

Faculty Senate Executive Council
MINUTES
March 12, 2012

Present: Vincent Anfara, Jimmy Cheek, Chris Cimino, Phillip Daves, JoAnne Deeken, Scott Gilpatric, Lee Han, Joan Heminway, John Koontz, Bruce MacLennan, Carole Myers, David Patterson, Lloyd Reinhart, Adam Taylor, Steve Thomas

Visitors: Megan Boehnke (Knoxville News Sentinel), Donna Braquet, Keith Carver, Guoxun Chen (for Beauvais Lyons), Wanda Costen, Jennifer Fowler, John Martin (WBIR News)

I. CALL TO ORDER

V. Anfara called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. He reported that S. Martin regrets missing the meeting, but she is out of town. Anfara will inform her of the issues discussed at this meeting.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the February 12, 2012, meeting was made by C. Myers and seconded by J. Koontz. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. REPORTS

President's Report (V. Anfara)

V. Anfara had met with the Provost on SAIS. She is aware of the issues regarding SAIS. There is a committee working on those issues. Anfara will keep the Executive Council informed of the SAIS committee's work.

J. Koontz asked what the issues are with SAIS. Anfara mentioned two of them: a 50.2% response rate and the fact that students are not completing SAIS for each class. They may complete SAIS for one class, but not others. For Assistant and Associate Professors being reviewed for retention or tenure, SAIS may be the only evaluation of teaching on file. SAIS should be supplemented by other measures such as self-evaluation and/or peer evaluation. Some professors have no SAIS since the response rates were not large enough to release data. There is concern about the lack of responses and suggests other types of evaluation such as peer review of teaching, self-assessment, and syllabi are other methods of evaluation. While other Top 25 universities have similar response rates, that rate is NOT sufficient. The Provost's office is experimenting with ways to increase response rates including looking for a new system. There were fewer problems with the paper system and the response rate was higher. While Anfara did not have exact figures, he believed it was 80+%. L. Han asked how teaching was evaluated before implementation of the paper SAIS. No one knew the answer. Anfara will ask Provost Martin about this at Friday's meeting. He said Provost Martin is serious about SAIS and serious about getting it fixed, but does not support holding something (e.g., grades) over the heads of students if it is at all possible.

V. Anfara said we are having a difficult time in getting people interested in faculty governance. Forty (40) people have applied for the Senate GA position, but not one has volunteered to run for President-Elect of the Senate.

S. Thomas gave a preliminary report from the Nominations and Elections Committee. See the handout for College results: Four colleges have fewer candidates for the Senate than they have open seats. Eight colleges have at least one candidate for each open seat, 4 of those have at

least 2 candidates for each open seat. The College of Business Administration presented a special problem. Thomas has been sending emails for months to the listed caucus chair. He recently learned that faculty member had moved to the College of Communication & Information. When informed, P. Daves stepped forward for the College of Business and will recruit nominees.

While the Nominations and Appointment Committee has not set a date for Senate elections, Thomas has been in contact with Cary Springer of OIT and Rob Chance of the Treasurer's Office and will recommend the period of March 19–March 31 as the time for elections. Another set of date ranges will likely be needed for the College of Business Administration.

To date, the committee has no nominations for President-Elect of the Senate. J. Heminway responded that no President equals no shared governance. While one is elected for a 3-year term (1 year President-Elect, 1 year President, and 1 year Past-President), the year of being President requires the most time and requires attending many meetings with the Provost and the Chancellor. It is good experience for anyone interested in moving into Administration or to a Department Head. You learn to care about the system or about particular issues. Some people seem to belittle the role, but it is important. All were asked to think about people on their committees and to suggest names to S. Thomas. Anfara will send a reminder email to the Executive Council members.

V. Anfara said he would be working through the summer on the idea of establishing a one-stop shop for faculty. There will be a one-stop-shop for students and he's part of a committee that is looking at a similar idea for faculty. He will be contacting other universities to see what they have. He's not sure where the idea will go, but he will work on it.

Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

It is important for everyone to be involved in the UT System Strategic Plan. Please look at the plan and provide input. While the plan has come a long way since the first draft, there is still a ways to go. One of the biggest issues is because the System is in Knoxville. This makes it more difficult for the Chancellor to work with the Mayor, the Chamber of Commerce and other local entities.

The campus is dedicating the Min Kao building this week (Thursday, March 15, 2012). This will be the first new building dedicated to Engineering in almost 50 years. The John Tickle building will be opening soon and will carry on the quality of the Min Kao building.

Space remains one of the most critical problems we have. Two Deans have told Chancellor Cheek we can't hire any new faculty because there is no lab space available. Cheek is confident the Governor will get approval from the Legislature to fund the Science Building (at site of Strong Hall) and get the planning money for the planning of a second building. March 13 will be University of Tennessee Day at the Legislature. There will be representatives from all campuses and the system. Issues to be discussed are control of tuition, accountability, and addressing what each campus does. Cheek will stress that UTK is both effective and efficient. The resources we have per student are lower, but we graduate more students with those lower resources.

Cheek will continue to work on the issue of differentiating IT at UTK from IT at UT System. He hopes to have reporting lines implemented soon.

Koontz appreciated Cheek's report at a recent Faculty Senate meeting. Anfara said the report (PowerPoint slides) was available on the Senate web site. Cheek replied that it is critical to talk with others about raising tuition and faculty raises. Cheek will be writing an Op Ed piece stressing UTK has a high quality of education for a low price when compared to other institutions. He wants to remind everyone that UTK has lost \$60 million in state funding after all the increases made this fiscal year. L. Rinehart asked if this would be a local or state-wide piece. Cheek hopes the piece will also appear in Chattanooga and possibly in Memphis as well. There is a large pool of students from outside the state. Rinehart said he knew someone who came to UTK and paid out of state tuition that was cheaper than the in-state tuition of the student's home state of Michigan. Anfara suggested that Cheek tweak the op-ed article and send it to *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. D. Patterson said that there is a problem with using the phrase "land grant" when speaking of the UT system. Cheek prefers to use the terms "outreach and engagement."

V. NEW BUSINESS

Athletics Committee (W. Costen)

COIA (Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics). W. Costen from the Athletics Committee reported on the recent meeting of COIA at the University of Tulsa. There are new NCAA guidelines for academic performance for athletes. There is increased commercialization of the big conferences leading to some odd conference alignments. University Presidents are feeling more powerless to control issues like coach salaries. Most sports programs are outgrowing their institutions. Most (unlike UTK) have to shift money from academics to support athletics.

COIA should continue to support the collegiate process or there will be congressional anti-trust issues.

Costen reported on the outcome of the meeting regarding "pay for play." If campuses do what they say they do, we are paying athletes with a free degree. In addition, athletes can compete for PELL grants, but cannot take jobs for pay. There is interest in reinstating a multi-year scholarship contract with athletes with a University committing to a student for the length of time necessary for them to get a degree and for universities to increase the discretionary funds necessary to help students. There was a time when freshmen couldn't play. They were to use their first year to focus on academics. If that could be reinstated, perhaps students would integrate better. But many students only come to play. Only some are able to manage both academics and athletics. It is imperative that academic oversight be clearly defined. A key is providing clear definitions of "academically ready" and "special admit". It is imperative that the Chancellor has contact with athletics and gets regular reports from them.

BCS (Bowl Championship System). It is important to retain the academic integrity of bowl games. The BCS allows the sharing of the wealth. Some smaller colleges and non-division 1 institutions couldn't compete without the resources provided by BCS. P. Daves asked if there were any policy recommendations from the meeting. Costen replied there was more synergy between the faculty representatives and NCAA. The problem is turnover. If a university sends the President of the Faculty Senate to the NCAA meetings, they have no history with the process. Multi-year representatives have a greater grasp of history. The reports from COIA are posted on the Senate web site. Dan Murphy is our FAR (Faculty Athletic Representative).

