

FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES
February 3, 2020

Absent: Douglas Aaron, Brad Areheart, Joe Bailey, Stefanie Benjamin, Ann Berry, Chris Boyer, Jason Brown, Rachel Caldwell*, Lt. Col. Matthew Castillo, Courtney Childers, James Chyz, Chris Cimino, Fabrizio D'Alosio, Yuri Efremenko, Sarah Eldridge*, Eliza Fink, Yanfei Gao, Kristina Gehrman, Nick Geidner, Michael Gilchrist, Cheryl Greenacre, Kyung Han, Matt Harris, Qiang He, David Icove, William Jennings, Karen Jones, Jennifer Jordan, Luiz Lima, Darryl Millis, Stephen Paddison, Isabella Pfeiffer, Andrew Pulte, Amadou Sall, Sean Schaeffer, Lisi Schoenbach, Joe Scogin, S. Aaron Smith, Soren Sorensen, Marcy Souza, Rob Spirko, Scott Wall, James Williams, Edward Yu, Zhili Zhang, Xiaopeng Zhang

Zoom: Eva Cowell, Chris Parigger, Phyllis Thompson, Andrew Yu

Alternates*: Robin Bedenbaugh for Rachel Caldwell, Robin Nicks for Sarah Eldridge

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM (E. Bernard)

E. Bernard established a quorum.

II. CALL TO ORDER (G. Skolits)

G. Skolits began the meeting at 3:33 p.m. G. Skolits previewed the meeting agenda. He stressed that an item of great importance is voting on UTK advisory board member.

III. MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Faculty Senate meeting minutes of January 13, 2020, were presented for approval. F. Herron moved approval, M. Collins seconded, 1 abstention. The motion for approval of the minutes carries.

The Faculty Senate Executive Council meeting minutes of January 27, 2020, were included as an information item.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Office of Ombuds Services – Presentation (L. Yamagata-Lynch)

L. Yamagata-Lynch introduced herself to the senate and presented an overview of the Ombuds Services. She presented an update on a short video from the International Ombudsman Association (IOA): <https://youtu.be/OhX9iWe8fTc>. The Office provides a safe space for visitors to share their stories; the Ombudsperson serves as a consultant to faculty, staff, and graduate students to help them make empowered decisions while addressing conflicts and barriers related to experiences on campus. Individuals should consult with the Ombudsperson: 1) any time a gut feeling arises that one should talk to someone at the University but it's not clear whom is the best person; 2) when one is unsure of what to do regarding a decision related to issues at UT; and 3) when one feels they may have misread or not fully understood a situation. L. Yamagata-Lynch also discussed situations that may lead individuals to recommend seeking Ombudsman services including: 1) when it is unclear what an individual is complaining about and 2) when a person has a complaint but does not know what to do next. L. Yamagata-Lynch noted the IOA Code of Ethics: <https://www.ombudsassociation.org/standards-of-practice-code-of-ethics-3>. AT UTK, we adhere to the following set of standards: Independence, (the office is

independent from other formal organizational structures); Neutrality and Impartiality (the Ombudsperson is impartial and listens from a neutral perspective); Confidentiality (what you share with the Ombudsperson is not shared with others unless permission is given to do so); Informality (the office is an informal resource and not an office of notice, sharing your story to the ombudsperson does not mean that you have made a formal report to the university; the office does not participate in any formal university procedures). The Ombudsperson serves UTK, UTIA faculty, students, and staff. Faculty makes up the biggest proportion of individuals on campus to visit the office. B. Lyons expressed gratitude for L. Yamagata-Lynch for coming to talk with the Faculty Affairs Committee in March. He noted that 2 years ago there was some concern about the intersection of the Ombudsperson and Human Resources. L. Yamagata-Lynch responded that there is a good partnership between her office and Human Resources. She noted that when issues are discussed, there is a figurative discussion about confidentiality and how to best help people. B. Lyons asked how serving as the Ombudsperson has impacted her role as a faculty member and how it has informed her scholarship. L. Yamagata-Lynch noted that 100% of her job is serving as the Ombudsperson; scholarship must happen outside of this role. She noted, however, that the types of thematic analysis and data she has is akin to what she was doing as a faculty member.

Budget Model – Conversations (B. Schussler)

B. Schussler provided a comparison between the old and new models via a PowerPoint presentation: <http://senate.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2020/02/Budget-and-Student-Success-FS-Feb-2020.pdf>. She provided definitions of revenue, expenditures, subvention, and strategic initiatives under the new model. B. Schussler urged the senate to be thinking about metrics, as this is what drives the model; specifically, she raised the questions about whether the metrics are the right ones that help the University focus on teaching or research excellence. She noted that there will be excellence initiatives at the college level, but not necessarily at a higher level; it is not clear how we account for things like scholarship that is not generating funding or retention of adjunct faculty, which is critical to first year retention. B. Schussler noted that the budget will go to the deans on February 4. B. Krumm noted that this budget model runs the risk of sacrificing quality, stating that the College of Law could increase enrollment, but then decrease in their ranking by putting people in the workforce who are not qualified. B. Schussler responded that there will be a governance group. D. Manderscheid noted that it is assumed that the plan is to switch over after a parallel year (FY22) of running the old and new models together. After the first year, there will be a few months to tweak the model assumptions. A. Langendorfer noted concern that when one of the core values is teaching excellence, competition does not drive better teaching. B. Schussler responded that transparency is part of the value. D. Manderscheid emphasized that because this model is more transparent, that colleges will have the ability to add faculty lines, etc. In addition, faculty will be more involved in the decision process because of the governance structure. He stated that if enrollment increases and necessitates faculty lines, the money will flow to support that. There will be a faculty senate rep in the governance group for the budget model. F. Herron noted that in Social Work, many of the programs are distance education designated. She asked how these students are accounted for in the model as it pertains to the use of square footage. B. Schussler responded that there are college deans who will negotiate for changes in the support allocations for distance education. D. Manderscheid added that the goal is not to have Colleges with separate deals with the CFO; the goal is to be uniform, but it hasn't yet been decided what the uniformity should be. M. Black asked what metrics will be used to determine the budget for the administration of the university. D. Manderscheid noted that this will be determined by the

