



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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
Meeting 116
20 June 2019
3:00 pm (CT) / 4:00 pm (ET)
Videoconference
MINUTES (unapproved)

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 (Campus Representative)	Present

Education, Research and Service Committee (ERSC)		
	Bonnie Ownley (Board of Trustees ERS Committee Faculty Appointee)	Present
UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
UT	Randy Boyd (System President)	Present (12:10-12:45 p.m.)
	Linda Martin (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present
Faculty Council Guests		
	Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)	Present
	Peg Hartig (UTHSC)	Present
	Leigh Cherry	Present
	Jamie Harvey (UTC Faculty Senate President Elect)	Present
	Karen Etzkorn	Present
	Martin Donaldson	Present

The pre-meeting with Randy began at 12:10 p.m.

Randy started by saying that he wished he had more time to meet with us but his schedule did not allow that this time. He also said that it has been great working with everyone on the UFC this year. He expressed that he wished he could spend more time with faculty and students, but between buildings and legislation he is extremely busy. His goal is to double down on engagement with faculty and students. He is looking forward to a model of shared governance regarding the UTK/UTIA unification initiative. He added that information regarding the Oak Ridge institute will be brought up in his speech the following day, then solicited questions and advice.

Bonnie suggested that the “Unification” plan needed a better name, perhaps the Land Grant Plan? She pointed out that a survey had been sent out regarding the initiative, but faculty was not surveyed, but rather extension specialists and even some deceased folks, adding that a lot of administrators on the list. This was sent to 500 emails, including folks at TSU. She was disappointed that faculty had not been included in the survey. Randy said he knew there was a survey, but he thought faculty had been included. Bonnie said she was working on a summary of who it was sent to. Randy encouraged her to comment on that at the board meeting. She indicated that she would.

Misty pointed out that there had also been no consultation with the faculty senate. “This all happened yesterday—very quickly,” she said. “Whatever is counted as survey material should be couched in that context.”

Randy synopsised “the quick headline:” “as we try to compete with national institutions, we need the ability to compete nationally. There’s not a single peer that has the ag institute as a separate institution. By changing the reporting on the institutions, this allows us to go from 157th in ranking to 57th.”

Randy—some concern i.s that this is rushed, but we have been working on it for a long time. The real opportunity will be collaboration. There are many new ideas. That work will be lead by faculty and staff. All the important work is still left to be done.

Randy—the problem is that when you have change, people go to their deepest and darkest places (rumors, worries).

Bruce—any information vacuum fuels that.

Randy—going to try to address issues without being too prescriptive. Informative as possible without prescribing everything.

Bonnie and Misty confirmed there are natural areas for collaboration.

Misty—we could model some collaboration, which is more challenging. I think we might learn things about how we foster ideas.

Bonnie—I think it will benefit our research and teaching programs. Our peer reviews come in from other land grants and are surprised at our separate structure. The structure causes more siloing.

Phyllis—wanted to take the opportunity to ask a little bit about regarding the summit on opioid addiction. She has a colleague (Karen Darenfenko—leading opioid researcher at UTHSC) present via ZOOM. How can we collaborate?

Randy—email me directly and I'll connect you with everyone. Don't know how we missed Karen, but will get her connected. The problem has been that we have lots of folks working on this, but no one talking to each other. Karen—welcome to the commit—looking forward to seeing you there.

Karen—looking forward to it. They are having a lot of success with opioid addiction at UTHSC.

Randy—I can use your help regarding communication re unification effort.

Jorge—did you see the survey. I'm curious about the questions.

Bonnie—I'll share it. I think it was biased.

Randy—unfortunately the longer folks have misinformation, the more they believe it. I've got to make a lot of calls.

Misty—this survey does not represent faculty senate. I've heard overwhelmingly positive comments.

Bruce—collaborating with Oak Ridge has proven a challenge for the years I've worked here. Every new administrator says let's do it, but has a hard time doing it.

Randy—Mark had a good observation—we don't have shared objectives or metrics.

