



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE. CHATTANOOGA. MARTIN. TULLAHOMA. MEMPHIS

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

Meeting 111

16 January 2019

4:00 pm (ET) / 3:00 pm (CT)

Meeting and Videoconference

MINUTES

UT Faculty Council Voting Members (Quorum, 5 voting members, established)

UTHSC	George Cook (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Phyllis A. Richey (Campus Representative)	Present
UTK	Misty Anderson (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Bruce MacLennan (Campus Representative)	Present
UTM	Renee LaFleur (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Chris Caldwell (Campus Representative)	Present
UTC	Steve Ray (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Beth Crawford	Present

<b>Education, Research and Service Committee (ERSC)</b>		
	Bonnie Ownley	Present
<b>UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members</b>		
UT	Randy Boyd	Absent
	Linda Martin (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Absent
<b>Faculty Council Guests</b>		
	Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)	Absent
	Peg Hartig	Present

Meeting called to order by Bruce MacLennan, Chair at 4:07 p.m. !

George moves to approve the minutes from the 19 December 2018. Phyllis seconds. Approved unanimously.

Corrections to the minutes include: Chris and George were NOT present, Lou Gross' information and percentages that Bonnie presented.

UTHSC representatives reported that they have approved the charter revisions. All campuses have approved the charter. Bruce will send the charter on to Randy.

Regarding the first agenda item, Phyllis asked if other institutions have had problems splitting F&As when there are joint principle investigators or the equivalent of a funded grant that pays indirect fees. She said that at UTHSC one of the principle investigators has to be designated as the corresponding author and only one department gets credit for fees collected from the agency. This has created a problem on her campus. Less than 25% of grants have joint PIs at UTHSC, she said. "So it is not widespread, but still important. Is anyone else aware of how the indirect funds are handled on their campus?"

Bonnie said that she has been on numerous grants as the principle investigator. Whatever indirects accrue for that individual goes back to their unit.

Phyllis notes that "if, for example, Bonnie and I are joint PIs, we wouldn't have this problem because we are on different campuses and the other campus would be sub-contracted. The problem is when you are on the same campus."

Phyllis wonders if this is only a problem on her campus. Bruce said that UTK has had some complications previously working with other campuses. Bonnie indicated that they have "done this a lot" at UTIA.

Phyllis asked, "So you've been able to successfully direct F&As to the appropriate parties?" Bonnie replied, "Yes. What kind of software are you using for the grants?" Phyllis answered, "The software for the grants is not the problem, but the finance software is. They say they have to 'do it manually.'"

Beth and Steve will be checking at UTC. They do not think UTC has had this problem. Renee and Chris were not sure if UTM has had this problem.

Bruce asked, "If it is working at some campuses, are they doing it manually?" Phyllis responded, "This only becomes an issue once the grant is awarded and the indirects start getting awarded. It's a finance issue. They say that IRIS does not accommodate it."

Bonnie indicated that at UTIA, different colleges have different rules/percentages. "So we have to work all that out." George said they have the same system at UTHSC, but the problem is that it keeps changing. Phyllis indicated that at UTHSC, the administration takes its cut first, then it

trickles down eventually to the college. Bonnie said that at UTIA, they are able “go back in, grant by grant, and negotiate things.”

Phyllis said she didn't know if they have done that. “When I suggested this question before Christmas,” she said, “the committees of our senate had met with VC of Research and VC of Finance and they indicated that absolutely they would do it. But they say there is a problem at system where the software doesn't allow it to happen.”

Phyllis requested that the UFC members do some research on our campuses and get some data. Bruce said he is sure that it happens at UTK all the time and it is the same system. “Is there a document that lays out the proper procedures?” he asked. “It's all transparent here—how the F&As are split up. I think someone might be trying to get out of some work.”

Phyllis emphasized that it really is not an issue at UTHSC with multiple departments within a unit/college. “It's a problem only between units/colleges. Some deans are even questioning whether they want to support collaboration across units.” Bruce suggested they go to their chancellors and ask if they want more research funded. If they do, they should not put up roadblocks. He also noted that multi-disciplinary projects are more likely to get grants.

Phyllis asked the group to please forward whatever info they may gather.

Misty asked, “Is this something we can take to Linda directly here?” Bruce reminded us that President Boyd said to bring impediments to him. “We need to document this carefully before presenting it to him,” he added. “Do you have any emails that state that we can't do this?” Phyllis replied, “Not an email. Just what was said in a meeting with Finance. Joint PIs are not getting credit because it was not submitted through their college.”

Phyllis added that they have been told the reason for this was that joint PIs were not frequent enough to bother with. Is it really not that frequent? It sounds like it is on the other campuses. She stated that they have been told that “there are just not that many cases, so we will do it on a manual basis, IF they ask.”

General consensus that members will investigate this on their campuses and share the information via email.

Bruce opens the floor for new business.

Bruce opened conversation regarding the local advisory boards' bylaws. “We know the bylaws from all advisory boards except UTHSC,” he said. “UTHSC does not have a board. They can't meet until they add the last member.”

Bruce pointed out that UTK added amendments to their local board from Beauvais regarding clarity for faculty members. They were adopted by the Knoxville board. He raised the possibility of adding these as amendments at a later date to other local boards. Chattanooga

and UTM will send the amendments forward to their boards for consideration. Bruce said, "If there aren't reasons to do things differently across campus, it seems like we should do them the same way."

Bruce moved on to the next item: the UFC document on tenure/academic freedom.

Misty said that she has made that document available to others. UTM has already given the doc to their board. Steve said that the UTC Chancellor approved their faculty board member giving those out at the next local board meeting.

