



1-26-2009

## Faculty Senate - January 26, 2009 Meeting Agenda

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_fsmins](http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_fsmins)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate - January 26, 2009 Meeting Agenda" (2009). *Minutes, Senate Meetings*.  
[http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_fsmins/23](http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_fsmins/23)

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, Senate Meetings by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

**SENATE MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2009  
3:30 P.M. UNIVERSITY CENTER  
SHILOH ROOM**

**Agenda**

John Nolt, President  
Suzanne Kurth, Secretary to the Senate

Becky Jacobs and Carl Pierce, Co-Parliamentarians  
Toby Boulet, President-Elect

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS**

Establishment of Quorum (S. Kurth)  
Senate President's Report (J. Nolt)  
Chancellor's Report (J. Simek)  
Provost's Report (S. Martin)  
Report of Vice President for Agriculture (J. DiPietro)

**MINUTES**

Faculty Senate Meeting, November 17, 2008 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting, January 12, 2009 (information item)

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

Teaching Council Report on SAIS (E. Pemberton)

**NEW BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Discussion: Faculty Involvement with the Legislature (Hank Dye, Vice President for Public and Government Relations)  
Resolution on faculty reductions (D. Bruce)  
Proposed UTK Honorary Degrees Policy (V. Anfara)  
Proposed 2009-10 calendar (T. Boulet)  
Faculty Senate Elections (T. Boulet)

**ADJOURNMENT**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 17, 2008 (for approval)  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, January 12, 2009 (information item; will follow in later email)  
Resolution on Faculty Reductions  
Proposed UTK Honorary Degrees Policy  
Proposed 2009-10 calendar

**DISTRIBUTED BY:** Sharonne L. Winston, Administrative Assistant for the Faculty Senate  
812 Volunteer Boulevard  
974-2483

**PRESIDENT'S OFFICE:** John Nolt  
Department of Philosophy  
974-7218; nolt@utk.edu

The University of Tennessee Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
November 17, 2008

Absent: Lt. Col. Michael Angle, Alvaro Ayo, Roberto Benson, Stephen Blackwell, Bill Blass, Thomas Boehm, Bill Bradshaw, Marianne Breinig, Daniela Corbetta, Linden Craig, Steven Dandaneau, Ruth Darling, Jim Drake, Michael Essington, Becky Fields\*, Linda Frank, Glenn Graber, Jerome Grant, Lee Han, Bill Hofmeister, Nathalie Hristov, Becky Jacobs, Stephen Kania, Scott Kinzy\*, Murray Marks, Mike McKinney, John McRae, Thandi Onami, Natalia Pervukhin, Rupy Sawhney, Anne Smith\*, Montgomery Smith, Marlys Staudt, Johanna Stiebert, Steve Thomas\*, Patricia Tithof, Gary Ubben, Michelle Violanti, Peiling Wang, Pia Wood

\*Alternate Senators: Carole Myers for Becky Fields, Randal Pierce for Anne Smith, Edgar Stach for Scott Kinzy, Jeanine Williamson for Steve Thomas

J. Nolt called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### Establishment of a Quorum (S. Kurth)

S. Kurth reported a quorum was present.

#### Senate President's Report (J. Nolt)

Nolt indicated that the budget news continues to be bad and that at the same time we have been hit with escalating costs for electricity, coal and natural gas. These are in effect additional budget cuts. These cuts will in all probability entail layoffs of staff, loss of faculty lines and program cuts. There are four ways in which the Senate collectively and each of us individually can help: (1) Staying informed, (2) Anticipating and preparing for strategic program cuts, (3) Working to reduce unnecessary costs, and (4) Advocating revenue support.

Nolt announced that he has established an informal Senate working group to discuss budgetary matters and develop recommendations for the senate and for the new chancellor. The group consists of Matt Murray, Don Bruce, David Patterson and Toby Boulet.

Nolt said that program cuts may be unavoidable. The Senate, in cooperation with the Provost's office, has created a task force on criteria and procedures for program cuts. The members are: Brian Ambroziak, Toby Boulet, Carolyn Hodges, Susan Martin, Matt Murray, Lynne Parker, John Romeiser, Paula Williams, and John Nolt. He said that the caucuses should play an important role in the discussion and that we still do not have caucus chairs for Natural Sciences, Architecture and Social work.

