

Agenda
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
November 3, 2008

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of October 6, 2008

III. REPORTS

President's Report (J. Nolt)

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

Chancellor's Report (J. Simek)

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Report of Safe Zones Task Force (information item)

Resolution from Faculty Affairs Committee on Reappointment of Department Heads (J. Heminway)

V. NEW BUSINESS

Resolution from Faculty Affairs Committee on Timing of Annual Evaluations (J. Heminway)

Discussion of Provost's Task Force on Reapportionment and Reallocation (J. Nolt)

Attachments

Minutes of October 6 Executive Committee Meeting

Resolution from Faculty Affairs Committee on Reappointment of Department Heads

Resolution from Faculty Affairs Committee on Timing of Annual Evaluations

Report of Safe Zones Task Force

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
MINUTES
October 6, 2008

Present: Denise Barlow, Doug Birdwell, Marianne Breinig, Toby Boulet, Donald Bruce, Paul Crilly, Becky Fields, Joanne Hall, Suzanne Kurth, India Lane, Catherine Luther, Susan Martin, John Nolt, David Patterson, Carl Pierce, Scott Simmons, Anne Smith

Guests: Matt Murray, Jan Simek, Scott Simmons, Steve Thomas, Dixie Thompson

I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Nolt called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

The minutes of the August 25, 2008, meeting were moved, seconded and approved unanimously.

III. REPORTS

Senate President's Report (J. Nolt)

Program Closures. 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 involve three departments. The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils were asked to conduct expedited reviews of the programs based on AAUP and RRTF guidelines, but their reports later in the meeting indicate they did not have adequate time to do so. Nolt asked Provost Martin for a proposal before the Board of Trustees that would include a clause indicating that the proposed closures of these programs would be subject to regular channels of approval. Nolt expressed concern about Senate involvement in the closure of these programs being a "rubber stamp" of a "done deal." Thought needs to be given to establishing criteria for program reductions. The newly created Program Reduction Task Force has been charged with consideration of procedures.

Differential Tuition Increase. The proposed creation of a differential tuition rate has received push back. Legislators were unhappy about the timing of the proposal being made public. Efforts will continue, but a harder public press probably will be made after the election.

Honorary Degrees. Chancellor Simek requested that an Honorary Degrees Committee be appointed. The Graduate Council will create a subcommittee to serve that function.

Energy Conservation. Nolt turned over the numerous responses he received to the "Switch Your Thinking" memo. The Sustainability Manager will act on the suggestions. Nolt pointed out the availability of the link on the website for those with other recommendations. He also said preliminary discussions had occurred on how to infuse energy issues into the curriculum.

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

S. Martin announced the new Vice President for Student Affairs and Academic Success. The Board of Trustees' decisions on closing the programs in Industrial and Organizational Psychology and Dance were to be postponed, so reviews of them could be completed in the

normal way. She pointed out the system administration visit to the Knoxville campus would be the next day.

Chancellor's Report (J. Simek)

Budget. J. Simek noted information about the impoundment had been distributed. The system budget people reported the need for a budget impoundment this year, so the campus had prepared for an impoundment of 2%. Some questioned whether it was an impoundment or rescission. (The campus is treating it as an impoundment.) The \$6 million amounted to a 3.53% impoundment. Units would be held to 2% with funds from operations, travel, unfilled positions, etc. The remainder would be absorbed centrally. D. Barlow explained some of the sources. Reductions in next year's budget would involve hard choices, e.g., jobs. Human Resources is considering a reduction in force (RIF) by streamlining functions.

Chancellor Search. The Search Committee has sent names with comments on strengths and weaknesses to the President. Simek indicated optimistically a new Chancellor would be in place in January.

Questions and Answers. Some units report directly to Simek. Budget hearings would be after November discussions with Provosts and Deans. D. Birdwell asked whether background checks were conducted on Chancellor candidates. Simek said yes. Birdwell pointed out that research incentive funds often were really research operation funds, so serious consequences would result if they were used to meet impoundment. Martin said some departments were doing that. Barlow indicated there was no central move to withdraw research incentive funds. Birdwell also noted problems with faculty salaries. Simek said he was supportive of higher faculty salaries, but there is the issue of timing with the legislature. The public needs to be reeducated about what faculty members do. Patterson pointed out the annual salary report "kills us" and Simek agreed. C. Pierce commented that he assumed the University's endowment was tanking along with the stock market. Simek commented that because the University was in the midst of a capital campaign that the money being brought in helps to maintain the endowment. Pierce asked whether the campaign was meeting its goals. Simek said yes. P. Crilly expressed concern that a person was being paid full-time to pick up cigarette butts and wondered what the person was being paid. Barlow said that was a misunderstanding; the person is responsible for interior cleaning (e.g., sinks), as well as exterior cleaning.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Graduate Council (M. Murray)

