



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE, CHATTANOOGA, MARTIN, TULLAHOMA, MEMPHIS

FACULTY COUNCIL

MEETING 7 - MINUTES

January 7, Drury Inn & Suites – Nashville Airport, Nashville, TN

January 8, UT Office of State Relations, 226 Capitol Boulevard Suite 212, Nashville, TN

Members Present:

UTK	Toby Boulet, Faculty Senate President- Elect (representing John Nolt)
UTC	Pedro Campa, Faculty Senate President; H. Lyn Miles, Representative
UTHSC	Karen Johnson, Faculty Senate President; George Cook, Representative
UTM	Daniel McDonough, Representative
Trustees	John Schommer, Voting Faculty Trustee
President	John Petersen (Jan 8 11:00 a.m. meeting only)
Vice President	Bonnie Yegidis (Jan 8 11:00 a.m. meeting only)

Quorum Yes

Others Present: Director of State Relations Anthony Haynes (Jan 8 11:00 a.m. meeting only)

Members Not Present:

UTK	Beauvais Lyons, Representative
Trustee	Verbie Prevost, UTC Nonvoting Faculty Trustee
UTK	John Nolt, Faculty Senate President
UTM	Kathy Evans, Faculty Senate President

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Lyn Miles called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. at the Drury Inn & Suites Nashville Airport. The members present were the campus representatives to the Council.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Toby Boulet moved and Dan McDonough seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting which were distributed to Council members prior to the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

3. WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS

Lyn Miles welcomed new members Karen Johnson, Faculty Senate President of the UT Health Sciences Center, and Kathy Evans, Faculty Senate President of UT Martin (not present). She also welcomed UT Knoxville Faculty Senate President-Elect Toby Boulet, who was representing Faculty Senate President John Nolt who could not attend.

4. CAMPUS REPORTS

Lyn Miles received the Campus Reports for UTK which were distributed to the Council via email. Other campus issues discussed included proliferation of administration, layoffs, staff changes, budget cuts, and savings, and the need for transparency in budget cuts from both academic and nonacademic areas. Lyn Miles reminded members to submit their reports prior to the meeting.

5. UT WEBSITE

Lyn Miles requested that Council members, whose still need to be added to the UTFC website, send their photos immediately to Beauvais Lyons so our website can be completed.

6. TASK FORCE REPORT

Lyn Miles acknowledged receiving the Task Force Report from Beauvais Lyons which was circulated among Council members.

7. FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS

Toby Boulet reported that he had attended the Southeastern Conference of Academic Faculty Leaders (SECAFL). The SECAFL is in a formative stage and Boulet recommended that the UT system Faculty Council, and not an individual campus, should form a process for representation on the SECAFL. The Council agreed to propose such a process at its next meeting. Boulet further reported that John Nolt had attended the Tennessee University Faculty Senates meeting in August 2008 at Montgomery Bell State Park. The TUFSS meeting discussed the TBR furlough plan. Toby Boulet announced that the next TUFSS meeting would be April 3-5, 2009 at Fall Creek Falls, and for more information to contact ss@utk.edu. Toby Boulet moved and Pedro Campa seconded the recommendation to have at least one representative from the UT system attend the TUFSS meeting. The motion passed unanimously by consensus.

Recommendation Meeting 7.1: At least one UT system faculty representative will be at the TUFSS meeting.

8. UT BUDGET & ECONOMIC CRISIS

The Council discussed the growing political possibility of the Governor combining the UT system, Board of Regents system, and Tennessee Higher Education Commission to represent higher education in the future, especially given budget cuts and the current economic crisis.

The Council also engaged in a general discussion of current and proposed budget cuts and their effect on the UT system, including: administrative and academic program cuts; Board of Trustees concerns about the consequences of firing tenured faculty members; “golden parachutes” and other voluntary attrition offers; incentives for faculty retention and comparable offers; statewide perceptions of the UT system; and the current and future academic mission of the UT system. The Council members agreed that the Faculty Senates of each campus should make their faculty members aware of AAUP Guidelines on faculty and program discontinuance and financial exigency.

Karen Johnson provided a draft document, “UTHSC Version OF Academic Discontinuance Framework, University of Tennessee, 2009” (attached as an Appendix to these Minutes), which

had been provided on her campus. Johnson stated that she felt that some faculty positions would be terminated as a result. Council members expressed concern about program discontinuance procedures being a substitute for due process required by declarations of financial exigency. The Council stressed the importance of closely examining the UT system, whose budget equals an individual campus within the system.