Nolt announced the establishment of a new comprehensive Energy Conservation Policy. New daytime temperature set points are heat to 68; cool to 76. It will take a few weeks to get buildings adjusted.

*New Chancellor.* Jimmy Cheek will be on campus in February. He was scheduled to meet with some Senate Leaders in December.

*Ombuds Office.* Former Provost Holub wanted to have one full-time professional performing the role of faculty-staff Ombudsperson. Three candidates were interviewed and an offer to one of them was anticipated.

*Civility Memo.* The recent memo from Chancellor Simek was in response to hate speech and harassment incidents that had recently occurred. The Chancellor was unavailable due to a family emergency. Margie Nichols addressed civility questions in his stead. The incidents were not made public. Simek wanted to reinforce that the current times were positive ones and people should be civil. T. Wang inquired whether the incidents were related to the national election. Nichols said they were. Nolt specified that cotton balls were dropped in front of the Black Cultural Center and LGBT students were harassed at a football game. T. Boulet and Nolt met with the relevant commissions. J. Lounsbury asked if there was any evidence that the incidents represented trends. Nolt indicated that he was not aware of any, although the commissions perhaps were. Wang gave a personal example of the importance of guarding against subtle forms of discrimination.

Nolt was asked whether there would be a memo regarding the energy policy that could be given to colleagues. He indicated that it was a policy that would be announced to all. In response to a question about whether temperatures would be lowered in buildings over break, D. Barlow said it would be in buildings that were not occupied. Wang asked if football would be played during the day and Nolt reminded her that that is not a campus operation. J. Kovac pointed out that the campus has many windows that leak air and water making him skeptical about possible responsiveness. Energy conservation measures must take into consideration conditions in science labs. Nolt replied that exemptions were built in for labs, the library, and medical facilities. M. Clark asked whether the library would be opening and closing over break. B. Dewey responded that there would be a week of administrative closure, then it would reopen and then be closed for again January 1. J. Shefner asked about opportunities to propose cuts.

G. Fox said the reduction in faculty size effectively could have a generational effect cutting off opportunities to bring in new faces. She asked why there were not inducements for faculty to retire. Many universities were looking at retirement inducements for faculty eligible for Social Security (e.g., generous part time teaching, health). Nolt suggested that the Provost might address the question. P. Crilly made a counter point—new faculty members being hired at a higher market rate and requiring costly start-up packages. Nolt responded that the questions were ones that should be addressed to the task force, although they could also be sent to him.

#### Interim Provost's Report (S. Martin)

Provost Martin pointed out that there was a Chancellor's e-mail address to which anonymous suggestions could be posted, as well as a UT system one. The Provost's Office is engaged in conversations with the Deans about budget reductions. Support units discussions took place a week earlier. Budget reduction scenarios of 3-5% were developed, but the reductions could be greater. She had heard reflective ideas from both colleges and support units about conserving faculty strength, so there was concern about repeating the 1990s. She indicated that they were examining everything that the campus does. Simek scheduled budget hearings and a task force was in place. In response to Fox's questions about retirement inducements, she said the campus did not have a buyout plan and that at some institutions such plans have resulted in a brain drain.

The Effectiveness and Efficiency Task Force of the Board of Trustees was modeled on an initiative at the University of Maryland (which can be reviewed on its website). That university was proactive making some substantial cuts and in the process of doing so convinced the state to provide more appropriation. Contact has been made with officials at Maryland.

## **MINUTES**

### Faculty Senate Meeting

The minutes of the October 20 2008, Faculty Senate meeting were moved and seconded with the following correction: "J. Conant asked whether Hamilton would donate \$500,000 for the new Chancellor's use." Minutes were approved as corrected.

### Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting

The minutes of the October 6, 2008, meeting of the Executive Committee were available as an information item.

## **MINUTES POSTED ELECTRONICALLY**

### Graduate Council Minutes (V. Anfara)

G1279—report from the Academic Policy Committee. Social Work wanted an issue addressed that was not specific to Social Work, namely graduate students teaching courses approved for graduate credit. Social Work would still have to request exceptions to the policy, unless the students were in a post professional degree program. The vote was in favor of such a statement. (Anfara indicated he was out of town for the meeting.) Anfara said he thought the policy was not in the form needed for approval by the Senate. His understanding was the revision would limit teaching to applied courses, excluding courses such as theory and methods. A motion to return the proposed policy revision to committee was made and seconded. Motion passed.

