

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
May 2, 2011

Absent: Katherine Ambroziak, Lt. Col. Michael Angle, Itamar Arel, David Atkins, Caula Beyl, Feng Chen, Jim Conant, Linden Craig, Steven Dandaneau, Jim Drake, Todd Freeberg, Michael Gant, Jerome Grant, Matthew Gray, Douglas Hayes, Jennifer Hendricks, Russel Hirst, Bill Hofmeister, Becky Jacobs, Robert Jones, Ron Kalafsky, Baldwin Lee, Jun Lin, Brent Mallinckrodt, Norma Mertz, Lane Morris, Lynne Parker, Trena Paulus, Natalia Pervukhin, W. Tim Rogers, Harold Roth, Rupy Sawhney, Juergen Schumacher, Michael Sims, Robert Sklenar\*, Carla Sommardahl, Edgar Stach, Marlys Staudt, Carrie Stephens, Adam Taylor, Dwight Teeter, Pia Wood, Yang Zhong

\*Alternates: Patricia Carter for Robert Sklenar

J. Heminway called the Senate to order at 3:30 PM.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### President's Report (J. Heminway)

J. Heminway introduced a resolution honoring I. Lane. The resolution was adopted unanimously. Senators were referred to the President's written report submitted with the agenda. Senators were thanked for a productive year dealing with real initiatives and were asked to keep involved over the summer recess.

#### Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

J. Cheek gave Senators a quick update on current activities in which he has been engaged. He remains involved in discussions with State Senators and Representatives regarding the proposed legislation allowing licensed gun permit holders to bring guns on campus. The latest issue of "News from the Chancellor" mentions many successful faculty members. The campus sustained damage from last week's storms. Repairs and assessments continue. The campus broke ground on Tuesday for the Sorority Village. Saturday the "Evening in Orange" event was held. It raised \$1 million for the UT Health Sciences Center. Cheek especially praised the UTK students who performed at the event as the most spectacular performance he had ever seen. The students were amazing. Cheek would like to host a similar event in the future to raise funds for UTK.

Cheek voiced concerns about the resolution to be presented by the Senate Budget and Planning Committee regarding faculty raises/bonuses. Cheek is working very hard to be able to get permission from the Legislature for raises this year. He is meeting on Tuesday with Governor Haslam. He is concerned about the resolution since he feels faculty and staff need raises, not bonuses. He also worries about the specified 0.5% percent tuition increase mentioned in the proposed resolution. He indicated that percentage would be inadequate. It takes \$2.4 million to give a 1% raise. A 0.5% increase in tuition would only raise \$1.8 million additional revenue for the campus. That's just not enough.

Getting permission to give larger raises for UTK is a challenge for the Chancellor. He stresses to the Governor and the Legislature that UTK has the potential to be a Top 25 public university. We are already a Top 50 university (among public institutions). Our peers are external to the state. The Top 25 are our role models, not The University of Tennessee system campuses or other state institutions. President DiPietro is working for the system. His goals may differ from the Chancellor's goals. Cheek will have more information in the next couple of weeks.

D. Birdwell asked if any consideration had been given to moving compensation decisions to a unit level, rather than at the Dean or Department Head level. Perhaps bodies could vote in a more

democratic process? There is a possibility of misuse when only one individual makes the decisions. Cheek replied that S. Martin chairs the Compensation Board and referred the comment to her.

#### Provost's Report (S. Martin)

S. Martin announced that three Dean searches have been completed. The search for the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences is in progress. Attendance at the open meetings to date has been small. She urged all to attend and provide feedback on the candidates. The Search Committee meets on Monday (May 9) to compile the comments.

Martin thanked Heminway and Senators for their work this year. She then reported on the strategic plan. There will be a great deal of work done over the summer. The group dealing with undergraduate priorities has made good progress. The other groups will continue their work over the summer.

#### Thornton Center Report (D. Thomas)

Thomas has worked over 21 years on campus dealing with Women's Intercollegiate Athletics. This year, she accepted the position of Interim Director of the Thornton Center. "Most days, it's lots of fun."

The NCAA mandates that universities provide general academic support for student athletes. Universities must also monitor and certify progress towards graduation. UTK meets this responsibility through the Thornton Center. The Center reports to the Provost.

As of the fall term of this year, there were 521 student athletes enrolled on campus. This is down from 550. The loss is tracked mainly to the football program which had three coaches in a short time period. Of the 521 athletes, 242 are female and 259 male. Of the student athletes, 121 had a GPA of 3.5 or higher; 147 had a GPA between 3.0 and 3.49 (51% of student athletes had a GPA of 3.0 or higher); 129 had a GPA between 2.5 and 3.0; 81 between 2.0-2.49; and 33 below 2.0.

