

MINUTES
Executive Committee
February 11, 2008

Present: Denise Barlow, Stephen Blackwell, Marianne Breinig, Becky Fields (for R. Ellis), Lou Gross, Joanne Hall, Joan Heminway, Suzanne Kurth, India Lane, John Lounsbury, Beauvais Lyons, John Nolt, David Patterson, Owen Ragland, Otis Stephens

Guests: Todd Diacon, Rita Geier, Susan Martin, Scott Simmons

I. CALL TO ORDER

D. Patterson called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting of January 14, 2008, were approved.

III. REPORTS

President's Report (D. Patterson)

Enrollment. President Patterson reported, based on the Enrollment Management meeting, that it appeared the acceptance rate for new students would probably be 65% down from 71% last year. T. Diacon explained that there are more top-level applicants who would not have applied for admission in the past. No one knows at what point legislators might raise questions about the percentage of applicants who are denied admission. Governor Bredesen and THEC are "on board," but some legislators, including some in the local district, are not. Diacon noted the potential effects of unplanned enrollment growth and raised the question of the appropriate timing of revision in target enrollment numbers. The campus is admitting 4200 students and retaining more of them. Also, more of the students accepted are enrolling. L. Gross proposed the campus should reduce the target number.

Faculty Role in Administration. Patterson asserted that recent actions by the system administration (e.g., mission statement and disposition of Cherokee Farm) can be seen as violating the *Faculty Handbook*. The faculty should be involved in framing priorities, e.g., in the development plan for the University and changes to physical facilities. Patterson stated his perspective that the designated role of the faculty has not been honored.

Patterson announced that J. Lounsbury agreed to chair the Student Concerns Committee for the remainder of the term.

Provost's Report (S. Martin and T. Diacon)

S. Martin and Diacon represented Provost Holub at the meeting and were available to answer questions. Gross asked who paid the Chancellor's salary. Martin said that the campus did.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

No Confidence Vote/Meeting with President (D. Patterson)

Patterson reported that he had talked with M. Nichols about arranging for a small group (L. Gross, N. Howell, J. Lounsbury, J. Nolt, D. Patterson, O. Stephens, and C. White) to meet with President Petersen. The meeting was tentatively scheduled for February 22 at 10 a.m. Ground rules for the meeting had not been established yet. Patterson opened up the discussion for questions to be introduced at that meeting.

J. Heminway shared what she had told Patterson in a conversation, that in her view the approach to this meeting should be different, i.e., there should not be a set of charges brought to the meeting. She explained that she is an optimist. She asserted the need for objectives. B. Lyons asked

Heminway if the basis for a no confidence vote rests on public statements not fulfilled and areas not responded to, how such a vote could be taken, if those points were not addressed. Heminway reaffirmed the need to be positive. She suggested when there are objectives like changes in IT, the question is how do we get this done. She indicated she believed the President was probably doing things, but that there was no common bridge. O. Ragland noted the military does not emphasize shared governance and that as a consequence others have different perspectives than he has. He suggested considering in what areas the President wants faculty input. Petersen clearly has not communicated on some issues like IT. In his view the question is how to get to the desired end state. He has not observed a strong relationship between the President's staff and the campus staff in contrast to the military where staffs work together. D. Barlow commented that sometimes they work together and sometimes they do not. She said that it seemed related to personality. O. Stephens asked what she meant by personality. Was it the people involved? Barlow concurred. Stephens asked whether problems were ever linked to issues. Barlow said it was personality.

Gross said if there was going to be a meeting, there should be a list of items for campus/system collaboration. He noted he was cynical. Gross pointed out he had posted several questions/suggestions. In his view the problems are structural. There are two very different groups with little in common, except personnel (Knoxville and Agriculture). The current President, as previous Presidents, has ignored structural problems. He felt the Board of Trustees had been lied to and is appalled that the President's staff had lied to them. Heminway said she did not have a list. She advocated taking a different approach, such as asking the President to provide a list. I. Lane agreed with Heminway that the discussion should focus on communication rather than issues. She pointed out as someone from the Agriculture campus that faculty there do not want Knoxville to have control. She said focus should be on interfacing as interfaces confuse people. She advocated focusing on communication and collaboration to constructively move forward. Lounsbury said in his view communication could not have been any clearer. As an organizational person, he found the results of the survey appalling. He pointed out as a problem things like the President's unlikely assertion that faculty share his vision. He said he would like clarification of shared governance. J. Hall said he used the term faculty governance rather than the term shared governance. She thought the President laid out a top-down structure that suggested he was not working on interfacing. She pointed out that the faculty had spoken and the Executive Committee cannot ignore the questions it had asked the faculty to respond to.

