

**SENATE MEETING  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2008  
3:30 P.M. UNIVERSITY CENTER  
SHILOH ROOM**

**Agenda**

John Nolt, President  
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary to the Senate

Becky Jacobs and Carl Pierce, Co-Parliamentarians  
Toby Boulet, President-Elect

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Establishment of Quorum (S. Kurth)  
Senate President's Report (J. Nolt)  
Chancellor's Report (J. Simek)  
Provost's Report (S. Martin)

**MINUTES**

Faculty Senate Meeting, October 20, 2008 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting, November 3, 2008 (information item)

**MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

Minutes from the Graduate Council of October 30, 2008, were distributed to Senators electronically prior to the meeting and available at (<http://gradschool.utk.edu/GraduateCouncil/Minutes/GCMinutes10302008.pdf>)  
Minutes from the Undergraduate Council of October 28, 2008, were distributed to Senators electronically prior to the meeting and available at (<http://web.utk.edu/~ugcouncil/docs/minutes/UGCMinutes102808.pdf>)  
Implementation of these minutes takes place after approval of the Faculty Senate.

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

Report of Safe Zones Task Force (information item)

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

Faculty Affairs Committee (J. Heminway)

**NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Discussion with Women's Athletic Director Joan Cronan (M. Holland)  
Report on Senate Effectiveness Task Force faculty survey (C. White)

**ADJOURNMENT**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 20, 2008 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, November 3, 2008 (information item)  
Minutes from the Graduate Council of October 30, 2008  
Minutes from the Undergraduate Council of October 28, 2008  
Report of Safe Zones Task Force  
Memorandum to Faculty Senators from Joan Heminway  
Resolution from Faculty Affairs Committee on Reappointment of Department Heads  
Resolution from Faculty Affairs Committee on Timing of Annual Evaluations

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

**PRESIDENT'S OFFICE:** John Nolt  
Department of Philosophy  
974-7218; nolt@utk.edu

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
October 20, 2008

Those absent were: Brian Ambroziak, Lt. Col. Michael Angle, David Atkins, Lora Beebe, Roberto Benson, Bill Blass, Thomas Boehm, Bill Bradshaw, Max Cheng, Linden Craig, Paul Crilly, Steven Dandaneau, Ruth Darling, Jim Drake, Mary Gunther\*, Lee Han, Douglas Hayes, Tricia Hepner, Bill Hofmeister, Roxanne Hovland, Yuri Kamychkov, Scott Kinzy, John Koontz, Jeff Kovac, James Larson, Jun Lin, Norman Magden, Murray Marks, Mike McKinney, John McRae, Lynne Parker, Trena Paulus, Lloyd Rinehart\*, W. Tim Rogers, Molly Royse\*, Rupy Sawhney, Jon Shefner, Neal Shover, Montgomery Smith, Marlys Staudt, Johanna Stiebert, Patricia Tithof, Gary Ubben, Michelle Violanti, Tse-Wei Wang, Andrew Wentzel, Tim Young, Yang Zhong

\*Alternate Senators: Carole Myers for Mary Gunther, Keith Stanga for Lloyd Rinehart, Jeanine Williamson for Molly Royse.

J. Nolt called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Establishment of a Quorum (S. Kurth)

S. Kurth reported a quorum was present.

Senate President's Report (J. Nolt)

*Budget.* J. Nolt reported that when the Senate's resolution advocating differential tuition was reported in the newspaper, some legislators were unhappy. Governor Bredesen told the *Chattanooga Free Press* that he would rather see program mergers than tuition increases. The Senate will continue to press for differential tuition.

The budget report was dire. The Audiology and Speech Pathology program is being closed on this campus and is being moved to Memphis. The undergraduate degree programs will eventually be eliminated. The Dance and Industrial and Organizational Psychology (IO) programs are slated for campus closure. The program changes would go through the regular curricular process, but a plan would be submitted to the Board of Trustees later in the week. Both the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils looked at the proposed program closures, but concluded there was not adequate time or information available to make decisions. Nolt said there was a need for a new process. S. Martin's Program Reduction Task Force would begin meeting the next week. Nolt pointed out the need for adequate representation from different colleges made the role of caucus chairs even more important. Caucus chairs were needed for Arts & Sciences—Natural Sciences, Social Work, and Education, Health, and Human Sciences. He asked for volunteers to speak with him after the meeting. The process of budget reduction will be painful. Faculty members will look to campus and system administrators to make cuts too in order to protect the core mission of the University

*Chancellor Search.* The announcement of a new Chancellor would probably be announced later in the week. Nolt was forming an informal advisory group to develop recommendations to put before the new Chancellor. Those recommendations would be given to the Executive Committee and then presented to the Senate at its January meeting.

*Energy Conservation.* The campus has been hit simultaneously by budget cuts and rising energy costs. The Office of Sustainability established during the summer is focused on reducing costs. The "Switch Your Thinking" campaign goal has a 10% cost reduction goal. Energy problems can be

reported via a link on the Make Orange Green site: <http://environment.utk.edu/>. An effort is underway to infuse environmental concerns into the curriculum.

*Survey.* Nolt directed attention to the Faculty Senate Effectiveness survey results included in the materials distributed for the meeting.

*Faculty Council.* The meeting scheduled for the weekend was postponed. Nolt and D. Patterson (replacing B. Lyons) are the campus representatives. Nolt noted the rally the United Campus Workers would be holding at noon Wednesday.

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

*Budget.* The recent reduction was 3.53% in addition to what had been cut earlier. As it was never clear if it was an impoundment or a permanent cut, the campus could use loose resources to cover it. Units had been told to prepare for a 2% one-time reduction (e.g., instructor money, travel). The differential was covered centrally. The administration is preparing for future budget cuts that probably will necessitate a reduction in force (RIF), and may include a reduction in programs, mission change, and administrative streamlining.

*Chancellor Search.* The Search Committee sent two names to the President and his announcement of his selection would be made soon. Simek said he would leave a blueprint for the new Chancellor. Nimbleness would be needed.

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

S. Martin noted that the first class of Chancellor's Professors was being honored that day. The goal is to have a group of 18-20 distinguished faculty members (full professors with five or more years of service at UTK) that would meet and offer advice. The first class was then introduced. She then reported that the recent Deans, Directors and Department Heads' retreat focused on managing and leading in times of change. She directed attention to the information posted on the Provost's web site and expressed the hope that the new Program Reduction Task Force would use it and other materials as resources.

### **MINUTES**

#### Faculty Senate Meeting

The minutes of the September 8, 2008, Faculty Senate meeting were moved by D. Birdwell and seconded by G. Graber. Minutes approved.

#### Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting

The minutes of the October 6, 2008, meeting of the Executive Committee were available as an information item.

### **MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

#### Graduate Council Minutes (V. Anfara)

Nolt pointed out that the minutes of the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council contained program closure reports. Senate approval of Council minutes puts into effect actions within them.

V. Anfara reported the Council met August 28 and September 28. The committee structure was reviewed and each committee is in the process of establishing bylaws. He pointed out the recommendations of the Credentials Committee. Various colleges had curricular changes. The Executive Committee is working on a policy for awarding honorary degrees at UTK.

M. Murray, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Program Closure, reported on the Committee's activities since it was formed in mid-August. To evaluate the soundness of closing the IO and Audiology and Speech Pathology programs they considered the RR Task Force guidelines. The Committee realized it did not have the time or resources to do what was needed and that the RR Task Force guidelines were never approved by anyone. The Committee reported to the Council that they did not see that two programs could be reviewed in isolation. The report did not take an up or down stance on the proposed closures, but rather recommended a focus on process. The Council accepted the Committee's recommendation with one person abstaining.

J. Heminway asked what would happen next with the report. Nolt said he thought it would be passed on to the Board of Trustees and the Program Reduction Task Force. J. Hall asked about budget cuts beyond those involved in the proposed program closures, e.g., reduction in faculty size. She wondered whether there should be a broader process. Nolt said there were policies that addressed dire situations that constituted financial exigency (e.g., AAUP Redbook). The big gap in his view was having a way for faculty members and administrators to work together on budget cuts. J. Malia said what was not in place was planning for who would be involved. Hall expressed the desire to be as responsive as possible. Report approved.

#### Undergraduate Council Minutes

Minutes of the September 16, 2008, meeting was approved.

### **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

#### Budget and Planning Committee: Faculty Salary Report (D. Bruce)

The report was included in the materials distributed for the meeting. The Budget and Planning Committee is working on a supplementary report that considers part time faculty pay and administrative salary comparisons.

### **NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### Athletic Committee (M. Holland)

At the behest of the Athletic Committee, Athletic Director Mike Hamilton gave a power point presentation that provided information and addressed questions received prior to the meeting. His report is available at <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/index.html>. Hamilton said his goal since being appointed in 2003 was to be an open book. He encouraged people with questions to contact him at [mhamilton@tennesse.edu](mailto:mhamilton@tennesse.edu). And, he expressed the hope that he would have the opportunity to meet with the Senate more often.

Hamilton was asked about coordination on the advertising promoting the campus during televised athletic events. He said the University (not the Athletic Department) provides the advertisements aired during games. There is a new television contract. There will be online ESPN360.com. The University will determine the content for ESPNU and it will be all academically driven.

Hamilton was asked about the \$7 million reserve. He indicated that \$500,000 would be donated to the new Chancellor, as the new Chancellor would be strapped. He said the University requires a 6-8% reserve. He had talked with the Chancellor and the President about the new contract and funds available to the University.

