I. CALL TO ORDER
J. Nolt called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES
The minutes of the October 6, 2008, meeting were moved by T. Boulet, seconded by D. Birdwell and approved.

III. REPORTS
Senate President’s Report (J. Nolt)
Budget Problems. J. Nolt reported on his comments to the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting in October. The comments are posted on the website under “President’s Comments.” He pointed out that the campus had never recovered from previous cuts, e.g., the campus no longer has a tenured faculty member to teach Chinese. He also talked about academic program eliminations and the need to consider other efficiencies. (The BOT has a committee focused on efficiencies probably primarily at the system level.) Nolt also emphasized the need for a tuition increase. In addition, in meetings with individual trustees he emphasized energy conservation, a tuition increase, and administrative efficiency particularly at the system level. The appointment of Chancellor Cheek was announced at the BOT meeting.

Provost Martin has a task force (B. Ambroziak, T. Boulet, C. Hodges, M. Murray, J. Nolt, L Parker, J. Romeiser, and P. Williams) that is developing program evaluation criteria and procedures for obtaining faculty input. The committee has had one meeting. S. Simmons is obtaining information from peer institutions. As all faculty members have program affiliations, there are conflicts of interest. So, processes need to be out in the open before the Senate. The goal is to have criteria and procedures to the Senate in the spring.

A committee that emerged informally is working on ideas for budget reductions and recommendations for the new Chancellor (T. Boulet, M. Murray, B. Bruce, D. Patterson, and J. Nolt).

Nolt met with D. Millhorn and discussed the development of Cherokee Farm and ORNL. They talked about poor communication between the campus and the system. The plan is to have Millhorn talk with campus researchers. Nolt wants there to be an academic component at Cherokee Farm.

The question of where tenure would reside for the new chancellor was noted.
The BOT was notified that the proposed closures of the graduate and undergraduate programs in Audiology and Speech Pathology, the graduate program in Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and the undergraduate minor in Dance would go through normal channels. The Chairs of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils were asked if they had received any paperwork. They had not. Nolt commented that the process needed to move forward in a timely manner for the process to be completed by the end of the year. Chancellor Simek clarified that the department would initiate the paperwork for the program closures, e.g., I. Schwarz would apply to the Graduate Council. The application to the Undergraduate Council for the closure of the undergraduate programs will be much slower to allow students to complete their degrees. V. Anfara asked about the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Program. Simek said he could not speak for Provost Martin. The College of Education, Health and Human Sciences would probably put forward the paperwork for the Dance Program.

Nolt said he thought the two proposals to be introduced by the Faculty Affairs Committee should be heard differently from the usual Senate custom. Typically, there are two readings, but the proposals were time sensitive. He suggested sending them to Senators immediately if approved with a notice stating that a vote would be taken at the November 17 meeting of the Faculty Senate. This process would not violate any rules as the two reading requirement is for revision to the Bylaws and these are revisions to the Faculty Handbook.

D. Patterson said Nolt might consider sending his BOT comments to the faculty. He asked whether Millhorn provided a timetable for what would be happening at Cherokee Farm. Nolt responded that he was on the committee that had one meeting in October. The stated goal was to break ground in the spring, but that did not seem realistic. Discussion of the need to act to retain the federal funding for the JAMS building supported the idea that some type of ground breaking would occur in the spring.

Chancellor's Report (J. Simek)
J. Simek complimented Nolt on his presentation to the BOT. The BOT is concerned about structure, i.e., the size of the system administration and its effectiveness, which is not the campus focus. The campus does not want to respond to the BOT’s Efficiency and Effectiveness Task Force, rather the goal is to be proactive. The campus is engaging in studies of campus processes and structures. The goal is to demonstrate that the campus has adequately “tunneled down.” Simek gave the example of how UTK processes student tuition invoices. The current multiple mailings involve substantial costs in labor, energy, and paper. Changing to electronic billing would produce a saving of $65-66,000 and 33 trees (reducing our carbon footprint). J. Heminway asked that they also look at the process for students that are children of faculty. Simek also identified the process for registering international students that currently requires too many different people handle the papers. He also discussed the use of motorcycles and bicycles to help the police force stay within its leases of SUVs and pursuit vehicles.