Patterson said there were communication problems, e.g., its unidirectional nature and the articulation of intention to institute changes that do not occur (IT). But, he argued, there were other problems related to ineffective governance of the University. The JIAM building was delayed two years with the decision to not put it on campus. The engineering building that was to be completed this year had not been started. He also brought up the Vice President's role in software selection and the creation of online degree programs across the state without faculty input. He argued such things had deleterious effects on faculty work. Lounsbury said there were negatives perceptions in the community, i.e., people asking what is wrong.

Heminway wanted to separate conduct of the meeting with the President (collaboration and communication) from other initiatives. S. Blackwell said a list of action items could be put together and the faculty could seek commitments. Then the administration could be held accountable down the road. Nolt argued not much would occur without goals. He wondered whether there could be a conversation about how such a list of items could be accomplished. He suggested there was a need for a list of specific goals. Stephens liked the idea of a specific list that would be given to the President in advance. He expressed the need to come across as committed to the University. Patterson said he would have the list of questions sent out before the open meeting. Nolt said he wanted them as items, not questions. Lane asked about the list Gross had. Gross identified IT, IRIS (grants administration problems), financial transparency (promised in November), ORNL faculty appointments (how paid for), and benefits to campus of supercomputer associated with

collaboration with ORNL. Blackwell identified other items: collaboration between campus and system staffs, regularly scheduled meetings to discuss development of Cherokee Farm, and the need for a point person for every item. Lyons asked how UTK faculty could facilitate the filling of the Governor's Chair positions that have to be situated in academic units. The failure to fill those reflects a problem. Heminway expressed her appreciation of Lyons' phrasing "how can we facilitate." She asked whether the list should be generated at the meeting or delegated to the subcommittee. Patterson responded that taking a social work perspective would be similar to approaching a meeting with a person with whom there was a problematic relationship and saying how can we change to accommodate. Lane said what you would do? Patterson said he would ask them when they would take responsibility for the relationship and what they were doing that impeded doing that. Lane said it was not a people problem. Hall using Patterson's analogy said it would be the President and Chancellor's relationship and that was symptomatic of where the institution is.

Breinig was concerned about all the discussion about another meeting. Her sense was the natural sciences faculty was overwhelmingly for a no confidence vote and would not want another meeting to forestall a vote. Gross concluded that it sounded like a dysfunctional organization that may need a mediator, someone not part of the organization. Patterson said he could take that idea to the President's staff. Lounsbury said he saw this as a last chance and that it was either too early or too late for a mediator. Stephens saw the meeting as one last attempt at dialogue.

Lyons said an action item was needed, i.e., a set of discussion topics for the meeting. He asked whether such a list could be formed as a resolution. In his view, what was desired was a proactive, non-combative exchange with the President. Lyons moved that the Executive Committee empower the subcommittee to formulate a set of discussion topics of mutual concern. Heminway seconded. Ragland proposed a friendly amendment asking the President to also formulate a set of discussion topics that was accepted. In the ensuing discussion Ragland noted that if a no confidence vote were taken too early, it would not be good. Lounsbury commented it was another list. In his view there needed to be dialogue about the President's role and the faculty's role. Stephens agreed. Nolt said he would like to come out of the meeting with constructive steps. Resolution passed.

B. Fields said she had a sense similar to Breinig's that the faculty had effectively voted. She asked: What do we do? What is the time line? How long should the faculty have to wait? Breinig said there was a good chance that a no confidence motion would come from the floor at the next meeting of the whole body.

Nolt said a big splash had been made. In his view, pursuing a no confidence vote at this time would not be very effective. Breinig said someone needed to inform the faculty. Patterson said he saw informing people as his role. He said he was cognizant that if the Executive Committee went forward with a motion that failed, that it would be a problem, also. Heminway noted the opposition of a number of Law faculty members who had contacted her with their opinions on the issue. Patterson declared that responsible action was being pursued.

