

**Agenda**  
**Faculty Senate Executive Committee**  
**October 6, 2008**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of August 25, 2008

**III. REPORTS**

President's Report (J. Nolt)

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

Chancellor's Report (J. Simek)

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

Graduate Council Report; Program Closures (V. Anfara)

Undergraduate Council Report; Program Closures (D. Thompson for J. Romeiser)

Faculty Affairs Resolution (S. Thomas for J. Heminway)

Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) membership (J. Nolt)

Faculty Council Proxy for Beauvais Lyons (J. Nolt)

Committee Reassignments (J. Nolt)

Alcohol on Campus Task Force (D. Patterson)

Faculty Salary Survey (D. Bruce)

SAIS information and plans; 2009 teaching and advising awards cycle (I. Lane)

IT Committee (M. Breinig)

Research Council (J. Hall)

Wellness Task Force Report (B. Fields)

**Attachments**

Minutes of August 25 Executive Committee Meeting

Statement of the Undergraduate Council on program closures

Summary of Findings from the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Program  
Closures

Faculty Affairs Committee Resolution

TUFS Constitution

Athletic Committee Report

Wellness Task Force Report

Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
MINUTES  
August 25, 2008

Present: Vince Anfara, Doug Birdwell, Toby Boulet, Marianne Breinig, Donald Bruce, Paul Crilly, Becky Fields, Joan Heminway, Margo Holland, Suzanne Kurth, Catherine Luther, Beauvais Lyons, Susan Martin, David Patterson, Carl Pierce, Wornie Reed, John Romeiser, Anne Smith, Ken Stephenson (for Joanne Hall), Tse-Wei Wang

Guests: Jan Simek, Dixie Thompson, Scott Simmons

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

J. Nolt called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

**II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

A motion to approve the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of April 7, 2008, was passed unanimously.

**III. REPORTS**

Senate President's Report (J. Nolt)

The Senate's Executive Council charged with acting for the Executive Committee during the summer met a number of times to address the proposed elimination of academic programs (Audiology and Speech Pathology, Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and Dance). The Executive Council objected to their elimination without appropriate review, as the *Faculty Handbook* specifies a role for the Faculty Senate in the formation and closure of academic programs. After action by the Board of Trustees was postponed until its October meeting, the Council worked on a plan to have the programs reviewed before then. The planned reviews by the bodies specified in the *Handbook* (Graduate and Undergraduate Councils) is proceeding, despite the recent administrative statement about continuation of the Audiology and Speech Pathology programs, as it is unclear how they would exist. Two processes have been initiated. One process involves the programs slated for closure. The Graduate Council will review the graduate degree programs in Audiology and Speech Pathology, as well as the Industrial and Organizational Psychology program. The Undergraduate Council will review the Dance minor. (The undergraduate program in Audiology and Speech Pathology is not being terminated.) The other action was formation of a task force on program reduction that will address the process for evaluating programs for termination. T. Wang asked what the original criteria for eliminating the programs were. Nolt deferred discussion of those until Interim Provost Martin and Interim Chancellor Simek gave their reports.

The other major activity of the Faculty Council was a tenure termination recommended by a Cumulative Performance Review (CPR) Committee in the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources. (The CPR process is initiated when there are a certain number of unsatisfactory evaluations. CPR committees have three possible decisions, one of which is tenure termination.) The current process has committee recommendation going to the chief academic officer (DiPietro in this case), then the Chancellor and finally the Faculty Senate. A subcommittee of the Executive Council reviewed the materials and recommended that additional time be given to the faculty member. No response to that recommendation has been received. In the process of considering the case some contradictions between Board of Trustees' policies and the *Faculty Handbook* became apparent that require revision of the

Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Affairs Committee will be addressing that and other important proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook*.

Other items:

- A Senate Effectiveness Task Force has been appointed (Candace White, Chair). The goal is to have recommendation from that group by the end of the year.
- The Senate budget has been increased to pay for a course release for the President. The Board of Regents' schools provide such support.
- The Senate has not had an Information Officer, although such a position is allowed. Nolt appointed S. Ohnesorg to serve in that position. She will condense the minutes of every Senate meeting for distribution to all faculty members.
- At the Faculty Senate Retreat on August 29 time is allotted for all committees and caucuses to meet.
- Nolt noted that new energy conservation initiatives are planned for this fall.

K. Stephenson asked about the *Faculty Handbook* and the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources. Nolt indicated the Board policy specifies that tenure termination cases have to go to the Chancellor. P. Crilly commented that with the number of changes in campus administrators, he was concerned that all of the candidates for Chancellor were from other institutions. Nolt referred him to H. McSween, Search Committee Chair.

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

S. Martin reported that the Student Success and retention initiatives would be continued. She encouraged people to participate in the campus visits of the Chancellor candidates. The campus faces financial challenges, but energy costs provide an opportunity to institute an energy conservation program. She indicated rationales were provided for the program eliminations proposed. Although the administration had only about one week to make the decisions limiting communication opportunities, serious consideration was given to the quality, centrality, and importance of the programs (measured by funded research profiles, fit with college, etc.) in question for years. The Deans provided rationales that in some cases went back to earlier APEC recommendations.

V. Anfara indicated he did not know about the Dance program, but knew the Audiology and Speech Pathology Department had a good reputation and seemed viable. Martin said it did provide service.

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

J. Simek reviewed the rapid shift in the anticipated budget from 2% raises to the need to cut \$11.7 million from the budget three months later. He has given up virtually all the discretionary money allocated to him. Auxiliary units were tapped for money. After those adjustments, \$5 million had to come from academic units. Decisions about cuts were to focus on the institution's core mission (e.g., number of students served, contribution to general education, how it interfaces with other units) and quality of education. Audiology and Speech Pathology operated as a separated world with only 180 students. It was expendable and the clinical program was very expensive. The Dance program was an "orphan" that had been considered for elimination for a number of years, as either it needed to be substantially expanded or dropped. The Industrial and Organizational Psychology (IO) program had been considered for elimination for some time and admission to the program had been stopped. The Audiology and Speech Pathology program could not be shifted to another campus unit, as the money had to

be cut from the campus budget. Simek expressed the desire for the campus to be more nimble in responding to crises.

