

**SENATE MEETING  
MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2009  
3:30 P.M. UNIVERSITY CENTER  
SHILOH ROOM**

**Agenda**

Toby Boulet, President  
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary to the Senate  
Stefanie Ohnesorg, Information Officer

Becky Jacobs, Parliamentarian  
Joan Heminway, President-Elect

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

**MINUTES**

Faculty Senate Meeting, September 14, 2009 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting, October 5, 2009 (information item)

**MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

Minutes from the Undergraduate Council meeting of September 8, 2009, were distributed to Senators electronically prior to the meeting and are available at (<http://web.utk.edu/~ugcouncil/docs/minutes/UGCouncilMinutes9-8-09.pdf>).

Minutes from the Graduate Council of September 10, 2009, were distributed to Senators electronically prior to the meeting and available at (<http://gradschool.utk.edu/GraduateCouncil/Minutes/20090910-GC-Minutes.pdf>).

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

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

Resolution for Carl Pierce

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

Graduate Council (V. Anfara)  
Undergraduate Council (D. Thompson)

**NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Proposed Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar for 2010-2011 (J. Heminway)  
Presentation of BANNER (L. Painter)

**ADJOURNMENT**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 14, 2009 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes, October 5, 2009 (information item; will be distributed by email)  
Faculty Senate President's Report  
TUFS Press Release  
Remarks Welcoming the Board of Trustees to UTK  
Proposed Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar for 2010-2011

**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  
September 14, 2009

Absent: Lt. Col. Michael Angle, Alvaro Ayo, Roberto Benson, Bill Bradshaw, Steven Dandaneau, Jim Drake, Michael Essington, Greer Fox, Roxanne Hovland, Jeff Kovac, Beauvais Lyons, Norman Magden, Lane Morris, Lloyd Rinehart, W. Tim Rogers, Rupy Sawhney, Montgomery Smith, Carla Sommardahl, Marlys Staudt, Matthew Theriot, Pia Wood

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### Establishment of a Quorum (S. Kurth)

S. Kurth reported a quorum was present.

#### Senate President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet announced that he had distributed his report via e-mail (attached) because of the items on the meeting agenda. He added that an Ombudsperson search committee had been appointed and a person to temporarily fill the position identified. As the Provost and the Chancellor were at the Deans, Directors and Department Heads (DDDH) Retreat, the order of items considered on the agenda was adjusted.

### **MINUTES**

#### Faculty Senate Meeting

The minutes of the April 20, 2009, Faculty Senate meeting were moved by N. Mertz and seconded by D. Bruce. Minutes approved.

#### Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting

The minutes of the August 31, 2009, meeting of the Executive Committee were available as an information item.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

S. Martin said the DDDH retreat focused on the challenges facing the campus once the stimulus money is spent. Various presentations had been made including one by W. Fox and A. Haynes that focused on where the campus would be at the end of stimulus funding. The question was how UTK could be the best possible university with a leaner budget. Planning is essential. She noted the development of a document on best practices for non-tenure track faculty, specifically lecturers. Appropriate management is being sought.

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

J. Cheek announced the first year students constituted the best and most diverse class ever (9 % African-American and 12% from low income families). Discussions about the relationship between the campus and the system were continuing. He encouraged inviting the faculty representative to the Board of Trustees (BOT) to speak about proposed changes, namely:

- 1) The system should be located somewhere other than on a campus.
- 2) A committee would be formed soon to consider the reporting structure of Athletics. A report from that committee should be available in January or February.
- 3) The BOT approved a 9% tuition increase for 2009-2010 that had the support of the Student Government Association (SGA).

Increasing academic effectiveness and efficiency through actions such as articulation with community colleges and change in the date for dropping courses is under consideration.

*Questions.*

T. Wang noted that the faculty has been hearing for several years that each succeeding entering class was the best ever. She asked what evidence there was that changes in the characteristics of entering class members had improved the 6-year graduation rate. Cheek said for the last academic year there was an 11.4% increase in the number of graduates compared to the previous year. There was no increase in the 6-year rate over the previous year. He said that the campus should be in the 80% graduation rate category.

M. Breinig asked about enrollment. Cheek said enrollment was down a bit because of the number of students who graduated.

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

There was no previous business.

**MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

Graduate Council Minutes (V. An fara)

V. An fara highlighted several actions in the April 9, 2009, minutes passage of Academic Policy Committee Bylaws, policy change concerning international exchange students, revision of the Appeals Committee Bylaws, and a change in policy requiring grade appeals be made within 30 days. The August 13, 2009, minutes included approval of bylaws for the Curriculum Committee. Mertz moved that both sets of minutes be considered together. M. Wirth seconded. Motion approved. The minutes of both meetings were approved.

**NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

J. Nolt invited C. Pierce to attend the meeting as former Senate Co-Parliamentarian to recognize his service:

*The University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
Faculty Senate*

**WHEREAS**, *Carl A. Pierce, J.D., is a highly respected colleague, teacher, and researcher;  
and*

**WHEREAS**, *he served with distinction as Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate during  
the academic year 2008-2009; and*

**WHEREAS**, *not only as Parliamentarian but also as a former President of the Faculty  
Senate, he has demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the rules of order and the  
traditions of the Faculty Senate;*

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

*Carl A. Pierce*

*for his outstanding and devoted service to the Faculty Senate and the University of Tennessee; and*

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** *a copy of this Resolution be presented to Professor Pierce and that the Resolution be made a part of the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting held on September 14, 2009.*

---

Suzanne Kurth  
Secretary

---

John Nolt  
President, 2008-2009

D. Birdwell moved the resolution and D. Bruce seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

J. Boulet asked for recognition of J. Nolt's service as Senate President:

*The University of Tennessee  
Faculty Senate*

**WHEREAS**, *Professor John E. Nolt is a highly respected colleague, teacher, scholar and citizen; and*

**WHEREAS**, *he has served with distinction as President of the Faculty Senate during the 2008-2009 academic year, elevating the prestige of the Senate within the University community by his assertive leadership and speaking truth to power at the campus, system, and board levels; and*

**WHEREAS**, *he has patiently and persistently promoted the interests of faculty, staff, and students by supporting the ideals of sustainability, shared governance, diversity in hiring, faculty participation in the development of Cherokee Farm, and increased efficiency at all levels of administration of higher education in the state of Tennessee; and*

**WHEREAS**, *he has also served the Senate and the Faculty of this campus as a member of the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (of which he is the current President) and the UT Faculty Council; and*

*WHEREAS, he has worked tirelessly to communicate the activities of the Senate to faculty and to improve the overall organization of the University for the benefit of faculty, staff, and students;*

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

*Professor John E. Nolt*

*for his exemplary leadership and service to the Senate and the University of Tennessee; and*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a copy of this Resolution be presented to Professor John E. Nolt and that the Resolution become part of the minutes of the Senate meeting held on September 14, 2009.*

---

*Suzanne Kurth*  
*Secretary*

---

*Toby Boulet*  
*President*

D. MacClennan moved to adopt the resolution by acclamation and J. Shefner seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Resolution on TUFs Position Paper (J. Nolt)

J. Nolt introduced the resolution approved by the Senate Executive Council. The Tennessee University Senates (TUFs) position paper was developed over the summer. Nolt briefly reviewed the history of TUFs and referred people to the information on its website. UTK joined the organization last October. In April 2009 Nolt was elected President. At that meeting it was decided that reorganization of higher education should be a priority. Initially, Governor Bredesen was expected to appoint a commission to address reorganization, but instead he decided to pursue the issue on a more informal consultative basis. When TUFs's view was sought, the 10 Faculty Senate Presidents decided to see what they could agree on and meet August 14-16. At that meeting they decided to submit the document to their respective senate bodies and report the votes by September 30. It would become the TUFs position paper if approved by 6 senate bodies.

To date UT Health Sciences Center voted against it and two other bodies voted for it. If it receives a majority vote and becomes TUFs official position, then the hope is that it could be discussed with the Governor's office and legislators on the education committee. Nolt would represent the view of all (for and against), if it is passed by the majority. The initiative probably would die if not approved in September, as no TUFs meeting was scheduled until April 2010. Two possible justifications for the proposed reorganization were offering better service to students and the current dire economic circumstances and forecast that may produce program mergers and cuts, as well as loss of positions. (As faculty members are not all that popular with legislators, the TUFs participants wanted to express interest in students.). Nolt reviewed the political history that led to the creation of two systems and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) to coordinate. The position paper has two foci. One set of proposals aim to reduce administrative costs by taking advantage of the economies of scale. THEC would be eliminated, but a separate 2-year college system would

be retained. The system would be moved to a new location. The other set addresses the elimination of institutional barriers (e.g., shared library resources, joint academic programs, and centralized admissions record keeping).