Graduate Council Bylaws (M. Murray)

M. Murray was ill. Lyons asked if it was the first reading. Patterson said there had been no bylaws for the Council. Breinig said they had not been approved by the Council. Lyons said it was an information item then.

Research Council – Faculty Forum (J. Hall)

Hall reported the Research Council was working on identifying topics and participants for panels that would address intellectual growth and resources on campus. The first panel was scheduled for March 5 at 4 p.m. in conjunction with the Office of Research.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Research Parks Report (S. Simmons)

Patterson indicated that he had asked S. Simmons to pull together information on research parks in response to University efforts to apparently create a public/private one at Cherokee Farm. Simmons reported there was not much information on them. There are apparently two often hard to define conflicting views. There are business folks (looking at profits) and academics focused on research dollars and benefits to the university. Simmons found 72% of tenants at such parks are business and only 11% university employees. Private corporations manage 57% of the parks. Different numbers are produced on profitability and viability. There are apparently some problems with attracting tenants, e.g., 75% desire to have amenities, such as stores and day care on site, that are cost prohibitive. Generating a positive revenue stream is difficult.

One study was of 116 parks. (Parks included in the study were at least four years old due to the high mortality rate for parks.) White men held the vast majority of new jobs in the parks. “True” parks do not make a profit and have no significant effect on their regional economies. The likelihood of a park being successful is apparently linked to a university being perceived as top flight (e.g., top 30).

Lyons expressed concern about the business incubator building inaugurated last fall. He asked whether having a mix of academic and research buildings would increase the probability of success. Was there a case for looking at broad mixed use? Simmons replied that the two groups had different goals. Business partners are reluctant to give up information, while academics are more likely to do so. There could be more conflict mixing business and academic groups because of their different goals. Hall asked what gains did the universities reap. Simmons looked at economic development and impact. He said there were some slight indications of more research faculty members and dollars, but economic impact was not the focus of his research. Hall said it should be noted that areas like RTI developed because research dollars were already there. Simmons agreed that if reputation and research are in place beforehand, chances of success dramatically increase. As a point of information, Gross noted apropos of Simmons mention of child-care as a desired amenity that the Senate passed a resolution about having childcare available at Cherokee Farm last year. Patterson asked what should be done. Lyons said it would be useful to have it as an information item for the next meeting. Lounsbury said it needed to be put in the context of Cherokee Farm.

Crabtree Recognition Resolution (D. Patterson)

Patterson asked Barlow for clarification of numbers. Barlow said currently the numbers were optimistic. Gross had different numbers. Simmons realized the numbers were not budgeted ones. As the resolution referred to Crabtree, the question was what numbers should be in it. (There was confusion between the job announcement and resolution.) Barlow said she preferred expenditures (fiscal year 2007 actual research expenditures plus F & A). Gross said research expenditures should be close to his \$157 million number. Simmons was thanked for drafting the resolution. Lyons said the other question to consider was whether Crabtree would be present to receive it. He would like to do more than put it in the minutes. Patterson said he was going to create a plaque and send it to him. Heminway moved and Nolt seconded that the resolution be approved with the appropriate numbers inserted. Motion passed.

WHEREAS, Chancellor Loren Crabtree was a highly-respected leader and colleague at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville; and

WHEREAS, he served this campus as Chancellor with tremendous integrity and fortitude for nearly five years; and

WHEREAS, he prior served just as commendably as Provost of this campus for two academic years; and

WHEREAS, under his leadership and tutelage, this campus enjoyed a record-breaking year in terms of garnered research dollars in 2007, accumulating nearly \$130 million in total awards, the highest such number in its 213-year history; and

WHEREAS, in his final year of guidance, the campus admitted the most highly-qualified entering academic class in its history, with an average grade point average of 3.6 and an ACT score of 25.8; and

WHEREAS, his vision and determination vaulted the University's flagship campus into the ranks of the top public research institutions in these great United States; and

WHEREAS, he persevered in his support of the principles of shared governance to the benefit of the faculty, students, and administration alike; and

WHEREAS, his inspirational leadership and camaraderie will be remembered far longer than his interrupted tenure;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the University of Tennessee Faculty Senate expresses its sincere appreciation to

