

Faculty Senate Executive Council
MINUTES
October 3, 2011

Present: Vincent Anfara, Jimmy Cheek, Chris Cimino, Phillip Daves, JoAnne Deeken, Gregory Kaplan, John Koontz, Beauvais Lyons, Bruce MacLennan, Susan Martin, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Conrad Plaut, Steve Thomas, Michael Zemel

Guests: Brent Mallinckrodt (for A. Taylor), Tim Rogers, Sarah Gardial

I. CALL TO ORDER

V. Anfara called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the August 29, 2011, Faculty Senate Executive Council meeting was made by P. Daves and seconded by C. Plaut. Minutes approved as submitted.

III. REPORTS

President's Report (V. Anfara)

The UT Faculty Council will be hosting a *Faculty Handbook* retreat in Nashville in late October. Attending from UTK will be P. Daves, S. Thomas and S. Gardial.

India Lane is visiting all UT Faculty Senates. She will attend the UTK Faculty Senate meeting on October 17, 2011, and will speak for 10-12 minutes.

R. Fuller and J. Logan have agreed to continue representing the Senate on the Technology Fee Advisory Board.

B. Gard will speak for 10 minutes at the October 17th Faculty Senate meeting regarding the emergency management system on the Knoxville campus.

Anfara made a presentation to the Alumni Board of Directors. Anfara is on the awards committee. There was an award ceremony at the Marriott. Both the Board of Directors meeting and the award's ceremony were well done.

Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

Cheek outlined some issues that we will be facing on campus in the next year:

1. System/Campus Relationship. The relationship is improving. There is more collaboration. The System is going through strategic planning this year. All are encouraged to take part in the process as it proceeds. The System mission is changing. The missions of the System and the campus are different as each of the UT System campuses has a different mission. UTK and the UTIA are becoming more autonomous. The next meeting will be held October 19th. Members of the Executive Council will be invited to the meeting.

2. Goals. UTK is different from the other UT campuses and from any other colleges or universities in the State. We are going to be a Top 25 Research Institution. There is nothing wrong with what we are now, but we have aspirations to this higher role. If we do not

continue to improve, we will lose the best and brightest students from the State. This will have an effect on the future economic development of the State. President DiPietro understands that UTK has different goals and objectives from other campuses and needs to be different. UTK needs to be in control of its own destiny and have its own goals and objectives. The priorities of the system and the Board, the Governor and Legislators are to improve the entire System. Chancellors and Deans now sign diplomas, not the President. This is a powerful symbol of the separation of the campuses and institutions from the system.

3. Board Meeting. The Board meeting in June was productive. At that meeting, the Board authorized 5% raises for UTK, but not system-wide. The Chancellor's top priority for this year is raises. The Chancellors and the President understand our priorities are different. There will be different tuition rates among campuses.

When President DiPietro was here, he was shown the worst and the best, including residence halls and laboratories. The President understands the two major issues for the UTK campus are compensation and facilities. The facility fee of \$100 per semester is a significant step towards raising money for facilities. The Chancellor thinks the Governor is beginning to understand the UTK issues and may be drafting legislation regarding funding options for the campus.

4. Miscellaneous. The Board approved the UTK strategic plan at their June meeting. The transfer of Athletics to the Chancellor went into effect on July 1, 2010. Cheek feels UTK has hired a great new Athletics Director. He has had many years of experience, including three recent years at Alabama as COO. Cheek was delighted when Dave Hart accepted the offer from UTK.

There are two issues of concern to the Chancellor: (a) determining what we need for tuition and getting approval for it, and (b) facilities need substantial improvement.

We have \$5.7 million this year to reinvest. The Provost is working with the Deans on allocating this money. Most of it will go to the colleges. The money is from tuition. This is the most money UTK has had in years.

B. Lyons, as Chair of the Senate System Relations Committee, asked Cheek to identify any "grey areas" in Campus/System relations. Cheek said he had no specific issues. Lyons followed up with a question on IT. How would Cheek articulate the differences? Cheek responded that there are two searches in progress: one for UT System Chief Information Officer and the other for UTK CIO.

