



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Minutes, Executive Council/Committee
Meetings

Faculty Senate

10-5-2009

Faculty Senate - Executive Council October 5, 2009 Meeting Agenda

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_exmins



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate - Executive Council October 5, 2009 Meeting Agenda" (2009). *Minutes, Executive Council/Committee Meetings*.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_exmins/20

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes, Executive Council/Committee Meetings by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

UTK Faculty Senate Executive Council

Eighth Floor Board Room, Andy Holt Tower

October 5, 2009

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

Introductions

II. Review of Minutes

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of August 31, 2009 (Attachment 1)

III. Reports

President's Report (T. Boulet) (Attachment 2)

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

IV. Old Business

V. New Business

Senate calendar for 2010 - 1011 (Attachment 3)

TUFS' Announcement (Attachment 4)

BANNER

Process for allocation of funds donated by Athletics from proceeds of ESPN contract

Attachments

- 1 Minutes of Executive Committee meeting of August 31, 2009
- 2 President's report
- 3 Proposed Senate Calendar
- 4 TUFS' Announcement

Faculty Senate Executive Council
MINUTES
August 31, 2009

Present: Vincent Anfara, Toby Boulet, Marianne Breinig, Donald Bruce, Chris Cimino, Becky Fields, Sarah Gardial (for Susan Martin), Glenn Graber (for Ken Stephenson), Rob Heller, Joan Heminway, Laura Howes, Suzanne Kurth, Beauvais Lyons, John Nolt, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Scott Simmons (Graduate Assistant), Steve Thomas, and Dixie Thompson

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

Heminway asked to clarify the Faculty Affairs Committee report in the minutes of April 6, 2009, by changing it to "Joan Heminway noted a set of amendments to the Faculty Affairs Committee's resolution (proposed by Doug Birdwell) were passed by the Senate at its last meeting." She also asked that on p. 4 the paragraph beginning "Anfara," be modified to state "Heminway noted that when discussion on the PRRR Task Force started, she had raised concerns about the availability of quality comparable data." The corrected minutes were moved, seconded, and approved.

III. REPORTS

President's Report (T. Boulet)

T. Boulet announced:

- The first annual all Knoxville campus faculty meeting would be held September 21 at 3:30 in the University Center Auditorium.
- D. Patterson was appointed chair of a committee to search for an Ombudsperson. In the meantime, a temporary Ombudsperson is being sought.
- T. Diacon has taken a new position. President Simek has sought names of people to take on his role as NCAA faculty representative. Diacon's term will end December 31.
- The Faculty Senate Retreat will focus on two topics: budget issues and the potential reorganization of higher education in the state.
- L. Howes appointment as an at large member of the Executive Council was announced.

Boulet proposed no longer including historical summaries at the end of changes in the *Faculty Senate Bylaws*. J. Heminway explained that by keeping the former documents available online the information was available. B. Lyons said he thought the summaries were useful showing that it is a living document. He elaborated that there was no need to detail all changes made, rather he thought there should be a few sentences talking about the *Bylaws*. G. Graber pointed out that the summaries provide guidance as to where to look for action on changes in the Senate Minutes.

Provost's Report (S. Gardial)

S. Gardial indicated that Provost Martin was out of town. She thanked the Faculty Affairs Committee for all the work it did over the past year. She said the administration had heard faculty members' concerns about the need to follow procedures. The revised process is being reviewed with Department Heads. There was discussion with V. Anfara about having peer-to-peer training for Department Heads, drawing on the expertise of experienced Heads. There

were meetings over the summer about some changes that were not substantive (e.g., editorial). Some changes would come to the Executive Council rather than the Faculty Affairs Committee.

1) Revision of Family and Medical Leave.

A significant change in policy is proposed particularly for faculty on 9-month appointments. The revised policy was posted and the system questioned it, so wording was revised after consultation with the General Counsel's Office. Heminway raised several issues:

- Would people be able to find the policies, as they were variously designated as Human Resources policy and personnel policy? She wanted to be sure that people would be able to find them.
- She was concerned about policy references being made with no specific citations.
- She raised a specific question about the section referring to faculty members who arranged modified duties, noting that it said two. Gardial said such arrangements were not limited to two occasions. L. Howes asked whether usage of the verb "may" indicated that a Department Head might not give approval. She suggested substituting "shall," so approval was not in question.
- Heminway said she questioned repeating the 7-year rule, as she finds it problematic to repeat policy statements made elsewhere, as it is difficult to maintain consistency when statements are made in multiple locations.

