

FACULTY SENATE
Minutes
October 15, 2018

Absent: Jennifer Akerman*, Tami Bland*, Chris Boyer, Ham Bozdogan, Rachel Caldwell*, Qing Cao, Vincent Carilli, Chris Cimino, Ramon Degennaro, Yuri Efremenko, Kelly Ellenburg, Nick Geidner, Qiang He, Silke Hecht*, David Icove, Julia Jaekel, Asafa Jalata, Jackie Johnson, Srinivasan Mahadevan, Tomás Martín-Jiménez, Stephen Marz, Andreas Nebenfuehr*, Chris Parigger, Victor Ray, Alex Rodrigues, Sean Schaeffer, Lisi Schoenbach, Reza Seddighi, Gary Skolits, Matthew Theriot, Phyllis Thompson, Alan Wallace*, Stewart Waters, Brian Whitlock, James Williams, Melanie Wilson, Courtney Wright, Andrew Yu, Zhili Zhang, Xiaopeng Zhao

Present by Zoom: Mark Collins, Eva Cowell, Rebecca Koszalinski, Phyllis Thompson, Andrew Yu

*Alternates: Teresa Berry for Alan Wallace, Samereh Abdoli for Tami Bland, Thura Mack for Rachel Caldwell, Anne Ho for Andreas Nebenfuehr, Avigail Sachs for Jennifer Akerman, Angela Rollins for Silke Hecht

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM (E. Bernard). E. Bernard established that a quorum was present.

II. CALL TO ORDER. M. Anderson called the meeting to order at 3:46 p.m.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President's Report (M. Anderson)

M. Anderson began by asking, "what are you doing here?" She explained that understanding what the Senate is, how it works, and why we serve here is fundamental to our success. She noted that the primary charge is the formulation of general educational objectives, with additional roles in consulting in the selection of administrators and in policies concerning the general welfare of faculty and students, all through our advisory role to the chief academic officer of the campus, which is broad and purely consultative. She quoted Tennyson's *Ulysses*, urging his aging crew to carry on, "we are not now that strength which in old days/Moved earth and heaven, that which we are, we are." M. Anderson stated that shared governance in the age of the modern university depends on meaningful and mutually respectful collaboration. Recent efforts to improve the campus PPPR implementation plan is an example of a good campus process that strengthened shared governance by the practice of it. She emphasized that the Administration and faculty collaboratively turned a Board policy that began as an alarming assault on tenure into something that now feeds back into EPPR. Further, the AAUP noted that while we should continue to monitor it, the campus plan was now deemed not to undermine the principle of tenure, and they have signed off on it. M. Anderson encouraged senators to vote for the plan as a way to assert our place in the process, although it began with top-down actions. There is also a vote today on a resolution that outlines explicit reasons for why the Board should reconsider its policy. M. Anderson commended Provost Manderscheid and Interim Chancellor Davis for pushing back on the System template. She also thanked Past President, Beauvais Lyons, and research assistant, Brooke Killion, for their work. M. Anderson further noted that the PPPR process highlighted a concern about the state of the *Faculty Handbook* and the delay in implementing changes and updates since January of 2016 including the language governing EPPR. She commended Senator Michelle Kwon and past-Ppast President Bonnie

Ownley for tracking this problem, and thanked Vice Provost Zomchick for helping to sort it out. M. Anderson explained that most of the Senate's work is done in committees, Executive Council, and caucuses. In response to concerns about use of time during Senate meetings, the meeting format will be shifted toward more discussion. The Provost and Chancellor's reports will be simplified to a tidy highlight or two, with longer communications posted beforehand with the agenda, so that 10 minutes at the front of the meeting can be spent on general Q&A. This change is an attempt to balance the need for timely discussion. M. Anderson noted that New Business will continue to be placed at the end of the meeting and future presentations will be geared toward conversation befitting policy and advisory roles. Anyone from the campus community can bring a concern or idea through the Caucus chairs, or a proposed action to a committee so that it may be considered. M. Anderson will actively feed that process through faculty-wide polling, which will be included with the mini-minutes that will be distributed after each full Senate meeting. Meetings will now be organized around a matter of shared concern; for today's meeting the focus is tenure and shared governance. M. Anderson noted that the next meeting will take up faculty roles in student success including discussion with Undergraduate Council about the new GenEd templates, Dean of Students Shea Houze, and Jennifer Gramling, Director for E-Learning. She emphasized the need for faculty to assert their role in the educational objectives of the institution. M. Anderson has requested that Interim President Randy Boyd address the senate about his plans regarding diversity, access, and growth, and have urged a town hall before that. The UFC is the corresponding advisory body to the President, as we are to Chancellor Davis and Provost Manderscheid, but this senate also represents roughly 2/3 of all faculty in the System; there is a need to have an open channel to the System President; this will continue to be requested. M. Anderson explained that she believes this can make a better case for faculty contributions and higher education in general. The PSA program, Tennessee: Home, will launch this month. The OpEd project, which trained 20 faculty members and two communications staff from across this campus (every college was represented) September 27-28 has already yielded 3 published OpEds. The collected notes from the OpEd session was distributed to senators and M. Anderson encouraged everyone to advocate for higher education in their respective disciplines/communities. Vol For Life films has agreed to do a series of short spots featuring faculty with student athletes, and efforts are continuing with Alumni Affairs to help to shift the narrative to one that better appreciates faculty contributions to Tennessee and the world. United at the Rock 2.0 will come up in February, illustrating our commitment to a campus where Vol means All, and where we stand together against hate. M. Anderson applauded senators' commitment to serving.