Benefits and Professional Development (A. Taylor)

Domestic Partner Benefits. A. Taylor introduced and summarized a resolution from the Benefits and Professional Development Committee regarding Domestic Partner Benefits. He pointed out

that the resolution is only calling on written responses from the Chancellors to the 35 benefits listed on the chart attached to the resolution. Heminway stated she was in favor of the resolution, but considered it rather timid. The resolution is necessary but not sufficient. She commended the Committee and especially D. Braquet for all their research on the issue. Heminway noted that the call is for discussion of all unmarried domestic partners, not solely those in the LGBT community. She spoke about the difference between equality and equity. Equality means the exact same benefits. There are possible legal issues regarding equality including Tennessee's Defense of Marriage Act. She hopes the Chancellors respond. Anfara stated he and Chancellor Cheek had discussed the issue. He will make an appeal to Larry Arrington (Chancellor of UTIA) on the issue.

Daves asked if the resolution covers opposite sex domestic partners, not just LGBT partners. Taylor and Braquet responded that all unmarried spouses would be covered. There was a reminder that this resolution just asks for a response from the Chancellors. Heminway supports equality of benefits. The LGBTQ community is mentioned in the resolution as an example. Rinehart asked about the cost of providing benefits. Heminway stated the cost would be minimal. Anfara suggested that cost could not come from public coffers. Heminway replied that the state statutes refer to a Benefits Commission covering state employees. That body would not and has not voted on this issue. Many could cover the cost privately. Braquet referred to what Florida does. They currently have 70 employees with enrolled partners. C. Myers asked why there was no "Whereas" clause that did not mention LGBTQ partners. She would prefer a more explicit statement mentioning all domestic partners.

Anfara called the question. The Executive Council voted unanimously to send the resolution to the full Senate on April 2. Anfara reminded all that the resolution calls for Cheek and Arrington to respond regarding the status of benefits equality—not to act in any way beyond that. Heminway asked that the Benefits and Professional Development Committee look at the status of benefits equality each year.

Faculty Affairs Committee (P. Daves)

P. Daves introduced a resolution from the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding freedom of speech for academics outside of their classroom. He read and stressed the last paragraph (the "Therefore, be it resolved..." portion). Daves reported he had spoken with I. Lane on the subject. She said would be interested in taking the proposal to the Board, but wanted to know where Cheek and Martin stood on the issue. Daves reported the Chancellor and the Provost want to wait to respond until after the faculty votes on the issue. Anfara said the resolution would extend the definition of academic freedom. Heminway said it was very important. Patterson said he would take it to the Faculty Council. The resolution passed unanimously.

Daves then introduced a resolution on what he called the "Third Document." Currently, faculty members are governed by two documents: *The Faculty Manual* and *The Manual for Faculty Evaluation*. His committee is recommending the creation of a third document called a *Resources Manual*. Everything in the current document that mentions "Best Practices" would be removed from those two documents and placed in the *Resources Manual*. These are procedural items and not governance items. Anfara explained that everything in the current two manuals are considered governing documents which means any changes to them have to be approved by the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) and by the Board of Trustees. Since the *Resources Manual* would not be a governing document, but instead a list of procedures, it could be modified without having to be approved by the OGC. Anfara said right now everything has to go through

the OGC. Heminway stated there is nothing that would stop the OGC from deciding in the future that they needed to approve everything in the *Resources Manual*. In the past, OGC did not review *The Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, but they recently decided they should approve changes to that document. Anfara said the OGC would not review anything in the new document. Daves asked if we wanted the information to remain in the Provost approved *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*? Anything in it would have to be approved by the Chancellor and any reactive Provost. Anfara said we would be running the risk of having the Provost dictate best practices that the faculty have no control over. He feels this document would prevent this possibility. Heminway suggested we leave as is and let the Senate decide. The resolution passed unanimously.