C. Pierce suggested that discussion should be left to the units charged with conducting the reviews. B. Lyons asked Simek to differentiate the current situation from financial exigency. Simek indicated that the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate would be involved in a declaration of financial exigency and he had not sought it, as tenured faculty were not being eliminated. Wang asked how much money was saved (\$1.3 million Audiology and Speech Pathology, \$107,000 Dance, and \$300,000 IO). Simek pointed out that in the past, reductions in based budgets were made by cutting vacant positions. He wants to make strategic decisions that allow the campus to focus on strong elements and the future. The administration is looking for further saving, while trying to retain undergraduate programs.

D. Patterson asked if Simek would be supportive of differential tuition, as a resolution recommending it was going to be proposed. Simek said he was noting that one of the revenue constraints the administration operated under was a modest tuition increase. He has proposed three scenarios to Deans and Vice Chancellors. A 2% impoundment for this year—the type of reduction usually covered with one-time money from central administration. The second scenario would be a 3% reduction in next year's based budget (1% in addition to 2% this year). The third would be a 5% reduction in base. The Deans and Vice Chancellors have been instructed to discuss proposals for reducing their budgets with faculty members before bringing them to the Chancellor and Provost.

Wang expressed concern about grade inflation contributing to the high number of new students in the College of Engineering.

#### Committee Reports

To ensure full consideration of important items of new business, committee reports were skipped.

### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

It was agreed that the Faculty Survey Resolution that was under consideration when a quorum call was made during the last meeting of the Senate did not need to be reintroduced.

### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

#### Recommendations to Graduate and Undergraduate Councils (Executive Council)

A proposed charge to the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils concerning program closures developed by the Executive Council was distributed and discussed. It was agreed the Councils should report their findings by October 13, so the Senate could vote on their recommendations at its October 20 meeting. The Executive Council drew on the best available guidelines, i.e., the ones developed by the Review and Redirection Task Force and AAUP guidelines. T. Boulet moved and J. Heminway seconded that the proposed charge be adopted.

Lyons interjected that one problem with the process could be having public hearings. The document did not provide process information. He expressed the hope that the Councils would be diligent in obtaining input from administrators, appropriate data, and providing opportunities for input from the concerned programs. The challenge would be in applying the RRTF criteria, e.g., the Councils will not have comparative college data.

The Executive Committee of the Graduate Council has met and has another meeting scheduled. Anfara did not know if M. Murray (subcommittee chair) had received the data he needed to distribute to his committee. Nolt said they would have the most recent program review data and data from the department heads. On some points, the committee might have to report a lack of adequate data. Lyons asked whether the last Audiology and Speech Pathology Review was 10 years ago. Martin said there was a more recent mid-cycle review. Anfara questioned whether there needed to be coordination between the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. J. Romeiser noted the Undergraduate Council did not have an executive committee, but had only one program to review. Anfara said he recognized the differences, but he was concerned with having a similar process. Simek said the issue was not quality but making strategic decisions. Lyons noted the *Faculty Handbook* invests authority to review programs on academic grounds but not financial bases. He expressed the desire to have faculty members involved when cuts are made for budgetary reasons. D. Birdwell expressed concern that using RRTF criteria represented "mission creep," using the merger of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering as an example. He questioned whether the problem was being skirted, i.e., if it is financial, isn't it a case of exigency. Further, he questioned whether relocated faculty would be seeking redress, e.g., through the Faculty Appeals Committee. Simek said he was involved in the merger of two colleges into one, the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences, and it went reasonably well. Birdwell indicated he did not want the RRTF to be misused. Boulet pointed out that the proposed process was "quick and dirty" given the time constraints, but the goal was to develop a better process. Heminway noted that the introduction to the RRTF material in the document presented it as having the best guidelines currently available. Wang proposed that since a budget crisis was the impetus for eliminating the programs that it should be noted that the criteria do not address quality. Nolt responded that quality was an issue. Heminway expressed the desire to not constrain the process in that way. Crilly asked how money could be saved, if tenured faculty members were not terminated. Simek replied that the Department has an expensive superstructure of clinics and clinical faculty. Martin pointed out the college proposal had retained the faculty. Motion passed.

#### Differential Tuition Resolution (B. Lyons and D. Patterson)

A motion to present the distributed resolution (with the deletion of the final "Whereas," grammatical corrections, and correction of UTK's research classification) at the next Faculty Senate meeting was moved and seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

#### Senate Quorum Requirement (T. Boulet)

A document outlining four quorum options and their possible consequences was distributed for discussion. Heminway suggested the quorum standard might be something appropriately referred to the new Senate Effectiveness Task Force. Pierce noted maintaining a quorum has been a persistent problem for the Senate given the late hour at which it meets. Birdwell addressed the risks associated with having a smaller number of people constitute a quorum. Lyons expressed support for having a majority of the member present when the meeting comes to order count as a quorum. Nolt indicated he would structure the agendas for the meetings so action items would be addressed earlier in the meetings. Patterson encouraged him to remind Senators of the need for a quorum.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned 4:55 p.m.

**This statement was approved with no further discussion at the September 16, 2008 meeting of the Undergraduate Council:**

**PROPOSED CLOSURE OF THE DANCE PROGRAM AND ELIMINATION OF THE DANCE MINOR**

The Undergraduate Council curriculum committee did not take action on the proposal but said that we would do so once we receive the necessary paperwork from the College of Health, Education, and Human Sciences. The committee is equipped to make decisions regarding academic programs and courses but not on questions related to financial matters when they originate at the highest administrative levels.

We urge the Undergraduate Council to discuss this issue at their next meeting but realize that the Council as well may not be equipped to endorse or reject undergraduate programs, majors, or minors slated for elimination, when they do not follow standard curricular channels.

