



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE, CHATTANOOGA, MARTIN, TULLAHOMA, MEMPHIS

FACULTY COUNCIL

MEETING 8 - MINUTES

**February 25-26, 2009, Marriott Hotel Downtown, Memphis, TN
& University Student Center, UT Health Sciences Center**

Members Present:

UTC	H. Lyn Miles, Representative
UTHSC	George Cook, Representative; Parker Suttle (representing Karen Johnson)
UTK	Toby Boulet, Faculty Senate President- Elect (representing John Nolt)
UTM	Kathy Evans, Faculty Senate President; Daniel McDonough, Representative
Trustees	John Schommer, UTM Voting Faculty Trustee

Members Not Present:

UTC	Pedro Campa, Faculty Senate President
UTK	Beauvais Lyons, Representative
UTK	John Nolt, Faculty Senate President
UTHSC	Karen Johnson, Faculty Senate President (present for February 26 session)
Trustee	Verbie Prevost, UTC Non-voting Faculty Trustee
Vice President	Bonnie Yegidis (non-voting) (present for February 26 session)
President	John Petersen (non-voting)

Guests

UTHSC	Vice Chancellor/Provost Cheryl Scheid (present for February 26 session)
-------	---

Quorum **Yes**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:20 p.m. at the Marriott Downtown Memphis hotel.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Dan McDonough moved and George Cook seconded approval of the Minutes of the previous meeting (Meeting 7); the motion passed unanimously.

3. CAMPUS REPORTS

Reports from campuses are attached.

4. UT FACULTY OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS

The Council agreed that each member campus will send a representative to the Tennessee University Faculty Senate Meeting, April 3-5, 2009, to be held at Fall Creek Falls, Tennessee. This organization networks the Faculty Senates of both the UT system and the Board of Regents System, and had its first meeting last year.

Toby Boulet reported that the major issue will be the structural organization of the two Tennessee higher education systems and the growing interest in the State for reorganizing or combining them. The meeting hopes to form consensus among the Senates of the two systems to work together in advocacy for the restructuring. Boulet stated that this possibility has been considered for some time in the State, and that possibly combining the two systems has both a practical as well as conceptual appeal, given the economic crisis and reports of continuing budget cuts for the next several years.

Lyn Miles moved and Toby Boulet seconded the following recommendation (which passed unanimously):

Recommendation 8.1:

The individual campuses represented by the UT Faculty Council will send a representative to the April 3-5, 2009 Meeting of the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) to be held at Fall Creek Falls, Tennessee. Each campus leadership will convey the importance of this statewide association of faculty senates and their consideration of the reorganization of the UT system and Regents system.

Toby Boulet also reported that he will be representing UTK at the Southeast Conference Academic Consortium Academic Leadership Development Program (SECAC-ADLP).

5. PRESIDENT PETERSEN'S RESIGNATION & TRANSITION

The Council discussed the performance of President Petersen over the last five years and the events leading up to his resignation, effective June 1 (he is on leave from March 1). Toby Boulet and Lyn Miles announced that at least two members of the Council had been interviewed in the review process. Chair Lyn Miles reported that she conveyed to President Petersen thanks for his service, on behalf of the Council. The Council pledged to work with the interim President Jan Simek, who is a UTK anthropology professor and former Interim Chancellor for UTK. Simek will serve for two years and oversee budget cuts and the transition to a new administration..

6. UT PPROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

The Council discussed the latest draft of the University of Tennessee Procedural Framework for Academic Program Discontinuance. The Council had reviewed an earlier draft at its previous meeting and made suggestions for additions; only the provision for faculty input into the process was included in current draft to be presented to the Board of Trustees for their approval.

The Council members agreed, prior to further budget cuts or announcement of financial exigency, that a Discontinuance Plan would establish a procedure for strategic discontinuation of academic programs since the Board of Trustees by-laws did not stipulate a precise mode of action. The Council further agreed that the procedure in many respects appeared to be appropriate.

Parker Suttle, George Cook, Lyn Miles, and Toby Boulet expressed great concern that the “Purpose and Application” section first paragraph of the Discontinuance Plan did not sufficiently ensure that academic programs would be strategically examined due to budget cuts, rather than individual faculty being targeted as a means to single out one individual for termination or to revamp a program in ways unrelated to the budget.

