

Faculty Senate Executive Council
MINUTES
April 18, 2011

Present: Joan Heminway, Vince Anfara, Toby Boulet, JoAnne Deeken, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Doug Birdwell, Chris Cimino, Beauvais Lyons, Susan Martin, Carole Myers, Conrad Plaut, Lloyd Rinehart, Anne Smith, Ken Stephenson, Steve Thomas

Guest: Mike Hamilton

I. CALL TO ORDER

J. Heminway called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2011, meeting was made by B. Lyons and seconded by D. Birdwell. Minutes were approved as submitted.

III. REPORTS

Vice Chancellor's Report (C. Cimino)

Chancellor J. Cheek was unable to attend the meeting. Vice Chancellor C. Cimino reported that the UTK budget is facing a 2% reduction in funding or approximately \$3.4 million dollars. That money is partially offset by funding under the new formula. Next year, an approximation of formula funding shows UTK's state allocation will increase by \$561,000. Since there is a three-year time line for full implementation of the funding formula, we expect that amount will increase in each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014. The University is also looking at different tuition models including using tuition to help increase salaries in the future. President DiPietro and all the Chancellors are working hard to develop relationships with the legislature. What they are stressing is the need for "flexibility" in funding models, including with respect to salary increases. If the legislator supports this flexibility, we will see more than the 1.6% faculty and staff raises mentioned by the Governor. Building trust between the University and the legislature is important to enabling the flexibility we need.

The only other increases in student payments would be an enhancement of the facilities fees (to be voted on by the student body). This type of fee is used to support, e.g., reconstruction of the Student Health Services facility and the University Center. Students now pay a \$35 facility fee per semester for classroom upgrades and they have a voice in how that money is spent. The Humanities and Social Sciences Building has been the recipient of the majority of support from that fund in the last couple of years.

The current \$35 fee approximately equals \$3 million per year. \$850,000 of the money is spent directly on classroom upgrades. The rest is spent on things such as entryways. The "green" initiatives on campus are also supported by this funding. There is a task force looking at raising the fee to \$75-\$100 per semester. Students are looking at that request now. The plan will be introduced to other groups in the next couple of weeks. Students are very interested in the quality and cleanliness of campus buildings.

The Master Plan for the UTK was introduced to the University community with a presentation in the Carolyn Brown University Center on April 13. The event was well attended. There was a

full presentation and good feedback. There was much discussion on the style and presentation of buildings at the Alumni Board presentation on April 16. Alumni like and want a historic look of buildings. They don't like as much glass and concrete as the current plan has. Cimino is meeting next week with the College of Architecture and Design and on April 21 (4:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.) with community leaders. A copy of the Master Plan can be accessed at www.utk.edu/masterplan. All are encouraged to give feedback and make suggestions on the plan. The plan is still in draft form, and not all of the report is presently available at the website. The plan also is being presented to past and present student leadership groups. There will be a larger student forum in the August/September timeframe.

Lyons asked about how the Master Plan addresses historic preservation concerns on campus and in the community. Cimino said this was a challenge. As an example, he used the Melrose Building. They would love to renovate the building but with the floor-to-ceiling heights in the present building, renovation to add air conditioning would limit access to people less than five feet tall. The Fire Marshall visits every building and structure on campus, and they are all structurally safe, but major renovation means major upgrades including compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, among other things. While it is possible to renovate in a manner similar to the Ayres Hall renovation, it is quite expensive. McClung Tower and the Humanities and Social Sciences buildings are two that some would like to preserve at that level, but both are extremely difficult to renovate. The authors of the Master Plan do not want to lock any future university administration to only one option.

The planners have looked at each building on an individual basis. For instance, with Strong Hall, they are recommending just keeping key architectural features, such as the front arches and the gardener's cottage, and demolishing the rest in a renovation similar to the Haslam Business Building (formerly Glocker). They will work with the College of Architecture and Design on these issues.