**There has been no discussion yet on the proposed elimination of the undergraduate programs in audiology and speech pathology after receipt of Senate President John Nolt's September 22 message as follows:**

John and Don,  
Since receiving your messages, I have talked about this issue with Jan Simek and Susan Martin. I think now that it may be possible to back off from the October deadline as regards the closure of the undergraduate programs in ASP. My understanding is that the Board may be asked simply to improve a general plan, which would not specifically include closure of the undergraduate programs in ASP and that that would allow us time to run proposals for these closures through the standard procedures.

My concern when I wrote the messages below was that if we did not act immediately a plan that included closure of the undergraduate ASP programs would be presented to the Board in October and approved without any faculty or college input at all. I think we all have a common interest in avoiding that.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE PROGRAM CLOSURES

### COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE:

Matthew Murray, College of Business Administration, Chair (past Chair, Graduate Council)

Mary Albrecht, College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (Dean's Group)

Joy DeSensi, Graduate School

David Dupper, College of Social Work (Chair, Curriculum Committee)

Michael Essington, College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (member, Curriculum Committee)

Stefanie Ohnesorg, College of Arts and Sciences (Chair, Academic Policy Committee)

Kay Reed, Graduate School

### CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND:

In May, the College Deans were told to make proposals for budget cuts for the 2008/09 academic year. The colleges were encouraged to make strategic cuts and avoid horizontal cuts that would cause across the board "bleeding" of quality initiatives and programs. Each college was given a budget cut target.

Two colleges, the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business Administration, proposed cutting graduate degree programs to meet the budget cut that was expected of them. This included three graduate degree programs in Audiology and Speech Pathology (ASP) and the Ph.D. program in Industrial and Organizational Psychology (IOP). These proposed closures of graduate programs were only part of the budget cuts necessary to satisfy overall budget needs.

After the announcement that academic programs were to be cut, some faculty members involved in the programs, and constituents of one of the programs (ASP), voiced opposition to the proposed closures. The Faculty Senate leadership noted that normal channels for program closure were not used in these decisions. The Board of Trustees, once prevailed upon by the constituents of the programs under threat of closure, postponed action on the decision of closure until their October 2008 meeting.

During the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting on August 25, 2008, Interim Chancellor Jan Simek provided the following rationale for the proposed program closures: "Decisions about cuts were to focus on the institution's core mission (e.g., number of students served, contribution to general education, how it interfaces with other units) and quality of education. Audiology and Speech Pathology operated as a separated world with only 180 students. It was expendable and the clinical program was very expensive. The Dance program was an "orphan" that had been considered for elimination for a number of years, as either it needed to be substantially expanded or dropped. The Industrial and Organizational Psychology (IO) program had been considered for elimination for some time and admission to the program had been stopped. The Audiology and Speech Pathology program could not be shifted to another campus unit, as the money had to be cut from the campus budget. Simek expressed the desire for the campus to be more nimble in responding to crises." (Quoted from the so far unapproved minutes of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting of Aug. 25, 2008 posted at <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/minutes/2008-09/Exec. Minutes August.pdf>.)

On September 18, Interim Chancellor Simek released a memorandum noting that a plan would be presented to the Board of Trustees Executive and Compensation Committee that would sustain the activities of ASP. Under the proposed arrangement, administration of ASP would be moved from the College of Arts and Sciences to the College of Allied Health Sciences at the UT Health Science Center. While this proposed move would save the ASP program, it nonetheless represents closure of a graduate program on the UTK campus. Interim Chancellor Simek has offered no additional commentary regarding the IOP program.

#### THE CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE:

On August 12, 2008, John Nolt, President of the Faculty Senate for 2008-2009, charged the Graduate Council Executive Committee with the task of assessing the “pedagogical and intellectual soundness” of the proposals developed by the respective colleges to terminate the following graduate programs:

College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Audiology and Speech Pathology-  
Master of Arts with a major in Speech Pathology  
Doctor of Audiology with a major in Audiology  
Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Speech and Hearing Science

College of Business Administration, Department of Management  
Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Industrial and Organization Psychology

In the charge, the role of the Faculty Senate in academic program terminations was noted from the description in the *UTK Faculty Handbook*, Section 1.8, as follows:

The Faculty Senate, through its Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, and Educational Policy Committee, gives approval for establishing new programs and for terminating existing ones. Administrative judgments about the costs of these programs inform this deliberation and in turn are affected by the judgments of the faculty as to the pedagogical and intellectual soundness of such proposals. Deans, department heads, and the chancellor or vice president consult with appropriate faculty groups at their respective levels concerning the general fiscal implications of decisions about the curriculum, enrollment, class-size, and admission policies.

The Faculty Senate leadership stated that one possible scenario for assessing quality would be to use the criteria developed by the Chancellor’s Review and Redirection Task Force (RRTF draft 11-24-03, <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/RRTFCommStandards.html>). Those criteria were not adopted formally by the Faculty Senate to assess the quality, centrality, and importance of academic programs. While they do offer guidelines from a department, college, and university perspective, this committee has some reservations regarding the applicability of the RRTF criteria to the full array of graduate programs at UTK. The Faculty Senate leadership also offered guidelines developed by the AAUP.

#### GRADUATE COUNCIL’S RESPONSE TO THE CHARGE:

In response to the charge from Senate, the Executive Committee of Graduate Council established the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Program Closures (hereafter referred to as the Ad Hoc Committee). The Ad Hoc Committee would have a short timeline to fulfill its charge. A report was to be developed and presented to Graduate Council for discussion and approval on September 25. This report would then be conveyed to the Senate Executive Committee no later than October 13.

The Ad Hoc Committee determined that it could not focus on the criterion of budget as a basis for responding to the Faculty Senate's charge. The Graduate Council does not consider budget as a primary basis for approving graduate programs as they are presented to the Curriculum Committee. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to make judgments of these programs slated for closure based on budget. A program's service mission was also deemed problematic; service would not be a primary consideration in *approving* a degree program through Graduate Council.

