

**SENATE MEETING
MONDAY, MAY 3, 2010
3:30 P.M. UNIVERSITY CENTER
SHILOH ROOM**

Agenda

Toby Boulet, President
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary to the Senate
Stefanie Ohnesorg, Information Officer

Becky Jacobs, Parliamentarian
Joan Heminway, President-Elect

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Establishment of Quorum (S. Kurth)
Senate President's Report (T. Boulet)
Provost's Report (S. Martin)
Proposed Changes to the Timetable (S. McMillan)
Family Campaign Report (L. Davidson)

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Meeting, March 29, 2010 (for approval)
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting, April 19, 2010 (information item)

MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY

Minutes from the Undergraduate Council meeting of April 13, 2010, were distributed to Senators electronically prior to the meeting and are available at (<http://web.utk.edu/~ugcouncil/docs/minutes/UGCouncilMinutes4-13-10.pdf>).

Minutes from the Graduate Council of September 10, 2009, were distributed to Senators electronically prior to the meeting and are available at (<http://gradstudies.utk.edu/GraduateCouncil/Minutes/20100415-GC-Minutes.pdf>).

Implementation of these minutes takes place after approval of the Faculty Senate.

PREVIOUS BUSINESS

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Undergraduate Council (D. Thompson)
Graduate Council (V. Anfara)
Budget and Planning Committee (D. Bruce)
Committee on Nominations and Appointments (J. Heminway)

NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Resolutions from TUFs

ADJOURNMENT

ATTACHMENTS:

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 29, 2010 (for approval)
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes, April 19, 2010 (information item)
Faculty Senate President's Report
UTK Timetable Proposal
Institutional Support Update
TUFs Resolutions

DISTRIBUTED BY:

Sharonne L. Winston, Administrative Assistant for the Faculty Senate
812 Volunteer Boulevard
974-2483

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE:

Toby Boulet
Department of Mechanical, Aerospace & Biomedical Engineering
974-8376; boulet@utk.edu

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate
MINUTES
March 29, 2010

Absent: Lt. Col. Michael Angle, Lora Beebe, Doug Birdwell, Bill Blass, Bill Bradshaw, Chris Cimino, Jim Conant, Linden Craig, Steven Dandaneau, Jim Drake, Jerzy Dydak, Michael Essington, Joan Heminway, Russel Hirst, Nathalie Hristov*, Denise Jackson, Robert Jones, Yuri Kamychkov, Jeff Kovac, Baldwin Lee, John Lounsbury, Mary McAlpin, Lane Morris, Trena Paulus, Natalia Pervukhin, Jay Pfaffman, Gina Pighetti, Joan Rentsch, W. Tim Rogers, Rupy Sawhney, Jon Shefner, Robert Sklenar, Montgomery Smith, Edgar Stach, Marlys Staudt, Carrie Stephens, Sam Swan, Matthew Theriot, Yang Zhong, Svetlana Zivanovic

*Alternate Senators: Jeanine Williamson for Nathalie Hristov

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Establishment of a Quorum (S. Kurth)

S. Kurth reported a quorum was present.

President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet's report was distributed prior to the meeting. Boulet added that the Alumni Board of Directors, of which he is a member, was choosing recipients for awards.

Chancellor's Report

The Chancellor was not available.

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

- Provost Martin announced the Chancellor was having an open forum on budget planning on April 13.
- The Provost's Office was active on various fronts. S. McMillan was working with the General Education Committee on changes necessitated by recent legislation. C. Cimino was working with a committee addressing formula funding. S. Martin was on a performance funding committee.

Report on New Education Legislation (T. Diacon)

T. Diacon was reporting for B. Yegidis on the Complete College Tennessee Act passed in January. He expressed appreciation for the campus responses from the Provost's Office. He said the legislation was good for the campus as its rewards outputs and provided seed funding for the Oak Ridge partnership. Enrollment one way or another is key to the current formula funding (based on a census on the 14th day of each semester). The new funding formula considers the mission of each campus in the weighting of items (e.g., research is more important for UTK than Austin Peay). The census will be conducted on the last day of the term rather than the 14th day. Other output measures include number of degrees granted rather than graduation rates based on first time enrollees (excluding transfer graduates). Student retention will address progression from year one to year two, from year two to year three, etc. A third likely output measure would involve students transferring to an institution. UTK has an exemption. All other state universities have to admit any community college graduates. (Other possible measures could be number of adult students (24+), accessibility to low-income students (Pell grant recipients).

Diacon pointed out that the 2008 legislation required the Tennessee Board of Regents and University of Tennessee systems to create pre-major curricula to ease transferring. One resolution that had to be worked out was the 41-hour general education requirement.