Toby Boulet moved and Karen Johnson seconded a recommendation regarding program termination which was passed unanimously by consensus:

Recommendation Meeting 7.2: Each UT Campus should create a committee balanced between faculty and administration to review and propose administrative and academic program cuts. Significant administrative cuts should precede academic program cuts. This committee should be inserted into any procedures outlined in the academic program discontinuance framework plan as the first step.

George Cook moved and Karen Johnson seconded a further recommendation regarding the UT system which passed unanimously by consensus:

Recommendation Meeting 7.3: A system-wide faculty and administrative committee should review appropriate cuts at the system level.

The Council discussed the goals, purpose, and future of the UT system and its campuses. Pedro Campa stated that education and scholarship should be paramount and that sterile cuts like a Wal-Mart store inventory should not be made without regard for the essential and traditional elements of a strong university.

Toby Boulet moved and George Cook seconded a recommendation regarding the overall approach to continuing budget cuts which was passed unanimously by consensus:

Recommendation Meeting 7.4: As we consider budget cuts, we need to think strategically and be guided broadly by what kind of university we want to be, by building both on the traditions of the past as well as meeting the needs of the 21st century.

-----MEETING SUSPENSION-----

The meeting was suspended at 10:00 p.m., and was resumed at 8:00 a.m. on January 8, the next morning, at the Drury Inn & Suites Nashville Airport, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Council resumed its discussion of UT system budget cuts and the state's fiscal crisis, including buy-out packages and furloughs, and disposition of faculty coming up for tenure.

-----MEETING SUSPENSION-----

The meeting was suspended at 9:30 a.m., and was resumed at 11:00 a.m. at the UT Office of State Relations in downtown Nashville, where we were joined by President John Petersen, Vice President Bonnie Yegidis, and Anthony Haynes, Director of State Relations.

The Council continued its discussion of various aspects of the proposed plan for discontinuance of academic programs. Bonnie Yegidis distributed a plan draft to Council members. The Council presented its recommendations formulated in the previous sessions and stressed the importance of a first step in the plan to be a joint faculty and administrative committee on each campus.

Lyn Miles asked about the programmatic units which would be considered, and Yegidis replied that the proposal was to use the CIP codes developed by the National Center for Education Statistics. These codes list programmatic areas and subcategories and Council members and their faculties were advised to visit the National Center for Education Statistics website which lists the codes at: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/>. Yegidis stated that the UT system would utilize sub-codes as well as major headings, e.g., “ancient history,” as well as “history.”

Karen Johnson asked about voluntary retirement packages, how lists of possible candidates might be created, and whether the UT system was considering an open call for those who might be interested in such packages. Bonnie Yegidis replied that the current packages have limited attractiveness for most faculty but individual negotiations currently exist, but we have to be careful not to single out older faculty. Pedro Campa asked if it is illegal to offer negotiations with individuals and not groups. Bonnie Yegidis replied that you can give incentives but cannot force retirement. Yegidis stressed that any conversions from 12 to 9 month faculty should be voluntary.

Karen Johnson asked about across the board furloughs. Bonnie Yegidis reported that her office had considered furloughs only for those faculty and administrators making over \$100,000 in income, but the UT Legal office recommended against this proposal. The salary change and furlough decision will be made at the individual campus level as a recommendation, and the final decision on salary reduction will be made by the Board. Yegidis reported that the UT system is trying to preserve jobs and improve salaries as much as possible. George Cook asked if it is better to take a furlough by day or by a week, or month. Bonnie Yegidis confirmed that a faculty member can be furloughed on Saturday and Sunday so it does not affect a teaching schedule.

Lyn Miles asked about system cuts. Bonnie Yegidis replied that the UT system was very lean—she has only a secretary that that the UT system is lean compared with other institutions. George Cook reported that that is not true of campuses, and that there has been an expansion of high administrators at the campus level.

Pedro Campa raised the issue of duplication in the UT system, e.g., travel disbursements which are done at the campus level and then rechecked at the system, and that UT should streamline the process. Bonnie Yegidis reported that as a cost saving measure, UT libraries will move toward central contracting. It will cost \$90K to purchase backfiles of science databases for UTM and UTC to update their libraries with UTK and share the UTK subscription.