Hamilton was asked whether there was any information about post college activities or if there was only information about graduation rates. He indicated there were no post college data. D. Patterson asked about the graduation rate for football players. For football the rate is 54%. The rate needs to improve for basketball players. Patterson also asked about the possible impact of the current economic downturn. Hamilton replied that it might impact major gifts, that is, people may

delay making major donations. A recent budget cutting exercise was conducted in anticipation of an anticipated shortfall due to such things as increased transportation costs. He noted there are always risks with dependence on discretionary revenue. One Senator commented on the change in the football ticket benefit (increased cost of tickets). Hamilton noted there is a faculty/staff pool of tickets. This year some tickets were available for those who did not have them and he anticipates there will be some available next year. It turned out to be a bad time for an increase.

Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS): Membership (J. Nolt)

The President of the Faculty Senate at ETSU last spring initiated a meeting of representative from four-year state institutions. The goal was to create an organization of faculty senates that would facilitate communication and cooperation, as well as foster shared governance. A constitution was drawn up at an August meeting. Each school would be represented at meetings held twice a year. The Executive Committee passed a resolution proposing the UTK Faculty Senate join the organization. Nolt was asked who would pay for travel to the meetings. He replied that funds would come from the Senate budget. The costs should be limited as the meetings would be in state and held at state parks. Motion passed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Kurth, Secretary

Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
MINUTES  
November 3, 2008

Present: Vince Anfara, Denise Barlow, Doug Birdwell, Toby Boulet, Donald Bruce, Paul Crilly, Becky Fields, Joan Heminway, Margo Holland, Becky Jacobs, Suzanne Kurth, India Lane, Catherine Luther, Beauvais Lyons, Susan Martin, John Nolt, David Patterson, Carl Pierce, Wornie Reed, John Romeiser, Anne Smith, Tse-Wei Wang

Guests: Jan Simek, Scott Simmons, Ken Stephenson for Joanne Hall,

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

J. Nolt called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

### **II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the October 6, 2008, meeting were moved by T. Boulet, seconded by D. Birdwell and approved.

### **III. REPORTS**

Senate President's Report (J. Nolt)

*Budget Problems.* J. Nolt reported on his comments to the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting in October. The comments are posted on the website under "President's Comments." He pointed out that the campus had never recovered from previous cuts, e.g., the campus no longer has a tenured faculty member to teach Chinese. He also talked about academic program eliminations and the need to consider *other* efficiencies. (The BOT has a committee focused on efficiencies probably primarily at the system level.) Nolt also emphasized the need for a tuition increase. In addition, in meetings with individual trustees he emphasized energy conservation, a tuition increase, and administrative efficiency particularly at the system level. The appointment of Chancellor Cheek was announced at the BOT meeting.

Provost Martin has a task force (B. Ambroziak, T. Boulet, C. Hodges, M. Murray, J. Nolt, L. Parker, J. Romeiser, and P. Williams) that is developing program evaluation criteria and procedures for obtaining faculty input. The committee has had one meeting. S. Simmons is obtaining information from peer institutions. As all faculty members have program affiliations, there are conflicts of interest. So, processes need to be out in the open before the Senate. The goal is to have criteria and procedures to the Senate in the spring.

A committee that emerged informally is working on ideas for budget reductions and recommendations for the new Chancellor (T. Boulet, M. Murray, B. Bruce, D. Patterson, and J. Nolt).

Nolt met with D. Millhorn and discussed the development of Cherokee Farm and ORNL. They talked about poor communication between the campus and the system. The plan is to have Millhorn talk with campus researchers. Nolt wants there to be an academic component at Cherokee Farm.

The question of where tenure would reside for the new chancellor was noted.

The BOT was notified that the proposed closures of the graduate and undergraduate programs in Audiology and Speech Pathology, the graduate program in Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and the undergraduate minor in Dance would go through normal channels. The Chairs of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils were asked if they had received any paperwork. They had not. Nolt commented that the process needed to move forward in a timely manner for the process to be completed by the end of the year. Chancellor Simek clarified that the department would initiate the paperwork for the program closures, e.g., I. Schwarz would apply to the Graduate Council. The application to the Undergraduate Council for the closure of the undergraduate programs will be much slower to allow students to complete their degrees. V. Anfara asked about the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Program. Simek said he could not speak for Provost Martin. The College of Education, Health and Human Sciences would probably put forward the paperwork for the Dance Program.

Nolt said he thought the two proposals to be introduced by the Faculty Affairs Committee should be heard differently from the usual Senate custom. Typically, there are two readings, but the proposals were time sensitive. He suggested sending them to Senators immediately if approved with a notice stating that a vote would be taken at the November 17 meeting of the Faculty Senate. This process would not violate any rules as the two reading requirement is for revision to the *Bylaws* and these are revisions to the *Faculty Handbook*.

D. Patterson said Nolt might consider sending his BOT comments to the faculty. He asked whether Millhorn provided a timetable for what would be happening at Cherokee Farm. Nolt responded that he was on the committee that had one meeting in October. The stated goal was to break ground in the spring, but that did not seem realistic. Discussion of the need to act to retain the federal funding for the JIAMS building supported the idea that some type of ground breaking would occur in the spring.

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

J. Simek complimented Nolt on his presentation to the BOT. The BOT is concerned about structure, i.e., the size of the system administration and its effectiveness, which is not the campus focus. The campus does not want to respond to the BOT's Efficiency and Effectiveness Task Force, rather the goal is to be proactive. The campus is engaging in studies of campus processes and structures. The goal is to demonstrate that the campus has adequately "tunneled down." Simek gave the example of how UTK processes student tuition invoices. The current multiple mailings involve substantial costs in labor, energy, and paper. Changing to electronic billing would produce a saving of \$65-66,000 and 33 trees (reducing our carbon footprint). J. Heminway asked that they also look at the process for students that are children of faculty. Simek also identified the process for registering international students that currently requires too many different people handle the papers. He also discussed the use of motorcycles and bicycles to help the police force stay within its leases of SUVs and pursuit vehicles.

Simek anticipates a base budget reduction similar in size to the one incurred this year. Reducing unit budgets 5% would produce about 2/3 of the money needed. The other 1/3 would be covered centrally. He indicated that he did not see how to avoid cuts in personnel. Revenue enhancements were also being considered, such as lab fees. Such fees have to be approved by the BOT, so the timing would be risky. Simek said he would have a draft budget for Chancellor Cheek.

B. Lyons asked about enrollment management, specifically whether the size of the entering class would be reduced. Simek said it would, but there would not be much gain unless there were a shift in in-state and out-of-state students. Lyons asked about outsourcing and whether there were ethical ways to do it. Simek said yes, but pointed out that by definition outsourcing means people will lose jobs. Lyons asked specifically about the motor pool. Simek said it was not a campus operation, but again any change in it would mean people would lose jobs. Lyons asked if there was a commitment to limiting the impact of budget cuts could Simek offer a rebuttal to across the board salary reduction. Simek explained everyone would have to agree to such a reduction and there would be contractual/legal issues that could lead to litigation. Simek said the people administering the campus are good people and the campus needs to figure out how to have nimble responses.

P. Crilly said that lab fees are supposed to go to particular programs. Simek said the issue is that there are programs, such as in art, which should be eligible to have fees and have not gotten them because of resistance to adding fees as a form of tuition increase.

T. Wang asked if anyone was working on adjusting the temperature in SERF. Simek replied that work was proceeding on a detailed plan.

Patterson asked in what department the new chancellor would be tenured. S. Martin said it was under discussion and it would go through all procedures. Patterson said students at the BOT meeting raised the question about sports fields. Simek replied that the University is acquiring property between Lake and Terrace that will be committed to fields in the near term. Patterson pointed out that he had recently received the faculty/staff/student directory. He asked whether the campus needed to continue printing it. Simek said no. D. Birdwell said *Business Week* concluded that the worst response to a downturn is to take advantage of employees in the short term. He commented that the motor pool has been turning cars over at 50,000 miles, a standard that dates from a time when cars had a shorter lifetime, and turning them over at 80,000 miles would save money. Simek replied it was a system operation and noted that car dealers had a role in setting the mileage standard. Then Birdwell asked how much money was being spent per person on the e-mail system. Simek said J. Poore would need to come to explain, as he did not know. In his assessment the e-mail system is working better this year, but still some units are using other systems. Birdwell that, if it were \$50 a head as had heard, it exceeded the industry standard of @\$10. And, he noted that fewer servers had been replaced with more. Nolt encouraged people to go to the Chancellor's website link to make suggestions and/or to the suggestion link on the website of D. Horne, Chair of the Board of Trustees' Committee.

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

S. Martin reported that she is working on reports for the Chancellor including revenue enhancement ideas. She attended the meeting of the BOT's Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee. The Committee wants to look at all levels. The University of Maryland had been visited. Faculty workloads are one thing at issue. C. Pierce asked whether the campus had started collecting information on savings from actions, such as not hiring adjuncts. Martin said the Deans knew of no cuts in adjuncts hired for terms or one-year non-tenure track positions. Reductions would have been in those hired a semester at a time. Pierce said he was concerned about possible reductions that would result in people not being willing to come back to teach at



later dates. S. Martin said there had been an increase in the number of untenured faculty to cover the increased number of students. The problem is more often seen as one of increased use of adjuncts/lecturers leading to reduction in the number of tenured faculty. Wang asked whether with lottery scholarships and higher test scores for entering students there was a need to reduce the number of "remedial" courses. Martin said the state is raising the high school graduation requirements. Simek said there should be fewer inadequately prepared students, as a result. Crilly reported that numerous students enter not ready to pursue engineering. He asked whether teaching them what they need could be outsourced to Pellissippi. Stephenson said the math courses might be moneymakers because of the cost of instructors. Birdwell asked about consolidating the teaching of courses, e.g., eliminating course like math for education students. Martin said faculty members have to inform her about such issues.

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

*Report of Safe Zones Task Force.* The report of the task force established to consider safe zones for Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transsexuals was included in the materials distributed for the meeting as an information item.