Program Closures Report. The report was distributed. The Executive Committee of the Graduate Council formed a special committee to address the information provided them by Nolt on Industrial and Organizational Psychology and Audiology and Speech Pathology. They did not address issues such as tenure as the Graduate Council does not normally deal with those. Also, there was concern that the RRTF criteria were never approved. Looked to see if information was provided about faculty and programs not meeting performance standards. Consideration of two programs without comparing them with other programs seemed inappropriate. The remainder of the report focused on process. No process is in place to make resource reallocation decisions. Nolt expressed appreciation for the committee's work and asked about the next step, as the intention was to bring a recommendation to the next Senate meeting. The report could be brought to the Senate or the Senate could be told a recommendation could

not be made. Murray pointed out the report would appear before the Senate as part of the Graduate Council Minutes. The Senate could act at that time.

Patterson asked about "fit" with Martin's report. Nolt pointed out that Audiology and Speech Pathology programs were not part of the package. The Board of Trustees would look at a plan, rather than voting up or down on programs. Simek said the goal was not to take down the programs right away, as normally 4 years are provided for undergraduates to complete programs. Traditionally, programs are eliminated when they are no longer operative. Murray asked whether departments would put forward initiatives to close programs and courses, noting that in any case courses not taught could eventually be dropped. Simek brought up the program viability/quality issue when there are budgetary constraints. Pierce pointed out the process issue. If the ad hoc committee submitted its report to the Graduate Council, then it should just go to the Senate. If an ad hoc committee had been formed by the Executive Committee, then the Executive Committee would have to make the decision. In any case, the report would be received. For recommendations to be made, motions would need to be made. If the Executive Committee acts, the report would need to show that. Nolt agreed with Pierce's assessment, but he indicated that since the Executive Committee started the process, he thought it should propose some action. Birdwell said that when the Senate receives the Graduate Council minutes, they are seen as adopted. Birdwell agreed with the decision not to make a recommendation given the lack of comparisons. He suggested separating the Report from the rest of the minutes and not having the Faculty Senate take any action that would have immediate adverse impact on students. Martin noted the catalog lasts 6 years. Pierce explained that when the minutes of the Graduate Council come to the Senate, they constitute a set of recommendations that can be separated. Amendments could be made from the floor, but they should be available before the meeting. Nolt said the issue was whether the Executive Committee wanted to take action. C. Luther moved the Executive Committee endorse the Report and recommend that the Senate approve it. Motion died. J. Hall asked whether the Executive Committee was in effect recommending "no recommendation," that is, taking a passive role. Birdwell and D. Patterson considered how discussion of the Report could occur.

Undergraduate Council (D. Thompson for J. Romeiser)

Program Closures Report. Thompson reported that the reactions of members of the Council were similar to those of Graduate Council members, that is, the Undergraduate Council members were uncomfortable with conducting a review driven by finances. The statement from the Curriculum Committee (indicating no action had been taken) was approved by the full Undergraduate Council without discussion. Pierce noted the report was really an information item rather than an action item in the form he received.

Faculty Affairs (S. Thomas for J. Heminway)

Resolution to Revise Faculty Handbook. The resolution distributed proposed changes in the "Reappointment of Department Heads" section. The word "dean" would be treated as both singular and plural. A couple of grammatical changes were proposed. The report was moved. The first reading would be at the October Senate meeting. Birdwell said he knew of four reappointment cases—two agreed and two disagreed. He expressed concern about elimination of a vote by the faculty. He argued a strong case should need to be made to retain in cases of a negative faculty vote. Thomas said the problem was that the current policy has the dean making a decision and then informing the faculty. The resolution has the faculty giving input first. Birdwell said his concern was about no vote. Crilly agreed with Birdwell arguing for

something stronger than “input,” for if a head lacks faculty support, a unit would be dysfunctional. I. Lane said the option for more input was available (e.g., in departmental bylaws). Birdwell moved to return the resolution to committee. Patterson seconded. T. Boulet asked about the Provost’s involvement. As Provost, Martin said she reviews reappointment decisions. All Deans have processes in place circumventing the Faculty Handbook by consulting the faculty beforehand. Pierce said he was not in a position to judge the implications to the document of change (input vs. vote). An alternative would be to send the resolution to the Senate and bring a motion to amend it to the Senate meeting. Motion to return the resolution to committee passed.