Chancellor Loren Crabtree

For his exemplary leadership and service as the voice and face of the Knoxville campus of the University of Tennessee, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a copy of this Resolution be presented to Chancellor Crabtree, and that the Resolution become part of the minutes of the Senate meeting held on February 25, 2008.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Ombuds (J. Heminway)

Ombuds Resolution. The document is a response to Provost Holubs' dissatisfaction with a current statement in the *Faculty Handbook*. The Committee engaged in a long and difficult discussion of the proposed changes. Some wanted to have a faculty member knowledgeable of faculty issues and roles in the position. The proposed resolution includes:

- change in number, plural to singular references, reflecting one instead of three
- a new paragraph addressing integration with faculty, as being a faculty member would no longer be a requirement
- a footnote indicating the position may be combined with that of a staff ombuds
- a shift in reporting responsibility from the Provost to the Chancellor.

Based on consultation with Parliamentarian Stephens, the changes could be expedited. If the document were approved at the Executive Committee meeting, it would not need to be considered at two full Senate meetings. It could be voted on at the next Senate meeting. Gross asked why it would not require two readings. Stephens said it would not be required, as it is a change in the *Faculty Handbook*, not the *Bylaws*. Lyons said there was a tradition of having two readings and he was worried that following a different process would not be a good idea. It would be better to present it at the next meeting, encourage discussion of it, and then vote on it at the March meeting.

He thought faculty concern would focus on the selection process and why a faculty member would not hold the position. Those decisions needed to be explained. Patterson asked about following tradition. Heminway said she would not object. Stephens said he would not either. Gross argued the need for historical information pointing out that why the changes were being made was not discussed. He did not know who should prepare the explanation, but the document was written by the administration. Patterson indicated he would be glad to explain the background. Heminway said each time it gets explained the explanation is different. She expressed her willingness to work with Patterson on such an introduction. Lyons said it was important to let people know they should express their concerns at the first reading or on the listserv.

Leadership Group on Interculturalism (R. Geier)

R. Geier reported the Committee was pulled together by former Chancellor Crabtree to focus on intercultural education and to enhance diversity goals. The Committee had addressed: integrating goals into procedures, drafting a statement for faculty and staff position announcements, and defining diversity broadly. Gross playing devil's advocate said his colleagues might question asking candidates for Mathematics' positions how they would contribute to intercultural education. Geier discussed the importance of broadening perspectives. Breinig said she saw the merits of the policy statement, but she did not see what would be the gain from the "demonstration" component for new hires. Geier said aren't departments generally hiring people with faculty experience. Breinig said no. Geier pointed out that in any case they would have had relevant personal and educational experiences. Lyons pointed out that the "tag line" in advertisements is usually shorter because of costs. He asked whether the long statement would be included when advertisements were placed in career bulletins. Geier said she did not know. Gross pulled up the Chancellor position announcement. Geier said she thought it should always be used. Lyons said it was especially important to provide it to those outside the "cultural" sphere. Lyons said he applauded the institution for dealing with diversity in employment. He said he would like to see the statement in every published document (e.g., graduation program). He asked whether having it appear in other documents was a goal. Geier replied it was tied to recruitment. Lyons encouraged her to push the application of the statement in other venues. Hall pointed out that there are no protective statements for students (e.g., covering housing). Patterson said he would bring the statement up at the next meeting for action. Breinig said she remained concerned about implementation.

Budget and Planning Committee – Shared Governance Fund (S. Blackwell)

Patterson said some money from the fund was used for the reception for former Chancellor Crabtree. A draft of a letter soliciting fund contributions had received approval from appropriate administrators.

Chancellor's Search (D. Patterson)

Patterson noted the position announcement had been distributed and that Heminway would serve on the search committee.

Faculty Senate Elections (J. Nolt)

Nolt reported he had sent a message to the academic deans about the upcoming election. He sought advice. The number of FTEs in Engineering has dropped, so that they should have 8 not 9 Senators next year. The response he received was that Engineering had had 8 Senators, but there was an agreement to add Senator L. Parker to their representatives with the relocation of Computer Science. Gross said it would be appropriate for her to continue to serve. Lyons offered two options for retaining her: not hold an election for a vacant seat or have 9.

Meeting adjourned 5:36 p.m.