

**SENATE MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2009
3:30 P.M. UNIVERSITY CENTER
SHILOH ROOM**

Agenda

Toby Boulet, President
Joan Heminway, President-Elect
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary to the Senate

Becky Jacobs, Parliamentarian
Stefanie Ohnesorg, Information Officer

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Establishment of Quorum (S. Kurth)
Senate President's Report (T. Boulet)
Provost's Report (S. Martin)
Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Meeting, April 20, 2009 (for approval)
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting, August 31, 2009 (information item)

MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY

Minutes from the Graduate Council meetings of April 9, 2009, and August 13, 2009, have been distributed to Senators electronically and are available at (<http://gradschool.utk.edu/GraduateCouncil/Minutes/20090409-GC-Minutes.pdf> and <http://gradschool.utk.edu/GraduateCouncil/Minutes/20090813-GC-Minutes.pdf>)

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

PREVIOUS BUSINESS

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Resolution on TUFS position paper (J. Nolt)

ADJOURNMENT

ATTACHMENTS:

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 20, 2009 (for approval)
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes, August 31, 2009 (information item)
TUFS Position Paper
Tennessee AAUP Endorsement of TUFS Position Paper
Resolution on TUFS Position Paper
Faculty Senate Membership Roster with Email Addresses
Faculty Senate Committee Listing

DISTRIBUTED BY:

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

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE:

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

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate
MINUTES
April 20, 2009

Absent: Lt. Col. Michael Angle, Janice Appier, Alvaro Ayo, Roberto Benson, Bill Blass, Thomas Boehm, Bill Bradshaw, Marianne Breinig, Max Cheng, Deniela Corbetta, Steven Dandaneau, Jim Drake, Linda Frank, Glenn Graber, Mary Gunther*, Lee Han, Russel Hirst, Yuri Kamychkov, Stephen Kania, John Koontz, Jeff Kovac, Norman Magden, Jeff Maples, Murray Marks, John McRae, David Patterson, Natalia Pervukhin, W. Tim Rogers, Rupy Sawhney, Montgomery Smith, Edgar Stach, Marlys Staudt, Jeannine Studer, Patricia Tithof, Michelle Violanti, Andrew Wentzel, Michael Wirth, Pia Wood, Yang Zhong

*Alternate Senators: Carole Myers

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Establishment of a Quorum (S. Kurth)

S. Kurth reported a quorum was present.

Senate President's Report (J. Nolt)

J. Nolt announced J. Heminway was elected to be President-elect. Given the long agenda he did not present his year-end report, but noted it was available electronically. He thanked S. Ohnesorg for editing the Senate newsletter, T. Boulet for his work as President-elect and Co-Parliamentarians B. Jacobs and C. Pierce for their assistance. He expressed appreciation for the administrative support of Chancellor Cheek, Provost Martin, Vice Provost Gardial, S. Winston, and "jack of all tasks" graduate assistant S. Simmons.

Nolt encouraged faculty to attend the investiture of the new Chancellor on May 1. He reminded everyone that April 22 was Earth Day and that environmental leadership awards would be presented on the pedestrian walkway.

Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

Chancellor Cheek thanked Nolt for the positive relationship they had and said he looked forward to working with the new leaders of the Senate.

He said work was ongoing on the tuition proposal for the June Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting. An increase of 7½% would just cover increased costs. The Student Government Association (SGA) was supportive of a 9% increase. He thanked C. Pierce for temporarily assuming leadership of the Baker Center.

Comments/Questions. There were no questions.

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

Provost Martin thanked Nolt for representing the faculty in difficult times. She said she looked forward to working with the new leaders of the Senate. She reported that the evaluation of Deans would be done as it had been done in past years. She said she had agreed with Nolt on doing what had been done in previous years (rather than conducting the evaluations online). She encouraged everyone to fill out the evaluation forms.

She said her office was working on a list of Department Head terms and a schedule for 5 year evaluations.

She reported the stimulus money had been allocated. She asked Deans to look for areas of high demands, so students could get the classes they needed. She was looking forward to May 1, when fall admission information would be available. She expected the Knoxville campus would continue to be perceived as a great value and was waiting for confirmation of that.

Martin announced that T. Diacon would be in charge of the fall Life of the Mind Program, which would be focused on the memoir *The Glass Castle*, and Freshmen Seminars (129).

Comments/Questions. T. Wang asked about the anonymity of the online evaluation of Deans. The evaluation was no longer online.

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Meeting

The minutes of the March 23, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting were moved by J. Heminway and seconded by S. Thomas. Minutes approved.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting

The minutes of the April 6, 2009, meeting of the Executive Committee were available as an information item.

MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY

Graduate Council Minutes

Minutes of the April 9, 2009, Graduate Council were not available. Nolt announced that either the Faculty Council would address them over the summer or they would be brought to the first fall Senate meeting.

Undergraduate Council Minutes

Neither Chair J. Romeiser nor council member N. Magden was available to answer questions. Wang asked about page U1592, specifically the statement indicating that a grade of C- would not be accepted unless there were an articulation agreement (or the student had an AA from a TBR school). She questioned whether the College of Engineering would think a C- grade was adequate. Diacon said all the change did was add to a policy statement that specified D. T. Boulet pointed out that the policy did not preclude units from requiring more, i.e., higher grades. Diacon agreed that the policy only meant that the course would appear on the student's transcript.

Minutes approved.

PREVIOUS BUSINESS

Proposed Changes to Senate Bylaws (T. Boulet)

Boulet briefly summarized the proposed changes:

- 1) terminology referring to the campus
- 2) quorum
- 3) ex officio members right to vote on committees
- 4) provision of summaries of Undergraduate and Graduate Council minutes
- 5) formalized filling of vacancies on various committees

D. Birdwell moved to divide the proposed changes separating the issue of the quorum from the main motion. Holland seconded. The motion to divide was approved. The main motion and its

amendments were approved. The quorum issue was brought up because at the last meeting of the previous year a resolution of recognition could not be passed because a quorum call was made and not enough Senators were present. The issue was whether a sentence should be added about not losing a quorum. Malia asked whether *Robert's Rules of Order* addressed the issue and was told it was not addressed. Parliamentarian Pierce said it was very common in business meetings to have the proposed provision and that whether to have it was simply a matter of choice. Nolt said it would not prevent someone from making a motion to adjourn. Birdwell noted that in one case ending the meeting would require a majority vote and in the other a single person could effectively end the meeting. L. Beebe asked whether the change would apply to committees. Boulet said it would not as the committees had their own bylaws. The separated motion passed.

