

FACULTY SENATE
Minutes
September 18, 2017

Absent: Joe Bailey, Stephen Blackwell*, Stan Bowie, David Butler, Vincent Carilli, Lt. Col. Matthew Castillo, Jiangang Chen, Chris Cimino, Todd Freeberg*, Martin Griffin, Sharon Jean-Philippe, Gregory Kaplan, Hyun Kim, Nicole Labbé, Mary Leitnaker, Tomás Martín-Jiménez, Larry McKay, Sally McMillan*, Jennifer Morrow, Andrew Pulte, Arthur Ruggles, John Schmisser, Reza Seddighi, George Siopsis, Gary Smith, Soren Sorensen, Maurice Stucke*, Pedro Tomás, Ahmad Vakili, Margarita Velandia, Brynn Voy, Stewart Waters*, Brian Whitlock, Xiaopeng Zhao*

Present by Zoom: Ramon Degennaro, Jennifer Franklin, Jacqueline Johnson

*Alternates: Eliza Fink for Maurice Stucke, Aaron Buss for Todd Freeberg, Nick Geidner for Sally McMillan, Lisa Driscoll for Stewart Waters, Rosa Toledo for Steven Blackwell, Audris Mockus for Xiaopeng Zhao

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

E. Bernard established a quorum.

II. CALL TO ORDER

B. Lyons called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

III. HONORARY RESOLUTIONS

Beauvais Lyons with Chancellor Emeritus Jimmy Cheek presented a resolution and plaque in honor of Dr. Bonnie Ownley for her dedication and work as Past-President of the Faculty Senate (2016-2017) ([click here](#)). L. Gross seconded, unanimously approved.

P. White and members of the UT Law School Legal Clinic presented a resolution in honor of the 70th Anniversary of the UT Law School Legal Clinic Motion from FSEC. Unanimously approved ([click here](#)).

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President's Report (B. Lyons)

B. Lyons talked titled "Reminding Ourselves of What is Important" in which he emphasized five areas; process, institutional structures and policies, valuing individual members of the campus community, free speech and community, and the importance of being optimistic. Some key initiatives for the Faculty Senate include general education implementation, *Faculty Handbook* revisions, the bylaws audit, diversity and inclusion, opting out of outsourcing, and taking the long view as we work to improve the university.

Provost's Report (J. Zomchick)

J. Zomchick shared slides from the academic leadership retreat as an update on academic affairs. The budget for this academic year is \$420 million for academic affairs; 89% went to the Colleges; 8% stayed in academic affairs, and 3% went to conferences and continuing education. (This is mostly revenue that the conferences earned, such as Destination Imagination. These fees pass through the academic affairs budget. Chancellors Honors Program