Lyons would like to see more preservation of the varied architectural history of the campus in its renovations. He recommended that Cimino look at the University of Cincinnati campus. There is a diversity of architectural styles that reflects the history of the University that works well. Cimino replied that other universities have better funded maintenance and renovation accounts. We do not. He cited to the University Center garage, which has significant deferred maintenance. The reason the bridge from the garage to the University Center is closed is because it is structurally failing. There is no funding to fix the problem. They looked at the cost of renovating the garage but the cost would be \$7 million. If we had access to adequate maintenance funds over the years, the problems could have been fixed without the decay getting to this point and renovation would be more affordable.

K. Stephenson expressed concern about the new streets leading to Neyland Stadium. They may create the impression that the football stadium and athletics is driving the plan. Is this the impression we want to give? The University Center is used daily by many students, but the stadium is used only a few times a year. Cimino replied that athletics had no special impact on the plan. The planners looked at the need for more visitor parking to support places like Alumni Hall, the new student center, Hodges Library, and the Clarence Brown Theatre. They also balanced the need to push all parking to the perimeter. There is a representative from the Athletics Departments in the Master Planning group to ensure balance in the group. Phillip Fulmer Way was redesigned to permit the creation of the grand mall for pedestrians.

Stephenson said the appearance of the plan may be descriptive of the purpose. But Athletics will use the new parking garage. He does not want a seven-story ugly concrete building with a bridge to Neyland Stadium. Cimino said there will be a bridge from the parking structure to The Hill, but not to Neyland Stadium. The building will be aesthetically pleasing. Stephenson asked about bike lanes on pedestrian walkways. Bikes go too fast on the current sidewalks. Cimino replied there will be bike lanes but the actual configuration has not been finalized.

Stephenson then asked how students felt about the increase in facilities fees. Cimino replied that most students pay for attendance and most use academic facilities. But there is no funding for maintenance. Out-of-state students pay more than in-state students. The SGA understands the issue, but there is no final plan on increasing fees.

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

Provost S. Martin reported that the campus is getting ready to roll out Banner for grade entry. That should happen next week. They are currently testing the system. All hope the process will proceed smoothly. The University is currently late by more than one month in completing the required Title IV (of the Higher Education Act) reporting. She asked for faculty assistance in completing the report as we race to the end of the semester. There are problems with the transcript report in Banner. It will be next spring before Banner is fully implemented.

Background Checks on new hires have been implemented. Martin is now gathering data to benchmark our procedures with peer institutions. She hopes the data will improve our process. She will keep the Senate informed of her progress.

V. Anfara asked about the response rate for online class evaluations. He feels something as simple as a new subject line in messages to students would help response rates.

Birdwell said he had received an email regarding documentation of use of space in our facilities. The instructions alone were 22 pages long. The completed report is due May 22. There was no IRIS access available. Cimino responded that this report is something done every year. It is nothing new. It is possible Birdwell received the report in error. Anfara said he believed that the report was sent to the Deans, Departments Heads, and Directors list. Cimino said getting an accurate space audit is extremely important this year since this is our base year. UTK may ask for an extension to complete the audit. Birdwell said we need a higher facilities and administration (F&A) allocation. He suggested working with a commercial firm to achieve better support for facilities. Cimino said they may use a consultant. In the past, they have relied on in-house staff to bargain.

C. Meyers noted that in the Library and Information Technology Committee it was reported there is a patch that links Blackboard and SAIS. There is a check mark noted in Blackboard if a student has entered the class evaluation form (but no way of knowing if the student actually completed the form). Blackboard will be updated May 18 and will continue to include this optional feature.

T. Boulet asked about background checks. He understands that there is a new version of the release form. Martin responded the new draft is narrower than the first, and is being implemented, but that additional improvements are being sought. For faculty, there have only

been a couple of questions raised by background checks already completed, and these issues were dismissed as irrelevant or insignificant. There have been more substantive issues with applicants for some staff positions.

