



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE, CHATTANOOGA, MARTIN, TULLAHOMA, MEMPHIS

FACULTY COUNCIL

**MEETING 16 - MINUTES**

**Thursday, January 20, 2011, 4:00 - 5:00 p. m. EST**

A quorum of members of the Council met via videoconference, with delegations seated at the various campuses.

**UT Faculty Council Members Present**

- UTHSC    George Cook (Chair)  
          Richard Nollan (Faculty Senate President)
- UTK        Toby Boulet (Non-voting Faculty Trustee)  
          India Lane
- UTM        Mike McCullough (Faculty Senate President-Elect)  
          Dan McDonough  
          Robert Nanney  
          Janet Rasmussen-Wilbert (Faculty Senate President)
- Guest      Katie High (Interim VP for Academic Affairs and Student Success)

**1. Call to Order at 4:00 p. m. EST**

**2. Approval of Minutes.**

Minutes of meetings 14 and 15 were approved by voice vote.

**3. Discussion Led by Council Chair**

**(a) Promotional Raises.** Rasmussen-Wilbert reported on the new policy on promotional raises at UT Martin. The policy was drafted by UTM's VC for Academic Affairs and posted on his web site. It establishes as a guideline that for all faculty promoted to the rank of associate professor or professor "... base salaries will be increased 10 percent effective at the beginning of the academic year following the approved promotion," and states that "All salary increases based on faculty promotions will be institutionalized centrally as fixed, recurring costs." High noted that most campuses plan each year to set aside funds for this purpose. Cook noted that the UTM policy goes further by stating that the source of the funds is internal.

[Secretary's note: The remainder of the discussion on promotional raises is reported here, even though it took place after (b).]

Nollan noted that the UTHSC Faculty Senate President attends deans' meetings, at the behest of the Chancellor. The Chancellor will not fund promotional raises. Deans must fund them. Deans expressed support, but would not commit to funding these raises. At Tuesday's meeting of the FS Executive Committee, the Chancellor got an earful as to the importance of this issue. Although the Chancellor is still not committed to funding 10% promotional raises in the future, he did review last year's raises and found that some chairs have serious morale problems without these raises. McCullough stated that it makes sense for administration to commit to this to engender trust. Cook noted that 95% of his department's budget was salary, and cuts in state funds raised that portion. It follows that there is no way to get raises from state funds. Lane stated that the situation at the College of Veterinary Medicine is the same. Cook recalled that former president Gilley's goal was to have no more than 85% in recurring costs. High said that has not been discussed in about twelve years. Nollan said that deans are stuck with no money and faculty who want raises. Faculty are losing ground. The problem is not that they're not getting rich. High asked whether at his meeting at UTHSC, President DiPietro had indicated that raises are a first priority this year? Nollan confirmed that, but said that the needed action is to have a policy that mandates promotional raises. McCullough noted that the VCAA is the key at Martin. Nollan reiterated that the key at UTHSC is the Chancellor, and he will not dictate to the deans (unfunded mandate), and he will not commit to funding it himself. Nollan asked whether faculty will be involved in ongoing discussions of this issue? High noted that they will at UTM, since the FS President attends the Chancellor's cabinet mtgs.

**(b) Compensation Policy for 2011-2012.** Cook asked about the UT system's compensation policy for the next academic year. High noted that the system annually establishes compensation guidelines, which are technically not a policy. The CFO works with HR to draft the guidelines. The CFO has taken the guidelines proposed for next year to the Chancellors' videoconference, and the Chancellors have taken the guidelines to their campuses for vetting. The guidelines will be presented to the Board of Trustees in June. Boulet: No knowledge of the proposed new compensation guideline among faculty at UTK. Nollan asked whether the Compensation Advisory Board (CAB) is involved in discussions regarding the guidelines. Boulet replied that the CAB had not yet discussed the guidelines, but that he expected the CAB to hear of it at the CAB's February meeting. If not, he raise the issue then. High said she would also follow up and let us know.

**(c) Campus Climate Surveys.** Cook noted that in her email, Joan Heminway had raised the issue of campus climate surveys. Boulet responded that UTK has executed a campus climate survey and the results are currently being reviewed. No one reported such activity at other campuses.

**(d) Nature of the UT System.** Cook recalled that at a previous meeting, Council members from UTC had inquired about the nature of the UT system. Some faculty at UTC have been unhappy in the past with the way the system operates. Since UTC members were not present, no further discussion of this issue was held.

**(e) UTHSC Students Residing at UTK.** Cook noted that UTHSC is exploring the feasibility of having some UTHSC M1 and M2 medical students reside at UTK. Lane had read a task force report on that question. The Medical College of Georgia is doing the same thing. Students would be based in Knoxville but would receive instruction from Memphis. Perhaps

similar to what's being done in pharmacy. High had not seen an official proposal, but then she would not necessarily see it since it would not require approval by the Board of Trustees. Cook stated that UTHSC has asked for their approval for this sort of thing, because it's not clear what they're supposed to have to approve. The definition of "policy" is vague. High noted that the Board approves admissions policies. It receives "for information" an inventory of programs. It approves new programs. We give the Board much information on initiatives that do not require their approval. Lane noted that the Board might be involved in approving a system for choosing which students are located away from the home base of a program. High noted that enlarging the size of the class would be taken to the Board. Cook explained that the size of gross anatomy teams limits enrollment at UTHSC, so expanding the class could be done by having some M1 and M2 students located at Knoxville. Lane commented that the report she read on this issue is fairly detailed. Cook asked about the title of the report, but Lane was not sure of it. Perhaps it was something like "Task Force on Medical School Expansion." She knows a few members of the Task Force.

#### **4. Future Meetings**

Cook stated that we plan to meet at dinner on Wednesday, February 23, and have a meeting with President DiPietro the next morning. We need a room for the meeting. High asked whether the meeting with the president is on the president's calendar? She'll check. If it's not already scheduled, she'll ask for it. McDonough inquired about hotel arrangements for the next meeting. Cook will check with the UTC members of the Council. Lane asked whether the Board's agenda had been made available yet. High replied that it would not be ready until sometime after the next day's meeting of the Board's Executive and Compensation Committee.