The proposed resolution states:

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.

Nolt explained that as the resolution came from the Executive Council it was on the floor for discussion. Boulet asked that discussion initially be restricted to questions for J. Nolt. The first questioner asked him to explain how a statewide curriculum would be good for our students. Nolt said the meaning was "general education" curriculum. C. Plaut asked whether it meant that UTK's general education curriculum would be geared to all students, not just those entering as first year students but those transferring in. Nolt said it would not, that it would be what UTK currently has for transfers. Mertz said that the documents said "core curriculum" and did not refer to transfers. Nolt said it would not require having the same courses. M. Handelsman asked whether the document would make it necessary for UTK to submit core curriculum changes. Nolt said it probably would not. M. Levering asked whether other institutions would see the document the same way.

M. Hristov asked about the first recommendation that appeared to suggest "one size" fits all. She thought all the recommendation seemed to be like that and asked Nolt to respond. Nolt said it arose from the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) dealing with community colleges and "one size fits all." P. Crilly, returning to General Education, said transferring was not the problem, but that a common General Education curriculum muddies the water of articulating. Nolt said because it was a TUFS document, the Senate was being asked to vote it up or down. S. Zivanovic asked why the Senate was voting on a position paper rather than a simple request to be involved. Nolt replied that at the August meeting there was agreement on goals and principles, but the general perception was that that documents would be a "yawner." The emergent consensus was to make some specific recommendations. Another question was about the recommendations made 10 years ago that were still relevant, that is, what were they (Sundquist Higher Education Report)? Nolt said they essentially kept the two systems in place addressing graduation rates, but not reorganization. D. Birdwell asked the position of the University's lobbyists in Nashville on the Position Paper. Nolt said he had talked to H. Dye and it apparently made them nervous because they thought the University was well-off, as it was. Boulet said A. Haynes was also concerned about the consequences of endorsing reorganization that might not be implemented until after a different administration is in Nashville. Shefner commented that Dye and Haynes were uncomfortable the previous year with faculty members stepping outside of their traditional role. In his view they do not understand very well what faculty members want. Could TUFS be a voice of opposition to cuts rather than one attempting to shape budget cuts? He said he would like it to offer a voice of opposition to cuts. Boulet said TUFS could speak in opposition to cuts. Wang said she had questions about two items—one having to do with students moving easily and the other the goal of having a visiting faculty consortium. Nolt said several things were possible. Students could pursue distance learning or enroll for a semester at another institution. And, there could be collaboration among graduate programs at different institutions. The proposed faculty consortium represented parallel types of options, for example teaching on another campus. Handelsman had questions about the impact of the centralization proposed in #7 and the quality of service. Nolt pointed out it said centralization should be "considered." Breinig noted that Nolt had said several times that TUFS would not meet until April, so her question was what would TUFS do? Nolt said if asked TUFS members would meet. Boulet said that as UTK's representative, he would transmit this campus's view. Nolt said that he, too, would convey the Senate's views. B. Blass said attention should be paid to the document. If it were approved it would be like buying a pig in a poke. He said it needed to be approved in principle. He expressed concern about changes in who decides on the curriculum. In the past the costs of maintaining the system Vice Presidents has been examined. Consideration should be given to eliminating them.

Boulet then opened debate on the motion and said it would follow the format of alternating speakers on the two sides. Birdwell spoke against the position expressing his concern that endorsing the Position Paper would be taken as representing agreement with the recommendations and he did not agree with a number of them. He noted the seamless library reminded him of when ORNL tried to take advantage of our library, basically a cost shifting rather than a cost sharing action. He also argued that the issue in many cases is not geographic distribution of programs, but rather that there are too many programs, e.g., in Engineering.

B. Mallinckrodt said he was persuaded by the argument that the faculty needs to have a voice at the table, although he still had a question about who would be fleshing out the proposals.