Faculty Affairs: Resolutions on Annual Review and Retention Review (J. Heminway)

J. Heminway presented the resolutions:

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 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 the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation to improve, clarify, and simplify the faculty annual review and retention review processes;

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, 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 (i) input from the Interim Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by, consultation with, and the approval of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—various revisions to the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation designed to improve, clarify, and simplify the faculty annual review and retention review processes; and

WHEREAS, the memorandum from the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee to the Faculty Senate attached to the minutes of this meeting as Exhibit A describes these various revisions to the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation;

now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that the changes to the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation attached to these minutes as Exhibits B and C are approved and adopted and that the changes to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation become effective only if and at the time the changes to the Faculty Handbook become effective; and it is further

RESOLVED, that the Annual Recommendation on Retention of Tenure-Track Faculty and the Faculty Annual Evaluation Report attached as part of Appendix A to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation are deleted and that the two-sided Faculty Annual Review Form attached to these minutes as Exhibit D is substituted for those documents; and it is further

RESOLVED, that, in addition to the changes to the Faculty Handbook noted in Exhibits B and C to these minutes, paragraph 3 of Section 7.2 of the Faculty Handbook is revised to delete the following sentence:

“The faculty member may choose to include a description and review of compensated outside activities as a separate addendum to the annual review, if appropriate.”

And it is further

RESOLVED, that in addition to the changes to Parts I and II of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation noted in Exhibits B and C to these minutes, certain conforming changes are made in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation as follows:

(1) the term “annual evaluation” in the text of the “Introduction: General Information and Guidelines for Using this Manual,” Part V.A.1., Part V.A.2.a., Part V.A.2.b., and Part V.A.3. of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation is changed to “annual review;”

(2) the reference in Part IV.A.1.e.i. to “Annual Recommendation on Retention forms and Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports” is changed to “Retention Review Forms and Annual Review Forms;”

(3) the two references in Part IV.B.3.d.i. of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation to “Annual Recommendation on Retention forms” are changed to “Retention Review Forms” and that the word “for” be inserted after the first reference;

(4) the two references in Part IV.A.1.e.ii. and the reference in Part V.B.1.a. of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation to “Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports” are changed to “Annual Review Forms;”

(5) the reference to “Faculty Annual Evaluation Report” in Part V.A.3. of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation is changed to “Annual Review Form;”

(6) Appendix A to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation is re-titled as follows “Faculty Annual Review Report and Cumulative Peer Review Report;”

(7) the first two listed items in Instruction G and the two items in numbered paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part G in Appendix B are deleted and are replaced with “Retention Review Forms (for tenure-track faculty only)” and “Annual Review Forms (for faculty seeking promotion only),” respectively;

(8) the reference to “Annual Recommendation on Retention forms and/or the Faculty Annual Evaluation Reports” in Part A. 3. of Appendix B is replaced with a reference to “Retention Review Forms and/or Annual Review Forms;” and

(9) references to “annual evaluation” and “annual teaching evaluation” in the “Best Practices for Assessment and Evaluation of Faculty Teaching” attached to the Manual for Faculty

Evaluation are changed to "annual review" and "annual teaching review," respectively; and it is further

RESOLVED, that this Faculty Senate approves and adopts a five-category evaluation scale (as included in the Annual Review side of the Faculty Annual Review Report attached to these minutes as Exhibit E) for use in annual reviews on a pilot basis commencing in the fall 2009 semester and that the Faculty Annual Review Report attached to these minutes as Exhibit E be used for faculty annual reviews commencing in the fall 2009 semester and continuing until the pilot program is terminated; and it is further

RESOLVED, that the Faculty External Compensation and Consulting Annual Report Form attached to these minutes as Exhibit F is approved and adopted and that this form be included as part of Appendix A to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation; and it is further

RESOLVED, that the changes to the Faculty Handbook approved in these resolutions be presented to the Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture (who then will submit their recommendations concerning the proposed revisions 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).

On page 9 of the handout was a discussion of *ex parte* communication. Exceptions to the rule discussed at the March Senate meeting were mentors and the Faculty Appeals Committee. The "Pulsinelli Amendment" as further amended included two others representing other confidential lines of communication whose inclusion would be consonant with the *Faculty Handbook*: Ombudsperson and Office of Equity and Diversity. J. Malia moved to add to the resolution the *Faculty Handbook*. Thomas seconded the motion. T. Onami asked whether D would allow for consultations with the Chair of the Appeals Committee. Wang asked what would happen if there were a violation. Heminway said a violation would invoke procedures already in the *Faculty Handbook*. Birdwell asked whether there was overlap in Chapter 5. Heminway said the processes were already in the *Faculty Handbook*. People requested that these two be specifically identified at this point for purpose of clarification. The "Pulsinelli Amendment" was approved.

Discussion returned to the whole resolution from the Faculty Affairs Committee. Exhibit A addressed retention review and annual review. A6 requires only substantiated information be permitted in materials. The goal was to prevent the inclusion of undocumented comments. In the case of Agricultural Extension personnel who are scattered throughout the state, phone calls are often relied on. The question was raised about whether the burden then was on the tenured faculty to fact check. Heminway said that at the meeting of the tenured faculty each person should report with whom they spoke, so that the phone conversations would become part of the record. Basically, unattributed comments were being prohibited.

P. Crilly asked about engagement in outside activities, noting he agreed with the "Birdwell Amendment." As he read the form, it looked like approval was being granted. Heminway explained it was an informational or reporting form. Departmental and collegiate bylaws might limit engagement in outside activities. Crilly said some department heads do not want faculty members to engage in consulting, so they could prevent faculty members from engaging in such activities. Heminway commented that the "Faculty Handbook" guidelines may come across as standards. The best thing for an individual faculty member to do would be to work on his or her unit bylaws. Crilly further pursued the topic asking why the Senate was engaging in this action, as it was the current default position. Heminway said it did not change the substantive rule, as the burden of proof remained in the same location, i.e., the department head would have the burden of proof.