Tennessee University Faculty Senate (TFUS) (J. Nolt)

Nolt attended a meeting with representatives from other state colleges and universities that led to the proposal to form a statewide organization that would meet twice a year. It would be independent of the Board and Trustees and Regents. Nolt suggested sending a resolution to the Senate recommending the Knoxville campus join the organization. Birdwell asked whether the organization existed. Nolt said a constitution was approved and colleges and universities were in the process of voting. Lane asked about representation for the Ag Institute on this and other bodies. Nolt explained that it was a body of Senate representatives from four-year colleges and universities. Pierce wondered about the timing, given the recent Knoxville proposal for differential tuition. Nolt gave an example of what was being proposed for joint action—cases where academic departments were dissolved and faculty members subsequently treated as staff rather than faculty. It was moved and seconded that the Executive Committee recommend joining the organization to the Senate. Motion passed.

Faculty Council (J. Nolt)

Proxy for Beauvais Lyons. Lyons cannot attend two meetings and asked that someone be appointed in his stead. Moved, seconded, and approved that Patterson replace Lyons on the Faculty Council.

Committee Reassignments (J. Nolt)

Nolt reported that Birdwell asked that O. Stephens be appointed to fill a vacancy on the Appeals Committee. R. Darling asked Nolt to be placed on the Student Concerns Committee. A motion to accept the appointments was made, seconded and approved.

Alcohol on Campus Task Force (D. Patterson)

The Task Force has looked at laws applicable to the sale of alcohol on campus. President Petersen made the serving of alcohol within the purview of Chancellors. Chancellor Crabtree approved Tyson House, McClung Museum, and Clarence Brown Theatre. A vote on sale of alcohol at Thompson-Boling was scheduled for Wednesday. Any student purchasing alcohol at Thompson-Boling would be in violation of the campus student conduct policy. Patterson wanted a reading of views on sale of alcoholic beverages at non-athletic events. (A vote “for” would require many levels of change in Code of Student Conduct.) In any case, the Task Force’s decision would not be the final word on whether alcohol would be sold. Nolt suggested having either a straw poll or sending comments to Patterson. A straw poll was taken and sentiment was evenly split.

Faculty Salary Survey (D. Bruce)

The annual faculty salary survey was distributed as an information item.

Teaching Council (I. Lane)

SAIS. The Council is working with SAIS. Institutional Research is considering what is happening on other campuses. Lane said she wanted to have E. Pemberton give a brief presentation at a Senate meeting.

Chancellor's Teaching and Advising Awards. Nominations are due November 7.

Teaching Panel. Lane drew attention to the October 15 panel of recent award winners to be held in collaboration with the new Teaching Learning Center.

Information Technology Committee (M. Breinig)

M. Breinig reported that J. Poore had appointed a committee to look into outsourcing student e-mail, suggesting there were more pros than cons to such a change. (There will be a survey of students.) She questioned how much faculty input should be sought, as the change would be for students. Nolt suggested she communicate with Paul Crilly as Chair of the Student Concerns Committee. Birdwell said it needed to be an appropriate system.

Research Council (J. Hall)

The Council is concerned about financial support for graduate students. There is interest in co-sponsoring a forum, e.g., with the Graduate Council, to address how to get graduate students involved in faculty research.

Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee (B. Fields)

Wellness Task Force Report. The Task Force would like to stay intact because of the current budget limitations. The Task Force recommends at least one FTE person. A. Chesney plans to put the position in his budget next year. Fields indicated it was their final report and had been submitted to the Chancellor. The Task Force hoped for follow through on some of the proposed initiatives. Pierce asked if the Executive Committee needed to take action. Nolt replied it was an information item.

Athletic Committee

The Athletic Committee Report was distributed.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

**RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE
UTK FACULTY SENATE
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT A MEETING OF THE
UTK FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
[JANUARY 26, 2009]**

Comment [MSOffice1]: Please note that the timing of adoption will be discussed at the meeting.

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;]

Comment [MSOffice2]: Note that the brackets will be removed before this is circulated to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

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
[JANUARY 26, 2009]**

Comment [MSOffice1]: Please note that the timing of adoption will be discussed at the meeting.

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;]

Comment [MSOffice2]: Note that the brackets will be removed before this is circulated to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

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).”

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.