Hristov argued against saying the recommendations are well-defined, i.e., interconnected IT systems. Usually such proposals come out of committees that have examined the options. She thought they could be used given how they are worded and proposed simply stating "communicating," as the bottom line message was the faculty wants to be heard.

Mertz called the question.

D. Bruce spoke in favor noting that he shared the reservations of others. He thought it provided an opportunity to speak. Without supporting the process the faculty has no voice. He said Boulet and Nolt would represent the UTK Faculty Senate's views.

T. Wang spoke in opposition arguing that UTK had more to lose than other institutions, noting #4 "regional access to graduate programs." She argued that students should enroll in the institutions with the desired programs and that in her view it was better to build one quality program.

R. Hirst spoke in favor saying while there were problematic things, what message would be sent about TUFs if the resolution were voted down.

Levering spoke against saying the proposal represented the interests of TBR schools. In her view the distinctiveness of our campus is its first rate research and graduate programs. Spreading resources would make it more difficult for programs to be excellent.

J. Lounsbury said he was troubled about whether there would be a voice if the Senate voted "no." Nolt said there was a desire to respond to regional programs. People who are employed and seeking degrees in nursing and education have limited flexibility when enrolling in graduate programs.

A visitor from the history department faculty was given the opportunity to comment that the document was meant to be consequential for people who are not academics. Those people might read it and assume there could be easy movement from one campus to another.

B. Ambroziak spoke in favor saying Senators had had a week and a half to review the document (others said only 4 days). He supported B. Lyons and Nolt's arguments.

Lounsbury asked what the administration thought. The Chancellor said he, Vice President DiPietro, and President Simek had some serious concerns (e.g., about research coordination). They questioned why the faculty would want to centralize, when the campus had opposed system control for years. He did not think the time frame was as urgent as it was presented as being. The advice he received from BOT members was basically "wait and see."

Birdwell said that as the flagship institution, any position taken would be heard. Nolt asked in what practical way that might occur and influence the Governor. He doubted consensus would be easy to achieve. In his view if the resolution were not adopted there would be no substantial statement, that is, the proposal was the only way to voice views.

Crilly spoke against the resolution noting he shared others' concerns. The Legislature has limited time to review such documents and would not understand that the intent was to express broad principles.

Mertz called the question.

The resolution was defeated (9 for and 43 opposed).

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made, seconded and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary

Faculty Senate Executive Council  
MINUTES  
October 5, 2009

Present: Marianne Breinig, Doug Birdwell, Toby Boulet, Donald Bruce, Chris Cimino, Jimmy Cheek, Becky Fields, Rob Heller, Becky Jacobs, Suzanne Kurth, Beauvais Lyons, Susan Martin, John Nolt, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Ken Stephenson, Steve Thomas, and Dixie Thompson

Guest: Scott Simmons (Graduate Assistant)

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

## **II. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

B. Lyons requested that the words "with Board policy" be added to the material on the *Faculty Handbook* after "ensures not in conflict." J. Nolt said that on page 4, second full paragraph, the second sentence should indicate the wording came from the TUFs "discussion." The corrected minutes were moved by D. Bruce, seconded by D. Birdwell, and approved.

## **III. REPORTS**

### President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet added to the report he distributed that not only did he attend the Southeastern Conference Associated Faculty Leaders (SEC AFL) annual meeting, but also the assembly approved a set of bylaws, so UTK is now a member of two more organizations.

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

S. Martin noted that she had previously reported on the Deans, Directors and Department Heads (DDDH) Retreat. At the end of the week the Board of Trustees (BOT) would be meeting. The BOT will discuss closing the Memphis branch of the UTK Master's in Social Work Program. Reports will be given to the BOT's Student Success Committee on various metrics. UTK is working with consultants on strategic planning, specifically on what is good and will help UTK establish its own metrics.

The Academic Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee that Martin chairs is looking at possible problems, e.g., course scheduling and bottleneck courses. The Provost's Student Advisory Committee met. The students expressed the desire to have the library stacks open 24/7 and to have quiet study areas. The students also requested more substance in the summer orientation program.