Birdwell questioned the use of the word "request" on the second page of the form. Heminway noted #3 said "requesting" and asked what he proposed as a substitute. Birdwell proposed saying "reporting basis" rather than "requesting basis."

Two other friendly amendments accepted were to substitute "period of activity" for "time" and at the top of the page delete the first "request." A friendly amendment to change on the first line of form A "Annual Reporting Form" "this request applies" to "this report applies" was accepted.

S. Blackwell said he thought that the form dealt with activities within 100% time. He wondered about going beyond that. Heminway noted that changes could not violate the *Faculty Handbook*. L. Parker's friendly amendment to change in two places the "acknowledge and agree" by the person's signature to simply "acknowledge" was accepted. Motion passed.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Budget and Planning Committee (D. Bruce)

D. Bruce directed attention to particular categories in the distributed report. The "Institutional Support" category showed a substantial increase (2004-2008) in spending at the system level. The Committee was concerned about the focus on non-academic salaried and benefits. When expenditures in this category are compared with those of UT's self selected peer institutions, UT is third highest. Bruce introduced the Committee's resolution:

Whereas Institutional Support spending is defined by the UT system as "costs associated with executive management, fiscal operations, personnel services, and administrative computing;" and

Whereas UT system-wide spending on Institutional Support increased by \$25.9 million between 2004 and 2008 (or by about 32.6 percent, which exceeded overall spending growth of about 11.4 percent during this same period of time); and

Whereas about two-thirds of the \$25.9 million increase occurred at the System Administration level, and more than 80 percent of the increase went toward non-academic salaries and associated staff benefits; and

Whereas UT Institutional Support spending amounted to 7 percent of total spending in 2007, which ranks as third-highest in UT's self selected peer group within the National Center for Education IPEDS data; and

Whereas higher education in Tennessee faces long-term budget cuts following the two-year period of federal stimulus funding; and

Whereas these budget cuts threaten to impair UTK's capacity to achieve its most important missions of teaching, research scholarship and creative activity;

Thereby be it resolved that the UTK Faculty Senate calls upon Acting UT President Jan Simek to:

- 1. exhaust any and all opportunities for efficiencies in Institutional Support and other Administrative spending before cutting any academic programs, reducing class sections, laying off instructional faculty, or otherwise reducing instructional or research capacity;*
- 2. reduce the duplication of administrative functions across the UT system to the greatest extent possible; and*

3. *engage in the ongoing discussion regarding the restructuring of higher education in Tennessee, with a focus on achieving administrative efficiencies while preserving instructional and research capacity and UTK's role as the flagship institution of higher learning in the state of Tennessee.*

Birdwell sought clarification of Table 1. Bruce replied that early on he encountered problems as University Support Services were transferred to the campus and other things were moved around. The follow-up question was whether Athletics shows up in the system budget. Bruce replied that it still was not entirely clear, but it was clear that Athletics was not in the "Institutional Support" category. Bruce noted that for Figures 4 and 5 that instruction was not in the numerator and similarly for the last two pages of text, if that were changed immediate savings would be generated. Birdwell asked if it was stated spending. Bruce said it was total spending. Crilly pointed out that "good" schools spent less on institutional support than UT did. Malia asked whether UTK administration was included. Bruce said it was.

Parker asked about Table 1: There were significant increases in other groups, so why did the resolution only address the system. Bruce said given the problems focus was on the 2nd column. The goal was to cover all of the system with the resolution not just the system administration. He noted that there had been good conversations with the system administration. Nolt said the clear intent was to address all administration. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Procedural Framework for Academic Discontinuance and Reorganization (J. Nolt and S. Martin)
The document addresses budget motivated reductions (e.g., Dance and Audiology and Speech Pathology). The procedure on page 2 was already approved. The "Purposes and Applications" section addresses Classification of Instructional Programs Codes (CIPs). Nolt and others argued they were too specific. In the document (in material previously passed) the definition of program is used instead of CIP, thus deviating from the system document. The remainder of the document follows the system document except for: an expanded list of criteria and the section "Shared Governance in Program Reorganization" was expanded to include mergers and consolidations. (These recommendations were from the Program Review, Reduction and Reevaluation Task Force (PRRR)).

J. Lounsbury asked whether the proposal was looking ahead or retrospectively. Nolt said the goal was adoption of a new policy. Wang asked about point 10 about costs on page 3, specifically whether it should be clarified whose costs were being referred to. (She gave the example of the administrative move of Audiology and Speech Pathology to Memphis.) Nolt replied that the document was intended to govern UTK, so Wang's example would not be addressed by the policy proposed in the document.

Wang asked about the concept of program uniqueness referred to in point 9. She thought it might be dangerous to include it. She asked whether "competition" needed to be more closely defined and what constituted "duplication." Nolt replied that the wording was taken from the system document, so it constituted policy the campus had to live under. He added those are criteria that must be addressed, but they are not the only factors considered. Wang pursued the issue asking whether there was a move to focus programs on certain campuses. Nolt said there was. Lounsbury asked whether the Senate wanted to include duplication as an issue. He amplified his point asking whether the Senate should articulate its own view even when the system hands down policy. Nolt replied that the Senate should recognize there is reason to look at duplication as one of many criteria. Lounsbury said he was concerned that duplication constituted an easy argument. Martin

said a duplication criteria would work to UTK's advantage as it would have the oldest degree programs. The criteria would protect the strength of many of our programs. Lounsbury continued that it did not seem equitable. L. Rinehart agreed with Martin that UTK's mission was distinctive. Crilly agreed that duplication would be only one of many points of discussion. Blackwell said the report represented due diligence.

It was pointed out that point 9 did not address proximity. Nolt said it thought there was implicit recognition of proximity. Lounsbury said that faculty associated with industrial psychology at UTK thought what happened here was different from what was happening at Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU). He noted he was arguing against UT system being an explicit consideration. Boulet said it seemed the campus would be harming itself, if it did not consider duplication, as it has to be a factor. Lounsbury said he would like to add "Other campus programs." Parliamentarian Pierce pointed out that the campus was part of the UT system. Blackwell said he thought it was a moot point because the campus was expected to incorporate the system criteria as BOT policy. J. Grant asked about "other higher education systems" referred to in number 9, specifically whether that went as far as Kentucky, as a number of unique programs might be available nearby but not in Tennessee. And, the concept of distance learning was introduced. Wang asked whether it would be possible to ask for clarification of the system statement.

