

UTK Faculty Senate Executive Council

Committee Reports for Consent Agenda for October 7, 2019

Appeals

Faculty Senate Appeals Committee meetings, Sept 5 & 6, 2019

Attending: R. Prosser, L. Lima, M. Griffin, B. Areheart, H. Dahms, R. Koszalinshi, J. Johnson (via Zoom)

Across the two meetings we discussed the charge of our committee, possible ways to improve our procedures, and if we can enhance the perceived value of our activities.

Regarding our charge, the Faculty Handbook states that *"The jurisdiction of the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee regarding promotion and tenure includes complaints regarding failure to follow the procedures contained in the handbook and in collegiate and departmental bylaws."*

Preceding this, it states that the committee's function is *"guided by the aim of maximizing the protection of the principles of academic freedom, due process, and fairness."* Exactly how "fairness" should factor into our inquiries and decisions is not outlined. Generally, we have interpreted this to mean that we should assess whether bylaws and procedures are being followed in a consistent manner. Going beyond that, we believe, contradicts the statement in the handbook that the committee *"does not replace the role of faculty and administrators in making employment-related decisions."* That is, we are not charged with assessing whether someone *deserves* tenure/promotion/retention, but whether bylaws/procedures were followed in a consistent manner when those decisions were made. If the committee should be considering fairness more directly in appeals cases, this needs to be clarified in the Faculty Handbook. The committee also plans to look into Faculty Appeals procedures at other institutions for comparison.

The Handbook also states that *"The Faculty Senate shall provide ongoing advice and assistance for the ombudsperson on the rules and policies applicable to university faculty."* Thus, with other committee members, I plan to meet with the new ombudsperson to discuss appeals-associated procedures and how we can work together to enhance the culture of fairness and correct behavior on campus.

Regarding our procedures, one difficulty with our proceedings is our policy of not using electronic communication to distribute materials or information regarding specific appeals cases. This means that when we meet there is often a large volume of information that needs to be reviewed in a short amount of time before making decisions. In extreme cases, we have located the documents a locked room that committee members have access to in order to review materials in more detail, but that is not ideal either. I will discuss this issue with General Council to see if there are electronic means we can use to distribute materials that are safe, secure, and confidential.

Regarding the perceived value of the committee, we (the committee members) are often frustrated by the consistent pattern of the administration disagreeing with recommendations of the appeals committee that are based on extensive and detailed investigations. The

administration without fail (in my experience) declines to reverse actions that the committee has concluded are the result of improper implementation of bylaws and procedures. We cannot be sure to what extent this lack of administrative reversals has discouraged faculty from initiating appeals.

However, thinking optimistically, it is possible that our efforts have contributed to the administration directing more resources towards improving the training and culture as it pertains to assessment procedures that affect retention, promotion and tenure decisions. Recent efforts by the Provost along these lines include workshops on assessment best-practices, and additional training of new department heads, deans, and directors. If we take the perspective that our efforts regarding individual appeals cases are enhancing “*academic freedom, due process, and fairness*” overall, despite our inability to persuade the administration to reverse decisions in specific instances, this enhances our perception of the value of the committee. Importantly, this perspective should encourage faculty to utilize the appeals process when they believe they are the victim of procedures or bylaws not being followed appropriately, in that it could benefit themselves as well as the university more broadly.

Athletics

Faculty Senate Athletics Committee Report (James Williams and Bonnie Ownley)

The FS Athletics Committee met with Jason McVeigh (Associate Athletics Director for Sports Medicine) and Joe Scoggin (Senior Associate Athletics Director & Assistant Provost) on September 23, 2019 to discuss medical services available to student athletes. Jason explained that services provided to student-athletes range from emergency services to wide-ranging specialty physicians. In the late 1990’s services relied on Student Health physicians; currently the Athletics Department provides primary care physicians in the training room. The schedules of student-athletes are very full and one of the goals of the medical team is to increase efficiencies of medical services as they work around student schedules. In addition to their physical wellbeing, they also provide mental health services and team psychiatry. Student-athletes may experience significant of pressure due to expectations. The medical team feels that it is important to destigmatize mental health and they are working with coaches to help them understand the mental health challenges of student-athletes. Kristen Martin is the Director of Mental Health/Wellness on the Sports Medicine team

Medical services are provided to all student-athletes for all injuries. In 2018, the NCAA had a rule change and UTK now provides two years of medical insurance beyond when the student separates from the university for documented injuries. If student-athletes are not self-insured, the Athletics Department will purchase a policy for them. The Athletics Department currently processes approximately \$4M in claims annually.

