The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate
MINUTES
February 7, 2011


*Alternates: Christian Parigger for Bill Hofmeister

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS
Establishment of a Quorum (J. Deeken)
J. Deeken reported a quorum was present.

President's Report (J. Heminway)
J. Heminway's report was posted for review on the Faculty Senate website prior to the meeting. Due to a long agenda, Heminway referred Senators to the distributed report. If anyone has (or is asked) questions about the new policy on background checks (referenced in the written report), please refer them to Heminway and she will pass them on to S. Gardial and Human Resources representatives. She added that representatives of the Tennessee University Faculty Senates will have a short meeting with the Tennessee Senate Education Committee on February 9. Heminway submitted a list of issues of concern to these representatives, who include past Faculty Senate Presidents J. Nolt and T. Boulet (a current senator). She asked that senators mention to her or to Boulet, as the Senate meeting ends, any issues that they may have for the legislature. Heminway will report on the meeting at the March Faculty Senate meeting.

In light of the delayed arrival of the Chancellor and the Provost, Heminway suspended the order of the meeting and asked Vice Provost Sally McMillan to give her portion of the Provost's Report.

Provost's Report (S. McMillan)
S. McMillan then reported on the first implementation plan for the VolVision\Top 25 Plan. Her presentation is available at http://www.utk.edu/strategic-planning/docs/faculty-senate-presentation.pdf. There are five strategic priorities: undergraduate students; graduate and professional students; research/scholarship/creative activity; faculty and staff; and the resource base that supports the preceding four priorities (and more).

Currently the undergraduate student plan is the most advanced. To date, there are 12 metrics designed to help us “[r]ecruit, develop, and graduate a diverse body of undergraduate students.” The implementation plan for the undergraduate student strategic priority will be the model for the other four priorities. Action plans for meeting the metrics are also being created. Some of the guiding principles for funding the Top 25 quest include the potential for near-term funding, self-funding, modest investments, and increasing efficiency and effectiveness.

In response to questions about class scheduling, McMillan said that task forces are exploring options and will not just “try anything,” but make informed decisions about course scheduling options. Course scheduling impacts time to graduation. McMillan noted that while some programs, like
Engineering or Architecture are known to often take five years (or more) to complete, some students do graduate in four years.

The Chancellor is focused on funding the gaps between UTK and the aspirational Top 25 public universities.

McMillan indicated that not enough data is available about the Freshman Seminar program to indicate its effect on retention and graduation. However, there is national data showing retention is 25% higher for students who take similar courses.

Chancellor’s Report (J. Cheek)
Chancellor Cheek reported that he is working with the legislature on allowing a portion of the HOPE scholarship to be used for Summer School. There would be no funding effect of this move. A HOPE scholarship covers 5 years of classes. The Chancellor would like the legislature to allow up to one year of a student’s scholarship to be used for Summer School. This year, Pell grant funding is available to cover Summer School classes.

Pay raises for faculty and staff continue to be the Chancellor’s top priority. He has spoken about this with the Governor, the legislators, and representatives of the THEC. He will continue to talk with anyone who will listen. It is unlikely that any raises will be funded by the State. The only other major resource UTK has to fund raises is tuition. The THEC funding formula for next year will be the same as this year’s. UTK supports this since there is alignment between the funding formula and the Top 25 initiative. Campus administration is currently studying the tuition structure at UTK. We are significantly below our peers in the total money available per student—approximately $8000. There is a large amount (about $200 million) of deferred maintenance on campus. Most buildings have obvious upkeep issues. Most of the building currently in progress on campus is privately funded. The Chancellor tries to speak to the deferred maintenance issue at every opportunity.

In response to a question, the Chancellor stated his opposition to guns on campus. Eight state legislatures have introduced bills to allow guns on campus. He will express his opinions to the Governor and hopes it will not pass the legislature.

Provost's Report (continued) (S. Martin)
Provost Martin addressed questions about Summer School and the changes being instituted in it. This is a work in progress. The strategic goals are now being set:

a. Rising sophomores and juniors need help to keep on track for graduation.
b. Students “at-risk” need opportunities for early intervention so they can get into required courses.
c. Removing the cap on faculty funding for Summer School and giving control to the individual Colleges is important. Colleges should receive incentives tied to strategic goals. This year, all Colleges will be held harmless for Summer School financial effects.
d. Use of HOPE Scholarship money for Summer School is a key.