also falls under other programs.) Of the 8% total of academic affairs budget – 1/3 goes to enrollment management for student recruiting, admitting, Registrar, OneStop, etc., and Provost's office. A new recurring budget appropriation of 1.7 million from Chancellor Cheek was allocated for the purposes of professional advising, Quality Enhancement Plan, graduate support waivers, reorganization commitments, academic affairs staff/OneStop, and new faculty lines. J. Zomchick highlighted enrollment patterns, comparing two points in time from the fact book (Fall 2012 and Fall 2016). There has been an increase in the undergraduate student population in the Colleges of Business, Engineering and Education, Health and Human Sciences. There have been small increases in CASNR and Communication and Information. There has been a decrease in undeclared. The faculty distribution has not followed the same pattern as the trend among students. There has been a small increase in Arts & Sciences. There is a bigger increase among clinical faculty in Nursing and Social Work in the clinical lines to support the community-based training of students for clinical experiences. The College of Engineering gained the most tenure lines in the 2012-2106 time period as a result of a one-time recurring appropriation of \$3 million dollars with a university match. Engineering was able to then increase their tenure track faculty size. The College of Business did not add any faculty; the Colleges of Communication and Information and Architecture lost faculty. The Office of the Provost is undertaking an initiative to look at how faculty lines are allocated and reallocated based on various data points, including but not limited to: undergraduate enrollment, graduate excellence, research achievement, and cluster hires in areas of distinction (yet to be defined). AY17-18 is going to be dedicated to formulating processes of allocation of lines. All vacancies will return to a central pool. This kind of flexibility is needed to adjust to the changes in higher education, as well as the ability to be responsive to the Chancellor's aspirations to become more competitive. Retention is another focus for this academic year. The fiscal health depends, to a degree, on the university's ability to recruit and retain students. The retention rate has plateaued and is currently at 85.5%. UT is near the bottom when it comes to retention of first time, full-time, first year students when compared with peers. RJ Hinde is focused on achieving a retention rate of 88%. As recently as 2003, the 4-year graduation rate was 31%. As the University graduates students faster, meeting enrollment goals will continue to be a challenge. The number of college-bound aged individuals will decline between now and 2024. There will thusly be increasing competition for these students. Last year, 87% of undergraduate students were in-state. Alabama had 62% out of state students. Tennessee is one of the states that the southern neighbors are targeting for out-of-state recruitment. J. Zomchick indicated that it is critical that senators take this message to the colleges. It is imperative to reach out to all students to help them where they are. The intrinsic good in reaching out to students early is that we are able to make a difference in the lives of that many more students. At the 14-day mark, we had 22,317 UG students, 5280 grad students, 351 Law students, and 373 students in Vet Med for a total of 28,321 students. We met our enrollment goals. To continue this, the faculty must help to keep students here and engaged. J. Zomchick urged that faculty contact the Provost's office for assistance with students. Senator J. Jurat-Fuentes asked do we know why the students leave? J. Zomchick answered that the reasons are due to money, major, and math. UTK continues to be very high in the number of Pell-eligible students. This is an inherent strength of the University in continuing to provide access. J. Williams asked what percentage of first generation of graduates attend UTK? RJ Hinde indicated that 25% of our students are first-generation college students. J. Zomchick stated that we need to break down the barriers in order to better serve our faculty and our students because as the Chancellor has indicated, 85% of the students' time is spent outside of the classroom. A mentoring program may be very

helpful. L. Knox remarked that there are very few non-tenure track hires in A&S who teach general education courses—a strategy is needed to encourage the tenure/tenure-track colleagues. J. Zomchick underscored that NTT faculty carry an enormous burden when it comes to teaching general education courses. Salaries need to be examined. L. Gross requested the consideration of strategies for faculty retention, stating this is very costly to the institution. J. Zomchick stated that M. Theriot is implementing new programs aimed at faculty retention. B. Ownley pointed out that as we improve on metrics of retention and graduation, it will hurt us when it comes to formula funding. J. Zomchick responded that we have made tremendous progress and we are currently at a point where we will not be making money. The university needs to return to THEC to see what the end game is for maintaining excellence. G. Skolits asked about the issue of math being a reason for students leaving. J. Zomchick responded that there is a correlation between students who do not do well with math and exit in the first year. RJ Hinde added that the Provost's office is brainstorming options to provide academic support to students who are struggling early in the semester. There are about 500 students per year who are lost each year as a result of this.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Faculty Senate Meeting minutes of the May 1, 2017, were moved for approval by L. Gross and S. Murphy seconded; minutes were unanimously approved.

The Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes of August 28, 2017, were provided as an information item.

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES/COUNCILS

A document, Faculty Senate Committee and Council Goals for 2017-2018, were posted in order to be of assistance to all. Any changes can be added over the course of the year.

Committee on Nominations and Appointments (M. Anderson)

M. Anderson indicated that her charge as president-elect is to recruit a robust group of colleagues to represent the faculty. The caucus chairs will receive a list serve for their constituents. All senators must be communicating with colleagues informally and formally. She indicated that caucus chairs should gather senators in the caucus to discuss issues that are aspirational, pinpointing the relevant administrator with whom we might want to discuss the issue. Caucus chairs have also been charged with recruiting new senators. M. Anderson indicated her hope for a better era of shared governance.