Yegidis and Diacon have presented UT and UTK can keep its current general education requirements, as long as it accepts credits for those transferring in. Nineteen-hour pre-major curricula have to be developed, so that entering transfer students are ready to take junior and senior level courses upon admission to a program. Pre-major curricula have been created for General Business and Psychology. Diacon said he wanted to faculty to have consensus and only generate minor changes. For example, people worked on coordinating the pre-major in psychology. UT Martin required two general introduction courses, but will have to change to one in line with other campuses. UTK requires a two-semester biology sequence and other campuses have agreed to do the same. Other states, Florida, Georgia and North Carolina, have pursued similar curricular coordination. Diacon had no comment on the third part involving seed money for the Oak Ridge initiative.

Nolt said the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) was concerned that the changes would take the traditional prerogative of the faculty and give it to a limited number of faculty members. Faculty senates would then only be involved at the end of the process. TUFS proposed an amendment about "consulting with faculty senates" and that passed. His question was how do senates get involved in the process. Diacon said it was appropriate for campus officials to respond to that. He noted R. Saudargas was involved in developing the psychology pre-major. Diacon said he hoped the pre-major curricula could be approved with little or no change. One standard petition would be developed. S. McMillan said the Undergraduate Council would review it and as she understood it the curricular changes would be open to a vote. Ultimately, the curricular changes would come to the Senate from the Undergraduate Council. Nolt commented that checks and balances were important. J. Koontz expressed concern about the possible impact of the change from the 14th day to the end of the term for the enrollment census on the withdrawal deadline. McMillan said they were looking at the drop policy due to concern about students "shopping." No changes were being considered based on the change in the census date. P. Crilly asked if the pre-major 19 hours would supercede prerequisite requirements (e.g., in Engineering). Diacon said that would be a task for those who work on the pre-major. He suggested there would probably be generic engineering. Crilly said he understood the retention goals, but he was concerned that "dumbing down" of courses might be the result. Diacon said faculty members have control over that. T. Wang asked whether articulation agreements would be replaced. Diacon said he had seen articulation agreements drive pre-major agreements. He explained the concept of pre-major agreements is that they would allow admission into specific programs. M. Handelsman asked how are 19 hours specified when most courses are three hours. Diacon said the Psychology Department created an elective one credit hour course. C. Plant expressed concern about counting transfer students graduating, specifically would UTK be hurt. Diacon said each school's mission was different, so that the weight given to the number of degrees granted might be less at UTK. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) indicated it would try to fashion the formula, so that there would be no impact initially, e.g., the first year. B. Lyons asked if anyone had applied the new formula to current output. Diacon said the problem was that the new formula was not yet available.

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Minutes

For the February 1, 2010, minutes, D. Bruce had an addition, "*but none of those factors were included in the regression analysis*", that clarified his discussion of the salary study. Approval of the minutes was moved by M. Wirth and seconded by S. Thomas. Minutes approved as amended.

For the March 1, 2010, minutes, S. Thomas requested that the text of the resolution passed be inserted. Approval of the minutes with that change was moved and seconded. Minutes approved as revised.

Faculty Senate Executive Council

The minutes of the March 15, 2010, meeting of the Executive Council were distributed as an information item.

MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY

Undergraduate Council

Bruce moved and Crilly seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2010, meeting. Minutes approved.

Graduate Council

Bruce moved and Thomas seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the March 4, 2010, meeting. Minutes approved.

PREVIOUS BUSINESS

Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

- S. Thomas presented the Committee's non-binding resolution for non-tenure track faculty. Motion passed.

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate "is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*," and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* to include as a "best practices" statement in the *Manual* a report by the Task Force on Lecturers; and,

WHEREAS, as outlined on page 2 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, "[r]evisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, if any, are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final approval by the full Faculty Senate;" and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed the task force report and believes the recommendations it contains would be useful in leading to more consistent treatment of our non-tenure-track teaching faculty; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that the text accompanying this resolution is added to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in the Best Practices Statements with the title "Best Practices and Recommendations Regarding the Supervision and Development of Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty."

- Another resolution from the Committee defined the new rank of Senior Lecturer. The material would be inserted and would define the position in relation to two other positions. T. Wang asked where the definitions were. Thomas said there was a paragraph defining Senior Lecturers. Motion passed.

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook* to allow for a new rank of “senior lecturer” for non-tenure track faculty teaching faculty; and,

WHEREAS, under Section 8.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee “is responsible for recommending changes, which should have input from the chancellor, the vice president, and their administrative staff including deans for consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed—and sought (i) input from the Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* related to this issue; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.1 of the *Faculty Handbook* are revised as follows.