Bonnie-some logistic problems with Oakridge. i.e. money that you get on a grant where UTK is the primary can't in some cases be passed on to OR.

Randy—there are some practical things as well such as regular bus service.

Linda—this unification lifts the reputation across the state. The added impact at a national level helps everyone.

Misty—will other campuses be presenting at the Athletics committee. Noticed that only UTK was mentioned.

Randy—other campuses should be there as well.

Randy—we will work together on this. We will focus on things like concussion prevention state wide. Also, student success as it relates to athletes.

Misty—how can we get beyond the “football bubble” and get those benefits (such as advising).

Randy leaves at 12:42.

BREAK

Bruce called meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

Approval of the minutes.

Misty—want to understand Lela’s argument about the workaround mentioned in the minutes. Not a correction just more information. What is the timeframe?

Linda—going to be brought to the board at the next board meeting for the next tenure cycle.

Beth moves. Renee seconds. Approved unanimously.

New Business

1. Election of Chair

Phyllis—suggests that it should rotate campuses.

UTM’s time. Chris is nominated by Renee. Chris says he’s willing. Unanimous approval.

Linda—thanks to Bruce for serving. Really appreciate the work he’s invested. Also thanks those who are rotating off. You will be missed.

Bruce—I will be continuing another year as the rep.

2. Meeting Calendar (Bruce)

Phyllis—one question—what about secretary? Consensus was that it will be decided at the first meeting of the next year.

Misty—do we need to meet monthly?

Linda—President Boyd gave me options for when to meet with UFC.

Beth—every meeting this year has been two hours plus. When would we get things done. Plus Mr. Boyd has been at every meeting except two this year. It's a great opportunity to discuss with him.

Bruce—hate to see us give up the opportunity to meet with Randy.

Chris—if we can just move off subjects once we are spinning our wheels. We might be able to handle it by moving it online.

Beth—really important to have conversation with Randy.

Linda—Randy's learning how to use these meetings in terms of conversation. He can tap into the collective group.

Beth moves to accept calendar as is (can be changed later).

Renee seconds.

Unanimous approval.

Linda—change in the November [sic Winter] meeting dates. Will send those to us.

Linda—one of the things the ERS committee has been talking to me about is doing a summer workshop with the ERS Committee with UFC. Allocation of faculty effort, workload and other items the board is looking at. This is just an idea now, but will be explored with the board. Told them we would be interested.

Bonnie—I'm curious as to why the faculty rep is not included in orientation.

Linda—I've asked that and we are going to try to figure out why. They would be valuable.

Misty—Is it within the realm of the board to appoint a faculty member to itself?

Jorge—state law defines composition.

Linda—Board views Bonnie as the voice of the faculty to the board. I've tried to reinforce that that is a good way to get the faculty perspective.

Phyllis—now that we don't have a faculty trustee. WE only have a representative to the ERC. We've lost continuity. What about suggesting that since we know who is coming up next. At the point that that next person is determined, that that person be allowed to attend as a guest.

Linda—meetings are public.

Chris—Jeff did attend.

Phyllis—is there a purpose to make it formal?

Bonnie—with the way it's set up they could get someone who has no experience with faculty governance.

Phyllis—is there a need to formalize an “on deck” person who is coming up?

Linda—are you suggesting that the board elect that person in advance—a faculty rep “elect.”

Phyllis—why not.

Linda—I will pursue that.

Renee—on our campus, our chancellor was going to nominate whomever the faculty senate nominated.

Misty—on our campus, it was not at all clear that it was going to be someone with shared governance experience.

Renee—maybe it's time to change how the person is chosen as well. Whose idea was it to have the dean's choose?

Bonnie—it came from UTK's administration.

General consensus that it is a good issue to push back on.

Phyllis—separate asks—having someone on deck. Change how that person is chosen?

Linda—the way I'll approach it is we have had this in place for a year and we've learned some things.

Bruce—do we say “chosen” by the senate or “recommended” by the faculty senate.

Linda—we could say “experience with faculty governance.”

