

MINUTES – Draft not yet approved
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
November 6, 2006

Members Present: Denise Barlow, Marianne Breinig, George Dodds, Robert Glenn, Glenn Graber, Louis Gross, Tom Handler, Nancy Howell, Alberto Garcia (representing Way Kuo), Suzanne Kurth, John McRae, Kula Misra, Matt Murray, David Patterson, John Romeiser, Neal Schrick, Otis Stephens

Guest: Gerald Schroedl

I. CALL TO ORDER

L. Gross called the meeting to order at 3:43 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of October 9, 2006, were approved with grammatical revision.

III. REPORTS

President's Report (L. Gross)

Board of Trustees November Meeting. Gross stated his speech to the Board is posted on the Senate President's web page. His remarks focused on the faculty's generation of resources and gender equity. He passed around his notebook from the meeting. The Board took several actions that may affect the faculty. 1) To be in accord with State policy, a resolution was passed giving preference for admission to in-state applicants, if applicants are equally qualified. Gross noted the policy applies to all applicants, undergraduate and graduate. 2) Several of the scorecard benchmarks were revised. One revision was removal of the metric of number of National Academy members and was replaced with percentage increase in research space. 3) The diversity of the student body will be measured as the proportion of total enrollment that is African-American, Hispanic American, Native American, and from disadvantaged Tennessee counties. 4) Each campus presented its own additional compensation proposal for this year. The UTK proposal included one percent increases for faculty members who met or exceeded expectations, equity raises, extension of one-time bonuses to all those employed less than three years, and the opportunity for any unit to propose additional salary increases if they can demonstrate no negative effects on their teaching capacity. 5) President Petersen's highest priority for the next fiscal year is salaries. The Board is supportive of this priority. D. Barlow noted that of the proposed \$23 million in salary funding, the campuses would have to produce approximately \$5 million.

Executive Committee members asked various questions about the change in the scorecard benchmark. D. Patterson asked if there were any questions raised about the change. Gross replied that he could not attend the discussion. He noted a one-sentence explanation was provided that indicated that the University was running out of research space. Further, the benchmarks were not clearly defined at the outset. N. Howell pointed out that the original guideline had been linked to AAU status. Barlow pointed out that the identification of additional research space lends itself to benchmarking. G. Dodds raised the question of why both criteria could not be used.

Howell asked about administrative raises. Gross reported that the President's two-year evaluation had been delayed (from June to November) at the President's request. The President employed a system for establishing minimum salaries for senior staff by using comparisons with other institutions. Four of his staff members were below those minimums. An incentive pay plan was approved for development officers for the current campaign. Barlow clarified that those increases would be non-recurring. N. Schrick asked if the 1% increase was approved. Gross replied that it

was. He explicated that every November campus can revise how their monies are being allocated (e.g., for salaries). O. Stephens asked what had happened to the Geier money. Gross reported that the November Board notebooks included a document describing the President's plan for requesting post-Geier money in the coming budget year. This year post-Geier money was not given to any components of UT.

Discussion of Issues with Chancellor and Provost. Gross noted earlier in the meeting that the Provost was unable to attend the Executive Committee meeting. He indicated his surprise at the Provost's comments about removal of progression to the major GPA requirements at the October Senate meeting. Since then he has engaged in extensive correspondence about the topic with Provost Holub. To further address the changes that Holub has proposed to the Deans, a meeting is planned with the Undergraduate Council Chair, as well as the President and President-elect of the Senate.

Gross has made suggestions to R. Darling for the Task Force on Retention. Another issue is faculty compensation. Schrick is on the newly formed Faculty Compensation Task Force that will meet November 8. Another development is a task force on incentive pay that the Chancellor is setting up. (The Institute of Agriculture and the Health Sciences Center already have incentive pay plans.)

Gross indicated that the memo from S. Martin about titles for joint faculty will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting, so she and L. Riedinger can attend. This will require modification of the Faculty Handbook, and so will become the responsibility of the Faculty Affairs Committee to bring to the Senate. On another matter, Gross asked Riedinger whether joint institutes will be subject to reviews as conducted for all other institutes. They have not been to date and Riedinger indicated it was appropriate to carry out such reviews. Gross also raised the question of a campus level policy on F & A distribution and compliance with federal standards of effort reporting with the Research Council. T. Handler reported that the Research Council has discussed the issue.