- 1) The final paragraph 4.1.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Positions) is amended by adding the phrase “senior lecturer” between “lecturer” and “distinguished lecturer” in the list of ranks or titles for non-tenure track teaching faculty.
- 2) Section 4.2.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty) is amended by inserting the following paragraph between the paragraphs for “Lecturer” and “Distinguisher lecturer.”

Senior lecturer: This rank is for those who hold a degree appropriate to their disciplines (or its professional equivalent) and who have demonstrated outstanding teaching at the rank of lecturer, normally through five or more years of service. A departmentally designated group of faculty will review and evaluate appointments to the rank of senior lecturer, in accordance with departmental and college bylaws.

- Appointment limits changes were needed for some non-tenure track faculty appointments. Senior Lecturers and Clinical and Research Faculty may have appointments for longer terms.

T. Wang asked if that meant that a person could not be laid off if there were budget cuts. Thomas noted the clause indicating all appointments are subject to availability of funds. Motion passed.

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook* to change the provisions requiring all non-tenure track faculty appointments to be renewed annually; and,

WHEREAS, under Section 8.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee “is responsible for recommending changes, which should have input from the chancellor, the vice president, and their administrative staff including deans for consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed—and sought (i) input from the Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* related to this issue; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that sections 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3 of the *Faculty Handbook* are revised as follows.

- 1) The present second and third paragraphs in section 4.1.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Positions) are deleted and replaced by these two paragraphs. Typically, initial non-tenure-track teaching appointments will be made at the rank of instructor for a definite term of one year or less. Appointments are renewable subject to availability of funds and satisfactory performance. Each lecturer must complete a reapplication process each year, preferably by March 1. Non-tenure track teaching faculty promoted to the rank of senior lecturer or distinguished lecturer may have appointments lasting up to three years or five years, respectively, and must complete the reapplication process in the final year of their current letters of appointment.

In unusual circumstances, the department head, with the prior permission of the dean and the chief academic officer, may recommend to the Office of the Chancellor or Vice President initial appointment at a rank of senior lecturer or distinguished lecturer. In such cases, initial appointment may be for a period of up to three years for a senior lecturer or up to five years for a distinguished lecturer.

- 2) The second paragraph in section 4.1.2 (Non-Tenure-Track Research Positions) is amended by replacing the words “one year or less” with “up to five years” so that it read in full as:
All non-tenure-track research appointments will be made for a definite term of up to five years, subject to continued availability of external funding. Appointments are renewable subject to continued availability of external funding and satisfactory performance.

- 3) The second paragraph of section 4.1.3 (Non-Tenure-Track Clinical Positions) is amended by replacing the words "one year or less" with "up to five years" so that it read in full as:
All non-tenure-track clinical appointments will be made for a definite term of up to five years. Appointments are renewable subject to availability of funds and satisfactory performance.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Undergraduate Council (D. Thompson)

Thompson noted several reports from the Advising Committee about retention were in the minutes. She was asked whether transfers were being separated out in the examination of retention and when students were being lost. McMillan said the greatest loss was after the first year.

Graduate Council (S. Ohnesorg)

S. Ohnesorg noted the policy on Joint Doctoral Degrees passed at the March meeting was separate from any academic department. UTK would award a degree and the partner institution could also for work completed at both institutions.

Committee on Nominations and Appointments: Elections (T. Boulet)

Boulet announced the elections had been completed. He called for a vote on the candidates for Information Officer and Secretary. Both candidates were approved.

He announced the new Faculty Council representative would be India Lane. Vince Anfara was elected President-elect.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made, seconded and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Kurth, Secretary

Faculty Senate Executive Council
MINUTES
April 19, 2010

Present: Vince Anfara, Doug Birdwell, Toby Boulet, Marianne Breinig, Don Bruce, Jimmy Cheek, Chris Cimino, Rob Heller, Joan Heminway, Suzanne Kurth, Beauvais Lyons, Susan Martin, John Nolt, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Ken Stephenson, Steve Thomas, Dixie Thompson

Guests: Scott Simmons (Graduate Assistant), Ashley Meredith (Graduate Assistant 2010-2011)

I. CALL TO ORDER

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. and introduced Ashley Meredith, who was selected as the new Graduate Assistant.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the March 15, 2010, meeting was made by B. Lyons and seconded D. Thompson. The minutes were approved.

III. REPORTS

President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet's report had been distributed with the meeting agenda. He drew attention to the Commission for Women report about the views of faculty women, particularly their interest in having more support for spousal hires. He added the TUFs report to the meeting agenda.

Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

- Chancellor Cheek said civility was an important issue and he welcomed ideas about improving it. A task force on civility/diversity would be established. Campuses around the country are addressing the issue.
- He briefly reported on the budget.
- He noted that the Academic Alignment Task Force unanimously supported Athletics reporting to the campus. The Athletic Board took a straw vote indicating support for the change.

B. Lyons complimented the Chancellor on his civility statement and suggested that LGBT people should be included in the proposed task force. He asked about the potential 5% salary cut for state employees. Cheek said he hoped the Tennessee Legislature and Governor Bredesen would not seriously entertain it, but if it were enacted everyone at UT would be included. Lyons also asked about plans for how the money received from the ESPN contract would be spent, noting during the current year \$800,000 had been spent for "top off" offers for graduate students. Cheek said he understood it would be spent on stipends for terminal degree students with \$100,000 set aside for the Student Success Center. Lyons inquired about the possibility of using the funds for forms of graduate student support other than stipends (e.g., travel). Cheek expressed his preference for the money being spent in the visible form of stipends and that other funds be located to support travel. S. Martin clarified that each college made slightly different decisions, but the focus was on students pursuing terminal degrees. Cheek said he had reallocated some discretionary money across colleges and particularly to the humanities. V. Anfara asked about salary compression. Martin said Deans and Department Heads were asked for recommendations about salary compression cases in their units. The focus was on equity,

not market comparisons. D. Birdwell asked that salary inequities created when the Computer Science and Electrical and Computer Engineering Departments were merged be addressed.

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

- S. Martin reported the inaugural ORNL distinguished fellowship awards had been offered to outstanding students. A person to direct the fellowship program would be sought.
- She noted that Sally McMillan would present possible new course schedule models at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- She explained that in the future all students would be required to register when traveling abroad when supported by any UT money.
- She stated that there would be a new policy restricting the presence of animals on campus in line with those currently in force on other state campuses.
- She thanked everyone for participating in VOL Vision and noted another draft was in preparation.

Questions were asked about possible exceptions to the prohibition on animals on campus (e.g., the use of companion animals in the therapeutic recreation program). Lyons asked whether there would be a packet of material depicting possible new timetables. In response to a request for clarification about students traveling abroad, Martin explained that it included any sponsored travel for students, e.g., band trips.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

No old business.

V. NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas said that Deans indicated they had a problem with some faculty members applying for promotion year after year. Current policy indicates the faculty member should "consult" before applying for promotion leaving the decision with the faculty member. The Committee's proposed change suggested a two-year wait. Proposed resolution:

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate "is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook* concerning when and how frequently an associate professor might apply for promotion to the rank of professor; and,

WHEREAS, under Section 8.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee "is responsible for recommending changes, which should have input from the chancellor, the vice president, and their administrative staff including deans for consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate;" and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed —and sought (i) input from the Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on— the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* related to this issue; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that section 3.10 of the *Faculty Handbook* is revised by inserting this text as a new paragraph between the existing two paragraphs.

After serving at least the prescribed five years as an associate professor, a faculty member should consult with his or her department head before initiating promotion procedures. The final decision on proceeding rests with the faculty member. However, if a bid for promotion is unsuccessful, the faculty member must wait at least two years before applying again for promotion.

J. Heminway said she had two concerns with the distributed proposal. The wording suggested a five-year period that was inconsistent with the period depiction in the next paragraph. Her other concern was that the “bid” for promotion language in the proposed new paragraph was not used elsewhere. She proposed stating “completion of the process” described in the next paragraph. D. Bruce said it was unclear to him when the two-year period would begin. Birdwell had a question about the five-year period noting there was an exception clause. He stated that in the College of Engineering the rule had seemingly been treated cavalierly. His question for the Provost was whether the rules were being enforced. Thomas said we would check with S. Gardial. Lyons said the essence of the motion (the two year wait) needed to be clarified. Ohnesorg suggested forgoing at least one promotion cycle. Heminway suggested that the Faculty Affairs Committee members could discuss the proposed change via email and distribute the formal motion to the Executive Council. The need for the change was briefly discussed. Lyons suggested that the issue was not an urgent one requiring action before fall. Boulet said the Committee could obtain a straw vote from the Executive Council for a revised motion and/or bring a revised motion directly to the Faculty Senate. No vote was taken.

