



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

**FACULTY COUNCIL  
MEETING 24 - MINUTES**

**Wednesday, November 16, 2011, 3:00 p.m. – 4:15 p.m. CST**

A quorum of members of the Council met via videoconference.

**UT Faculty Council Members Present**

UTHSC	George Cook (Chair) Lawrence (LB) Brown (Faculty Senate President) Thad Wilson (Faculty Senate President-elect)
UTK	Vince Anfara (Faculty Senate President) David Patterson (Faculty at-large) Toby Boulet (Board of Trustees Faculty member)
UTM	Mike McCullough (Faculty Senate President) Jenna Wright (Faculty at-large) Janet Wilbert (Board of Trustees Faculty member)
UTC	Not in attendance
Guest(s)	Robert Nanney (UTM Faculty Senate President-elect) Katie High (Interim VP for Academic Affairs and Student Success) India Lane (Asst. VP for Academic Affairs and Student Success)

**Call to Order at 3:00 p. m. CST**

**Approval of Minutes.**

Dispense with the approval of the minutes from meeting 23, October 19, 2011 as no minutes were available.

**Order of Business**

**1. Strategic Planning Committee.**

LB reported that 9-10 task forces will be established to facilitate the Strategic Planning process. He requested the names of 10 representatives, who would be willing to serve on a task force, from each campus. He made an additional request for names from each campus. Each task force will have 10-12 people on it and meetings will be (likely) by conference call. The appointments will take place in December with work to be completed through January so that a report can be made at the next BOT meeting in February. There was discussion about volunteers being available and *willing* to work over the holidays.

**2. Library access/database access/online journal access**

The feedback thus far has been positive. The Library Directors have been pleased with the achievements that have been made by the new system person who has been negotiating contracts for the campuses. Each campus was encouraged to check with the Library Directors for the status on the progress if this contact had not already been done.

### 3. Handbook Retreat

There was a request for clarification on “who” decided which handbook topics were designated as *yellow* (to do now) or *green* (to keep under consideration). It was explained that these decisions were made collectively by those in attendance at the retreat.

There was mention that most campuses did not send their Faculty Senate Presidents, but instead representatives from campus with most background in handbook maintenance and revision. It was mentioned that as a follow-up High’s office will initiate a videoconference for amendments and updates from the individual campuses now that the campus have had time to go over the outcomes from the retreat.

Also, High and Lane are meeting with Legal to discuss the approach that needs to be taken to propose changes to the *Policies governing academic freedom, responsibility, and tenure* BOT policy. Success is dependent upon all the campuses, Legal, and Dr. DiPietro endorsing the change before the BOT meeting.

All handbooks have been reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success and recommendations sent back to each campus. It appears that when the control of a process is in the purview of another body, then that section of the handbook is being deleted and the policy or purview documentation is being referenced. (Entirely up to the campuses. Just a recommendation).

#### Faculty Evaluation.

Although the faculty evaluation section of the handbook at UTK and UTHSC has been removed from the Faculty Handbook, those sections must still be approved by the BOT since they include information related to a faculty member’s contract.

#### Non-discrimination statements.

UTK has been successful in referencing gender identities in their non-discrimination statement. Reference must be made to [HR 0220](#). Academic Affairs can send the language to the other campuses upon request. For routine handbook revisions in general, it was recommended that the campuses not be deterred by issues that have to go to the BOT.

#### Department Guidelines and Bylaws.

The question was asked if bylaws must be vetted by Legal. The guidelines and bylaws do not have to have Board approval; however, they should include language that indicates that when there is a conflict that BOT policy or campus Faculty Handbooks take precedence. Discussion followed regarding a department at UTK adding to its bylaws language about romantic or sexual involvement with students and/or staff. It has been recommended to the administrative academic officers on each campus that the departmental and college bylaws be reviewed regularly and be made available on line.

#### Promotion requirements.

There was discussion if there should be published promotion (number of publications) requirements for faculty. Due to the variability within colleges and between colleges it was determined that each department needed to maintain this in-house. A department can choose to look at the quality of the journal instead of the number of publications.

#### Board of Trustee Policy Issues.

Page 6, Section VI from the handbook retreat notes are all BOT policy issues. High and Lane are meeting with Legal to work through each of those issues. Do not expect proposals in February,

more than likely these will not surface until the June meeting. Lane asked if there was anything that was currently *green* that should be *yellow*? There was discussion about the Bill of Rights and Code of Ethics, with a suggestion that they be considered along with freedom of speech issues which are both going to be considered when Lane meets with Legal. Lane suggested the UFC may want to pursue ideas for a bill of rights in the meantime.

Chairs and Department Heads training.

There was discussion that there should be training made available to Chairs and/or department heads to facilitate communication with faculty. UTK mentioned that they currently have a [Procedural Handbook for Academic Department Heads and Directors](#)

Ombudsman.

UTK has language in their [Faculty Handbook](#) (page 42 of the document) that discusses ombudspersons. Discussion followed regarding the needs for ombudspersons and which campuses had one.

Next face-to-face meeting with President DiPietro.

February 28-29, 2012 is the next BOT meeting in Memphis. UTFC will be given f2f time with the President during those days. The meeting will be 30-45 minutes. UTFC usually meets the night before the BOT meeting. Additionally, April 11, 2012 is a TENTATIVE date for a f2f meeting in Nashville.

Amendment of the notes from the Handbook Retreat.

It was brought up that the minutes from the retreat contained questionable language regarding the "punishment" of disruptive or non-productive faculty (top of page 4). All present agreed that those were not the words used at the retreat and the notes will be amended to reflect the tenor of the conversation without the harsh language.

Department Head training revisited.

It was brought up that the conversation regarding department head training was never completed. Patterson moved that: *UTFC recommend to the President that the Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success work with the Vice Chancellors of Academic Affairs on each campus to facilitate department head/chair training.*

Second by Boulet. (final version following friendly amendment)

#### **4. Budget**

There was discussion how successful the Senates were with being a part of the budgeting process. The HSC, being a non-formula unit pursues budgetary requests differently than the formula units.

Lane offered that any campus wishing to know the breakdown of budgetary expenses can contact her and she will work with "the Ron's" (Ron Maples and Ron Loewen) to provide an accurate analysis of campus expenditures. She is currently working on completing the chart, for each campus, that was viewed at the TUFs meeting at ETSU. (This chart was added to the minutes from August 17th UTFC meeting). If UTFC would like "the Ron's" to come to a meeting it would be helpful if specific questions were compiled prior to the meeting so that appropriate information/documents can be provided to the group.

Hearing no additional agenda items the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm CST.

The next meeting will be by videoconference Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012 beginning at 3:00 CST

Respectfully submitted by  
Janet Wilbert