

# 2010-2011 Final Report

---

*Prepared by the UTK Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee*

The reports and resolutions of the Budget and Planning Committee, as well as the minutes of our meetings, are available online at the Faculty Senate website, and the details of those documents will not be repeated here. Mainly this short report summarizes our activities and indicates something of a timeline.

## **Civility and Community Task Force**

In November, the committee undertook a study of the recent report of the Civility and Community Task Force from the standpoint of cost effectiveness (which had not been part of the charge to the Task Force from the Chancellor). Two documents resulted: (1) A resolution from the committee expressing support for the report, but urging caution concerning implementing some of the more costly recommendations. (2) A resolution asking that harassment in various forms be included in the student code of conduct. While discussed among committee members, the latter resolution was ultimately brought to the floor by Plaut, via the Executive Council. Both resolutions were passed by the Faculty Senate.

## **Faculty Salaries**

The committee looked more deeply into salary data than had been done previously, soliciting data separated by unit and rank, then comparing salaries to those in three comparison groups of universities. We found that UTK faculty are not only severely underpaid in general, but that large disparities exist among units at the university, with no clear connection to external assessment of quality. During the April meeting of the Faculty Senate, members of the committee successfully moved to refer a motion by Michael Handlesman to the B&P Committee. The committee produced a report with several recommendations, including market-based and Top 25 oriented pay raise strategies. The report was received by the Faculty Senate, and an accompanying resolution was approved in amended form.

## **Assessment of Non-Academic Programs**

The committee continued work on assessment of non-academic programs begun the prior year, and finished a report, which was received by the Faculty Senate. A resolution related to the report will be presented to the Executive Council in the fall. In connection with this project, Lyons and Plaut met with Joan Heminway and members of system administration to discuss the role of institutional support spending in increasing the percentage of the system budget that goes to non-academic functions.

## **Living Wage**

In 2000, the Faculty Senate began a series of reports on staff wages at the University of Tennessee, centered on the concept of a living wage. There was controversy on the committee concerning the value of living wage methodology. Ultimately a compromise was reached in which a report was produced as mandated by the 2000 resolution of the Faculty Senate, but which contained no advocacy concerning continuation of living wage studies. An accompanying resolution containing advocacy for the concept

was offered by Beauvais Lyons was approved 5-3 . The report was received by the Faculty Senate, but consideration of the resolution was delayed to a subsequent Executive Council meeting, which then postponed consideration until the fall semester (with planned discussion at the Faculty Senate retreat).

### **Other Issues**

The Budget and Planning Committee also dealt with lingering concerns expressed by Joan Heminway that the committee had stopped doing gender equity salary reports. Former chair Don Bruce explained the reasoning for this decision during the prior year in a report to the Faculty Senate. Plaut summarized the reasoning to Joan; see also a summary in the 9/27/10 B&P committee minutes. The committee agreed informally that such reports should not be produced by the committee in the foreseeable future.

The committee also considered a request from Steve Blackwell to look into the process being used to possibly terminate the Russian and Italian programs. The committee agreed to monitor the situation and perhaps become involved once the process had moved forward to a point where the reasoning behind a decision to terminate the programs became public (if such a decision were made). However, the programs were ultimately retained, and no action was required.