



UTK Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes
Monday, September 12, 2022
3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Student Union Room 377

I. Call to Order at 15:36 with a quorum

Attending: M. Scoggins, C. Castille, B. Ownley, L Meschke, L. Jewel proxy for T. Freeberg, B. Lyons, J. Heminway, J. Chyz, D. Thompson, D. Kelly, E. Lukosi, M. Griffin, B. Issa, A. Langendorfer, M. Stanley, L. Schoenbach, S. Madison, T. Fridman, M. Brannen, E. Bernard, N. Hristov, K. Baker, D. Ader, R. Spirko, A. Steiner, A. Roessner, J. Laughter.

E. Schussler presiding.

II. Approval of Minutes

a. Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting [Minutes, April 18, 2022](#)

Motion to approve by Lyons, second by Schoenbach.

There was no discussion. 18 in favor; none opposed.
The minutes were approved as submitted.

The president reminded the group that only one member of each committee can vote. At-large members can vote, as can proxies. The UFC representative can vote but administrative guests and appointed officers cannot.

III. Announcements and Reports

a. President's Report (E. Schussler)

The president thanked everyone for their engagement and service with Faculty Senate. She noted that the senate leadership is thrilled to finally see the Bullying procedure realized; it was a long process and represents that shared governance works, although slowly sometimes.

The senate leadership is enacting an UG / Grad Council pilot program where we only approve their minutes at the Faculty Senate meeting, not in the Executive Council. This is to help those committees meet deadlines more efficiently. The leadership also sees a need to re-educate Faculty Senate about their role in this final curriculum step so that everyone takes the review seriously. The senate leadership recognizes the many approval

steps these changes go through and the rigor of the process, but also that things slip through (such as the change in the Haslam College of Business language requirement.) One of the foci of Faculty Senate Leadership this year is enhanced communication, and the leadership extends this to our Executive Council meetings this year. They are foregoing the traditional reports from the Chancellor / Provost / SVC-SVP, and the president will be framing the meeting, not providing a formal report. Everyone will give reduced reports at Faculty Senate. This leaves more time for open and honest communication in this smaller forum.

During discussion, Roberts Rules dictates that individuals address whoever has the floor. We take comments from any individuals who want to speak once, then circle back to those who want to speak again. If members of the executive council could contain their comments to one minute, it will assure that everyone has time to contribute.

Any voting member can bring forward a motion at any point, but it will need to be seconded before we take it up for discussion. Please clearly state the motion for the recording secretary so that she can accurately record the motion.

Finally, the job of the Executive Council is to discuss and move things to Faculty Senate. The focus should be on what we want to bring to the full Senate meeting.

IV. New Business

a. Faculty Senate Committee Introductions (E. Schussler)

All attending offered a brief introduction emphasizing their priorities for the year.

b. Green cards for Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track Faculty (M. Stanley)

Stanley explained that there is a situation with a senior lecturer, Betsabé Navarro, in MFLL who is seeking permanent residency and requests financial support for this from her college. She would like assistance from the senate in this matter. The NTTF issues committee has noted the disparity between the support offered TTF vs NTTF in issues related to immigration. TT faculty automatically receive this support but NTTF do not. This senior lecturer is at the end of her temporary visa renewals which have been paid by UT and needs support to apply for permanent residency. The committee would like the senate to support NTTF in this position. The committee asks if there is a set UT policy on supporting NTTF for permanent residency and can we as the senate advocate for change if there is not?

A senator from UTIA shared that she is not aware of a specific policy but in her department TTF and NTTF have been treated equally in terms of financial support for permanent residency. Another senator had an anecdotal case from the past in which a faculty member hired a private lawyer to process his residency since the office handling residency cases was not always successful. He reminded the body that each case is different and many are complicated. Just clarifying policy will not necessarily make things easy. It was suggested that we look at the international scholars and services website (<https://international.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/86/2020/06/Permanent-Policy-revised-2013.pdf>) for information on existing policies.

Another senator mentioned that there are support letters, salary considerations and other considerations for getting permanent residency. Sometimes NTTF salaries are insufficient for this. Based on research by the Senate leadership there are not clear policies or qualifications for immigration support and that NTTF with one-year contracts are not eligible for support. Brannen noted that there is some out of date information on the website and it says departments are responsible for providing financial support. VP Kelly said that there is nothing in the faculty handbook about this. There are many restrictions on the categories UT can use to identify individuals for residency. Stanley asked if there can be a support mechanism for NTTF implemented. Schussler clarified that there are a number of inequities and there are complications surrounding immigration law. The NTTF taskforce could be re-energized to address this issue as well. She asks what can the senate do in this case? Perhaps having someone from CGE attend to answer some of these questions. It was clarified that the employer must sponsor the application, the individual cannot do it alone. A member from the College of Law cautioned that a lawyer must be consulted on this. Chief of Staff Scoggins suggested that someone in the college could consult with the GC's (General Counsel) office to explore options since this is a different sort of case. A senator in MFLL echoed the need to offer support and reiterated the value of this faculty member to UT. Getting a one-year contract her first year put her in the Catch-22 of not being able to apply now with university support.