The draft paragraph under “Purpose and Application” discussed was:

“This procedural framework sets out the minimum procedures to be followed by any campus or institute proposing discontinuance of an academic program. For this purpose, a program includes any academic unit or discipline identified by the National Center for Education Statistics Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP codes) and any unit with a unique and identifiable function within such an academic unit or discipline. The latter includes units with such unique specializations that the faculty would not normally cross from that unit to another within the larger academic unit or discipline. A program is not limited to degree-granting programs and may include non-instructional units such as laboratories and research programs.”

Parker Suttle pointed out that the Discontinuance Plan would be based on CIP codes and sub-codes (available online), and that some sub-codes, if applied, would include only one individual. Lyn Miles reported examining the codes on line at:

<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/ciplist.asp>

Miles stated that many sub-codes would target only one individual at UTC and Martin; Toby Boulet reported that this would occur at UTK as well. Thus, it would be possible to selectively eliminate one individual, for a variety of reasons, under the guise of a sub-code rather than a strategic program discontinuance due to budget cuts.

Toby Boulet questioned the meaning of the wording, “not normally cross from that unit to another” phrase. George Cook and Lyn Miles questioned the addition of the phrase “any unit with a unique and identifiable function within such an academic unit or discipline” since the last draft seen by the Council. They argued that “unique” was too vague and would allow any individual to be deemed to be unique in some manner. The changed might be misinterpreted as allowing for the targeting of an individual and not reflect strategic decisions about whole programs.

Parker Suttle said that the current draft also negated the function of tenure. Toby Boulet reiterated that the draft would give *carte blanche* to administrators for any cuts. John Schommer

stressed that the Discontinuance Plan should follow the *Faculty Handbook* and noted that provision in a later paragraph of the revised draft.

George Cook and Parker Suttle informed the Council that this misuse of the Discontinuance Plan may have already begun at the Health Sciences Center since several faculty members have already received letters that they are being targeted for discontinuance—before the Board of Trustees has even approved the Plan. In some cases, administrators already have plans for hiring other new faculty having various specialties. The faculty members targeted are sole individuals, often with decades of service, coming from different areas which do not constitute a single program, giving further credence to the possibility that individuals may be being targeted based on age or other factors, and that the discontinuance is not based on strategic program cuts. Cook described this action as a “surgical cut” to perhaps opportunistically redirect the University’s research and teaching. At any rate, that is the concern of the faculty at UTHSC, and other campuses.

Dan McDonough said that CIP codes may not match UT departments or faculty, and wondered what implication that might have. McDonough also questioned the haste in discontinuance given that any federal Stimulus Plan for higher education in Tennessee, due to the current economic crisis, might actually restore funding levels.

The Council debated about the precise definition of an academic program, stressing that it would be a department, division, or college, etc., as represented by faculty Rank and Tenure Committees, college-governance, Senate subdivisions, UT campus website divisions, or other measure.

Toby Boulet moved and George Cook seconded the recommendation, which passed unanimously, expressing in principle that cuts should be programs and not individuals within programs while the Council reflected on more precise wording:

Recommendation 8.2:

The Procedural Framework for Academic Program Discontinuance should be based on an administrative academic unit, e.g., department or division, and not based on an individual singled out by the use of a CIP sub-code.

7. FACULTY SALARIES

Lyn Miles followed up on the recommendation from the previous Council meeting for cuts to be made from the UT system prior to academic program cuts at the UT campuses. She raised the issue of continuing low faculty salaries, the lack of cost of living raises for over a decade for most faculty, and the discussion now of possible furloughs or salary cuts. This placed UT faculty at a severe disadvantage, compared with our peers and other national faculty, and might result in mass resignations as highly mobile faculty took positions at more economically advantageous institutions.

Miles presented data regarding the number of administrators vs. faculty on UT campuses provided by UTC’s Committee on Efficiency and Effectiveness, and pointed out that most

campus peer institutions have 11-13% administrators, while UT campuses have from 23-35% administrators. She suggested that the Council might be interested in tabulating total salaries and 10-year percentage increases in salary of administrators on each campus and in the UT system for comparative purposes, and offered to initiate this process, which was approved by the Council by voice affirmation.

Miles also raised the issue of administrative and Faculty Handbook procedures for faculty outside consultation, teaching, and other income-generating activities during this period of severe budget cuts, decline of raises, and low overall salaries when compare with peers. This issue has arisen on the UTC campus but affects all UT campuses should the economy continue to decline.

