

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate
MINUTES
January 28, 2008

Those absent were: Vasilios Alexiades, Gary Bates, Roberto Benson, Thomas Boehm, Donald Bruce*, Max Cheng, Steven Dandaneau, C. A. Debelius, Bethany Dumas, Patricia Freeland, Randall Gentry, Mary Gunther*, Lee Han, Roxanne Hovland, Scott Kinzy*, Norman Magden, Murray Marks, John McRae, Wesley Morgan, Lynne Parker, Lloyd Rinehart, W. Tim Rogers, Molly Royse, Anne Smith, Montgomery Smith, Klaus Van den Berg, Andrew Wentzel*, John Wodarski, Tim Young

*Alternate Senators: Natalia Pervukhin for Andrew Wentzel, Carole Myers for Mary Gunther, Marleen Davis for Scott Kinzy, Harold Black for Donald Bruce

D. Patterson called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INTRODUCTIONS

Establishment of Quorum (S. Kurth)

Kurth confirmed that a quorum was present.

Senate President's Report (D. Patterson)

D. Patterson addressed the recent removal of Chancellor Crabtree from office, which he linked to the struggle resulting from the "Mission of the University" statement issued by President Petersen in August 2007. He expressed appreciation to Jan Simek for assuming the interim post and to the faculty members and administrators who agreed to serve on the Chancellor Search Committee. He indicated that there is apprehension that the search will either attract candidates aware of the situation leading to Crabtree's dismissal who are willing to accept the current constraints imposed by the UT System or candidates who somehow are unaware of the situation.

Whatever the limitations of the survey instrument, the survey results made clear that the faculty on the Knoxville campus and those on the faculty of the Institute of Agriculture hold dramatically different views. Two areas of divergence that have long been recognized revolve around administrative hierarchy and the right of faculty members to disagree with administrators. As President of the Faculty Senate, he represents both campuses and he indicated that he would strive to do so to the best of his ability. Faculty on both campuses need to understand one another's respective experiences and concerns, so that they can speak with one voice concerning what is needed to advance the University and to serve its students.

He noted that among the many messages he received (from internal and external sources) were some that suggested that a dispute with the President could cause damage to public perceptions. He acknowledged that a public dispute could result in negative perceptions. But, he proposed that there may be a lack of understanding on the President's and the public's part of the faculty's role and responsibility in shared governance. Patterson quoted the following passage that addresses the faculty contract with the Board of Trustees from the *Faculty Handbook*:

The faculty role in campus-wide governance is through the senate, the representative body specifically charged by the board...to consider, advise, and recommend to the administration policies about a wide range of issues affecting the general welfare of the faculty.

He further quoted a section identifying some of those issues:

c. priorities for the university development plan

d. changes in physical facilities.

Patterson indicated that Petersen seemed surprised by this Handbook passage at the January 22 open meeting. Patterson then quoted from the *AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, section c. "Internal Operations of the Institution":

The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern to the academic community.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding building and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

Patterson expressed the view that those provisions were applicable in the debate over the site of the Joint Institute for Advanced Materials (JIAM) building and the planning for Cherokee Farm. The Cherokee Farm resolution the Faculty Senate passed in October was ignored by the UT System. Despite public statements about faculty involvement in planning, it apparently has not occurred.

Patterson noted that public perception is important, but asserted the need to balance concerns about public perception with the obligation to speak out, to participate in the shared governance articulated in the *Faculty Handbook*. He expressed the view that the current situation represented a pivotal point in the history of the University and the Faculty Senate and that goals and options needed to be carefully considered. He identified several issues/initiatives that needed to be addressed: IT leadership, Cherokee Farm and the JIAM building, the one-way and sporadic flow of communication with the UT System, the possible creation of a sixth system entity (UT/ORNL) that would drain away campus F & A, and the lack of focus on students in the President's recent funding requests.

He thanked all those who attended the reception for Chancellor Crabtree and offered special thanks to Beth Gladden, Wanda Davis, Sharonne Winston, Scott Simmons, and University Center staff for their contributions to the event's success.

Chancellor's Report (J. Simek)

Interim Chancellor Simek acknowledged the recent events that led to his current role and pledged to do his best in his new position. He stated that very good people had been appointed to the Chancellor Search Committee. He gave his assurance that all commitments (both moral and financial) that Chancellor Crabtree had made to faculty members and academic units would be honored. He clarified that when he agreed to assume the position that there were no admonitions from President Petersen. He stated there clearly were difficulties to be faced, but avowed his commitment to the University and his belief that it is a fine institution capable of AAU status.