Section IV on program discontinuance, point 1 "tenured or non-tenured" was brought up as a problem because it referred to Board policy, but it was not clear what it meant. Wang asked if "tenure track" faculty could be dismissed.

Election of Senators and Committee Assignments (T. Boulet)

Boulet reported on the percentage of faculty who voted overall. He said some colleges did not have elections. He noted that committee assignment for the next year and the need to identify chairs for a couple of the committees. Bruce moved and Wang seconded the proposed committee assignments that were distributed. Motion approved.

J. Malia suggested providing free courses for state legislators. They could come to our campus or engage in distance learning. Nolt said that topic could be placed on the agenda of the Teaching and Learning Council.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Birdwell and seconded by Wang was approved. Meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary

Faculty Senate Executive Council
MINUTES
August 31, 2009

Present: Vincent Anfara, Toby Boulet, Marianne Breinig, Donald Bruce, Chris Cimino, Becky Fields, Sarah Gardial (for Susan Martin), Glenn Graber (for Ken Stephenson), Rob Heller, Joan Heminway, Laura Howes, Suzanne Kurth, Beauvais Lyons, John Nolt, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Scott Simmons (Graduate Assistant), Steve Thomas, and Dixie Thompson

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

Heminway asked to clarify the Faculty Affairs Committee report in the minutes of April 6, 2009, by changing it to "Joan Heminway noted a set of amendments to the Faculty Affairs Committee's resolution (proposed by Doug Birdwell) were passed by the Senate at its last meeting." She also asked that on p. 4 the paragraph beginning "Anfara," be modified to state "Heminway noted that when discussion on the PRRR Task Force started, she had raised concerns about the availability of quality comparable data." The corrected minutes were moved, seconded, and approved.

III. REPORTS

President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet announced:

- The first annual all Knoxville campus faculty meeting would be held September 21 at 3:30 in the University Center Auditorium.
- D. Patterson was appointed chair of a committee to search for an Ombudsperson. In the meantime, a temporary Ombudsperson is being sought.
- T. Diacon has taken a new position. President Simek has sought names of people to take on his role as NCAA faculty representative. Diacon's term will end December 31.
- The Faculty Senate Retreat will focus on two topics: budget issues and the potential reorganization of higher education in the state.
- L. Howes appointment as an at large member of the Executive Council was announced.

Boulet proposed no longer including historical summaries at the end of changes in the *Faculty Senate Bylaws*. J. Heminway explained that by keeping the former documents available online the information was available. B. Lyons said he thought the summaries were useful showing that it is a living document. He elaborated that there was no need to detail all changes made, rather he thought there should be a few sentences talking about the *Bylaws*. G. Graber pointed out that the summaries provide guidance as to where to look for action on changes in the Senate Minutes.

Provost's Report (S. Gardial)

S. Gardial indicated that Provost Martin was out of town. She thanked the Faculty Affairs Committee for all the work it did over the past year. She said the administration had heard faculty members' concerns about the need to follow procedures. The revised process is being reviewed with Department Heads. There was discussion with V. Anfara about having peer-to-peer training for Department Heads, drawing on the expertise of experienced Heads. There

were meetings over the summer about some changes that were not substantive (e.g., editorial). Some changes would come to the Executive Council rather than the Faculty Affairs Committee.

1) Revision of Family and Medical Leave.

A significant change in policy is proposed particularly for faculty on 9-month appointments. The revised policy was posted and the system questioned it, so wording was revised after consultation with the General Counsel's Office. Heminway raised several issues:

- Would people be able to find the policies, as they were variously designated as Human Resources policy and personnel policy? She wanted to be sure that people would be able to find them.
- She was concerned about policy references being made with no specific citations.
- She raised a specific question about the section referring to faculty members who arranged modified duties, noting that it said two. Gardial said such arrangements were not limited to two occasions. L. Howes asked whether usage of the verb "may" indicated that a Department Head might not give approval. She suggested substituting "shall," so approval was not in question.
- Heminway said she questioned repeating the 7-year rule, as she finds it problematic to repeat policy statements made elsewhere, as it is difficult to maintain consistency when statements are made in multiple locations.

2) Merger of two documents—one addressing spousal-partner hires and the other addressing opportunity hires.

- Gardial announced there had been 8 or 9 such hires in the past year. Lyons noted for clarification that the focus is on hiring, not on retaining faculty who may have long distance relationships. Gardial said there was no restriction preventing hiring spouses/partners of current faculty members, but recognized such hires occurred primarily during the recruitment process.

3) "Introduction" to *Faculty Handbook* (Attachments 5 & 6)

- Attachment 5 discussed previous revisions. With the new substantial changes, Attachment 6 would be used. Heminway said there were two procedures she could not locate (incorrectly identified). She also noted that the attachment only selectively included people involved in preparing the changes. She said she would prefer not including any than doing so piecemeal. Lyons noted the General Counsel's Office ensures that the *Handbook* is not in conflict. It becomes an issue of who is required to give approval. Gardial and others indicated that it referred to the process and that would include everyone. Howes asked about what was currently posted online, i.e., prior handbooks. She was specifically interested in what had happened to earlier versions. Heminway said she had asked S. Martin about the issue of previous versions and learned some were available only as paper documents. Boulet suggested a statement could be placed on the Provost's website telling people to contact the Provost's Office, if they wanted a paper copy. Lyons said the types of changes made to the *Faculty Handbook* had been refinements. More information could be confusing, as changes could be initiated in a number of ways. He argued that the two copies available represented the major ones. Howes supported the idea.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Appointments to Committees and the Executive Council (T. Boulet)

Boulet said R. Heller and A. Wentzel had agreed to serve as co-chairs of the Athletics Committee. Their appointment was moved, seconded and approved. The one change to committee appointments (R. Sawhney) was moved, seconded and approved.

Voting in Executive Council (T. Boulet)

Boulet said some people have more than one role and, for example, in the case of Lyons, two disparate roles. He consulted with the Parliamentarian about a person having more than one vote due to multiple roles. With no dissent it was agreed that the rule should be one person has one vote.

