



**UTK Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, November 21, 2022
3:30 pm – 5:00 pm**

**IN PERSON AND ZOOM
Strong Hall Room 101**

MINUTES

I. Call to Order at 3:39 pm

Not in attendance: R. Acharya, D. Ader, Y. Efremenko, C. Ferrigno, K. Franck, T. Fridman, S. Groenke, D. Icové, L. Knox, J. Latham, E. Lukosi, K. Martin, S. Mobley, T. Mueller, M. Nowicki, M. Pittman, S. Rampold, K. Sun, E. Teston, T. Toledo, L. Whitnah, Z. Zhang, C. Cimino, and F. Cuevas.

II. Approval of Minutes

a. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes from October 17, 2022

Motion to approve: Issa; Second: McAlpin

Discussion: There was no discussion

The minutes were approved. 73 in favor; 0 against

b. Approval of Undergraduate Council Minutes from November 1, 2022

- Summary of November 1, 2022 minutes and approvals

Discussion: The president reminded the senate that approval of the minutes is approval of any action items in them. Baker reviewed the minutes.

The minutes were approved. 76 in favor; 0 against

III. Announcements and Reports

a. President's Report (E. Schussler)

For those in CAS, the President encouraged senators to attend one of the office hours posted by Interim Executive Dean Hinde to provide feedback about the restructuring. There is also an anonymous survey you can fill out. She invites all faculty to come to our first Faculty Chat session Wednesday, November 30, 3:05-4:05 in 262B Student Union. The email went out on November 17 from the faculty senate email. We will be working to identify ultimate causes of everyday faculty challenges. And eating cookies. As a former co-chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, she thanked Chris Cimino for his attendance in our meetings and engagement with faculty questions about BAM. She then called attention to three attachments under "d" in informational items. Everyone received a google spreadsheet last month asking for feedback about burdensome processes that are getting in the way of work. Caucus chairs sent this to their caucuses and last week condensed 341 lines of data into the executive summary here. We identified 13 processes mentioned most, with annual/tenure review processes leading the pack, closely followed by Concur and parking. Our next steps are to work with the Chancellor and Provost to see how these concerns can be addressed.

The second attachment is a visual representation of data from institutional research looking at how different groups/employment categories on campus have changed over 9 years (she is still waiting for this year's update). You can see student growth over time on the left. The lines at the bottom are expanded on the right. She called attention to specific issues because we need to have a broader conversation across the institution about what these trends should look like in light of the student growth we have seen. There may be some explanations here regarding faculty feeling overloaded.

A senator asked what happened between 2014 and 2016 that changed the numbers so much. No one knew. Another senator observed that the graph illustrates why so many faculty are burned out. Dean Lee suggested we break this down by college. That is a future avenue of investigation.

Finally, we continue to talk about the intersection of the curriculum approval process and the realities of BAM. She re-shared a diagram of the approval process. On the right is a simplistic way to think about the things that are considered during the process of arriving at an outcome of quality curricula at UT. BAM has introduced two new sticking points that were really not a big point of concern before - impact on other units in terms of loss of enrollment and the more egregious duplication of courses for duplicitous purposes. We can think of these on a sliding scale of impact, from something that might reduce someone else's enrollment a little, to something that might have major impacts. Some initial consensus:

1. We cannot create new courses without it having some impact on other courses - the key is to know the extent of the impact, which the new Curriculog software and pre-vetting should allow. The key is to build into the process where those conversations happen so that no one is unaware of the impacts. Although we all don't want to be driven by finances when this is really about education, it is also asking a lot of faculty to ignore the fact that monetary reductions impact people's jobs and disciplinary offerings. Advance notice of changes to course enrollments can give units time to make innovative adjustments of their own to maintain enrollments.
2. In a recent conversation with the UG curriculum committee, Dr. Baker found that they do NOT want to engage with impact and do not feel qualified to do so. We think this is something to explicitly ask the Associate Deans of each College to do before the courses reach the Councils. They need to identify impact and talk with the impacted units.
3. Second however is documenting those conversations so that no one on the Councils has to ask about whether those conversations happened - it should be documented for everyone to confirm.