Birdwell would like to see a system where grades are held until a course evaluation form is completed. Martin suggests that withholding grades would not be acceptable. She suggests perhaps some other kind of incentive such as receiving grades earlier if the forms are completed.

President's Report (J. Heminway)

A. Master Plan. Heminway reported she was unable to attend the Master Plan meeting on April 13, and thanked Cimino for creating the Web site to keep faculty and others informed.

B. Launch of Campus Civility Initiative. J. Cheek launched the Campus Civility Initiative on April 15 at the International Festival. This begins a process that must be continually supported. The Senate should consider its role in fostering this ongoing process.

C. Update on UT Background Check. The topic was covered in Martin's report.

D. Update on Service Learning Insurance Fee. S. McMillan is gathering information and will report to the Senate President on the information she obtains. The campus and the College of Arts and Sciences are conducting a risk management assessment.

E. Update on Guns on Campus. This week, the Tennessee Senate Judiciary Committee takes up the House bill on this issue. Some UT students are going with Boulet and others from the campus to Nashville to present to the Committee or be present at the hearing. H. Dye has collected various documented expressions of support for continuing the present ban from (among others) the GSA, SGA, Alumni Board, and this Faculty Senate.

Heminway noted that she had circulated a message from a faculty member who supports allowing guns on campus to ensure all faculty have information on both sides of the debate.

F. Other. Heminway encouraged all Senate Committee chairs to have their annual reports to her before the May 2 Faculty Senate meeting. If there are questions, contact Heminway.

The external national search for Vice Chancellor of Research was not successful. She indicated that the Chancellor had informed her that an internal search has been opened. She encouraged members of the Executive Council to identify and request applications from suitable candidates.

The last meeting of the Faculty Senate for this year will be by May 2. Heminway extended thanks to the group for a productive year. She highlighted the Presidential search, the Energy Sciences and Engineering Ph.D. proposal from the Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education, guns on campus, the move of Athletics to campus control, and many other issues handled by the Council and the Senate. She also noted amendments to the *Faculty Manual* and the Faculty Senate Bylaws were passed over the course of the academic year. Special thanks were extended to those who agreed to continue in their roles next year.

Election Report (V. Anfara)

Anfara reported that Senate elections had been finalized and distributed a chart of senators and alternates for next year. Also listed were dates for Senate and Executive Council meetings for next year. S. Winston was thanked for her assistance in producing these materials.

Anfara noted his intention to appoint B. Jacobs and O. Stephens as co-Parliamentarians for 2011-12. Birdwell moved the nomination of J. Deeken as Secretary and S. Ohnesorg as Information Officer. S. Thomas seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Under the Senate Bylaws, these nominations go before the Senate for approval. A list of proposed Committee chairs for 2011-12 was distributed. Chairs still are needed for the Research Council, the Appeals Committee, and the Faculty Affairs Committee. Birdwell said B. MacLennan had agreed to chair the Appeals Committee. Anfara will confirm.

Budget and Planning Committee Report (C. Plaut)

C. Plaut reported that the Committee was completing several reports for the May meeting. Senators should expect to receive an updated Living Wage Study. There has been much discussion in the Committee about this report. Plaut characterized the spirited dialogue as discussion, not discord.

The Committee will also report on faculty salary issues. The matters raised in M. Handlesman's resolution from the Senate meeting on April 4 will be addressed in the report.

Also to be released is an assessment of non-academic programs and how they impact support for faculty and students. This report will show the percentage of funding going to instruction versus non-academic areas. The percentage of money is going down. Between 2005 and 2009, monetary support of instruction increased 14%; other parts of the University increased 25% and the University Administration increased 26%.

