



# FACULTY

# SENATE

# NEWSLETTER

November 1999

## Governance: A Symposium

### An Administration View

by Robert A. Levy  
Associate Senior Vice President,  
University of Tennessee



Sometime in the early Sixties, when I was an undergraduate zealously trying to think of new ways to shake my college's tree by publishing student evaluations of faculty, a kindly professor took me aside and told me about the school's governance. It was, he said, shared by the faculty and the administration (and it was far too serious a responsibility to share with students, who shouldn't waste their time evaluating their instructors). I didn't know what the "administration" was, what "governance" was, or what he meant by its being "shared." I'm still not sure about the precise shape of some of these things, but the intervening thirty-five years have given me a dictionary, some experience, and—maybe—some insight.

(Continued on p. 4)

### A Governing Board View

by Roger W. Dickson  
Miller & Martin, Chattanooga  
Member, UT Board of Trustees



When Bob Glenn asked me to contribute an article to the UTK Faculty Senate *Newsletter* on a Board Member's perspective of governance at the University of Tennessee, I had several reasons why I should not accept this invitation. However, after some thought, I accepted the invitation, because it would give me an opportunity to reflect upon my eight plus years of service on the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees. During those eight years, I have formed certain opinions on governance and on the role of higher education. The views and opinions expressed on these matters are mine alone, and I do not attempt to speak on behalf of all members of the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees.

(Continued on p. 5)

### A Faculty View

by M. Mark Miller,  
Immediate Past President,  
UTK Faculty Senate



"We sure kicked some major administrator butt today!"

If you hang out with the UTK Faculty Senate don't expect to hear a statement like that very often. In the first place most faculty members don't talk that way. More important, things just don't happen that way.

Even when the faculty does have major impact—and sometimes it does—you won't hear Senate leadership bragging about it. If they did brag, they'd jeopardize their relationship with the administration, and that's the most important resource they have.

The Senate and its leaders are most effective when they have the respect and trust of the administration. Senate leaders are assured of access to UTK administrators, but such access can be just an empty form without a sound relationship between faculty and administrators.

The Senate has several advantages that make it the most effective faculty voice at UTK:

- It's elected by procedures that assure that the range of faculty views is represented across disciplines, ranks, and demographics.
- Its leadership has official access to administrators at all levels.
- It sets its own agenda and convenes itself.

AAUP, in contrast, represents only those people who elect to join it and isn't officially recognized by the administration. AAUP does have the substantial advantage of being part of a national organization, which can provide expertise, support. In extreme cases AAUP can even censure a university injuring its reputation and ability to recruit faculty.

(Continued on p. 6)

## Contents

GOVERNANCE: A SYMPOSIUM	1
CALENDAR	2
SENATE OFFICERS	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	2-3

## Calendar

<b>Senate Meetings</b> (Shiloh Room, 3:30 p.m.)	<b>Executive Committee</b> (605 Hodges, 3:30 p.m.)
November 15, 1999	November 1, 1999
February 7, 2000	January 24, 2000
March 6, 2000	February 21, 2000
April 3, 2000	March 13, 2000
May 1, 2000	April 17, 2000

### Board of Trustees

February 10–11, 2000  
(UT-Memphis)  
June 13–15, 2000  
(Board Room, Andy Holt Tower)

## Senate Officers

### President

Mary E. Papke 4-6934  
304 McClung Tower papke@utk.edu

### President-Elect

Robert W. Glenn 4-1923  
105 McClung Tower glenn@utk.edu

### Immediate Past President

M. Mark Miller 4-4452  
330 Comm. Building mmmiller@utk.edu

### Secretary

G. Samuel Jordan 4-4329  
313 Ayres Hall gjordan@utk.edu

### Parliamentarian

Norma C. Cook 4-7067  
101 McClung Tower ncook@utk.edu

## Senate Committee Reports

[As Mark Miller explains in his essay in this *Newsletter*, most of the work of the Faculty Senate is done through its committees. The responsibilities of the committees are described in the Senate's Bylaws, <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/Bylaws.html#25>. Information about committee chairs and members is available at <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/Committees.html>. The following reports explain the activities or interests of the Senate's committees this term.]

### Athletics Committee

The Athletics Committee will be studying the tutoring program for student athletes, use of Incompletes to retain eligibility, use of late course withdrawals to retain eligibility, and Learning Disabled issues. Also, the Committee will develop a publicity program to inform faculty about opportunities on campus for improving physical fitness.