John Petersen joined the meeting and stressed that the UT system should work with the UT Board of Trustees and bring them on board with cuts recommended by the central administration. Petersen said that the cuts were serious and unavoidable and would likely increase over several additional years. This has created a significant challenge for the UT system.

With regard to Recommendation 7.2 calling for a joint faculty-administrative committee to determine cuts and that “significant administrative cuts should precede academic program cuts,” John Petersen raised the issue of the core university, and reported that administrative cuts will exceed the academic program cuts, e.g., existing salary cuts, but not to point of not being able to operate the system.

John Schommer asked how the ratio of UT administrative salaries and faculty salaries compared with similar universities. John Petersen reported that the national benchmark is 10%. He stated that UT is currently a little under 10%. Karen Johnson asked for the statistics at each campus level, and Petersen replied that those would be provided.

John Petersen went on to report that the UT system is cutting 17.7% of the budget and that is a huge chunk. He described minimization of duplication of services, e.g., IT, reporting that savings and better service will result. John Schommer mentioned that at a recent Board of Trustees Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness teleconference, Trustee Andrea Lowry stated that the UT system has too much administration. John Petersen replied that the Space Institute does not have a large administration and that all degrees go through Knoxville. In the future, the Space Institute will be reviewed and better connected to Oak Ridge.

John Petersen stressed that we need to cut strategically and not across the board so that you can keep focus on a good university. Petersen stated that the “process piece” is important in determining the cuts. Faculty leaders will have to be strong. But if you establish a process and metrics, it doesn’t take away the pain, but the process decisions will be based on something and not just knee jerk, and will be best for the University. Petersen said that all jobs are at risk.

The Council discussed the student population served by UT. George Cook asked how many graduates stay in Tennessee, and how many are leaving. John Petersen said that some programs, e.g., nursing, may have to increase the number of students to meet national standards. There will be larger classes as well, and perhaps research faculty doing more teaching.

Pedro Campa stated that metrics sometimes runs directly against tradition and intangibles. The danger of bean counting is that something like electrical engineering would be vital for an area with TVA, but the actual figures of the program may reflect low enrollment. How do you weigh student numbers against possible role in the community?

John Petersen responded that there are economies of scale that we can do, e.g., forming consortiums in better organized ways around the state, and expand distance education so you don’t do everything at every place in the state.

John Schommer stated that UTM faculty are asking why are we operating certain centers. Anthony Haynes explained that there is a political emphasis on having these programs decentralized and we may be targeting nontraditional students or have other ways to get the college graduation rates up. Students today learn differently and we need to increase the state’s educational attainment.

Haynes also discussed the recent University of Memphis bid to become independent out of Board of Regents. John Petersen responded by pointing out the advantage of UT is we are statewide, while the University of Memphis is based only in Shelby County. George Cook asked about how the possible status of Memphis as an independent campus would impact UT. Petersen replied that its funding would come primarily from Shelby County.

Karen Johnson stressed that when we evaluate programs, to take all aspects of the programs into consideration, not just grant revenues and nature of students, e.g., value, service to the university as well as direct dollar cash production. John Petersen stated that campus is going to have to make individual decisions on what overall is best for the University. Petersen stated that we are going to lose some things we don't want to lose. It has to be holistic, not just dollars, but tough decisions will have to be made.

Toby Boulet suggested that the academic program discontinuance plan have a sentences added to the opening paragraph that mentioned intangibles of university education and academic life be considered, and Bonnie Yegidis and John Petersen agreed. Boulet also raised the issue of the Board of Trustee Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness and their own list of guidelines for budget cuts. John Petersen replied that we need the Committee in the same boat with us in determining the budget cuts, but the University must drive the agenda not the Board. We can take some suggestions and be more efficient, but it is a parallel process and will depend on how each of our campus units does its job.

Lyn Miles asked about the UT private airplane. John Petersen responded that UT had spent a lot in airline charters in the past, and was now using teleconferences. Petersen said that the plane is needed, especially in transportation from Memphis to Knoxville, and Bonnie Yegidis added that the commercial airfare is often \$700 or more.