The discontinuance of the Russian and Italian majors is still under discussion. The Provost sent a memo late in the semester to the College and the Department asking about the balance of languages being taught, the faculty appropriate to teaching them (lecturers, tenure-track, tenured), and other related issues in light of changing global realities. The College and Department are required to respond on or before February 15.
The response rate was low for student evaluations of faculty teaching in the fall that were conducted electronically. In the spring, faculty still will have the option of requesting paper evaluations. A committee is looking at other universities' systems and processes for conducting online faculty teaching evaluations to ascertain best practices that will help UTK to increase response rates. The hope is that an “app” [application] that can be used from any smartphone or handheld device will be developed by spring. This would allow digital evaluations to be done similarly to the paper evaluations (at a set time in the classroom). Hopefully, this will increase the response rates to the paper response rates.

The Provost was asked about the possibility of a mini-term during the December/January break. It is being talked about. One possibility is to offer “cyber classes” during this period.

A senator suggested withholding grades until class evaluations are submitted. That is a possibility that needs to be discussed with students and faculty. In fall 2011, it is anticipated that all evaluations will be done online. Currently, students receive an email asking them to complete the evaluations with no follow-up. For this Spring, that process will continue.

Another senator asked if there has been a statistical analysis of paper versus on-line results? For example, with digital evaluations, it may be that only those who are highly motivated will respond. The Provost noted that there is a lot of literature on student evaluations. The Provost believes that she understands the issues involved well since she read every student comment on her colleagues in her nine years as a Department Head. She is accustomed to the yin and yang of student evaluations of faculty teaching. They are blunt instruments. We need peer evaluation and other ways to measure teaching effectiveness to supplement student assessments. Right now, however, we have to work with what we have. Discussion will continue.

**MINUTES**

**Faculty Senate Minutes**

A motion for approval of the minutes of the November 22, 2010, meeting was made, seconded, and approved.

**PREVIOUS BUSINESS**

**Faculty Affairs (S. Thomas)**

S. Thomas brought to the floor a motion from the Faculty Affairs Committee to approve the proposed change to the *Faculty Handbook* (regarding promotions to full professor) as distributed for and first read at the November 22 Faculty Senate meeting. No second was needed. The motion passed unanimously with no discussion.

**Budget and Planning (C. Plaut)**

C. Plaut introduced a motion on behalf of the Budget and Planning Committee to approve in principle the report of the committee on the Final Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Civility and Community. The motion was stated in the following form:

> RESOLVED, that this Faculty Senate (1) approves in principle the Report of the Budget and Planning Committee (“Budget Committee Report”) on the Final Report of the Chancellor’s Task Force on Civility and Community (“Civility Report”) and (2) directs that it be sent to the Chancellor for his use in evaluating and planning implementation of the Civility Report.

No second was necessary. The resolution passed unanimously.

Plaut then introduced a second resolution on his own behalf:
RESOLVED, that this Faculty Senate forward to the Chancellor the memorandum of Conrad Plaut to Joan Heminway dated January 18 2011 for further thought and debate in the UTK and UTIA campus communities.

S. Gilpatric seconded.

Plaut stated the memo asked for additional dialogue on the issue of a change to the student Code of Conduct. He noted that there is nothing in the memorandum that is incompatible with the First Amendment. He noted that FIRE (http://thefire.org/), a watchdog group on the First Amendment, ranks Universities and Colleges in a green, yellow, red category. Currently UTK has a green light. Most of the other institutions with a green light also have a robust policy on civility and/or community.

B. Lyons suggested a friendly amendment to the resolution on the memorandum.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the university affirms its commitment to academic freedom, valuing the rights of individual faculty members, staff and students on campus to engage in free speech and forms of expression that may be unpopular or may challenge social and political norms.

Plaut accepted the further resolution as friendly. A motion to approve the amended resolution was made by Plaut. Gilpatric seconded. The amended motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES
Graduate Council (M. Essington)
M. Essington reported on the November 18 meeting of the Graduate Council. The report comes to the Senate floor as a seconded motion from the council. The motion passed unanimously. See http://gradschool.utk.edu/GraduateCouncil/Minutes/20101118-GC-Minutes.pdf for details.

Undergraduate Council (J. Koontz)
There was no report from the Undergraduate Council. Heminway announced that the council met this week and minutes were not yet available.

NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
Faculty Senate Bylaw Revisions (V. Anfara)
V. Anfara presented for first reading a slate of housekeeping changes to the Bylaws. These included changing names or titles to reflect current practices. There was no disagreement voiced with the changes. The proposed changes will be moved and voted on during the March meeting.

Anfara indicated that there will be further suggested changes as the review of the Bylaws continues. These additional changes will deal more with inconsistencies, such as whether ex-officio committee members can vote. Another issue is consistency in wording. For example, various Senate committees describe membership in different ways such as “at least 8” or “no fewer than 12” members. He is working on making the wording consistent. These additional changes will first be presented to the Executive Council.

Campus Work-Life Survey (J. Heminway)
Heminway presented a motion from the Executive Council to approve in principle the “Results of the 2010 Campus Work-Life Climate Survey” from the Chancellor’s Commission for Women. The motion read as follows:
RESOLVED, that this Faculty Senate approves in principle the Results of the 2010 Campus Work-Life Climate Survey.

Since the Executive Council had already approved such a resolution, no second was necessary. The motion passed unanimously.

Report from the Women’s Athletics Department (J. Cronan)

Women’s Athletics Director Joan Cronan reported on Women’s Athletics. She described the three-fold purpose of Women’s Athletics as educational first, business second, and entertainment third. Why athletics? It teaches life skills, encouraging women to be the best they can be. 80% of the women in the top echelon of business were college athletes. Across America, $2 billion in scholarships are given to female athletes. She reminded the Senate that, in 1982, Title 9 gave women equal opportunity. It was exciting to watch what happened next to girls’ and women’s sports. The University of Tennessee and the University of Texas are the only two universities with separate Men’s and Women’s Athletics Directors. When asked about the effects of Title 9, she responded by saying she is often asked two questions about Women’s Athletics on airplanes or other public venues. (1) Does “SHE” [Pat Summitt] stare at you? and (2) “I have a daughter (or granddaughter or niece) who...” People want/expect the same opportunities for their daughters as they do their sons. That’s what Title 9 has done for us all.

Cronan believes the move of her reporting line to the Chancellor and his Council has been a great change. Athletics is the front porch of the university. She wants to keep it clean, strong, and inviting to all. There are 504 student athletes on campus; 221 of them are female. Of the 504, 61% are on scholarship and 32% are walk-ons. The average GPA for female student athletes is 3.28. UT has 10 women in various Halls of Fame. The first requirement of entrants is graduation. Of the 20 intercollegiate sports programs at UT, 11 are men’s and 9 are women’s.

The budget for Women’s athletics is $100 million. None of the budget comes from tax revenues. The income comes from: ticket sales (36%), donors (27%), SEC (15%), media (10%), concessions (3%), and other (9%). The Athletics Departments give $7-$10 million each year to the University. (C. Cimino explained that the lower figure takes account of the amount that flows back from the University to Athletics.) Cronan then mentioned several other statistics regarding the Lady Vols. Of the 1,734 Lady Vol athletes: 1 in 7 have been All-Americans; 107 received All-SEC honors; 122 were academic All-Americans; and 1,412 received All-SEC academic honors. Last year, 127 of 246 Lady Vols earned degrees: 67% had a GPA of 2.0 or higher; 33% had a GPA of 3.0 or higher. Lady Vol athletes have had 49 appearances in Olympic games. Cronan believes UTK does more to support female athletes than any other university in the United States. All women’s sports have a “miss a class/miss a game” rule.

A Senator questioned support of the Thornton Center. Support for that Center is given from the University and is part of the $3 million “back and forth” funds mentioned above. Men and women get equal support at the Thornton Center.

Lyons said he enjoys having athletes in his classes, but class attendance can be affected by games. Cronan says they look carefully at schedules to try to minimize class conflicts, but some will always be necessary. That’s the reason they so strongly enforce the rule to attend all classes when they don’t conflict with the athletic schedule. There are very few problems if professors are notified in advance of schedules.
Cimino stated that the $10 million returned to the University was state-wide, but that $9 million was to UTK. He confirmed that $1-$2 million goes back from UTK to Athletics and verified the $7-$8 million net return to UTK.

UTK is unique among U.S. universities in the high level of taxation of the revenues of its athletics programs. Florida’s totals are similar to ours, but no other state institution is higher taxed than UTK Athletics.

Heminway announced that Derek Dooley would attend the next Faculty Senate meeting and that Mike Hamilton would attend the May meeting.

T. Boulet moved adjournment. D. Atkins seconded it. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JoAnne Deeken, Secretary