

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
September 20, 2010

Absent: Caula Beyl, Doug Birdwell, Doug Blaze, Hoan Bui, Feng Chen, Chris Cimino, Jim Conant, Steven Dandaneau, Seddik Djouadi, Jim Drake, Robert Jones, Jeff Kovac, Jun Lin, Brent Mallinckrodt, Clea McNeely\*, W. Tim Rogers, Rupy Sawhney, Juergen Schumacher, Carla Sommardahl, Marlys Staudt, Carrie Stephens, Adam Taylor, Dwight Teeter, Klaus Van den Berg\*, Scott Wall, Pia Wood, Debbie Wooten

\*Alternate Senators: Patricia Carter for Klaus Van den Berg, Gregory Petty for Clea McNeely, Donald Evans

J. Heminway called the Senate to order at 3:30 PM.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Establishment of a Quorum (J. Deeken)

J. Deeken reported a quorum was present.

President's Report (J. Heminway)

An outline of J. Heminway's report was distributed prior to the meeting. Items covered included:

- a. Dean/Department Head evaluations. Senators were urged to participate.
- b. Fall Faculty Meeting. To be held Wednesday, September 22, 2010, in Haslam Building, Room 402. Both Chancellor Cheek and Chancellor DiPietro, as well as Heminway, will speak. All were urged to attend.
- c. VOL Vision/Top 25 Initiatives. The revised VOL Vision plan that incorporates certain Top 25 metrics is available through the Provost's Web site. Comments on the document are due by September 30 and can be provided through the Web or to Heminway.
- d. UT Presidential Search. The list of candidates will be released on October 7. Interviews will be held between October 11 and October 20. This is an extremely tight time line. We need to know as much as possible about the candidates once the names are released. All faculty are encouraged to use contacts they have with people at institutions where the candidates have worked to gather information.
- e. Program Discontinuance Proposals. The Russian and Italian majors are under program discontinuance review. Heminway and T. Boulet, as her designee, will participate in the review process. They will ensure the Procedural Framework for Academic Program Discontinuance and reorganization are followed and that all available information relevant to the process is presented.
- f. Sustainability Courses. A list of courses currently listed as sustainability courses was distributed with the agenda. Faculty are urged to suggest additions and/or deletions at any time. The goal is to make the list accurate.
- g. Recognition for Campus Service. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to honor Past Senate President Toby Boulet for his service with the resolution set forth below. A framed, signed copy of a citation including the resolution and a wooden gavel were presented to Dr. Boulet.

*The University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
Faculty Senate*

*WHEREAS, J.A.M. ("Toby") Boulet, Ph.D. is a highly respected colleague, teacher, scholar, and citizen in and outside the University community; and*

*WHEREAS, he has served with merit as President of the Faculty Senate during the 2009-10 academic year, maintaining the reputation of the Faculty Senate through his diligent leadership and capable representation of faculty issues at the campus, system, and board levels; and*

*WHEREAS, he has left and continues to leave his mark on higher education in the State of Tennessee through his thoughtful interactions with administrators, faculty, staff, and students on and outside the campus; and*

*WHEREAS, he has also served the Faculty Senate and the faculty of this campus as a member of the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (of which he is the current President-Elect) and the UT Faculty Council and as a member and chair of various Faculty Senate, campus, and University committees and task forces; and*

*WHEREAS, he has worked tirelessly to streamline Faculty Senate and Executive Council meetings and create and institute other efficiencies in process conducive to the conduct of Faculty Senate business;*

***THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT** The University of Tennessee, Knoxville Faculty Senate expresses its sincere appreciation to*

***J.A.M. Boulet, Ph.D.***

*for his exemplary leadership and service to the Faculty Senate and The University of Tennessee; and*

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** a copy of this Resolution be presented to Dr. Toby Boulet and that the Resolution become part of the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting held on September 20, 2010.*

---

*JoAnne Deeken  
Secretary*

---

*Joan Heminway  
President*

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to honor Dr. Brad Fenwick, former Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, for his service (especially the development of extraordinary support for faculty in the development of grant funding) with the resolution set forth below. A framed, signed copy of a citation including the resolutions was presented to Dr. Fenwick.