Lyons asked how the reframing of the strategic plan fit with the SACS review and common goals. Martin said it fit with the SACS mid-cycle review as updating of all compliance material is necessary for the review visit. M. Albrecht is working on updating the materials and refocusing, e.g., developing and implementing an assessment plan. There is an executive committee and a steering committee. The goal is integration of materials into the curriculum. Ready for the World is related to the Quality Enhancement Plan. The original Strategic Plan was oriented to the system "scorecard" that had global awareness as one element. D. Birdwell commented on the importance of having library resources available at a research institution. Martin said library access had been limited due to a security issue that had since been addressed. Birdwell said

the Ready for the World Program appeared to address cultural issues, while huge issues such as sustainability perhaps were not addressed by the program. He noted that the faculty of Engineering was not involved.

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

Chancellor Cheek noted that differential tuition had been proposed by several colleges. He had visited with members of the Board of Trustees (BOT) about the topic. He had also met with students in one of the colleges to talk about the need for more money, if a long-term solution to current problems is to be developed. Some colleges are faced with unattractive alternatives, such as large numbers of students taught by few professors. He indicated he would discuss the possibility of differential tuition with a BOT Committee this fall and the full Board next spring.

An additional budget cut in the 8% range in 2011 is anticipated. Cheek said he had indicated that it would have to be covered by a tuition increase. He said he was working to get a reduction in the size of the cut. He said among his priorities is obtaining raises for faculty and staff and money for a few new positions to address bottleneck courses. This year was the third without raises, leaving our faculty salaries low in the Southeastern Conference. When tuition increases are discussed a major question from the BOT is what happens to students who cannot afford to pay the increase. Schemes are being considered that would assist such students. He noted that the campus Human Relations Director position had been eliminated. The Chancellor said his budget had been reduced twice as much as those of the colleges. L. Hendricks would be assuming a larger human relations role on campus. He had encouraged units to look at course fees to see if they were adequate.

Cheek said the 1st Annual All-Campus Faculty Meeting was a good event. It would probably be held in the McClung Museum in the future. The System reorganization was going well. While looking at locations to reduce costs, he is working to make both the system and the campus what they should be. On October 6 President Simek will officially visit the campus providing an opportunity to express concerns and talk about good things. Lyons asked whether consideration was being given to shifting full time enrollment from 12 to 15 hours looking at the "revenue side." Cheek said that change had been under consideration since he arrived on campus. He thought summer school should be incentivized to increase the four year graduation rates. Students should be encouraged to attend 4 years plus summer rather 5 years. Such a change probably requires change in the Hope scholarship program. Ultimately students would save money if they graduated in four years, but it was not the right time yet to change full time status to 15 hours. Lyons asked about other possibilities. Cheek said possibilities included enrollment reduction and differential tuition. Breinig asked what differential tuition meant. Cheek explained that some students, e.g., upper division students in a college would pay an addition per hour fee. The majority of the fee would go to the college, but a small percentage would go to the campus for what it provides. Birdwell said another suggestion for cost saving involved Human Relations classification guidelines. He said he had to keep writing letters seeking exceptions to the salary limits. Birdwell said there had been problems with raises written into contracts. Cheek said he was committed to addressing such problems and a meeting was scheduled for the next week. Boulet said some SEC schools charge students additional fees for extra hours. Cheek said he was deciding which battles to fight first.

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

There was no old business.

## **V. NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### Faculty Senate Calendar 2010-2011 (J. Heminway)

Lyons said after examination of the religious holiday conflicts it looked like movement of the November dates would permit avoidance of religious holidays. He proposed moving the dates forward (Executive Council on November 8 and the full Senate on November 22). Birdwell agreed. As there was no dissent, it was agreed that the proposed calendar with those changes would be taken to the Senate for a vote.

### TUFS' Announcement (J. Nolt)

The materials J. Nolt sent to Governor Bredesen were attached to the meeting agenda (a letter explaining the documents, the position paper, and dissenting statements). He noted the Governor's current position.