Lyons asked if the \$5.7 million was for this FY? If so, it would be a great opportunity for a one-time investment in facilities and a laboratory building. Cheek responded that in the past, this non-recurring money went to the colleges and was used for graduate fellowships and to support graduate students presenting papers at conferences. Provost Martin will be meeting with the Colleges in November and December. Some portion will be spent on recurring costs such as lab assistants.

J. Koontz asked how much of the \$5.7 million would be spent in support of VolVision. Cheek and S. Martin both replied that ALL of it would. Cheek reiterated that the graduation rate issue needs to be solved. Koontz stated that each college would have to decide how to spend the

money not for stipends. Cheek said that he wanted to focus on getting the best Ph.D. and terminal degree students in the country. Plans for providing money to cover expenses for these students to travel and present are being developed quickly as an inducement to attend UTK.

Anfara mentioned that L. Gross was representing the Senate on the UTK CIO search committee.

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

1. Lecturers. S. Martin said she and S. Gardial were working on implementing the promotion process for adjunct faculty. The process will be implemented this spring, after promotion and tenure decisions for regular faculty. This process is still in a draft phase: a "trial balloon." The University wants to be able to identify outstanding lecturers and reward them through promotion. There is money to allow a 10% increase in pay for adjunct professors who are appointed; 25% of lecturers have been lecturers for more than 5 years. The procedure/process will be sent to the colleges quickly.

2. SAIS online. There is considerable concern from the online only SAIS program. The College of Arts and Sciences is very concerned. Response rates are the major issue. The Provost is establishing a Task Force to work on the issues. They are trying to identify and send to faculty ideas on how to get students to use the system. Students have to understand that response is NOT optional. They must complete the assessment. One possible solution is to force the students to perform the assessment during a class period, in a manner that mirrors the former paper assessment. The students appear eager to work on the issues, but they do not like the form itself. It is important to have a "green" process and have students use it. The Provost's office is developing a mobile app for the process and hopes to address some of the student issues with it. Anfara stated the Teaching and Learning Council wants to be involved in the process and work towards revisions of the current form. The Undergraduate Council is also discussing the SAIS issue.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Faculty Senate meeting dates for 2012/2013. S. Thomas discussed the issues contained on the handouts for this meeting. October is the most problematic month. After minor discussion, Daves moved and Koontz seconded a motion to accept Option A for the next Academic year, 2012-2013. The motion passed unanimously. Anfara asked Thomas to try to identify a date for the Faculty Senate Retreat that does not conflict with the DDDH retreat. Lyons also suggested that planners look at the home football game schedule when planning the retreat since more Board of Trustee members would possibly be available to attend the retreat.

Faculty Affairs Committee. The Committee placed two resolutions to change the *Faculty Handbook* before the Executive Council. The first changes the signatures on appointment letters for lecturers. The letters will now be signed by the Department Head, not the Provost. This codifies current practice. The motion passed unanimously.

The second was to modify the section on letters from external evaluators on candidates for promotion and tenure. The *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* currently specifies that there be a paper copy of the letter. The Committee suggested a wording change. After discussion,

alternate wording was suggested by Daves. The new wording was accepted unanimously by the Senate. The section as passed by the Executive Committee is as follows:

(Additions are in bold and deletions in strikethrough)" Letters from external evaluators must be submitted ~~by regular mail~~ on institutional letterhead and carry the evaluator's signature. **These letters, or their images, may be submitted via regular mail, email, or facsimile.** ~~Letters submitted via e-mail or facsimile are acceptable in cases of critical timing, but they should be followed by a mailed original.~~ If a mailed letter is received after an e-mail or facsimile, then both versions should be retained the candidate's dossier.

UTFC UTK Representative. Thomas reported that the election of the UTK representative to the UT Faculty Council was a tie. Sharonne Winton will be sending another ballot to all Senators. Ballots must be returned by Tuesday, October 11th, counted on Wednesday, October 12th, and announced at the October 17th Senate meeting.