2) Merger of two documents—one addressing spousal-partner hires and the other addressing opportunity hires.

- Gardial announced there had been 8 or 9 such hires in the past year. Lyons noted for clarification that the focus is on hiring, not on retaining faculty who may have long distance relationships. Gardial said there was no restriction preventing hiring spouses/partners of current faculty members, but recognized such hires occurred primarily during the recruitment process.

3) "Introduction" to *Faculty Handbook* (Attachments 5 & 6)

- Attachment 5 discussed previous revisions. With the new substantial changes, Attachment 6 would be used. Heminway said there were two procedures she could not locate (incorrectly identified). She also noted that the attachment only selectively included people involved in preparing the changes. She said she would prefer not including any than doing so piecemeal. Lyons noted the General Counsel's Office ensures that the *Handbook* is not in conflict. It becomes an issue of who is required to give approval. Gardial and others indicated that it referred to the process and that would include everyone. Howes asked about what was currently posted online, i.e., prior handbooks. She was specifically interested in what had happened to earlier versions. Heminway said she had asked S. Martin about the issue of previous versions and learned some were available only as paper documents. Boulet suggested a statement could be placed on the Provost's website telling people to contact the Provost's Office, if they wanted a paper copy. Lyons said the types of changes made to the *Faculty Handbook* had been refinements. More information could be confusing, as changes could be initiated in a number of ways. He argued that the two copies available represented the major ones. Howes supported the idea.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Appointments to Committees and the Executive Council (T. Boulet)

Boulet said R. Heller and A. Wentzel had agreed to serve as co-chairs of the Athletics Committee. Their appointment was moved, seconded and approved. The one change to committee appointments (R. Sawhney) was moved, seconded and approved.

Voting in Executive Council (T. Boulet)

Boulet said some people have more than one role and, for example, in the case of Lyons, two disparate roles. He consulted with the Parliamentarian about a person having more than one vote due to multiple roles. With no dissent it was agreed that the rule should be one person has one vote.

Guide for Collegiate and Departmental Bylaws (S. Thomas)

The assistance of S. Simmons in collecting information was recognized by Thomas. Nolt asked where the document would appear and was informed it would replace the document currently on the Senate website. Deans would be assigned responsibility for departments revising their bylaws by a specific date, for example January 1. Thompson pointed out that with the shift to fall evaluations, waiting until the end of spring semester might be better for Department Heads. Simmons noted that some Department Heads would not even give him copies of their bylaws when he was collecting them fall 2008. Gardial asked for advice on timing. Lyons said January 1 might be too soon. He said he had worked on this project since he chaired the Faculty Affairs Committee. He argued it was urgent to have them in place because such governing documents are important in tenure and promotion decisions. He thought the end of the academic year was probably a reasonable due date as faculty members needed to be at the table, too. Boulet asked about mid spring. Gardial agreed with mid spring, e.g., March 30. She noted in meetings this summer it was apparent that a lack of specificity is a problem. Heminway pointed out Lyons' role in having this process occur.

Position Paper from Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) (J. Nolt)

J. Nolt explained that the 10 universities in state systems had been engaged in major discussion about the possible reorganization of higher education statewide. In May a joint committee (Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) and University of Tennessee system (UT)) was created to explore how the systems might work together. No major change was proposed. Nolt asked Governor Bredesen in April about faculty involvement in any change to higher education. TUFS created a position paper. All points in the position paper were voted on, for example, having a unified library system that would produce efficiency due to the advantages of size.

In terms of large-scale reorganization, what has been tentatively put forward as having one system for four-year institutions, a change that would eliminate the need for the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), and another system for two-year institutions. The TUFS document was being presented at each institution for approval by its faculty senate. The document is non-amendable, i.e., it must be voted up or down as is, due to the logistical considerations involved in getting approval at all institutions. The first step to obtaining Faculty Senate approval on our campus would be approval from the Executive Council. Since the

document was approved by TUFSS, Representative Beth Harwell indicated she was interested in sponsoring legislation. She has met with Governor Bredesen since then. The plan was for all faculty senates to vote by the end of September, after which the document would be sent out as a press release, information to politicians, etc.