*The University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
Faculty Senate*

*WHEREAS, Brad Fenwick, Ph.D., has served as Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement for The University of Tennessee, Knoxville ("UTK"), since 2007; and*

*WHEREAS, during his tenure in this position, Dr. Fenwick has done a superlative job of improving faculty resources available through the Office of Research to enhance the ability of faculty to pursue external funding; and*

*WHEREAS, Dr. Fenwick encouraged the development of faculty workshops and training programs through the Office of Research designed to assist faculty in obtaining external grants and contracts, resulting in many new learning opportunities for faculty across the range of disciplines at UTK; and*

*WHEREAS, Dr. Fenwick has persistently advocated evidence-based approaches to university administration; and*

*WHEREAS, Dr. Fenwick has implemented systems and procedures that have been highly successful in improving external research funding to UTK, resulting in total sponsored awards of over \$178M for FY 2009, a far larger amount than any previous year; and*

*WHEREAS, Dr. Fenwick established within the Office of Research a team to assist faculty in developing proposals for major new centers and institutes; and*

*WHEREAS, through his efforts to establish and support the QUEST magazine and the weekly appointment of QUEST scholars, Dr. Fenwick has effectively increased public recognition of the faculty's scholarly efforts across the disciplinary spectrum; and*

*WHEREAS, Dr. Fenwick has successfully advocated for important campus-wide institutional support in the form of (among other things) start-up funds to facilitate and encourage new faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity;*

*NOW THEREFORE IT IS RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate expresses its sincere appreciation to*

*Brad Fenwick, Ph.D.*

*for all of the foregoing and extends its best wishes for continuing success on the faculty of the College of Veterinary Medicine; and*

***IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED***, that a copy of this Resolution be presented to Dr. Fenwick and that the Resolution become part of the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting held on September 20, 2010.

---

*JoAnne Deeken*  
*Secretary*

---

*Joan Heminway*  
*President*

Dr. Fenwick spoke giving thanks to his staff. He noted that by putting a small amount of money toward support for faculty in identifying and applying for external grants, the total dollar amount increased to over \$188 million during his tenure. He stressed that the Office of Research and Engagement currently has the staff who are dedicated to assisting the faculty. He urged all faculty to use the opportunities the Office offers. He also distributed a recently published article authored by David Smelser of the Office of Research. The article is copied below.

# Submitting a \$20 Million Proposal

By David Smelser

Recently there has been shift in sponsored research towards interdisciplinary programs emphasizing collaborative research efforts. Bringing researchers from a variety of disciplines together to examine an issue is the academic equivalent of moving away from the "great minds think alike" mentality towards a "two heads are better than one" approach. Sponsors are dedicating enormous sums of money to these types of cross-cutting programs, often specifically for the formations of new centers, and in turn are soliciting proposals that require a tremendous amount of effort to prepare. As someone who has conducted research of my own, I appreciate the new emphasis on collaborative research and welcome the contributions that will be made to science as a result. As a university employee, I also welcome the countless benefits to the institutions involved with these projects, such as millions of dollars in funding, more faculty lines, higher quality graduate students and postdoctoral researchers, and maybe even a little fame.

Over the past year, I have had the opportunity to work with faculty to submit both a Science and Technology Center (STC) proposal and Engineering Research Center (ERC) proposal to the National Science Foundation (NSF). The STC and ERC programs issue some of the largest awards made by NSF annually. These awards are very prestigious, extremely competitive and worth a lot of money (\$43.5 million combined). Consequently, the proposals to these programs are quite complex and require both great attention to detail and a significant amount of time to prepare.

To give you an idea of the complexity of these proposals, our STC proposal had 33 researchers identified by name, 16 subcontractors and four other affiliated institutions, 19 postdoctoral researchers, 14 new graduate students, 10 technicians and a 96-page budget to explain the \$25 million request. The ERC proposal had 99 letters of commitment from private industry partners, state government, pre-college schools, national laboratories and affiliated and partner universities, as well as 37 researchers identified from six countries. I was very fortunate because I was able to work with the faculty for about four months on each of these proposals – and trust me, I needed every minute.

While researchers and institutions gain so much from these awards, the question must be asked, what does preparing mega-proposals mean to research administrators, especially to those of us working in pre-award services? Does it mean longer hours, an extra cup of coffee each day and a bottle of Excedrin in your desk drawer? It could, but it does not have to. As it turns out, submitting a mega-proposal can be pretty easy. After preparing these mega-proposals, I have learned some valuable lessons, which can be used not only on the largest of proposals, but also in our day-to-day work as well.