The Ad Hoc Committee did not have the capacity to evaluate all RRTF criteria given the time available. In general, under current policies and procedures the Graduate Council Curriculum and Academic Policy Committees would not have information such as this available if they were to deliberate on program curriculum and closure proposals.

The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed a variety of documents as it pursued its task. This included a memo from the Office of the Provost, dated August 11, 2008, describing the proposed closures; documents from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business Administration offering an explanation of their proposed cuts; Academic Program Reviews from ASP (including a 2002 mid-cycle update) and the Department of Management (dated 1997); and the response to proposed closure from the Head of ASP. A set of advocacy statements from supporters of ASP was provided to the Ad Hoc Committee but the decision was made not to review these documents; advocacy statements generally are not something considered by Graduate Council in its deliberations. The Ad Hoc Committee also reviewed the statement that was issued by SACS on "Closing an Institution or Program" dated January 2007 (<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/teach%20out.close%20institution.pdf>) where it says specifically: "A decision to close an educational program, branch campus, or the entire institution requires thoughtful planning and careful consultation with all affected constituencies. Every effort should be devoted to informing each constituency as fully as possible about the conditions compelling consideration of a decision of such importance, and all available information should be shared. As much as possible, the determination to close a program, branch campus, or the institution should be made through a consultative process and only after alternatives have been considered, but responsibility for the final decision to close rests with the board of trustees. Since the immediate interests of current students and faculty are most directly affected, their present and future prospects require especially sensitive and timely attention and involvement."

The Ad Hoc Committee also requested additional information to support its charge. These requests went to the Chair of the Undergraduate Council, the faculty of IOP, Associate Dean Tom Ladd in the College of Business Administration, the President of the Graduate Student Senate, and Interim Provost Susan Martin. Since information from the Head of ASP was available, the committee felt it was important to solicit information from the individual faculty of IOP. Additionally, Associate Dean Ladd from the College of Business Administration was contacted to provide administrative feedback on IOP's proposed closure; Associate Dean Bill Dunne from the College of Arts and Sciences had attended a Graduate Dean's meeting and a Graduate Council meeting where closure had been discussed and he had been given the opportunity to provide feedback, so this same opportunity was extended to Dean Ladd.

The committee looked for signals from the College Deans to the department faculty about lack of program quality or centrality, or lack of shared goals, because these were the criteria presented by Interim Chancellor Jan Simek in his remarks during the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting on Aug. 25, 2008 as the rationale for the proposed program cuts. The committee believed that appropriate

administrative oversight of a program that would be recommended for closure would include warnings or other communication about dissatisfaction and allow the program faculty to respond with changes or justifications. The committee found some information suggesting that this process was at work in the context of the IOP program, though the information from College administrators and two faculty members in this unit was not always in agreement. There did not appear to be clear signals to faculty in IOP that their program was at risk of cutback or termination.

In this context, the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Program Closures also deliberated on the concept of “centrality” and its possible relevance or irrelevance in the context of graduate studies. The committee members considered the concept of “centrality” as too open-ended and vague to serve as a valuable criterion for the evaluation of graduate programs. It was determined that in the graduate context “centrality with regard to general education” – a form of centrality that seems of importance in the context of undergraduate education – cannot be ‘the’ determining issue for justifying (or closing) graduate programs. Without additional information that would clarify matters like “central to whom” and “central with regard to what context and/or mission,” this concept cannot be applied to graduate education in a meaningful way. When engaging in graduate work, the institution must give (and guarantee) faculty and graduate students the necessary leeway that will make state-of-the-art research possible without infringing on the concept of academic freedom. Furthermore, any pre-defined notion of “centrality” in this very context could possibly become an impediment in our campus’ effort to move up in the ranks of research universities.

#### CURRICULUM PROCESS AT UTK:

It is important to put the academic program policy process at UTK in context. The curriculum adoption and termination process is generally “bottoms up,” with proposals for curriculum and degree programs having academic units as their starting point. Approval is then sought through college committees. Graduate Council then takes action on these proposals and forwards recommendations to the Faculty Senate for approval. Graduate Council and Faculty Senate do not recommend academic degree programs and curriculum themselves. The central administration is not always closely involved in the development of an academic program. There is no policy or procedural document that outlines the relationship between faculty and departments in creating new or closing old programs with the Graduate School, Faculty Senate, Office of the Provost, Office of the Chancellor, Office of the UT System President, Board of Trustees and, ultimately, THEC.

Under normal circumstances, programs are terminated through a process initiated at the departmental or programmatic level. From here, the steps are the same as outlined above. In extraordinary situations—such as this past summer when the Deans were challenged with the need to identify budget cuts—this process will necessarily break down if program closures are being considered as an option to react to an unforeseen crisis that requires immediate action. It is often difficult for faculty and academic units to respond quickly to a request to terminate a degree program when the decision is made in a “top down” fashion absent a formal planning process, especially during the summer when many faculty are not on campus and in a position to react and respond. Similarly, Graduate Council is not in a position to evaluate and make recommendations on closure under such extraordinary circumstances via its usual channels and procedures.

#### FINDINGS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE:

1. The Committee offers no recommendation as to whether it is appropriate to terminate the graduate programs in ASP and IOP. At the same time, it is clear from a review of all of the available information that each of these programs had elements of quality that determine their academic standard as measured within and outside the university. Many of these elements of quality are consistent with the criteria spelled out in the RRTF report.
2. The decisions made by the colleges to close these programs were designed to impact other programs in the colleges minimally. The issue of lack of centrality rather than quality appears to be the driving force behind the closure proposals. However, the lack of centrality of these graduate programs relative to the mission of the university did not appear to be evaluated beyond the college administrative level. The administrative response to save the ASP program strongly suggests that centrality, if used as a criterion for strategic planning, always needs to be considered with regard to the institution as a whole, i.e., beyond simply the confines of a single college. Therefore, any strategic plan that proposes the termination of academic programs must be scrutinized and evaluated at all institutional levels in order to determine the impact that these program closures will have on the institution as a whole.

