

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
March 29, 2010

Absent: Lt. Col. Michael Angle, Lora Beebe, Doug Birdwell, Bill Blass, Bill Bradshaw, Chris Cimino, Jim Conant, Linden Craig, Steven Dandaneau, Jim Drake, Jerzy Dydak, Michael Essington, Joan Heminway, Russel Hirst, Nathalie Hristov\*, Denise Jackson, Robert Jones, Yuri Kamychkov, Jeff Kovac, Baldwin Lee, John Lounsbury, Mary McAlpin, Lane Morris, Trena Paulus, Natalia Pervukhin, Jay Pfaffman, Gina Pighetti, Joan Rentsch, W. Tim Rogers, Rupy Sawhney, Jon Shefner, Robert Sklenar, Montgomery Smith, Edgar Stach, Marlys Staudt, Carrie Stephens, Sam Swan, Matthew Theriot, Yang Zhong, Svetlana Zivanovic

\*Alternate Senators: Jeanine Williamson for Nathalie Hristov

T. Boulet called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Establishment of a Quorum (S. Kurth)

S. Kurth reported a quorum was present.

President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet's report was distributed prior to the meeting. Boulet added that the Alumni Board of Directors, of which he is a member, was choosing recipients for awards.

Chancellor's Report

The Chancellor was not available.

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

- Provost Martin announced the Chancellor was having an open forum on budget planning on April 13.
- The Provost's Office was active on various fronts. S. McMillan was working with the General Education Committee on changes necessitated by recent legislation. C. Cimino was working with a committee addressing formula funding. S. Martin was on a performance funding committee.

Report on New Education Legislation (T. Diacon)

T. Diacon was reporting for B. Yegidis on the Complete College Tennessee Act passed in January. He expressed appreciation for the campus responses from the Provost's Office. He said the legislation was good for the campus as its rewards outputs and provided seed funding for the Oak Ridge partnership. Enrollment one way or another is key to the current formula funding (based on a census on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of each semester). The new funding formula considers the mission of each campus in the weighting of items (e.g., research is more important for UTK than Austin Peay). The census will be conducted on the last day of the term rather than the 14<sup>th</sup> day. Other output measures include number of degrees granted rather than graduation rates based on first time enrollees (excluding transfer graduates). Student retention will address progression from year one to year two, from year two to year three, etc. A third likely output measure would involve students transferring to an institution. UTK has an exemption. All other state universities have to admit any community college graduates. (Other possible measures could be number of adult students (24+), accessibility to low-income students (Pell grant recipients).

Diacon pointed out that the 2008 legislation required the Tennessee Board of Regents and University of Tennessee systems to create pre-major curricula to ease transferring. One resolution that had to be worked out was the 41-hour general education requirement.

Yegidis and Diacon have presented UT and UTK can keep its current general education requirements, as long as it accepts credits for those transferring in. Nineteen-hour pre-major curricula have to be developed, so that entering transfer students are ready to take junior and senior level courses upon admission to a program. Pre-major curricula have been created for General Business and Psychology. Diacon said he wanted to faculty to have consensus and only generate minor changes. For example, people worked on coordinating the pre-major in psychology. UT Martin required two general introduction courses, but will have to change to one in line with other campuses. UTK requires a two-semester biology sequence and other campuses have agreed to do the same. Other states, Florida, Georgia and North Carolina, have pursued similar curricular coordination. Diacon had no comment on the third part involving seed money for the Oak Ridge initiative.

Nolt said the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) was concerned that the changes would take the traditional prerogative of the faculty and give it to a limited number of faculty members. Faculty senates would then only be involved at the end of the process. TUFS proposed an amendment about "consulting with faculty senates" and that passed. His question was how do senates get involved in the process. Diacon said it was appropriate for campus officials to respond to that. He noted R. Saudargas was involved in developing the psychology pre-major. Diacon said he hoped the pre-major curricula could be approved with little or no change. One standard petition would be developed. S. McMillan said the Undergraduate Council would review it and as she understood it the curricular changes would be open to a vote. Ultimately, the curricular changes would come to the Senate from the Undergraduate Council. Nolt commented that checks and balances were important. J. Koontz expressed concern about the possible impact of the change from the 14<sup>th</sup> day to the end of the term for the enrollment census on the withdrawal deadline. McMillan said they were looking at the drop policy due to concern about students "shopping." No changes were being considered based on the change in the census date. P. Crilly asked if the pre-major 19 hours would supercede prerequisite requirements (e.g., in Engineering). Diacon said that would be a task for those who work on the pre-major. He suggested there would probably be generic engineering. Crilly said he understood the retention goals, but he was concerned that "dumbing down" of courses might be the result. Diacon said faculty members have control over that. T. Wang asked whether articulation agreements would be replaced. Diacon said he had seen articulation agreements drive pre-major agreements. He explained the concept of pre-major agreements is that they would allow admission into specific programs. M. Handelsman asked how are 19 hours specified when most courses are three hours. Diacon said the Psychology Department created an elective one credit hour course. C. Plant expressed concern about counting transfer students graduating, specifically would UTK be hurt. Diacon said each school's mission was different, so that the weight given to the number of degrees granted might be less at UTK. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) indicated it would try to fashion the formula, so that there would be no impact initially, e.g., the first year. B. Lyons asked if anyone had applied the new formula to current output. Diacon said the problem was that the new formula was not yet available.

## **MINUTES**

### Faculty Senate Minutes

For the February 1, 2010, minutes, D. Bruce had an addition, "*but none of those factors were included in the regression analysis*", that clarified his discussion of the salary study. Approval of the minutes was moved by M. Wirth and seconded by S. Thomas. Minutes approved as amended.