Renee—if this person is representing the faculty, then it should be the faculty who recommends.

Misty—I've heard alarming arguments such as that the faculty senate doesn't rep the faculty.

Bruce—that's something that could be done without changing the law—just change the board policy.

3. Campus Reports

UTC--Steve

UTHSC?—(having video problems)

George—Now have 70% of faculty who are NTT. Chancellor—says the TT faculty are “aging out.” We will probably go to 90% NTT.

Faculty Senate: we have finally given the college of medicine—have faculty members in K and Chat to elect senators. Started selection for PPPR. Now we have to get together those review committees.

We have asked for years to have an ombudsperson. Our chancellor does not want one over the whole organization, but rather in colleges approved by deans.

Changed our calendar for APPR. Helped with the problem of finishing our classes in June and getting faculty reviews done.

Increased the number of students in colleges.

Biggest problem is in pharmacy. We used to have one in TN. We now have 6 across the state. We now have 200 students. Becomes a problem for students because they can't find jobs in the state. Pharmacies don't seem to hiring full-time pharmacists.

Lot of work on our handbook and bylaws. Mostly trying to keep up with changes in the system. But also allowing every college to have the same amount of representation. This summer a new orientation for Faculty Senators.

Bruce--Are your NTT faculty eligible for senate

Peg—Yes. Many of them are.

Linda—reason why the ombudsperson could not be hired at campus level

George—Chancellor doesn't want one.

Phyllis—In light of all that's going on with faculty evaluation procedures. The arduous hours that it takes for senate officer hours to deal with faculty grievances. The Ombudsperson could help with the speed and help the FS officers especially. Since this is board mandated stuff and since the UFC has been talking about this for years and years, I'm curious if this is something that could be a system level thing—if not hiring this person, but maybe having the system mandate it to campuses.

Renee—UTM does not have one.

Beth--Chattanooga has one.

Bruce—we used to have two one for faculty one for staff.

Bonnie—we have one now.

Jorge—it's difficult to argue against having one today. They can deal with issues before they escalate and also let the administration know about patterns.

Renee—Not familiar with role.

Beth—a mediation role. Rather than an official grievance.

Jorge—imagine if five people go to the ombuds about the same complaint.

Phyllis—our chancellor isn't opposed to individual deans having an ombudsperson, but he doesn't feel like it should happen at the campus level.

Bonnie—what if the dispute is between people from different colleges.

Bruce—is there a value at having a person at a system level.

Beth—harder to get to that person?

Misty—if you could give the campus ombuds authority to go higher that could solve any issues that might arise on a higher level. But on faculty level, better on a campus.

Phyllis—physical distance not as important as workload. What is the most efficient level?

Linda—often work best when they are close to the situation—not so much physical distance, but closeness to the situation.

Linda—all formal grievances come to me. Most of what I see aren't really grievances. I work to get them resolved at the college or dept. or campus level.

Phyllis—how can we leverage the system power to get all the campuses an ombudsperson.

Jorge—hopefully, we can look at our system peers. I think we are going to find that local campuses have their own ombudsperson.

George—the biggest problem is that administrators do not know what ombudspersons are. International Ombudsperson Association is the place to start, but you need to go beyond it.

Misty—question for HSC. At UTHSC, the senate bylaws are an appendix of the Handbook? Does this need to be approved by the BOT?

George—yes. We wanted them to be in the handbook so they couldn't be changed easily.

UTM, UTC and UTK the bylaws are fully independent.

George—biggest problem we've had is that we had separated our procedures from the handbook. After all these years, it's never been put back together.

UTK Report:

Misty—in report, I linked into yearend reports from committees. Many of us consider our biggest accomplishment was pushing for the reinstatement of the office of diversity. Continuing to work with that office. Turning to faculty expertise (beyond shared governance)

A really good year of collaboration after a rocky start. Brand new provost and fired chancellor. Trust level was improved.

Major improvements in outdated Handbook language. Now have an up to date handbook. Converting to an online format. We will have an online handbook with links to the relevant appendices. We will also have archived copies so that can go back and track the changes.