UTK Chancellor's Report (W. Davis)

W. Davis reported that the Vice Chancellor for Communications candidates will be coming to campus beginning Monday, October 22, 2018. The Vice Chancellor for Research search has been postponed. R. Nobles will remain as Interim Vice Chancellor for Research. His position in the Office of Research and Engagement is temporarily open. The current plan is for R. Nobles to put out a call for two faculty fellows to assist with carrying out his responsibilities while he serves in the interim capacity. Hiring faculty fellows will help develop internal experience in research administration. W. Davis expects that within the next two weeks there will be an announcement to begin the new Chancellor search. The hope is that this announcement will occur before the BOT meeting the first week in November.

Provost's Report (D. Manderscheid)

D. Manderscheid thanked M. Anderson for her remarks. He reported that we have the best retention numbers to date on our campus. We hit a record high 6-year graduation rate of 72.5%. There was also an 86.8% retention rate for first time students returning to campus. The Provost's Office is sending a group to Georgia State to learn about strategies for improving retention among underrepresented groups. D. Manderscheid reported that UT is also considering membership with University Innovation Alliance, which is a national coalition of public research universities committed to increasing the number and diversity of college graduates in the United States. The cluster hire search process is beginning; the Provost is working closely with Vice Chancellor Nobles. They recently met with the leaders of these groups to begin this process. More information is forthcoming.

UTIA Chancellor's Report (T. Cross)

T. Cross submitted a written report that is included with the agenda items today. He thanked the faculty for being present and is looking forward to working collaboratively on lots of initiatives, specifically student success.

S. Eldridge asked about the searches that are open, wanting to know what the timeline is for the President's search and why the Chancellor search is occurring before the System President search. W. Davis responded that if we do the President's search first, we could be as many as three years away from having a Chancellor. He emphasized that it is in the best interest of the campus to hire a Chancellor as soon as possible. At this time there is no intention to rush the System President's search. As it pertains to the Chancellor's search, there will be a combination of individuals representing the campus and system who will serve on the search committee. W. Davis noted that there has been input to the President's office regarding the makeup of the search committee to ensure there is representation of faculty on behalf of the Faculty Senate. S. McCallum asked about PPPR, wanting to know whether there is any consideration for additional compensation to be attached to the process in light of a favorable review. D. Manderscheid answered that there has been no discussion of this to date. He also stated that the campus is trying to keep the processes as short as possible to minimize faculty workload. B. Lyons commented that it would be wise not to attach merit awards to the PPPR system, citing that it only happens every six years. B. Lyons also asked about updates regarding Haslam appointing five members to the campus board. W. Davis responded that he communicated with Governor Haslam 2 ½ weeks ago. Haslam was looking at campus committee members for the campus board and also looking at additional BOT members. At this time there is no official news regarding the names of the appointees. A. Roessener asked about what the first strategic step is identifying the priorities for Diversity and Inclusion. D. Manderscheid has charged M. Theriot with working with the diversity champions to identify a strategy. This work will be shared with the Faculty Senate. J. Shefner indicated that he thinks it would go a long way if the Chancellor and the Provost voiced their desire for R. Boyd to hold an open forum for the campus given the issues around transparency that have transpired. W. Davis indicated that R. Boyd is enthusiastic about holding this type of meeting. Chancellor Davis noted that he will be happy to talk with R. Boyd about placing this as a high priority.

IV. MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Faculty Senate meeting minutes of September 17, 2018, were presented for approval. Corrections include adding Stephen Marz to the attendance list and correcting the spelling for Senator McCallum. Minutes were unanimously approved with these friendly amendments.

The Faculty Senate Executive Council meeting minutes of October 1, 2018, were included as an information item.

V. REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEES

Legislative Outreach Task Force (D. Keffer)

D. Keffer is leading the legislative outreach task force as part of better telling our story, emphasizing that he has seen a great deal of good work occurring by the faculty and wants to do more to reach legislators. D. Keffer noted that he wants faculty to be perceived as a valuable resource. The charge is to help improve the legislators' understanding of what goes on at UTK, to improve perception of the value of UTK, and to establish communication channels so that the positive and negative impacts of pending bills on UTK can be relayed to the legislators. D. Keffer reviewed the features of the task force that are planned; a PowerPoint slide show is included on the senate website ([click here](#)). A sign-up sheet was distributed at the meeting for faculty volunteers. D. Keffer invited Calvin Skinner to address the senators. He is a 2003 alumni of UTK. C. Skinner represents One Knox Legacy Coalition (OKLC) which is a non-partisan effort aimed at helping to mobilize people to participate in the election but to also engage beyond election day. OKLC is cultivating a think tank to coordinate efforts to engage and empower people to be part of the political process. C. Skinner emphasized that UT is a valuable asset to the city, state, and nation; the University has a lot of power to galvanize what is going on at the city and state level. He encouraged representation from the university. The Think Tank will be held on November 17. M. Anderson reminded senators that the Little Hatch act prohibits public employees from using their official position, authority, or influence to interfere with an election or nomination for public office.

