FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
January 13, 2020

Absent: Brad Areheart, Chris Boyer, Graciela Cabana*, Lt. Col. Matthew Castillo, Courtney Childers, Neal Eash, Sarah Eldridge*, Kristina Gehrman, Michael Gilchrist, Elyssa Gould*, Matt Harris, Jon Hathaway, David Icove, Karen Jones, Jennifer Jordan, David Keffer, Michael Kilbey, Luiz Lima, Andrea Ludwig, Madhu Madhukar, David Manderscheid, Crystal McAlvin, Stephen Paddison, Isabella Pfeiffer, Andrew Pulte, Alex Rodrigues, Amadou Sall, Lisi Schoenbach, Soren Sorensen, Jennifer Tourville, Forbes Walker, Courtney Wright

Zoom: Fabrizio D'Aloisio, Nathalie Hristov, Chris Parigger, Reza Seddighi,, Phyllis Thompson, Andrew Yu, Zhili Zhang, Xiaopeng Zhao

Alternates*: Robin Bedenbaugh for Elyssa Gould, Asafa Jalata for Graciela Cabana, Robin Nicks for Sarah Eldridge

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

II. CALL TO ORDER (G. Skolits)
G. Skolits called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS
President's Report (G. Skolits)
G. Skolits welcomed everyone and reminded senators to sit in the middle of the room and be certain to announce names when asking a question or making a comment. One major item on today's agenda are the Vol Vision courses that must be voted upon. Further, Chancellor Plowman will provide an update about strategic planning, which should result in an updated strategic plan by the end of the academic year. C. Cimino will address the Senate about the new budget model. L. Yamagata-Lynch will be speaking regarding the Ombudsperson role. G. Skolits reminded Senators to keep the following items for consideration at the forefront: presentation and elections for a representative to UFC and the Campus Advisory Board. These are two important positions from the Senate to campus leadership. He also noted that in April, we will vote for a new Faculty Senate president-elect. Another topic that is forthcoming is the Board's decision regarding who will serve as the next president of the UT System. G. Skolits reminded Senators that the legislative session has begun; it is critical that we are engaged and weighing in. Further, there has been some positive response regarding a voting faculty member on the UT BOT. UFC will bring this forward as an agenda item; it is expected that a resolution will be prepared.

UTK Chancellor's Report (D. Plowman)
D. Plowman welcomed senators back to the new year. She noted that a message was sent out last week to the campus providing a summary of the principles on which we have been working. She felt it was important for the University community to be reminded about the items to which we hold ourselves accountable. She encouraged senators to review the principles and decide how they can be used in their respective units. D. Plowman reviewed changes in the cabinet. The search for the VC for Research is moving quickly; there needs to be consideration

of a diverse group of individuals who can be successful in that role. The position is more about choosing a good leader rather than the resume of the individual. V. Carilli resigned as VC of Student Life. F. Cuevas is serving as interim VC for Student Life; a search is forthcoming. If you know people who could be a great candidate for either position, please get in touch with D. Manderscheid for the VC for Research position or T. Small/T. Benton for the VC for Student Life position. Two other big initiatives on campus include the budget allocation model. D. Plowman noted that it will be necessary to determine how UTIA fits into the model. D. Plowman noted that she and Randy Thomas met last week to discuss the Oak Ridge Institute, met with the steering committee, and got feedback. She expressed gratitude to M. Mench for serving as interim VC for Research. D. Plowman shared that the new University Leadership Council will meet for the first time this week. This is a new governance idea that brings the cabinet, deans, the Senate president and student government presidents together to make operational decisions regarding processes and ascertain information/feedback about the strategic visioning process.

IV. MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
The Faculty Senate meeting minutes of November 18, 2019, were presented for approval. B. Lyons moved approval; R. Koszalinski seconded. Minutes were unanimously approved.

The Faculty Senate Executive Council meeting minutes of November 4, 2019, were included as an information item.

The Faculty Senate Committee Reports were included as an information item.

V. OLD BUSINESS
Faculty Handbook NTT Chapter Revision (B. Lyons)
B. Lyons began by acknowledging that M. Kwon and the Faculty Affairs and NTTI Committees did a great deal of work to make these revisions possible. He underscored that these are living documents that require refinement. The *Handbook* language being voted upon today outlines promotion criteria that have been expanded to be more descriptive. The criteria for rank will have some discipline specific articulation.
    Proposed Changes to Chapter 4 (click here). Motion passes unanimously.