Karen Johnson reminded the Council that in any program discontinuance we must follow the Faculty Handbook of each campus. There is concern among campus faculty about singling out faculty for targeting. John Petersen replied that the use of CIP code categories will avoid this, although certain codes might affect just one individual.

Toby Boulet raised the issue of how bad would conditions have to get before some of John Petersen's key project initiatives would be terminated. John Petersen responded that Oak Ridge is one of our biggest assets, and that UT is not just a science/technology institution, but needs to take advantage of our assets. "Bang for the buck" is a big factor. You don't carve academic programs and put everything into science and technology, but if you can make something that is good, excellent, go in that direction. Boulet voiced the concern that some of these initiatives do not help campuses deliver their education mission. He raised the issue of how you make Oak Ridge "help" the UTK faculty, for example.

Anthony Haynes reported that the Governor's passion is the economic develop of the state. Hayes stated that the legislative and citizen view is that we should use the UT institution to help the state, not vice versa, and that faculty need to keep this in mind.

John Petersen stated that cuts are going to happen, but they need to be on our terms. We have to work together, and make sure the institution's integrity is maintained, as best as possible. Petersen likened the process to making sausage, saying "making sausage is going to be ugly." Lyn Miles stated that the Faculty Council will work with Peterson on these plans and the issue of continuing budget cuts, and Petersen reiterated that the cuts were going to be tough.

9. PLANS FOR NEXT MEETING

Lyn Miles announced that the Council would continue to try to have at least two face to face meetings with the UT President, out of the minimum of three meetings required each year by the Council Charter, and that these meetings would be in association with the UT Board of Trustees meetings, wherever possible. This arrangement would ensure good networking among Council members, face to face contact with UT administration, an opportunity to engage in discussions with Board of Trustee members, and a travel savings for Council members who also serve as Faculty Trustees.

The schedule for the next Council meetings will be:

Meeting 8	BOT Meeting	February 26-27, 2009	Memphis, TN
Meeting 9	BOT Meeting	June 16-17, 2009	Knoxville, TN
Meeting 10	BOT Meeting	October 8-9, 2009	Knoxville, TN

10. ADJOURNMENT

Toby Boulet moved, and Pedro Campa seconded a motion for adjournment which was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 12:52 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 1

Topics and Issues for Discussion Prepared by the University Faculty Council for the Videoconference with the Efficiency and Effectiveness for the Future Committee Monday January 5, 2009, 2-4pm Eastern Time (1-3pm Central)

1. What metrics are being considered to assess the contributions of system-level administration to advancing the institution as a whole and the campuses in particular?
2. Is the Committee reviewing the formula by which the system administration is funded?
3. What energy-saving steps is the committee considering? In particular, will performance contracting be implemented system-wide?
4. Given that many forms of faculty research bring prestige to the institution, but may not generate external funding, what metrics are being used to consider the efficiency and effectiveness of research that encompass the full range of research, scholarship and creative activities?
5. Efforts to fill open Governor's Chair positions have been unsuccessful. How will the committee address this issue?
6. Is the Committee considering major changes that will require discussion by faculty based upon the procedures specified in various campuses Faculty Handbooks (such as elimination of all graduate programs associated with UTSI)? Additionally, is there any consideration of a merger between UTK and UTIA?
7. Is the Committee constrained by the statements of President Petersen that athletic programs will continue (e.g. are such programs at UTC and UTM which are controlled by the campuses rather than the System constrained to be continued and must all the athletics programs at UTK be continued or are some possibly to be discontinued)? Additionally, is the Committee considering ways to prevent potential budget deficits in athletics from impacting academic operations?
8. What if any discussions with the leadership of Board of Regents institutions are ongoing to reduce redundancy and/or collaborate on cost-saving mechanisms or potential mergers?
9. If the State decides to modify the longevity pay policy or other benefits for State employees, we encourage this to be done in such a manner so as to minimize the impact on those State employees for whom longevity pay is a very significant fraction of their annual compensation. As one possible guideline, given the action of the UT System administration to reduce their compensation by 5%, we suggest that any reduction in longevity pay for the coming year be structured so that no employee has a greater reduction in total compensation than 5% of their salary.
10. Is the Committee going to advocate for privatizing some functions of the university? If the cost savings from such decisions is the result of managerial efficiencies, we support this. However, if they are achieved by paying uninsured workers poverty wages, privatization will

result in social and economic costs to the state. Doesn't this represent a form of cost-shifting to the state and would this really be efficient or effective?

