

## MINUTES

Faculty Senate Open Meeting

January 22, 2008

Meeting called to order at 3:37 p.m.

President Patterson reviewed the procedures for the special meeting. No items of business were to be introduced at the meeting. Patterson would provide brief comments and then President Petersen would have an opportunity to make opening comments. Senators would have first opportunity to ask questions and then the audience would have the opportunity to ask questions. Those asking questions would have one minute to pose their questions and the President three minutes to respond.

Patterson stated that many of those at the meeting knew the Faculty Senate had been conducting a survey of faculty that included those at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, the Institute of Agriculture, the Space Institute, and ORNL. There were 1175 respondents: 87% UTK, 12 % Agriculture, 1% Space Institute, and 1% ORNL. Patterson has requested that the results of the survey be posted on the web. The survey data were given to a statistician for analysis. Patterson identified two primary findings: 18% expressed some degree of satisfaction with the President's performance and 19% some degree of confidence in the President's performance.

President Petersen thanked everyone for coming, particularly given the weather. He wanted to amplify on one phrase in the questions given to survey respondents: "given what you know." Petersen stated he had not spent much time with the faculty on this campus. He had told former Chancellor Crabtree that he would stay out of his hair. His first year he was asked to meetings, but was not asked to do so more recently. Interim Chancellor Simek has indicated to him that that will no longer be the case, that is, there will be increased information sharing. He expressed the view that the summary of the comments he made at the Jan. 4 meeting with the Executive Committee appeared to be inaccurate. Petersen stated that this meeting was to open dialogue. He noted this is a difficult time. A number of people are upset and have the right to be upset. Former Chancellor Crabtree oversaw the campus in difficult times, that is, when there were problems in the President's Office. In Petersen's view the institution has never been better positioned to move forward than it is now. The differences with Crabtree were not around their visions of what the campus could be, but rather revolved around organizational structure. Petersen pointed out that he had made no changes in the organizational structure—it is the same as when he was hired. The "governance" issue in the survey had come up in previous discussion with the Executive Committee. In his view, faculty governance deals with topics such as hiring, curriculum, tenure, and promotion. The structure of a university as an organization is typically dealt with by the board. Petersen noted he did challenge the Faculty Senate (in light of a controversial case recently addressed) to look at tenure and promotion guidelines, as the current procedures lack a timeline for appeals. He wants to improve communication with this

group (UTK faculty). He believes the faculty does and should respect Simek. Today he finalized and appointed the search committee for a new Chancellor. Copies of the list of committee members are available.

Petersen stated the success of this campus is most important to the success of the University of Tennessee, as an institution. But, you have to have a fleet to have a flagship campus. And, success is not something that exists in limited amounts, that is, many can be successful. Joint appointments of persons at ORNL can contribute to the success of multiple units. He stated that he did not propose that the majority of the 1700 people at Oak Ridge should be granted faculty appointments; rather he proposed that there should be more of such appointments. Some departments have done better than others in making joint appointments.

Patterson thanked Petersen for his opening comments. As a point of information he read a passage from the Faculty Handbook concerning faculty involvement in governance, particularly noting the phrase "changes in physical facilities."

The floor was opened to questions beginning with Senators.

Question.

Senator Birdwell expressed concern about the process for appointing persons from ORNL. In the former Electrical and Computer Engineering Department they had a process for deciding who was qualified and who should be considered for joint appointments. Comments from Lou Gross indicated that Petersen was interested in appointing a significant proportion of the 1700.

Petersen said very few of those at Oak Ridge would have intersecting interests. He asked Birdwell how many had joint appointments in his former department. Birdwell estimated more than 5 people, but less than 20. Birdwell clarified that his concern was that such appointments should not be "rubber stamped." Petersen said perhaps the campus should go out and recruit persons who have interests and qualifications that do fit. He questioned the statement about having those granted joint appointments teach. He said that those at Lawrence Livermore do not all teach classes at Berkeley, although they may work with graduate students. He suggested that lots of institutions would like to as physically proximate to a highly ranked lab as we are.