    Appendix to Chapter 4 (click here). B. Lyons noted that these changes will allow us to fully retire the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (MFE). Under M. Kwon's leadership, work was done adjusting the various titles for NTTF. In 2003-2004 when the *Handbook* went through a complete revision, the MFE was more of an appendix. B. Lyons noted that the *Handbook* represents policies, while the MFE represents procedures. These can be difficult to separate; the revisions will ensure that policies and procedures are closely aligned. With this action, everything in Appendix 2 will rest in the *Handbook*. These changes will come forward to the BOT for their March meeting. B. Lyons noted that one of the most important items is that when NTTF are evaluated, their % effort in various areas will be listed. M. Anderson thanked M. Kwon, B. Lyons and J. Zomchick. She asked for B. Lyons to describe what happens after this material is voted upon to ensure that the changes are made. B. Lyons responded that there is an improved and clearer process for improving the workflow. He also noted that the Office of the General Council has been made aware of the changes and have provided advisory suggestions. B. Lyons also noted that we are not responsible for writing our own *Handbook*, but rather, work

closely with the campus and the system administration because this is the document to which all faculty are held accountable. The motion carried unanimously.

Vol Core/Curriculum Approvals (A. Welch)
The Undergraduate Council minutes, specifically the courses listed on page 3 and pages 5-6, were made available ([click here](#)). A. Welch began by thanking those who have proposed courses under review this afternoon. So far this year, the Faculty Senate has approved 5 courses for the new Volunteer Core curriculum, which takes effect in Fall 2021. He noted that today senators will be asked to vote on 92 Vol Core course proposals that were recommended for approval by the Undergraduate Council's General Education Committee at its meetings on October 9 and November 13, 2019. These 92 courses have already received approval from the Undergraduate Council and the Faculty Senate Executive Council. In both cases, electronic voting was adopted in order to move these courses through the approval process as quickly as possible. A. Welch stated that they expect to have another 52 Vol Core courses ready for review at the next Faculty Senate meeting in February, and approximately 54 proposed courses for the Senate's March meeting. When Vol Core courses are approved by the Faculty Senate, they are posted on the Undergraduate Council's Volunteer Core website so that departments and programs can incorporate those courses into their program requirements and uTrack showcases. Vice Provost Hinde is also working to build a website that will share this information with community college partners; the hope is that this will be up and running by February. During the Faculty Senate Executive Council voting on the list of 92 courses, members raised a few technical questions. A. Welch wanted to address three broad themes that arose: 1. Who staffs Vol Core courses, especially in departments that don't typically employ instructors who are specialists in those disciplines (for example, if a course in the Written Communication category is offered by the College of Engineering)? Vol Core course proposals do indicate who teaches each course (e.g., professorial faculty, GTAs, etc.). The Gen Ed Committee doesn't set requirements for who may teach a course in any Vol Core category. The job of the Gen Ed committee and its subcommittees is to determine whether the proposed course will deliver the learning outcomes for that Vol Core category, based on the information provided in the proposal. If some instructors do not achieve those outcomes, the ability exists to detect that problem when the courses are assessed in the coming years. Each Vol Core course will be assessed at least once every ten years to ensure that it delivers the learning outcomes associated with its Vol Core requirement. 2) Are subcommittees assessing the proposals according to consistent standards? Some proposals provide more detailed information than others. A. Welch noted that most of the Vol Core subcommittees have developed scoring rubrics to help ensure consistency in their evaluation of course proposals. By the time each proposed course reaches the Faculty Senate, it has already been reviewed at least four times: by the Vol Core subcommittees, then by the General Education Committee, the Undergraduate Council, and the Faculty Senate Executive Council. A. Welch also noted that many Vol Core course proposals are really *reapprovals* of current General Education courses that seek to join the new Vol Core curriculum. It's possible that some of those courses will undergo less scrutiny than new courses that don't have a long track record. A. Welch encouraged anyone who has concerns about this process to contact him or Barb Murphy. 3) How are Vol Core courses addressing the goals of diversity and inclusion? A. Welch noted that enhancing diversity and inclusion is an important overall goal of the Vol Core curriculum, yet it is not a formal learning outcome for every Vol Core category, and not every Vol Core course will explicitly or directly address this part of UT's educational mission. The Vol Core curriculum as a whole will advance these goals in a variety of ways; the GC and EI categories are well-suited for courses focusing