Nolt noted that the TUFSS paper was discussed at the statewide American Association of University Professors (AAUP) meeting. Howes asked about the vision of a common general education core curriculum. Nolt said the idea was to make it seamless. Lyons said at the June University Faculty Council meeting the idea of reciprocity was discussed, for example, reciprocity between UT Martin and UT Knoxville. He thought TUFSS was proposing a common curriculum rather than reciprocity. Lyons said support could be given to the general recommendation of TUFSS without being specific about changes to general education requirements. Nolt said the goal was to do things that would benefit students and save money. D. Thompson said she was supportive, but she saw the issues as very complicated. Nolt said the group wanted to initiate a process of rational reevaluation of the system of higher education in the state that involved faculty. D. Bruce said it might be appropriate to have a qualifying statement supporting the process, but not endorsing all the specific proposals. Lyons said the battle would be about having two flagship institutions. Boulet said an effort was made to write a document that did not get into "turf." One thing he thought the document did not address was quality, e.g., pooling schools with quite different graduation rates. He went on to say that it is clear that the current situation was inefficient. Heminway suggested one way to proceed might be to craft a resolution of support. Boulet said any statement would have to include in it the words "we endorse." Nolt pointed out that action had to be taken quickly to meet the end of September deadline. Lyons said this was a time when the Faculty Senate Listserv could play an important role by preempting unfounded concerns. Boulet suggested the resolution could be put out and discussion on the Listserv could follow. Nolt said the same thing could be accomplished by passing a resolution to endorse the position paper and then explaining why. Boulet identified two approaches: circulating the resolution via e-mail after voting on its appropriateness or simply bringing it to the whole Senate. Nolt said he preferred getting the support of the Executive Council (EC). If the EC endorsed the TUFSS document and it were then sent to the Senate, it would be accompanied by a resolution for presenting it to the Faculty Senate. Nolt moved that the Executive Council support the position paper and Heminway seconded.

Breinig began the discussion of the motion by asking what it meant to "endorse" a position paper. Nolt said the wording came from the TUFSS constitution provision requiring individual Senate approval. Breinig noted that EC members did not necessarily agree. Boulet said he thought endorsing the paper meant that the Senate wanted TUFSS to take the document to the Governor. Anfara said his concern was that the document did not emphasize *process*. Nolt said the process would ultimately be political. Anfara said he was concerned that the recommendations seemed so specific, that it was not process oriented. Nolt replied that it was necessary to have something to present. Bruce raised the question of the downside or risk of not supporting it. He wanted support to be framed. Lyons suggested emphasizing Section III—objectives endorsed by TUFSS.

Heminway said she saw it as a position paper of TUFSS, not of the UTK Faculty Senate, so she saw the Executive Council's role as a facilitative one. Boulet offered a friendly amendment: to distribute a framing statement for the Executive Council's support of the position paper before

the statement was placed on the Senate Listserv. The friendly amendment was accepted by the maker of the motion and the second. Lyons said there should be a link to the TUFs Constitution in the memo accompanying the resolution. Amended motion passed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

S. Simmons asked that everyone please *RSVP* for Friday's retreat.

Lyons said R. Heller had a photo exhibit at the East Tennessee Foundation that could be visited after the retreat.

Adjournment was moved, second and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

UTK Faculty Senate President's Report

October 5, 2009

The first annual all-campus faculty meeting was held September 21, in the University Center. About 110 people attended. A webcast of the meeting is available at the Chancellor's web site.

This semester's first brown bag lunch with the Provost and the Faculty Senate President was held on September 24 in the UC. Attendance was sparse.

The annual meeting of the Southeastern Conference Associated Faculty Leaders (SEC AFL) was held at the University of Kentucky on October 1 - 3. The Faculty Senate President represented UT at this meeting.

Next year, the Senate will have a new Graduate Assistant. Planning for this transition is underway.

The Faculty Senate President and the chair of the legislative task force that was active last year are discussing the role that the task force might play this year, and how that task force would coordinate its efforts with our new University System Relations committee.