### Budget Committee

The Budget Committee is preparing an analysis of UTK salary data by discipline and rank. Issues to be considered include current policies governing performance evaluations, comparisons of UTK salaries with the "market rate" and of the lowest salaries with a "cost of living" wage, and comparisons of UTK data with that from other institutions.

### Bylaws Committee

The Bylaws Committee has prepared proposals to be debated at the November 15 Senate meeting for revising the Senate calendar to avoid conflicts other important events, and

for planning an annual Senate agenda. Those proposals are described in the Committee report, <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/BylawsRpt10-99.html>.

### Educational Policy Committee

The Educational Policy Committee regularly reviews and sends to the Senate for approval curricular and policy changes coming through the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. This year, the EPC will also discuss policy issues related to the work being conducted by the *ad hoc* committee on electronic and technologically-enhanced teaching and delivery.

### Executive Committee

The Executive Committee is the principal policy-making body of the Senate. The Committee has established *ad hoc* committees to make recommendations to the Senate concerning electronic and technologically-enhanced teaching and the awarding of honorary degrees, and has reconstituted the committee on evaluation of administrators. Minutes of Executive Committee meetings are available at <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/MinutesEC99-00.html>.

**Faculty Affairs Committee**

The Faculty Affairs Committee provides mediation or grievance hearings for faculty involved in employment disputes. Also, the Faculty Affairs Committee has prepared a commentary on the draft of the Faculty Evaluation Manual (<http://web.utk.edu/~senate/EvalManual.pdf>), and will be examining the varied meanings of “faculty” in UTK personnel practices.

**Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee**

The Faculty/Staff Benefits committee is working on the following items: long term care; UT’s full-time representation on the State Insurance Committee; cashability of retirement funds; appeals assistance for denied insurance claims; and the salary compression/inversion problem at the full professor rank.

**International Education Committee**

The International Education Committee screens student applicants for Fulbright awards and interviews and mentors Rhodes Scholarship applicants. This term the Committee is developing a program to improve student awareness of international education opportunities and of campus services to assist with applications and interviews. Also, the Committee has prepared a set of goals and objectives for international education which has been included in the Chancellor’s Five-Year Plan for the campus (<http://web.utk.edu/~senate/UTK5YearPlan.html#10>).

**Legislative Committee**

The Legislative Committee has established ongoing communications with the College Democrats, College Republicans, and the Student Government Association, and has participated actively this term in lobbying efforts. The Committee is also meeting with Frank Cagle (Managing Editor of the Knoxville *News-Sentinel*), Representative Joe Armstrong (D-Knoxville), and Congressman Jimmy Duncan.

**Nominating Committee**

The function of the Nominating Committee is to nominate two candidates for the office of President-Elect of the Senate. The committee solicits nominations from the University faculty at large and from the list of nominees received

selects two candidates. The committee then prepares a ballot that includes biographical information on the candidates. Faculty Senate members then vote to determine the President-Elect for the coming year. The committee is meeting this term to make preparations for the election.

**Professional Development Committee**

The Professional Development Committee will be meeting to consider the definition of “professional development,” the desirability of compiling a booklet or webpage on internal professional development resources, and other projects.

**Research Council**

The Research Council recommends SARIF (Scholarly Activities and Research Incentive Funds) awards, EPPE grants (funding small exhibition, performance, and publication grants to faculty), and Summer Research Assistantships. It also makes recommendations for renewal of Research Centers and for Research and Creative Activities Awards. The work of the Research Council is done through a structure of 3 standing committees, a special projects committee (which is completing a proposal for a faculty workstation program), and 4 review panels. The RC webpage is at: <http://www.ra.utk.edu/rc/>.

**Student Affairs Committee**

The Student Affairs Committee is working with various student issues including access to mental health services, confidentiality of student discipline records, and extra-section funding. Also, the Committee is supporting SGA activities in freshman orientation to campus life and in voter registration and lobbying.

**Teaching Council**

The Teaching Council is completing its review of the Campus Teaching Evaluation Program (CTEP) and will soon submit recommendations regarding CTEP for Senate consideration. The Council has also suggested revisions of the Faculty Evaluation Manual and will recommend faculty and instructors to receive Chancellor’s Awards for Teaching and Advising in the spring.

## Governance: An Administration View

by Robert A. Levy

(cont. from p. 1)

Let's start with what my dictionary says about "govern." The word "govern" goes back to Latin, and comes to us through Old French and Middle English. It and its several variants (like "governance") are words that have stayed useful over hundreds of years, and they have spun off a fair number of senses of their meanings. For me, virtually all of these senses fall into one of two categories:

1. to manage, regulate, or rule;
2. to guide, influence, or sway.