on diversity. To date, dozens of courses recommended for approval by the General Education Committee support those goals. J. Shefner asked whether individual departments are being told about the approvals. A. Welch responded that the subcommittees are reaching out to the contact on the proposal. He also stated that 1-3 months is an average turnaround time for a response about the outcome of a proposal. He stated that if folks are not hearing back, they should feel free to get in touch with B. Murphy or the subcommittee chairs. M. Violanti asked about whether a graded assignment could be used for assessment. A. Welch responded that a standardized rubric will be used to assess the VolCore. Instructors are encouraged to use graded work as samples, but the assessment itself will be according to rubrics prepared by the committees for use across committees evaluating courses. W. Jennings made a suggestion that one of the University Honors courses should put the word "Hillbilly" in the title in quotations. A. Welch ensured this would be considered. M. Anderson asked a procedural question to know better if we are voting responsibly going forward. She wanted to know whether there was a way to provide a better index early in the process given that the Sharepoint site is difficult to navigate. M. Anderson noted that one possibility could be a summary list. R. Spirko and B. Murphy worked to break out the subcategory list for voting. G. Skolits noted that this may speed up the process for a more thorough and efficient review. The motion carried by a majority vote. There was one abstention.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Strategic Planning Process Update (D. Plowman)
D. Plowman shared that she has assembled an ad-hoc group of about 20 people who represent the full scope of the campus; a SOAR analysis has been completed. A hired consultant group will be returning to the campus with a draft of a white paper that will get the strategic re-visioning process started. D. Plowman shared that the white paper will be distributed to the campus and various committees will be assembled. She noted that there will be one large visioning committee of about 45 individuals. This group will consider questions such as, "Who do we want to be going forward?" D. Plowman noted that there will also be an executive sub-committee to ensure strategic planning items move forward expeditiously. A visioning statement will be drafted and shared; multiple town hall meetings will be convened to garner input. B. Lyons noted that many strategic plans were enacted and much was accomplished under VolVision 2020. A. Lagendorfer asked about the possibility of a parental leave policy to be considered for NTTF. D. Plowman responded that this is being considered by the UT System. L. Gross explained that in the time he has been at UT, donations have always worked the same way. However, as of January 1, there is a % surcharge; he stressed that it is important to let donors know what is being done with their donation. D. Plowman responded that this is a way to fund the operation behind giving gifts; every organization that depends on philanthropy has to address this issue. She validated that she heard the concern and that there will be more communication about this.

Budget Allocation Model – Q & A (C. Cimino)
C. Cimino introduced K. McCollough and recognized the BAM steering committee. He noted that this is our 226th year on the same budget model; there has been no information to demonstrate that we have ever done anything different. C. Cimino explained that at the outset of this process, our consultant partners, Huron, interviewed 19 academic leaders. Themes from the interviews led to the creation of guiding principles by the BAM (https://budget.utk.edu/budget-allocation-model/guiding-principles/). There are three primary goals: 1) to align resources with the strategic priorities; 2) to create greater transparency and accountability; and 3) to give

more control to the units/deans/non-academic units to make decisions. C. Cimino reviewed five key elements of the model: direct revenues, allocation of general revenues, direct expenses, allocation of indirect expenses, and use of central funding. C. Cimino described that the revenue will be shared back to the units; an 80/20 split was agreed upon for the college of instruction/college of record. Indirect cost recovery will flow back to the college. With regard to state appropriations, the current model is based on graduation/degrees awarded, research, etc. This will be mimicked in the new model, driving revenue in the same fashion as receiving it from the state currently. C. Cimino reviewed next steps to include determining the governance structure, defining what subvention means for the unit's ability to access resources, participating fee assessment for auxiliary units, carryover procedures, reserve policies, and evaluation of unintended consequences. An executive budget committee will be formed. On 1/28/2020 in the Student Union Auditorium at 1:30 p.m. there will be an open forum with three panelists from universities who have been using this budget model. L. Gross pointed out that the timeline designated January for consensus building, but the senate budget committee has not been asked to provide input. He asked for a description of what is meant by consensus. C. Cimino noted that there will be adjustment to the timeline and further consideration in order to move toward consensus in conjunction with the consultants from Huron. C. Cimino noted that draft scenarios will be run in the next academic year, but in actuality, what we do today and what we put in IRIS will be what's done. The new budget model will be running a parallel. D. Plowman stated that this is a period of trying to get people to understand, learn more, obtain feedback. C. Cimino described that there have been at least four meetings with each college, but the open office hours with C. Cimino and D. Manderscheid have not been well attended. B. Lyons stated that he sent a set of questions forward. He stated that *Tyranny of Metrics* by Jerry Muller is being read as a common book. While the author does not dismiss the importance of having metrics, he writes about metric fixation. B. Lyons underscored that not everything we value as an institution can be measured and expressed concern that student credit hour production may be valued over the quality of instruction, which inherently shifts the priorities. J. Shefner noted a lack of clarity about the process of cost pools and the relationships to colleges that would pay for them. The colleges don't set the priorities for certain charges; it is possible there will be costs with which the colleges don't agree. C. Cimino noted that incentives and cost pools is where accountability comes through. There will be a governance structure that will address this and operating costs. Deans will understand what they are paying into and what they are paying for. Further, if a unit wants to implement an initiative for which they don't have money, there will be a discussion about how that will be done.

Office of Ombuds Services – Presentation (L. Yamagata-Lynch)
Deferred to next meeting.

Proposed 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar (S. Spurgeon)
The proposed 2020-2021 Faculty Senate meeting calendar was distributed with the agenda. M. Anderson moved approval; A. Lapins seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES
Approval of Minutes of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils
Minutes from the Undergraduate Council meeting of November 21, 2019, and the Graduate Council meeting of November 21, 2019, were included with the agenda as information items. These minutes will be voted on by the Faculty Senate Executive Council on January 27, then presented to the full Senate at February meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sadie Hutson, Faculty Senate Secretary