Guide for Collegiate and Departmental Bylaws (S. Thomas)

The assistance of S. Simmons in collecting information was recognized by Thomas. Nolt asked where the document would appear and was informed it would replace the document currently on the Senate website. Deans would be assigned responsibility for departments revising their bylaws by a specific date, for example January 1. Thompson pointed out that with the shift to fall evaluations, waiting until the end of spring semester might be better for Department Heads. Simmons noted that some Department Heads would not even give him copies of their bylaws when he was collecting them fall 2008. Gardial asked for advice on timing. Lyons said January 1 might be too soon. He said he had worked on this project since he chaired the Faculty Affairs Committee. He argued it was urgent to have them in place because such governing documents are important in tenure and promotion decisions. He thought the end of the academic year was probably a reasonable due date as faculty members needed to be at the table, too. Boulet asked about mid spring. Gardial agreed with mid spring, e.g., March 30. She noted in meetings this summer it was apparent that a lack of specificity is a problem. Heminway pointed out Lyons' role in having this process occur.

Position Paper from Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) (J. Nolt)

J. Nolt explained that the 10 universities in state systems had been engaged in major discussion about the possible reorganization of higher education statewide. In May a joint committee (Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) and University of Tennessee system (UT)) was created to explore how the systems might work together. No major change was proposed. Nolt asked Governor Bredesen in April about faculty involvement in any change to higher education. TUFS created a position paper. All points in the position paper were voted on, for example, having a unified library system that would produce efficiency due to the advantages of size.

In terms of large-scale reorganization, what has been tentatively put forward as having one system for four-year institutions, a change that would eliminate the need for the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), and another system for two-year institutions. The TUFS document was being presented at each institution for approval by its faculty senate. The document is non-amendable, i.e., it must be voted up or down as is, due to the logistical considerations involved in getting approval at all institutions. The first step to obtaining Faculty Senate approval on our campus would be approval from the Executive Council. Since the

document was approved by TUFFS, Representative Beth Harwell indicated she was interested in sponsoring legislation. She has met with Governor Bredesen since then. The plan was for all faculty senates to vote by the end of September, after which the document would be sent out as a press release, information to politicians, etc.

Nolt noted that the TUFFS paper was discussed at the statewide American Association of University Professors (AAUP) meeting. Howes asked about the vision of a common general education core curriculum. Nolt said the idea was to make it seamless. Lyons said at the June University Faculty Council meeting the idea of reciprocity was discussed, for example, reciprocity between UT Martin and UT Knoxville. He thought TUFFS was proposing a common curriculum rather than reciprocity. Lyons said support could be given to the general recommendation of TUFFS without being specific about changes to general education requirements. Nolt said the goal was to do things that would benefit students and save money. D. Thompson said she was supportive, but she saw the issues as very complicated. Nolt said the group wanted to initiate a process of rational reevaluation of the system of higher education in the state that involved faculty. D. Bruce said it might be appropriate to have a qualifying statement supporting the process, but not endorsing all the specific proposals. Lyons said the battle would be about having two flagship institutions. Boulet said an effort was made to write a document that did not get into "turf." One thing he thought the document did not address was quality, e.g., pooling schools with quite different graduation rates. He went on to say that it is clear that the current situation was inefficient. Heminway suggested one way to proceed might be to craft a resolution of support. Boulet said any statement would have to include in it the words "we endorse." Nolt pointed out that action had to be taken quickly to meet the end of September deadline. Lyons said this was a time when the Faculty Senate Listserv could play an important role by preempting unfounded concerns. Boulet suggested the resolution could be put out and discussion on the Listserv could follow. Nolt said the same thing could be accomplished by passing a resolution to endorse the position paper and then explaining why. Boulet identified two approaches: circulating the resolution via e-mail after voting on its appropriateness or simply bringing it to the whole Senate. Nolt said he preferred getting the support of the Executive Council (EC). If the EC endorsed the TUFFS document and it were then sent to the Senate, it would be accompanied by a resolution for presenting it to the Faculty Senate. Nolt moved that the Executive Council support the position paper and Heminway seconded.

Breinig began the discussion of the motion by asking what it meant to "endorse" a position paper. Nolt said the wording came from the TUFFS constitution provision requiring individual Senate approval. Breinig noted that EC members did not necessarily agree. Boulet said he thought endorsing the paper meant that the Senate wanted TUFFS to take the document to the Governor. Anfara said his concern was that the document did not emphasize *process*. Nolt said the process would ultimately be political. Anfara said he was concerned that the recommendations seemed so specific, that it was not process oriented. Nolt replied that it was necessary to have something to present. Bruce raised the question of the downside or risk of not supporting it. He wanted support to be framed. Lyons suggested emphasizing Section III—objectives endorsed by TUFFS.

Heminway said she saw it as a position paper of TUFFS, not of the UTK Faculty Senate, so she saw the Executive Council's role as a facilitative one. Boulet offered a friendly amendment: to distribute a framing statement for the Executive Council's support of the position paper before

the statement was placed on the Senate Listserv. The friendly amendment was accepted by the maker of the motion and the second. Lyons said there should be a link to the TUFs Constitution in the memo accompanying the resolution. Amended motion passed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

S. Simmons asked that everyone please *RSVP* for Friday's retreat.

Lyons said R. Heller had a photo exhibit at the East Tennessee Foundation that could be visited after the retreat.

Adjournment was moved, second and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Tennessee University Faculty Senates Position Paper on the Reorganization of Higher Education in Tennessee

I. Background

Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS), an association of the four-year state university Senates founded in April 2008, represents nearly 10,000 higher education faculty in Tennessee. It is an historic collaboration, involving faculty from the four campuses of the University of Tennessee system and the six universities of the Board of Regents system.

As the statewide reorganization of higher education became a topic of conversation in Nashville in 2009, TUFS sought to make a contribution. This potential reorganization was the central theme of TUFS' April 2009 retreat at Fall Creek Falls State Park. Two TUFS representatives, Ed Stevens (University of Memphis) and John Nolt (UTK) were appointed to the joint UT/TBR Task Force on Higher Education in the spring of 2009.

The purpose of this position paper is to lay out TUFS' recommendations for reorganization.

II. General Principles Endorsed by TUFS

As representatives of the faculty of Tennessee's public four-year institutions, TUFS' central purpose is to promote the richest and best possible education for Tennessee students and to provide for Tennessee's faculty the means to deliver that education effectively. Much can be accomplished toward these goals by the reorganization of the state's higher education administration, but only if all of us put aside, to the extent possible, traditional arrangements, political considerations, wrangling over resources, and regional or institutional loyalties.