Simek noted the Governor's State of the State Address to be given in the evening would be important given the budget shortfall in the state. The Governor had indicated that he supported salary increases, but that the money would be found elsewhere. Usually, such a position leads to unfunded mandates. Simek also indicated that he did not plan on changing the budget process. Provost Holub made some changes in the academic units' budget presentations. The process will be made as transparent as possible, although it will be organized in a more centralized way. Simek indicated he was not waiting for something to happen, but was engaged in action, e.g., the pursuit of space earlier in the day.

L. Gross asked about a joint memo from President Petersen and Chancellor Crabtree issued in early November concerning transparency in financial arrangements. Simek referred the question to D. Barlow, as there were deadlines for submitting the materials. Barlow said the first step had been completed.

The committee had not looked at the operating accounts, which was what Gross was addressing. Questions of formula funding are involved. Simek noted two tasks remain for that committee, but it had made more progress than the human resources and information technology committees. Patterson followed up by asking if there were scheduled meetings. Simek replied that a request has been made that meetings be scheduled.

J. Malia stated that she was pleased with his appointment and commended his courage.

Provost's Report (R. Holub)

Provost Holub spoke about the strategic planning process, as requested by President Patterson. It was decided it should go forward in the six areas (e.g., access and success). He also noted the three emphases: excellence and quality; diversity and inclusion; and accessibility (size of campus). (He clarified that there would not be an increase in size without adequate funding for it.) Many things were already taking place. Hopefully, the process will be flexible enough. When completed, the plan would be submitted to the President and then to the Board of Trustees, who would hopefully push it forward. The Strategic Planning Committee has 30 members and 18 subcommittees. Three reports will be generated: a narrative report, a bulleted report, and a report with benchmarks. Input is desired. The subcommittees include faculty members, students and staff from across the campus. People can make comments on the web and they will be sent to the subcommittees. Also, there will be town hall meetings.

In response to a question about whether students and alumni were included, Holub answered that they were. T. Wang asked about the impact of the new plan on high school graduates. Holub replied that there was adequate time to think about it because no change would occur for several years. He expressed belief that the new requirements should hopefully make students better prepared. K. Stephenson asked whether the UTK strategic planning activities were part of a system wide initiative or were a Knoxville activity. Holub replied that the six areas were established by the system, but he did not know if each campus was doing an extensive plan. He pointed out the need for UTK to address its role as the flagship campus. Stephenson asked whether part of the campus is linked to Cherokee Farm. Holub indicated that if the campus were going to expand, it would have to be considered. Stephenson asked whether an increase in enrollment were part of Holub's planning. Holub discussed the plan to increase enrollment to 33,000 over 10 years. Graduate enrollment would be increased at a faster rate than undergraduate enrollment. Most schools that UTK would like to emulate have 25% graduate student enrollment. Even with the planned increase, graduate enrollment at UTK would be less than 25% of the total enrollment. Work will have to be done on the plan and the perception that it will be good for the state.

MINUTES

Faculty Senate

Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of November 19, 2007, were approved.

Minutes of specially called Faculty Senate meeting of January 22, 2008, were approved as corrected by the substitution of two words for *the*: "Petersen responded that *there are* student aspects of athletic life."

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

The minutes of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting of January 14, 2008, were available as an information item.

MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY

Graduate Council (M. Murray)

M. Murray summarized the major points in the minutes. The College of Law grading policy changed from hundredths to tenths. Also, an additional English language test was approved (in addition to TOEFL). The minutes of the meeting were approved.

PREVIOUS BUSINESS

Teaching Council (I. Lane)

I. Lane presented information about student assessment of instruction. She pointed out that Elizabeth Pemberton is the contact person. Faculty members should be aware of the abundant amount of material online and that they may choose from among approximately 12 different evaluation forms. Work will continue with the new director Richard Tucker continuing to pursue improvement in the process. The Teaching Council is moving forward with evaluation of nominees for the various Chancellor's awards. Also, the Council will have another program this spring.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Campus Environment (J. Nolt)

J. Nolt introduced a resolution seeking Senate endorsement of some of the work Crabtree began. Last summer a plan containing an extensive series of recommendations, including the creation of an Office of Sustainability, was submitted. Crabtree signed two important agreements. During the fall, Crabtree created a Sustainability Oversight Committee (Clif Woods, Chair) that recommended establishment of a Sustainability Office. Crabtree was considering this recommendation. The goal is to encourage Interim Chancellor Simek in that direction and create the office in fiscal year 2009. Wang asked for clarification. P. Crilly pointed out that a high level administrator would cost money and wondered whether the sustainability function could not be done in Facilities Services. Nolt acknowledged it would cost money, but the proposed office would be charged with getting grants, etc. He stated that other universities have saved enough money through the actions of such offices that the costs have been minimized. Stephenson noted that there are some new mandates. Nolt replied many campuses are pursuing actions, that there is recognition of the need for central coordination.

