

Faculty Senate Executive Council
November 4, 2019
MINUTES

Present: Misty Anderson, Joel Anderson, Sadie Hutson, David Keffer, Michael Kilbey, Laurie Knox, Beauvais Lyons, Bruce MacLennan, David Manderscheid, Bonnie Ownley, David Patterson, Rebecca Prosser, Beth Schussler, Gary Skolits, Rob Spirko, Shawn Spurgeon, Anthony Welch

Guests: Monica Black, Vincent Carilli, Todd Freeberg, Lou Gross, Nathalie Hristov, Lucy Jewel, Andrea Ludwig, Mary McAlpin, Todd Moore, Donde Plowman

I. CALL TO ORDER

G. Skolits called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Executive Council meeting of October 7, 2019, were presented for approval. B. Lyons moved for approval, M. Anderson seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

President's Report (G. Skolits)

G. Skolits welcomed everyone and noted that the work has been completed with the end of course (EOC) task force. This will be on a future agenda and posted on the website. D. Manderscheid provided thanks to the committee for their work. G. Skolits asked the FSEC to reserve the January 13 meeting of the Senate as there will be undergraduate curricular matters that will need to be addressed.

UTK Chancellor's Report (D. Plowman)

D. Plowman shared that a small contingency of leaders (R. Nobles, T. Small, K. Aldridge, P. Hauptman) traveled to UTHSC in Memphis to brainstorm ways in which the institutions could strategically collaborate more fully. The group connected on ideas related to the Oak Ridge Institute and engagement with UT Medical Center. There will be another meeting forthcoming. D. Plowman discussed the departure of R. Nobles. A meeting is scheduled to explore suggestions regarding an interim appointment. Plans are already underway to contract with a search firm for this important position for UTK. G. Skolits and M. Anderson have been asked to provide names of individuals from the Senate to serve on the search committee. D. Plowman noted that the UTIA unification task force has provided a report and a memo from T. Cross, D. Plowman, and R. Boyd which will be made available to the campus. The most significant priority moving forward is that authority for the instructional budget will rest with UTIA; this will allow UTIA to participate in the new budget model as a stand-alone unit. In addition, five smaller operational workgroups will be established that will focus on several key areas. B. Lyons noted his gratitude for the meeting with UTHSC to enable it to connect more fully with the system regarding research alignment. He also noted that it was positive to see United at the Rock as a feature in the Chancellor's Monthly message. D. Plowman noted that the cameras have been installed at the rock and can be viewed at <https://therock.utk.edu>. L. Gross asked whether anyone from St. Jude's was present at the meeting at UTHSC to discuss biomedical engineering given that UTK faculty can provide expertise in this area. D. Plowman said she would explore this further. D. Plowman explained that there has been some discussion regarding the naming

of the Office of Research and Engagement (ORE) as engagement overlaps with both ORE and Diversity and Engagement. D. Plowman also noted that ORE may be renamed in the future.

Provost's Report (D. Manderscheid)

D. Manderscheid announced that Dr. Ellen McIntyre has been named as the new Dean of the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences and will begin on January 21, 2020. He also noted that the search for the Vice Provost for Student Success is moving along quickly and a recommendation from the search committee should be coming forward this week. Another item of note is that a group of lecturers presented a petition to increase the minimum pay for various grades of lecturers. J. Zomchick has begun work on lecturer salary benchmarking with peer and aspirational schools.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Shared Governance (D. Plowman)

D. Plowman expressed her thanks to the FSEC for the revised document on shared governance. She noted agreement on the principles and wanted to respond to a few of the practices of healthy shared governance noted in the document. D. Plowman emphasized that one thing we lack is a place where faculty, students, staff, and administrators gather together; it is not necessarily the best idea to have the Faculty Senate President present at the Chancellor's cabinet meetings. One solution is to create a University Leadership Council (ULC) to include leaders of the senate, deans, student senates, staff senate, and Chancellor's cabinet. This group could meet every other month to examine policy, introduce new initiatives, and discuss issues. D. Plowman noted that there will be a steering committee for the strategic planning process that will naturally include an elected representative from the Senate. D. Manderscheid also noted that a governance committee will be appointed during the implementation of the new budget model that will also include Senate representation. G. Skolits noted that one priority for the faculty is to be at the table early in the discussions rather than at the end. D. Plowman proposed laying the groundwork for the ULC including membership and a sample agenda. B. Lyons urged consideration regarding the ways in which decisions are made, including delegating charges of responsibility. B. Lyons asked whether it is possible to consider adding the Senate president to some of the meetings of the Council of Deans. M. Anderson noted that there are various different councils and groups on campus that make it difficult to know decisions are made; an organizational chart is needed. D. Plowman agreed that an organizational chart would be a prudent activity to undertake. R. Spirko noted that it will be important to consider who needs to be present at different stages of the decision-making process such that faculty expertise is not overlooked. L. Gross added that one of the most important aspects of the Senate is to ensure that the information flows in both directions. M. Anderson expressed caution about proliferating another meeting when it might be more efficient to make use of existing committees/etc. D. Plowman will return to the group with an idea of how to move forward.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Student Programming (V. Carilli)

V. Carilli began by underscoring that the State Comptroller's report has driven changes in the process for allocating funds for student programming. Interim Chancellor Davis, Interim President Boyd, V. Carilli, Chancellor Plowman, and representatives from GSA and GSS have reviewed a series of documents that direct how the University uses student fees for programming. This process was finalized on August 19, 2019. The Programming Student

