

UTK Faculty Senate Executive Council

Committee Reports for Consent Agenda for November 5, 2018

Appeals

- No report

Athletics

Summary Report from September 24, 2018 Meeting

Our committee had Don Bruce share about the significance of his role in regard to faculty senate, faculty, athletics, and outside stakeholders. This meeting lasted for an hour and 10 minutes. We also discussed this year's initiatives to fortify the relationship between faculty and athletics, informing the committee about Misty and James's video series to demonstrate relationships of faculty members and athletes. Committee members shared ideas about how to improve our video series initiatives, such as probing deeper into the impact that sports have on their desire to pursue lifelong learning. We have not met since our September's meeting, but we plan on scheduling a meeting prior to Thanksgiving break.

Our future meeting will discuss issues that might be impacting our diverse populous of students, to emphasis the importance of Dr. Davis and President Boyd's diversity goals. We will examine and explore effective ways to ensure all student athletes have an equitable voice on this campus, pushing this under "MY ALL and VOL NATION" agenda. This meeting will be held at some different sporting facility to provide committee members with an experience as a student-athlete on campus.

James A Williams, PhD, DM, CHE, CC

Benefits and Professional Development Committee

- No report

Budget and Planning

Budget & Planning Committee (FSB&P) October 8, 2018 Meeting

Attendance: Larry McKay (chair), Ken Baker, Chris Cimino, Lisa Driscoll, Lou Gross, Sean Schaeffer & Beth Schussler

- Introduced members of the FSB&P committee (revised member list attached).
- Scheduling of meetings. Will continue to schedule most meetings for the Monday before the Faculty Senate Meeting. Time is 3:30 pm and location is Strong Hall 611.
- Discussed summary of 2017-18 FSB&P committee activities (previously sent to committee). This covered all of the major FSB&P activities and was used to help inform decisions for priorities outlined below. In some cases, comments from the 2017-18 discussion are rolled into the discussion of 2018-19 priorities.

High Priorities for 2018-19

1. Faculty Salary Analysis (annual). Extensive discussion of how/if the data is used. Faculty, Heads and Deans use it for hires, negotiations, etc. Cimino (VC F&A) did not think the survey played a role in deciding faculty raises. Senator concerned that some units have seen greater growth in salaries relative to others, partly because of higher level hires in some units (the rich get richer, for percentage-based raises). Senator felt that with changes in Chancellor/Provost/BOT, this might be a good time to request a greater role for FSB&P in advising on raise priorities (ex. minimum raise levels for staff, per capita raise

pools rather than percentages, etc.). Senator asked whether it was feasible to include non-TT faculty salaries in survey? Senator asked why GTA raises are not considered annually and in the same pool as raises for faculty & staff? Long discussion of GTA stipend history. Baker, Driscoll and Baker volunteered to lead effort for faculty salary analysis in current year.

2. Efforts to Increase Transparency in UT and UTK Budget Process. In recent years, FSB&P met with senior administrators (Chancellor, Provost, Graduate Dean, Athletic Director, etc.). Concluded that this was useful and will invite administrators to meet with us again this year. Would like to include Interim President, Randy Boyd (will discuss with FS president). Topics for current year, carried over from last year, will likely include: a) budget priorities, b) rate of increase of UT System budget, relative to UTK budget, c) request for Athletic contribution towards UTK academic costs, d) athletic budget and cash reserves, e) risk of future athletic financial crises related to coach buyouts, capital projects, etc. and their possible impact on academics. McKay will set up a calendar and start inviting administrators.

3. Possible Changes in the UTK Budget Model. Cimino (VC F&A) indicated that he has had discussions with Provost Manderscheid on the possibility of a major revision of the Budget model. A revision will inevitably have different impacts on different units. Process is likely to take 1-2 years and Cimino expects they will make a decision on whether to start the process this fall (within a month or two). FSB&P would like to be involved in the revision process, along with other groups at UTK. This could be a major effort for FSB&P for the next couple of years.

4. Graduate Student Stipends, Workload and Related Issues. FSB&P made some progress getting info on stipend levels and distribution of tuition waivers last year, but data is complex and much of it is still difficult to access (password protected). New funds (\$1M) were promised for this year, but B&P has received very little info on how they will be allocated. Will likely continue to focus on GTAs this year, but GRAs will remain a concern for future years. FSB&P would like the assessment to expand to include how GTAs and tuition waivers are allocated, as well as disparities in GTA workload and quality of work environment. There was a discussion of ORE efforts to repurpose Science Alliance Graduate Stipend support for STEM departments (\$800K in CAS and \$94K in COE), which could put a great strain on these departments. The status of this effort will likely be part of the FSB&P assessment. McKay, Schussler and Schaeffer agreed to lead effort on Grad Student support/workload issues.

