter moved and Fisher seconded the motion to approve the proposed curriculum. The vote was five in favor, eight opposed, and four abstentions. Motion failed.

Janice Harder moved and Bitter seconded the motion that further discussion involving business and math faculty who teach statistics (both calculus-based and noncalculus-

based) be held concerning the calculus-based statistics requirement in the business administration program. Motion was approved unanimously.

Sub-council members were asked to send Dr. Short names of faculty on their campuses who teach statistics (both calculus-based and noncalculus-based).

Discussion Items

Furlough Policy Approval Process. Dave Vinson asked why there was no discussion in the TBR telephone meeting of the furlough policy approval. Ed Stevens, faculty regent, reported that the sub-council's wording on the furlough policy went to the Board. Stevens had gone to Chris Modisher and asked her to expedite it through the Joint Presidents' Council. It did go through the Joint Presidents' Council, but changes were made. The compromise that came from the Presidents' Council went to the Board. When the vote came to Stevens, all votes were "yes" with only one vote remaining. Vinson and Bitter spoke against Stevens' decision to vote "yes." Voting "no" would have attracted attention and might have led someone in the media to respond to faculty. They expressed concern that the time spent in writing the proposed policy received no public consideration.

Role and Function of the TBR Faculty Subcouncil. Siska distributed Policy 1:03:04:00—Councils and Guideline G-020—Sub-Councils to the Joint Presidents' Council and referred to several statements in the policy and the guideline, including the following:

- “. . . established for the purpose of providing means through which campus administrators may formally assemble to communicate on matters of common channels in the system to the Board of Regents.”
- “. . . for the purpose of providing a mechanism to promote effective communication and internal management throughout the Tennessee Board of Regents System.”
- “. . . no releases of information or public statements shall be made by the sub-councils.”
- “It is recommended that the Faculty Sub-council members be the chairman of the faculty senate, assembly or advisory committee established by each of the various institutions; however, a representative may be selected annually by the faculty organization to serve as a Faculty Sub-Council member.”

Siska emphasized that the TBR Faculty Sub-Council is a Board committee and must operate within prescribed parameters. Other organizations, such as AAUP and TEA, are able to do things the sub-councils cannot do.

Chris Modisher reported that by statute, a faculty regent on the TBR serves only one year. She suggested making it statutory that the faculty regent serves two years (one nonvoting and one voting). Another way faculty have a voice is through TBR committees. Currently the faculty member on these committees comes from the campus on which the meeting is held. Faculty are also represented through subcouncil.

Modisher explained the selection process for faculty regent as follows:

- Three nominations for faculty regent go to the governor each year, one nominee from each of the following: universities, community colleges, and technology centers. These nominations rotate alphabetically among universities, community colleges and technology centers.

- The governor selects the faculty regent from these three nominees.

Three nominees for student regent (one each from universities and community colleges and one at-large nominee) are selected statewide by the SGA presidents, with the Governor selecting the student regent.

The selection process for both student and faculty regents is by law (Section 49-8-203).

Modisher explained the intent of the statement “no releases of information or public statements shall be made by the sub-councils” as no sub-council member is to report to the media on behalf of the Faculty Sub-Council.

Modisher stated that the TBR Faculty Sub-Council is not a “policy-making body” even though it is listed on the TBR website as such. Any action of the sub-council is sent to the Joint Presidents’ Council, which can accept or reject the recommendations of the sub-council.

It was suggested that one way to change perceptions is to have the presidents explain why changes are made to the subcouncil recommendations.

Jeffrey Bermann moved and Len Assante seconded the motion that recommendations from the TBR Faculty Sub-Council should be acknowledged by the Joint Presidents’ Council and that the sub-council receive written explanation of any recommendation not accepted. Motion was approved unanimously.

Sub-council members were encouraged to talk with their presidents about this and other recommendations sent from the sub-council to the Joint Presidents’ Council.

In response to a question about the relationship between the TBR faculty regent and the TBR Faculty Sub-Council, it was reported that the TBR staff can invite the faculty regent to sub-council meetings. Approved motions are sent to the faculty regent. A member suggested that a faculty regent from a technology center may not have the background for some recommendations.

Modisher reported that a bill introduced into legislation about software licenses may pass this year.

End of State Law Requirements for TBR Print Job Numbering. George Malo reported that the state committee that overlooks printing was sunsetted. Usually the public relations person on a campus assigns the job number.

Bitter reported that at ETSU, it is not clear what is meant by “printing” since copiers and printers are in every office and every department. He understands that only items going through ETSU’s University Press must be numbered. If the requirement applies only to certain jobs, clarification is needed. ETSU is considering a highly decentralized process for printing. So a question is raised of how the requirements of the law will be met if University Press is eliminated.

Malo will clarify the requirements of the state law, but the print job number is generally used only for publications that go to the public.

UT and TBR Legislature Lobbying. Bitter reported that Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) was told by legislators that they see UT lobbyists frequently but not the TBR lobbyists. Short reported that David Gregory, who is identified as the TBR legislative liaison is on the hill continually and all the time when the legislature is in session.

The Board's position on direct contact with state legislators by presidents and the faculty senate is that the presidents are to have direct contact with legislators with the faculty senate working through the president.

Bermann asked what Gregory is doing to lobby on behalf of faculty concerns and reported that UT legislative liaisons invited faculty to meet with the legislators. A difference exists between a UT legislative liaison going with a group of faculty to talk with a legislator and the TBR liaison going by himself. The sub-council may invite Gregory to meetings. Subcouncil has the power of a petition or resolution.

Assante reported that the Tennessee Conference of AAUP has a lobbyist, Coleman McGinnis.

Information Technology Subcouncil. Bermann reported the need for a representative from the sub-council on the Information Technology subcouncil to replace him. Mitch Rhea volunteered to serve.

Remaining Discussion Items. The following discussion items will be moved to the July 2009 agenda: (1) Review of TBR-required reports, (2) common calendar, (3) 14th-day census, (4) campus fees, (5) retention/persistence to graduation measures, (6) TBR grants to support creative initiatives and pilots.

Information Items

eLearning Updates. Robbie Kendell-Melton distributed the following handouts: (1) RODP/ROCE Quality Standards and Measurements, (2) RODP Quality Standards, and (3) RODP New Course Development Training Agenda. She reported that RODP is looking at withdrawal and failure rates and is tracking math, biology, and Spanish. She expressed concern with faculty not signing into their courses. Faculty are required to log in and participate at least three times each week, to grade papers within two weeks, and to answer e-mails within 48 hours. RODP removed two professors who refused to grade papers and had not graded papers since January. With real-time integration, she reported projections of 25,000 enrollments and 17,000 headcount. RODP is working on redesigning courses.

Updates on RALI and DSP. Treva Berryman reported that decisions on the DSP redesign will be made when the data is in. A task force will meet during the summer to draft recommendations. These recommendations will be brought to the sub-councils in October to be carried back to the campuses for input. The recommendations will come back before the sub-councils in January for approval. The DSP redesign should be in place by fall 2010.

Other Information Items. Updates on the general education assessment, AST, and academic audit will be shared by e-mail.

New Business

Siska reported that the sub-council needs an operations manual. She has asked Howard Doty to work on the development of such a manual. Vinson and William Northcutt volunteered to work with Doty.

The next meeting of sub-council will be Friday, July 24, 2009. A secretary will be needed for the July meeting since Harder will be replaced by the new Motlow College representative. Siska will check with Will Benson.

Appreciation was extended to the chair and secretary and to sub-council members rotating off the membership.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Submitted: Janice Harder, TBR Faculty Subcouncil Secretary