There are student athletes in all colleges. There are 259 of the athletes who are undeclared or undecided. This is a strategic move. Many of them know what their majors will be. They wait until their 5<sup>th</sup> semester to declare their majors. Before an athlete declares his or her major, any course he or she takes counts towards his or her NCAA eligibility. Once a major is chosen, only classes taken in the major count towards eligibility.

The Thornton Center is involved in athletic student recruitment and supporting the academic success of student athletes. Its students have many of the issues of non-student athletes, including a spectrum of learning disabilities. Many have a less-than-stellar commitment to going to class. Others graduate in 3.5 years.

The Thornton Center is enlarging programming to meet the diverse needs of its clientele. It has developed a bridge program for its students. First-year students attend the 2<sup>nd</sup> session of Summer School and take 6 credit hours through the Thornton Center. Those who cannot attend Summer School will take the 6 hours in the Fall semester.

Thomas is redirecting some staff in the Thornton Center to focus on high academic achievers. The Center gives much support to lower performing students. She feels it is time to redistribute some of that support to the high achievers. The center tracks athletes from eligibility to success.

The Thornton Center is seen by athletes as an academic institution; academics view it as an athletic institution. Thomas says it is both. The Thornton Center staff tries to clearly communicate to athletes that they are students. But the center staff also understands and supports the need to

modify class attendance for travel during competition seasons. Thomas asked the faculty for support and asked to be notified if it would be better for an athlete to take particular courses in times other than their competition season. There are reports requested from all professors who have a student athlete in their course. While recognizing the extra work involved, Thomas urges faculty to complete the reports or, at a minimum, to contact the center if a student athlete needs either behavioral or academic support in a class.

UTK is striving to be a Top 25 public university. In the Athletics Department, they strive to be in the Top 3 of SEC and the Top 10 in every sport. That is a tough, but reachable, goal. The four goals they have for the student athletes are graduation, championships, being honorable and being a positive representative of campus.

Please contact Thomas via email or phone if you need help with a student athlete.

#### Student Affairs Strategic Planning Report (M. Shivers and M. Sallee)

M. Shivers and M. Sallee reported on the actions of the Student Affairs Strategic Planning Task Force. Shivers was hired in June 2010. The first task she was given was to write a strategic plan for Student Affairs with a completion date of May 2011. Shivers was excited about writing a plan that would help UTK become a Top 25 public university. The Task Force, composed of 10-15 faculty, staff, students and alumni, worked all year, but especially in the spring semester. They listened across campus to gather input from all constituencies. M. Sallee was their representative from Academic Affairs. The Task Force conducted 16 focus groups. Half of them were with students. They made an effort to have a wide range of campus groups included in the focus groups. Examples of targeted groups were LGBT students, students of color, and first-generation college attendees. The Task Force spent six weeks reading the reports from the focus groups. They have developed eight strategic goals for Student Affairs that align with VOL Vision. Details on the strategic plan should be available in the fall semester. While the focus of Student Affairs is on work outside the classroom, they also worked with faculty in developing the goals.

#### **MINUTES**

##### Faculty Senate Minutes

The minutes of the April 4, 2011, Senate meeting were approved unanimously.

#### **PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

##### Proposed Amended and Restated Faculty Senate Bylaws (V. Anfara)

Anfara introduced the revised document and moved its approval. He called for discussion. None followed. The motion passed unanimously.

##### Resolution re. Salary Increases (C. Plaut)

Plaut said that the Budget and Planning Committee incorporated the sentiments in M. Handlesman's resolution of April 2 in the salary study and in the fifth "Whereas" statement in the resolution. After questions from the floor, Heminway ruled that if the salary study was being presented for approval or adoption, then it needed to be voted upon before the committee's proposed resolution could be addressed.

Plaut then presented the study. The results of the survey are posted online at [http://web.utk.edu/~senate/docs/2010-11/2010-11%20Faculty%20Salary%20Report%204\\_26.pdf](http://web.utk.edu/~senate/docs/2010-11/2010-11%20Faculty%20Salary%20Report%204_26.pdf). Succinctly stated, faculty at UTK are underpaid when compared to other universities. The Committee broke the data down by department and found differences in how departments ranked against peers. Some were exceeding NRC norms and others were well below them. In general, salaries at UTK were 89% of the NRC S-rankings. The Committee did NOT compare departments against other UTK departments. They compared UTK salaries only to the NRC S-rankings. The