##### Faculty Affairs Committee (J. Heminway)

*Resolution on Reappointment of Department Heads.* The Executive Committee voted to return the resolution on the reappointment of department heads to the Faculty Affairs Committee at its October meeting. The reason for pushing through the revisions (considering not having a second reading) is the timing of faculty evaluations and reviews of department heads. Comments were invited from the Chancellor and the Vice President for Agriculture. None were received. The primary objection had been that no faculty vote was mandated before reappointment. The Committee added back in a faculty vote along with the opportunity for units to develop other forms of consensus building. Also, some "wills" were changed to "shalls." Lyons indicated this modification was in response to comments from Deans, who perceived the process was somewhat backward preferring faculty input before they made decisions. He thought it was a workable solution. With reference to the omission of a first reading, he argued that any changes from the floor should be discouraged. He also argued that a brief narrative summary or "skinny" on the changes prepared by Heminway would be helpful. Nolt stated the goal was to get the resolution out before the end of the week. Pierce noted that, as the *Bylaws* do not require two readings, all Senators needed was the information; that two readings were not required. He also disagreed with Lyons about discouraging Senate involvement. Nolt commented that changes from the floor could not be ruled out, but they could be discouraged. The resolution came as a motion to the Executive Committee. The resolution with a cover memo was to be given to the Senate for action at its next meeting. The motion passed.

#### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

##### Faculty Affairs Committee (J. Heminway)

*Resolution on Timing of Annual Evaluations.* The resolution proposes changing the timing of annual faculty evaluations. Currently departments are conducting retention reviews in the fall and annual evaluations in the spring for the same faculty members. Having annual evaluations in the fall would work better. UTIA and UTSI would not be included in the change in the evaluation year. The change better aligns the evaluation process with the academic year. The resolution required defining the academic year. This change would put UTK in accord with BOT policy. Birdwell pointed out that some departments have many faculty members to evaluate.

Lyons asked about the impact of this change in years with possible merit raises at stake. Heminway replied that there are various half year issues. Fall evaluations would remove them further in time from when raises are decided, but Heminway pointed out that annual evaluations and merit pay are not necessarily linked. Lyons indicated he liked them to be linked. The Committee's motion to change the timing of annual faculty evaluations was passed.

Research Council (K. Stephenson for J. Hall)

The Council is planning on holding forums again this year and is soliciting topics.

Task Force on Criteria and Procedures for Academic Program Evaluation (J. Nolt)

Nolt said he thought the goals were to develop criteria for programs elimination and faculty input in procedures. He asked for suggestions for making it an open process. Martin pointed out that the process was not replacing the normal process through which departments and colleges for various reasons sought to eliminate programs. This process would be economically driven and would build on APEC (Academic Program Evaluation Committee) and the RRTF (Review and Redirection Task Force) documents. Some materials were developed at the department heads retreat. There is a Blackboard site for suggestions. The Task Force needs to develop criteria and an expeditious process. Patterson said he heard a twofold approach. The administration would ask deans for proposals to cut 5%. The deans might come back with proposals to eliminate programs. He asked whether there might be someone above the deans looking down at colleges and the programs within them. Martin said it would be unusual for anyone outside to identify college programs. Deans may propose cuts of various sorts including program cuts. The process will involve back and forth discussion. Heminway commented that data gathering metrics should be linked to decisions and that data should be reported on a regular basis. If comparative data were available, programs would have a better basis for knowing their relative standing. Martin said the institution is doing better at collecting relevant information. Simek noted that this budgeting process does not mean that the poorest programs are targets of elimination, which makes setting the criteria harder. He acknowledged the University has not done a good job of data acquisition. He also pointed out that while it is important for a unit to know where it stands, having clear rankings can create morale and recruitment problems. Wang pointed out that when a program or department is eliminated there can be problems placing tenured faculty in other units because of a lack of fit. She asked whether anything could be done about that problem. Simek said it was troublesome and stated the need for criteria. Lyons, following up on Heminway's ideas about linking data to program assessment, asked whether UTK still looked at Delaware data and whether Institutional Research continued to generate the relevant data. Martin said while there was some question about the consistency of the data across institutions (e.g., definitions of lecturers and instructors), they were the best data available. Lyons commented that the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council were equipped to deal with program quality, but the program elimination process necessitated other data. Simek stated that the institution did not want to declare financial exigency. Birdwell said there were two problems: the immediate need for a decision making process and the lack of good information on which to base decisions.

Pierce wanted to point out the good things that happen on campus like the opportunity to get flu shots. He thought the Student Concerns Committee might consider whether the shots could be given at lower cost for students.

Meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

## THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Members Present

Richard Bennett, Stan Bowie, Ralph Brockett, Ed Caudill, Robert Compton, Harry Dahms, Mark DeKay, Michael Essington, Daniel Feller, Tom George, Eric Haley, Robert Hatcher, Thomas Heffernan, George Hoemann, Drew Justice, Stephan Kania, Laura Ledgerwood for Julie Lynch, Jan Lee, Sandra McGuire, Sally McMillan, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Linda Phillips, Greg Petty for Barbara Thayer-Bacon, Cynthia Rocha, John Wachowicz, Michael Waugh for Clara Brown, Michael Zemel, Catherine Cox, Joy DeSensi, Gay Henegar, Carolyn Hodges, Kay Reed, Brenda Rayman, Sonia Sarangthem

The Graduate Council meeting was called to order by Stefanie Ohnesorg on Thursday, October 30, 2008, at 3:00 p.m. in the Great Room, International House.

1. Minutes of the Preceding Meeting

The minutes of the September 25, 2008 meeting were approved by the Graduate Council.

2. Committee ReportsAcademic Policy Committee

Ralph Brockett, Academic Policy Committee member, presented the report for the October 16, 2008 meeting (Attachment 1). A proposal from the Academic Policy Committee was presented, and a motion to approve the following change to the Graduate Catalog was requested:

Graduate teaching associates are ineligible to teach courses approved for graduate credit, **unless they are in a post-professional degree program where the terminal degree is a Master's degree and has been approved by Graduate Council as an exception.**

Council members expressed concern with the wording and graduate students teaching research and theory classes. The motion was approved with eight ayes, seven nays, and two abstentions. The consensus of the discussion was that the Academic Policy Committee should clarify the wording and return to the Council for approval.

Credentials Committee

Michael Zemel, Chair of the Credentials Committee, presented the report for the October 2, 2008 meeting. Council approved the committee recommendations on faculty approved to direct dissertations as presented (Attachment 2).

Curriculum Committee

Stan Bowie, Curriculum Committee member, presented the report from the October 16, 2008 meeting (Attachment 3). The Graduate Council approved the changes as presented.

Appeals Committee

Kay Reed, Graduate School liaison to the Appeals Committee, reported that the Appeals Committee is meeting once a month to make revisions to the procedures for appeals.

3. New Business

No new business.

4. Administrative Reports and Announcements

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

Carolyn Hodges, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, presented the following information:

- A 3% or 5% budget cut may occur. Although the Chancellor supports funding of graduate students, some of the money for the new assistantships may be cut.
- The Task Force on Reapportionment and Reallocation, which deals with matters of program elimination, has been formed by Interim Provost Susan Martin. The committee is establishing criteria by reviewing materials from other institutions and faculty. Matthew Murray is a member of the group.
- The third week in November the Banner Committee will be working with Sungard Consultants to prepare a readiness assessment and gap analysis prior to implementation of the new student record database system.
- Temporary assistance will be given to Catherine Cox to complete the on-line catalog. Proposal for curriculum changes for the 2009 – 2010 Graduate Catalog are due to Catherine by December 1.
- Graduate Hooding will be on Friday, December 12 in the Thompson-Boling Arena. Department heads, graduate directors and faculty are encouraged to attend.

Graduate Deans Group

Joy DeSensi, Chair of the Graduate Deans Group, presented the following report from the October 2, 2008 meeting:

- Necessary changes are being made to the Graduate Deans Group Bylaws.
- Vince Anfara reported on the Task Force on Faculty Senate Effectiveness.

- Linda Phillips presented information regarding digital archiving.
- The January meeting will concentrate on graduate directors and deans issues.

#### Graduate Student Senate

Laura Ledgerwood, Graduate Student Senate Social Chair, presented the following report from the October 23, 2008 meeting:

- The Travel Award Committee is reviewing the graduate student travel award process and contacting the colleges to help establish award criteria. The changes will be reflected in the Spring 2009 application which covers travel from January 15, 2009 to April 14, 2009. These applications will be due on January 15, 2009.
- The 17<sup>th</sup> Annual "Love Your Library" Fun Run will be on Saturday, February 21, 2009 at 8:30. There will be a 5K run and a 1 mile fun walk.
- The next Graduate Student Senate meeting will be on November 13, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. in 227 University Center.

#### Graduate Council Chair

Stefanie Ohnesorg presented Vincent Anfara's report:

- On October 21, 2008 Joy DeSensi, Stefanie Ohnesorg, and Vince Anfara met with members of the Research Council and Greg Reed, Office of Research, to discuss the possibility of a jointly-sponsored forum.
- Carolyn Hodges, Matthew Murray, and Vince Anfara met with the members of the Task Force on Faculty Senate Effectiveness on September 29, 2008. Graduate Council members took the position that the Graduate Council's effectiveness must not be impacted.
- Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate met on October 6, 2008 to discuss the policy of the granting of honorary degrees. Faculty Senate leadership has requested that the Graduate Council develop a proposal on a policy for conferral of honorary degrees.
- The Graduate Council minutes from the September 25, 2008 meeting and report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Program Closure were approved by the Faculty Senate on October 20, 2008.