Committee members asked how faculty could help injured student–athletes. It was explained that there is a formal process in place involving both mobility and brain injuries. They also have a concussion protocol in place. They watch injured players for behavioral issues related to any injury and have a communication plan in place to identify developing problems as soon as possible. Staff members, many of whom have had experience as student-athletes, are player mentors and encourage them when they are having a difficult time.

Committee members asked how knowledge of a player's injuries is affected by the new Tennessee state law that allows sports betting on intercollegiate athletics. The medical team said that this was a challenge. The Southeastern Conference has an oversight attorney focused on player injuries and sports betting. Those who have knowledge are not supposed to use this as insider information for betting. But it's difficult to control the information flow when university employees and classmates see obvious signs of injury when a player attends class. In addition, there are a large number of undergraduate students who work in the Athletics Department. The FS Athletics Committee will have a meeting in the spring devoted to the challenges of sports betting and the impact on intercollegiate athletics programs. The next meeting will be October 21st, and the topic will be academic support programs and academic success metrics for student-athletes.

Benefits and Professional Development Committee

Date: 9/27/19

Attendees: Alexander Lapins, Stephanie Madison, Angela Rollins, Reza Seddighi, Edward Yu

Discussed action item #1 from agenda - "Coordinate with Non-Tenure Track Committee and Teaching & Learning Committee regarding their priorities for faculty development. Take this information to the office of Teaching & Learning Innovation to clarify what is already available and what more could be made available."

Discussed that the request from NTTF to support profession development as part of the lecture workload distribution is probably beyond the scope of our committee.

We are still waiting for more information from the teaching and learning committee before moving forward with action item #1.

The Non-Tenure-Track Committee requested that we establish a liaison between their committee and our committee and Dr. Madison has volunteered to serve as that liaison.

Action item #2 -"Establish discounted rates at non-UT exercise facilities (gyms)."

- Discussed UT-based benefits versus insurance-based benefits
- Discussed that some gyms have discounts that aren't advertised
- Plan to find out what gyms currently have UT discounts by developing a gym list using a google doc
- Plan to contact blue cross/blue shield and Cigna to determine what gym membership benefits are available.

Other topics

Discussed maternity-related parking issues and plan to follow-up with Misty to determine where and why the proposal approved by the faculty senate has not moved forward.

Dr. Madison plans to ask what the future plans for expansion for ELC are. We also discussed how ELC enrolls students.

Budget and Planning

September 23, 2019

Attendees: Beth Schussler, Ken Baker, Lisa Driscoll, Alex Rodrigues, Tamah Fridman, Lou Gross, and Chris Cimino

Beth reviewed the committee goals for the year and asked for volunteers for tasks.

We discussed the UT system budget analysis we started last year. Chris showed us various ways we could access information regarding the system and each campuses' budget.

- Budget.tennessee.edu: Budget approved by the BOT.
- treasurer.tennessee.edu: The annual Report of the Treasurer.
- [System-wide transparency](#) database: Ongoing project within UT admin to allow easy access to data; some items uploaded, others still in progress.

Lou suggested we pursue questions about return on investment in student success and advising positions and investments to meet the needs of the growing student body.

Chris provided an overview of the Budget Remodel process to the committee. He indicated there would be a website associated with the process soon and will be a couple forums this fall we should be aware of. The steering committee will discuss different ways to approach the model, but will not make the final decision. Chris is happy to update our committee on the process and / or we could ask Huron Consultants to visit with us. Once the University decides on the new budget model, they will test it in parallel with the current model over the next year. Chris then reviewed with us the budget process for this year. We decided to start meetings with the Vice Chancellors earlier this year and only have one visit per meeting. We will likely focus on Athletics, Research, Provost. We may meet with Advancement. Chris can provide us with info on Finance and Administration.

Tamah then provided us with information she had collected about NTTF faculty salaries at other universities.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:10 pm

Diversity and Inclusion Committee

Monday, 9/23/2019, Meeting Summary

Committee members in attendance: Samareh Abdoli (Nursing) Jason Brown (Art/CDI), Matthew Castillo (Engineering), Freida Herron (Social Work), Srinivasan (Rajan) Mahadevan (Psychology) Lori Amber Roessner (Co-Chair, Journalism), Michelle Violanti (College of Communication), Richard Wood (Engineering).

The Diversity & Inclusion committee of the Faculty Senate convened at 3 p.m. September 23, 2019.