For the March 1, 2010, minutes, S. Thomas requested that the text of the resolution passed be inserted. Approval of the minutes with that change was moved and seconded. Minutes approved as revised.

#### Faculty Senate Executive Council

The minutes of the March 15, 2010, meeting of the Executive Council were distributed as an information item.

### **MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

#### Undergraduate Council

Bruce moved and Crilly seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2010, meeting. Minutes approved.

#### Graduate Council

Bruce moved and Thomas seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the March 4, 2010, meeting. Minutes approved.

### **PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

#### Faculty Affairs Committee (S. Thomas)

- S. Thomas presented the Committee's non-binding resolution for non-tenure track faculty. Motion passed.

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate "is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*," and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* to include as a "best practices" statement in the *Manual* a report by the Task Force on Lecturers; and,

WHEREAS, as outlined on page 2 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, "[r]evisions to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, if any, are made in consultation with and the approval of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for final approval by the full Faculty Senate;" and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed the task force report and believes the recommendations it contains would be useful in leading to more consistent treatment of our non-tenure-track teaching faculty; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that the text accompanying this resolution is added to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in the Best Practices Statements with the title "Best Practices and Recommendations Regarding the Supervision and Development of Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty."

- Another resolution from the Committee defined the new rank of Senior Lecturer. The material would be inserted and would define the position in relation to two other positions. T. Wang asked where the definitions were. Thomas said there was a paragraph defining Senior Lecturers. Motion passed.

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook* to allow for a new rank of “senior lecturer” for non-tenure track faculty teaching faculty; and,

WHEREAS, under Section 8.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee “is responsible for recommending changes, which should have input from the chancellor, the vice president, and their administrative staff including deans for consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed—and sought (i) input from the Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* related to this issue; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.1 of the *Faculty Handbook* are revised as follows.

- 1) The final paragraph 4.1.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Positions) is amended by adding the phrase “senior lecturer” between “lecturer” and “distinguished lecturer” in the list of ranks or titles for non-tenure track teaching faculty.
- 2) Section 4.2.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty) is amended by inserting the following paragraph between the paragraphs for “Lecturer” and “Distinguisher lecturer.”

Senior lecturer: This rank is for those who hold a degree appropriate to their disciplines (or its professional equivalent) and who have demonstrated outstanding teaching at the rank of lecturer, normally through five or more years of service. A departmentally designated group of faculty will review and evaluate appointments to the rank of senior lecturer, in accordance with departmental and college bylaws.

- Appointment limits changes were needed for some non-tenure track faculty appointments. Senior Lecturers and Clinical and Research Faculty may have appointments for longer terms.

T. Wang asked if that meant that a person could not be laid off if there were budget cuts. Thomas noted the clause indicating all appointments are subject to availability of funds. Motion passed.

WHEREAS, under Section 2.G. of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate “is responsible for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, and for reviewing proposed revisions and recommending changes to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* in accordance with the amendments procedures set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*,” and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Provost recommended that the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee review and recommend proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook* to change the provisions requiring all non-tenure track faculty appointments to be renewed annually; and,

WHEREAS, under Section 8.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee “is responsible for recommending changes, which should have input from the chancellor, the vice president, and their administrative staff including deans for consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and final consideration by the full Faculty Senate;” and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed—and sought (i) input from the Chancellor and the Vice President of Agriculture and (ii) consideration by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on—the various sections of the *Faculty Handbook* related to this issue; now, therefore, it is

RESOLVED, that sections 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3 of the *Faculty Handbook* are revised as follows.

- 1) The present second and third paragraphs in section 4.1.1 (Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Positions) are deleted and replaced by these two paragraphs. Typically, initial non-tenure-track teaching appointments will be made at the rank of instructor for a definite term of one year or less. Appointments are renewable subject to availability of funds and satisfactory performance. Each lecturer must complete a reapplication process each year, preferably by March 1. Non-tenure track teaching faculty promoted to the rank of senior lecturer or distinguished lecturer may have appointments lasting up to three years or five years, respectively, and must complete the reapplication process in the final year of their current letters of appointment.

In unusual circumstances, the department head, with the prior permission of the dean and the chief academic officer, may recommend to the Office of the Chancellor or Vice President initial appointment at a rank of senior lecturer or distinguished lecturer. In such cases, initial appointment may be for a period of up to three years for a senior lecturer or up to five years for a distinguished lecturer.

- 2) The second paragraph in section 4.1.2 (Non-Tenure-Track Research Positions) is amended by replacing the words “one year or less” with “up to five years” so that it read in full as:  
All non-tenure-track research appointments will be made for a definite term of up to five years, subject to continued availability of external funding. Appointments are renewable subject to continued availability of external funding and satisfactory performance.

- 3) The second paragraph of section 4.1.3 (Non-Tenure-Track Clinical Positions) is amended by replacing the words "one year or less" with "up to five years" so that it read in full as:  
All non-tenure-track clinical appointments will be made for a definite term of up to five years. Appointments are renewable subject to availability of funds and satisfactory performance.

#### **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

##### Undergraduate Council (D. Thompson)

Thompson noted several reports from the Advising Committee about retention were in the minutes. She was asked whether transfers were being separated out in the examination of retention and when students were being lost. McMillan said the greatest loss was after the first year.

##### Graduate Council (S. Ohnesorg)

S. Ohnesorg noted the policy on Joint Doctoral Degrees passed at the March meeting was separate from any academic department. UTK would award a degree and the partner institution could also for work completed at both institutions.

##### Committee on Nominations and Appointments: Elections (T. Boulet)

Boulet announced the elections had been completed. He called for a vote on the candidates for Information Officer and Secretary. Both candidates were approved.

He announced the new Faculty Council representative would be India Lane. Vince Anfara was elected President-elect.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made, seconded and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Kurth, Secretary