#### 5. Items from the floor

No items from the floor.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gay Henegar  
Secretary to Graduate Council

**ATTACHMENT 1****ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE  
Thursday, October 16, 2008, 2:15 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room, Andy Holt Tower**

Present: Stefanie Ohnesorg (Chair), Ralph Brockett, Mark DeKay, Yanfei Gao, Robert Hatcher, Julie Lynch, Sandra McGuire, Kay Reed. Karen Sowers and Cynthia Rocha were present.

The meeting was called to order by Stefanie Ohnesorg at 2:15 p.m.

1. Proposal from College of Social Work.

The committee discussed a proposal by the College of Social Work concerning an exception to the policy on graduate teaching associates who would be allowed to teach other graduate students.

Cynthia Rocha, Associate Dean of the College of Social Work, asked for an exception on the policy as present in the 2008-2009 Graduate Catalog on page 22. The rationale for the change was to allow doctoral students in their program to have experience in teaching since the opportunity to teach at the undergraduate level is limited. She and Dean Karen Sowers noted that the most recent program review had recommended that the doctoral students have more development opportunities in the teaching area.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the following change to the policy:

2008-2009 Graduate Catalog, page 22, left column, second paragraph under Registration and Enrollment Requirements (addition **bolded and underscored**)

Graduate Credit

Courses numbered at the 500 level, as well as those 400-level courses approved for graduate credit, must be taught by faculty members who 1) meet the criteria of an assistant professor or above as defined in the Faculty Handbook and 2) have been designated by the department head as being appropriate. Graduate teaching associates are ineligible to teach courses approved for graduate credit, **unless they are in a post-professional degree program where the terminal degree is a Master's degree and has been approved by the Graduate Council as an exception.**

The motion carried. The committee recommended that the College of Social Work now come back to the Academic Policy Committee and the Curriculum Committee together with a request for exception to be approved and placed in the Graduate Catalog text for their program description.

2. Sandra McGuire asked for a clarification of the policy on correspondence courses not being accepted for graduate credit. That policy is found in the 2008-2009 Graduate Catalog on page 23, left column. With many changes in recent modes of delivery of graduate courses, the committee recommended that the policy be reviewed.

3. Bylaws and Operating Procedures.

Ohnesorg asked that the committee note any discrepancies or questionable parts of the committee bylaws for discussion at the next meeting.



**ATTACHMENT 2**

**CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2008, 3:30 – 5:00 P.M.  
218 UNIVERSITY CENTER**

Members Present: Stephen Kania (Chair in absence of Michael Zemel), Ed Caudill, Rudy Santore, Rupy Sawhney, Barbara Thayer-Bacon. Electronic votes received from Michael Zemel and Bob Compton.

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Stephen Kania.

The committee recommended that the Graduate Council approve the following faculty members to direct dissertations:

<b>FACULTY MEMBER</b>	<b>FACULTY RANK</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>APPROVAL</b>
DeGennero, Ramon	Professor	Finance	Approved Until October 2018
Han, Lee	Associate Professor	Civil and Environmental Engineering	Approved Until October 2018
Koo, Win (Gi-Yong)	Assistant Professor	Exercise, Sport and Leisure Studies	Approved Until Tenure
Waller, John	Associate Professor	Animal Science	Approved Until October 2018

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**ATTACHMENT 3****COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING****All changes effective fall 2009****I. COURSE CHANGES****DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL, AEROSPACE, AND BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING****(018) Aerospace Engineering**

ADD

**562 Fundamentals of Aeroacoustics (3)** Generation, propagation and absorption of sound in static and moving media.

*Registration Permission: Consent of instructor.*

Previous Course (018) Aerospace Engineering Fundamentals of Aeroacoustics 561	Equivalent Course for Fall 2009 (018) Aerospace Engineering Fundamentals of Aeroacoustics 562
---	---

**COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK****All changes effective fall 2009****I. COURSE CHANGES****(905) Social Work**

ADD

**528 Neurophysiology for Social Work Practice (1)** For Advanced Standing students. Covers the basis of neurophysiology. Students will explore the effects of genetics and epigenetics on human development and behavior; brain development and functioning; and physiological responses to stress and trauma. Particular focus is placed on understanding interactions between environment (including intra-uterine, cultural, and other environments) and physiological processes and how these topics relate to social work practice and all system levels.

*Comment(s): Admission to Advanced Standing program.*

**531 Working with Maltreated and Traumatized Children and Their Families (2)** The purpose of this course is to immerse students in the knowledge and issues related to working ethically and effectively with child and adolescent victims of child maltreatment, interpersonal traumas, and manmade/natural disasters. This course will pay particular attention to cultural status, including race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, disability status, and others in understanding and working with traumatized children while maintaining a strengths perspective.

*(DE) Prerequisite(s): 510, 512, 513, 517, 519, 520, 522, 537, 538, 539.*

*Comment(s): Advanced Standing may satisfy prerequisites with consent of instructor.*

**555 Psychological Development and Mental Health in Later Life (2)** Course examines psychological, mental health and mental illness aspects of the aging process, with special emphasis on age, gender, race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and psychological resources across various mental health domains. The domains investigated include memory, cognition, intelligence, personality, mood and anxiety disorders, emotion, elder abuse, spirituality, and culture.

*(DE) Prerequisite(s): 510, 512, 513, 517, 519, 520, 522, 537, 538, 539.*

*Comment(s): Advanced Standing may satisfy prerequisites with consent of instructor.*

DROP

**501 Foundations of Social Work Practice I (3)**

**503 Foundations of Social Work Practice II (3)**

**504 Foundations of Social Work Practice III (3)**

**506 Social Work Research (3)**

**514 Human Behavior in the Social Environment I (3)**

**515 Human Behavior in the Social Environment II (3)**

**516 Social Welfare Policy and Services (3)**

**518 Social Work and Oppression (3)**

**521 Clinical Social Work Practice with Individuals (3)**

**523 Clinical Social Work Practice with Families (3)**

**524 Psychopathology and Social Deviance (3)**

**525 Clinical Social Work Practice with Groups (3)**

**526 Evaluating Clinical Practice (3)**

**530 Seminar in Clinical Social Work (2-3)**

**534 Social Work Interventions with Children and Adolescents (3)**

**541 Leadership and Management in Human Services (3)**

**543 Financial Management and Resource Development (3)**

**547 Evaluation Research (3)**

**550 Seminar in Management and Community Practice (2-3)**

**551 Seminar in Social Welfare Policy (3)**

**580 Field Practice (3)**

**581 Field Practice (3)**

**582 Field Practice (2-6)**

**583 Field Practice (2-6)**

**584 Field Practice (3)**

**588 Advanced Standing Program Field Practice (1)**

REVISE HOURS, DESCRIPTION; ADD (DE) PREREQUISITES AND COMMENTS

**532 Short-Term Interventions (2)** Theory and practice of planned short term, emergency, and crisis interventions. Provides an introduction to the evidence-based practice, motivational interviewing (MI). Learners will be introduced to application of MI to increasing motivation for substance use reduction, mental health service utilization, and other health behavior changes. Finally, students will understand the evidence based theory, the transtheoretical model of change and its foundational role in motivational interviewing.

*(DE) Prerequisite(s): 510, 512, 513, 517, 519, 520, 522, 537, 538, 539*

*Comment(s): Advanced Standing may satisfy prerequisites with consent of instructor.*

**540 General Topics in Social Work (2-3)** Current topics in theories and practice for advanced social work.

*(DE) Prerequisite(s): 510, 512, 513, 517, 519, 520, 522, 537, 538, 539.*

*Comment(s): Advanced Standing may satisfy prerequisites with consent of instructor.*

**552 Community Organization (2)** Locality development, social planning, and social action as practice models for developing resources to meet human needs. Designed to give students essential knowledge base and skills to practice community organization. Community organization is a mode of social work practice, including locality development, social planning, and social action, through which the community is mobilized and empowered to deal with its issues and problems, and to resolve them to its satisfaction.

*(DE) Prerequisite(s): 510, 512, 513, 517, 519, 520, 522, 537, 538, 539.*

*Comment(s): Advanced Standing may satisfy prerequisites with consent of instructor.*

REVISE TITLE, HOURS, DESCRIPTION; ADD (DE) PREREQUISITES AND COMMENTS

**564 Evidence-Based Substance Abuse Treatment (2)** Prepares students for evidence-based practice in the field of substance abuse treatment. Presents an integrative biopsychosocial model for the understanding and treatment of substance abuse. Content includes overview of the history of substance abuse, review of models of addiction, multidimensional model of the addiction process, physiological affects of commonly abused substances, assessment and diagnosis of substance abuse disorders, and specific, evidence-based interventions adolescent and adult clients.  
*(DE) Prerequisite(s): 510, 512, 513, 517, 519, 520, 522, 537, 538, 539.*  
*Comment(s): Advanced Standing may satisfy prerequisites with consent of instructor.*

**566 Social and Cultural Aspects of Aging (2)** Explores the reciprocal relationship between society and those considered older by society. Examines the social and cultural forces that impinge on the aging process, including socially constructed images of older adults, and patterns of inequality of gender, race, and economics. Theoretical perspectives relevant to the aging process, from activity theory and life span development to post modern constructions of aging are examined. Emphasis is placed on current critical aging-related issues and how these issues are experienced personally and societally. Students are challenged to critically analyze prevailing assumptions and perspective on aging and how these impact older adults, family members and society.  
*(DE) Prerequisite(s): 510, 512, 513, 517, 519, 520, 522, 537, 538, 539.*  
*Comment(s): Advanced Standing may satisfy prerequisites with consent of instructor.*

REVISE DESCRIPTION

**586 Advanced Field Practice (1-6)** Instruction and supervision in advanced evidence-based social work practice. Includes an agency-based experience. This practicum is completed concurrently with required and elective concentration coursework.