After discussing announcements (i.e., the two-day Pen America symposium, entitled Free Speech, Hate Speech, and the Future of Campus Community, including faculty workshop from 10 a.m. to noon on Oct. 3; the next meeting time and location: 3 p.m. Oct. 28, COM 207, (<https://maps.utk.edu/?id=314>) and engaging in a debrief conversation regarding university response to two recent incidents of hate speech at the Rock, we focused our conversation around programmatic initiatives planned for the academic year, in particular our proposed campus dialogue on Hidden Difference at the University of Tennessee [with a panel of faculty participants who will consider invisible diversity (i.e., sexual orientation, class, religion, age, regionalism, and other categories) as it relates to theories of intersectionality and conversations based in personal experience about identity, inclusion, and engagement on March 5th or 26th]. Rajan Mahadevan graciously agreed to consider faculty experts who might be willing to facilitate the campus dialogue around hidden difference, and we all agreed to come to the next meeting with ideas for recommended faculty, staff, and student panelists with a hidden difference who might be willing to serve as panelists. Following the discussion, we considered two items of new business: a) the appointment of a CDI representative [Jason Brown graciously agreed to serve as our representative for the remainder of the academic year] and b) Gary Skolits' proxy request for recommended data tracking elements and questions for the annual faculty survey. Please send me any recommendations that you might have no later than 5 p.m. this Thursday.

The co-chairs will circulate an agenda and a logistical reminder in advance of the Oct. 28 meeting.

Faculty Affairs

The Faculty Affairs Committee met on Monday September 30th to (1) discuss an updated audit of college and department bylaws, (2) to review a new appendix to Chapter 4 of the Faculty Handbook, (3) discuss prior work the committee completed on a policy on bullying for the Faculty Handbook, and (4) discussed handbook language at the conclusion of Chapter 5 on the termination of non-tenure track faculty. Minutes will be posted soon.

Graduate Council

- [GC Minutes - August 29, 2019](#)

Library and Technology

- No report

Nominations and Appointments

- No report

Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee

Non-Tenure Track Issues (NTTI) Committee Meeting

September 23, 2019 at 3:00pm in Hodges 252

Present: Crystal McAlvin, Laurie Knox, Samantha Murphy, Jennifer Jordan, Sarah Eldridge, Anne Langendorfer, Anne Ho, Brooke Killion (Faculty Senate GRA), Kristina Gehrman, Rossy Toledo

Absent: Pedro Tomás-Mitchell

Call to order. Members of NTTI started with a round of introductions.

Updates and New Business:

1. Update on FH and MFE (more on this later): L. Knox said that Chapter 4 has been implemented, but there is more work to be done, and administrators are just realizing what the details of this are. The FH is on the Provost's website (<https://facultyhandbook.utk.edu/>), but the appendix and the MFE revisions are still being discussed. C. McAlvin confirmed that there is a note on the Provost's site to explicitly say that there are still revisions to the document.
2. Reports from various members on "liaison" contact emails and responses:
 - a. The co-chairs discussed that all Faculty Senate committees have some overlap with NTTI, but not all of these issues are ones that are solely for us to address. The idea of reaching out is to try to get the other committees to work on these areas of overlap.
 - b. Anne L. had written a template, and we all reached out to other committees to see where they are.
 - c. Various members took turns with their updates. Details are linked on this [notes document](#) and [this liaison contact list](#) (both of which are in the Liaison Project folder of our shared Google NTTI Team Drive).
 - d. One of our concrete goals for NTTI is to collect data on NTTF (Brooke Killion will check on deadlines for this). Two methods that were discussed:
 - i. Survey the faculty - Brooke Killion joined the conversation here and mentioned that she can help with incorporating NTT questions for all faculty or with a separate NTTF survey. Pros and cons were discussed for this: one survey for all faculty is only one email, but a separate NTTF survey might get more NTTF responses.
 - ii. Make a formal data request (ORIA - institutional data on things like workload, salaries, etc.). This will be done by approximately the end of October.
3. Short discussion of new "Survive and Thrive" website being produced by the TLI for adjunct faculty: https://teaching.utk.edu/adjunct_kit/. Are there things to add? If so, please email L. Knox and C. McAlvin.
4. Homework: Look over the survey that Brooke Killion sent to all of us. Think about which types of questions we want to ask on this in comparison with the formal data request. Also, follow-up appropriately on the various liaisons.