The Ad Hoc Committee found that centrality is an important factor to consider at the undergraduate level, especially with respect to the general education mission. In contrast, centrality is a problematic criterion for graduate programs that are often highly specialized.

3. The planning process for dealing with budget cuts was very short and afforded the administration little flexibility. At the same time, the role of the faculty in campus governance should not have been ignored. At a minimum, the Faculty Senate should have been brought to the table to offer their input. Faculty generally should have some voice in the decisionmaking process on any program closure. Faculty who confront the possible closure of a degree program they are involved with and other campus units that might be affected by closure should be informed in the most timely fashion possible.
4. Proposals for closure should be supported by an ongoing multi-year strategic planning process that engages faculty and degree programs, college administration and central administration. There are many mechanisms that can support this process, including Academic-Program and Mid-Cycle Reviews, annual reviews of faculty and Heads, and budget hearings. These mechanisms—especially Academic-Program Reviews—would need to be strengthened to serve this role in the context of program closures. A process that involves all stakeholders can ensure that departmental, college and university-wide missions are reflected in any recommendations on closure. Programs that are identified as unsatisfactory or misaligned with a College mission should be given clear signals and provided with an opportunity to respond to any specific concerns that are raised. This would help greatly in informing a program closure process, and would help more generally with budgeting and resource reallocation proposals. In this context, program elimination would be part of an ongoing strategic planning process with faculty involvement and checks and balances that focus on academic quality. This would be in line with the recommendations made by SACS (quoted above) regarding program elimination.

The members of the Ad Hoc Committee are aware that there are inherent problems associated with highlighting weaknesses in degree programs as part of an ongoing evaluation process. Faculty morale may suffer and faculty may leave for positions elsewhere; student retention and recruitment may be hurt; and units may choose to muster external support from stakeholders that could influence decisionmaking. The Ad Hoc Committee nonetheless supports a stronger long-term planning process and feedback process that would help identify programs for strengthening, maintenance or closure.

5. Criteria for evaluation of degree programs should be developed and formally adopted by faculty and the administration. The development of such criteria must recognize the tremendous diversity of degree programs across UTK. The RRTF criteria are incomplete in scope, and since they have never been formally adopted by the faculty or administration, they cannot serve as an effective mechanism to support planning and resource allocation decisions.

**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 (i) to a vote on the dean’s reappointment recommendation and (ii) 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

**Comment [MSOffice1]:** Note that the brackets will be removed before this is circulated to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

in more meaningful engagement and decision making before the reappointment determination is made, with the ability to further define the exact process in unit bylaws (and not foreclosing (a) a faculty vote, if the faculty so desires one and can call one under departmental bylaws, or (b) 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). Department heads may be reappointed for an additional five-year term after a reappointment review. The dean or deans, as applicable, will 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 or deans (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 or deans will solicit input from all departmental groups, including students, staff, and faculty, and will 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). The process for input solicitation and consultation may be further defined in collegiate or departmental bylaws. Absent compelling circumstances, the dean or deans will give great weight to the consensus views of these full-time voting members of the departmental faculty in making reappointment decisions. The dean or deans shall issue a written report to the full-time voting members of the departmental faculty that states his, her, or their 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 or deans. If a department head is not reappointed, the dean or deans 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).

## Constitution of the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS)

### Article I: Name

The name of this Association shall be Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS).

### Article II: Purposes

This Association shall have as its purposes:

- 1) To facilitate communication and cooperation between the various Faculty Senates and Councils of the State of Tennessee's public universities
- 2) To foster the role played by the Faculty in the shared governance of Tennessee's public universities
- 3) To represent the missions, accomplishments and needs of public universities to state agencies and to the general public of the State of Tennessee

### Article III: Membership

This Association shall be composed of the Tennessee public university Faculty Senates and Faculty Councils that elect to become members.

### Article IV: Meetings

General meetings of the Association shall be held twice annually, during the Fall and Spring academic semesters. The date of a meeting shall be fixed at the meeting immediately preceding it.

Additional meetings may be called with the approval of a majority of the entire cohort of voting representatives. In such instances, voting may occur by mail ballot or by electronic ballot.

### Article V: Voting

Each member body shall be entitled to one vote. One person shall be elected by each member body as its voting representative. Each body shall also elect an alternate voting representative who shall participate in the discussions of the Association and who shall be empowered to vote in the voting representative's absence. In the event that neither the voting representative nor the alternate voting representative are able to attend a meeting, the secretary of the member body affected shall certify in writing to the Secretary of the Tennessee University Faculty Senates the name of an individual authorized to vote on the body's behalf during that meeting.

Voting representatives and alternate voting representatives shall be current members or immediate past members of Tennessee public university Faculty Senates or Councils. An immediate past member of a Faculty Senate or Council is anyone who was a member of such a body at any time in the preceding two years.

The names of the voting representative and the alternate voting representative shall be certified in writing by the secretary of each member Faculty Senate or Faculty Council. This certification shall be addressed to the Secretary of the Tennessee University Faculty Senates.

Motions to be voted on at the general meetings shall be submitted to the member bodies at least thirty days before the general meetings of the Association. The following exception to the provision holds: at general meetings, voting representatives may authorize that motions be formally written, that they lie before the member bodies for thirty days, and that they be decided by the majority electronic vote or by the majority mail vote of the entire cohort of voting representatives. Routine and operational voting may occur without thirty days notice.

In the case of a tie vote, the President shall resolve the tie by casting the deciding vote.

## Article VI: Officers

The officers of the Association shall be the President, the President-Elect, the Secretary, and the Immediate Past-President. They shall be known collectively as the Executive Committee. The President and the President-Elect shall serve a one-year term, and the Secretary shall serve a two-year term. These officers shall be elected by the voting representatives of the Association's member bodies. Officers of the Association shall be current or immediate past members of these constituent bodies. The President and the President-Elect may not be the voting representatives or alternate voting representatives from their respective institutions.