UTK Faculty Senate

Proposed 2010-11 Calendar of Meetings¹

<u>Executive Council</u>	<u>Full Senate</u>
August 30, 2010 ²	September 20, 2010
October 4, 2010	October 18, 2010
November 1, 2010 ³	November 15, 2010 ⁴
January 24, 2011	February 7, 2011
February 21, 2011 ⁵	March 7, 2011
March 21, 2011 ⁶	April 4, 2011 ⁷
April 18, 2011 ⁸	May 2, 2011 ⁹

¹ In pertinent part, the Bylaws of the Senate state as follows:

The Faculty Senate shall ordinarily meet on the third Monday in September, October, and November during the Fall Semester and on the first Monday in February, March, April, and May during the Spring Semester. The President-Elect shall review the calendar one year in advance and adjust meeting dates as necessary. The pro-posed schedule for the following year shall be presented at the October meeting of the Senate and be published as appropriate.

Executive Council meetings typically occur two weeks before a regularly scheduled Senate meeting. This proposed calendar attempts to conform to the Bylaw provision and Executive Council needs as closely as possible.

Deviations are noted. All meetings are on Monday afternoons from 3:30 pm to 5:00 pm, with apologies to parents of school-aged children for whom this is an extreme inconvenience.

² This meeting is scheduled for three weeks before the first Faculty Senate meeting, rather than two. Labor Day, a national and UTK holiday, is the second Monday before the meeting. The Senate's annual retreat typically is scheduled near the Labor Day weekend (for the past two years, on the Friday before Labor Day). I suggest that we schedule the retreat for the Friday after Labor Day, September 9th.

³ I note that this is All Saint's Day, a Christian holiday. It may be advisable to move this meeting to November 8. See *infra* note 4.

⁴ I note that this is Eid al-Adha, the Muslim Day of Sacrifice. We may therefore want to move this meeting to November 22, although this is the Monday of Thanksgiving week.

⁵ This is Presidents' Day. Typically, UT has not given this as a holiday. The preceding Monday is Valentine's Day and (after sundown) Mawlid-al-Nabi (the Muslim holiday honoring the birth of Mohammed).

⁶ This is the second day of the Jewish holiday Purim. We can hold the April meeting on March 28, but we cannot move the March 21 meeting back to March 14, since Spring Break is March 14-18.

⁷ See *supra* note 6.

⁸ The Jewish holiday of Passover begins at sundown. I am assuming that our meeting will be completed before sundown, but we may want to consider moving this meeting to April 11. We then also could switch the May meeting to April 25.

⁹ See *supra* note 8.



TUFS

Tennessee University Faculty Senates

Representing nearly 10,000 university faculty at ten state institutions of higher education.

Phil Bredesen, Governor
State Capitol
Nashville, Tennessee
37243-0001

September 30, 2009

Dear Governor Bredesen,

In April I wrote to you, asking that Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) be allowed input into the impending discussions of the statewide reorganization of higher education. On May 4, Deputy Governor Morgan responded on your behalf, saying, "Throughout this process, the input from all relevant interests will be sought and thoughtfully considered. Your input, and those you represent, will be critical to our success."

Since May, the Presidents and other representatives of the TUFS faculty senates (the senates of all the UT and TBR universities) have been working to craft a response that is representative of faculty views across the state. After much electronic discussion over the summer, we met in Nashville on August 14-16 and drew up the attached Position Paper. Then during the following month and a half, we took this Position Paper back to our senates for their consideration. Five of the ten TBR/UT University Senates voted to approve the paper outright. These were Austin Peay State University, UT Chattanooga, Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee State University and East Tennessee State University. Four (UT Knoxville, UT Health Science Center, UT Martin and Tennessee Tech) declined to approve it. The University of Memphis endorsed the objectives of the paper but did not endorse the recommendations, though it called for "careful consideration" of the latter. In sum, a majority of the TUFS senates have indicated that they want this paper to be considered as a contribution to the discussions that you are now conducting.

Because, however, the Position Paper has met with objections from some of the faculty senates, I have appended to it a document entitled *Dissenting Statements*. The statements in this second document were prepared by the Presidents of the faculty senates of the four UT/TBR universities that endorsed no part of the TUFS Position Paper. They summarize the objections raised against the Position Paper by these faculty senates.