We believe that making changes like this will allow the Councils to focus solely on educational quality and consistency with institutional policies and mission. Nothing has been finalized and this information is intended to keep the senate apprised of some of the leadership's thinking.

A senator reminded the body that impact can come from other areas than just the creation of a new course, i.e., changes in requirements can have a big impact on other units.

b. UTK Chancellor's Report (D. Plowman)
The Chancellor was not in attendance.

c. Provost's Report (J. Zomchick)
The Provost has set a target of 6700 for the new freshman class. This is 150 fewer new students than admitted this year in response to issues of space and housing. There will still be a 7% increase in undergraduates next year. More faculty need to be hired to meet enrollment pressures at the Upper Division. The enrollment has not been spread evenly across the university. He will work with Institutional Research to investigate more the growth in faculty

in response to the growth in student population. The colleges are responsible for planning for projected growth.

The Provost feels curriculum discussions should be based on how well courses serve the students in the program that they are enrolled in. These are disciplinary decisions not budget decisions. We should not oppose curricular changes based on the budget model. The new budget model has not changed how much money goes to colleges; it just makes it more transparent. Most colleges get money from a general fund to support their courses. Isolated changes should not impact a particular unit in a profound way. He feels strongly we need to separate the educational from the financial. Our diversity of offerings is one of the strengths of the university and this benefits our students. Mostly we need to hire more faculty and he is working on this.

The provost's office is featuring faculty achievements across the university on social media and in other venues. There will be 48-49K new student applications for next year. We are garnering national attention and students want to come here. We have a national reputation for outstanding academic programs.

The Institute for American Civics (IAC) should be approached collaboratively. This is a great opportunity for faculty from many disciplines to work to prepare students to participate in the American democracy. He trusts that the faculty building these courses and the leaders of the institute are collaborative colleagues who are aware of issues of overlap. The tuition revenue from Arts and Sciences is enormous. Even taking 100 students from that college would not have a huge impact on revenue and might even encourage students to take more classes in A and S.

The provost would like to have more listening sessions and respond to faculty needs.

Discussion: A senator asked about the 7% overall increase in the student populations and said that it will be hard to hire more faculty by next year. There is a shortage of teaching faculty in many disciplines and it is impossible to fill all the positions now. The provost clarified that the increase in student population is a pipeline issue (larger classes are moving through the university as smaller classes graduate) and everyone is aware of the difficulty of hiring qualified faculty.

There was an on-line question about acceptance rates. Last year the acceptance rate was 66%. This year it is 52.5%. This is challenging the access mission that the university has and they are working to get more students from TN enrolled.

Another senator highlighted the lack of faculty in departments that serve a lot of first year students. Hiring new faculty is almost impossible because of the low base salary and the lack of housing. The base salary has not been increased for two years. The ongoing request is 60K as a base salary for NTTF. Is any progress being made on this? The provost said they will be discussing this with the college of Arts and Sciences at the budget meetings.

How will the on-line collaboration with Arizona work? There should be more to discuss in February. How can faculty participate in this process? Email the provost. This program is designed for students with some credit but no credential, students who are not currently served, and will give them the opportunity to finish their degrees.

d. UTIA Report (C. Castille)

Dr. Clark gave the report for VP/VC Castille via Zoom. UTIA's proposal to create the school of natural resources was approved. It will begin January 1, 2023.

The creamery was dedicated in October. This is a joint effort between Herbert School of Agriculture and EHHS. They should be selling ice cream this spring. The vet

teaching/learning center should open soon as well. The Energy and Environmental Science research building is on schedule and should be completed by December 2023. They have completed a master plan for non-Campus centers and these should have a role in expanding on-line learning. They will be soliciting input from the senate on how to best make this happen.