Lyons distributed a draft entitled "Two Wage Stories from The Living Wage Report" illustrating some of the issues with distributing salary increases in an "across the board" manner. L. Hendricks is aware of the issues. Lyons defines a living wage as \$12.02 per hour plus benefits. This is 115% of the poverty level for a family with one wage earner. Lyons will be bringing a resolution separate from the one from the Budget and Planning Committee to the May Senate meeting. He feels it is not appropriate that many staff on campus are eligible for federal aid.

Teaching and Learning Council Report (L. Rinehart)

L. Rinehart reported on the Teaching and Learning Council's work on teaching evaluations. The Council analyzed the SAIS form to identify its most meaningful content. In general, members of the Council felt the form was too long and that this discouraged student response. He asked all members of the Council to rank the 33 questions on the current form. He discovered a fairly strong level of consistency among the rankings by committee members and the order on the current SAIS form. If the survey were cut to 12 questions, 8 of his top 12 (and at least 8 of every other Council member's top 12) would be included. Lyons said the University of Washington had a good student evaluation form 10-12 years ago and suggested someone there be contacted to find out what kind of form currently being used.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Proposed Amendments to the *Faculty Handbook* and *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*

S. Thomas introduced a revision of the *Faculty Manual* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* relating to advising and mentoring. This was a modification of the proposal that the Executive Council returned to the Committee last month. Birdwell was concerned that the Faculty Affairs Committee was adding too much to the *Manual*. If the resolution passed, nowhere would either document state that teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty. The language appears to make advising and mentoring, taken on their own and independent of teaching, weighted as almost equivalent to teaching. There would be a lot of information on advising and mentoring but nothing that said that teaching had to be of high quality or up to date. He is worried the change would put everything a little off base by concentrating on “whys” and “hows” without any mention of quality, rigor, or excellence in teaching. Rinehart was worried about the requirement of having all learning outcomes listed on the syllabus. He and Birdwell indicated that they each use personal growth learning outcomes that are not written anywhere. Both feel these are valid learning outcomes that really should not be listed. Heminway suggested that the syllabus isn't the only resource for students and that the language in the proposal does not indicate that all learning outcomes need to be expressly listed in the syllabus. Nothing currently in the existing *Manual* or the proposed revisions restricts the statement of learning outcomes to the syllabus. But the revisions require that they be clearly defined.

Thomas stated the suggested changes came from a campus committee on advising and his committee had “whittled down” suggested changes in this draft proposal. Birdwell stated he supported advising but the current changes make the weighting between advising and teaching unbalanced (in favor of advising). Thomas replied that the committee wants recognition that advising is an important part of a professor's job, but not more important than teaching. But the current *Faculty Handbook* and *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* do not currently mention advising at all. Anfara felt the new wording implied that there had to be some kind of evaluation of advising. Heminway said she had expected a much shorter insertion into the documents, perhaps referring to another document, rather than the current proposal (which still seemed like a lot of text for the point it is intended to make). As it is written, it appears to give equal weight to teaching, advising and mentoring.

Boulet moved to postpone further discussion on this motion to next year. Lyons seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Men's Athletic Report (M. Hamilton)

M. Hamilton indicated that he considers the move of athletics to campus administration as great. It makes good sense. We are building new relationships and hope athletics becomes more transparent to campus. He appreciates having faculty members as part of the Athletics Board. He gives good advice and counsel to the board and hopes he learns from them as well.

NCAA Sanctions. In February, the campus received official notice of allegations from the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). We have 90 days to respond. The report is due May 21. The Department has prepared documentation addressing both the general and the specific responses to the allegations in the notice. A draft of the response document is being prepared by outside counsel, will be ready for review in the next few weeks, and then will be sent to the NCAA.

On June 10-11, UTK will be in Indianapolis for an appearance before the NCAA. The contingent will include the Chancellor, Hamilton, and all named persons as well as the University's counsel. There is only one charge that relates to UTK as a whole and that is related to a failure to monitor phone calls made in the men's basketball program. All other allegations are related to people who no longer work for the University.