Committee felt that any UTK salary should be at least 80% of the norm and the "normal" salary should be slightly less than 100% of the norm. The Committee did not break down the NRC data into geographic sections because the data groups would be too small. The Committee looked at each of our departments in comparison to the small world of like departments, reiterating that UTK departments were not compared to each other in terms of salary. However the Committee did graph the NRC-S rankings against UTK salaries, without naming departments. The graph clearly shows that most UTK salaries for full professors are below the average, but that some departments have salaries that are higher. Plaut stated the Committee wondered how this had happened. Was it luck of the draw? Lyons suggested the disparity might partially be explained by UTK's long-term policy of giving raises as a percentage of the base salary. If a department started with a low base salary, that difference would have been compounded over time. UTK does not base salary increases on market value. The NRC-S rankings may be the most accurate base. Plaut responded that some departments are not included in the NRC-S rankings. In addition the rankings look at large groupings. (E.g. the rankings would show English departments, but not Shakespearean literature.) If a college or a department is not in the NRC-S Rankings, then the college or department would have to find its own comparison group. Handlesman reported that his department is Modern Foreign Languages and Literatures, but NRC-S rankings list "Spanish." Plaut said that department would have to decide how to handle the situation.

The subject changed to discussing salaries at ranks other than Professor. Plaut said that the data on Professors best illustrated the discrepancy in salaries. P. Daves said there is inversion, not just compression in UTK salaries. Plaut replied there is some inversion but that compression is a bigger problem. F. Harte asked if the Top 25 public universities might be a better comparison group. Plaut replied that the salary ratio would be similar, but the differences would be smaller. B. Huang asked if data on compression had been analyzed by Assistant or Associate Professors. Plaut replied the Committee has the data, but that the Professor level is super compressed. He wondered if that was the result of small salary increase pools for merit. Salaries are one measure of the desirability of the campus to faculty who are considering coming or remaining here. If the Committee had averaged all the ranks, it would have been skewed by the number of full professors. Thus, they chose to evaluate each rank separately. Plaut suggested that each department needs to make a decision on what to do with the data and how much to use. The goal should be increasing salaries to move towards the average. But he feels that the decisions should be made by faculty committees, not a single person. D. Birdwell felt the data is a powerful incentive for faculty to become involved in raising our rankings since faculty should feel the effects in their salary.

Plaut said the Committee had considered other rankings such as citation ranking, but choosing the journals to compare and finding data would be time consuming and problematic.

M. McAlpin asked about the role of merit raises. Plaut replied that the salary discrepancies the Committee identified should not lead to the cancellation of merit raises. They should be in addition to merit. Plaut is not advocating stopping merit raises. The Chancellor is supporting both merit and market-based raises this year.

Birdwell asked if the motion on the floor was to receive or accept the report. He explained the acceptance implied endorsement; receiving does not. Looking at all the data, he is hesitant to endorse the report. The record was not clear so Plaut move to receive the report. That motion passed unanimously. The Committee's report was received.

Discussion moved to the resolution. Plaut accepted a friendly amendment to renumber the four clauses in the resolution. Plaut reported that the Committee had had much discussion on whether to include bonuses in the resolution. Bonuses do nothing to alleviate a long-term problem. They last for only one year. Plaut is willing to change the resolution based on Senate input. But he is not

recommending that bonus pay be eliminated. B. Lyons said the discussion included whether bonuses should be based on the number of years a faculty member had been in a department or based on merit. If there was a consistent bonus pool, there would be some money available at every annual review period. Without a bonus pool, there is a possibility of no increases at all, even for extraordinary achievement. Bonuses can incentivize annual reviews.

Lyons reminded all that the resolution is advisory to the Chancellor. When the Senate votes for it, we are actually just voting to send the included matters to the Chancellor. Plaut felt that the resolution reflects the view of the majority of the Senate. Handlesman said bonuses lead to much angst over tiny increases and distract many from the objective reality of low pay. Plaut is hoping the future is better. Reviews have been an empty exercise. Even if a faculty member is highly productive, s/he receives no raise. Handlesman asked why we are discussing bonuses when there is no money for raises.

Birdwell moved that we strike the reference to raises from the resolution. S. Thomas seconded it. Lyons spoke against the amendment motion. Including the wording gives the Administration broader options. Birdwell felt that the current system of bonuses undermines the annual review process. Plaut called for the vote. There were 19 ayes and 20 nays. The motion to amend failed.

Plaut then moved to discussion of the 0.5% tuition increase included in the (renumbered) third clause of the resolution. He points out that this figure was in relation to one small recommendation of the report (moving to top 25). Cheek said the report is aspirational, but the amount can't fix the problem. He suggested removing any definite figure from the resolution. He wants UTK to work toward the salary structure of the Top 25 universities. This would include raising tuition and additional funding. Daves moved and S. Gilpatric seconded a motion to remove the 0.5% from the resolution and change the phrase so that it reads ". . . establish a percentage tuition increase." The motion to remove passed unanimously.