## "Stay Organized, Stay Stress-Free"

- 1) **Take Pride in Your Contribution:** We all work in research administration, so we are fully aware that we will not be the one with our picture on the cover of the university newspaper when the proposal gets funded. But that should not stop us from being proud of the role we play. It is very important to keep in mind that the science in all of these mega-proposals will be rock solid, so it is the little things that can determine whether or not the proposal will be funded. Catching a minor oversight by the PI could make a major difference to the review panel. When working on these proposals I always tell my PIs, "you do what you do best, and let me do what I do best." Never forget that you are an expert in your field, just as they are in theirs, so take pride in your contribution to the proposal.
- 2) **Get to Know Your Counterparts:** When was the last time you received a proposal that was due at the last minute? If your answer is "earlier this week," you are in the same boat as the rest of us. This is why it is vital to touch base with your fellow research administrators at collaborating institutions early in the process. We all welcome the chance to get ahead of the game and not get stuck with a million-dollar subcontract with 20% mandatory cost-share that is due in two days. Also, when working on proposals, it is inevitable that something will change at the very end. By establishing a relationship with your colleagues at other institutions, you will have an ally in your corner.



With a few days left until the deadline, having confidence that your new friend will come through for you provides great peace of mind.

- 3) **Understand Your Time Frame:** All too frequently, researchers are four months away from a deadline and feel they have all the time in the world, but we all know that is not true. It is very important that we, as research administrators, discuss time constraints and the realities of proposal preparation with the PIs we will be working with. Those of us in research administration have seen nearly every road bump imaginable, and it is important for the PIs to understand how long the process really takes and the common things that tend to cause delays. When working on a mega-proposal, it is beneficial to create a timeline that includes milestones for different points in the proposal process. Also, having regular "status check" meetings tend to keep the proposal on track. When PIs have to show up at a meeting and report on their progress, they often feel more accountable for completing the tasks they have been assigned. Do not be surprised if the PI is hesitant to accept a timeline at first, but they will thank you for it in the end.
- 4) **Invest Some Time Up Front:** It is also important to know what the research team is trying to do. No, I do not mean becoming an astrophysicist or expert in smart grid technology overnight, but it is good to understand the overall theme of the proposal. Does the proposal primarily consist of research activities, or is it focused on educational outreach? The central theme of a proposal can have a dramatic effect on the types of documentation you need to obtain, how the budget should be prepared and which institutional officials should be involved. Understanding what the

# MILLION

PI is proposing will allow you to organize better and save yourself some valuable time in the days before submission.

5) **Gather Static Documents Early:** How long does it take to get a CV, in the proper format, from a PI? I can see the grin on your face. How can such a trivial thing possibly be so difficult? Documents such as a researcher's CV, Current & Pending support, or the institution's Facilities & Equipment form generally do not change very often and can be gathered very early in the proposal preparation. While preparing our STC and ERC proposals, even after weeks of requesting and reminding, some individuals did not submit their CVs until the week the proposal was due. Can you imagine how hectic life would have been if I had not started gathering them early? Beyond helping yourself, collecting these documents early will make the PI's life easier as well, because as the deadline approaches, they want to concentrate on their science and not on formatting their CVs. Gathering the static documents before the researchers are stressed out will certainly make your job much easier.

## "Sitting Behind the PIs Desk"

Working on our STC and ERC proposals gave me the unique opportunity to see what proposal development is like from the other side of the fence. Many people who work in research administration never get the chance to see a proposal come to life, from the original idea all the way through the proposal development process. We generally only see a proposal a few days before the deadline and do not tend to examine the efforts required to get the proposal to our desk. By working with these PIs for several months, I

gained a new perspective on how they felt during different stages in the process and have begun to better understand their mindset. It might be hard to believe, but they do not try to make our lives difficult; they just see things in a different way. I truly believe that in the field of research administration, we can all become more effective if we take the time to understand the PI's point of view.

**Under enormous pressure:** In the final days before submission, the PIs are focused entirely on their work. For most PIs, having a proposal funded could be the difference between gaining tenure and losing their job. In the case of the mega-proposal, this may be a career-defining moment: the culmination of years of dedicated work. Either way, PIs feel an enormous amount of pressure during proposal development. While this proposal might be just one in a giant stack for you, submitting a proposal is not just another day at the office for the PI.

**PIs are people, too:** PIs do not get release time to write their proposals. They still have to teach classes, grade student papers, publish articles, manage their labs, mentor post-doctoral researchers and graduate students and even to squeeze a personal life in there somewhere. While research administrators are not "clock punchers," researchers, especially those ambitious enough to apply for sponsored funding, are doing so on their personal time. Often we see PIs as robots, but they are people, too.