Simek anticipates a base budget reduction similar in size to the one incurred this year. Reducing unit budgets 5% would produce about 2/3 of the money needed. The other 1/3 would be covered centrally. He indicated that he did not see how to avoid cuts in personnel. Revenue enhancements were also being considered, such as lab fees. Such fees have to be approved by the BOT, so the timing would be risky. Simek said he would have a draft budget for Chancellor Cheek.
B. Lyons asked about enrollment management, specifically whether the size of the entering class would be reduced. Simek said it would, but there would not be much gain unless there were a shift in in-state and out-of-state students. Lyons asked about outsourcing and whether there were ethical ways to do it. Simek said yes, but pointed out that by definition outsourcing means people will lose jobs. Lyons asked specifically about the motor pool. Simek said it was not a campus operation, but again any change in it would mean people would lose jobs. Lyons asked if there was a commitment to limiting the impact of budget cuts should Simek offer a rebuttal to across the board salary reduction. Simek explained everyone would have to agree to such a reduction and there would be contractual/legal issues that could lead to litigation. Simek said the people administering the campus are good people and the campus needs to figure out how to have nimble responses.

P. Crilly said that lab fees are supposed to go to particular programs. Simek said the issue is that there are programs, such as in art, which should be eligible to have fees and have not gotten them because of resistance to adding fees as a form of tuition increase.

T. Wang asked if anyone was working on adjusting the temperature in SERF. Simek replied that work was proceeding on a detailed plan.

Patterson asked in what department the new chancellor would be tenured. S. Martin said it was under discussion and it would go through all procedures. Patterson said students at the BOT meeting raised the question about sports fields. Simek replied that the University is acquiring property between Lake and Terrace that will be committed to fields in the near term. Patterson pointed out that he had recently received the faculty/staff/student directory. He asked whether the campus needed to continue printing it. Simek said no. D. Birdwell said Business Week concluded that the worst response to a downturn is to take advantage of employees in the short term. He commented that the motor pool has been turning cars over at 50,000 miles, a standard that dates from a time when cars had a shorter lifetime, and turning them over at 80,000 miles would save money. Simek replied it was a system operation and noted that car dealers had a role in setting the mileage standard. Then Birdwell asked how much money was being spent per person on the e-mail system. Simek said J. Poore would need to come to explain, as he did not know. In his assessment the e-mail system is working better this year, but still some units are using other systems. Birdwell said that, if it were $50 a head as he had heard, it exceeded the industry standard of @$10. And, he noted that fewer servers had been replaced with more. Nolt encouraged people to go to the Chancellor’s website link to make suggestions and/or to the suggestion link on the website of D. Horne, Chair of the Board of Trustees’ Committee.

Provost’s Report (S. Martin)
S. Martin reported that she is working on reports for the Chancellor including revenue enhancement ideas. She attended the meeting of the BOT’s Efficiency and Effectiveness Committee. The Committee wants to look at all levels. The University of Maryland had been visited. Faculty workloads are one thing at issue. C. Pierce asked whether the campus had started collecting information on savings from actions, such as not hiring adjuncts. Martin said the Deans knew of no cuts in adjuncts hired for terms or one-year non-tenure track positions. Reductions would have been in those hired a semester at a time. Pierce said he was concerned about possible reductions that would result in people not being willing to come back to teach at
later dates. S. Martin said there had been an increase in the number of untenured faculty to cover the increased number of students. The problem is more often seen as one of increased use of adjuncts/lecturers leading to reduction in the number of tenured faculty. Wang asked whether with lottery scholarships and higher test scores for entering students there was a need to reduce the number of “remedial” courses. Martin said the state is raising the high school graduation requirements. Simek said there should be fewer inadequately prepared students, as a result. Crilly reported that numerous students enter not ready to pursue engineering. He asked whether teaching them what they need could be outsourced to Pellissippi. Stephenson said the math courses might be moneymakers because of the cost of instructors. Birdwell asked about consolidating the teaching of courses, e.g., eliminating course like math for education students. Martin said faculty members have to inform her about such issues.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Report of Safe Zones Task Force. The report of the task force established to consider safe zones for Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transsexuals was included in the materials distributed for the meeting as an information item.