**Graduate Courses Not Taught in Four or More Years  
TO BE DROPPED FALL 2009**

**Note:** If courses are cross-listed and the primary course is dropped, the secondary course(s) will also be dropped.

<b>COLLEGE</b>	<b>ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE</b>	<b>COURSE</b>
<b>ARTS AND SCIENCES</b>		
	(122) <b>Anthropology</b>	512 (Urban Studies in Anthropology)
	(278) <b>Ecology and Evolutionary Biology</b>	514 (Foundations: Readings in Mathematical and Computational Ecology)
		556 (Ice-Age Environments and Global Climate Change)
		557 (Quaternary Ecology)
		577 (Landscape Ecology)
	(405) <b>French</b>	510 (The French Language)
	(462) <b>History</b>	658 (Seminar in United States Regional and Local History)
	(708) <b>Music Ensemble</b>	511 (Marimba Choir)
	(830) <b>Psychology</b>	560 (Psychology of Learning)
		617 (Seminar in Cognitive Science)
	(863) <b>Religious Studies</b>	514 (Religion and Healing)
<b>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</b>		
	(283) <b>Economics</b>	579 (Environmental Policy Research Workshop)
		661 (Regional and Urban Location and Development Theory)
	(529) <b>Human Resource Development</b>	606 (Research in Human Resource Development)
		609 (Seminar in Technological Frameworks for Human Resource Development)
		611 (Internship in Human Resource Development)
	(568) <b>Industrial and Organizational Psychology</b>	628 (Personality Assessment)
	(632) <b>Marketing</b>	510 (Principles of Marketing Management for Non-MBA Students)
<b>COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION</b>		
	(560) <b>Information Sciences</b>	601 (Advanced Seminar in Information Sciences)
	(841) <b>Public Relations</b>	598 (Internship)
<b>EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SCIENCES</b>		
	(255) <b>Counselor Education</b>	565 (Facilitation of Technical Task Groups)
		580 (Case Management Process in Mental Health Counseling)

COLLEGE	ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE	COURSE
	(274) Dance	510 (Ballet: Level IV)
	(959) Sport Studies	505 (History of Olympics: Ancient and Modern)
		514 (Advanced Philosophy of Sport)
<b>ENGINEERING</b>		
	(254) Civil Engineering	671 (Behavior of Steel Bridges and Buildings)
	(266) Computer Science	522 (Cybernetics)
		576 (Sparse Matrix Computations)
	(638) Materials Science and Engineering	526 (Welding Metallurgy)
		542 (Further Topics in Polymer Processing)
		625 (Materials Life-time Science and Engineering I)
		626 (Materials Lifetime Science and Engineering II)
		627 (Case Studies in Materials Lifetime Science and Engineering)
<b>LAW</b>		
	(613) Law	928 (Case Development and Resolution)
<b>INTERCOLLEGIATE</b>		
	(261) Comparative and Experimental Medicine – Veterinary Medicine	505 (Laboratory Animal Care and Use)
		506 (Experimental Animal Surgery)
		603 (Correlative Post-Mortem Pathology)

**The following 400-level courses (which had graduate credit) were dropped on the Undergraduate Courses Not Taught in Four or More Years List.**

- (194) Biosystems Engineering Technology 442
- (139) Art History 474
- (144) Asian Languages 431
- (188) Biochemistry and Cellular and Molecular Biology 465
- (405) French 411
- (424) Geology 401, 410
- (962) Statistics 472, 473
- (255) Counselor Education 410
- (285) Education of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing 424
- (638) Materials Science and Engineering 429, 472

**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville**  
**Undergraduate Council**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**October 28, 2008**  
**2:00 p.m. - Shiloh Room - University Center**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Amy Billone, Don Clark, Ann Fairhurst, John Koontz, Mike Kotowski, Lisa Jahns, Jon Levin, Norman Magden, Mark Moon, Rachel Moran (student), Bill Park, Chris Pionke, Gary Ramsey, John Romeiser (Chair), Matthew Theriot (also ex-officio), Dixie Thompson (Vice Chair), Captain Carsell Walker (for James Haynes)

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Mary Albrect, Fadia Alvic (for George Hoemann), Chuck Collins, Don Cox, Ruth Darling, Tom George, Sally McMillan, Fred Pierce, Kathryn Salzer (for Steve Dandaneau), Rita Smith

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by John Romeiser, Chair.

The minutes of the [September 16, 2008](#), meeting of the Undergraduate Council were approved.

Gordie Bennett, UTK Sustainability Manager, gave a presentation on the American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment.

Ruth Darling gave a presentation on student success data and the Retention Leadership Group.

#### Committee Reports

- Academic Policy (Koontz) (NO REPORT)
- Advising (Darling) – will report at January meeting
- Appeals (Park) – see page [U1449](#)
- Curriculum (Theriot) – see pages [U1450-1455](#)
- General Education (Collins) – see pages [U1456-1457](#)

#### Announcements

- Monique Anderson, University Registrar, announced Brenda Rayman's upcoming retirement, thanked Brenda for her service, and introduced Cheryl Norris who will take over the position in January.



## APPEALS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

### Readmissions and Reinstatement Recap, Fall 2007 through Summer 2008

#### Annual Summary

The story of the 2007-08 appeals committee was the story of the University's new dismissal policy. The conclusion of Fall 2007 marked the initial implementation of the new policy for dismissal appeals. Summer 2008 marked the implementation of the policy for readmissions cases, as students dismissed in Fall 2007 were eligible to return to UT.

#### Dismissal Appeals Overview

In the 2007-08 school year, we witnessed an increase in the number of academic dismissals in comparison to the previous year, and a decrease in the percentage of cases appealed.

<b>Number of Academic Dismissals</b>			
<b>School Year</b>	<b>Total Dismissals</b>	<b># Appeals</b>	<b>% of Dismissals Appealed</b>
2007-08	757	65	8.6%
2006-07	671	72	10.7%

We also witnessed a decrease in the percentage of granted appeals.

<b>Total Dismissal Appeals</b>				
<b>School Year</b>	<b># Appeals</b>	<b># Granted</b>	<b># Denied</b>	<b>% Granted</b>
2007-08	65	18	47	28%
2006-07	72	30	42	42%

For students dismissed for the first time, the new policy reduced the amount of dismissal time from a full year to one semester. This may account for a decrease in the number of appeals from first time dismissals, and certainly contributed to the decrease in percentage of appeals granted for first time dismissals.

<b>Students Dismissed for the First Time</b>				
<b>Year</b>	<b># Appeals</b>	<b># Granted</b>	<b># Denied</b>	<b>% Granted</b>
2007-08	48	11	37	23%
2006-07	67	29	38	43%

#### Readmissions Overview

The following annual summary reflects only complete applications for readmission.

<b>Readmission Applications from Students Previously Dismissed</b>				
<b>Year</b>	<b># Applications</b>	<b># Granted</b>	<b># Denied</b>	<b>% Granted</b>
2007-08	342	290	52	85%
2006-07	284	232	52	82%

## CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT

The Curriculum Committee met at 3:30 p.m. on October 14, 2008, and approved curricular proposals from:

- College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences
- College of Nursing
- College of Social Work

The Courses Not Taught in Four or More Years Report was reviewed. Courses to be dropped Fall 2009 appear at the end of this committee report. All of the drops were approved by departments with the exception of French 411. The committee voted to drop the course since this was the sixth year it has appeared on the on the list.

The committee discussed a request for guidance from the Department of Modern Foreign Languages and Literatures concerning the de facto closure of the Chinese program due to a dean's level decision not to replace a vacant line. While the committee did not take any specific action, they did express sympathy and concern. The Curriculum Committee does not really have a mechanism for reviewing this kind of appeal or request. On the positive side, committee members did encourage Council chair John Romeiser to bring up the following at the first meeting of the Reduction Task Force, which he will attend October 29:

1. process for delineating an appeals procedure for RIF's/reductions that clearly threaten a program, including both the major and the minor
2. coming up with a definition of what constitutes an academic program

The above concerns represent the committee's good faith attempt to respond to the department's concern as well as those of other programs and departments that will surely arise in this and subsequent years.

◆ Indicates change to a course with a General Education designation

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SCIENCES

Effective Fall 2009

### DEPARTMENT OF EXERCISE, SPORT, AND LEISURE STUDIES

MOVE THE INTERCOLLEGIATE/INTERDISCIPLINARY GERONTOLOGY MINOR FROM THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SCIENCES TO THE COLLEGE OF NURSING.

Delete the text on page 151 of the 2008-2009 *Undergraduate Catalog* indicating the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences as the "home" for the Intercollegiate/Interdisciplinary Gerontology Minor. The primary responsibility of the program will now reside in the College of Nursing.

On page 143 of the 2008-2009 *Undergraduate Catalog*, insert text below to show the college's participation in the gerontology minor as follows:

#### **Intercollegiate/Interdisciplinary Gerontology Minor**

An intercollegiate/interdisciplinary undergraduate gerontology minor is coordinated through the Interdisciplinary Gerontology Colloquy Group members from the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences; the College of Nursing; and the College of Social Work. Courses from the colleges are available under the gerontology minor. Please refer to the College of Nursing for specific requirements.

## COLLEGE OF NURSING

Effective Fall 2009

### I. COURSE CHANGES

#### (720) Nursing

REVISE (DE) PREREQUISITES, COREQUISITES; ADD COMMENT

◆ **403 Health Promotion and Maintenance in Childbearing Families (5) (WC)**

*(DE) Prerequisite(s) or Corequisite(s): 406 and 471.*

*Comment(s): Nursing 477 may be substituted for 471.*

Formerly: (DE) Prerequisite(s) or Corequisite(s): 406.