TUFS also holds that higher education should be frugal with Tennessee's scarce fiscal resources. We seek to avoid waste and unnecessary expense in our teaching, scholarship, creative activity, research and service, and expect a Tennessee higher education administration that is responsive, rational, lean and efficient.

III. Objectives Endorsed by TUFS

TUFS holds that reorganization of higher education should achieve the following objectives:

1. **More rational and efficient organization.** The TBR system, for example, includes two-year community and technical colleges, a foreign language institute and six universities, five of which have doctoral programs. Those on the ground in the TBR system are frequently frustrated by "one-size-fits-all" directives from the TBR administration. A more rational organization might help avoid this.
2. **Faculty and student collaboration and exchange.** The breadth and depth of talent and expertise available in the TBR and UT systems is enormous, but institutional barriers prevent beneficial collaboration and exchange. Graduate students and faculty from each institution would benefit greatly from the ability to move between one campus and the other, but this would be extraordinarily difficult under current arrangements. Much more along these lines could be accomplished to the benefit of faculty and students if it were facilitated by a common administration.
3. **Research informs the education process.** Beginning in the undergraduate years, research informs the teaching and learning process. At both the undergraduate and graduate levels, education and research activities of each university should fulfill its mission statement and facilitate accreditations. Regional access to graduate programs is imperative for an educated citizenry and workforce, and should be maintained.
4. **Seamless system-wide access to library resources for students and faculty.** At present, each university negotiates separate licensing agreements and contracts for library databases and other resources for their library users. This process duplicates efforts across institutions, involving libraries, legal affairs, and purchasing departments on our campuses. Most importantly, it overlooks consortial buying power, which allows greater access to library resources.
5. **Better geographical distribution of programs.** Academic programs have grown up around the state for reasons that are often historical or political. The students of Tennessee will be best served by a distribution designed to deliver a rich array of educational services where they are needed. TUFS supports the reinforcement of programs that deliver valuable services well but are not now adequately

supported and the elimination of unnecessary duplication within service areas but also the development of new programs where needed. These things require effective statewide administration.

6. **Flattening administration.** Higher education in Tennessee is administered at too many distinct levels, which are often too far removed from the classroom to appreciate the effects of their decisions on campus administrators, faculty and students. In addition to campus administrations, which themselves can be extremely complex, there are the two systems and their boards of Trustees, and THEC.

IV. Recommendations

In order to flatten administrative systems, better serve students, reduce costs and advance the other objectives of reorganizing higher education in Tennessee, TUFS recommends that:

1. Whatever administrative structure emerges from the reorganization ensures the ability of faculty and students (both graduate and undergraduate) to move easily without institutional barriers among the various campuses. It should be easy for students to take classes at more than one campus while respecting prerequisites. There should also be a visiting faculty consortium that allows faculty to work at other state campuses. Achieving these goals will require coordination of academic calendars.
2. With respect to libraries, there should be a statewide catalog, centralized vendor contract negotiation, and centralized purchase of library resources, which facilitate broad access.
3. There should be a statewide common general education core curriculum.
4. Institutions should have interconnected IT systems.
5. It should be easy to develop joint academic programs that use resources from multiple state institutions.
6. Application for undergraduate admission to all state institutions should be centralized, leaving recruitment and acceptance to individual campuses.
7. Centralization of the following functions should also be considered:
 - Benefits - insurance, medical, retirement, etc.
 - Human resources policies and procedures
 - Purchasing
 - Research administration.
8. As a further cost-saving measure, the proportion of campus budgets used for administration should be regularly examined.
9. There are several good ways to organize the governance of higher education in Tennessee. However, we suggest establishing a separate system for the community colleges and technical schools, and merging the Tennessee Board of Regents universities with The University of Tennessee system. The administration of the resulting university system should be located in Nashville. We recommend that each campus in the new system have a local advisory board that is unpaid, self-perpetuating, and dedicated to the interests of its local university. University faculty senates should be involved in all stages of the development of this new system.

Tennessee State Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
Statement on the Reorganization of Public Higher Education in Tennessee
August 25, 2009

The Tennessee State Conference of the AAUP supports the goals outlined in “Investing in People: Tennessee’s Commitment to 21st Century Higher Education Excellence,” a report submitted to Governor Don Sundquist in May 1999 by the Governor’s Council on Excellence in Higher Education. The report states:

Tennessee’s Twenty-first Century system of higher education should elevate the overall knowledge level of the state, open wide the door to high quality advanced education for all Tennesseans, and motivate them to take advantage of this enhanced opportunity.

Joining in the common pursuit of these noble goals, we value Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS), an association of the four-year state university Senates, as a model of faculty participation in higher-education governance. We commend TUFS for putting their vast professional expertise and educational experience at the service of the state of Tennessee in their draft “Position Paper on the Reorganization of Higher Education in Tennessee,” which has been sent to the universities' senates for consideration and ratification. Finally, we recognize TUFS as the body representing the Senates of our state’s four-year public universities and as an indispensable participant in all discussions concerning higher education in Tennessee.

The Tennessee State Conference of AAUP is open to faculty members from all types of higher-education institutions, including community colleges and technical centers. Recognizing that the community colleges may have a different perspective on reorganization, and in the spirit of shared governance, we urge the community colleges to form a representative body similar to TUFS to ensure that their unique perspectives (for example on recommendation IV.9 of the TUFS position paper) will be heard. The AAUP offers both organizational and financial support toward convening a meeting of the community colleges for that purpose.

The AAUP believes that all efforts at reorganizing higher education in Tennessee should be based on shared governance, the idea that appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the essential stakeholders of an higher-education system not only advance the system’s academic mission but also, by guaranteeing the timely and proper use of all available expertise, contribute to system efficiency and rationality. Thus, we recommend that shared governance be both an integral part of any reorganization plan and the essence of the process by which a proposed plan is designed. Only by establishing shared governance in the reorganization process can the full benefits of this principle be realized.

Such a focus on joint thought and action supports a high-quality education, prevents the dissipation of available resources, entails shared measures of accountability, encourages institutional efficiencies, and develops a sense of institutional and system ownership among all stakeholders that is crucial to strengthening the sense of community on which higher education thrives.

Contact information: Dr. Delphia F. Harris (President, Tennessee Conference of the AAUP),
df_harris@loc.edu; (901)219-4801.