11. Is the Committee considering salary reductions, furloughs or other forms of pay reduction for faculty?

12. In addition to areas of cost-cutting, are there areas of increased resource allocation the committee is considering that would enhance efficiency and effectiveness?

ATTACHMENT 2: UTC Campus Report

February 16, 2009

Pedro F. Campa, President of Faculty Senate

Among the most important of faculty concerns on our campus is the issue of faculty salaries and compression. The faculty feels that the measures taken by the administration are insufficient when addressing these issues. UTC faculty has not had a significant salary increase in the last ten years while some administrators have received significant bonuses. UTC has lost some competent, young faculty as a result of salary issues.

The question of faculty morale is a burning concern. The post-tenure review initially imposed by the UT Board of Trustees, and later modified as a review based on two-subsequent-years evaluations, continues to be a source of discontent. The report on the UT/UTC merger agreement of 1969, whose provisions have not been honored by UT, have revealed that many of UTC's concern could have been addressed and resolved in a timely fashion.

ATTACHMENT 3: UT-Martin Campus Report

January 23, 2009

Dan McDonough, Kathy Evans, John Schommer

An Organization and Efficiency Task Force (OETF) committee was created by UTM's Chancellor [Tom Rakes] during the Fall 2008 semester. The committee was composed of faculty and staff representatives from various units across the university whose primary mission was to field and analyze budgetary recommendations. The committee fielded a large number of suggestions, and in its November report recommended that the university move forward with suggestions in six categories: 1) new revenue sources; 2) reorganization; 3) procedural changes; 4) in-sourcing, outsourcing; 5) administrative policy changes; and 6) elimination and discontinuance. Important as many of these may eventually turn out to be in terms of organizational efficiency, most had small or uncertain immediate budgetary impact. Moreover, these recommendations involved little in the way of academic reorganization. In the end, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' (VCAA) Academic Council (composed of the campus deans) developed a reorganization plan that involved the dismantling of some academic departments and the fusing of others. In this regard, the Department of Modern Foreign Languages was joined with the Department of English (the resulting department is yet to be named); the Department of Psychology was joined with the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work, and Criminal Justice (the Anthropology program, which is currently a minor, will be deleted from the university and, consequently, from the departmental title); the Department of Geology, Geography, and Physics was disbanded and its members distributed among various other departments. Several other units were moved from one college to another, most prominently the Department of Communications was to be moved from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts to the College of Business and Public Affairs (now to be renamed the College of Business and Global Affairs), a move which has since been retracted, and the Center for Global Studies, with International Programs, moving into the new College of Business and Global Affairs. Chancellor Tom Rakes and VCAA Jerald Ogg indicated that no personnel will lose their jobs under this plan, though a few department chairs in the fused areas will lose their chair positions and return to full-time faculty. Some secretaries will be moved to different positions which are expected to open through retirements before the changes take effect on July 1. The reorganization is estimated to save some quarter of a million dollars. As with all UT campuses, savings will also be realized retaining vacant positions.

Though most faculty were pleased that no faculty or staff lost jobs under this plan, there was some unhappiness among faculty who were affected either through being moved to a different college or losing the separate departmental identity they had enjoyed. Still, there was a general acceptance that some changes were necessary amid the budgetary uncertainty and that these probably provided as little dislocation as possible, though there is a general sense of foreboding concerning expected future cuts.

ATTACHMENT 4: UT Knoxville Campus Report

January 7, 2009

Beauvais Lyons and John Nolt

The search for a new Chancellor for the UT Knoxville campus concluded in late October with the appointment of Dr. Jimmy Cheek from the University of Florida where he has served as Senior Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources. Faculty served on the Search Committee and a group of faculty leaders met with each candidate as part of the campus visits. Dr. Cheek will start on February 1, 2009. Information is posted at: <http://chancellor.utk.edu/announcements/chancellorcheek.shtml>

In August John Nolt attended the second statewide Faculty Senate Summit at Bell State Park. At this meeting a new organization was created and a constitution was drawn up. The organization is called Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS). The idea is to bring together (twice yearly) representatives from the senates of all the TBR 4-year schools and the UT system schools for mutual support and joint initiatives. There was a good bit of discussion as to how this new organization should relate to the UT Faculty Council. TUFS would remain completely independent as an organization but needs some form of interaction and communication with the UT Faculty Council. Nearly all the four-year TBR schools are represented among the founders of TUFS. John Nolt was given the assignment of making sure that each UT system school was informed and invited to join and proposes that each Faculty Senate in the UT system appoint a voting representative. TUFS will meet this spring, probably in April.