Kathy Evans moved and Parker Suttle seconded a recommendation that passed unanimously:

Recommendation 8.3:

Given the economic crisis, overall low faculty salaries, and continued budget cuts which may further reduce or curtail UT faculty salaries, UT campuses should loosen restrictions on outside consulting, teaching, or other secondary academic or non-academic employment activities in order to create greater means to supplement faculty income.

SUSPENSION---

The meeting was suspended at 8:00 p.m. and resumed at 12:00 noon on February 26 at the UT Health Science Center University Student Center. Vice President Bonnie Yegidis and UTHSC Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty and Student Affairs (Provost) Cheryl R. Scheid joined Council members John Schommer, Lyn Miles, Karen Johnson, Parker Suttle, Toby Boulet, and George Cook for a further discussion of the Discontinuance Draft Purpose and Application section.

8. DISCONTINUANCE DRAFT PURPOSE AND APPLICATION SECTION

The Council continued its discussion of the University of Tennessee Procedural Framework for Academic Program Discontinuance and discussed the revised draft of the Purpose and Application section.

Council members strongly conveyed to Vice President Yegidis that the Plan should not be based solely on CIP codes and sub-codes or the new addition of “unique functions” since this would allow the targeting of individuals, rather than strategic program discontinuance. Council members present discussed this issue with Yegidis and UTHSC Vice Chancellor/Provost Scheid.

Parker Suttle presented a supplemental sentence to the Discontinuance Plan section on Purpose and Application, to be placed at the end of that paragraph:

“In any case, an academic program or functional unit must serve as an entity for which there are documented periodic evaluations of the entity’s function and performance as a whole, separate and distinct from annual evaluations of the members of the entity.”

The Council discussed this provision with Bonnie Yegidis and Cheryl Scheid who presented “devil’s advocate” discontinuance examples from her campus. Karen Johnson, Parker Suttle and George Cook questioned the examples and suggested that they might be related to management issues. Yegidis agreed that academic programs and not individuals should be targeted, as was also stated by both President Petersen and Yegidis at our last meeting. Yegidis stated that any changes would have to be approved by UT Vice President and General Counsel Catherine Mizell on short notice. Karen Johnson stressed that this should be done that afternoon, and Council members agreed that otherwise full Council support would be in question.

[Council Chair’s Note: Bonnie Yegidis provided a rewording of the Discontinuance Plan Purpose and Application to the Board of Trustees (see UT Board of Trustees Minutes) that only partially took the Council concerns into account. Yegidis and Mizell changed “functional unit” to “function” which diluted the emphasis on program or administrative unit; and “are documented periodic evaluations” to “may be an expectation for an evaluation” which de-emphasized the requirement of periodic evaluations and also loosened a link with administrative units by the use of the conditional “may.”

The revised wording Yegidis presented to the Board of Trustees on February 27 was (Council wording show in ~~strike through~~; Yegidis changes shown in *italics* (not in original):

“In any case, an academic program or ~~functional unit~~ *function* must serve as an entity for which there ~~are documented periodic evaluations~~ *may be an expectation for an evaluation* of the entity’s function and performance as a whole, separate and distinct from annual ~~evaluation~~ *evaluation(s)* of the ~~member~~ *member(s)* of the entity. The majority of Council members remain concerned regarding the possible misuse of this rewording.

Yegidis noted to the Board that the revision was not entirely identical to what the Council had proposed. At the Board meeting, Faculty Trustee John Schommer made remarks about the importance of focusing on academic units, and not individuals. Student trustee asked that students be able to have a role in the review process, and Yegidis indicated that that would be added to the final draft and to those that are adopted by the individual campuses. The Discontinuance Plan was passed the Board of Trustees unanimously.]

8. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

H. Lyn Miles, Chair

ATTACHMENT 1

University of Tennessee Faculty Council Recommendations – Summary

Recommendation 8.1:

The individual campuses represented by the UT Faculty Council will send a representative to the April 3-5, 2009 Meeting of the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) to be held at Fall Creek Falls, Tennessee. Each campus leadership will convey the importance of this statewide association of faculty senates and their consideration of the reorganization of the UT system and Regents system.

Recommendation 8.2:

The Procedural Framework for Academic Program Discontinuance should be based on an administrative academic unit, e.g., department or division, and not based on an individual singled out by the use of a CIP sub-code.

Recommendation 8.3:

Given the economic crisis, overall low faculty salaries, and continued budget cuts which may further reduce or curtail UT faculty salaries, UT campuses should loosen restrictions on outside consulting, teaching, or other secondary academic or non-academic employment activities in order to create greater means to supplement faculty income.