TUFS was created to ensure that thoughtful, carefully formulated university faculty concerns be made known to state officials, the media and the public. Our Position Paper and the Dissenting Statements represent our effort to do so on the issue of the statewide organization of higher education. We appreciate your willingness to consider our input.

If TUFS can be of any service to you regarding this issue, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Best wishes,



John Nolt
President, Tennessee University Faculty Senates
Past President, UT Knoxville Faculty Senate
Professor
Department of Philosophy
801 McClung Tower
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-0480
(865)-974-7218
nolt@utk.edu

Tennessee University Faculty Senates Position Paper on the Reorganization of Higher Education in Tennessee

I. Background

Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS), an association of the four-year state university Senates founded in April 2008, represents nearly 10,000 higher education faculty in Tennessee. It is an historic collaboration, involving faculty from the four campuses of the University of Tennessee system and the six universities of the Board of Regents system.

As the statewide reorganization of higher education became a topic of conversation in Nashville in 2009, TUFS sought to make a contribution. This potential reorganization was the central theme of TUFS' April 2009 retreat at Fall Creek Falls State Park. Two TUFS representatives, Ed Stevens (University of Memphis) and John Nolt (UTK) were appointed to the joint UT/TBR Task Force on Higher Education in the spring of 2009.

The purpose of this position paper is to lay out TUFS' recommendations for reorganization.

II. General Principles Endorsed by TUFS

As representatives of the faculty of Tennessee's public four-year institutions, TUFS' central purpose is to promote the richest and best possible education for Tennessee students and to provide for Tennessee's faculty the means to deliver that education effectively. Much can be accomplished toward these goals by the reorganization of the state's higher education administration, but only if all of us put aside, to the extent possible, traditional arrangements, political considerations, wrangling over resources, and regional or institutional loyalties.

TUFS also holds that higher education should be frugal with Tennessee's scarce fiscal resources. We seek to avoid waste and unnecessary expense in our teaching, scholarship, creative activity, research and service, and expect a Tennessee higher education administration that is responsive, rational, lean and efficient.

III. Objectives Endorsed by TUFS

TUFS holds that reorganization of higher education should achieve the following objectives:

1. **More rational and efficient organization.** The TBR system, for example, includes two-year community and technical colleges, a foreign language institute and six universities, five of which have doctoral programs. Those on the ground in the TBR system are frequently frustrated by "one-size-fits-all" directives from the TBR administration. A more rational organization might help avoid this.
2. **Faculty and student collaboration and exchange.** The breadth and depth of talent and expertise available in the TBR and UT systems is enormous, but institutional barriers prevent beneficial collaboration and exchange. Graduate students and faculty from each institution would benefit greatly from the ability to move between one campus and the other, but this would be extraordinarily difficult under current arrangements. Much more along these lines could be accomplished to the benefit of faculty and students if it were facilitated by a common administration.
3. **Research informs the education process.** Beginning in the undergraduate years, research informs the teaching and learning process. At both the undergraduate and graduate levels, education and research activities of each university should fulfill its mission statement and facilitate accreditations. Regional access to graduate programs is imperative for an educated citizenry and workforce, and should be maintained.
4. **Seamless system-wide access to library resources for students and faculty.** At present, each university negotiates separate licensing agreements and contracts for library databases and other resources for their library users. This process duplicates efforts across institutions, involving libraries, legal affairs, and purchasing departments on our campuses. Most importantly, it overlooks consortial buying power, which allows greater access to library resources.
5. **Better geographical distribution of programs.** Academic programs have grown up around the state for reasons that are often historical or political. The students of Tennessee will be best served by a distribution designed to deliver a rich array of educational services where they are needed. TUFS supports the reinforcement of programs that deliver valuable services well but are not now adequately supported and the elimination of unnecessary duplication within service areas but also the development of new programs where needed. These things require effective statewide administration.
6. **Flattening administration.** Higher education in Tennessee is administered at too many distinct levels, which are often too far removed from the classroom to appreciate the effects of their decisions on campus administrators, faculty and students. In addition to campus administrations, which themselves can be extremely complex, there are the two systems and their boards of Trustees, and THEC.