This was followed by another resolution removing all the material discussed above from *The Manual for Faculty Evaluation* and the *Faculty Handbook*. Koontz asked if moving the material to the *Resources Manual* means a faculty member could choose to NOT follow the best practices. Daves replied that if we prescribe something, it has to go in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*. Heminway suggested removal of the first sentence of the 2nd paragraph of section 4.3 Evaluation. Daves said he would accept that revision as a friendly amendment. The last paragraph now reads "In the case of non-retention, every effort should be made to notify the faculty member as soon as possible." The resolution passed unanimously.

System Strategic Plan (K. Carver)

Keith Carver talked about the UT System Strategic Plan. The plan needed review since it had not been updated since 2006. Since that time the System has undergone many changes. Each of the campuses had redone their strategic plan. They decided to use those individual plans to create a new System plan. The three purposes of the System are: 1) To advocate for the member institutions; 2) To support and provide resources for them; and, 3) Provide accountability.

The NAPA Group won the bid based on the RFP process. They set up a listserv and held sessions on each of the campuses. They received input from faculty, staff, students and alumnae.

Twelve cross-university task forces were set up to lead the discussion on the key areas identified. 190 people (approximately 10-12 on each task force) are on a task force. Faculty, staff and students are serving on Task Forces. Each Task Force populated itself. They worked for months to create, modify and add action items. The Steering Committee met in February and created the existing document. President DiPietro does not want this to be a hidden process. He wants transparency and input. There is a web site set up for comments. Comments can also be made directly to the listed campus contact. Consider activities that are "value-added". Think of ourselves as a client or customer. The group met at the end of the month for strategic and specific characteristics of each campus. They are casting a wide net. The initial information was broad and now is being shaped to fit individual campuses. Two things are needed in the Mission Statement—what is meant by "The UT System" and "What does the Administration do?"

President DiPietro provided additional support to clear any obstacles. Everyone is encouraged to look at the system as an enterprise. The mission statement is being written jointly by the Chancellors. It will include what UT does for the citizens of Tennessee and beyond.

The drill down for each section is being developed. The Task Forces want feedback. They have no intentions of doing things in a vacuum. The plan is to allow and support unique campuses.

Questions: How do people send input? It is fine to send emails or phone calls directly to Keith Carver.

Patterson referred to the land grant mission discussed in Goal 3. But only UTK is an original land grant institution. Martin and Chattanooga are not. Patterson suggests using wording such as "outreach and community engagement." Carver encourages input and discussion. He mentioned the listening sessions as an example. For instance, how should the university celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Morrell Act? Representatives of UTK and UTIA are involved in celebrating it. And the other campuses appointed "at large" members. Martin used to be a branch of UTK. UT Martin and UTK both claim UT Martin's alums. And those alums identify themselves with both campuses. And UT Martin supports rural Tennessee. They want to represent that group in any meetings to represent the excitement of that group. UTHSC has a similar public service focus. But the planning is being driven by UTK and UTIA. All of the campuses have advocacy for the public as part of their mission.

Anfara said it is time for the System to step forward and say "this is our [the System's] role. He does not see much separation in the document between the UT System and the campuses in the first three goals. Heminway wants to see the subsidiary documents. Carver replied that he would be glad to return to discuss the plan in the future.

Non Tenure Track Faculty (J. Fowler)

Jennifer Fowler was recognized to speak for non-tenure track faculty. The non-tenure track faculty wants to work with the tenured/tenure-track faculty through the Faculty Senate. They would like a voice in the decisions made for and by the faculty. They would prefer to work with the UTK Faculty Senate rather than setting up their own Senate. Anfara said that UTIA has a non-tenure track faculty representative on their current Senate membership (with the current Faculty Senate structure). Heminway moved to put the issue before the Faculty Affairs Committee. They would need to examine (and possibly propose amendments) to the Senate By-Laws and the *Manual* and/or the *Handbook*. Koontz seconded. L. Han thought this was the appropriate group to consider the issue. Fowler agreed to work with that group. Myers suggested they look as broadly as possible. She felt there would be several places dealing with or requiring "tenured or tenure track" faculty. It is an equity issue. Anfara called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment was moved by J. Heminway and seconded by S. Thomas. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.