Obviously, the first set of meanings has a more authoritarian ring to it, and a focus on maintaining the status quo; the second set seems more to do with consensus-building in order to reach an intended objective. In Academe, maybe we should remember that there are these two types of governance.

The need for some form of governance (whatever meaning one wishes to give it) must surely be thoroughly embedded in our species. Certainly as far back as Paleolithic times, human beings banded together and acted in a concerted way to hunt and to protect themselves from predators (of their own species or other). No group of hominids could long survive without ways to govern group behaviors.

There are about 3,500 colleges and universities in the US, and each has found ways to operate in the present and to build toward the future. Their individual pasts, sizes, affiliations (public? private? tightly denominational?), budgets, curricular complexities have almost everything to do with their governance structures. So, what's meant by "governance" at a large, mature, complex, public, Land-Grant, Southern, Research I university in East Tennessee?

One answer is a legalistic one. The *Bylaws of The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees* try to be quite clear at their very beginning (Article 1, Section 1):

*The Board of Trustees, which is the governing body of The University of Tennessee, shall have full and complete control over its organization and administration.*

Both constraint and clarity are almost immediately added in Section 2, which says that the Board shall "Establish policies concerning the scope of the educational opportunities to be offered [and] prescribe admission, progression, and retention requirements for the University and particular programs of instruction; however, the planning and development of curricula shall be the function of the faculties."

The Bylaws go on to explain that the vehicle for effecting this governance is the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees (Article III, Section 5):

*The Academic Committee shall approve and recommend to the Board, or to the Executive Committee, proposals concerning the development of new academic programs and the revision of existing programs relating to instruction, research, and service; the establishment of new academic organizations, such as major campuses, colleges, and institutes; the adoption of admission, progression, and retention standards; and the adoption and revision of faculty personnel policies.*

But, Charter and Bylaws aside, what else can be said about governance at UTK? Well, we all believe that it is "shared." My experience at UT suggests that there are governance players well beyond the "faculty" and "administration" groups that my old prof revealed to me in 1963. Today, I believe, the people who add value to an institution have both a right and an obligation to help chart its course. A public university has many such people: faculty members, administrators, and other employees; students and alumni; The People (i.e., their elected representatives, the bureaucracies that support those office-holders, and the trustees and commissioners named by them); philanthropists and others who help to keep the lights on. There may be more,

but my point is that many, many constituencies logically should have some degree of something to say about how some part or parts of a public university should be governed.

I know that it wasn't always this way, and that David Vold (past President of the Alabama Conference of the AAUP) may be right in his essay, "The Soul of a University":

"Time had been when professors had enjoyed the status of a guild of scholars. It was painful to them to be reminded that as guild control had given way to control by a lay governing board, professors had settled into this subordinate position." (Quote from John Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition, A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1976* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976). What's more, the ideal of a professorial guild seems, if anything, more threatened than ever by bureaucratic regulations, legal restrictions, and a professorate that identifies more with its subject-matter distinctions than with the academy as a whole.

The AAUP, which speaks what many faculty members feel, bills its 1966 *Statement* as "a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest, and producing joint effort, is essential." The *Statement* goes on to say that universities like ours are made of highly interdependent parts and stakeholders who need to communicate well and work together, even though "differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand." But as the *Statement* progresses, it becomes clear that AAUP's vision of mutuality is very different from the Trustees' notion of the "function" of the faculty. AAUP says,

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances.... The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.... Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal.... The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.... The chair of head of a department serves as the chief representative of the department.

AAUP President James T. Richardson, in the "Opinion & Arts" section of the 12 February 1999 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, says that

The A.A.U.P.'s statement was never a vehicle to give college and university faculties dominant power, but was meant to establish a balance of powers. It was an acknowledgment that governing boards' hardheaded business skills, coupled with faculties' insistence on scholarly excellence, breed a constructive, if not always easy, tension. For some three decades, faculty members have accepted the fact that boards of regents or trustees have final, fiduciary responsibility for their institutions and a role in arbitrating controversial disputes. But faculty members also have asserted that boards must delegate substantial authority to the professorate in educational issues—curriculum, student grading, admissions, and professional standards. Faculty members have understood that administrative decisions affecting them will not always be to their liking, but will at least be informed by faculty advice—through peer review, faculty councils, and the like.