IV. Recommendations

In order to flatten administrative systems, better serve students, reduce costs and advance the other objectives of reorganizing higher education in Tennessee, TUFSS recommends that:

1. Whatever administrative structure emerges from the reorganization ensures the ability of faculty and students (both graduate and undergraduate) to move easily without institutional barriers among the various campuses. It should be easy for students to take classes at more than one campus while respecting prerequisites. There should also be a visiting faculty consortium that allows faculty to work at other state campuses. Achieving these goals will require coordination of academic calendars.
2. With respect to libraries, there should be a statewide catalog, centralized vendor contract negotiation, and centralized purchase of library resources, which facilitate broad access.
3. There should be a statewide common general education core curriculum.
4. Institutions should have interconnected IT systems.
5. It should be easy to develop joint academic programs that use resources from multiple state institutions.
6. Application for undergraduate admission to all state institutions should be centralized, leaving recruitment and acceptance to individual campuses.
7. Centralization of the following functions should also be considered:
 - Benefits -insurance, medical, retirement, etc.
 - Human resources policies and procedures
 - Purchasing
 - Research administration.
 -
8. As a further cost-saving measure, the proportion of campus budgets used for administration should be regularly examined.
9. There are several good ways to organize the governance of higher education in Tennessee. However, we suggest establishing a separate system for the community colleges and technical schools, and merging the Tennessee Board of Regents universities with The University of Tennessee system. The administration of the resulting university system should be located in Nashville. We recommend that each campus in the new system have a local advisory board that is unpaid, self-perpetuating, and dedicated to the interests of its local university. University faculty senates should be involved in all stages of the development of this new system.

Dissenting Statements

The following statements were prepared by the Presidents of the faculty senates of the four UT/TBR universities that endorsed no part of the TUFS Position Paper. They summarize the objections raised against the Position Paper by the faculty senates of these universities.

Tennessee Tech

After careful study, the Faculty Senate of Tennessee Technological University (TTU) voted 26 to 1 against endorsement of the TUFS Position Paper. The TTU Senate agrees with the need to make the state-level governance of Tennessee higher education much more cost efficient. The position paper failed, however, to make an adequate case as to why the proposed UT/TBR merger would be the best way to accomplish that. The TTU Senate also strongly objects to open-ended statements that pave the way for cutting programs and erasing the unique identity of each campus through homogenization and assimilation. Overall, the TTU Faculty Senate endorses the evaluation of options that seek to preserve the academic quality and distinctive role of each university, while reducing the cost of administrative oversight.

UT Knoxville

The UT Knoxville Faculty Senate voted NOT to endorse the Tennessee University Faculty Senates Position Paper on the reorganization of higher education in Tennessee by a vote of 43 AGAINST the endorsement, 9 FOR. During discussion of the TUFS paper, several objections were raised. These focused primarily on the recommendations of the paper rather than the objectives. As consequences and costs of the recommendations had not been thoroughly investigated, several of them were considered to be premature. These included interconnection of IT systems, centralization of library services, centralization of research administration and merging of the TBR and UT systems. There was also objection to one of the TUFS paper's objectives, namely, regional access to graduate programs. The specific objection relates to the need to provide high-quality programs. While it may be possible to provide some programs in a variety of locations across the state, it is not likely that the State can afford this approach for the more expensive programs, such as medicine and engineering. If the state were to adopt the "regional access" guideline in a way that dilutes the quality of its best programs, our ability to compete with our neighboring states for the best students would be jeopardized. The highest six-year graduation rate in the state is at UTK, and that is far below the rates in Georgia and North Carolina. Having programs of high quality, rather than proliferation of mediocre programs, is Tennessee's best chance for attracting the best students. To reorganize in a way that ignores this will not serve the State well in the long run.

UT Martin

The UT Martin Faculty Senate voted NOT to endorse the Tennessee University Faculty Senates Position Paper on the reorganization of higher education in Tennessee by a vote of 52 AGAINST the endorsement, 0 FOR, and 2 absent. Furthermore, the Faculty Senate voted to adopt the following statement:

The Faculty Senate at the University of Tennessee at Martin strongly objects to the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) Position Paper. Any reorganization of the higher education system in Tennessee must be done for the benefit of the students and citizens of Tennessee and must take into account the effectiveness of the individual institutions. The quality of performance of an institution can be measured using graduation rates, retention rates, and alumni satisfaction surveys. If the goal of a reorganization proposal is to save money, then the savings should be significant and quantifiable; yet the TUFS Position Paper fails to provide a single metric or piece of data to support the proposal. The TUFS Position Paper also seeks a one-size-fits-all solution by asking for unified schedules, curriculum core, and interchangeable faculty, but Tennesseans deserve a strong, effective, and diverse collection of institutions. Finally, TUFS proposes flattening administration by creating layers of bureaucracy. We only support changes which will improve the education of our students, the universities' support of our communities, and the most effective uses of state revenue.