Several resolutions—Parking accommodations for third trimester mothers. Working with the Provost office to do better faculty evaluator training. Our budget committee had a really productive meeting with Athletics staff.

Got nowhere on concept of raises connected to PPPR and gave up that fight perhaps prematurely, but we are tracking the number of hours that go into this process to see if it is in fact efficient.

Passed a new gen ed curriculum called Vol Core. Spreads Gen Ed throughout four years. Launching it in 2021. That will be a race. New categories. Hosting a weeklong series of lunch meetings to talk about content of courses. Committed to making sure the rollout goes well.

This year started “mini-minutes” seemed to go well. Faculty reported in survey that they seemed to be really well informed by the senate.

Chancellor search—Misty served on it. Thrilled to welcome Donde [Plowman].

We have a new ombudsperson. We have a new faculty senate training/retreat

Nervous about the registered student organization process. Going to monitor that. Might raise some painful issues.

Linda if a group is tied to a [student organization], how can we still get that input without creating a forum? How each campus operationalizes it might look different, but there are some general principles about what we can do or can't do.

Misty—have to commend Vice Chancellor who represented us well.

NTT faculty pay will be on the radar next year.

Our working slogan is “student success is all we do.” We have some ideas about faculty centric approaches to student success.

George—parking resolution question—we had an issue about breast pumping station. There is a law that requires a space and time for mothers to do this.

Renee—we just got one in at Martin—a lactation room. Only one on campus.

Beth—we found an office with no windows for this at UTC.

Bonnie—gender salary equity—it took months for this group to do something. We think that when this is finished it will provide a model for other campuses to use.

Renee—so that model will be available to be used on other campuses?

Bonnie—that's what I'm pushing for.

Misty—the one catch on getting the gender study done was the methodology—we think we have a solution for that. Our goal is a methodology that is sustainable.

Linda—other places I've been at this was an annual report by the faculty senate.

Bonnie—standardization of some of these things is really needed.

Misty—the salary survey highlights the bigger issue that the faculty senate is facing—communication. All information is not getting to the faculty member. Some things stop at deans or dept. heads. We are looking at the most effective ways to communicate to faculty members without simply creating more noise in your inbox. I'm an advocate for a weekly faculty email that compiles non-emergency faculty information. There was resistance to that. Going to see what the VC of communications comes up regarding this.

UTM Report:

Renee--First part of the year devoted to updating our handbook. Brand new provost started when I did. He deferred to faculty senate on almost everything. Implementing the new changes (PPPR, etc.) has caused hiccup. College level committees, i.e. Some problems getting letters out to folks regarding their moving to the next stage. Administrator letters to faculty came out late. This made faculty members anxious. I was getting calls from faculty members, which reminds me of the need for the ombudsperson. PPPR is still an issue for us. We don't know who is going to be up for it this coming year. So implementing is really the issue.

Bruce—is there a procedure for how faculty members will be staggered?

Chris and Renee—not that has been made public

Jorge—when faculty receive contracts, does this say where they are in the process?

All--Generally not.

George—we used to do that, but there were too many letters.

Peg—I've gotten an email about PPPR. It had a lot of details about the process.

Renee—we've not gotten the PPPR done yet. We needed to update bylaws in the departments. None of the colleges had bylaws. We spent the first part of year developing those.

Bruce—does that include expectations for rank

Renee—yes. We are also revamping our faculty evaluation process. We have beta groups testing that out. It's an ongoing, complicated process.

Salaries have been a major issue—especially related to how merit pays were distributed and market issues. Issues concerning leave were also addressed.

FMLA happens so infrequently that most dept. chairs do not know how to handle it. We think we have issues related to this solved, but they could pop up again.

One thing I'm most proud of. Survey of NTT faculty. They can't serve as senators. They don't have committees or anything that represents them directly. Survey asked about issues of concern, awareness of policies, support, etc. Result of surveys sent to the deans to work on actual items. Senate created an ad hoc committee of NTT faculty. Will continue to work on this issue.