The remainder of the minutes was approved.

### Undergraduate Council Minutes (J. Romeiser)

Minutes of the October 28, 2008, meeting was approved.

### Previous Business

Last year the Senate passed a resolution creating safe zones. A task force headed by Jane Redmond and Rod Ellis submitted a report proposing their development to the Chancellor and he accepted the proposal. J. Hall asked if everyone understood the meaning of the term. Nolt stated the information had been distributed.

## **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

### Faculty Affairs Committee (J. Heminway)

The Executive Committee at its November meeting approved a resolution modifying procedures concerning the reappointment of department heads. The Deans have the key role, but faculty members vote before a dean makes a decision on reappointment. A dean is expected to give weight to the faculty vote and also to provide a report to the faculty. The revision was vetted by the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and also compared with AAUP guidelines. Motion passed.

A second resolution addressed the timing of annual faculty evaluations for the Knoxville campus (not the Agriculture campus or UTSI). Evaluations would be changed to the academic year method and would be held at the same time as retention reviews. The campus is currently out of compliance with the Board of Trustees' policy that calls for academic year evaluations. Nolt noted that the resolution had been approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Executive Committee. J. Malia asked what the change meant for the transition. S. Gardial would hold workshops to implement the calendar shift. The next evaluations would be fall 2009 (instead of spring 2009). In response to a question about implementation, J. Heminway explained change would be effective immediately (upon passage). Motion passed.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### Athletics Committee (M. Holland)

Joan Cronan was introduced. Cronan recognized the activities of T. Diacon and M. Holland, as well as the public relations efforts of T. Carpenter, in charge of the power point presentation to be given. The athletic program is like a front porch, not the most important part of the structure but the most visible. Asked about Title IX, Cronan indicated it certainly was working at UT. UT has one of two programs with both men's women's athletic directors. She discussed the success of teams and individual athletes, as well as success in increasing attendance and revenues. Women's athletics is a \$16 million program. Men's and women's athletics work well together. Barlow asked Cronan her prediction for women's basketball. She replied that the team started off ranked 7<sup>th</sup> and that was not good enough for them.

### Report on Senate Effectiveness Task Force Survey (C. White)

C. White gave a power point presentation on a preliminary report of the survey. She discussed the strengths, weaknesses, and other perceptions designated by survey respondents. The need to work on working more effectively with other units was identified. Another finding is the Senate is seen as the recognized policy body. A number of respondents were unclear about the connection between the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils and the Faculty Senate; that is, they were not aware that the councils are Senate committees. The results indicate that respondents believed the Senate had an effect on administration policy, but Senators and non-Senators differed in their relative support of that belief. The Senate was believed to be important but communication was an issue.

She then reported on the qualitative responses. One problem identified was the campus climate in which there is mistrust on both sides. Some believe there are too many administrators on the Senate and that their reports take too much time. On the positive side, there was affirmation of the need for a Senate. White then discussed what could be called challenges. The Senate needs to be more proactive, e.g., looking at areas of policy where it could make a difference. On the other hand, the Senate does a lot of things it does not need to do, as there are some things over which it has no influence. Recommendations concerned the need to restructure committees and to address the problem of continuity (the difficulty of starting and finishing anything in one year). Related to the second recommendation was the lack of infrastructure. Barlow noted that the Senate received more than \$8000 but it was distributed piecemeal over the course of the year. It was noted that there was a 1/3 time administrative person and that both Councils have staff support to run elections, etc. Infrastructure could help with communication. A third recommendation addressed the long term need to be more proactive in creating an environment of shared governance.