governance structure. J. Shefner noted the importance of metrics in the governance structure and asked for a commitment of half the governance structure be formed by faculty. D. Manderscheid noted that it would not be possible to commit to this presently. L. Reyes-Mason emphasized that distance education presents a challenge as lots of work is happening by email and Zoom; often smaller colleges require more attention because of the specialized work that is happening. She asked how qualitative measurements are being made with this model. D. Manderscheid noted that they would be open to suggestions for qualitative metrics. He also stated that they are trying to keep model as simple as possible. A. Roessner noted that when looking at who has spending money, there are units that will be privileged. She suggested that it might be better to wait to roll out the new budget model until after strategic visioning occurs. B. Schussler acknowledged that the timing is off regarding the new strategic plan and the rollout of this model. D. Manderscheid stated that the model is based on previous years' credit hours generated. He stated that some of the items that will come from strategic visioning will include student success, including 1st to 2nd year retention, and graduation rates. G. Alexandre asked about how the model will account for rapid changes in enrollment, both increased and decreased. B. Schussler noted that there will be some new software that will help account for changes to enrollment; retraining of budget managers will occur. D. Manderscheid responded that we have been in the fortunate circumstance that we have grown enrollment, as such, this is an appropriate time to introduce a new budget model. T. Fridman asked whether we can talk to individuals who adopted the new budget model and moved back to old model. Manderscheid responded that very few have moved back to the old model, but they have modified.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Candidate Statements for Election of Faculty Representative to the UTK Advisory Board ([click here](#))

B. Lyons gave a candidate statement as attached. He noted his accomplishments and thanked the senate for the opportunity. D. Patterson provided his candidate statement, emphasizing that he was honored to be nominated. He noted serving as a past president of the senate, UFC, and academic outreach and engagement committee. He stated that as faculty we are making connections to people and changing lives; this is an important message for the board to hear. Senators cast their votes; B. Lyons was elected to the CAB.

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Approval of Minutes of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils

UG Council Minutes of Evote: [November 21, 2019](#). A. Welch noted that the committee submitted a proposal stating that a student who transfers in a course that is equivalent to a UTK non-EI course may petition that course to count as EI, provided the student can document that the course was taught in an acceptable EI format. The proposal was approved by the UG Council. The motion for approval of the minutes carried unanimously.

UG Council Minutes of Evote: [January 15, 2020](#). The minutes include approval of another slate of 53 course proposals; the list is included with the minutes. The motion for approval of the minutes carried unanimously.

Grad Council Minutes November 21, 2019. L. Gross asked about the subcommittee that has been formed to address concerns about ORI. D. Patterson responded that an ad hoc subcommittee has been formed; this group has articulated a number of questions and is presently planning a meeting with D. Thompson before the next Graduate Council meeting. D.

Patterson noted that he would be happy to share these with the senate. Dean T. Lee asked a question about the rights of graduate students who are working; for example, Bredesen students who may or may not have the opportunity to get teaching experience. D. Patterson noted that he would add this question to the list. M. Anderson noted that because the EC will meet again before the planned meeting with D. Thompson, we can commit to putting the current list of questions on the EC agenda for consideration; if there are additional questions, we can add them during that time. The motion for approval of the minutes carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda - [Committee Reports](#)

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President's Report (G. Skolits)

None today.

UTK Chancellor's Report (D. Plowman)

Deferred.

Provost's Report (D. Manderscheid)

D. Manderscheid reported that he was in China and has been back for 18 days. The goal of the trip was to discuss re-establishing a relationship with Nanjing University as part of the Confucius Institute. Approximately 60 people attended the meeting. D. Manderscheid provided an update on ORI as one of the co-chairs of the steering committee. He noted that a report was submitted right at the end of 2019. In addition, there was a recent meeting with T. Zachariah, R. Boyd, and D. Plowman to decide how to distribute and frame the distribution, but it is important to wait and learn about the Governor's budget announcement. D. Manderscheid noted that for strategic visioning the goal is to develop a plan that leads with values rather than metrics. The strategic visioning executive committee meets for the first time on Friday, February 7. Another group, 50-60 people, will be appointed as the visioning committee and will interact with the executive committee. He reinforced that there is faculty senate representation on both of these groups and that communications about this would be forthcoming.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

G. Skolits adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sadie Hutson, Faculty Senate Secretary