UTK Alcohol Policy. Anfara received a copy of the new policy from concerned faculty in one of the colleges. He did not realize this was a revised, not a new, policy. He thanked C. Cimino and T. Rogers for coming to the meeting to discuss the policy. C. Cimino said that in the past UTK had a list of buildings where alcohol was allowed, but had codified it into a policy last year. This spring, they realized the policy needed clarification, especially regarding spaces such as the skyboxes. But that was the only change they made to the policy. The policy itself has not been on the website, only the list of places where alcohol was allowed. The revised policy was sent to all business managers this summer. The real question was not the venues, but the students. In the past, no alcohol was allowed when students (graduate or undergraduate) were present. The policy does not differentiate between graduate and undergraduate students. They are now being asked how the policy should cover students over the age of 21. Because of the questions, the policy is now under review by the Chancellor's Cabinet. They are looking for alcohol policies from different colleges and universities. They have found a variety of rules. Some policies do not allow any alcohol where there are students; others will. Others allow alcohol for those over the age of 21. In developing the policy, the campus needs to be aware of what is in *Hill Topics*. Lyons asked why alcohol can be allowed in McClung and not in the Ewing Gallery. He also asked about Bridgeview. Cimino explained that the restaurant was not UTK property. The property is leased by Aramark. Off-campus alcohol policies would apply at Bridgeview. Lyons stated he was not opposed to a dry campus and he applauds the effort to create a policy.

Daves stated the policy should allow students over the age of 21 to drink off campus. G. Kaplan asked about study abroad programs: would students studying abroad as part of UT programs be bound by an alcohol policy that is totally at odds with the local culture? This is a big issue since students would have to disassociate themselves from many events if they could not attend events where alcohol was present. Anfara considers the phrase "in attendance" a problem. The policy needs a clear definition of that phrase. He raised the same issue with the phrase "university sponsored event." Is it used to mean any event where UTK money is spent in any manner to support an event?

Cimino thanked the Council for their recommendations. He will bring them up when recommending changes to the policy and ensure the issues are clarified.

Senate Resolution Tracking. Anfara discussed the idea of setting up a tracking system for Faculty Senate resolutions. The system would be designed in a fashion similar to the current system for faculty evaluations. This way, the Senate could easily track where their resolutions were in the process of being accepted. This is especially important on resolutions regarding changes to the *Faculty Manual*. Everyone would be able to track the resolutions as Senate approved changes went from the Senate to the Chancellor to the Office of the General Counsel to the President to the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor said he thought resolutions were sent to him on a FYI basis. He did not realize he was to approve and send them forward. Daves thought the tracking database was a good idea. Cheek suggested a slightly different workflow would better reflect reality. The approved changes would be sent from the Senate to S. Gardial and then to the Provost, the Chancellor, the General Counsel, the President and finally to the Board. Gardial acknowledged that while the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* states the workflow Anfara outlined, internally; the changes go to her office first. It will be August or September of this year before changes made last year would get through the system. Koontz suggested that the Faculty Senate President, not the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee be the person who initiates the process in the proposed new system. Gardial pointed out that the *Manual* will need extensive revisions to approve the new workflow. She felt the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) would welcome the clarification. She also suggested that it might be nice to have OGC review some proposed changes earlier in the process. She felt that the OGC would, in principle, support tweaking the process.

Standing Committee Reports. Anfara stated he will add this section to each Executive Committee Meeting Agenda so that committees can report on their discussions, issues and pending actions.

- a. Kaplan announced the Undergraduate Council is looking at a possible revision of the College of Arts and Sciences core curriculum. He believes this revision will be ready for further action this academic year. He also stated that the Undergraduate Council will next meet on October 28th, so they will have no report at the October Senate meeting.
- b. Daves said his committee was looking at freedom of speech and expression in light of the Garcetti decision which stated there was no freedom of speech protection for university employees. They may recommend changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* based on this decision. He expressed concern about how the OGC might respond to these changes.

VI. Adjournment was moved, seconded, and approved.

Daves moved adjournment of the meeting; Koontz seconded it. Motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.