Plaut requested acceptance of the original motion as amended. He mentioned that the input from Handlesman at the last Senate meeting was incorporated in the fifth "whereas" statement. Additional discussion ensued. Handlesman felt it was contradictory to thank the Governor (in the sixth "whereas" statement). He stated his belief that we would be letting him off the hook and legitimizing his recommended 1.6% raise. The Chancellor said the percentage amount doesn't matter. Handlesman stated Governor Haslam's top aides received a 25% raise for taking on new duties and working hard. His recommendation of 1.6% is a slap in the face of any other public employee who did the same (meaning assuming new duties and working hard). Handlesman doesn't want to applaud that slap in the face. Plaut replied the statement is applauding a raise proposal. We have worked four years without a raise. In general, Governor Haslam supports higher education. We are applauding not only the raise, but giving higher education the flexibility to look for other ways to fund raises. Plaut feels complaining is not an effective way to get more money.

Discussion returned to the resolution. Martin moved and M. Griffin seconded the replacement of the word "applaud" in the sixth "whereas" statement with the word "appreciate." The motion failed. B. McLennan moved and D. Hayes seconded a motion to reword the same statement to read "is aware of the Governor's efforts to secure...". The motion failed. Daves moved and Gilpatric seconded a motion to rephrase the "whereas" clause to read ". . . are encouraged by the Governor's effort to secure the first general raise pool in four years and his signaling . . . ." The motion failed. Birdwell moved and J. Hall seconded a motion to table the resolution until next semester. The motion failed. T. Boulet moved and Thomas seconded a motion to delete the sixth "whereas" statement altogether. The motion passed with 2 "nays." MacLennan moved and Thomas seconded to approval of the resolution as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

Plaut then introduced the "2010-2011 Report on Assessment of Non-Academic Programs." The Senate voted to receive the document. Since the resolution accompanying the report had not been posted in advance, the Committee's resolution relating to the report was not moved.

Plaut moved receipt of the 2010-2011 Living Wage Study. Lyons agreed that the Budget and Planning Committee considered the report finished. He indicated that the resolution based on the report narrowly passed in the Committee. He then gave an abbreviated history of the Living Wage movement at UTK. The Senate supported a Living Wage of \$8.50 per hour in 2000. The original study looked at the cost of living in Knoxville. And that wage was basic. It covered food, housing, basic clothing and gas to get to work and school. It did not cover any savings, emergency funds, entertainment or dining out. This was basic living. In the 2005 study, the Living Wage was recalculated to be \$10.73 based on the cost of living in Knoxville.

Lyons went on to say that looking at the market for positions in a corporate environment is not a good method of benchmarking a Living Wage. As a state institution, UTK has the goal of supporting the economic conditions off the state. 23% of UTK employees currently make less than \$12.02 per hour. We have an obligation to look after our lowest-paid wage earners. He welcomes other ways to analyze the data for purposes of the Living Wage report, but believes the most accurate way is to look at cost of living and not market realities.

Birdwell asked for clarification on whether student workers would be covered under the plan. He feels that we are sending a poor message if we pay student workers less than we pay, e.g., custodians. He then moved to amend the motion to include student workers. J. Koontz seconded. Lyons questioned the need for including student workers, who may have family support or other means of support. Daves asserted that for many students, the point of a student job is to provide experience or money for entertainment. That is very different from our staff members. Birdwell disagrees. Huang said students work to supplement their income and gain research experience. He cannot afford to pay his student workers at the Living Wage rate. The motion to amend failed.

Discussion returned to the resolution as initially proposed. Plaut does not feel that a full study of the cost of living for an area is productive. It assigns a very high number to a Living Wage that is not matched by market-based studies. When the first Living Wage report was conducted, several cities and universities agreed to use the cost of living methodology. Most of them no longer use that criteria and have shifted to a market-based analysis. These municipalities and institutions no longer state that they support the Living Wage movement. San Francisco is the only city to say it supports a Living Wage and its Living Wage is \$9.00 per hour. Based on cost of living differentials, that would equate to \$6.00 per hour in Knoxville. The issue is complex, but he does not feel the prior cost-of-living-type of analysis is the appropriate way to calculate a Living Wage.

Plaut then moved to remove the phrase "that does not qualify them for public assistance and" from the fourth "whereas" statement.

At that time, C. Myers called for a quorum check. Heminway stated there was no quorum present. All discussion and action immediately ended at approximately 5:30 P.M., at which time the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

JoAnne Deeken, Secretary