Misty said she wants to be clear about how to get these to the board. We have faculty representatives on the board. The chancellor is not actually a member of the board. Bruce added that "it is certainly within the rights of any member (of the board) to say, here's something I think is important." Renee said, "Our chancellor's main concern was the sunshine laws. Our chancellor introduced me and the document. We were trying to keep in mind the legal provisions of the board." Chris said, "We put it in their regular packet. We were advised NOT to hand it to them outside the meeting." Renee added, "Having the chancellor introduce it gave it some weight." Steve said that UTC's chancellor did not want to give too much content to the board during first meeting, and also did not want to give a disproportionate sense to the board about their involvement in academics.

Misty said that, "going forward, I don't want us to miss opportunities for other ways to use this information. Even if we chop it up into bits. Are there opportunities to education about the difference between K-12 tenure and Higher Ed tenure? Maybe this is helpful for Anthony and our legislative folks. They have copies." Bruce affirmed that "it's our document, we can give it out as appropriate." Phyllis asked, "Is it on our website?" Bruce answered, "Yes. It is." Bruce said, "It's a valuable document. Let's use it whenever we can." Misty said, "All of it comes down to how it is actually being used. It is on us to distribute it." Bruce suggested, "Maybe we need to make it explicit that others can use the document. At UFC, we can use it how we want for different audiences. On campuses, if you find this useful, please use it. Each different party, might decide not to use it."

Bonnie said she had heard that the whole issue of doing away with tenure will be brought up in the state legislature this year just to have the conversation, but it will likely really be addressed in the next election year.

Bruce said that many people have high school as their primary frame of reference and do not understand the difference between what K-12 teachers do and what Higher Ed teachers do. "Both do a lot, but they are different," he said.

Bruce encouraged us and leaders on our campus to distribute the UFC tenure/academic freedom document. There was discussion about printing vs. hard copies.

Bruce said that Linda's office printed the first batch, but some were distributed electronically.

Bruce moved the discussion on to Item #3—Shared Governance

Misty said, “We were going through some books that are important for higher ed. These included Christopher Newfield’s “The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How We Can Fix Them.” Beauvais presented to a UTK Humanities group on the book. “I like that the book shows what shared govt ISN’T,” Misty said.

Bruce added that the book describes three flawed models. He asked, “Should we be preparing some sort of short document on the purposes and principles of shared governance?” Our BOT and local boards are mostly business people.

Bonnie suggested that Jimmy Cheek, the former Chancellor who still teaches in Leadership Studies at UTK, would be a great person to go to for advice.

Misty said, “Even if you don’t read Beauvais’ whole review, the table is very useful.”

Misty said that it would be helpful for Bonnie to talk to Jimmy Cheek. “I’d like to see this body come up with a version of this chart or something similar,” she added. Bonnie confirmed that she will talk to Jimmy.

Bruce moved the discussion to the last item—Administrative Effectiveness Task Force. This item was included based on Discussion with David Miller at last meeting.

Bruce said that since Randy initiated the Task Force, it was all internal to the system. “We would like the task force to have input from the faculty facilitated by UFC or with input from UFC,” he said. Bonnie said that the next UTK budget committee meeting will discuss documents that she has been sent. She will send these to Bruce and he will forward to everyone.

Bruce said that on the Knoxville campus, the cost of the system has been a discussion for years. Are we getting a good value?

George said it is a big issue at UTHSC. “We feel we are being taxed for nothing,” he said. “The only thing the local boards can really advise on is tuition and it is just advice. They don’t have any authority.”

Misty said that the FOCUS act makes her wonder what the longer goals are here.

Continued conversation about system efficiency.

Bruce said, “Hopefully we can meet with Randy in February, and we can suggest to him that he have some people outside the system involved in the task force.” Misty added that “it doesn’t have to be this body. But we are an appropriate body to raise the concern. It’s a problem that they don’t have perspective from the campuses.”

Bonnie asked, "Why don't we focus on a few (three) questions for David? In order to pick this apart a bit." Misty said, "If we think of questions this body would bring to the task force, can we workshop two or three questions now? I'd like to include the request that there are non-faculty members on the taskforce. Should we talk to task force members on our campus?" Bruce added that "it's a reasonable thing to do to say we have an organization, let's look internally at what we can do better." Bonnie concurred, stating, "We often bring in external voices." Misty asked, "What is the appropriate relationship between the system and the flagship institution and other campuses? That's a philosophical question." Bruce expressed a concern that "that invites a vague answer."

Phyllis said that we should request the scope/charge of the task force. "We can come up with a couple of questions and bring them to Randy at the next meeting," she said.

Phyllis asked, "Do we need some planning for the next meeting that is the same time as the board?" Renee suggested making reservations soon at the one hotel in Martin. Hampton Inn. Bruce said that they are not making block reservations for the board. Renee will send info about Martin accommodations to everyone.

Phyllis asked, "Do we know that Randy will be available on the 28<sup>th</sup> to meet with us? Might be worth checking with Linda." Bruce said that Randy says he plans to attend all meetings. Phyllis said that "this is a bit different though, because of the board meeting."

Misty asked, "Is there a time that we can meet with the board socially?" Phyllis asked, "Do we have that opportunity that we've talked with Linda about (outside the lunch on Friday)?"

Chris said that the board was thinking about changing their pattern regarding how they have their meetings. "Hopefully that is all settled," he said. Renee said that "there will be a lunch with some faculty members."

General consensus that we ask Linda to pursue this.

Bonnie brought up a concern regarding early tenure. This was brought up at UTK, she said. "You have a situation when you can put an extra year on your tenure (mostly for women having babies), but if they don't feel they need the extra year, it has been their choice. Some have been told that if they don't take the extra year, it will be considered early tenure because of the date in IRIS." She expressed concern that software was driving policy.

Bruce adjourns at 5:55.