The resolution distributed to all Senators before the meeting:

Whereas, the creation of a campus-level office of sustainability is a central recommendation of The Committee on the Campus Environment's Conceptual Energy Plan for the Knoxville Campus of the University of Tennessee (<http://www.cce.utk.edu/energyplan/energyplan.htm>), and

Whereas Chancellor Crabtree's Sustainability Oversight Committee (chaired by Clif Woods) recommended the creation of such an office to Chancellor Crabtree last fall, and

Whereas before his departure, Chancellor Crabtree had been considering plans to hire a person for whom sustainability management would be among his or her responsibilities,

The Faculty Senate recommends to Interim Chancellor Simek the creation of an Office of Sustainability to oversee energy and climate-neutrality operations and other aspects of campus sustainability. The office should be headed by a high-level administrator, hired by national search, who is provided with an adequate budget and staff.

The resolution was endorsed by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Faculty Senate Survey Results/Goals/Next Steps (D. Patterson)

Patterson said questions had been raised about bias in the survey. He indicated he understood the criticisms, but that he assumed his highly educated colleagues would have adjusted their responses accordingly. He noted there was variability in the responses as evidenced in the crosstabs. He asked J. Lounsbury to report on the statistical analysis he had asked him to perform. Lounsbury reported there were few differences in mean scores by rank, unit, etc. One difference was members of the Faculty Senate were *more* favorable in their view of the President than other groups. The correlation analysis revealed no relationship between satisfaction with the President and longevity. In doing the analysis, he was struck by the degree of consistency among subgroups (ranks, tenure statuses, length of service). Malia asked how many Senators there are. There is some ambiguity about the number. Patterson asked about the factor analysis. Lounsbury reported that confidence in Petersen and satisfaction hung together. D. Birdwell asked about confidence levels. Lounsbury indicated he had not computed them, but they should be small. Wang asked what the response rate was. Patterson thought it was about 60%. The survey was sent to the FacultyInfo listserv and subsequently sent to Deans and Directors for distribution, after some of them indicated that some faculty members had not received it. In response to a question about survey security, Patterson indicated the Zoomerang software was set for one response per IP address.

M. Clark asked whether the comments made at the end of the survey would be available and analyzed. Patterson replied that it probably would not be productive to share the raw responses. And, he expressed the hope that a qualitative researcher might take on the task of analyzing the open-ended responses. Malia referred to Patterson's opening remarks about the impact the current situation might have on potential applicants for the Chancellor position. She pointed to the problems any occupant of the position potentially could have with Peterson as President. She shared comments from a colleague that paralleled those she had received from other members of her department. Those comments focused on the process that led to the abrupt "ousting" of Chancellor Crabtree and Peterson's increasing centralization of the organization. She indicated she wanted to propose a resolution favoring a vote of no confidence, along the following lines:

Be it resolved, we the faculty hereby declare that we individually and as a whole do not have confidence in President Petersen.

Parliamentarian O. Stephens said *Robert's Rules of Order* says long resolutions should be prepared before meeting, so he concluded Malia was presumably suggesting that at a later meeting a resolution would be brought forward. Malia said she was trying to honor Patterson's desire for full discussion. J. Hall volunteered to work on the open-ended responses to the survey.

Crilly commented on the discussion about the search committee during the meeting the previous week. Petersen pointed out that it was not only the humanities that were not represented (at that time), but also Engineering was not represented. He wondered why a big college like Engineering was not represented when a unit that does not report to the Chancellor, Athletics, has a representative on the search committee. The number of conflicts between athletics and academics had been noticeable recently with more athletic events during the week.

R. Ellis said all possible responses need to be considered, as currently people are outraged. N. Mertz said she was troubled by several things Petersen said: 1) his comments that seemed to limit faculty governance to hiring, promotion and tenure decisions, and curricular matters; 2) his perception of where we are as an institution in achieving equity and diversity, and 3) the implied commitment in his remarks to a top down hierarchical structure. G. Pighetti said she recognized that the Knoxville faculty was angry

and upset. Her side (Agriculture) comes from a systems perspective and appreciates what they have received (e.g., salary increases). In her view it is a system as a whole and that there is even more support for President Petersen than is apparent from the survey responses. The faculty in the Institute of Agriculture thought the survey was biased.