UT Health Science Center

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee of the University of Tennessee Health Science Center Faculty Senate met on September 3, 2009 to review, discuss and vote on endorsement of the TUFs position paper on Reorganization of Higher Education in Tennessee. The FSEC voted not to endorse the TUFs position paper — 2 votes in favor and 7 votes opposed. The paper was then sent to each senator for review. On Tuesday, September 8, in the Faculty Senate meeting, the reasons for the FSEC vote not to endorse the position paper were stated and discussed. There was no floor motion from any senator to reconsider or to bring the paper to a further vote for endorsement by the full Senate.

The FSEC, representing the UTHSC Faculty Senate, based its vote not to endorse the TUFs position paper primarily on the following points.

Objectives

It is accepted that more efficient administration would help higher education, but from the UTHSC perspective, a merger to one state administration for all universities is not a logically derived or proven conclusion. There are equally valid arguments for separate state university systems that serve different purposes and come in different flavors. In fact, the first objective of the paper speaks to the frustration of a “one-size-fits-all” directive from a single administration that is over distinctly different educational institutions. One could easily see this same complaint if there were one administration over all the Tennessee Universities.

The objective regarding faculty and student collaboration and exchange sounds fine. Collaborations and exchange are beneficial and they do happen between Tennessee Universities within the present structure. Might this be facilitated by a common administration? Maybe. But the benefit of graduate students and faculty moving between one campus and the other is not defined and thus unsupportable. What exactly does “move between” mean? Are we talking about a summer month in a colleague’s lab, or a two-year change in affiliation and appointment? One could envision enormous difficulties in implementing such a policy or process.

Recommendations

Many of the recommendations in the paper are actually the reverse of the way we sense the UT system (and the State) moving. Dr. Simek in his visit to UTHSC was talking of more autonomy for the UT campuses, not increased centralization of the System.

1. This idea of students and faculty “moving” between campuses is very ill defined and seems fraught with difficulties, if not downright impossibilities. From the UTHSC perspective, coordination of academic calendars would be impossible, and we doubt it could be achieved even at the undergraduate level.

2. System-wide access to library resources is a reasonable and beneficial goal. However, centralized purchasing of resources can again move to a one-size-fits-all theme that is not beneficial to the specialized needs of a health science center library.

7. Again, because of the distinct nature and mission of the Tennessee Universities, and specifically the unique aspects of professional education at a health science center, centralization of human resources, purchasing and particularly research administration are viewed as detrimental to the achievement of individual university goals and needs.

8. This recommendation is true not only for administration, but also for education, research, campus security, capital maintenance, etc. Each aspect of a university’s function should be examined regularly for further cost-saving measures.

9. The UTHSC Senate cannot support the recommendation of a merging of TBR and UT systems without evidence that having a single administration would in fact bring about increased efficiencies and at the same time preserve and promote the distinct character, mission and stature of the separate Tennessee Universities.

The bottom line is that the basic idea of more efficiency is something that all agree with, but this paper seems overreaching and impractically (both logistically and politically) in its more specific objectives and recommendation.

Senate Votes on TUFS Position Paper

Institution	Date	Result	For	Against
Austin Peay SU	August 28, 2009	Yes	42	1
UT Chattanooga	September 3, 2009	Yes	22	1
UTHSC	No vote	No		
UTK	September 14, 2009	No	9	43
Tennessee Tech	September 14, 2009	No	1	26
MTSU	September 14, 2009	Yes	Unanimous	
UT Martin	September 15, 2009	No	0	52
University of Memphis	September 15, 2009	Yes	Unanimous approval for objectives and for "careful consideration" of recommendations	
TSU	September 17, 2009	Yes	22	2
ETSU	September 21, 2009	Yes	34	10