- a. Questions to start (from K. Gehrman): What are the research and travel funds for NTTF at the department level? Discretionary funds? How is parental leave done in your department?
- b. Data request idea: gender, race/ethnicity breakdown for TT vs. NTTF and part-time faculty

Adjournment

Research Council

- [RC Minutes of Meeting - September 11, 2019](#)

Teaching and Learning Council

- No report – Meeting set for October 16th.

Undergraduate Council

- [UC Summary of September 10, 2019](#)
- [UC Minutes of Meeting - September 10, 2019](#)

University System Relations Committee

University/System Relations Committee Meeting 9/25/2019

Present: Misty Anderson, Marcy Souza, David Keffer, Pat Rutenberg, Bruce MacLennan, Jennifer Tourville, Gary Skolits

UTIA/UTK Land Grant Mission:

We discussed the recent announced reunification of the two campuses and the concerns that have emerged about shared governance, process, and System/Campus relationships. Out of the concerns has also emerged that Ag's historically good relationship with legislature, could be compromised by other negatives about UTK. We also discussed how these reactions might be a way for the board to understand what broken trust means and how good process and shared governance can help repair it. Posting comments on a website or via email doesn't do it. We discussed helping to show what shared governance means and mapping out shared governance goals. Better process leads to better outcomes. We also want to communicate to the Board that change doesn't happen without faculty being engaged, being excited, and sharing institutional goals. We also want to avoid the narrative that the Campus is the problem, or that we are resistant to change when we are advocated for better shared governance process.

ORI

We reviewed the presentation from Stacey Patterson and David Manderscheid and agreed that most of the 15 questions we supplied in advance remained unanswered. Our committee will continue to pursue those questions, with an additional question about the future of the Joint Institutes, and will request to see some schedule for upcoming interactions with faculty about developing ORI plans. Anderson conveyed the basic sense of the Research Council's latest minutes, which capture some of the key points of the ORI initiatives as described so far and recommend specific goals for next steps with regard to process. One of its recommendations was the addition of two more faculty members to the Steering committee. We discussed

possible nominees to recommend, including Governor's Chair Bill Webber and Professor of Chemistry Craig Barnes. (**note: since the date of this meeting, Professor Soren Sorenson has been added to the Steering Committee.) We hope that the conversations with the Steering Committee and the committee chairs will help to clarify the lines of authority between System and Campus.

Graduate Council, Research Council, and the System Relations committees will also be jointly asking for meeting with Dixie Thompson and David Manderscheid to discuss the APR of the Bredesen Center and future of graduate education. We discussed also asking the key deans (Terpenny, Lee) to consider the following questions. How is the Campus's authority to admit and educate graduate students protected? How can we make sure that we're not waiting 5 years to assess graduate education in Bredesen Center? What are their reactions to the Bredesen APR and graduation rates? We see this as a time to act on our responsibilities as the educators and researchers whose programs will be affected by the new formation. We also shared our concern that the way this is being run is an insult to the Provost's office. How will the System support the Campus and the Campus's authority in admission, curriculum, and graduate education? Anderson will work with Patterson and Kilbey to reach out to Dean Thompson and Provost Manderscheid. We hope to discuss the questions above and talk about System/Campus lines of authority going forward.

Interacting with the Board and the System

Our committee has a particular remit to interact with the System and the Board, though since the change of the structure of the Board of Trustees and the disappearance of a faculty trustee, the appropriate channels for that interaction have been unclear. We discussed that in the past we had invited Board members to our Senate retreat, though with mixed results. We agreed that we should stay open to that idea in the future. We also discussed making some overture to the Board members who might be involved in Ag Day (October 5), and that we would ask to reach out to the board about contact in early Nov. Souza agreed to reach out about the Ag Day involvement, and Anderson agreed to talk to Chancellor Plowman and Provost Manderscheid about other interactions with the Board. It will be important that we work through/with our Campus toward positive and informed interactions with the Board. We will also have a conversation around shared governance at the request of Chancellor Plowman at our next FSEC meeting, which could provide the basis for some clearer examples of best practices and future interactions.

Survey and Goals

We agreed that our concerns were well represented by last years' FS survey and do not have additional items at this time. We have already accomplished a few of our goals, including inviting VP Stacey Patterson to present to the Senate (along with Manderscheid and Nobles), preparing questions in advance of that presentation, and attending a brainstorming/listening session about the UTIA/UTK reunification. The upcoming chairs committee should also advance our goal of clarifying the System and Campus roles in the new Institute arrangements and establishing some schedule for points of interaction with faculty about the remaining process that would make concrete the process of shared governance.