Question.

Senator Stephenson pointed out that the controversy over Cherokee Farm was the first instance when he became aware of the differences in philosophy between the Chancellor and the President.

Petersen said right now all the land is University land, although Cherokee Farm is currently assigned to the Institute of Agriculture. He said there are 2 million square feet that can be built in the area above the flood plain. Four people are looking at the

situation: the Chancellor, the Vice President of the Institute of Agriculture, the Executive Vice President and the system research officer. There are two places in the state where substantial space is available to UT. In Memphis there are plans for building in the space whether Baptist Hospital was imploded. Currently, there are plans to build the Joint Institute for Advanced Materials (JIAM), one building connected with Oak Ridge, and one building that UT will finance with research recoveries.

Question.

W. Plummer expressed frustration that as of February 22, the JIAM building will have been delayed two years waiting for the development of Cherokee Farm. He asked why can't we have our building back?

Petersen replied that it is not UT's rather it is a joint building with Oak Ridge. Plummer reiterated his plea: why can't we have our building back. Petersen stated the plan is to build it on the Farm property. There will be synergy having it on the Farm with the other buildings; that is why Cherokee Farm was chosen as the building site. Currently planners are working on roads for the Farm.

Question.

Senator Wang said according to the summary prepared by Gross the President asserted that the faculty should not be spending so much time on governance and faculty members are not doing all that they can do. She requested clarification of his views.

Petersen said another note taker at the meeting with the Executive Committee had different notes. In his view it is not a matter of governance, but rather difference in focusing on solid and dashed lines. There are issues that go beyond the campus. He stopped hearing about how to achieve AAU status. He is not going to move pieces. He emphasized that the pieces involve organization not governance. He is using the structure the Board had in place when he became President. He clarified that the comment he made with regard to the faculty at the meeting with the Executive Committee occurred in the context of discussing efficiency. If the focus is on metrics, our faculty is undersized and that means the collective has to work harder to bring in money. Currently, UTK, compared to its peers assigned by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), generates fewer research dollars (94%). The Medical Center generates 42% of what its peers do and THEC is putting pressure on it. He identified the need to find ways to push and assist research efforts. UT is under funded for an institution of its size. The University of Tennessee is approximately the same size as The Ohio State University, but UT is spread out across the state. One important thing is raising money for graduate fellowships and that is on everybody's head.

Question.

Senator Mertz said, as Petersen indicated that his remarks to the Executive Committee were not accurately reported, she would like for him to explain his comments on diversity.

Petersen said those involved in human resources need to be close to people. He had it looked into (people were interviewed). One of the complaints was that paperwork had to go back and forth three times. He talked with the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED) and ascertained that part of the problem is the lack of normal communication. In his view affirmative action people should not be police, rather members of the institution should monitor themselves. At another institution he was at, it was the responsibility of supervisors (Deans, Department Heads) to monitor searches, which were looked at after the fact. He said he recognized that the institution does not have enough diversity and there are glass ceilings, but OED should not be the police.

Question.

Senator Birdwell followed up on Wang's comment about research, by expressing frustration concerning infrastructure. He gave two examples—one from the past and one current one. At one time we used a cumbersome mainframe system for budgets that allowed him to know exactly how much money he had expended. Now he cannot tell within 10%. His second example involves what has happened during Petersen's tenure. He no longer uses the campus e-mail system because it does not work. The campus had people with the expert knowledge to advise against purchasing the current system. The campus needs to have quality IT management. The problems that exist have been known for years.