Discussion: There was no discussion

IV. New Business

a. Faculty Handbook (J. Laughter; M. Stanley; A. Langendorfer)

- Approved Chapter 4 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments (Clean version)
- Chapter 4 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments (Version showing edits)

These changes have been approved by faculty affairs and in consultation with VP Kelly. The committee still needs to seek additional feedback and get approval from the General Counsel. Today, senators should just give feedback. Senators Stanley and Langendorfer reviewed the changes to chapter 4 of the handbook. There have been more NTTF appointments in the recent past making consistency even more important. The handbook was inconsistent as parts were added over the years. The changes presented regularize, clarify and condense the language in the chapter. The changes make the NTTF hiring practices more stable and flexible and they underscore the value of NTTF. They regularize appointment lengths, revise the continuation and renewal processes and revise the procedures on non-renewal. There is still a goal to change titles of NTTF but these have not been included in these revisions. They welcome feedback via email and in person. A senator requested the executive summary be shared with the senate. That will be done. When will this be fully instated? The goal is to bring this back to the senate in March for approval and be presented to the BOT In June. Feedback should be presented to the committee as soon as possible.

A senator asked will this change evaluation of NTTF? This process already exists and should be in Departmental by-laws.

Will NTTF vote on personnel matters? There is a proposal to include NTTF for votes on NTTF appointments but that will be left to departments. They will not likely vote on tenure appointments. This chapter does not grant any new powers to NTTF

A senator asked for clarification of language on page nine about the listing of appointments. This was an oversight and will be corrected. Several commented that the changes are needed and appreciated.

A resolution to affirm the process of approval was presented. The resolution is appended to the end of these minutes.

A resolution moves the process along in a way a vote would not and should help streamline the approval process.

Motion to accept: Shefner, second: Hay

Discussion: There was no additional discussion.
67 In favor 1 Opposed

V. Old Business

- a. Reconsideration of Approval of Undergraduate Council Minutes from September 27, 2022 and Summary of September 27, 2022 minutes and approvals (K. Baker) with additional information about Institute for American Civics courses (Letter from M. Wanamaker, dated November 16)

The president reminded the body that we are considering the totality of the minutes.

The summary of the minutes was reviewed. A senator is concerned that a discussion beginning at 5:00 is problematic with declining participation. The president felt we should start the conversation and adapt as necessary. Once a quorum is established the vote can continue, even if senators leave the meeting and the total number falls below a quorum.

Drs. Wanamaker and Scheb gave background on the IAC courses. Wanamaker spoke with confidence about the program and its creation and reviewed the attached letter. They have created two courses that they feel meet the legislative mandate and do not yet know the full plan for courses and degrees at the IAC. Scheb spoke with confidence on the integrity of the program and the mainstream academic mission of the IAC. This is not a reactionary institution but a rigorous and respectable academic unit. They feel that they have been given the opportunity to create something valuable that does not favor any particular political stance.

A senator shared that he is uncomfortable on how the IAC was created but there is not much we can do about it. Building a curriculum that fosters democratic engagement is fine but many departments were not invited to participate in the creation of the courses, specifically sociology and geography, when these programs teach this material in their classes. More conversations need to be had across disciplines in the creation of these courses. Wanamaker indicated that they have engaged with many departments and still have work to do to engage with more. These two courses were designed to be unique and are not the only classes that will be developed.

Another senator encouraged colleagues to keep questioning course proposals from the IAC since it is a highly politicized institution and will have a lot of attention from the state government. Senators need to be vigilant since this is an imposed institution that was created out of distrust of faculty. She does not question the motives of the faculty involved but the senate needs to pay close attention since the faculty is in charge of curriculum.