REVISE (RE) PREREQUISITES AND COMMENTS

◆ **494 Alternative Preceptorship (4) (WC)**

*(RE) Prerequisite(s): 305 and 471.*

*Comment(s): For RN-BSN students who have successfully completed all ACE proficiencies or the comparable course work. Nursing 477 may be substituted for 471.*

Formerly: (RE) Prerequisite(s): 305 and 333.

Comment(s): For RN-BSN students who have successfully completed all ACE proficiencies or the comparable course work.

### II. PROGRAM CHANGES

MOVE INTERCOLLEGIATE/INTERDISCIPLINARY GERONTOLOGY MINOR TO THE COLLEGE OF NURSING

From: Creasia, Joan  
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2008 11:30 AM  
To: Rayman, Brenda L  
Subject: Gerontology Minor

TO: UG Council Curriculum Committee

This memo confirms that the College of Nursing has assumed the coordination of UG gerontology minor effective July 2008.

Sincerely,  
Joan Creasia, PhD, RN  
Professor and Dean  
The University of Tennessee  
College of Nursing  
Knoxville, TN 37996-4180  
Phone (865) 974-7583  
FAX (865) 974-3569

On page 177 of the 2008-09 *Undergraduate Catalog*, replace current paragraph with new paragraph (moved from p. 151 of College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences):

**Minor in Gerontology (Intercollegiate/Interdisciplinary)**

An intercollegiate/interdisciplinary undergraduate gerontology minor is coordinated through the Interdisciplinary Gerontology Colloquy Group members from the College of Nursing; College of Education, Health and Human Sciences; and College of Social Work. Courses from these colleges are available under the gerontology minor.

**Required Courses**

**Hours Credit**

9 hours from: Child and Family Studies 312(3); Health 406(3); Health 465(3); Nursing 400(3); and other courses approved by the Interdisciplinary Gerontology colloquy member coordinating the minor.....	9
3 hours from a practicum experience within the home department or Nursing 402 * .....	3-4
	<b>Total 12-13</b>

\* Nursing students may use nursing 461(4) to satisfy this requirement

**REVISE NURSING GRADING AND CONTINUATION POLICIES**

On p. 176 of the 2008-09 *Undergraduate Catalog*, change to

6. For undergraduate nursing students, 75% is the passing average grade in all nursing courses. To pass any clinical course, a student must achieve a minimum 75% weighted average across all examinations in the course, regardless of any other grades earned in other components of the course. If a student fails to achieve the minimum 75% weighted average on course examinations, the final course grade will be either D+ (68-69), D (62-67), D- (60-61), or F (59 and below). The following grading scale applies to all undergraduate nursing courses.

- A = 92-100
- A- = 90-91
- B+ = 88-89
- B = 82-87
- B- = 80-81
- C+ = 78-79
- C = 75-77
- C- = 70-74
- D+ = 68-69
- D = 62-67
- D- = 60-61
- F = 59 and below

Formerly

6. For undergraduate nursing students, 75% is the passing average grade in all nursing courses. To pass any clinical course, a student must achieve a minimum 75% weighted average across all examinations in the course, regardless of any other grades earned in other components of the course. If a student fails to achieve the minimum 75% weighted average on course examinations, the final course grade will be either D (67-74) or F (under 67). The following grading scale applies to all undergraduate nursing courses.

- A = 92-100
- B+ = 88-91
- B = 83-87
- C+ = 79-82
- C = 75-78
- D = 67-74
- F = <67

**COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK****Effective Fall 2009**

REVISE CATALOG TEXT FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE/INTERDISCIPLINARY MINOR IN GERONTOLOGY

On page 180 of the 2008-2009 *Undergraduate Catalog*, revise catalog text to**Intercollegiate/Interdisciplinary Minor in Gerontology**

An intercollegiate/interdisciplinary undergraduate minor in gerontology is available. See College of Nursing for required courses.



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

**College of Social Work**Office of the Dean  
109 Henson Hall  
Knoxville, TN 37996-3333  
Phone: 865/974-3176  
Fax: 865/974-4803  
[www.csw.utk.edu](http://www.csw.utk.edu)

September 17, 2008

Undergraduate Graduate Curriculum Committee  
Brenda Rayman, Undergraduate Catalog Editor  
202 Student Services Building  
1331 Circle Park  
Knoxville, TN 37996-0230

To Whom It May Concern:

The College of Social Work has been an active participant in the Gerontology Colloquy and in the development and teaching of the undergraduate and graduate Gerontology Minors and the graduate Gerontology Certificate Program. The College fully supports the proposed changes in the wording of the description of undergraduate Gerontology Minor that are being recommended.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Karen M. Sowers".

Karen M. Sowers, PhD  
Dean and Professor

## Undergraduate Courses Not Taught in Four or More Years TO BE DROPPED FALL 2009

**Note:** If courses are cross-listed and the primary course is dropped, the secondary course(s) will also be dropped. (Courses with \* are available for graduate credit and will be removed from the *Graduate Catalog* if dropped. Courses with ♦ are on the General Education List.)

COLLEGE	ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE	COURSE
<b>AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES AND NATURAL RESOURCES</b>		
	(088) <b>Agriculture and Natural Resources</b>	333 (Food, Forests, and the Environment)
	(194) <b>Biosystems Engineering Technology</b>	*442 (Agricultural Waste Management and Pollution Control)
<b>ARTS AND SCIENCES</b>		
	(122) <b>Anthropology</b>	321 (Indians of Northwest America)
	(139) <b>Art History</b>	*474 (Theory of 20 <sup>th</sup> -Century Art in Europe and America)
	(144) <b>Asian Languages</b>	*431 (Readings in Chinese Literature) -- <i>secondary is Chinese 431</i>
	(145) <b>Asian Studies</b>	♦102 (Asian Civilization) <b>(CC) Gen Ed</b>
	(188) <b>BCMB</b>	*465 (Human Genetics)
	(190) <b>Biology</b>	202 (Inside the Biological Sciences)
	(405) <b>French</b>	*411 (French Literature of the 16 <sup>th</sup> Century)
	(424) <b>Geology</b>	*401 (Quantitative Methods in Geology)
		*410 (Mineral Science)
<b>BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION</b>		
	(962) <b>Statistics</b>	*472 (Regression Analysis)
		*473 (Experimental Design Analysis)
<b>EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SCIENCES</b>		
	(255) <b>Counselor Education</b>	306 (Facilitation of Individual Technical Performance)
		*410 (Sex Role Development: Implications for Education and Counseling) -- <i>secondary is Women's Studies 410</i>
	(285) <b>Education of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing</b>	*424 (Nature of Hearing Impairments)
	(890) <b>Safety</b>	460 (Fire Risk Management)
<b>ENGINEERING</b>		
	(638) <b>Materials Science and Engineering</b>	*429 (Introduction to Ceramic Matrix Composites)
		*472 (Fundamental Principles of Composite Materials)

## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT

### Minutes from General Education Committee

Wednesday October 8, 2008, 8:30AM, UC 220

Members Present: Chuck Collins (chair), Jon Levin, Matthew Theriot, Harold Roth, Mary Albrecht, Beth Barret, Tom Georg, Missy Parker, Allison Bolorizadeh, Masood Parang, Mary Jo Reiff, Dick Heitmann, Don Cox, Judith Bryan, Kathy Warden, Monique Anderson, Michael McFall, Dixie Thompson

- We approved the topics for UH2X7 for Spring 2009
- Fall Deadline for New Course Proposals is Monday, November 3
- Honors versions and minor modifications of existing Gen Ed courses only require notification of the appropriate subcommittee chair. The chair can ask for more information if needed.
- Policy for Denied Course Proposals: If a proposal is denied, then the subcommittee will give written feedback to the course contact person, detailing why it was denied. The contact person can resubmit the proposal adding additional information as needed to address any issues raised in the feedback. If the proposal is denied again, the contact person can arrange with the subcommittee chair a face to face meeting with the entire subcommittee to address the issues.
- We reviewed the statistics for submitted petitions from Jan 1, 2008 through Sept 15, 2008. 820 have been submitted with 692 approved or in-process (84%). The numbers are comparable to the past 2 years.
- We approved a proposal to clarify the language for the Basic Skills WC requirement (see attached page).
- We discussed the concern raised at the last Undergraduate Council meeting as to the impact of the current budget cuts on our ability to offer adequate seats in Gen Ed courses.
  - We strongly recommend that any department making cuts that affect Gen Ed courses communicate those changes as early as possible to the Gen Ed committee and to any colleges or departments whose students use those courses to meet the Gen Ed requirement.
  - We will continue to monitor this situation and, with the help of the Provost's office, will develop an accounting of the available seats for a future meeting.
- Future Issues:
  - Gen Ed status for students with associate degrees from TBR schools and Gen Ed status for students coming to UT for a 2<sup>nd</sup> degree. (Proposal(s) and discussion at next meeting)
  - Continue evaluation of efforts to streamline process for petitions for students studying abroad.
  - Continue review of existing Gen Ed courses (Spring 2009)

Next meeting will be held Wednesday, November 12 at 8:30 AM in UC 220.



## Proposed Catalog Clarification, General Education Basic Skills, Communicating through Writing Section

**Rationale:** In the current Catalog, general information about course equivalencies for English 101 and 102 appears only under the College of Arts and Sciences on p. 76, with a note in the General Education Basic Skills section referring students to this description. However, because these courses are required of all students, university-wide, and these policies affect students in all Colleges, this description of requirements should appear under “Basic Skills” as part of the General Education discussion.

### CURRENT DESCRIPTION (page 17)

These are the General Education requirements (See Notes).