**Their mindset:** PIs are researchers, not research administrators, therefore they do not have the same level of understanding of administrative issues that we do. Their job is to conduct world-class research, educate future generations and bring in research funding, not necessarily to un-

derstand every policy and regulation of every sponsor. We see proposals day-in and day-out while most PIs usually do not work on them more than once or twice a year. An example of an administrative issue that PIs frequently do not realize is that proposals consist of much more than the page limit of the project narrative. PIs tend to focus on their research, which is completely understandable because that is their expertise and comfort zone. But we know that there is more that goes into submitting any proposal than just the project narrative. The STC and ERC proposals I worked on were about 88% documents that went beyond the project narrative. We should always keep in mind that a PI's skill set is different from our own. If we take the time to recognize and understand that PIs have a different outlook on sponsored research, we can help them understand all of the additional details that they are not aware of, do not understand or just do not want to worry about.

By keeping the proposal organized, encouraging the PI to stay on track, staying cool under pressure, understanding the PI's mindset and, most importantly, taking pride in your role in the proposal process, submitting any proposal, even a mega-proposal, can be easy! ■



**David Smelser** is a Sponsored Programs Administrator at The University of Tennessee - Knoxville and has worked for 7 years in various university research settings, from the laboratory to the University's Office of Research. His primary roles within

the Office of Research include representing sponsored programs on the proposal developing team, serving as the University's Responsible Conduct of Research coordinator, and administering the University's awards from the National Science Foundation, UT-Battelle, Department of Justice and Homeland Security.

### Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

Chancellor Cheek reported on the Presidential Search. The Presidential Search and Advisory Committees will meet October 6 and 7. On October 6, the Search Advisory Committee will review all candidates. They will recommend a subgroup of those candidates to the Presidential Search Committee for decision. The Chancellor noted that the UT system is currently moving forward under the leadership of Interim President Simek. It is critical, in his view, that the new President maintains this momentum. Chancellor Cheek seconded Heminway's plea to all faculty: find out everything you can about the candidates from colleagues who may know them. Send that information to Heminway, to him, or to a member of the Presidential Search Advisory or Search Committee.

Effective July 1, 2010, Athletics on the Knoxville campus reports to the UTK Chancellor. This is something long supported by the Faculty Senate. Past Senate President Boulet made a forceful presentation to the UT Board in support of this move. The NCAA has been conducting a review of UT Men's Athletics for the past 17 months. It is expected to issue a formal Letter of Inquiry in the next 10 days. When Athletic Director Mike Hamilton was notified of the actions of the Men's Basketball coaches, he immediately notified the Chancellor. Together they worked with attorneys and decided the appropriate actions to take with respect to Coach Pearl and his staff. The investigation is still ongoing.

The Provost is chairing the search committee for the new Vice Chancellor for Research.

The Chancellor reiterated that the Fall Faculty Meeting will be held on September 22 in Room 402 in the Haslam Building. All faculty are encouraged to attend the meeting. The Chancellor will discuss the Top 25 quest and why it is important to UTK, to the Governor, and to donors. He will outline ways to proceed during austere times. Refreshments will be served.

UTK will host a gubernatorial debate on October 7, 2010, at 8:00 PM in the Cox Auditorium in the Alumni Memorial Building. Attendance is encouraged. Chancellor Cheek feels it is essential that the new Governor understand the importance of the UT system to the State.

The biggest challenge that Chancellor Cheek faces is compensation for faculty and staff. He tried last year to get raises, but was unsuccessful. By July 2011, faculty and staff will have been without a raise for four years. The Chancellor's top priority for the next fiscal year is securing funding for a merit-based raise for faculty and staff. He doesn't believe it will come from state funding, so it must come from tuition and other sources. He encouraged the faculty to talk about this issue. He believes that we can't have the University we want without appropriate compensation of faculty and staff.

### Provost's Report (S. Martin)

Provost Martin began her report by announcing the arrival of 4,200 high quality freshmen. The campus plans to maintain that size and quality class for next year. The Life of the Mind (LOM) program went well. She thanked the many Senate members who teach LOM classes and Freshman Seminars. Senate members were encouraged to nominate books for next year's LOM reading.

The Banner system went live over the weekend of September 18-19, 2010. Banner is the new integrated student information system. If anyone has problems with the system, please notify Vice Provost Sally McMillan. This was not an easy installation, but it is going as well as can be expected.

The Dean and Department Head reviews will begin in October. There will be new, more complete, digital forms that request new types of information. Please complete the forms and notify the Provost's office of any issues.