5. Follow up to Living Wage study carried out in 2017-18. Ensure that UTK continues to look at minimum across the board raises for the lowest paid workers. Invite Mary Lucal, AVC Human Resources, to report to FSB&P committee on staff salaries, raises and the new staff job classifications that are in the process of being implemented. <http://senate.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2018/04/2017-2018-Living-Wage-Report-4-17-2018.pdf>

Lower Priorities

6. Tracking Costs of Periodic Post-tenure Performance Reviews (PPPR). FSB&P is interested in the result of tracking, but should not be the group to track the costs.

NEXT MEETING

- Monday, November 12 at 3:30 pm in Strong Hall 611
- Agenda will include a presentation by Chris Cimino (VS F&A) on possible scenarios for new budget models

Diversity and Inclusion Committee

Monday, 10/08/2018, Meeting Summary

Committee members in attendance: Jennifer Akerman (Architecture), Brian Ambroziak (Architecture, at large), Joel Anderson (Nursing), Jason Brown (Art) Amber Roessner (Journalism), Casey Sams (Theater), Jessica Westerhold (Classics)

The Diversity & Inclusion committee of the Faculty Senate convened on October 8.

Members present engaged in a follow-up discussion related to recent discussions with Interim Chancellor Wayne Davis; Provost David Manderscheid; Matthew Theriot, Associate Provost for Faculty Development and Strategic Initiatives; and Bonnie Johnson, Coordinator of the Pride Center about the status of recent reports related to diversity & inclusion submitted by Diversity Champions and various campus commissions, the recent Princeton Review findings, and the status of the Pride Center.

Based upon the assessment of our charge and the existing conditions at the University of Tennessee, members present determined our mission— to serve as Faculty Senate voice about campus matters involving diversity & inclusion—and prioritized our goals for the academic year, which include: facilitating communication among various committees and committees focused on issues related to diversity and inclusion; calling for more transparency and accountability from campus officials surrounding issues related to diversity and inclusion; offering assistance to CDI & the Commissions on the Diversity Summit; and working with TUFs to monitor Tennessee legislation that adversely affects the university's diversity & inclusion goals.

Based upon the determination of these goals, our committee will reach out to Theriot to request monthly D&I progress reports and to chairs of committees and commissions related to diversity and inclusion to offer assistance and to request regular status updates.

Faculty Affairs

Report of the October 31, 2018 Meeting

Submitted by: Michelle Kwon, Chair

Committee Members:

Michelle Kwon, Chair	Todd Freeberg
Misty Anderson	Nathalie Hristov
Monica Black	Beauvais Lyons
David Butler	David Patterson
Jennifer Fowler	Phyllis Thompson

1. Post-Tenure Periodic Performance Review (PPPR)
 - a. 10-15-18: PPPR campus procedures approved by Faculty Senate. To be submitted to the Board of Trustees for November 2018 meeting.
2. Chapter 4 Revisions (Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues)
 - a. 9-23-18: Received OGC comments to revisions approved by the Faculty Senate to Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook*.
 - b. 10-17-18: Met with Laurie Knox and Crystal McAlvin, co-chairs of Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee, to discuss John Zomchick's and OGC's comments. M. Kwon to compile these comments and submit to Zomchick.
 - c. 10-25-18: Met with Zomchick and Misty Anderson. Requested meeting with Zomchick and OGC.