ATTACHMENT 2



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE, CHATTANOOGA, MARTIN, TULLAHOMA, MEMPHIS

FACULTY COUNCIL

MEETING 8 - AGENDA

February 25-26, 2009, Marriott Hotel Downtown, Memphis, TN
AGENDA

1. Call To Order

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting

3. UT Faculty Representation

Southeast Conference of Academic Faculty Leaders (SECAFL) & Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) (April 3-5 Fall Creek Falls)

4. President Petersen's Resignation & Transition

5. UT Budget Cuts Update

UT Procedural Framework for Academic Program Discontinuance (Final Draft)

Faculty Input on APD Committee

APD Committee & Faculty Handbook

Administrative Budget Cuts Preceding Academic Program Cuts

CIP Codes & Sub-Codes for Program Discontinuance

6. UT Salaries

UT System & Campus Administration Salaries

Lack of Cost of Living Raises for Last Decade

Additional Sources of Income for Faculty

Lawsuit Networking

7. UT Structure

Combining Regents & UT System

Incorporating Agriculture, Space Institute, and Athletics into UTK

Privatization and Quality

8. New Business

ATTACHMENT 3

The University of Tennessee Procedural Framework for Academic Program Discontinuance

Purpose and Application

This procedural framework sets out the minimum procedures to be followed by any campus or institute proposing discontinuance of an academic program. For this purpose, a program includes any academic unit or discipline identified by the National Center for Education Statistics Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP codes) and any unit with a unique and identifiable function within such an academic unit or discipline. The latter includes units with such unique specializations that the faculty would not normally cross from that unit to another within the larger academic unit or discipline. A program is not limited to degree-granting programs and may include non-instructional units such as laboratories and research programs.

Guiding Principles

Academic program discontinuance is a natural and essential component of effective functioning of the University. Decisions about program discontinuance should be made only after careful review of the mission and effectiveness of the program as compared with the needs and goals of the campus/institute, the University, and the State. These difficult decisions require a frank examination of relevant information and appropriate consultation with faculty.

The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees require that the Board approve the termination of academic programs upon the recommendation of the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee.¹

When program discontinuance may impact tenured faculty, Board policy specifically requires that “termination of tenured faculty may take place only after consultation with the faculty through appropriate committees of the department, the college, and the Faculty Senate.”²

The Board will consider a proposal for discontinuance of an academic program only after the campus/institute has followed Board-approved campus/institute procedures and has provided the Board with appropriate documentation described in this procedural framework.

Campus/Institute Procedures

Each campus/institute must develop its own procedures for accomplishing the required consultation with faculty when discontinuance of an academic program may result in termination of tenured faculty. Campus/institute procedures must be consistent with the procedural framework outlined below and must be approved by the Board.³

¹ University of Tennessee Board of Trustees Bylaws, Article III, Section 7(a)(6).

² Board of Trustees Policy Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure, Section H(1)(b) at p. 11.

³ Campus/institute procedures must be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review and approval before being presented to the Board through the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee.

Timeframe

Recommendations to discontinue academic programs typically will be considered by the Board of Trustees at the Annual Meeting in June of each year. The procedures outlined in this framework for incorporation in campus/institute procedures should be implemented in a deliberate but timely manner facilitating presentation of proposals at the Annual Meeting. As a general rule, the procedures should be completed within four months.

Procedural Framework

- I. The campus/institute Chief Academic Officer is responsible for overseeing academic program discontinuance procedures. When discontinuance of a program is proposed, the Chief Academic Officer shall collect appropriate documentation related to the proposal. The Chief Academic Officer shall consult with the Chancellor/Vice President before initiating program discontinuance procedures. The Chief Academic Officer shall also consult with the Faculty Senate President and one other faculty representative designated by the Faculty Senate. The Chief Academic Officer shall continue to consult with the Faculty Senate President and the designated faculty representative throughout the faculty consultation process.
 - A. The proposal and related documentation should address the following factors, at a minimum, or explain why a factor is not applicable:
 1. Overview of the program including any corresponding degree, the mission and stated objectives of the program, and information regarding the faculty assigned to the program⁴;
 2. Contribution to the core mission of the campus and University as a whole and general educational value;
 3. Contribution to accreditation;
 4. Relevance to retention, progression, and graduation of students;
 5. Impact of research, scholarship, and creative activity by program faculty;
 6. Demand within the state and nationwide for graduates of the program and evidence of success in preparing graduates for employment;
 7. Impact of program on external community in the area or across the state;
 8. National or international reputation of the program;
 9. Program uniqueness or possible duplication or competition with other educational programs within the UT system, the Board of Regents system, or other higher education systems;

⁴ The report from any recent academic program review, accreditation documents, or other source of existing data should be included.