Budget and Planning Committee (D. Bruce)

D. Bruce noted budget updates were posted the past month. Rather than a resolution they were issuing a report. He pointed to the modest one-year decrease in institutional support, explaining that it was hard to see significant change in such a short time period. Attention was directed to the third paragraph on the first page. Cimino’s explanation applied to the campus but not to the system. Instruction is a budget focus. Both academic and non-academic budgets will be reviewed with VOL Vision in mind. Cimino said one of the challenges of looking at categories is making sure comparable things are being compared. The distributed table captured comparable items representing expenditures without non-recurring items.

Graduate Council (V. Anfara)

V. Anfara provided the Graduate Council’s year-end report noting various actions taken (e.g., approval of some new degree programs). Michael Essington will chair the Council next year.

Lyons asked whether the Graduate Council discussed the distribution of the ESPN money. Anfara said the issue was never brought to the Graduate Council. The money came quickly and there was little time to act. He noted Dean Hodges was trying to get a handle on assistantships across the campus. Lyons stated the Graduate School was doing a better job of listing

Graduate Assistant positions not tied to particular departments. Birdwell suggested that the new joint fellowships with Oak Ridge paid well and might lead to competition for departments with less well-paid forms of support. M. Breinig said some faculty had complained that the advertising for the new fellowships implied that research at ORNL was more exciting possibly affecting recruitment for campus positions.

University/Systems Relations Committee (B. Lyons)

Lyons distributed a report of the Committee's actions over the past year. The Cherokee Farm was going to continue to be an issue. He indicated a teleconference with Jim Murphy had been very valuable. Athletics was discussed with T. Diacon and Murphy. There might be a change in committees if Athletics is moved to the campus.

TUFS (T. Boulet)

Boulet and Nolt attended the meeting. Representatives were asked to take two issues to their respective senates.

- One resolution addressed the possible 3% bonus for state employees. The TUFS' resolution supports awarding equal amounts of money to faculty members not an equal percentage. The staff was not included in the resolution because some representatives from other campuses felt they could not speak for staff. The proposal came from United Campus Workers (UCW).

Thompson asked what the amount would be. Nolt said the estimate he received was about \$2000. Cimino said it would be between \$1400 and \$2000, depending on who is included in the pool. Lyons noted the one-time bonus concept had a long history.

Nolt moved to endorse and Thomas to second the TUFS resolution. R. Heller asked who would make the decision. Cimino said generally legislative actions provide no flexibility, but if there were flexibility, the decision would be the Chancellor's. Nolt said the goal of the resolution was to bring attention to the situation. Birdwell commented that providing health insurance for people occupying "outsourced positions" was more important. Cimino said they had found the cost savings expected by outsourcing had not been realized and the service did not measure up, so as positions became open they were being converted. Lyons said the audience for the resolution was the legislature, not the President or the Chancellor. Bruce said the proposal was only one way to get to that goal. He proposed making a more general statement about flexibility. Birdwell moved and Heminway seconded an amendment striking the word "endorsed." Motion to amend failed.

Motion passed.

- Another proposed resolution addressed state policy regarding 90 days notice of termination. When it was passed, higher education was exempted. The University of Tennessee system does not have a provision that an employee be given 90 days notice and be notified if the position becomes open again. The four UT campuses would vote on this resolution.

Cimino said the existing policy was a minimum of 30 days notice. The Chancellors had been posed the question and supported the flexibility associated with the 30-day minimum. Birdwell asked who would cover the costs associated with more extended notice. Cimino said the

reason why the Chancellors were for 30 days was that sometimes there was short notice on budget cuts without any budget resources to cover salaries for an extended period. Nolt proposed sending the resolution to the Budget and Planning Committee with a request that it be brought back to the Senate in the fall. Lyons asked Cimino to check to see about the second part about notification of a position being reopened.

Announcements

Heminway thanked S. Simmons for his service.

Adjournment was moved by Birdwell and seconded by Thomas. Motion approved. Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

As the University of Tennessee Knoxville (UTK) moves towards implementing budget cuts in 2011, we must take steps to improve efficiency and effectiveness in areas such as classroom utilization. Approximately 31% of all student enrollments occur on Tuesday and Thursday and about 29% on Monday, Wednesday, Friday. The remaining classes are offered either once a week (about 29% of student enrollments) or on “non-standard” times. Of the approximately 11% of students enrolled in a “non-standard” class time, almost all meet on Monday/Wednesday. About 69% of all classes meet during “prime-time” which is defined as having a start time between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. During prime-time hours, especially on Tuesday and Thursday, the number of available classrooms dips into single digits.