Advisory Board (PSAB) is responsible for providing feedback to the Vice Chancellor for Student Life regarding programming funded by the Student Programs and Services Fee (SPSF). The PSAB is housed within the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Life and meets periodically to discuss programming suggestions from Student Life departments, surveys, and similarly related bodies. The PSAB is tasked with reviewing program suggestions and providing feedback on the impact of these perspective programs on the University community. The PSAB discusses topics. A comment form is available online. V. Carilli noted that the PSAB is in the process of reviewing programming suggestions for the Spring term. Given the timing of the BOT policy, Interim Chancellor Davis urged that allocations would be made for Fall term and programming has been done to include 30-35 programs with another 40 that need to be reviewed. B. Lyons asked about how many separate proposals were received for funding. V. Carilli responded that there were about 30. B. Lyons expressed that students were not given the appropriate tools or awareness regarding how they can have input into the process. B. Lyons asked about how students navigate departmental sponsorship. V. Carilli clarified that the departments are not academic departments, but rather, departments in the Division of Student Life. The PSAB is comprised of 10 students: 3 students are appointed by the SGA, 2 students are appointed by the GSS, and 5 students are appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Student Life. Broad discussion ensued regarding the ways in which students can be better included in the process. M. Black asked for clarification about the departments noting that there are 22 departments within Student Life. V. Carilli affirmed that the nomenclature of "department" has caused some confusion and drop-down choices for the departments in Student Life will be added to the program suggestion form. L. Knox raised a question about how the current process promotes student leadership given that this appears to be a way in which leadership opportunities were eliminated. V. Carilli responded that there are more opportunities for students to lead than ever before within the division and across the University. N. Hristov remarked that faculty advisors have helped serve on these organizations and asked about how this process might undermine the role of the faculty advisor. V. Carilli responded that the role of the faculty advisor will evolve as a result of the process. He also noted that it is possible to reach out to faculty in the programming decision-making process to acquire faculty expertise. L. Jewel asked about what happens after the form is submitted online. V. Carilli responded that he gathers the documents and emails and provides the requests to the PSAB. L. Gross stated that this is an example of the institution moving backward given that students are not making the decisions. D. Plowman emphasized that the students have affirmed their willingness to try this process for one year and asked that the faculty do the same before changes are made. She further remarked that this is a far from perfect process, but it was a solution to ensure that funds were available for programming for this year. M Black underscored that students do not have institutional memory comparable with the faculty; caution needs to be exercised in doing away with democratic processes as these may be difficult to re-establish.

Appendix to NTT Chapter 4 Draft Revisions (B. Lyons)

B. Lyons announced that the draft version of Chapter 4 revisions is available for comment and input. There are some key areas of consensus, but some additional areas that require more discussion. B. Lyons urged the FSEC to review the document in detail. Forthcoming is an Appendix that will lay out the implementation guidelines. He also stated that the key components of Chapter 4 that place importance on the letter of appointment and renewal regarding workload have been retained. Questions remain regarding promotion.

Bullying Task Force (N. Hristov, T. Freeberg)

- Report ([click here](#))
- Draft Resolution on Bullying ([click here](#))

N. Hristov and T. Freeberg met with former Ombudspersons B. Nugent and E. Wynn who provided an account of situations that were occurring on campus, suggesting that bullying was a significant issue, particularly among faculty. N. Hristov noted that there is no anti-bullying policy in the *Faculty Handbook*. N. Hristov and T. Freeberg examined policies of other universities and then drafted a definition which was sent to J. Zomchick during the last academic year. T. Freeberg shared a handout that provides sample language from other universities. A resolution was presented that draws on Volunteer Values. An anti-bullying task force has been convened and will meet on December 11 for the first time. D. Manderscheid will give the charge to the task-force. The resolution comes forward as a motion from the Faculty Affairs committee; the committee is affirming the need for the Provost's Office to establish the task force. D. Patterson suggested a friendly amendment to clarify that training will be implemented at all levels that address bullying. B. Schussler seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously passed.

UTIA - Extension Senator Allocations (A. Ludwig)

- A. Ludwig noted that an issue was raised in the bylaws regarding faculty representation for Extension in Article II Section 1F. Just like with all other faculty appointments, the FTE appointments in Extension fluctuate. She noted that there is a need to propose consideration of aligning the representation from UTIA to be consistent with the rest of the faculty. B. Ownley indicated that this is an odd situation as there used to be a separate UTIA handbook; she encouraged that there be a conversation with R. Chance in the Treasurer's Office to ensure that we have the right number of FTEs calculated for UTIA. A. Ludwig noted that Extension is not proportionally represented within the caucus and that we are currently in violation of our own bylaws. B. Lyons indicated that the bylaws can be amended by the FSEC. This will go on the agenda for February as FTEs are calculated in January.

UTIA Update (M. Anderson)

The UTIA-UTK Reunification Report is now available ([click here](#)). M. Anderson noted that the first multi-disciplinary lunch will be held on November 14 to bring faculty together around big ideas for the UTIA-UTK unification. The Faculty Senate will fund the lunch.

ORI Update (M. Kilbey, D. Patterson, M. Anderson)

Report and Recommendations from the Research Council ([click here](#)). M. Kilbey noted that Stacey Patterson will be returning for further discussions with the Research Council.

Graduate Council Statement ([click here](#)). D. Patterson noted that this has not yet gone out to the Graduate Council for discussion. The statement will also be provided to the Steering Committee.

Strategic Principles – ORI ([click here](#)).

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- a. Undergraduate Council Minutes for [October 15, 2019](#)
- b. Graduate Council Minutes for [September 26, 2019](#)
- c. Committee Summary Reports ([click here](#))

Committee reports were approved unanimously.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

G. Skolits adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.