T. Handler said a new Oak Ridge connection was mentioned in the opening remarks. In his view the University is already too tightly intertwined with them. F & A is a serious issue, that is, the direction Petersen is going is seriously detrimental to the campus. He noted that during televised athletic events there is no longer any mention of Knoxville (the campus where the athletes are students), but only mention of the UT system. Patterson replied that he thought such advertising is part of a conscious effort by those in public relations to differentiate the campuses. A Senator commented that after the meeting with Petersen biological sciences faculty members felt outrage, i.e., they felt he was out of touch with our campus. The Walters Life Sciences Building has repeatedly experienced flooding. Stephenson spoke to differences in the cultures prevailing at Oak Ridge and at UTK. Many campus faculty members are concerned about being taken over by big science research values. One question is whether the campus has made the case to withstand pressure for big money in contracts. Patterson referred to the hegemony of big science. J. Mount made a plea for understanding the hierarchical structure, noting that we presumably do not want the President involved in day-to-day operations. In his view some problems are there, e.g., IT. On the other, there has not been more centralization, although faculty may want to decrease it. He said to put his comments in perspective that he was in Agriculture. An alternate tried to speak for the 15-20% of the survey respondents that consistently supported Petersen: 1) Petersen has already gotten the message that there is dissatisfaction; 2) he made a clear distinction between what faculty should do and organizational structure; 3) a vote of no confidence is serious and usually reserved for extremely egregious behavior; and, 4) a more constructive approach would entail passing a resolution asking Petersen to be more responsive to faculty concerns and then waiting 6 months to a year to see how he responded. G. Ubben expressed his shock at Crabtree's departure. He said he had thought about the major changes that had occurred in recent years including reinstatement of the position of Chancellor and partnering with ORNL, which Ubben perceived to be a new area of exploration. He was uncertain whether he liked the decisions, but believed they were not his to make; instead they were in the President's domain. He thought the faculty should be careful, that it needed to "move on."

Gross said following the meeting with President Petersen he talked with him and that Petersen and his staff listened. Gross subsequently sent suggestions on to President Petersen and Senate President Patterson. He noted that over the past year a large percentage of issues of faculty concern were related to functions controlled by the President (e.g., IT). They were brought to the President's attention and he *never* responded. Gross perceived that Petersen's administration had not been responsive to Faculty Senate requests for a long time. He indicated he was hopeful change would occur, but would not count on it happening. Hall commented that she did not think outrage was inconsistent with rationality. She noted the President said "faculty governance" rather than "shared governance." She expressed deep concern about diversity. She thought the Senate could move to a no confidence vote. B. Blass indicated he would support a no confidence motion with all the appropriate whereas clauses. He noted his dissatisfaction was based on 40 years of comparative experience. Birdwell said he was hopeful when he went to the meeting with Petersen, but he left the meeting disappointed. In his view, Petersen has: 1) accreted power over IT to his office, 2) claimed an Oak Ridge relationship that goes back almost half a century, and 3) taken a shocking stand on diversity (reactive rather than proactive). L. Fisher indicated that faculty members in her college were disappointed by Petersen's lack of responsiveness. Petersen might be a great fund raiser, but he did not demonstrate emotional intelligence. Patterson indicated that he would like to take the comments made at the meeting to the Executive Committee and then come back to the whole body with suggestions. Lounsbury inquired whether additional opportunities could be provided for administrative responses. J. Shefner commented that administrators had many opportunities to speak at meetings. He proposed that if the Executive Committee were going to move forward it should do so with awareness of the political context (Governor and Legislature) and a focus on democratic process. Patterson offered the possibility to Lounsbury of having a small group meet with

President Petersen about what was discussed during the meeting, seeking documented substantive action. Wang asked about the list of potential questions circulated before the open meeting. Patterson indicated they were given to the President. The tone of the questions was not intended to be disrespectful. Wang asked whether he (Petersen) had responded. Patterson said he had not yet done so. A follow up question focused on whether a resolution to recognize Crabtree had been proposed. Patterson replied "not yet."

Senate's Proposed Calendar (J. Nolt)

Nolt presented the dates for next year's Senate and Executive Committee meetings. A motion to approve was made, seconded and passed.

Proposed Amendment to Faculty Senate Bylaws (Budget and Planning Committee)

The proposed revisions to Section 3, Paragraph C were distributed and given a first reading. One proposed change involved correcting titles:

From: Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance and Vice President for Operations for the University
To: chief financial officer for the campus.

The other proposed change resulted from recent developments. There was not adequate information about the acquisition of Knoxville Place or about the proposed development of the Cherokee Farm. In the case of Knoxville Place, there had been what turned out to be false assurances that the campus would never have to deal with it, as well as a lack of consultation. (Knoxville Place was neither built to LEED nor residence hall standards.) The Budget and Planning Committee would like to be involved early in the process. The proposed change modifies the committee charge to include more than facilities. The addition of the following clause to the second paragraph was proposed:

planning for projects of the University or other entities that may eventually result in changes to campus facilities

Research Council (J. Hall)

Hall indicated that the Research Council was pursuing positive action. A handout was distributed about planned opportunities for face-to-face dialogue about the needs of researchers and creative scholars. The Council would welcome suggestions of names and ideas.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned 5:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne B. Kurth, Secretary