Taken together, these factors lead to several negative outcomes:

- Limited choices for students
- Limited room availability/poor room utilization
- General dissatisfaction with course scheduling

To address the negative outcomes detailed above, a taskforce made up of faculty, staff, and students was formed in spring of 2010 with the charge of proposing new timetable options that would spread course offerings across the day and across the week and accommodate 50, 75, and 150 minute classes/seminars on multiple days. After review of both UT’s own scheduling patterns and innovations at peer universities, the taskforce has identified four potential options for changes to the timetable. Those options along with pros and cons of each are provide in the following pages. Following is a time-line for “next steps” in the process.

April-May 2010

- Share alternative timetable options with faculty, staff, and students
- Seek input on which models are most likely to improve both efficiency and effectiveness
- Feedback on the plan should be shared with taskforce co-chairs Don Cox (dcox@utk.edu) and/or Jennifer Hardy (jhardy11@utk.edu).

June-July 2010

- Taskforce works with provost to fine-tune a revised scheduling system
- Develop a clear implementation plan

August 2010

- Provost announces new policy
- Registrar’s office works with departments and schedulers to define new procedures

October 2010

- Instead of rolling the times and days for courses from the previous year's schedule all departments will use the new timetable to schedule classes for fall 2011
- The new scheduling will include planning rubrics – including percentage of classes that can be scheduled during “prime-time” slots – to improve efficiency and effectiveness

Fall 2011 – “Go live”

Fall 2012 – Assess distribution of classes and student, faculty, and staff responses to changes

Variation #1: Hybrid approach. Honoring later start request. All classes with **15-minute breaks**. *Note: a student or teacher with MWF 50-minute and MW 75-minute “back-to-back classes” respectively will have a 40-minute break.*

MWF 50-Minute Class Times	MW, WF, MF 75-Minute Class Times	TR 75-Minute Class Times
8:30-9:20		
9:35-10:25		8:20-9:35
10:40-11:30		9:50-11:05
11:45-12:35		11:20-12:35
12:50-1:40	12:50-2:05	12:50-2:05
2:20-3:10	2:20-3:35	2:20-3:35
3:50-4:40	3:50-5:05	3:50-5:05
5:20-6:10	5:20-6:35	5:20-6:35
6:50-7:40	6:50-8:05	6:50-8:05
8:20-9:10	8:20-9:35	8:20-9:35

Pros - This approach honors the later start time in the mornings. The 75-minute meeting times on days other than TR do not begin until 12:50 - this allows us to continue to have seven time blocks before the five o'clock hour. (In other variations, we essentially lose a time block because of the need to have longer time in between 50-minute classes to preserve the nesting of the time blocks.)

Cons - A drawback to this approach is the potential for a bottleneck on MW afternoons. The College of Business schedules 75-minute blocks on MW, so there may not be enough 75-minute blocks on those days for them to schedule all of their classes so that they don't conflict with each other. Some departments may still 'illegally' schedule 75-minute blocks in the a.m. on MW.

Variation #2: Honoring later start request. Easy to remember start times. MWF with **40-minute breaks**; MW, WF MF and TR classes with **15-minute breaks**; there are **25/30-minute breaks** between MWF and MW (or WF or MF) classes. *Note: MWF classes begin 15 minutes after MW (or WF or MF) classes and end 10 minutes before.*

MWF 50-Minute Class Times	MW, WF, MF 75-Minute Class Times	TR 75-Minute Class Times
8:30-9:20	8:15-9:30	8:15-9:30
10:00-10:50	9:45-11:00	9:45-11:00
11:30-12:20	11:15-12:30	11:15-12:30
1:00-1:50	12:45-2:00	12:45-2:00
2:30-3:20	2:15-3:30	2:15-3:30
4:00-4:50	3:45-5:00	3:45-5:00
5:30-6:20	5:15-6:30	5:15-6:30
7:00-7:50	6:45-8:00	6:45-8:00
8:30-9:20	8:15-9:30	8:15-9:30

Pros - This approach honors the later start requests, with all 75-minute classes having the same times MTWRF. This variation also provides options for evening classes starting during the 5:00 hour (see also Variation #3 Cons).

Cons - The MWF start times are nested within the 75-minute blocks so that neither the start times nor end times match the 75-minute blocks - possible confusion? There are only 6 MWF time blocks before 5pm.