The President of Tennessee University Faculty Senates shall:

- 1) Preside over general meetings of Tennessee University Faculty Senates and meetings of the Association's Executive Committee
- 2) Provide an agenda for all meetings to the membership
- 3) Report at general meetings on all business transacted by the Executive Committee
- 4) Act as the official spokesperson for Tennessee University Faculty Senates in all external communications
- 5) Serve as a liaison to state agencies, including the University of Tennessee, the Tennessee Board of Regents, and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

The President-Elect shall assist the President in the performance of constitutional duties. The President-Elect shall become President immediately upon the expiration of the President's term.

The Secretary shall keep minutes of all general meetings of the Association, and of all meetings of the Executive Committee.

The Immediate Past-President of Tennessee University Faculty Senates shall be an ex officio member of the Executive Committee for a period of one year.

Vacancies on the Executive Committee may be filled on an ad interim basis by the Executive Committee. Such vacancies shall be filled by the voting representatives at the next general meeting of the Association.

Except under exceptional circumstances, the Presidency shall alternate between a faculty member from a University of Tennessee institution, and a faculty member from a Tennessee Board of Regents institution.

Any officer may be removed from office by a two-thirds vote of the entire cohort of voting representatives.

#### Article VII: Standing Committees and Ad hoc Committees

Tennessee University Faculty Senates may establish such committees as it deems advisable, and shall prescribe the duties of these committees. Committee chairs shall be elected by the voting representatives from among the voting representatives and alternate voting representatives. The term of office for Standing Committee Chairs shall be two years. Ad hoc Committee Chairs shall have their term of office specified at the time of their election. Committee members shall be elected from a list comprised of candidates proposed by the various Faculty Senates and Councils. The term of office for committee members shall be two years. Ad hoc committee members shall have their term of office specified at the time of their election.

#### Article VIII: Amendments to the Constitution

Any proposed amendment to the constitution shall require approval by a two-thirds majority of the entire cohort of voting representatives.

#### Article IX: Parliamentary Authority

The rules contained in the most recent revision of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Association in all cases in which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the present Constitution or with any special rules adopted by the Association.

**Faculty senate athletic committee meeting**  
**Sept. 22, 2008**  
**3:30-5:15**  
**Thornton Athletic Center**  
**Room 225**

**Members attending:** Margo S. Holland, chair, Roberto Benson, Brad Bertani, Eric Brey, Edmund Campion, Wanda Costen, Robert Heller, John Koontz, Rex Pringle, Donna Thomas, Andrew Wentzel, Guest-Chutney Walton, Tiffany Carpenter, Desiree Francois-Reed

**Presentation by Eric Brey and Thornton Center staff**

1. Central academic progress-early alert system; attendance policy
2. Information on recruiting process regarding the academic interest of prospective student-athletes and role of faculty in the recruitment process
3. Student athlete summer bridge program
4. Thornton Center usage by student-athletes
5. UT process governing admission policy on student athlete
6. NCAA clearinghouse student athlete eligibility
7. H.S. core GPA & ACT test scores for comparison with yearly incoming freshman's GPA and test scores.
8. Distribution of majors among student-athletes

FSAC questioned whether a balance exists in student-athletes being allowed time off from practice and athletic responsibilities to fulfill academic course requirements. This is a question which will be posed to coaches.

**Due to confidentiality concerns, information was distributed at the meeting and collected at the end of the meeting.**

The FSAC set Student Athlete Welfare as a priority for 2008-2009. The committee has set a goal to identify and assist in the implementation of ways to enhance student-athlete retention, graduation rate, and citizenship

**Potential Programs for FSAC**

1. Day in the Life of a student- Tiffany Carpenter, Athletic Dept. Director of Public Relations presented a concept developed by the athletics dept. to have student-athletes invite a professor to attend practice and eat lunch and/or dinner with the team. FSAC recommended that, time permitting, the faculty members spend the day or  $\frac{1}{2}$  day with the student-athlete to gain true insight into the student-athletes' responsibilities outside the classroom. FSAC would follow up the initial athletic dept. invitations with faculty peer invitations. FSAC would request feed-back from faculty members to compile pertinent suggestions and recommendations to present to thornton center and athletic dept. to assist in the academic success of student -athletes.
2. Summer Bridge Program-Thornton Center staff will explore access of UT LEAP program for student-athletes.
3. Faculty-Student Athlete Mentorship Pilot Program-subcommittie was formed to explore establishing a pilot mentorship program between 20 most 'at risk' student-athletes and faculty members. Subcommittee members : Roberto Benson, Brad Bertani, Wanda Costen, Desiree Francois-Reed, Margo Holland, John Koontz, Donna Thomas, & Andrew Wentzel.

### **Coach Presentations**

As the faculty liaison between the faculty senate and athletic department, the dialogue must go both ways. To further this objective, coaches will be allotted time to give a 10-15 presentation to the FSAC at the beginning of each meeting. The presentation will allow coaches an opportunity to voice issues and concerns regarding student-athletes that faculty senate should consider/address. The recommendation was made that coaches from similar sports of both genders be paired on the given day (i.e. the women's softball coach and men's baseball coach would present at one meeting.) Presentations will be based on which coaches would like the opportunity to speak to the FSAC.

### **Athletic Directors' presentations**

Mike Hamilton will present to the faculty senate at the October meeting. An announcement at the Sept. faculty senate meeting and an e-mail was distributed to faculty senate members that stated faculty senators should submit any questions/concerns they wish to have Mike address to the FSAC. The FSAC will compile the questions/concerns and submit to Mike Hamilton for him to address during his presentation.

Joan Cronan will present to the faculty senate at the November meeting.

### **Communications**

In an effort to enhance dissemination of information, the FSAC will present monthly reports for distribution to faculty senators. As the liaison between the faculty senate and athletics dept., the FSAC report will include one fact about the athletics dept.

## **DID YOU KNOW?**

-UT Athletics is one of less than a handful of athletic departments in the country that receives no funds from state subsidies or taxes.