This Fall Faculty Senate President-Elect Toby Boulet represented UT at the Southeastern Conference Academic Faculty Leaders (SEC AFL) meeting. The SEC AFL is currently creating bylaws, and will meet again in April. The UT system, rather than the Knoxville campus might form a process for representation on the SEC AFL.

In response to several proposed academic program closures last summer, and in compliance with the Faculty Handbook, the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council reviewed recommendations from the administration to close programs in Audiology and Speech Pathology, Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and Dance. Their report for the October Board of Trustees meeting resulted in no specific recommendation, though we have been told that graduate programs in Audiology and Speech Pathology would be transferred to UT Health Sciences. There appears to be no plan to reinstate (\$1.4 million) lost from the College of Arts and Sciences. It is expected that the programs in Industrial and Organizational Psychology and Dance are being dissolved, and there is only one case of reassignment of tenure to another unit.

In anticipation of further program cuts or mergers, the Senate in cooperation with Interim Provost Susan Martin created during Fall Semester a Program Review, Reduction and Reallocation Task Force. The goal of this committee is to provide an avenue for faculty recommendations on criteria and procedures for cutting or merging programs. The task force will recommend criteria and procedures to the Senate, which will vote on (and may modify) them. It will not recommend specific program rankings or cuts. All of this, of course, is merely advisory to the campus administration.

A UTK Faculty Senate Task Force on Faculty Senate Effectiveness was formed in August (chaired by Candace White) to assess the work of the Faculty Senate. The Task Force includes both faculty and administrative members. In October it completed a survey of faculty that is posted at: <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/docs/2008-09/FinalChartData.pdf> The Task Force is continuing its work and will be recommending various changes to the Senate Bylaws this Spring.

This past semester Faculty Senate President John Nolt has sent regular email notices through a campus-wide list server as the budget situation is known. A major initiative has been the “Switch Your Thinking Campaign” designed to encourage energy efficiency with many specific regulations. Information on this initiative is posted at: <http://environment.utk.edu/news/swtanouncement.html>

Interim Chancellor Jan Simek issued a call to all members of the campus community to offer suggestions to help the university save money. A section of the Chancellor’s web site was set up for this purpose. Several hundred suggestions were submitted some of which will be implemented.

In preparation for anticipated cuts, budget hearings normally held in March were held in December with Academic Dean preparing both a 3% and 5% budget reduction plans. The Provost’s office proposed to meet a hypothetical 5% reduction in its budget by cutting \$4.4 million in faculty salaries. Major cuts to non-tenure track faculty are anticipated while the number of incoming freshmen will remain at levels close to the past three years (4,100). Even with additional tuition dollars we anticipate a significant reduction in teaching capacity.

ATTACHMENT 5: UT Health Sciences Center – no report

ATTACHMENT 6: Task Force Coordinator’s Report from Beauvais Lyons

John Nolt (UTK Philosophy and F.S. President) serves as the faculty representative on the Cherokee Farm Master Planning Committee chaired by Vice-President David Millhorn. The Committee met twice this fall. Both meetings concerned general design specifications and the location and orientation of buildings. At the December meeting it was decided to adopt an overall plan that orients buildings in an east-west direction for solar power generation and allows room for geothermal fields surrounding the buildings. Meetings for public comment are to be held early in 2009. \$32 million has been appropriated by the legislature for building this infrastructure. David Millhorn plans on a groundbreaking sometime this spring. It is not clear when construction on the Joint Institute for Advanced Materials building will begin, which may put federal money for the JIAM building at risk. It is also possible that the legislature may decide to take back the unspent portion or all of the \$32 million committed to this project.

R. J. Hinde (UTK Chemistry) is the faculty representative on the Diversity Committee chaired by Vice-President Theotis Robinson. Last year the Committee held forums on the various campuses, but Professor Hinde reports that he has not received any communications about any meetings since being appointed. Since the formation of the committee diversity planning meetings were held for the leadership at each of the campuses last winter and spring in which UT's outside law

firm consultants provided guidance on the new legal parameters of diversity recruitment and admissions. It is anticipated that with Linda Hendricks, the new Vice-President for Human Resources in place since September progress in developing a comprehensive diversity plan for the UT system can move forward.