Petersen replied that the problem with the e-mail system was that it was brought up too fast. The IT people have taken a (unfair) beating on this. Petersen said he uses the same email system as everyone else's and it does not go down more than once a month. He said there is a need to offload as many services as possible. He does not want to replicate systems—need to push down to the local level. In his position, Petersen does not do budgets. He thinks the problems with the system were generated by the actions of people that did not realize what was needed. Provost Holub first made him aware of the problem a couple of weeks ago. (He had not paid attention to such issues because he was not managing the campus.) Birdwell responded the CIO was under his jurisdiction. Patterson interjected that the President had commissioned a study of IT and when it was completed months previously it was kept confidential. Petersen indicated they in fact had been working on IT since last fall and changes had occurred in the IT reporting structure. There was an interim CIO. There will be a search for a new CIO, but the University needs to get pieces moved out before a search can be conducted. No one would take the position given the current situation. In his view there initially was a disaster because new system rolled out too quickly.

Question.

Senator Rogge stated that communication always seems to be a problem. She asked whether a collective document representing what was said at his meeting with the Executive Committee could be created. (The ensuing discussion clarified that there were

no minutes taken at the meeting.) She then asked him to highlight his differences with Crabtree.

Petersen said basically the focus was on changing the organizational structure, that is, the reporting structure for Athletics and Agriculture. He stated that both units reported to him when he became President and they are probably doing as well as any part of the organization. He pointed out that he objected to the wording of the Senate survey questions that referred to *all* aspects, e.g., of athletics. The academic life of students is the responsibility of the campus. And, the Chancellor served on the ORNL board. Units on campus can compete for Governor's Chairs. The Provost has a search committee. A package has been put together with a group that includes campus representation.

Question.

Senator Shefner asked to return to the question about faculty productivity. The President's answer focused on funded research, but there are many possible indicators of faculty productivity, particularly in fields such as the social sciences. He requested clarification of the President's position.

Petersen said if you look at fellowships and other awards in the social sciences, they have gone up significantly in recent years. If you look in other areas, a huge rise has occurred. What he said at the meeting with the Executive Committee basically involved rather spur of the moment comments that the faculty should focus on what they do that the administration does not do. Faculty members do not "do" organizational structure. He finds most of the people he encounters outside the University are pleased with what the faculty is doing.

Question.

Senator Hall brought up the equity and diversity issues. She commented that Petersen had alluded to the University of California system. In the California context there are protections in place at multiple levels to prevent discrimination based on race, gender, transgender status, etc. At this university, those notions of diversity are not internalized. She expressed concern about the meaning of "streamlined."

Petersen explained that when he was a provost part of his evaluation of Deans was whether they had addressed diversity. In his view management is not a right; it should be seen as a privilege. People who do not do things are replaced and those who do them are rewarded. There are three ways to replace people: they leave voluntarily, people under them raise a hue and cry, or a supervisor makes a change. Senator Hall reiterated that those values (pro diversity) are not yet in place in this institution. Petersen replied that the Provost is supportive.

Question.

T. Burman stated that the President had mentioned strides in the humanities in recent years. Many of those came from the former Chancellor. He noted that no regular faculty

member in the humanities was appointed to the search committee for a new Chancellor and that there was no mention of the humanities in the President's mission statement. On the other hand, a person from Athletics is on the Committee, although it does not report to the campus.

Petersen responded that there are student aspects of athletic life. Also, no member of the Engineering faculty is on the Committee. Burman followed up with a question about what substantial steps Petersen would take to support the humanities. Petersen expressed believe in Simek's support of the humanities. He noted his wife had introduced an Italian contact and that he probably spends more times supporting the arts than the sciences when out in the community. He commended Crabtree on his support for the humanities. Petersen said he thought he did a good job on humanities while at the University of Connecticut. He talks about things he oversees when he goes out and he oversees ORNL. The Chancellors speak out about their campuses. He will speak about other issues, if asked.

Patterson noted that Dr. David Reidy was nominated to be on the Committee.

Question.

The questioner asked Petersen what his vision was apart from ORNL and Cherokee Farm, that is, what is the meaning of flagship institution.