### Budget and Planning Committee (D. Bruce)

D. Bruce reported the Budget and Planning Committee met briefly. C. Plaut is very interested in higher education reorganization. That committee would perhaps like to conduct an opinion survey in conjunction with another committee. Boulet distributed a statement from the Library and Information Technology Committee (Library and IT) addressing the proposed reorganization. Any committees with responses were encouraged to distribute them. Birdwell said survey results strongly depend on the questions being asked, so they need to be carefully worded. Lyons suggested to D. Bruce that C. White (member of the University System Relations Committee) had a lot of experience with surveys. He said one of the reasons for such a survey would be to help faculty know the issues. He said, for example, how many people know there are two systems. Nolt agreed with the concerns about the utility of such a survey. He preferred the approach of the Library and IT Committee, that is, the provision of information. Bruce said the desire was to not be reactive, but rather proactive. Senate votes simply provide opinions. Boulet said he would meet with Nolt to get the objections fleshed. He thought a survey could be useful. Nolt said the best source would be the University System Relations Committee. Birdwell argued for the need to clarify objections and goals.

### BANNER Implementation

Boulet said it was time for the Senate to know about BANNER. L. Painter talked at the Deans, Directors and Department Heads Retreat. She agreed to give a 10-minute presentation at the October Senate meeting.

### ESPN Funds Allocation

Lyons had asked about the process involved in allocating the funds from the ESPN contact that Athletics had donated. Boulet said he thought the Provost might address the question. Lyons said he knew there was a short turn around time, but he particularly wanted to know how the decision about graduate student funding was made. The Student Success Center received \$100,000, as did the Center for Teaching and Learning. The Chancellor wanted to augment graduate student stipends and talked with Deans about top offs versus money for new students. For the next year interest is focused on using the money to attract new students. Lyons suggested that the money for graduate student travel could be increased. S. Martin said there was \$40,000 for graduate student travel. K. Stephenson asked what "top off" meant. It was depicted as "added on" money. Martin said she thought the top off money would be for four years for doctoral students. Stephenson said the Mathematics Department ends up

forgoing some of its best applicants because they do not know which students will be returning. If a slush fund could be created, it would be possible to balance out over commitments made in one year in later years. It was suggested that R. Heller and A. Wentzel, Co- Chairs of the Senate Athletics Committee might play a facilitative role with suggestions. Birdwell questioned the one year commitment. He thought the policy was that stipends could go up, but not down. Martin said they were just in the process of collecting data. Birdwell said there was a huge difference in Engineering between the stipends of research and teaching assistants.

#### Research Council (K. Stephenson)

Stephenson said the Council was trying to figure out the effects of the budget cuts on research. The Council was considering a survey. B. Fenwick told him the campus had joined a consortium that would do surveys. It may be easier to sell instruction externally, but internally decisions are made on the basis of research. Boulet clarified that the services were paid for. Martin said the Provost's Office was drawing on the service. She also noted that there was something on the BOT agenda about the reorganization. C. Cimino encouraged interested people to check the website.

#### University Systems Relations (B. Lyons)

Lyons said the committee had a meeting with D. Millhorn and others about research. There does not appear to be a clear business plan. At the next committee meeting they will talk with H. Dye and A. Haynes. He suggested inviting D. Millhorn to an Executive Council meeting. Questions were raised about whether the public piece would come from in the future. Birdwell said one concern was the faculty would be on campus and research would be over there. Nolt said it was "doable" at Ohio State University. Birdwell said he would prefer a written report to a conversation.

#### Announcements

Boulet said the brown bag lunch he and S. Martin had was sparsely attended.

He said at the SEC AFL meeting he learned that academic freedom emerged in 1952 and died in the 1990s. If we are to have academic freedom, we need to have a written definition. Courts are apparently pushing for institutions to have definitions. He said he would take the issue up with L. Howes, AAUP Chapter President.

Adjournment was moved, second and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

## **UTK Faculty Senate President's Report**

October 19, 2009

1. On September 30, the attached press release was issued by TUFS.
2. The attached welcoming remarks given by the Faculty Senate President at the luncheon immediately preceding the fall meeting of the Board of Trustees on October 9, were warmly received by the Board.
3. At their meeting on October 9, the Board of Trustees expressed their continued support for President Simek's efforts regarding the redirection of the UT System administration.
4. The annual meeting of the Southeastern Conference Associated Faculty Leaders (SECAFL) was held at the University of Kentucky on October 1 - 3. The Faculty Senate President represented UT at this meeting. The SECAFL adopted a constitution, elected officers and requested affiliation with Southeastern Conference Academic Consortium (SECAC). SECAC includes the presidents/chancellors and provosts from all SEC schools.
5. As part of the Safe Zone program, which was initiated on the UTK campus by the Faculty Senate, the following training session has been scheduled.