3. Academic Bullying
 - a. 10-3-18: M. Kwon emailed draft academic bullying provisions for inclusion in Chapter 2 of the *Faculty Handbook* to Jenny Richter, Director of Office of Equity and Diversity; Bill Nugent, Faculty Ombudsperson; and Elaine Wynn, Staff Ombudsperson.
 - b. 10-30-18: Nathalie Hristov met with Faculty and Staff Ombudspersons to discuss academic bullying definition.
4. Chapter 3 revisions to implement sections of Board Policy (BT0006) without substantive change or adaptation
 - a. 10-15-18: Received proposed language from J. Zomchick.
 - b. 10-29-18: Deadline to receive comments from Faculty Affairs Committee members
5. Chapter 3 revisions to implement sections of Board Policy (BT0006) that require Board approval (early tenure consideration draft)
 - a. 10-22-18: Received proposed language from J. Zomchick
 - b. 10-23-18: M. Kwon sent initial comments to J. Zomchick
 - c. 10-24-18: J. Zomchick sent revised comments
 - d. 10-24-18: Board deadline extended until February

Graduate Council

Draft of September 27th Minutes

Prepared by Dr. Mehmet Aydeniz-Graduate Council Chair

Minutes of the Graduate Council's August 23, 2018 meeting were approved electronically on September 13, 2018.

Committee Reports

Academic Policy Committee:

Academic Policy Committee received two proposals for review.

Proposal one: revise the Admissions Standards text concerning other accrediting entities.

Proposal two: revise the academic standing policy to where the student's record will be reviewed after completing 3 hours instead of 9. This will alert the student and the department earlier that the student is on probation and struggling.

Both proposals were discussed in detail. After discussion, APC voted and unanimously approved both the above proposals. Graduate Council voted unanimously to approve both APC proposals.

Appeals Committee:

The Appeals Committee met and reviewed two appeals. After careful review, both appeals were denied and sent to Dean Thompson.

Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee received two submissions for review.

College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences proposal: Department of Retail, Hospitality, and Tourism Management had slight revisions to courses and revised requirements for their PhD program.

Haslam College of Business proposal: revised the Supply Chain Management major, MS, to add two concentrations – Integrated Supply Chain concentration and Tri-Continent Supply Chain concentration. After discussion, all items were approved and are recommended to Graduate Council for approval. Graduate Council voted unanimously to approve the Curriculum report as presented.

Dr. Sarah Pruett, Director, **Research Integrity Compliance**, Office of Research and Engagement provided an overview of the procedures for reporting alleged misconduct and plagiarism claims.

Administrative Reports and Announcements:

Deans Update:

- The Directors of Graduate Studies workshop is Wednesday, October 10.
- Money has been set aside to address our graduate stipends, for those that are on fee waivers.
- The Graduate School needs a copy of all Departmental Graduate Student Handbooks.
- The Graduate Associate Deans are working on the 3MT plans for spring 2019.

Graduate Student Senate:

- Constitution and Bylaws.
- The first travel awards were announced.

Graduate Council Chair:

- The Standing Committees are working to produce a Procedures Manual
- We will also review our Bylaws this year as the Credentials Committee is no longer a viable committee.

Library and Technology

Following our first committee meeting of the year on October 19, 2018, the following have been chosen as our actionable Priorities, Goals, and Objectives for 2018-2019.

1. Cybersecurity for Students and Faculty, and Staff
 - How many significant attacks has UTK had in the last 2 years and on specifically what areas of our infrastructure? Were we breached and was any data compromised? If so, what?
 - What policies, procedures, and software are used protect student data (especially grades and administrative records) and faculty and staff data (especially HR records, personnel information, and research data)?
2. Open Access Options
 - Benefits for faculty (and stakeholders) for submitting research to open access journals? Drawbacks to same, and actions we can take to mitigate?
 - Benefits for faculty and students if faculty adopt low cost/free openly licensed textbooks for UTK courses? Drawbacks and possible remedies?
3. Online Courses, Degree Programs, and Certifications
 - Largely fragmented across the colleges and departments, who is offering what right now?
 - Even with campus leadership changes, what is the campus plan for online positioning in the market? Are we planning to grow our campus level resources now, or are the college/units going to have to continue to piecemeal their our technology, resources, and quality assurance?

Other Areas of Interest

4. Classroom Technology
 - Could we/should we look at benchmarking our “minimum available” classroom technology to peer and aspirational schools?
 - Do we have any gaps that we already believe need to be addressed?

5. Library Layout

- What are the current plans for Hodges Library in terms of remodeling, renovations, or reconfigurations as the definition of a undergraduate student library continues to change?

The follow-up to setting priorities during the year is 1) asking OIT or Libraries to make a series of approximately 45 minute presentations to the committee at our scheduled meetings, and 2) also to report our finding, recommendations, and action plans to the full faculty senate during the course of the year.