Gender-based Salary Analysis. Gross has talked with the Commission for Women and Commission for Blacks about salary analysis. His proposal was distributed before the Executive Committee meeting.

Other announcements. The University Club is still an entity and is seeking members.

Provost's Report. The Provost was not available for the meeting.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Department Head Evaluation Process

B. Lyons has corresponded extensively with the Provost about the process. One possibility would be to survey all faculty members to ascertain whether evaluations were conducted this past year. The focus would be on the evaluation of Department Heads in their fifth year. Dodds noted that the Provost apparently took the position that Department Head evaluations are not in the purview of the Faculty Senate and that he would respond to any complaints as they arose. M. Murray inquired whether the issue could be framed as one of compliance with the Faculty Handbook. Gross indicated that was the tack taken. K. Misra asked what appeared to be the issue. Gross noted the Handbook has been in effect for only a year; so all aspects have not been fully implemented. The Senate could focus on implementation this year and in future years. One tactic might be to send a message to faculty encouraging them to become familiar with sections related to Head reappointment and associated evaluation. Handler inquired whether a list of who needs to be

evaluated could be obtained. Gross asked how such a list could be obtained. Patterson asked: what's the basis for this. Stephens reviewed the history of reviews and suggested that faculty members could be reminded of the policy and the policy should be made readily available to them. J. McRae suggested the issue be more one of making the policy readily available than one of conducting evaluations. Gross pointed out that the fifth year review is different in that there is supposed to be opportunity for faculty to respond to the evaluation. A. Garcia asked about working with Deans on this. Gross clarified that the Senate has no oversight or authority with Deans but collaborates with the Provost in matters related to academic policy. Patterson queried whether the Provost is indicating that it is not in the purview of the Senate. Gross replied that the Provost indicated that the evaluation process was fine, except in one college that was confronted with too many Department Heads with five or more years of service. Barlow suggested the Provost would not have a problem with providing information about Heads or reviews. Stephens pointed out that colleges normally set up a schedule to review Heads. Murray proposed asking the Provost for information. Barlow suggested in addition to obtaining information about dates of appointment that an affirmative statement be sent to the faculty about the review process.

M. Breinig asked how faculty input for yearly evaluations differs from that involved in fifth year reviews. Gross clarified that the fifth year review focuses on reappointment and is a public document and has a more elaborate process. The Senate needs to take into account that the Provost is new on campus. Gross agreed that part of the problem is that the Provost was not here last year (when the evaluations were to be conducted). Stephens suggested that by wording the request about who should be evaluated in terms of policy that the information should be forthcoming.

Gross summarized that there appeared to be two actions proposed: a request for a schedule of evaluation and a general e-mail to faculty members making them aware of the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The two proposed actions received consensual support without a resolution.

R. Glenn inquired about the evaluation of administrators above the level of Department Head. Misra briefly reviewed past experiences with the process noting that eventually people were not willing to chair or serve on the review committees. There is no current ongoing process of review of administrators except that conducted by their supervisors.

Budget and Planning Committee (N. Schrick)

The Committee is addressing faculty salaries. Schrick reported that the Budget and Planning Committee would meet Monday, November 13, 2006, at 3:30 p.m. and is expected to reaffirm the Faculty Affairs Committee resolution from last year. The Committee's goal is to be proactive. G. Bogue drafted a letter to Governor Bredesen (distributed to the Executive Committee) that hopefully will receive the support of other campuses. The Committee does not want anyone to be blindsided (e.g., institutional representatives in Nashville) by the letter. He asked whether the memo should go to anyone other than Governor Bredesen. Stephens thought it would be a good idea to send it to legislative leaders, i.e., appropriate committee chairs. McRae suggested modifying the letter, so that the third paragraph would emphasize what has happened with K-12 in contrast with higher education. Handler inquired whether a dollar amount was tied to having more students. Schrick tried to clarify whether that meant more faculty and staff and need for additional facilities. Gross clarified that it is not clear how to compute the marginal costs to the institution for additional students. So, the question would be whether the tuition from a larger student population covers the marginal cost. Dodds indicated that the Chancellor has suggested that there is red ink when more students arrived. Gross pointed out that the letter does not address those costs. Garcia expressed concern about sentences in the last paragraph and various word choices.