Variation #3: Total unification of start times. MWF 50-minute classes nested at the beginning of MW, WF, MF 75-minute class periods (with **40-minute / 15-minute breaks**, respectively). *Note: creates an opportunity for students and teachers to have back-to-back MWF and MW (or WF or MF) classes if desired.*

MWF 50-Minute Class Times	MW, WF, MF 75-Minute Class Times	TR 75-Minute Class Times
8:00-8:50	8:00-9:15	8:00-9:15
9:30-10:20	9:30-10:45	9:30-10:45
11:00-11:50	11:00-12:15	11:00-12:15
12:30-1:20	12:30-1:45	12:30-1:45
2:00-2:50	2:00-3:15	2:00-3:15
3:30-4:20	3:30-4:45	3:30-4:45
5:00-5:50	5:00-6:15	5:00-6:15
6:30-7:20	6:30-7:45	6:30-7:45
8:00-8:50	8:00-9:15	8:00-9:15

Pros - This approach has the same start time across the board, for all days, and all time blocks. This approach creates the opportunity for students and faculty to have back-to-back MWF and MW (or WF or MF) classes if desired.

Cons - There are only 6 MWF time blocks before 5pm. This approach does not honor the later start times, and there is a concern that the 8:00-8:50 and 8:00-9:15 time blocks will remain largely unused as they are now. Programs that have a large number of evening classes would not have multiple options for the approximately 5:00 hour. (Variation #2 works for them in this regard; they could have a 5:15 or 5:30 start time.)

Variation #4: Honoring later start request. MWF with **45-minute breaks**; MW, WF MF and TR classes with **20-minute breaks**; there are **30/35-minute breaks** between MWF and MW (or WF or MF) classes. *Note: MWF classes begin 15 minutes after MW (or WF or MF) classes and end 10 minutes before.*

MWF 50-Minute Class Times	MW, WF, MF 75-Minute Class Times	TR 75-Minute Class Times
8:30-9:20	8:15-9:30	8:15-9:30
10:05-10:55	9:50-11:05	9:50-11:05
11:40-12:30	11:25-12:40	11:25-12:40
1:15-2:05	1:00-2:15	1:00-2:15
2:50-3:40	2:35-3:50	2:35-3:50
4:25-5:15	4:10-5:25	4:10-5:25
6:00-6:50	5:45-7:00	5:45-7:00
7:35-8:25	7:20-8:35	7:20-8:35
9:10-10:00	8:55-10:10	8:55-10:10

Pros - This approach honors the later start requests, with all 75-minute classes having the same times MTWRF. This variation also allows for 20-minute breaks between TR classes, an idea that was posed by the group as a positive change, given the distances students and faculty potentially have to travel between classes (because they'll now be scheduled across campus instead of just in their own buildings).

Cons - There are only 6 MWF time blocks before 5pm. There are 45-minute breaks between MWF classes. There aren't too many starting options at the 5:00 hour.

In general, the taskforce heard comments that were pro- longer breaks in between classes (getting to and from classes, having 'down time' between classes in a long day of back to back 75-minute classes) as well as anti- longer breaks in between classes (mostly by faculty saying if breaks are too long, their 'back to back' teaching takes too long). Almost everyone was in favor of the later start time, however that presents the issue of losing at least one time block for MWF classes before 5pm. Given that we don't really use the 8:00 time block now, as well as the fact that we're going to be spreading classes across the timetable, this may not be a major issue.

Appendix – Current Valid Class Times for Fall/Spring Semesters

Valid MWF 50-Minute Class Times	Valid TR 75-Minute Class Times
8:00-8:50	8:10-9:25
9:05-9:55	9:40-10:55
10:10-11:00	11:10-12:25
11:15-12:05	12:40-1:55
12:20-1:10	2:10-3:25
1:25-2:15	3:40-4:55
2:30-3:20	5:05-6:20
3:35-4:25	6:30-7:45
4:40-5:30	7:55-9:10
5:45-6:35	9:20-10:35
6:45-7:35	
7:45-8:35	
8:45-9:35	
9:45-10:35	


UPDATE: Spending on Institutional Support in the University of Tennessee System

Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
March 2010

The Budget and Planning Committee of the UTK Faculty Senate regularly reviews UT budget and financial documents. This report provides an update to our April 2009 report and resolution on growth in spending under the category of Institutional Support between 2004 and 2008 (available at http://web.utk.edu/~senate/docs/2008-09/Senate_Agenda_April_20.pdf). The UT Budget web site defines Institutional Support as “costs associated with executive management, fiscal operations, personnel services, and administrative computing.”¹

An analysis of UT budget documents reveals that system-wide spending on Institutional Support increased by \$25.9 million between 2004 and 2008, but fell by just over \$832,000 between 2008 and 2009 (Figure 1). A five-year history in Table 1 shows that expenditures in all other functional classifications increased by similar percentages (about 23 to 29 percent) between 2005 and 2009 except Instruction, which increased by a much smaller percentage (14.3 percent). The five-year breakdown of Institutional Support spending by entity in Table 2 shows that nearly two-thirds of the total increase occurred within System Administration (after accounting for reorganization of certain items across entity lines, as explained in our original report).

