FACULTY COUNCIL  
MEETING 20 - MINUTES  
Wednesday, June 15, 2011, 1:30 – 3:00p. 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)  
   Lawrence (LB) Brown (Faculty Senate President)  
UTK  Joan Heminway (Faculty Senate President)  
   David Patterson  
UTM  Janet Rasmussen-Wilbert (Faculty Senate President)  
   Mike McCullough (Faculty Senate President-Elect)  
   Dan McDonough  
UTC  Victoria Steinberg (Faculty Senate President)  
   Lyn Miles

Guest Katie High (Interim VP for Academic Affairs and Student Success)

**Call to Order at 1:30 p. m. EST**

**Approval of Minutes.**  
No minutes were approved. Pending approval: February 24, 2011, April 20, 2011, May 12, 2011.

**Order of Business.**  
1. Discussion of setting up a regular time that UTFC will meet with President DiPietro.  
   High will verify with President DiPietro’s scheduler that there will be time the day before the Board of Trustee meetings for the President to meet with the membership. These meetings are to be set in advance so that the UTFC members can plan to be in attendance the day prior to the Board meeting proceedings starting. These meetings will be in addition to and a part of the regularly scheduled UTFC meetings. Miles encouraged members to attend the open sessions of the Board meetings and meet the Board members.

2. Wilbert agreed to act as secretary in the absence of Toby Boulet.

3. Campus Budgets. Cook mentioned that there is little to no engagement of the senate in budget hearings or meetings. UTK and UTC indicated that both campus faculty senates have some input/involvement with campus budget hearings and approval. Cook reminded the member that President DiPietro had indicated that campus budget meetings were going to be planned on each campus. [Members were asked to share with
the group any policy/guidelines that outline their senate involvement in budget hearings or approval so that other campuses can pursue similar involvement. Deadline set was July 1, 2011]

4. Library Update. High gave a report on a recent meeting with the Chancellors regarding the library situation. Web of Science was discussed and presented as an option for purchase by the System as a collaborative measure which will decrease the overall cost of Web of Science by $30,000 over the next 3 years. The cost will be allocated back to the campus budgets (not library budget). There has been a person hired to evaluate system-wide library purchases. The librarians have compiled a list of databases purchased for review of redundant purchases. The Chancellors indicated that they are philosophically in favor of the combined library system, but it comes down to cost.

a. Miles asked that a plan be developed to include the other UT schools the next time a contract is negotiated that currently includes a school outside the UT system (Vanderbilt was indicated).

b. High reminded the members that President DiPietro has “enhanced library resources” as one of his accountability measures submitted to the Board of Trustees. (There was discussion whether or not this was a one-year or four-year goal)

c. Miles referred to the Galileo system used by other states. It was pointed out that this system is partly funded by lottery money.

d. Cook suggested that a request to go the legislature to fund a Statewide library system. Heminway suggested that this be brought up at TUFS. High mentioned that we “fee” the students for everything else, should we have a library fee?

e. High suggested that each campus pursue a resolution (or something similar) charging the System and/or legislature to evaluate this as part of the Complete College Tennessee Act.

f. Various members requested that each senate compile a report that will include what an “ideal” library system would “look like” and “do”, as well as what the current problems are that campuses are experiencing and possible solutions. Some problems identified were:

i. Faculty using “friends” to access databases, journals, and books in other states because they have the resources we do not have

ii. Graduate students using their access to databases and other research resources from their undergraduate institutions outside Tennessee

iii. UTC not having priority interlibrary loan status with UTK

iv. Loss of hardcopy journal subscriptions which also eliminated online access

v. Faculty purchasing Scientific Society memberships to gain access to the journals personally

vi. Libraries eliminating hardcopy journals and replacing them with databases that have limited access to archived (older) journals or the most recent volumes

vii. Libraries eliminating databases due to cost when that database was purchased to replace a hardcopy subscription that was eliminated

g. Miles suggested that there be a timeline for expected outcomes for this library issue. [Cook charged the members to talk to campus representatives (students, faculty, library directors, etc) and produce a report, by campus, which describes the problems experienced by the campuses. The report should include what we
expect the library system to “look like” and how we expect it to work, and list the problems and possible solutions. These reports are to be sent to Cook as soon as possible. Specific examples are important.

h. McCullough indicated that North Carolina library system is not funded (he believes) by lottery and includes the public and K-12 libraries. All the more reason to approach the legislature.

5. Miles would like to keep the diversity issue on the table for the next meeting.

The next meeting will be in July by videoconference. A date and time will be determined by member poll.

Respectfully submitted by

Janet Wilbert