Thanks in part to Chancellor Cheek, the Provost's office has received \$1.6 million to reinvest in instruction. Vice Provost McMillan is leading a comprehensive study on how to best adjust courses and enrollment given the loss of state and stimulus funding for the next fiscal year. There will be a judicious investment in both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty and in student advisors. UTK needs to maintain the forward progress we have made. The College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Communication and Information will receive the majority of the funding.

## **MINUTES**

### Faculty Senate Minutes

The minutes of the May 3, 2010, meeting were moved, seconded, and approved as presented.

### Faculty Senate Executive Council

The minutes of the August 30, 2010, meeting were posted on the Faculty Senate Web site as an information item.

## **MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

### Undergraduate Council (J. Koontz)

The Undergraduate Council met September 7, 2010. It addressed academic policy issues to align admission requirements with state mandates. It delayed implantation of the advising policy until fall 2012. The current catalog includes the current policy and mentions the 2012 policy. The Curriculum Committee's changes to various College of Arts and Sciences programs were approved.

The Minutes of the Undergraduate Council were moved, seconded, and approved as submitted. They are now in effect.

### Graduate Council (M. Essington)

The minutes posted for the Graduate Council require no approval from the Faculty Senate. The Council met at the end of August for an orientation meeting. It will meet next week to discuss a new Ph.D. program and discuss other matters.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### TUFS Resolutions (J. Heminway)

Heminway introduced five resolutions from Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS). She stressed that the Executive Council had voted to bring these resolutions to the Senate floor for discussion, but that it did not make any recommendations on passage of the resolutions themselves.

### **1. Faculty and Staff Bonus Distributions**

**RESOLVED, that TUFS support the legislative plan that the one-time bonus be based on longevity.**

Heminway described the current state of affairs with respect to the legislature's grant of bonuses for fall 2010. A motion to pass as submitted was made and seconded. There was no discussion. The resolution passed with one abstention.

## **2. Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) Chancellor**

**RESOLVED, that TUFs should contact the national office of the AAUP regarding the procedures used in the selection of the TBR chancellor and for possible investigation and evaluation.**

Heminway described some of the issues with the Tennessee Board of Regents chancellor search process, which included no faculty representation on the committee. This violates AAUP policy. A motion was made and seconded. The resolution passed unanimously.

## **3. Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) Public Agenda for Tennessee Higher Education, 2010-2015**

**RESOLVED, that as the THEC Public Agenda plan is being implemented, member senates should utilize TUFs for consolidating the response from those member senates so that a consolidated voice can be given to legislators.**

Heminway explained that this would allow a consolidation of input from each campus, but that nothing would prevent UTK from promulgating an individual response. A motion was made and seconded. C. Plaut stated that the objections he voiced at the Executive Council meeting had been satisfied with written clarification from Jeffrey Berman (The University of Memphis and President of TUFs). The resolution passed unanimously.

## **4. Proposed Future Presentation to Tennessee Senate Education Committee**

**RESOLVED, that each senate should propose to the TUFs Executive Committee discussion points, concerns, and strategies for the anticipated presentation to the Tennessee Senate Education Committee.**

Heminway again noted that this involves aggregating discussion points and no more. A motion was made and seconded to consider the resolution. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **5. Informal TUFs Response to Emergent Matters of Mutual Concern**

**RESOLVED, that in matters that are time-sensitive, after consulting with the Executive Committee of TUFs and the faculty senate presidents of all of TUFs member institutions, the president of TUFs is authorized to communicate to the public the consensus of those consulted.**

Heminway explained that this resolution is borne of her concern, and that of others, that TUFs was unable to respond meaningfully to issues that arise between meetings (of which there are two per year). A motion was made and seconded to consider the resolution. There was no discussion. The resolution passed unanimously.

### 946-CARE

Sarah Gardial, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Mary Lucal, Human Resources, announced the launch of 946-CARE. Use this phone number to contact a trained staff member when you feel there

are issues with a faculty or staff member that could affect his or her well-being or the well-being of others. If you call during normal working hours (Monday-Friday, 8:00 AM-5:00 PM), you will be connected with a staff person in Human Resources trained in handling these issues. Calls outside those hours will be routed to the UT Police Department. The person calling may remain anonymous. The name of the person with difficulties will remain anonymous to anyone outside trained counselors unless there is a public safety issue. There is now a protocol on how and by whom a person will be approached and offered support. The manner of support will depend on the individual situation. Senators asked a number of questions regarding the new program.

The presenters noted that this program is modeled on the successful 974-HELP program used for students. The new program is for faculty and staff. However, calls to either number will be routed to the correct protocol.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment was moved and seconded. Motion approved. Meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

JoAnne Deeken, Secretary