If, in halcyon days of yore, two parties (faculty and administration) were able to share governance, those days are gone. Now there are too many parties. Now the university itself is too

multifaceted. Now the university's environment is too complex and fragmented. Maybe a new model is needed.

Maybe we should borrow from the dictionaries' several senses of "govern," and try to identify which activities are present-centered and which require only a single stakeholder (or nearly so). Not everything we do is shared, nor should it be.

Maybe we should teach ourselves to think of "sequential" governance, where two or more stakeholders may have governance responsibilities at different times in a process. For example, think about UT's conception of the academic department head. Here, as at institutions where a faculty elects its chairperson, heads are faculty members. But here heads are appointed by their dean and serve at her/his pleasure. Normally, the departmental faculty is intimately involved in selecting its head; rarely is a head appointed or removed without at least nominal consultation with the departmental faculty. Legally, the dean must make a choice; ethically and practically, she/he is well-advised to consult with the faculty. Later, should it not like the process or the dean's choice of head, the faculty is both ethically and legally entitled to disagree.

Or maybe UT's tenure policy is a fuller example, and one in which the faculty voice is heard first. Faculty expertise forms the basis of tenure recommendations; administrators at different levels consider different ramifications of the faculty votes; legally, the Board of Trustees must review and decide. At some of these steps the weights of responsibilities differ; at others they nearly vanish. Each succeeding step must rely on the one(s) before it; however, the wisdom of the departmental faculty underlies everything, yet only the Board of Trustees has the raw power to actually approve tenure. There's a kind of odd symmetry to this. The Board's policy requires that each academic unit enact by-laws that protect the faculty voice in tenure procedures (and, presumably, in other processes). By so doing, the Board exercises its governance responsibilities by guaranteeing the faculty's governance responsibilities.

Maybe, as UT creeps toward the millennium (this year or next), we need to find places where each of our appropriate voices can be heard at the appropriate stages in a discussion. Maybe we should think about *sequential* governance.

## Governance: A Governing Board View

by Roger W. Dickson

(cont. from p. 1)

Prior to discussing governance at the University of Tennessee, the recent report from the Governor's Council on Excellence in Higher Education focused attention on governance of higher education in the State of Tennessee as a whole. The authors of the Council's Report opined that a more centralized governing board for higher education in the State of Tennessee may be a more efficient and effective method of governance. I disagree. The University of Tennessee's 1999 Budget is in excess of one billion dollars. Our Board oversees five campuses and more than forty-two thousand students. It is extremely difficult to make knowledgeable decisions on matters involving numbers of this magnitude. I do not believe that any board could competently handle its responsibilities if those numbers were increased to include over 190,000 students spread over thirty campuses.

From the perspective of the University of Tennessee's Board of Trustees, governance starts with one principle—the Board has the ultimate responsibility to set policies to ensure the academic integrity and financial well-being of the University of Tennessee. This obligation rests solely with the Board and should not be delegated.

In discharging this responsibility, the Board must avoid the temptation of micromanaging the administration, classroom teaching, research, or other endeavors of the University. As a Board, we need to be advised and informed by the Administration as to all matters involving the University. We should also counsel with and listen to the faculty and the students of the University in order to understand their perspective on various issues. After receiving this input, it is our job to set policies pursuant to which the University of Tennessee will operate.

In establishing these policies, we should be mindful that although a University has many characteristics of a business enterprise, it also has many basic and inherent differences from a business. This concept is sometimes very difficult for the Board to appreciate, because, for the most part, we are more comfortable dealing in a business environment than in an academic environment. We must recognize and understand that the University of Tennessee does not operate with a profit motive and at times the process of teaching, learning, and research is at least as important as the product that those endeavors produce.

Today there is a great emphasis being placed on

"accountability." In higher education this can mean attempting to measure student learning outcomes. I am not sure there is a method by which we can definitively measure these outcomes or measure how we are doing as a University. Education at the university level is not meant to merely train students for the job market. Rather, a university's role is to provide students with an education that encompasses a great deal more than job training. As the Board of Trustees of the University of Tennessee, we have the obligation and authority to determine the mission of the University. We should make sure that the chief mission of the University of Tennessee is to enrich the lives of all students who pass through our campuses. If, after attending the University of Tennessee, a student's life has not been enriched and that student's view of the world and his or her place in it has not been broadened, then the University and its Board have not done their jobs.