#### A. For Building Basic Skills

**I. Communicating through Writing** (3 courses including English 101 and 102 plus an approved writing-intensive course). Good writing skills enable students to create and share ideas, investigate and describe values, and record discoveries – all skills that are necessary not only for professional success but also for personal fulfillment in a world where communication increasingly takes place through electronic media. Students must be able to identify areas for inquiry, locate relevant information, evaluate its usefulness and quality, and incorporate the information logically and ethically. They must be able to write correctly, and they must be aware that different audiences and purposes call for different rhetorical responses. To satisfy this requirement, students take the first-year composition sequence and, upon completion of **English 101** and **102** or their equivalent (see Note 4), take one other course designated as “writing intensive” (WC) in the undergraduate catalog. The writing-intensive courses can be within the student’s major or an elective. In order to gain a (WC) designation, courses shall require formal and informal writing assignments that total 5,000 words.

### REVISED DESCRIPTION

These are the General Education requirements

#### A. For Building Basic Skills

**I. Communicating through Writing** (3 courses including English 101 and 102 plus an approved writing-intensive course). Good writing skills enable students to create and share ideas, investigate and describe values, and record discoveries – all skills that are necessary not only for professional success but also for personal fulfillment in a world where communication increasingly takes place through electronic media. Students must be able to identify areas for inquiry, locate relevant information, evaluate its usefulness and quality, and incorporate the information logically and ethically. They must be able to write correctly, and they must be aware that different audiences and purposes call for different rhetorical responses. To satisfy this requirement, students take the first-year composition sequence, which may be met in one of two ways:

- By completing 6 hours in English writing courses – either English 101 and 102; or English 118 and English 102; or English 131 and 132. Eligibility for English 118 will be determined by ACT or SAT scores. Students who obtain a grade of A or B in 118 may complete their first-year composition requirement with 102, or with a sophomore-level course in the English Department, or English 355. The sophomore course, if designated AH, may also be used toward the Arts and Humanities General Education requirement.
- By earning a score of 4 or 5 on the College Board Advanced Placement Test in Literature and Composition. Credit in English 101 is earned with a score of 4 or 5 on the Advanced Placement Test in Language and Composition.

Upon completion of **English 101** and **102** or their equivalent, students must take one other course designated as “writing-intensive” (WC) in the undergraduate catalog. The writing-intensive courses can be within the student’s major or an elective. In order to gain a (WC) designation, courses shall require formal and informal writing assignments that total 5,000 words.

### CURRENT DESCRIPTION

#### NOTES

- (1) Some courses on the various General Education course lists may have prerequisites. Students are responsible for meeting all course prerequisites.
- (2) A student’s college/program may require specific General Education courses.
- (3) General Education courses must be taken for a letter grade (i.e., AF) rather than Satisfactory/No Credit (unless this is the only way the course is offered).
- (4) See College of Arts and Sciences Basic Skills Requirement- Communicating through Writing in the Undergraduate Catalog for information on course equivalencies for English 101 and 102.
- (5) The Office of Disability Services (ODS) is committed to providing equal opportunities for students with disabilities at the University of Tennessee. Appropriate accommodations will be made to enable persons with disabilities to satisfy the General Education requirements. Students with documented disabilities should contact the Office of Disability Services for assistance with appropriate accommodations at (865) 974-6087 or ods@tennessee.edu.
- (6) Subcommittees of the Undergraduate Council General Education Committee are charged with management of the courses to be included on the General Education course lists for the Basic Skills and Broadened Perspectives areas. The most current list of General Education courses is posted at <http://web.utk.edu/~ugcouncil>.

### REVISED DESCRIPTION

Remove Note 4

## **Safe Zones Task Force**

Dr. Rod Ellis, Social Work, Co-Chair  
Jane Redmond, Vice Chancellor, Co-Chair

The task force was established as a result of a Faculty Senate resolution.

Chancellor Loren Crabtree charged the Task Force to advise him on the planning, implementation and evaluation of a “Safe Zone” project on the Knoxville campus. After several meetings, extensive research and reviewing various manuals the Safe Zone Task Force presents the attached recommendation for the establishment of a Safe Zone plan at the University of Tennessee.

### **Proposal for the Creation of a Safe Zone**

#### **Mission Statement**

To foster an atmosphere in the University of Tennessee that is increasingly supportive of diversity among students, faculty and staff. To foster a climate conducive to learning and personal growth for all. The Safe Zone would focus on services to the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered (GLBT) community, although it would support efforts to provide support to other marginalized groups as well.

#### **Staffing and Development**

The Safe Zone Task Force (appointed by Chancellor Crabtree) recommends a progressive, incremental approach to the development of the Safe Zone. The development of Safe Zone would begin with hiring and training a Graduate Administrative Assistant to develop and operate the program. The committee proposed that the program might be housed in some easily accessible and appropriately confidential location such as the Office of Equity and Diversity. Funding for the position would be supplied by the Chancellor’s Office or some other source within central administration. One of the key roles of the GA would be to develop a foundation for future expansion of the program to include a full time (1 FTE) coordinator in the second year of operation. Secondly, the GA would

enhance awareness of and the need for the program throughout the University community. This could be done in several ways by recruiting allies (faculty/staff) to establish “satellite” safe zone locations, training and coordinating volunteers who could perform various functions and also provide a limited number of services directly to members of the LGBT community and other marginalized groups as well. The training component is key in that it will help educate faculty and staff on the issues that LGBT students encounter while also providing resources for students and an environment that will help them feel safe. Upon completion of the training program, the faculty and staff are considered “allies” for the LGBT population.

The GA would also work closely with the Safe Zone Advisory Committee (described in the next section).

### **Program Implementation**

In concern with the GA, the Safe Zone Advisory Committee will work to implement the “initial” components of the program. First, the Safe Zone program and training needs to be adapted to meet the needs of the University community. The Advisory Committee and GA will identify the specific needs of the LGBT community. An extensive collection of resource descriptions of other similar university programs were collected by the Safe Zone Task Force and several members of the Task Force have worked to develop similar programs at their universities.

Secondly, faculty and staff will need to be identified to complete the chosen training modules. Again, there are several training modules in which to select from.

Third, it is critical that the Safe Zone be recognized by our staff, faculty and students. Therefore, a strategic plan will need to be developed by the Advisory Committee and the GA and launched to make students and others aware of the program and its services. A key portion of the plan is to develop a Safe Zone symbol (yet to be selected) specifically related to the University of Tennessee. The symbol is a clear indicator to the LGBT population and colleagues that the person displaying the symbol is an ally who is understanding, supportive and trustworthy.

## **Safe Zone Advisory Committee**

The Safe Zone Advisory committee would be composed of members of the university community who have a strong interest in and commitment to the development of an effective safe zone. The committee would advise and support the GA in his/her activities and role and help promote the development of both the primary zone location and satellite zones throughout the campus.

Responsibilities of the Safe Zone Advisory Committee would include:

- Develop a detailed job description and strategic plan to guide her/him in their activities.
- Participate in safe zone training. (provide information on different modules.)
- Support the university administration's efforts to identify the resources to establish and sustain the Safe Zone initiative consisting of a full-time (1 FTE) staff member, a permanent location, and an ongoing operating budget.
- Engage in and support efforts to fund supplementary external funding that would augment ongoing training, supportive resources, and ongoing publicity and public relations activity.
- Support efforts to find funding to sustain and expand Safe Zone to include a full time (1FTE) staff member, a permanent location, other necessary resources (library, education materials), an operating budget, and training.
- Help recruit and coordinate volunteers to work in Safe Zone.

## **Safe Zone Volunteers**

Safe Zone volunteers would be members of the university and Knoxville communities who are supportive of the Safe Zone's goals and are willing to devote regular time to the activities of the Safe Zone. Examples of such activities might be helping to staff the physical location of the Safe Zone during specified hours, being able to answer phone calls, assisting with providing training to other volunteers and allies, and helping to facilitate groups and educational activities for members of the LBGT community.

## **Safe Zone Ally Initiative**

The initiative would provide the university community with information, training, resources and guidance regarding the issues facing LGBT individuals and other marginalized groups.

A Safe Zone ally would be a member of the UT community who is committed to visibly supporting members of the LGBT population and other individuals affected by sexual violence (or threats), or other inappropriate behavior against historically marginalized groups. The Safe Zone ally project would contribute to a safer campus and a more receptive and supportive campus climate.

The Safe Zone initiative would serve as the central resource for educating the campus community about LGBT issues and the staff will provide advocacy on the behalf of LGBT students. The initiative would promote Safe Zones by recruiting allies, providing training for them, and encouraging them to place Safe Zone symbols on their doors or showing the symbol to others. These symbols signify that this space is a safe place to talk about issues which impact people affected by homophobia, sexual violence/ threats or other inappropriate behaviors.

The initiative would also promote the establishment of a center for counseling development and implementing training and orientation programs and housing resource materials. The office would offer quality programs that educate, create community, offer support and foster dialogue. Such programming of our peer institutions include: National Coming Out Day, LGBTQ Faculty and Students of Color Lunch, AIDS awareness week, educational speakers and films.

### Services to be offered

1. a safe place and a listening ear
2. referral to resources for further support or professional help,
3. training for volunteers, allies and other members of the university community,
4. library/resources materials,
5. psycho education and support groups;

6. a visible reminder to non-LGBT people that there are LGBT people here,
7. a visible reminder to non-LGBT people that there are LGBT allies/supporters here, too.

### **Assessment**

A final component of any new initiative is to incorporate an instrument that measures the outcomes of the program.

## MEMORANDUM

**To: Faculty Senators from UTK, UTIA, and UTSI**  
**From: Joan M. Heminway (on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee)**  
**Date: November 4, 2008**  
**Re: Resolutions Proposed for Adoption at our November Senate Meeting**

Two resolutions are being transmitted to you with this memorandum. They are scheduled to be proposed for adoption at the Faculty Senate meeting on November 17, 2008. This memorandum summarizes the changes to the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* that would be effectuated upon approval of each resolution. As I described to you earlier in the fall term, these changes result principally from a desire to optimize the workability and efficiency of various important provisions in the current versions of the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, which have now been guiding our policies and procedures for the past few years.