**SAFE ZONE TRAINING:**

**EMPOWERING LGBT ALLIES**

Facilitator: James DeVita

October 29, 8:30-11:30

Section 50080972

238 Conference Center Building



# TUFS

## Tennessee University Faculty Senates

*Representing nearly 10,000 university faculty at ten state institutions of higher education.*

### FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

September 30, 2009

Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) today issued a Position Paper on Higher Education (attached), calling for careful consideration by state government of a list of nine recommendations, including unification of the University of Tennessee (UT) and Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) systems. TUFS is an association of the four-year state university faculty senates, representing nearly 10,000 higher education faculty in Tennessee.

The Position Paper, drafted by representatives of the faculty senates, has been debated over the past month by all ten of the university faculty senates in the UT and TBR system. Five of the ten have endorsed the paper outright. These are: Austin Peay State University, UT Chattanooga, Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee State University and East Tennessee State University. Four (UT Knoxville, UT Health Science Center, UT Martin and Tennessee Tech) have declined to endorse it. The University of Memphis endorsed the objectives of the paper but not its recommendations, though it called for “careful consideration” of the recommendations.

Appended to the Position Paper is a document entitled *Dissenting Statements* that contains statements prepared by the Presidents of the faculty senates of the four UT/TBR universities that endorsed no part of the TUFS Position Paper. They summarize the objections raised against the Position Paper by these faculty senates.

For further information, contact:

John Nolt  
President, Tennessee University Faculty Senates  
Past President, UT Knoxville Faculty Senate  
Professor  
Department of Philosophy  
801 McClung Tower  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN 37996-0480  
(865)-974-7218  
[nolt@utk.edu](mailto:nolt@utk.edu)

Members of the UT Board of Trustees, Emeritae and Emeriti Trustees, President Simek, members of the faculty and staff of the other UT campuses and of the UT system: on behalf of the faculty of UTK, in which I include faculty at the UT Space Institute and in the UT Institute of Agriculture, I welcome you to our beloved campus. We are deeply grateful for the work that each of you does on behalf of us and our students.

As I prepared these remarks, I was aware that some of my colleagues might see this as an opportunity for me to ask you for various things. And though I certainly wanted to consider that, I thought I should first take inventory of what you have already done for us lately. That inventory produced the following list of four items. (And since my training is in engineering, I hope you will forgive me for numbering this list and ordering it chronologically.)

1. You recently saw the need for a change in direction for the UT system administration and you acted on it.
2. You hired an eminently qualified Interim President. He is eminently qualified, not only because of his leadership skills, but also because he is a long-time faculty member and he has dealt with the UT system administration in his capacity as UTK's Interim Chancellor. His perspective is one that generates trust among the faculty, and the value of that trust is inestimable.
3. You have demonstrated a commitment to addressing several issues related to the organization of the UT system administration: what is the role of the system, what is the job of the president, what is the optimum reporting line for Athletics, where should system offices be located? These issues have been important to UTK faculty since long before I came to this campus almost twenty-five years ago. To some faculty at UTK, the fact that these questions are being seriously considered is almost a miracle.
4. In September, eight of you attended the UTK Faculty Senate Retreat. For an hour, you engaged in a frank and cordial exchange in which you expressed your support of the faculty and explicitly requested our input.

To summarize my reaction to this list, let me simply say that the UTK faculty are "feeling the love." I consider our relationship with the Board of Trustees to be in a healthier state that it has been at any other time in living memory. And we are deeply grateful to you for that.

Given this happy state of affairs, could I come to you now to ask for more? No, and yes. The faculty could not ask for more from you in the way of commitment and communication. You work hard for us, you ask for and analyze data to assess the health of the campuses and to guide our efforts, you praise our successes and you let us know how we can do better. But there is one endeavor in which we could use even more help from you. This is something in which the faculty have not traditionally engaged, but in which I think we must engage if the UT system is to continue to thrive. It is a special form of education in which many of you are experts. Let me explain. The State Legislature generally reflects the opinions of their constituents. As most of us already know, the percentage of Tennesseans who possess a four-year college degree is one of the lowest in the nation. It follows that the vast majority of the people in Tennessee have little or no appreciation for the educational activities that go on at the various UT campuses. One might conclude from these facts that the State Legislature cannot be persuaded to find a way to increase funding for higher education, because their constituents will never support that. But I disagree. Even in tough economic times, if pressure from the electorate is sufficient, the Legislature will find a way. They will listen to their constituents. The question is how to help those constituents to see the value of the academic side of the Universi-