Shefner pointed out that White's report focused on perceptions. He encouraged her to look at the crosstabs, as Senators might be incorrect in their perceptions and non-Senators more correct. It was pointed out that a number of committees have administrators on them. White stated that some faculty members reported they never heard from their Senators. She proposed that faculty do not realize what the Senate is doing. Shefner responded that he had been on the Senate for a year-and-a-half and still was not clear on what impact the Senate has. He noted the resolution passed earlier in the meeting had much clearer impact on the faculty. Wang agreed there was a need to be more proactive, but asked how Senators could be informed about actions so they would have the opportunity to be proactive rather than reactive. She proposed the need to consider how faculty members learn about issues. White responded that the Senate President was usually the link for policies coming down the road. Madden pointed out there was no Senate office unlike the University he was previously at that had an office. White noted the differential between what the Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate had. Nolt suggested that the Senate needed to make a list of accomplishments. Conditions would be much worse if not for the Senate. Last year the Senate considered a no confidence vote for President Petersen and in the meantime

things have improved. Nolt noted the appointment of Jesse Poore. The majority of the total resources allocated to the Senate (\$25-30,000) go for staff (S. Winston and S. Simmons) and the retreat.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Kurth, Secretary

## **Resolution of the UTK Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee**

Whereas the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is faced with the prospect of severe budget reductions for the 2009-10 fiscal year, and

Whereas at least partly as a result of our current inability to replace faculty who have left the university, many students are already having difficulties obtaining the classes they need, and

Whereas a 5% budget cut proposal from the Provost's office currently under consideration would reduce the money available for faculty salaries at UTK by \$4.4 million, about 40% of which would be obtained by not filling tenured faculty lines and about 60% of which would be obtained by layoffs of non-tenure-track faculty, and

Whereas more recent discussions suggest that the actual budget reduction will be larger than 5%, with proportionately larger reductions in faculty workforce, and

Whereas such a reduction in faculty workforce would further reduce the availability of classes for students, and

Whereas tuition increases and the uncapping of tuition are currently under discussion as means of addressing part of this shortfall, and

Whereas the Board of Trustees has in establishing the UTK Faculty Senate stipulated that the Senate may:

... consider, advise, and recommend to the chief academic officer, or, if appropriate, through the chief academic officer to the President, policies and procedures in other matters which concern the general welfare of the faculty of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, such as ... priorities for the University budget

and further that it may:

...consider, advise, and recommend on proposed policies regarding student life, rights, and responsibilities.

And whereas budgetary proposals affecting availability of classes are matters regarding student life and rights,

Therefore, the UTK Faculty Senate recommends to the Provost and Chancellor of UTK and to the President of the UT system that:

1. The first priority for the use of any increased revenue from the uncapping of tuition or tuition increases in Fiscal Year 2009-10 be to retain current faculty or to fill faculty vacancies, and that
2. Savings achieved by efficiencies or cuts in administrative functions be applied not to other administrative functions but to retain current faculty or to fill faculty vacancies.



# The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

## **PROPOSED POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON HONORARY DEGREES**

The Board of Trustees of The University of Tennessee (UTK) authorizes the awarding of honorary degrees to recognize individuals who have benefited the institution or society through outstanding achievements or leadership. The Board of Trustees has put forth criteria to guide campuses in nominating and considering candidates for honorary degrees. The University of Tennessee Knoxville (UTK) shall adhere to the policy as set out in the following procedures:

(NOTE: University of Tennessee policy statements are italic font; proposed UTK procedures are normal font.)

*A. Each campus of the University of Tennessee may award up to three honorary degrees each year.*

*B. University employees shall not be eligible for nomination during their employment. In addition, elected officials and University of Tennessee Trustees shall not be eligible for nomination prior to completion of their terms of service.*

*C. Each campus shall develop specific procedures for nominating and considering honorary degrees recipients. As a minimum, campus procedures shall include the following provisions:*

*1. A nominating committee shall be comprised of faculty (selected by the faculty governing body), the Chancellor/Provost, and the Chair of the Academic Programs and Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees.*

1. The Honorary Degree Nominating Committee (hereafter referred to as Nominating Committee) shall consist of the UTK Chancellor, the Chair of the Academic Programs and Planning Committee of the UT Board of Trustees, and five tenured faculty members selected as needed by the Executive Committee or Council of the UTK Faculty Senate.
3. The faculty members of the Nominating Committee will be appointed for a term of one year.
4. The Chair of the Nominating Committee shall be elected by the committee membership from among the serving faculty members.