If you have comments or suggestions on the resolutions, please contact me at [jheminwa@tennessee.edu](mailto:jheminwa@tennessee.edu) or disseminate your remarks to all of your fellow senators through the senate listserv as soon as possible. That will enable us to consider your ideas in advance of the meeting and address those comments or suggestions most efficiently at the meeting.

### **Reappointment of Department Heads**

This resolution includes revisions to Section 1.4.6 of the *Faculty Handbook* to better balance the need for faculty input and decanal accountability against the desire for a more logical, streamlined administrative process. Specifically, as noted in the resolution, the revisions

- clarify that the dean or deans to whom the department head reports make the ultimate decision as to the department head's reappointment (which is not expressly stated in the existing *Faculty Handbook* provision);
- compel the dean or deans to seek input from faculty and other constituencies, including extensive consultation with tenure-track, tenured, and other full-time voting faculty in the department, in advance of making a reappointment decision (rather than, as currently provided, requiring the dean to first recommend reappointment and subsequently seek input from and a vote of the tenure-track and tenured faculty on the recommendation);
- mandate that the dean or deans give great weight to the consensus views of voting departmental faculty (absent compelling circumstances) in making a decision on reappointment (as opposed to providing that faculty input "guide" the dean's final reappointment decision);
- require the dean or deans to issue a report to voting departmental faculty on his or her final reappointment decision that reflects the reappointment review process (instead of issuing "reasons in writing" when the dean's decision on reappointment differs from the faculty's consensus); and

- delete the faculty’s express rights to request a meeting with the chancellor or vice president should faculty disagree with the dean’s decision on reappointment, in favor of involving faculty in more meaningful engagement and decision making (including a faculty vote) before the reappointment determination is made, with the ability to further define the exact process in unit bylaws (and not foreclosing a meeting with the chancellor or vice president, as applicable, if desired).

### **Timing of UTK Annual Faculty Evaluations**

This resolution relates to revisions to Part II of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (annual evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty) to provide for annual evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (but not tenured and tenure-track faculty at the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture and the University of Tennessee Space Institute) with respect to performance through the end of the preceding academic year, rather than with respect to performance through the end of the preceding calendar year (the “Timing Change”). As noted in the resolution, the Timing Change

- aligns faculty evaluation processes at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (“UTK”) around the same calendar—the academic calendar—that most UTK faculty live by and plan for;
- afford UTK faculty the opportunity to assemble relevant materials and satisfy performance objectives during the summer months, when faculty with academic calendar appointments may have more time to do so; and
- allow for completion of annual evaluations at UTK before (a) engagement of the tenure and promotion review processes and (b) determination and allocation of any applicable merit pools for compensation enhancements.

The Timing Change is implemented in the resolution by changing various provisions in the *Manual* to incorporate a new term, “Evaluation Year,” that encompasses the two different evaluative periods at UTK and the other campuses covered by the *Manual*.

\* \* \*

Thanks, in advance, for your consideration of these proposed rule changes. Again, please contact me or use the Faculty Senate listserv to offer comments or suggestions in advance of the meeting on November 17th. I look forward to hearing from you and to seeing you at the meeting on the 17th.



**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE  
UTK FACULTY SENATE  
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE  
UTK FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
November 17, 2008**

WHEREAS, under Section 3.E. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* following review provisions as set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*,” and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost and the Deans’ Council recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to Section 1.4.6 of the *Faculty Handbook* (relating to the reappointment of department heads) to better balance the need for faculty input and decanal accountability against the desire for a more logical, streamlined administrative process;

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 Interim Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—proposed changes to the *Faculty Handbook* relating to the reappointment of department heads;

WHEREAS, these proposed changes to Section 1.4.6 include provisions:

- clarifying that the dean or deans to whom the department head reports make the ultimate decision as to the department head’s reappointment;
- compelling the dean or deans to seek input from faculty and other constituencies (including *extensive consultation with tenure-track, tenured, and other full-time voting faculty in the department*) in advance of making a reappointment decision (rather than requiring the dean to first recommend reappointment and subsequently seek input from and a vote of the tenure-track and tenured faculty on the recommendation);
- mandating that the dean or deans *give great weight* to departmental faculty consensus views (absent compelling circumstances) in making a decision on reappointment, rather than providing that faculty input “guide” the dean’s final reappointment decision;
- requiring the dean or deans to issue *a report to tenure-track, tenured, and other full-time voting faculty* on his or her final reappointment decision that reflects the reappointment review process as opposed to issuing “reasons in writing” when the dean’s decision on reappointment differs from the faculty’s consensus; and
- deleting the faculty’s express rights to request a meeting with the chancellor or vice president should faculty disagree with the dean’s decision on reappointment, in favor of engaging faculty in more meaningful engagement and decision making (including a

faculty vote) before the reappointment determination is made, with the ability to further define the exact process in unit bylaws (and not foreclosing a meeting with the chancellor or vice president, as applicable, if desired);

now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee recommends the following modification to the *Faculty Handbook* for final consideration and approval by the Faculty Senate:

Section 1.4.6 is amended and restated to read in its entirety as set forth below.

#### **“1.4.6 Reappointment of Department Heads**

The final decision on the reappointment of a department head rests with the dean—or deans in cases where a department head reports to more than one dean. (The singular form is understood to represent the plural form in this Section 1.4.6., as applicable.) A department head may be reappointed for an additional five-year term after a reappointment review. The dean shall base the review on the annual evaluations of the department head by the departmental faculty and the annual assessment of the department head by the dean (as provided for in Section 1.4.5) and on input from relevant constituencies. In particular, prior to making a decision on reappointment, the dean shall (a) solicit input from all departmental groups, including students, staff, and faculty and (b) consult extensively with tenured, tenure-track, and other full-time departmental faculty having voting rights on matters other than tenure and promotion, as may be determined in the departmental bylaws (collectively, the “Voting Faculty”). The process for input solicitation and consultation shall include a vote of the Voting Faculty on the reappointment and may be further defined in collegiate or departmental bylaws. The faculty vote and the bases for that vote shall be documented in writing and promptly sent to the dean for review. Absent compelling circumstances, the dean shall give great weight to the consensus views of the Voting Faculty in making reappointment decisions. The dean shall issue a written report to the Voting Faculty that states his or her final decision on the reappointment of the department head and the reasons for that decision, citing to support from the annual evaluations and other input.

During the term of office of the department head, he or she serves at the will of the dean. If a department head is not reappointed, the dean shall begin the process of selecting a new department head in accordance with Section 1.4.4.”

And it is further

RESOLVED, that the foregoing changes to the *Faculty Handbook* be presented to the Interim Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture (who then will submit their recommendations concerning the proposed revision to the chief academic officer for the system, who then will submit his or her recommendation to other appropriate vice presidents, the general counsel, and the president).

**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE  
UTK FACULTY SENATE  
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE  
UTK FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
November 17, 2008**

WHEREAS, under Section 3.E. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “shall concern itself with the development of criteria and procedures for faculty . . . evaluation” and “is responsible for . . . reviewing the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*;” and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost and the Deans’ Council recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to Part II of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (relating to the timing of annual evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty) to provide for annual evaluations of tenured and tenure-track faculty at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (but not tenured and tenure-track faculty at the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture and the University of Tennessee Space Institute) with respect to performance through the end of the preceding academic year, rather than with respect to performance through the end of the preceding calendar year (the “Timing Change”);

WHEREAS, under Appendix D of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, “[r]evisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* 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—and sought and received (i) input from the Interim Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consultation with and approval by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—the Timing Change;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has determined that the Timing Change complies with applicable policies of the Board of Trustees of The University of Tennessee and serves the interests of University, college, and department administrators and faculty by, among other things:

- aligning faculty evaluation processes at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (“UTK”) around the same calendar—the academic calendar—that most UTK faculty live by and plan for;
- affording UTK faculty the opportunity to assemble relevant materials and satisfy performance objectives during the summer months, when faculty with academic calendar appointments may have more time to do so; and
- allowing for completion of annual evaluations at UTK before (a) engagement of the tenure and promotion review processes and (b) determination and allocation of any applicable merit pools for compensation enhancements;

now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee recommends the following modifications to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* for final consideration and approval by the Faculty Senate:

Section A.3. of Part II of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* is amended and restated to read in its entirety as set forth below.

**“3. Timetable for Annual Evaluation.** Each faculty member at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville is evaluated annually on his or her performance during the previous academic year. Each faculty member at the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture and the University of Tennessee Space Institute is evaluated annually on his or her performance during the previous calendar year.”

The second sentence of Section B.2. of Part II of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* is amended and restated to read in its entirety as set forth below.

“The summary includes work accomplished during the previous academic or calendar year, as applicable under Section A.3. of this Part II (in either case, the “Evaluation Year”).”

Subparagraph b. of Section B.2. of Part II of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* is amended and restated to read in its entirety as set forth below.

“b. a summary of the faculty member’s activities and accomplishments during the Evaluation Year in teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, in accordance with Section 3.8 of the *Faculty Handbook*. The summary may include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience.”

Subparagraph a.i. of Section B.3. of Part II of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* is amended and restated to read in its entirety as set forth below.

“The department head writes a narrative describing and discussing the performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service during the Evaluation Year, based on procedures and standards in the departmental bylaws, this manual, and the *Faculty Handbook*.”

The Faculty Annual Evaluation Report form, in Appendix A of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, is amended to substitute the following for the third sentence in the italicized introduction: “The department head writes a narrative describing and discussing the performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service during the Evaluation Year (see Part II.B.3 of this manual).”