WHEREAS, on October 20, 2008, the UTK Faculty Senate elected to become a member of Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS), an organization created “To facilitate communication and cooperation between the various Faculty Senates and Councils of the State of Tennessee’s public universities,” “To foster the role played by the Faculty in the shared governance of Tennessee’s public universities, and “To represent the missions, accomplishments and needs of public universities to state agencies and to the general public of the State of Tennessee;” and

WHEREAS, TUFS created the Tennessee University Faculty Senates Position Paper on the Reorganization of Higher Education in Tennessee, attached to this resolution as Exhibit A (the “Position Paper”), in an effort to ensure faculty involvement at all stages of any process of reorganization of higher education in Tennessee, encourage specific discussion among its members about efficiency in the administration of higher education in Tennessee, and facilitate student and faculty access to educational programs and resources across the state; and

WHEREAS, TUFS has requested endorsement of the Position Paper from each of its member senates prior to distributing the Position Paper to the Governor, various legislators, and other state officials in order to engage in dialogue on the reorganization of higher education in Tennessee; and

WHEREAS, on August 31, 2009, the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate considered and supported the Position Paper and directed that it be submitted for a vote at this meeting; now, therefore it is

RESOLVED, that to ensure faculty involvement at all stages of any process of reorganization of higher education in Tennessee, to encourage specific discussion among its members about efficiency in the administration of higher education in Tennessee, and to facilitate student and faculty access to educational programs and resources across the state, the Faculty Senate endorses the Position Paper, with the understanding that this endorsement shall not be construed by TUFS as detailed, point-by-point agreement with each of the principles, objectives, and recommendations included in the Position Paper, but rather as a vehicle for TUFS’ engagement with officials of the State of Tennessee.

The University of Tennessee FACULTY SENATE <i>Membership – 2009-2010</i> http://web.utk.edu/~senate/ <i>All Email Address end with @utk.edu unless otherwise noted</i>					
2010		2011		2012	
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES AND NATURAL RESOURCES					
Gina Pighetti	pighetti	Jerome Grant	jgrant	Carrie Stephens	cfritz
Tim Young	tmyoung1	Douglas Hayes	dhayes1		
Svetlana Zivanovic	lanaz	James Larson	jlanson2		
		Jun Lin	jlin6		
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE					
Michael Essington	messington				
ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN					
Brian Ambroziak	bambrozi	Edgar Stach	stach	Scott Wall	swall2
ARTS AND SCIENCES <i>Humanities</i> <i>Natural Sciences</i> <i>Social Sciences</i>					
Humanities					
Alvaro Ayo	aayo	Russel Hirst	rkh	Michael Handelsman	handelsm
Robert Sklenar	rsklenar	Natalia Pervukhin	npervukh	Miriam Levering	mleverin
Norman Magden	nmagden			Beauvais Lyons	blyons
Empty Seat				Mary McAlpin	mmcalpin
				Klaus VanDenBerg	kvandenb
Natural Sciences					
Bill Blass	wbllass	Jim Conant	jconant	John Koontz	jkoontz
Marianne Breinig	mbreinig	Jim Drake	jdrake	Conrad Plaut	cplaut
Michael Clark	clarkgmorph	Jerzy Dydak	jdydak		
Yuri Kamychkov	kamyshko	Jeff Kovac	jkovac		
Social Sciences					
John Lounsbury	jlounsbu	Yang Zhong	yzhong	Robert Jones	mountain
Jon Shefner	jshefner	Empty Seat		Brent Mallinckrodt	mallinc
Empty Seat					
Empty Seat					
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION					
Donald Bruce	dbruce	Lloyd Rinehart	rinehart	Lane Morris	mmorris1
		Harold Roth	hroth	Joan Rentsch	jrentsch
		Randal Pierce—Alternate—	rpierce		
COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION					
Roxanne Hovland	rhovland	Peiling Wang	peilingw	Sam Swan	samswan
				Dwight Teeter	teeter
EDUCATION, HEALTH AND HUMAN SCIENCES					
Norma Mertz	nmertz	Greer Fox	gfox	Ernest Brewer	ewbrewer
Jay Pfaffman	pfaffman	Trena Paulus	tpaulus	Rob Hardin	robh
				Debbie Wooten	dwooten1
ENGINEERING					
Roberto Benson	rbenson1	Bruce MacLennan	bmaclenn	Doug Birdwell	birdwell@lit.net
Paul Crilly	crilly	Rupy Sawhney	sawhney	Lynne Parker	leparker
Tse-Wei Wang	twang				
Empty Seat					

2010	2011	2012
LAW		
Gary Pulsinelli gpulsine	Cathy Cochran cochran	Alex Long along23
LIBRARIES		
Steve Thomas sthoma15	Nathalie Hristov mhristov	David Atkins datkins
Jeanine Williamson-Alternate- jwilliamson		
NURSING		
Lora Beebe lbeebe1		
Mary Gunther mgunther		
ROTC – Air Force		
Lt. Col. Michael Angle mangle		
SOCIAL WORK		
Bill Bradshaw wbradsh1	Marlys Staudt mstaudt	Matthew Theriot mtheriot
SPACE INSTITUTE		
Montgomery Smith msmith@utsi.edu		Denise Jackson djackson
VETERINARY MEDICINE		
Patricia Tithof ptithof	Linden Craig linden	Michael Sims msims
Empty Seat		Carla Sommardahl csommard
ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS		
Michael Wirth mwirth	Steven Dandaneau sdandane Pia Wood pwood	Caula Beyl cbeyl Doug Blaze blaze
Susan Martin Chris Cimino W. Tim Rogers	Provost Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs	sdmartin cimino timrogers
OFFICERS		
PRESIDENT	Toby Boulet boulet	607 Dougherty Engineering Bldg.
PRESIDENT-ELECT	Joan Heminway jheminwa	384 Law Complex
PAST-PRESIDENT	John Nolt nolt	818 McClung Tower and Plaza
SECRETARY	Suzanne Kurth skurth	921 McClung Tower and Plaza
PARLIAMENTARIAN	Becky Jacobs jacobs	374 Law Complex
INFORMATION OFFICER	Stefanie Ohnesorg ohnesorg	712 McClung Tower and Plaza
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	Sharonne L. Winston swinston	812 Volunteer Boulevard
GRADUATE ASSISTANT	Scott Simmons ss	812 Volunteer Boulevard