Schrick indicated the Committee's goal was to work through the University Faculty Council to obtain broad support. Gross replied that the plan now is for the Council to meet in January rather than November. Schrick suggested moving it through the Senate to have a broader base of support. Gross asked whether the Committee wanted to bring it to the November 20, 2006, Senate meeting. Misra inquired about the status of the document on other campuses. Gross indicated it was distributed the previous week to other campuses Senate Presidents. Handler asked how the Hope Scholarship program has affected other campuses and there was general discussion of its relative impact on enrollments at the Martin and Chattanooga campuses. Gross asked whether the Budget and Planning Committee should bring the letter to the Senate. Patterson sought clarification of how it is to be coordinated with the other UT campuses Senates. Schrick, Gross, and Barlow identified various UT people involved with state government. McRae suggested deleting the last sentence and simply focusing on faculty salary issues.

Gross asked whether the letter should be sent back to the Executive Committee after it has been revised by the Budget and Planning Committee. Murray agreed that such a review might reduce the number of changes in wording proposed on the Senate floor. Gross indicated that that would be left up to the Committee, but in any case the letter would be distributed to members of the Executive Committee for a vote within a short period of time.

IT Committee (M. Breinig)

A draft resolution is in the hands of committee members. The next Committee meeting is Friday.

Task Force on Historic Preservation (G. Schroedl)

Schroedl indicated the Task Force was seeking Executive Committee and Senate approval of the report and subsequent transmission to the Chancellor and the President.

McRae moved and Misra seconded a motion: The Executive Committee accepts the report of the Task Force and will bring it before the Senate.

Dodds asked how the report could become an action item for the University. Gross noted that the report contained many recommendations and it was not clear who would need to take action on which recommendations. LEED certification for new buildings already has the Chancellor's support. Schroedl noted that the Getty grant also has been supported. Howell asked about any interface between the Task Force membership and the campus Master Plan Committee.

In response to a question, Schroedl indicated that information about the appointment of the Task Force was in the report. McRae suggested four items directly related to the Master Plan Committee and that they could perhaps be directed to the Master Plan Committee. He expressed concern that if the items were not broken up, no action might occur. Handler expressed concern about some Master Plan items (e.g., rumors about units being moved across the river) and would like some definitive statements. Howell stated that Barlow gave a good report at the Faculty Senate Retreat, but she is unable to find it on the web. Instead there is only an old plan. Barlow pointed out the role of the System and clarified that some of the rumored moves are not part of the Knoxville Master Plan. G. Graber suggested if a motion approving the report were accepted, the items could subsequently be separated for action. McRae proposed that items 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10 could be sent directly to the campus. Stephens clarified that the disposition of particular items could be moved after the motion on the floor received approval. The motion on the floor was then voted on. Motion approved.

McRae suggested that the Executive Committee bring to the Senate items 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10, and be forwarded with a letter from the Senate encouraging action. Misra asked what would happen to

the remainder. Upon further consideration, McRae said all recommendations should go the UTK Master Plan Committee. Schroedl indicated he did not disagree with the proposed resolution, but he would like to see written policy. Barlow suggested that a policy draft could be prepared for the Chancellor and his staff. Murray asked if the goal was to have action, i.e., the Committee would write the policy, not the Chancellor. Schroedl expressed concern about the campus/System relation, noting that the System has more control. Barlow noted that the campus works with the System and that either she or the Senate could transmit the recommendations to the System.

Patterson moved with several seconds: The Faculty Senate requests that the Campus Master Plan Committee review and implement the Task Force recommendations, modifying the Master Plan accordingly. As the System and campus are closely interrelated, the Faculty Senate will submit the recommendation to System CFO G. Rogers to facilitate coordinated action. The motion passed.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Gross asked whether there was a motion related to his salary analysis proposal. Schrick proposed delaying action until after the Budget and Planning Committee met.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.