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

UFC Brief on Faculty and the University (B. MacLennan)

M. Anderson noted that the FSEC reviewed and approved changes to the Bylaws that reflect the terms of the UT Focus Act.

The consent agenda of Committee Reports was submitted with the agenda online.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

Proposed Faculty Senate Bylaws Revision on Faculty Representation to the UTK Campus Advisory Board (B. Lyons)

B. Lyons reminded senators that this process is required by the UT Focus Act. The revision comes to the Senate as a motion from the FSEC. Unanimously approved.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Resolution Concerning PPPR (to the Board of Trustees)

M. Anderson noted that as a Senate we have an opportunity to make recommendations even if we do not have the option to opt out of the PPPR policy. This resolution comes before the Senate as a motion from the FSEC. C. Craig noted there was a final "and" that needs to be removed in the Whereas statements." N. Hristov indicated concern about the clause regarding the cost of 1.2 million in lost time. She believes costs could exceed this amount. It was suggested that a friendly amendment be added to include the words "could" and "annually" to read "could cost 1.2 million dollars annually in lost time." S. Sorenson noted that the underlying assumption was that each committee member would lose four days of doing these reviews. S.

Sorenson believes this may be an over-estimation. The resolution passed, 84 voted in favor, 4 abstentions noted.

Resolution Concerning Bias in SAIS Scores (B. Schussler)

S. McCallum noted that the resolution should include EOC and TNVoice; please add the correct label. M. Griffin noted that this resolution raises a wider issue regarding the use of evaluation scores. Ever since moving to online course evaluations, the general participation has decreased; the numbers have never reached the level of participation there was previously. The data pool generating the evaluation figures is smaller than in the previous paper-based system. He would like to propose a friendly amendment regarding the larger systemic questions about the value of online evaluations. M. Anderson reminded the body that we are trying to avoid multiple revisions. D. Manderscheid indicated that the format in which data are collected can be added to the discussion. J. Shefner noted difficulty in that although student assessments of instruction are not mandated for inclusion in the current annual evaluation, it is a requirement in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*. S. Murphy raised a question regarding whether the Provost's Office is conducting the analysis or whether there will be collaboration with the faculty. D. Manderscheid indicated that the analysis can be carried out in the spirit he wishes, which is to perform the analysis collaboratively with faculty. M. Griffin asked that his friendly amendment be withdrawn. This was unanimously approved.

PPPR Campus Implementation Plan for UTK, Faculty Handbook, System Template and Campus Draft (M. Kwon)

M. Anderson introduced this item by indicating that this campus draft was a successful collaboration between the campus administration and faculty governance. This item comes as a motion from Faculty Affairs Committee. A. Ludwig asked if there would be a separate vote for UTIA; M. Anderson replied that there would be a separate vote for UTIA. The vote is to affirm the engagement of shared governance in the creation of the process laid out before the Faculty Senate today. This policy provides protections that the BOT template did not provide. M. Black asked whether the Faculty Senate has to approve this because it is part of the *Faculty Handbook*. M. Anderson explained that section 8.3 does make clear that we are bound by board policy, but as a body we are also bound to approve handbook changes. B. Lyons stated that a vote in favor of this process affirms that the administration has been responsive to the concerns that the faculty have regarding the holes present in the BOT template. He further noted that we are affirming a good working relationship with campus administration regarding the processes which will be implemented. The motion passed. There were 84 who voted in favor, 4 abstentions.

PPPR Campus Implementation Plan for UTIA, Faculty Handbook (A. Ludwig)

A Ludwig worked very closely with faculty and with Chancellor Cross for their proposed process. T. Cross noted that there is an opportunity for an experiment between the two policies. There are a few main differences between the UTK and UTIA processes: 1) professors who are appointed to the PPPR committees will serve a 3-year term with a 1/3 rotating off each year; 2) UTIA's process includes language that a faculty member could request a PPPR; 3) If there is a post tenure review committee finding for "does not meet expectations," then the process returns to the EPPR process except that a committee would be appointed as stipulated by EPPR and continues directly to an improvement plan rather than asking the faculty member to submit all the materials that would normally be required in EPPR. B. Lyons noted that with UTIA, the plan involves more materials under review initially whereas the UTK plan has the summary

assessment from the department heads but not all the Elements documents. This means that when an EPPR process is triggered at UTK, there is an opportunity for the faculty member to submit additional materials. There will be data gathered about the time expended to complete these reviews. The collection of these data is in both policies. The motion passed. There were 85 in favor, 3 abstentions.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m. by M. Anderson.

Respectfully submitted,
Sadie P. Hutson, Faculty Senate Secretary