10. Costs (financial and otherwise) associated with the program as compared to these factors as well as projected financial savings and timetable for realization of any projected savings;
11. Impact of program discontinuance on currently enrolled students;
12. Impact of program discontinuance on faculty and staff;
13. Feasibility of various opportunities to minimize impact of program discontinuance on the external community, currently enrolled students, faculty, and staff; and
14. Results of a due diligence review to determine if discontinuance of the program will impact any contractual or other third-party commitments concerning the program. In conducting this review, the Chief Academic Officer shall consult with all appropriate campus/institute and system offices (e.g., business offices, research offices, Treasurer's Office, General Counsel's Office).

The proposal and related documentation shall be presented at each step of the faculty consultation process described below and shall be supplemented with any new information added at any step.

- B. After consulting with the Chancellor/Vice President, the Chief Academic Officer shall meet with the appropriate Dean and the program faculty to discuss the proposal for program discontinuance. Program faculty should provide (either before or after this meeting) further information supporting either continuation of the program or discontinuance of the program. For example, the faculty might provide details about the program's contribution to the campus mission or suggest reorganization or other ways to maintain the program.
- C. If either the Chief Academic Officer or the Dean then recommends further consideration of program discontinuance, the program faculty shall be given an opportunity to object in writing to the proposed discontinuance. The Chief Academic Officer shall then convene and consult with an appropriate committee of faculty from the affected college.
- D. If either the Chief Academic Officer or the Dean then recommends further consideration of the proposal for program discontinuance, the Chief Academic Officer shall consult with an appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate.
- E. If either the Chief Academic Officer or the Dean then recommends further consideration of the proposal for program discontinuance, the Chief Academic Officer shall make arrangements for a period of public notice preceding a public forum – electronic or otherwise – through which community constituents can present relevant information, raise questions, or express concerns about discontinuance of the program.

- F. After completing the consultation outlined above, the Chief Academic Officer shall make a written report to the Chancellor/Vice President summarizing the input of the program faculty, the appropriate college committee, the appropriate Faculty Senate committee, the Dean, and the community. Attaching all documentation gathered in this process, the Chief Academic Officer shall recommend to the Chancellor/Vice President whether to forward the proposal for program discontinuance to the President.
- G. After reviewing the Chief Academic Officer's recommendation and the related documentation, the Chancellor/Vice President shall decide whether to submit the proposal for program discontinuance to the President. If so, the Chancellor/Vice President shall submit the proposal and the supporting documentation to the President through the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- II. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall review the proposal for program discontinuance and then provide it to the Vice President and General Counsel for review. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall then forward the proposal to the President, together with his/her own recommendation and any recommendation of the Vice President and General Counsel.
- III. After consulting with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President and General Counsel, the President shall decide whether to submit the proposal for program discontinuance to the Board of Trustees. If so, the President shall submit the proposal and related documentation to the Board through the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee.
- IV. If the Board of Trustees approves the program discontinuance, and if the program discontinuance may result in termination of tenured faculty, the campus Chief Academic Officer shall consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President and General Counsel to ensure compliance with all notice requirements and other requirements of Board policy and the Faculty Handbook, including the following specific requirements of Board policy:
1. "[C]ampus administration shall attempt to place each displaced tenured faculty member in another suitable position. This does not require that a faculty member be placed in a position for which he or she is not qualified, that a new position be created where no need exists, or that a faculty member (tenured or non-tenured) in another department be terminated in order to provide a vacancy for a displaced tenured faculty member."⁵
 2. "The position of any tenured faculty member displaced because of . . . academic program discontinuance shall not be filled within three years, unless

⁵ Board of Trustees Policy Governing Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure H(1) at pp. 11-12.

the displaced faculty member has been offered reinstatement and a reasonable time in which to accept or decline the offer.”⁶

⁶ Id.

ATTACHMENT 4

UT Chattanooga Campus Report

Pedro F. Campa, President of Faculty Senate

In this period of economic crisis, the most disconcerting issue is not to know what is going to happen to academic programs. At UTC faculty/administrative committees have been created to address these issues. It is doubtful that the recommendations emanating from these committees will be implemented. There is a feeling that decisions have already been made by the Deans, or are being made secretly without regard for faculty concerns.