ATTACHMENT 7: Agenda



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

MEETING 7 AGENDA

January 7-8, 2009, UT State Relations Offices, Nashville, TN
& Drury Inn & Suites Nashville Airport, Nashville, TN

- 1. Welcome To New Members**
- 2. Call To Order With Members Present (Wednesday & Thursday meeting)**
- 3. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting (Thursday meeting)**
- 4. Campus Reports (Wednesday Meeting) (attached)**
UTC, UTHSC, UTK, UTM
- 5. UT Website (Wednesday meeting)**
Council Member Photos (Cook, Evans)
- 6. Task Force Report (Wednesday meeting)**
- 7. Organizations (Wednesday Meeting)**
Tennessee University Faculty Senates
Southeastern Conference Academic Faculty Leaders (SEC AFL)
- 8. UT Budget & Economic Crisis (Thursday Meeting)**
Teleconference with Board of Trustees Committee on Efficiency & Effectiveness
Discussion & Recommendations Regarding Budget Cuts & University Activities
Financial Exigency & Termination of Faculty & Programs (Yegidis attachment)
Tuition Increases for UT Campuses
Faculty Salaries, equity, & compression
Faculty Retirement – forced, early, age discrimination, benefit cuts after age 70
UT System Office Location
TBR & UT System Organization & Governance
- 9. Articulation and Transfer of General Education**
Banner Status
- 10. UT Library Sharing With UT Campuses**
Non-TBR Library Cards for UT campuses

11. UT Future

Campus Diversity Task Force

Campus Initiatives

Creating a Global UT Presence & Culture in Tough Times

Meeting 4: January 8, 2008 Recommendations

1. Institutional Planning & Decision-Making: President Petersen should be encouraged to stress the importance of involving the University Faculty Council in institutional planning and decision-making. The principle should apply to system level task forces and standing committees.
2. Task Forces: System Vice-Presidents should be sent an annual letter from the UFC Task Force Coordinator at the beginning of each fiscal year inviting them to use the University Faculty Council as a resource.
3. Council Web Site: The University Faculty Council should establish a web site to enhance communications and initiatives that include a listing of faculty on system-level task forces and committees.
4. Faculty & Board of Trustees: A voting faculty trustee should always be on the agenda of the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs and Student Life Committee to give a report on concerns from the University Faculty Council on faculty matters.
5. Improved Communication: The Council requests that it meet with President Petersen at its next meeting to discuss the need for improved communication between the trustees and campus leaders.
6. UT Scorecard: The Council requests that it meet with President Petersen at its next meeting to discuss the nature of the UT scorecard.
7. Entrepreneurial Research: The Council requests that it meet with President Petersen at its next meeting to discuss the risks/benefits associated with entrepreneurial research, and a projection for return on entrepreneurial investments to support the academic mission.
8. UT Budget: The Council requests that it meet with President Petersen at its next meeting to discuss UT budget transparency and accountability.
9. Merit Pay: The Council affirms its prior recommendation to address the cost of living before merit pay is awarded.
10. IT & Communication Issues: The Council requests that President Petersen should provide the Council with a follow-up report on the status of IT and communication issues.
11. Appeal Process: The UT Faculty Council will work with President Petersen and the General Council's Office to create a task force to review the appeal policies in all Faculty Handbooks and to determine whether there are fair and timely processes on each campus as well as at the system level.

12. UT Library System: UT faculty members should have better access to library resources across the system and the UT Library system should move toward campus-wide access modeled after the Georgia and North Carolina state university system.
13. Council Meetings: Whenever possible, and for convenience and cost, the Council will plan a meeting time and location in association with meetings of the Board of Trustees. A portion of the agenda for the Council meeting will include discussions only among the faculty Council members, while a portion will include discussions directly with the President and any administrative staff present.
14. Campus & Task Force Reports: The Council members agreed that campus and task force reports should be sent in writing (electronically) in advance of Council meetings to allow the Council members to digest the material, and to focus on discussion, action plans, and faculty recommendations at its face-to-face meetings.