-The only revenue received by the athletic department that is not generated by the athletic department is \$1 million from student fees that goes to the women's athletics department.

The University of Tennessee

Faculty and Staff Wellness Task Force

Report to Faculty Senate, May 2008

I. Task Force Charge

The task force has been established as a result of a recommendation from the Faculty Senate. The purpose of the task force is to advise the Chancellor on the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs to improve the health and well-being of all University employees by May 2008. Specifically, the Faculty Senate requested that this task force:

1. Quantify potential benefits and costs of a wellness program to UT
2. Identify specific benefits to employees willing to participate in a wellness program
3. Identify means of promoting participation in a wellness program among university employees
4. Identify potential resources to facilitate the creation and operation of a wellness program website
5. Identify process and timeline to implement a UT Faculty and Staff Wellness Program

II. Definition of Wellness

The Wellness Task Force is guided by a definition of health and a definition of health promotion.

According to the World Health Organization "**Health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.**"

The American Journal of Health Promotion defines health promotion as "**the science and art of helping people change their lifestyle to move toward a state of optimal health.** Optimal health is defined as a balance of physical, emotional, social, spiritual, and intellectual health. Lifestyle change can be facilitated through a combination of efforts to enhance awareness, change behavior and create environments that support good health practices. Of the three, supportive environments will probably have the greatest impact in producing lasting change".

### III. Task Force Membership

Victor Barr	Student Counseling
Jim Boyle	Student Health
Bob Cargile	College of Education, Health and Human Sciences
Alan Chesney	(Co-Chair) Human Resources
Karla Edwards	College of Social Work
Paul Erwin	Center for Public Health
Becky Fields	(Co-Chair) College of Nursing
Tonnette Harris	Office of Equity and Diversity
Nancy Howell	College of Veterinary Medicine
Mary Lucal	Human Resources
Susan Martin	Provost and Vice Chancellor
Rex Pringle	RecSports, Student Affairs
Jenny Richter	Office of Equity and Diversity
Dan Reilly	SEE Committee
Mark Smith	Environmental Health and Safety
PJ Snodgrass	Office of Information Technology
Otis Stephens	College of Law
Jeannine Studer	Educational Psychology and Counseling
Rosa Thomas	Student Health
Jay Whelan	Nutrition

### IV. Current Campus Resources

The Task Force has identified several wellness resources already available to staff on the Knoxville campus. These include:

#### **America on the Move in Tennessee**

America On the Move Foundation (AOM) is a national non-profit organization. Its mission is to improve health and quality of life by promoting healthful eating and active living among individuals, families, communities and society.

#### **The Center for Physical Activity and Health (CEHHS)**

The Center is dedicated to promoting physical activity and helping individuals enhance their health, fitness and quality of life.

#### **Center for Public Health**

The Center for Public Health Policy and Research's mission is to help improve the health of Tennesseans through research and teaching. The center coordinates academic units on campus that research public health initiatives and programs that train public health professionals.

### **College of Nursing**

The College of Nursing offers flu shots, an annual Health Check day, and ongoing exercise science classes.

### **College of Veterinary Medicine**

Veterinary Teaching Hospital- Flu Shots discounted for UTCVM employees and students, but open to public at full price

Veterinary Social Work- offers a Pet Loss Support Group for those coping with the death of a pet. The free meetings are held the first and third Tuesdays, February through April, on the agricultural campus. (Open to UT & Public)

Veterinary Social Work Spring Educational Series (Open to UT)  
Lunch brown bag seminars on topics related to health, well being, stress management, and human-animal relationship issues.

### **Employee and Organizational Development Lunch and Learn Series**

These lunchtime courses are informative yet casual opportunities for staff to learn about topics of personal interest to them. Many of the topics are health-related, for example: Stress Management, Personal Safety, Keeping It Clean: Talking to Family and Friends about Alcohol and Drugs.

### **Employee Assistance Program**

The Employee Assistance Program is a resource for faculty and staff. It provides information, resources, referrals and self-help tools on a wide range of issues, including mental health, legal and financial concerns. Employee Relations coordinates this program and also organizes a number of annual trainings geared toward work/life balance for UT staff.

### **Master's in Public Health**

All MPH students complete a major in public health which provides a solid foundation for professional employment in community-based settings. The public health model, emphasizing health promotion and health protection, uses the key strategy of prevention. Incorporated in the curriculum are the five public health specialty areas. These include biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental health sciences, health services administration, and social and behavioral sciences.

### **Mobile Mammography**

Mobile mammography is scheduled on campus once per year in partnership with the UT Medical Center.

### **Prostate Screening**

Prostate screening is scheduled on campus once per year in partnership with UT Medical Center.

### **RAD Training**

The UT Police Department teaches Rape Aggression Defense to women on the Knoxville campus. This course teaches basic self defense techniques and safety awareness.

### **RecSports**

The Recreational Sports Department has up-to-date programs and facilities available to faculty and staff on a membership fee basis. These programs and facilities provide an opportunity for all university personnel to maintain or improve their individual health through physical activity and exercise. Some additional offerings available throughout the year include:

- Body Fat Testing
- BMI (Body Mass Index)
- Stress Relievers
- Yoga/Relaxation Seminars
- Family Health & Fitness Day
- Fitness presentations for University Police
- Open House for TRECS
- National Women's Health & Fitness Day
- Skin Cancer Awareness Day
- Healthy Eating Awareness Day
- Fitness Assessments
- RecSports Wellness Week
- Blood Pressure Screening
- RecSports Fitness Challenge
- Group Fitness Challenge
- Aqua Classes
- Yoga/Pilates Classes
- Cycling Classes
- Educational Handouts on a variety of topics:
  - America/Tenn. On the Move
  - Mental Health Awareness
  - Depression Screening
  - Great American Smokeout
  - Healthy Weight Week
  - Cervical Health Awareness
  - Healthy Heart
  - Nutrition
  - Alcohol Awareness
  - Women's Health, etc.