ty. Could we help to raise that value in their eyes so high that they would demand that the Legislature do more for higher education? Difficult as that may seem, a significant step in that direction is already behind us because almost every citizen of Tennessee knows that UT exists, if only because of their loyalty to our athletic teams. What remains is to help them understand us. This is the special form of education to which I referred. And I do think that many of you are experts at it. But since there are only about two dozen of you, the task requires more troops. I would like to see the faculty take up this banner. But we would need your help to do it. We are accustomed to educating students who come to us, students who expect, for one reason or another, that a college education is a good thing. We are not accustomed to connecting with those who have no firsthand knowledge of higher education, and have no motivation to seek such knowledge. If there is any way that you can help the faculty understand how to do that, we would greatly appreciate your sharing it with us. For most of us, engaging in that kind of education does not come naturally. But if we can be shown how to go about it, we can learn to do it effectively. I am sure that some of us would even enjoy it. So, the next time you connect with an average citizen and help him or her to see the value of higher education, I hope you will think about us and our ignorance in this regard. Please help us to help you with this mission.

In closing, I wish you a pleasant lunch, a productive meeting this afternoon and safe travel when you return to your homes. Welcome to UT Knoxville.

## UTK Faculty Senate

### Proposed 2010-11 Calendar of Meetings<sup>1</sup>

<u>Executive Council</u>	<u>Full Senate</u>
August 30, 2010 <sup>2</sup>	September 20, 2010
October 4, 2010	October 18, 2010
November 8, 2010	November 22, 2010
January 24, 2011	February 7, 2011
February 21, 2011 <sup>3</sup>	March 7, 2011
March 21, 2011 <sup>4</sup>	April 4, 2011 <sup>5</sup>
April 18, 2011 <sup>6</sup>	May 2, 2011 <sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In pertinent part, the Bylaws of the Senate state as follows:

The Faculty Senate shall ordinarily meet on the third Monday in September, October, and November during the Fall Semester and on the first Monday in February, March, April, and May during the Spring Semester. The President-Elect shall review the calendar one year in advance and adjust meeting dates as necessary. The pro-posed schedule for the following year shall be presented at the October meeting of the Senate and be published as appropriate.

Executive Council meetings typically occur two weeks before a regularly scheduled Senate meeting. This proposed calendar attempts to conform to the Bylaw provision and Executive Council needs as closely as possible.

Deviations are noted. All meetings are on Monday afternoons from 3:30 pm to 5:00 pm, with apologies to parents of school-aged children for whom this is an extreme inconvenience.

<sup>2</sup> This meeting is scheduled for three weeks before the first Faculty Senate meeting, rather than two. Labor Day, a national and UTK holiday, is the second Monday before the meeting. The Senate's annual retreat typically is scheduled near the Labor Day weekend (for the past two years, on the Friday before Labor Day). I suggest that we schedule the retreat for the Friday after Labor Day, September 9<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> This is Presidents' Day. Typically, UT has not given this as a holiday. The preceding Monday is Valentine's Day and (after sundown) Mawlid-al-Nabi (the Muslim holiday honoring the birth of Mohammed).

<sup>4</sup> This is the second day of the Jewish holiday Purim. We can hold the April meeting on March 28, but we cannot move the March 21 meeting back to March 14, since Spring Break is March 14-18.

<sup>5</sup> See *supra* note 4.

<sup>6</sup> The Jewish holiday of Passover begins at sundown. I am assuming that our meeting will be completed before sundown, but we may want to consider moving this meeting to April 11. We then also could switch the May meeting to April 25.

<sup>7</sup> See *supra* note 6.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE

**FACULTY SENATE AGENDA**  
**October 19, 2009, 2009 3:30 P.M.**  
**UNIVERSITY CENTER**  
**SHILOH ROOM**  
**President's Office: 607 Dougherty Engineering Building**  
**Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-2210 (865) 974-8376**