Graduate Council (M. Aydeniz for J. Morrow)

M. Aydeniz summarized the minutes of the Graduate Council meeting of April 27, 2017. L. Gross moved, B. Ambroziak seconded, unanimously approved.

Undergraduate Council (R. Chen)

R. Chen summarized the high points in the materials posted on the Faculty Senate website as a summary of the minutes from April 11, 2017. J. Williams moved, J. Sheffner seconded, unanimously approved.

Regarding the minutes of April 18, 2017, A. Nebenfeuhr pointed out that when adding the requirements under the new general education requirements, it seems unclear whether

students will be able to meet the requirements given that they have very few choices about which courses they take. RJ Hinde responded that the proposal presented was developed by a task-force over a two-year period. There were over 30 meetings, 1 round table, and 3 meetings with the Undergraduate Council. The roadmap going forward will be an implementation task force which will be convened with adequate college and departmental representation and professional advising staff. Once the implementation task-force is named, the next two years will be devoted to approving existing and new courses that fit into the new general education categories. One of the principles used in developing the general education redesign, was gleaned from a listening session. Students have expressed a desire to have basic skills and ways of knowing provide a true academic foundation for life-long learning. The task force hopes that departments will find ways to integrate engaged inquiries courses in to their curricula. M. Anderson asked whether there are any elements of the general education curriculum that must be completed in the lower division? The engaged inquiries and contemporary issues courses can be designed to incorporate courses within the major and thus numbered at a higher level. M. Anderson asked about how this works for transfer students. RJ Hinde responded that the articulation with institutions who send us transfer students will work similarly except contemporary issues. J. Williams asked whether there will be a way for students to highlight this shift in the general education requirements in order for them to tout the advantages of this change. RJ Hinde responded that the Provost's office is exploring ways in which students can highlight this innovative curriculum. B. Lyons underscored that one aspect of this curriculum is to encourage more research/scholarly activity. This could also be a benefit to students. L. Gross emphasized that it is up to us as faculty to not have problems with our majors by ensuring that over the next two years that the courses in our respective units will meet these requirements for general education as well as the requirements for the colleges and departments. S. Murphy indicated that it is possible to take only one arts and humanities or one social sciences. How is this advantageous? RJ Hinde noted that the intention is to allow flexibility to specialize within the broad learning outcomes that the general education curriculum provides. B. Lyons stated that another potential benefit is the ability to pursue minors. S. Eldridge asked whether there will be help from the Undergraduate Council. RJ Hinde responded that the task force has already started to explore courses that may potentially fit with the new requirements. As the Undergraduate Council receives proposals, they will be shared with other deans and department heads as exemplars of proposals that have been approved. K. Gehrman shared the concern about the visual de-emphasis of the arts and humanities and social sciences and asked about the rhetorical presentation to the undergraduate students to help them to understand the value of the general education curriculum. RJ Hinde noted that he believes this will happen in advising 2020, in which every undergraduate student will have an advisor who will follow them for their whole academic career. The Provost's Office and the general education committee will work on how to present this to students so that it is not something that appears to be a checklist model, but rather a foundation for lifelong learning. L. Knox asked about the articulation of responsibilities between the Provost's office and the Undergraduate Council. How will this move forward? RJ Hinde responded that a small task force with broad-based faculty representation was tasked with determining the outcomes including pedagogical innovations and how students learn. From there, drafts were shared with UG council. Ultimately, it was shared with Undergraduate Council for approval. The new implementation task force will have a similar relationship with the Undergraduate Council. Some of the members of the original task force on general education redesign will continue to serve on the implementation task force.

A. Lapins moved approval of the general education framework proposal, R. Koszaliinski seconded. There were zero nay votes and 8 abstentions.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

B. Lyons adjourned the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Sadie Hutson, Faculty Senate Secretary