Term Expires July 31 of year indicated

SENATE MEETINGS

3:30 p.m. Shiloh Room
University Center

September 14, 2009
October 19, 2009
November 16, 2009
February 1, 2010
March 1, 2010
March 29, 2010
May 3, 2010

SENATE EXECUTIVE MEETINGS

3:30 p.m. 8th Floor Conference Room
Andy Holt Tower

August 31, 2009
October 5, 2009
November 2, 2009
January 11, 2010
February 15, 2010
March 15, 2010
April 19, 2010

*THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES, 2009-2010*

APPEALS

1. Doug Birdwell, Chair

2. Brian Ambroziak
3. JoAnne Deeken
4. Jerome Grant
5. Stephen Kania
6. John Koontz
7. Miriam Levering
8. Bruce MacLennan
9. Norman Magden
10. Norma Mertz
11. Gina Pighetti
12. Gary Pulsinelli
13. Sam Swan
14. Dwight Teeter
15. Tse-Wei Wang

ATHLETICS

1. Rob Heller, Co-Chair

2. Andrew Wentzel, Co-Chair

2. Mike Angle
3. Roberto Benson
4. Brad Bertani, MAC (ex officio)
5. Eric Brey (ex officio)
6. Edmund Campion
7. Wanda Costen
8. Joan Cronan (ex officio)
9. Todd Diacon (ex officio)
10. Mike Hamilton (ex officio)
11. Rob Hardin
12. John Koontz
13. Alex Long
14. Susan Martin (ex officio)
15. Rex Pringle (ex officio)
16. Carrie Stephens
17. Donna Thomas, WAC (ex officio)
18. Student Senate
19. Student Senate
20. Student Athlete (Athletics Dept.)
21. Student Athlete (Athletics Dept.)

**BENEFITS & PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT**

1. Becky Fields, Chair

2. Ernest Brewer
3. Brad Case (Adjunct)
4. Alan Chesney (ex officio)
5. Paul Crilly
6. Jim Drake
7. Nathalie Hristov
8. James Larson
9. Butch Peccolo (ex officio)
10. Johanna Stiebert
11. Patricia Tithof
12. Dan Trentham (ex officio)
13. Scott Wall

BUDGET & PLANNING

1. Donald Bruce, Chair

2. Chris Cimino (ex officio)
3. Jerzy Dydak
4. Michael Essington
5. Nathalie Hristov
6. Lane Morris
7. Jay Pfaffman
8. Conrad Plaut
9. Harold Roth
10. Marlys Staudt
11. Klaus van den Berg

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

1. Toby Boulet, Chair

2. Joan Heminway, pres.-elect.
3. John Nolt, past pres.
4. Suzanne Kurth, sec.
5. Becky Jacobs, parl.
6. Stefanie Ohnesorg, inf. off.
7. Vince Anfara
8. Doug Birdwell
9. Marianne Breinig
10. Donald Bruce
11. Chris Cimino (ex officio)
12. Becky Fields
13. Rob Heller
14. Laura Howes (at large)
15. Beauvais Lyons
16. Susan Martin (ex officio)
17. Lloyd Rinehart
18. Ken Stephenson
19. Steve Thomas
20. Dixie Thompson
21. Andrew Wentzel
22. at large

FACULTY AFFAIRS

1. Steve Thomas, Chair

2. Lora Beebe
3. Roxanne Hovland
4. Norman Magden
5. Mary McAlpin
6. Rupy Sawhney
7. Carla Sommardahl
8. Yang Zhong

GRADUATE COUNCIL

1. Vince Anfara, Chair

2. Michael Essington, Vice Chair

3. Matt Murray (past chair)
- Membership from the appropriate schools/units

**LIBRARY & INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY**

1. Marianne Breinig, Chair

2. Alvaro Ayo
3. Cathy Cochran
4. Jean Derco (ex officio)
5. Barbara Dewey (ex officio)
6. Mary Gunther
7. Doug Hayes
8. Robert Jones
9. Jill Keally (ex officio)
10. Carole Myers
11. Trena Paulus
12. Jay Pfaffman
13. Robert Sklenar
14. GSS
15. SGA

RESEARCH COUNCIL

1. Ken Stephenson, Chair

2. Bill Blass
3. Pauline Bayne (ex officio)
4. Barbara Dewey (ex officio)
5. Bill Dunne (ex officio)
6. Mike Handelsman
7. Wes Hines (ex officio)
8. Yuri Kamyshkov
9. Tom Ladd (ex officio)
10. Jun Lin
11. Brent Mallinckrodt
12. Robert Moore (ex officio)
13. Lynne Parker
14. Natalia Pervukhin
15. Joan Rentsch
16. Jon Shefner
17. Peiling Wang
18. Tim Young
19. GSS
20. GSS
21. GSS
22. VC for Research—TBD
23. Associate VC for Research—TBD
24. Library Designee (ex officio)

TEACHING & LEARNING COUNCIL

1. Lloyd Rinehart, Chair

2. Bill Bradshaw
3. Michael Clark
4. Jim Conant
5. Linden Craig
6. Joy DeSensi (ex officio)
7. Denise Jackson
8. Jeff Kovac
9. John Mount
10. Michael Sims
11. Edgar Stach
12. Jeanine Williamson
13. Debbie Wooten
14. GSS
15. GSS
16. GSS
17. Undergraduate Student–SGA
18. Undergraduate Student–SGA
19. Undergraduate Student–SGA
20. VP Academic Affairs (ex officio)

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

1. Dixie Thompson, Chair

2. John Koontz, Vice Chair

3. Richard Bayer (ex officio)
4. Norvel Burkett (ex officio)
5. Steven Dandaneau (ex officio)
6. Ruth Darling (ex officio)
7. Barbara Dewey (ex officio)
8. David Schumann (ex officio)
9. Pia Wood (ex officio)

Membership from the appropriate schools/units

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM RELATIONS

1. Beauvais Lyons, Chair

2. David Atkins
3. Greer Fox
4. Russel Hirst
5. John Lounsbury
6. John Nolt
7. Candace White
8. Svetlana Zivanovic

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
SEPTEMBER 14, 2009 3:30 P.M.
UNIVERSITY CENTER
SHILOH ROOM
President's Office: 607 Dougherty Engineering Building
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-2210 (865) 974-8376