Bonnie—How big is the population?

Renee—about 300. Our "centers" all have lecturers and adjuncts.

Determined method for faculty member on the local advisory board.

UTM will not get raises this year due to their financial situation. Second time since Renee has been there that UTM did not get raises when others in the system did.

Our regional retention summit was really good. Jorge, Randy, Chris attended. Everyone thought it was a success. Shocked at how many signed up for it. Retention and enrollment are going to continue to be important issues for our faculty.

Bruce—any feel for what UT Promise is going to do for you all?

Renee—I don't think it will do much.

Renee—at Martin it's going to be room and board that's the problem.

Our enrollment team has been doing a great job. They've increased our enrolment the past two years.

Bonnie—your freshmen are required to stay on campus for TWO years? Is that a deterrent that needs to be looked at it?

Renee—I think there are bigger financial issues that they are looking at.

Linda—there is a lot of data that says that students that stay on campus have a higher retention/grad rate—especially for the student demo that Martin has.

Misty—But it can be a deterrent to get them to come in the first place.

Misty—don't know if there is another university that has a strong model for how to help students with food issues.

Bonnie—Penn State has addressed this, particularly for homelessness.

Linda—every campus in our system has a process to help homeless students.

Many in the room were not aware of this.

Renee—wish there was a list for all student resources available in one place that's updated regularly.

Misty—we have one phone number that faculty members can call that helps triage issues.

Break—3:12-26

4. System/campus support for an Institutional ORCID (Phyllis)

Phyllis—regarding Faculty evaluation stuff, on our individual campuses, as I understand it, the BOT or our system mandated a faculty reporting system to be implemented on every campus. Is that correct?

Jorge—can you tell us more

Phyllis—we just had to adopt. Digital Measures.

Beth—UTC has Digital Measures

Renee—UTM DM as well

Misty—UTK has elements. It's relatively new and a different tool as the other campuses.

Phyllis—Is it correct, that that was something that was mandated that all campuses adopt in order to streamline reporting back to the BOT.

Beth—we did it on our own.

Renee—we had to do it.

Phyllis—we were told we had to and that it had something to do with what was needed to provide the board.

Linda—it would have been before I got here. I can find out more information.

Phyllis—the bottom line is that we all have some faculty reporting system and it is something that all of the faculty's activities, etc. go into this. The one advantage is that it can pull from different systems (Banner, etc.). Something that we have been made aware of is ORCID. That is a universal identifier that follows a faculty member in terms of their scholarship.

Bonnie—ORCID is only one way of doing that. We have ORCID here at UTK—at least the library does.

Phyllis—you can use this with other systems. Bottom line, there's more power if you do it at a system level than if you do it at a campus level. The cost is different. Is this something that could be explored at all campuses?

Linda—moving forward as we look at implementation of something new, but when a campus is adopting new software, etc., we will ask if there is a cost saving to do this at a system level. We won't make campuses change systems they have just implemented.

Jorge—we have talked about various systems. As contracts become renewed we do want to consider advantages for campuses using same software, service, etc.

Phyllis—a universal id that places you at an institution, I would strongly encourage those who make these decisions to consider this.

5. Update from Academic Affairs and Student Success

Linda—one of the things I'm excited about. Sometime in the summer the provosts have been working on funds for student success. There will be funds available for faculty or others to tap

into. Particularly for those who work across departments/colleges. Decisions will be made at the first of the year so that they can be implemented in the following year. There will be ½ million in funds available. UTK is excited because this is a way to provide support for existing programs that are already successful.

Last year we did a student success summit on mattering and belonging. WE asked campuses to identify those who would benefit. We decided to do a summit every year and focus on a different topic. Mental Health and Wellness is a topic that rose to the top this year. Your provosts will be able to nominate.