A senator expressed gratitude for the context provided and that faculty are involved in providing a rigorous academic experience. Faculty should see the IAC as a chance at collaboration. This can be an exciting opportunity. Wanamaker spoke to the lack of trust that was created by the legislature's decision and it will help to make this a more collaborative, positive experience. A senator shared that the trust needs to be built from within the Baker Center and information needs to be shared more freely. She asks that NTTF faculty involved should be protected and be given more support. Wanamaker spoke highly of the NTTF involved in the process. A senator pointed out that there is a lot of information on the website and a few people are doing a lot of work.

The minutes were approved. 44 in favor, 12 against

- b. Strategies to advocate for faculty salaries within the new BAM environment (E. Schussler)
 - Salary Overview
 - 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

This item will be moved to the next meeting.

VI. Information Items and Committee Reports

- a. Faculty Senate Committees and Councils Summary Reports
- b. Unapproved Faculty Senate Executive Council November 7, 2022 Minutes
- c. Graduate Council Items of Interest
- d. President's Report Supplemental Documents (Process Survey Results ; 9-year trends employee data; and Curriculum Process)

VII. Adjournment at 5:30 pm

Respectfully submitted by Millie Gimmel

Prospective Agenda Items for Spring:

- a. Faculty Handbook Revisions
 - a. Faculty Role in budgets (¶1.10) (J. Laughter)
 - b. NTT title series changes (M. Stanley, A. Langendorfer)
- b. Virtual test proctoring (M. Brannen)
- c. Intellectual property rights for online courses (E. Schussler on behalf of AVP J. Steele)
- d. BAM information (E. Lukosi, T. Fridman)
- e. Student distress (L. Whitnah, B. Issa)

Date: 21 November 2022

To: UTK-UTIA Faculty Senate

From: Chairs of the Non-tenure Track Faculty Issues Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee

Resolution to Endorse Revisions to FHB ¶14

The Non-Tenure-Track Issues Committee presents revisions to Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook*. These revisions emerge from an almost three-year long process of review, research, and collaboration between the NTTI Committee and a wide range of faculty and administrators, including the Office of the Provost most directly. Primary adjustments to policy include the following:

- Regularized, clarified, and extended appointment lengths, with initial appointments of up to three years—to both streamline administrative logistical processes and to ameliorate the sense of constant precarity for faculty;
- Revised continuation/renewal of appointment process, such that appointments automatically renew unless college administration opts to not renew an appointment—again, to the benefit of both faculty and administration; and
- Revised procedures for non-renewal of appointment, such that colleges afford faculty advanced notice of non-renewal according to a reasonable schedule (3-6 months before the appointment ends)—to clarify the employment relationship and give faculty and administration time to plan accordingly.

Also included are many changes to clarify verbiage and organization of the chapter and emphasize the importance of NTT faculty to the UT community.

The Faculty Senate looks to approve a final version of revisions to FHB ¶14 by March 6, 2023, to be recommended to the Chancellor and considered by the Board of Trustees during their June 2023 meeting:

WHEREAS these changes emerged from the Fall 2020 NTTF Task Force convened by Vice Provost Diane Kelly, whose spring 2021 report was presented to the Provost and the Council of Deans, and

WHEREAS these changes have been approved by the NTTI Committee on 24 October 2022, the Faculty Affairs Committee on 31 October 2022, and the Faculty Senate Executive Council on 7 November 2022, and

WHEREAS we acknowledge additional layers of stakeholders need to be consulted beyond the Faculty Senate (including Deans, the Chancellor, the Office of the General Counsel, the UT System Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success, and the UT System President), but Faculty Senate committees have completed and approved their revisions, and

WHEREAS these changes need to be vetted and moved forward as soon as possible to ensure our abilities to hire the highest-quality NTT faculty and create a climate of support for those faculty

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Faculty Senate endorses and supports these revisions and charges the Office of the Provost to complete the final review of these changes and present results and verbiage to the Faculty Senate for consideration at the Faculty Senate meetings either 6 February 2023 or 6 March 2023.

Approved by a vote of Faculty Senate on November 21, 2022.