Langendorfer suggested a motion that we change the faculty handbook immediately to say that all NTTF receive three-year contracts. Heminway stated that changes have to go through faculty affairs and it was decided to pursue this change through the faculty affairs committee.

Stanley moved to have the senate Executive Council appeal to the Office of the Dean, the Office of the Provost and the office of Chancellor that we as an institution should do as much as we can to support Betsabé Navarro in achieving permanent residency through funding, legal support, and personal sentiment.

The motion was seconded by Fridman.

Discussion: There was supportive discussion and some discussion of the handbook which will be dealt with later.

16 in favor. None opposed. The motion passed.

c. Re-visit Faculty Salary Analysis (E. Schussler)

- UTK Faculty Salary Report 2020 - 2021 from Budget and Planning Committee
- Budget and Planning Committee's PowerPoint: 2022 UTK Tenured and Tenured Track Faculty Salary Analysis Report and 2020 NonTenured Track Salary Analysis Report.

Last year the faculty salary analysis by the budget and planning committee was presented late in our last meeting and several senators asked for more time to discuss this. What are the concerns that arise from the salary analysis? What issues need to be addressed by the senate or committees?

A senator mentioned that TTF salaries are benchmarked against peer institutions and NTTF salaries are not. Another pointed out that there is a high variation in NTTF salaries. Some make 36K and the median is 62K which is under the national average.

There are also gender disparities. A member of the committee clarified that they did not find large gender disparities upon closer analysis. This was questioned in the body since some of the tables indicated a real disparity. In the future it will be necessary to clarify more between NTTF and TTF and the push from the BAM will likely encourage colleges to employ more NTTF, thus making their salary situation even more salient. The Commission for Women is doing a more granular analysis. It's important to look at ranks. There are fewer women at full professor and more in NTTF. It will be important for the various commissions looking at salaries to share methodology and results.

What can the senate do to check and balance some of the impacts of the BAM? How do we impact salaries at the college level? Could the senate advocate to the Provost for minimum salaries across the university? Could we encourage the Provost's office to encourage deans to take direct action in their colleges to address disparities?

The president will include an agenda item on discussion of salary at the next senate meeting.

d. College of Arts and Sciences Restructuring Discussion (E. Schussler)

The president reviewed the survey results. The survey was an attempt to find what the majority of people in the College of Arts and Sciences really felt about restructuring. Most of the CAS faculty want no change to the college structure. This was consistent across divisions. Most were concerned about the costs outweighing the benefit of restructuring. What should be brought to the full senate meeting? Do we need questions for the Chancellor and Provost? How does this information inform how we move forward?

A senator commented that a 58% response rate over 3 days was extraordinary. There were a lot of comments in the survey about the costs and the number of administrators. Has a cost analysis been done and can this be shared with the senate? There is rumor of a meeting that happened recently with the Chancellor but it is not clear to many members of the Executive Council who attended. The Deans, Directors and Department Heads meeting had restructuring on the agenda but not everyone in the university has been informed of what happened in that meeting or of delays in the timeline. The Chancellor's timeline has been changed to a decision being made in December with discussion and conversation with the chancellor before then.

There was a request for a direct response from the chancellor on this report and a clarification of the timeline for the decision on restructuring. The upper administration completed some budget analysis but this information was not widely shared. It would be helpful to have a list of issues to help to focus the discussion on options for restructuring. A list of action items presented to the Provost and Chancellor would also help the conversation.

In the survey respondents expressed a fear of loss of interdisciplinarity and of diminishing the university's commitment to humanistic education. Many were concerned about the impact on all departments in the college not just their own department. IDPs and College Scholars would be deeply impacted by the splitting of the College.

Having an anonymous survey with clear information is really helpful and helps work against the confusion and lack of clarity about the change. We still need to be told the

benefits of the change and if there is information that has not been shared with faculty it should be shared so that we can work together to fix it. What are the real issues? We need more honest conversations about the reasons behind this suggested change. An honest conversation would engender more trust.

Historically the senate has presented a resolution on outsourcing with clear data and a cost benefit analysis. Could we do the same on this issue? There are measurable and immeasurable costs to these changes. There is a perceived cost to the identity value of being part of the College of Arts and Sciences for many faculty.

The president will use this information in preparing for the next full Senate meeting.

- V. Information Items and Committee Reports
 - a. Unapproved Faculty Senate Minutes from May 2, 2022
 - b. Undergraduate Council Minutes August 30, 2022
 - c. Graduate Council Minutes, April 28, 2022

- VI. Adjournment at 17:12

Respectfully submitted by Millie Gimmel

Appendix: Prospective Agenda Items for Fall 2022

- a. Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee *Faculty Handbook* changes (M. Stanley and A. Langendorfer)
- b. Upcoming *Faculty Handbook* Revisions (J. Laughter)
 - Faculty Role in budgets (§1.10)
 - Termination of Faculty (§3.12)
 - Policies on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (§4)
- c. Revision of Retention Review Process (J. Zomchick)
- d. Virtual Test Proctoring (M. Brannen)
- e. Intellectual Property Rights for Online Courses (E. Schussler on behalf of AVP J. Steele)
- f. BAM information (E. Lukosi and T. Fridman)