- HIV & AIDS
- Food Safety at Home
- A Lifetime of Good Health
- Women & Alcohol
- Antibiotic Resistance
- Cholesterol
- Women & Heart Disease
- High Blood Pressure
- Pap Tests
- Smoking Cessation

### **Student Counseling Center**

The Student Counseling Center offers a number of wellness-related seminars, including suicide prevention topics, to employees.

### **Student Health**

Seminars and literature on various health-related topics are available to employees through Student Health Services:

- Allergy Injection/Education
- Health Fair – w/NAACP – Spring
- Blood Pressure Screening
- Travel Abroad Clinic
- Great American Smoke Out
- Skin Care Awareness (Skinsolutions)
- Stress Workshop
- Women's Health Workshops
- Cold & Flu Awareness
- HPV/Gardasil Awareness
- Prostate Screening
- Health Fair w/College of Nursing – Fall
- Flu Vaccinations
- STD Awareness
- Heart Disease/Go Red Awareness
- QPR for Suicide Prevention – Presentations
- Rape Prevention Awareness
- Health Education/Health Promotion Literature on various topics in English and Spanish

## V. Findings

The task force studied research conducted by Segal/Sibson in public and private institutions nationally and in the TN area (“Healthy Campus Survey,” Segal/Sibson, 2007). This study was designed to gather metrics and health strategies used at various higher educational organizations. It found that mental and physical health is

key to healthy campus, and a healthy campus helps people be more productive. It also found that having a wellness program in place creates a significant reduction in health care costs. It may also create a better work/life balance for staff, which in turn may have a positive effect on overall health and institutional ranking.

This research helped the task force to identify common denominators at schools with low health care costs and effective wellness programs:

- \*dedicated wellness staff
- \*appointed committee to steer wellness efforts
- \*creation of a business initiative related to staff wellness
- \*monitored metrics
- \*incentive payments
- \*smoking cessation programs

The task force has identified the following needs:

- The development of a wellness program at the University of Tennessee.
- Coordination of the many seminars/educational activities, creating a marketing strategy, and oversee the development of a website. We suggest some kind of catch phrase or name to create program recognition.
- Benchmarks of success
- Health data from the State of TN and/or health insurance providers
- Informed consent forms for participants
- Awareness of resources
- Health focus for Fall Festival

## VI. Recommendations

To address the needs listed in “Findings” and to create a quality wellness program for the University of Tennessee, the task force makes the following recommendations:

1. The task force suggests following a successful model for any wellness program implementation. For example, the Wellness Councils of America suggest these seven basic steps:
  - Securing Senior Level Support
  - Creating Cohesive Wellness Teams
  - Collecting Data to Drive Health Efforts
  - Crafting an Operating Plan
  - Choosing Appropriate Interventions
  - Creating a Supportive Environment
  - Consistently Evaluating Outcomes

Established wellness programs at several state institutions (Ohio State University, Cornell University, University of Florida, University of Iowa, University of Kentucky, to name a few) incorporate several of these components. In an effort to create a strong and effective wellness program at UT, the committee recommends following some of these examples.

2. The task force proposes creating a wellness program which includes a budget (TBD), dedicated Human Resources staff (at least 2 FTEs plus administrative support) housed in and reporting jointly to RecSports, and a web presence.

The staffing model suggested by the commission is very modest; similarly situated state institutions of higher education employ over 6 FTEs to staff their wellness programs. We suggest a creative staffing configuration; some combination of regular full-time staff and GA's or part-time staff might be effective. These individuals should have health certifications, be able to market to faculty and staff, and be capable of seeking grants.

3. The task force recommends that any wellness program contain incentives through health awareness. This model was used by the East Tennessee Regional Health Office. The task force finds this model a useful one also because of its simplicity and specificity. This program, called "Star Wars," focused on four health areas: weight management, physical activity, tobacco cessation, and general health assessment. It included various incentives, from trophies to time off from work. Being part of a program, having incentives, and participating with peers were among the features most successful with participating staff.

Some examples of the incentives used by other wellness program providers:

Ohio State University	cash awards
Tennessee Tech	\$50-\$100 award packages
University of Iowa	Gift certificates
University of Kentucky:	\$5.00-\$15.00 per month award
University of Michigan	\$500 travel vouchers
University of Texas	gift cards, ipods, digital cameras

4. The task force suggests that any wellness program be required to collect, assess, and report measurable outcomes. These outcomes can take many forms, from direct assessments of risk factor biomarkers (such as, BMI, BP, fasting blood sugar or plasma lipid profiles) prior to and after the interventions (if they can be collected) to self reported measures like total minutes of exercise, etc. In addition, other parameters could be collected that would demonstrate an effective program, such as identification of previously unknown risk factors or a previously unknown diseases, i.e., prostate screening detecting prostate cancer,

or mammograms detecting breast cancer, or blood pressure measurements detecting hypertension, or plasma profiles detecting diabetes mellitus or high cholesterol levels. Early detection of a previously undiagnosed condition is critical for maintenance of good health, wellness and prevention of a more serious future condition.

5. The committee suggests continuation of the task force as the program evolves and adapts.
6. The committee suggests that a combination of health profession student learning opportunities and opportunities for scholarly research be built into the program. Nursing, Social Work, Nutrition, Exercise Science, Public Health, Education Counseling, Psychology and Sociology are some of the programs which could develop learning projects at a UT Wellness Center. This committee recommends that data related to the program be maintained by the fulltime wellness staff.
7. The committee suggests that relevant HR policy be reviewed and changed once a wellness program is in place. Particular attention should be given to the question of whether UT policy/procedures encourages work/life balance.
8. The committee recognizes that marketing will be crucial to the success of any wellness program that UT implements. To this end, we suggest that particular emphasis be given to targeted marketing of various segments of the UT community. We suggest partnerships with Media Relations/Internal Communications to assist in this area.
9. The committee proposes that Kathy Brown, Director of Health Promotion, Knox County Health Department, be on the Advisory Board.