After the hearing, the NCAA has 60 days to respond. It may be August or September before UTK learns the results. The wait will be hard on the staff, athletes, and the community. Hamilton feels the two new head coaches we have hired in the past two years for football and men's basketball (Dooley and Martin) will set a new tone for Men's Athletics.

Hamilton believes he and the Senate share some concerns. The first is the real separation in the GPA and ACT scores of student athletes when compared to the rest of the student body. Student athletes need to have the ability to succeed academically. Right now, we have a great student success (graduation) rate of 75%, but as the quality of other students increases, the athletes may fall further behind. We are overhauling the Thornton Center to address this issue.

The second concern is the general economic condition. The country is going through tough times. Spending for athletics is discretionary; it is a choice. If we are not as competitive as in the past, then attendance at games may decline. If the football program improves, the impact will be lessened. According to Sports Illustrated, attendance is decreasing in all sports. For UTK, we see this in the decrease in ticket sales to visiting fans. Fortunately, we are experiencing an increase in income from ticket sales and in development activities for Athletics.

The third concern is the 24/7 media news market. This puts immense pressure on everyone.

Hamilton hopes he and the Senate can create a constructive working dialogue. The Senate and Athletics won't always agree, but both of us should be open to each other.

Birdwell said he supports the actions of Hamilton and Cheek in terminating the employment of the basketball coaches, but was surprised that people lying in an investigation left with any money. He wonders if Hamilton would share some of his favorite emails (referenced in the Knoxville News Sentinel on April 18). Hamilton replied that things are hard when the coaches involved had immense popularity and fan support. He had to have police protection for a few days after the announcement was made. The saddest part for him was the defeatist attitude in the emails he received. He believes the authors of these emails are wrong. UTK's team will improve, but it will take time. There was tremendous emotion in the events surrounding the men's basketball team this spring. Hamilton indicated that he is comfortable making hard decisions, however, even when they are not always popular.

Rinehart asked if the Athletic Departments would be looking at internal processes after these events. Hamilton replied that they had done so and will continue to do so. The NCAA investigators have complimented UTK on its compliance activities.

Hamilton stated he will be more proactive—invasive if necessary—with his coaches. In general, he doesn't feel they are trying to cheat, but the rules are constantly changing and very complex.

Appointment of Temporary UTFC Representative (J. Heminway)

Heminway reported that I. Lane has taken a position in UT administration and can no longer serve as our representative to the University of Tennessee Faculty Council. There are two meetings of that body remaining this year. Under the Bylaws of the Senate, “[i]f for any reason a representative is not able to complete his/her term, the Faculty Senate Executive Council shall elect an individual to complete the current year of the term.” D. Patterson narrowly lost the election to I. Lane last year. Heminway contacted Patterson and he is willing to serve for the rest of the year. Boulet moved and C. Myers seconded a motion to elect Patterson to the position. The motion passed unanimously.

Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics – Knight Commission Endorsements

The Knight Commission Report covers three issues involving college athletic programs: financial transparency, support for academic values, and treating student athletes first as students. Heminway asked that the Council support the endorsement of the Knight Commission Report by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), which was posted for review for this meeting. In response to a question, Cimino said he thought it would be possible to meet the financial transparency recommendations set forth in the Report.

Myers moved and Rinehart seconded a motion to COIA's endorsement of the recommendations of the Knight report. The motion passed unanimously.

TUFS Resolution (J. Heminway)

Heminway introduced the “Resolution on Shared Governance and Academic Freedom” as passed by TUFS. This would authorize TUFS to send a letter to the Executive Director of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the President of the University of Tennessee, and the Chancellor of the Tennessee Board of Regents asking them to affirm the rights of faculty members to engage in shared governance without institutional discipline. After a brief discussion, Birdwell moved and Rinehart seconded a motion to support the resolution. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Plaut moved and Birdwell seconded adjournment. The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:20 p. m.