Faculty Affairs Committee (J. Heminway)

Resolution on Reappointment of Department Heads. The Executive Committee voted to return the resolution on the reappointment of department heads to the Faculty Affairs Committee at its October meeting. The reason for pushing through the revisions (considering not having a second reading) is the timing of faculty evaluations and reviews of department heads. Comments were invited from the Chancellor and the Vice President for Agriculture. None were received. The primary objection had been that no faculty vote was mandated before reappointment. The Committee added back in a faculty vote along with the opportunity for units to develop other forms of consensus building. Also, some “wills” were changed to “shall.” Lyons indicated this modification was in response to comments from Deans, who perceived the process was somewhat backward preferring faculty input before they made decisions. He thought it was a workable solution. With reference to the omission of a first reading, he argued that any changes from the floor should be discouraged. He also argued that a brief narrative summary or “skinny” on the changes prepared by Heminway would be helpful. Nolt stated the goal was to get the resolution out before the end of the week. Pierce noted that, as the Bylaws do not require two readings, all Senators needed was the information; that two readings were not required. He also disagreed with Lyons about discouraging Senate involvement. Nolt commented that changes from the floor could not be ruled out, but they could be discouraged. The resolution came as a motion to the Executive Committee. The resolution with a cover memo was to be given to the Senate for action at its next meeting. The motion passed.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Faculty Affairs Committee (J. Heminway)

Resolution on Timing of Annual Evaluations. The resolution proposes changing the timing of annual faculty evaluations. Currently departments are conducting retention reviews in the fall and annual evaluations in the spring for the same faculty members. Having annual evaluations in the fall would work better. UTIA and UTSI would not be included in the change in the evaluation year. The change better aligns the evaluation process with the academic year. The resolution required defining the academic year. This change would put UTK in accord with BOT policy. Birdwell pointed out that some departments have many faculty members to evaluate.
Lyons asked about the impact of this change in years with possible merit raises at stake. Heminway replied that there are various half year issues. Fall evaluations would remove them further in time from when raises are decided, but Heminway pointed out that annual evaluations and merit pay are not necessarily linked. Lyons indicated he liked them to be linked. The Committee’s motion to change the timing of annual faculty evaluations was passed.

Research Council (K. Stephenson for J. Hall)
The Council is planning on holding forums again this year and is soliciting topics.

Task Force on Criteria and Procedures for Academic Program Evaluation (J. Nolt)
Nolt said he thought the goals were to develop criteria for programs elimination and faculty input in procedures. He asked for suggestions for making it an open process. Martin pointed out that the process was not replacing the normal process through which departments and colleges for various reasons sought to eliminate programs. This process would be economically driven and would build on APEC (Academic Program Evaluation Committee) and the RRTF (Review and Redirection Task Force) documents. Some materials were developed at the department heads retreat. There is a Blackboard site for suggestions. The Task Force needs to develop criteria and an expeditious process. Patterson said he heard a twofold approach. The administration would ask deans for proposals to cut 5%. The deans might come back with proposals to eliminate programs. He asked whether there might be someone above the deans looking down at colleges and the programs within them. Martin said it would be unusual for anyone outside to identify college programs. Deans may propose cuts of various sorts including program cuts. The process will involve back and forth discussion. Heminway commented that data gathering metrics should be linked to decisions and that data should be reported on a regular basis. If comparative data were available, programs would have a better basis for knowing their relative standing. Martin said the institution is doing better at collecting relevant information. Simek noted that this budgeting process does not mean that the poorest programs are targets of elimination, which makes setting the criteria harder. He acknowledged the University has not done a good job of data acquisition. He also pointed out that while it is important for a unit to know where it stands, having clear rankings can create morale and recruitment problems. Wang pointed out that when a program or department is eliminated there can be problems placing tenured faculty in other units because of a lack of fit. She asked whether anything could be done about that problem. Simek said it was troublesome and stated the need for criteria. Lyons, following up on Heminway's ideas about linking data to program assessment, asked whether UTK still looked at Delaware data and whether Institutional Research continued to generate the relevant data. Martin said while there was some question about the consistency of the data across institutions (e.g., definitions of lecturers and instructors), they were the best data available. Lyons commented that the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council were equipped to deal with program quality, but the program elimination process necessitated other data. Simek stated that the institution did not want to declare financial exigency. Birdwell said there were two problems: the immediate need for a decision making process and the lack of good information on which to base decisions.

Pierce wanted to point out the good things that happen on campus like the opportunity to get flu shots. He thought the Student Concerns Committee might consider whether the shots could be given at lower cost for students.

Meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m.