*2. The nominating committee will receive and screen nominations and recommend candidates to a special committee of the faculty governing body.*

1. The process for nominating candidates will be available through the UTK website (Chancellor's Office) and nominations can be received at any time. Nominators must hold a current faculty appointment with UTK. Nominations should be sent to the Office of the Chancellor on the UTK campus and addressed to the Chair of the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee. All complete nominations must include:

1. A letter from the nominator and supporting documentation detailing why the candidate is worthy of an honorary degree from UTK
  2. The candidate's CV or a biographical statement
  3. At least three names and contact information of individuals who may be solicited for letters of recommendation
  4. The nominator's relationship with the candidate, including any potential or perceived conflicts of interest
2. The Nominating Committee shall consider all complete nomination packets.
  3. The Nominating Committee will consider individuals who have distinguished themselves in the areas of teaching, research, or service. Achievements of national or international significance, or outstanding and sustained service to our state or community, should be the overriding criterion for all candidates.
  4. Financial contributions to UTK or UT, or prior service as an elected official, shall not be the sole deciding factor in the nominations process.
  5. The name and supporting documents of any candidate recommended to receive an honorary degree from UTK by at least a two-thirds vote of the membership of the Nominating Committee shall be submitted to the chair of the Graduate Council, who will form a Special Committee (see Section 3.1 below) for the unit that best matches the achievements of the candidate.
  7. The Chair of the Nominating Committee will send a letter to the nominator of any candidate not recommended. Candidates may be reconsidered upon re-nomination.
  8. All members of the Committee are required to function in a confidential manner, respecting the privacy of all candidates; including those recommended and those not recommended.

*3. Upon concurring with a recommendation by the nominating committee, the special committee will submit the candidate to the Chancellor/Provost for consideration.*

1. For each candidate, the Special Committee will consist of five individuals: the head of the department in which the degree is recommended, the Provost and three tenured faculty members who are not on the nominating committee and who are appointed by the chair of the Graduate Council. The chair of the Graduate Council will appoint the chair of this Special Committee.
2. Based on the candidate's merits and compliance with the UT Board of Trustees' policy and UTK procedures, the Special Committee will vote whether or not to concur with the recommendations of the Nominating Committee.
3. If four or more members of the committee vote to approve the candidate, the name and application of that candidate shall be submitted to the Chancellor for consideration.
4. All members of the Committee are required to function in a confidential manner, respecting the privacy of all candidates; those selected and those not selected.

*4. Upon approval, the Chancellor/Provost will submit the candidate to the President for consideration.*

1. The UTK Chancellor, provided s/he approves the candidate, shall notify the

candidate to ascertain their willingness to accept the honorary degree and their availability to attend commencement exercises.

*5. Upon approval, the President will submit the candidate to the Board of Trustees for consideration.*

*D. The Board of Trustees will make the final decision to award an honorary degree.*

*E. The University expects honorary degree recipients to participate fully in commencement exercises, but exceptions will be made for extenuating circumstances.*

## 2009-2010 Faculty Senate Calendar

<b>Executive Committee</b>	<b>Senate</b>
August 31, 2009	September 14, 2009
October 5, 2009	October 19, 2009
November 2, 2009	November 16, 2009
January 11, 2009	February 1, 2010
February 15, 2010	March 1, 2010
March 15, 2010	March 29, 2010
April 19, 2009	May 3, 2010

# August 2009

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
26	27	28	29	30	31	1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31	1	2	3	4	5

Classes Begin

Executive Committee

# September 2009

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
30	31	1	2	3	4	5
6	7 Labor Day	8	9	10	11	12
13	14 Senate	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	1	2	3

# October 2009

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
27	28	29	30	1	2	3
4	5 Executive Committee	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15 Fall Break	16	17
18	19 Senate	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

# November 2009

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	2 Executive Committee	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16 Senate	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26 Thanksgiving	27	28
29	30	1	2	3	4	5



# January 2010

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
27	28	29	30	31	1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11 Executive Committee	12	13 Classes Begin	14	15	16
17	18 MLK Holiday	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31	1	2	3	4	5	6

# February 2010

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
31	1 Senate	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15 Executive Committee	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	1	2	3	4	5	6

# March 2010

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
28	1 Senate	2	3	4	5	6
7	8 Spring Break	9	10	11	12	13
14	15 Executive Committee	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29 Senate	30	31	1	2	3

# April 2010

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
28	29	30	31	1	2 Spring Recess	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19 Executive Committee	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30 Classes End	1

# May 2010

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
25	26	27	28	29	30	1
2	3 Senate	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12 Commencement	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31	1	2	3	4	5