Nominations and Appointments

- No report

Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee

- Working with Faculty Affairs Chair Michelle Kwon, we are moving toward a resolution of a few concerns raised by Vice Provost Zomchick about Chapter 4 in the Faculty Handbook, based on his discussions with the university's General Council. At the request of President Anderson, we are also looking into the use of Elements with NTTF. We conducted a survey to see how departments are currently using Elements with NTTF (there is great variation) and have drafted a list of questions for Vice Provost Zomchick that we hope can inform policy discussions. Finally, we have formed subcommittees to develop guidelines and best practices that can help administrators implement the new Faculty Handbook, in anticipation of its approval by the BOT.

Questions about the use of Elements with NTT Faculty

Compiled by the NTTI Committee and presented as a draft on Oct. 29, 2018

Questions about the System

1. How flexible/adaptable is the Elements system as a way to represent different kinds of productivity? Is it a good fit for the ways that NTTF contribute to their disciplines? It seems to be nimble in reporting on conventional research publication, but users report that it is time-consuming and a poor fit for other kinds of productivity. For NTTF, important contributions might include patents, peer teaching observations, creative work, community outreach, pedagogical innovations, workshops offered and attended, updated syllabi and teaching materials, adoption of new teaching technologies, etc. If Elements makes it hard to report these kinds of activities, is there a better system that accommodates a wider range of ways that faculty are productive?
2. Is training available for faculty/units that use Elements effectively, especially for faculty whose activities don't fit the conventional 'research-and-publish' model?
3. Does Elements talk to other systems such as TNVoice?
4. What policies/technologies are in place for aggregating, sharing and using the information that is collected in Elements? Who has access to Elements profiles? Who has access to aggregated information from Elements, such as number of courses taught overall or number of publications by department? How is the information from various Elements profiles aggregated for various users and uses?
5. We know that NTTF who are not "using" Elements actually have Elements profiles that have been partially populated by automatically uploaded information, but these profiles are incomplete. This raises two questions: How is the information on these incomplete profiles currently being used and integrated into the overall system? And is it possible to delete the Element profiles of NTTF who have been told that they are not required to use it?

Questions about Elements as an “Authoritative Record “ of Activity/Productivity

1. The Provost’s website says that “Elements serves as authoritative record of each faculty member’s teaching, research/scholarship/creative, and service activities.” What do you mean by “authoritative record”? If NTTF are not included in this record, is it possible to get an accurate picture of unit/college/system-wide productivity? (We are concerned both about the skewed picture this might give of a department’s productivity and the invisibility of NTT productivity)
2. The provost’s website says, “Beginning in the 2017–2018 academic year, a faculty member’s annual activity report, which is required by the *Faculty Handbook* for the annual performance review, will be drawn from the profile in Elements.” This has not been the case for NTTF. In fact, there is still great variability across hiring units in what kind of information is required for annual review of NTTF and how it is reported. There is also inconsistency across hiring units in whether NTTF are required to use Elements. Is this inconsistency a problem? What is the value that the Provost’s office sees in a uniform, unified record of productivity? Does that value apply to NTTF as well?
3. Vice-Provost Zomchick has mentioned in meeting that administrators might use Elements to identify experts in given areas when they get requests from the community. If NTTF are not in Elements, we won’t be searchable for this function. Is that a problem?
4. We see some potential benefits in using Elements for NTTF--e.g. simplifying evaluation, keeping our work visible and accounted for as part of our hiring unit’s productivity, joining the university’s list of experts who can be referred for outreach-- but If NTTF are required to use Elements, will it replace or supplement the kinds of reporting we already do? We are wary of adding an extra layer of paperwork to our jobs without compensation.

Research Council

- No report

Teaching and Learning Council

- No report.

Tennessee University Faculty Senate

Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) met on October 19-21, 2018 on the East Tennessee State University (ETSU) campus. TUFS is an independent consortium of faculty senate presidents and campus representatives from the 10 public 4-year universities across Tennessee. Misty Anderson (UTK Faculty Senate President), Bonnie Ownley, (TUFS President) and Gary Skolits (UTK Faculty Senate President-elect) represented UTK/UTIA. TUFS members were hosted by ETSU President Brian Nolan and Donna Nolan for dinner and discussions. TUFS members met with State Representative David Hawk (Greene County), who carried the UT-FOCUS Act legislation for the governor’s office and engaged in meaningful discussions on numerous higher education issues, including the value of tenure. Hawk encouraged TUFS faculty to interact with legislators. During the business session, campus issues focused on post-tenure review, relationships between faculty senates and governing boards, impact of Tennessee Promise, credit for dual enrollment and AP courses, impact of K-12 testing, and potential legislation that would impact higher education in 2019. Austin Peay reported that they now have 6-wk paid parental leave. TUFS members are working on developing messages about the role of tenure and 4-yr institutions in developing students who can think and do. More information on TUFS can be found at <http://tnfacultyssenates.org/>.