Petersen said obviously it entails undergraduate education, but graduate education does more and that is an area where the institution should go--without going to the extreme of the University of North Carolina. A flagship institution has the best students, better retention rates, etc. (Holub has improved retention rate.) Petersen tells parents of prospective students the advantages associated with sending their children to research institutions like this rather than small institutions. At institutions like this students learn from knowledge creators not just knowledge purveyors. He focuses on scholarly activities—pushes our arts, humanities and sciences.

Question.

V. Nordquist said as a department head he is evaluated every year. If 70% of his faculty gave him indicated they were dissatisfied with his performance and lacked confidence in is performance, he would meet with them and find out what the problems were. He asked Petersen why he thought faculty members were so dissatisfied (with his performance).

Petersen replied that when there is an agenda with a pointed end, this occurs. He indicated that no one knew how many faculty members did not respond or voted multiple times. Patterson interjected that there was security. Petersen asked what it was. Patterson indicated that people could not respond from the same computer twice and additional efforts were made to ensure security. Petersen stated that he was annoyed that some statements made in the survey were not true. He then asked those

present to indicate if they constructed surveys. And, he followed that with the question of whether they could construct a survey like the one that was distributed. He indicated he would call the survey an "are you still kicking your dog" survey. He said he was concerned, that there needs to be more dialogue.

Nordquist followed up with the comment that in the decades he had been at UTK, he had never seen so many faculty joined together about anything. The survey asked global question about performance and the answer was clearly negative. The faculty members in his department are not happy. Crabtree was a tremendous support. He asked Petersen to be honest about why the resignation was so precipitous. Crabtree was gone in a heartbeat.

Petersen replied that he does not comment on personnel matters. Crabtree was given a choice. He decided to resign that day rather than do it later. Nordquist commented that if the faculty members do not have confidence, there is a tremendous problem. Petersen replied that he does not oversee day-to-day operations on the campus. He tries to raise money in Nashville and from private donors. His perception is that faculty members do not want him to become more involved in day-to-day operations.

Question.

L. Gross said since his veracity, at least in taking notes, had been challenged he wanted to raise some well-documented problems. 1) Last February Petersen issued a detailed statement saying the various campuses should manage IT. Based on his conversations with Crabtree, he knows one of his frustrations revolved around the management of IT on this campus. Gross was told a month ago that he was appointed to an IT committee and he responded do what the President said 10 months ago. It's a \$1.5 billion organization.

2) After R. Levy, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success, announced his resignation last spring, Petersen said a search for a replacement would begin. Now the name of an Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success has appeared on the web without even an announcement. Some problems have created difficulties for the faculty at large. A new advertisement for a chief human relations office makes no mention that there is no discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

Petersen said the statement for the position Gross referred to was generated by the Provost. The statement on non-discrimination on this campus differs from those on other UT campuses. He pointed out that the campuses make the minimum statement required by law. There is a difference between discrimination and statistical reporting requirements. The approach in Tennessee, which he does not necessarily agree with, is to include the characteristics required by law. In his opinion Provost Holub came up with a great resolution to that. UT does not discriminate; it hires the brightest people. Campuses like UTK typically have non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation statements, but smaller campuses like UTC do not.

Question.

Senator Malia said many faculty members are upset about the loss of Crabtree. There is a desire to say it is a hierarchical system and he lost because he had less power. What would be your response if the Faculty Senate were to pass by a clear majority a resolution of no confidence in your administration?

Petersen said he guessed he would think one of several things: Crabtree was right in how he wanted to reorganize the university, the faculty do not believe the system is bringing in what it thinks it needs, or the faculty liked Crabtree. Petersen said he has a Board that gave him a charge to build an enterprise. He has brought in money for the faculty. The faculty has given students and the state many things. He found a way to bring a super computer to Oak Ridge that will be important to a lot of researchers. Legislators are very supportive of the University. The organizational structure issues were matters of opinion.

Patterson asked Senators to discuss the issues with their constituents.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Suzanne B. Kurth, Secretary