There are many challenges facing the University of Tennessee in the future, not the least of which is dealing with the rapid increase of information technology and how that technology will impact the University. I believe the Administration, the Faculty, and the student body should all be engaged with the Board in making policy decisions which ensure that this improved technology is used as an asset to enhance the quality of education at the University. If we allow education at the University of Tennessee to become a process whereby students sit at terminals while being fed information through their computers, we will have failed in our responsibility. The process of higher education entails a great deal more than merely receiving information. The information that is received is often soon forgotten; however, the impact a university has on our perspective should last a lifetime.

I believe that the University of Tennessee is poised to become one of the greatest institutions of higher education in the world in the next millennium. However, this cannot be accomplished without solid leadership and a united effort from the Board of Trustees, the University Administration, the Faculty, the students, and our elected officials. As our new President, Dr. Wade Gilley has stated, to have a great state, you must have a great university. Our goal as a Board should be to make certain the policies of the University promote excellence in teaching, learning, and research so as to allow the University of Tennessee to reach its full potential of being that great University.

## Governance: A Faculty View

by M. Mark Miller

(cont. from p. 1)

The faculty and the university are served best when the Senate and AAUP maintain distinct voices. The Senate at its best works inside established procedures making compromises and working for incremental change. AAUP is free to be more insistent and to seek dramatic improvements.

Of course, the Senate and AAUP can and do cooperate on many issues. For example, efforts at presenting the university case for improved financial support call for a united front.

There are groups other than the Senate that enjoy relative autonomy and set their own agendas. They include the Commission for Women and the Commission for Blacks, which have specific constituencies and focused agendas. These groups often cooperate with unofficial groups of faculty and staff who share their interests. Again, the university is well served by a system where official organizations like the Commissions have formal access to administrators and others, like the Black Faculty Staff Association, have the freedom to make pointed statements.

Many other groups articulate faculty interests to the administration. One of the most important is the Chancellor's Advisory Committee for Planning and Budget. CACPB membership includes Senate officers and other faculty representatives. Over the past couple of years CACPB has taken on such tasks as writing procedures for review of academic and non-academic programs and drafting the UTK Five-Year Plan.

But as important as CACPB is, the Chancellor convenes it and sets its agenda so it can only react to administrator priorities. This is true of a number of administrative committees that address such issues as setting the academic calendar and advising on computing policy.

Among the most important vehicles of shared governance are the Undergraduate Council, which works with the undergraduate deans office, and the Graduate Council, which has a similar relationship with the graduate deans office. These Councils have strong roles in managing the curriculum and devising academic policies.

Because curriculum and academic policy are directly under faculty control, the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils report to the Senate through its Academic Policies Committee. Thus the Senate controls curriculum and academic policy. The Councils do exert strong influence and administrators often initiate such policies. Ideally curricular change emerges from aca-

demical departments and moves up the hierarchy through the Councils to Senate and back to the administration.

Of course, the academic departments are vehicles of shared governance. The faculty is supposed to have a powerful voice at the departmental level in matters of curriculum and faculty recruitment, retention, and promotion. There apparently is wide variability in the level of faculty input in departmental matters across the university. Also, UTK has a system in which department heads are chosen by deans rather than one in which department chairs are elected by faculty. Presumably the headship system puts more control in the administrators than does the chair system.

Despite the word "Council" in the names, the Teaching Council and the Research Councils clearly are committees of the Senate. Unlike the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils, their members are appointed by the Senate and they elect their own chairs. The Teaching and Research Councils do work closely with appropriate administrators and often are effective voices for faculty participation in governance.

There are more than a dozen other Senate Committees that serve as vehicles for faculty participation in governance. Among the most important are:

- The Faculty Affairs Committee, which works on faculty rights and responsibilities and serves as a grievance committee on tenure and promotion decisions.
- The Athletics Committee, which monitors the activities of student athletes.
- The Budget Committee, which advises the administration on budgetary matters.
- And others whose names explain their function: the Faculty/Staff Benefits Committee, the Library Committee, and the Legislative Committee.

In recent years the Senate has been more assertive beyond the Knoxville campus, from the UT Board of Trustees to legislators and other community leaders.

The faculty routinely has a substantial impact on university policy. Often that impact is subtle and comes from faculty efforts to discover, inform, and persuade. That's what we faculty do best.

It would be a lot more fun if we could "kick some major administrator butt," but it just doesn't work that way.



UT Knoxville is an EEO/AA/Title VI/Title IX/Section 504/ADA/ADEA institution in the provision of its education and employment programs and services.

Senate URL: <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/home.html>

E01-0130-007-00



105 McClung Tower  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN 37996-0405