Undergraduate Council

[Approved Minutes from 10/16 Meeting](#)

Summary report for October 16, 2018:

Submitted by Robert Mindrup, Chair

- Academic Policy – No report.
- Advising – (September 18) Information items only, including to plans to assess the purpose and intent of the Advising Committee moving forward.
- Curriculum – (October 2) Several course and program changes to take effect in fall 2019 were presented. First, the College of Architecture and Design proposed adding several courses. The Graphic Design program is moving from The College of Arts and Sciences to the College of Architecture and Design. A specific migration plan, including but not limited to the financial structure of course fees has been agreed upon by both colleges. The College of Social Work added several new electives as well as revised several courses that included credit hour changes. Additionally, the College of Social Work will add an online program specifically designed for transfer students that will mirror the Knoxville campus program in scope and content. No THEC approval is necessary since the online program curriculum and requirements are identical to the Knoxville campus program. Finally, the formation of the Contemporary Issues and Solutions (CIS) subcommittee was approved. This subcommittee will be responsible for reviewing all curricular submissions within this new category. Additionally, the CIS statement of purpose and learning objectives were discussed and approved.

All proposals aforementioned were approved unanimously with minor edits to the CIS statement of purpose and learning objectives.

- General Education – (September 12) The committee voted to delay implementation of the new General Education Curriculum by at least one year, making the current effective date fall 2021. With the decision to delay implementation, the plan to form a new General Education Implementation Task Force was discussed and approved. Members of this task force include members representing faculty, academic advising, university registrar, associate deans, and members associated with articulation and transfer operations. This task force will plan to finalize a revised implementation calendar for the November 14 committee meeting. Statements of purpose and learning objectives for the following new general education categories were presented and approved: Applied Arts and Humanities, Applied Oral Communication, and Global Citizenship International. Final draft statements of purpose and learning objectives for the other new General Education categories are due by the October 10 committee meeting. Final course proposal forms for each new General Education category are due by the November 14 committee meeting.
- Appeals – No report.
- Associate Deans - No report.
- Other: The council also reviewed and discussed two proposals to amend the UG Bylaws and Operating Guidelines. One proposal was intended to clarify and revise ex-officio membership to the UG council as some positions identified had either changed or no longer existed. The other proposal added language to include the ability to hold a secret ballot for election of a Vice-chair when more than one candidate is nominated.

University System Relations Committee

- 9/24/2018 - The USR Committee met to discuss priority items for the next few months, including information related to Periodic Post-tenure Review (PTR), the status of capital outlay projects on the UTK/UTIA campus, and anticipated legislation that would impact higher education. Regarding PTR, concern was expressed that more information was needed to conclude that several of our peer and aspirational peer institutions have PTR processes similar to the one that has been instituted by the

UT Board of Trustees. Initial review has suggested that many post-tenure reviews at other institutions were triggered reviews, such as Enhanced Post-tenure Performance Review (EPPR), which we also have. A subcommittee was formed to provide more information. Regarding legislation, it was decided that the committee would meet with members of the UT Advocacy group to discuss potential legislation for the coming year. Regarding capital outlay, concern was expressed about a potential shift of state funds from 4-year to 2-year institutions. It was decided that the committee would meet with campus administration to discuss the process by which capital projects are proposed as well as the status of current ones.

- 10/16/2018 – The USR Committee met with Anthony Haynes to discuss legislation that could be proposed in 2019. Items included a bill that would financially penalize universities for subsequent low performance of their graduates who were K-12 teachers and bills focused on tenure.
- 10/30/2018 – The USR Committee met with Chris Cimino to discuss the process of proposing and funding approval for capital outlay projects, competition with Locally Governed Institutions (LGIs, formerly Tennessee Board of Regents 4-year universities) for funding, and the priority and status of future/current projects. Other topics included sources of funding for the new University Center and placement of various units in the UC, gender neutral restrooms, and the impact of Public Chapter 929 on a campus alcohol policy and on any other policy that would impact Tennessee citizens.