Additional data provided by Vice Chancellor Chris Cimino show that the bulk of the increase at the Knoxville campus can be attributed to (a) organizational transfers of items from the system to the UTK campus level as shown in Table 2, (b) minor renovation and construction projects, and (c) administrative support for the increase in sponsored research activity, which is primarily funded out of F&A budgets within research grants. After accounting for these three areas, the UTK increase in Institutional Support spending between 2005 and 2009 was only 13.8 percent.



¹ <http://web.dii.utk.edu/budget/>.

Table 1: University of Tennessee Spending by Functional Classifications

	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	5-year change	Percent change
Instruction	\$376,959,885	\$390,263,177	\$412,401,825	\$433,964,197	\$430,865,699	\$53,905,814	14.30%
Research	62,289,764	60,795,710	63,444,729	74,843,064	76,991,687	14,701,923	23.60%
Public Service	53,745,786	56,852,576	61,949,805	68,744,835	66,079,285	12,333,499	22.95%
Academic Support	92,906,044	98,446,460	107,197,670	116,336,361	115,638,277	22,732,233	24.47%
Student Services	59,835,105	61,493,893	66,131,562	72,341,186	74,668,023	14,832,918	24.79%
Institutional Support	83,788,640	87,859,249	94,773,463	105,311,063	104,478,649	20,690,009	24.69%
Operation and Maintenance of Plant	82,931,500	87,793,430	94,297,378	97,819,062	104,838,903	21,907,403	26.42%
Scholarships & Fellowships	39,712,644	46,563,050	45,972,269	48,299,375	51,077,044	11,364,400	28.62%
	<u>\$852,169,368</u>	<u>\$890,067,545</u>	<u>\$946,168,701</u>	<u>\$1,017,659,143</u>	<u>\$1,024,637,567</u>	172,468,199	20.24%

Sources:

FY 2009 Revised Budget, The University of Tennessee, p 21.

FY 2010 Revised Budget, The University of Tennessee, pp. 25, 31

Table 2: UT Institutional Support Spending by Entity

	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	5 year Change	5 Year % Change	Adjustment to Exclude Reorganization	Adjusted 5-year Change	Adjusted % 5 year Change
Total Institutional Support	83,788,640	87,859,249	93,773,463	105,311,063	104,478,649	20,690,009	24.69%	0	20,690,009	24.69%
Knoxville	9,390,423	11,448,213	12,700,182	23,368,940	25,057,820	15,667,397	166.84%	11,468,243	4,199,154	44.72%
Space Institute	750,858	1,058,048	920,378	1,271,159	1,150,305	399,447	53.20%	226,338	173,109	23.05%
Chattanooga	6,126,431	6,007,870	6,855,977	7,396,813	6,723,037	596,606	9.74%	356,603	240,003	3.92%
Martin	3,656,595	3,721,862	4,143,771	4,337,373	4,367,401	710,806	19.44%		710,806	19.44%
Health Science Center	10,615,284	9,830,363	10,752,522	15,174,997	15,281,425	4,666,141	43.96%	4,164,420	501,721	4.73%
Institute for Agriculture	897,714	1,111,080	1,241,719	1,771,963	1,942,506	1,044,792	116.38%		1,044,792	116.38%
Institute for Public Service	462,581	509,626	514,601	573,406	771,076	308,495	66.69%		308,495	66.69%
System Administration	51,888,754	54,172,186	57,644,313	51,416,413	49,185,079	-2,703,675	-5.21%	-16,215,604	13,511,929	26.04%
	83,788,640	87,859,248	94,773,463	105,311,064	104,478,649					

Sources:

2009 Report to Faculty Senate, Table 1, UT Institutional Support Spending by Entity, 2004-2008

FY 2010 Revised Budget, The University of Tennessee

TUFS Resolutions

Resolution 1

Whereas, the current economic recession brings the greatest hardships to the lowest paid among us,

Therefore be it resolved that, if the Chancellor is authorized to award a bonus to UTK faculty for the 2010-2011 fiscal year, the Faculty Senate supports distribution of the bonus as an equal dollar amount to each faculty member.

Resolution 2

Whereas, the current economic recession brings the greatest hardships to the lowest paid among us,

Therefore be it resolved that, if the Chancellor is authorized to award a bonus to UTK employees at for the 2010-2011 fiscal year, the Faculty Senate supports distribution of the bonus as an equal dollar amount to each employee.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
MAY 3, 2010, 3:30 P.M.
UNIVERSITY CENTER
SHILOH ROOM
President's Office: 607 Dougherty Engineering Building
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-2210 (865) 974-8376