The word however, is that no faculty will be dismissed, or academic programs be discontinued this year. Academic programs considered to be “in trouble” in the THEC list will be give ample time to justify their existence through a process of evaluation. At the heart of these issues is the UT tradition of vertical governance at a time where cooperation and collegiality are most needed. Many of us feel that “shared governance” is social fiction, and now the myth is truly falling apart.

The issue of web courses is very much a source of controversy. By all accounts it seems that UTC lags behind other institutions in these programs. Our faculty basic teaching load is 12 hours. In order to implement these courses we need release time and technical help at a time when we are considering increasing teaching loads and dismissing adjunct faculty. Some of us feel that here are issues of curriculum quality about web courses that need to be examined before we launch a full-scale program.

The negative/evaluation/post-tenure review has yielded some of the administratively-desired results. Some faculty members have been forced to retire under pressure, and I am afraid that there are more to come. There is talk about eliminating phase retirement, or at least limiting the period. Unfortunately, this program is something we worked very hard in order to get UT approval, based on the fact that we wanted to preserve faculty expertise and we needed to reward poorly-paid senior professors at the end of their teaching career.

Good news; freshman applications for admission are at an all-time high. We have no idea how we are going to accommodate so many students. There is plenty of room for transfer students in upper-level courses, but the Gen-Ed courses will be overcrowded.

ATTACHMENT 5

UT Knoxville Campus Report

Beauvais Lyons, UTK Representative

[Compiled from the February 16, 2009 UTK Faculty Senate Newsletter]

At its January 26 meeting the Faculty Senate unanimously passed a resolution recommending to the Provost, Chancellor and President that:

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

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.

A series of brown-bag lunches are being sponsored for this semester with the faculty Senate President John Nolt and Provost Martin and Chancellor Cheek. UTK will get some direct help this spring from the Athletics Department. This year, for the first time, Athletics will charge for tickets to the Orange & White Game, and proceeds will go to instructional needs on the UTK campus. The Faculty Senate has formed a Legislative Task Force, chaired by Jon Shefner, has been meeting with legislators and planning lobbying activities, with the assistance of UT's lobbyist, Anthony Haynes, and Vice President for Public and Government Relations, Hank Dye. Legislators with whom members of the task force have met so far include: Sen. Jamie Woodson, Sen. Dolores Gresham, Rep. Ryan Haynes, Rep. Harry Brooks and Rep. David Hawk. Our primary message has been the need for keeping teachers in the classroom and the need for tuition flexibility.

Vice-Chancellor for Finance Denise Barlow retired from the university at the beginning of February. Barlow was a vital resource for the Senate Budget and Planning Committee, and was involved in many aspects of campus planning. Her services will be deeply missed.

UTK Faculty Senate President John Nolt has made a case for putting students first and arguing for keeping teachers in the classroom as the best strategy to deal with the budget crisis because UT is visible to the largest number of people through its students. In his view the best path to preserving the research and service missions is by keeping teachers teaching. He pointed out that the following, if done or done more fully, could help alleviate the current budget crisis: releasing the rainy day fund, having flexibility in setting tuition, having the legislature reallocate money set aside for Governor's chairs (\$17 million) and Cherokee Farm development (\$32 million), and pursuing energy conservation (e.g., through performance contracting).

Last fall a Program Review, Reduction and Reallocation Task Force was created with faculty and administrative representation. The purpose of this task force is to develop a process that ensures adequate faculty input in situations where budget-based program closures may become necessary. It has drafted a procedure for budget-based program closures that takes administrative recommendations directly to the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils and then to the Senate.

The Senate is also actively engaged in a review of its own bylaws with significant changes being considered for this semester. Candace White is chairing a committee working on this.

The Research Council has produced two important policy statements, one on research data and one on tangible research property that have been sent to all for faculty for review.

The Senate will participate in TUFSS, a statewide organization of faculty senates at four-year institutions will meet April 3-5, 2009. We anticipate some legislative efforts will be launched as an outgrowth of that meeting, and encourage representatives from all other UT Faculty Senate's to attend.

The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs has developed a revised Family Care Policies for Faculty. It stipulates that tenured faculty will be eligible for leave (one semester off with pay) and a one-year extension to the promotion and tenure clock for maternity, adoption, or foster care. The revisions codify what the campus has tried to practice for the past few years