(not Karen) expounded on summit. We are looking for faculty involvement ideas. I might be reaching out to you to see how we can incorporate ideas that have come up today. Nov. 22

Misty—would like to see faculty built in to the front end of the planning. Student success does not mean anything if it does not include classroom success. Sometimes these initiatives do not always engage faculty meaningfully. For example, if you have a summit in Nashville and you are teaching, this is not always easy. Beauvais recruited faculty at the last minute for the first summit. The second smaller summit, I was the only faculty member that could go due to the last minute notice. How to work with teaching schedule? How do you get a large group of faculty together? Etc.

Linda—another thing we are doing. At the state level there is a lot of interest in teacher preparation program. How do we do a better job. Campuses have been engaged in this conversation for a while. We have the opportunity to talk to folks from SCORE about how do we measure successful programs. One glaring example—we only get credit for teachers who get jobs in state. UT Promise has a mentoring component and service promise. Working to coordinate with campuses and TN Promise so that campuses do not have to take on the burden of that. We will have a lot of updates on that.

The other big thing is the external review of tenure process. The last board wanted us to look and see if the tenure process is working. Are we following the process? What are best practices? Randy and the new board think this is a good idea. We are looking at processes, practices, procedures, etc. Jorge is taking the charge on this. We will have an hour of discussion with the group with UFC later when they come in.

Jorge—doc. “Best Practices in Tenure” AAUP. The charge to the committee based on this document. Wed. Aug. 28 in the morning is the date that is set aside for discussion with UFC. Please mark it on your calendars.

Bonnie—People have different appointments (research/teaching vs. extension). There have been cases where a person was not doing well in one of these areas, but had their appointment changed so that they were appointed in the area in which they were doing well.

Linda—this should not be a safety net, but rather decided based on the need of the college or dept.

Bonnie—that's not always been the case.

Linda—we don't always see that. It happens in Ag sometimes because need change (teaching vs. extension).

Linda—if there are concerns about if we are following procedures—where we need to be doing better—help us by making suggestions.

Linda—the reviewers that we have—it's hard to get folks at different levels to do this. What I did was looked at all the peer institute for our campuses and look at folks that were looking at tenure reviews, etc., and saw if they were faculty, dept. head, dean, etc. then I looked at of all these people are there some that fill smaller boxes, then I wanted unique perspectives, so I was trying to get as many different experiences as possible on this committee.

Jorge—[Dr. Marlene Strathe (committee chair) - Professor and Director of the School of Education, Iowa State University; Dr. Mark Arant - Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Murray State University; Dr. Ronnie D. Green - Chancellor, University of Nebraska – Lincoln; Dr. Steven K. Smith - Secretary of the Faculty, University of Wisconsin – Madison.]

Linda—they come with accreditation expertise and backgrounds.

Jorge—I think this review represents a unique opportunity—advantage of having outside eyes. To get some wonderful feedback. I'm looking forward to this review.

Bruce—outcome will be a report?

Linda—yes—report and recommendations to the President

Bonnie—looking at the board materials. I mentor Assist profs one of whom should have gone up early, but our chancellor would not allow anyone to go up early. Just this year because of what had happened with board concerns.

Misty—after November we should have a clearer policy on early tenure.

Bruce—is there a timeframe for report?

Jorge—Initial report to president on day they head out. Actual report within thirty days of the visit in time for the Nov. Board meeting.

Misty—RFP for student success. What kinds of participation are you imagining from faculty?

Linda—I think there are faculty who are going to come forward with ideas. I think it's wide open.

Misty—is it only trans-disciplinary teaching?

Linda—it can be used to pay a salary or buy someone out, but it can be used to do something you want to do.

Jorge—if one faculty member is doing something interesting in the classroom, they can apply for that for say \$10,000. If there is something that is across colleges or departments, they can apply for larger sums. One of the intents is to support innovative ideas.

Bruce—how to measure success

Jorge—there is a rubric that will be assigned to proposals. We are hoping to have participation from all campuses. Hoping to have information sessions for folks to get feedback on their proposals.

Misty—how are you generating rubrics

Jorge—developing a steering committee, hopefully with representatives from each campus.

Misty—is the audience for this faculty?

Linda—faculty or staff—best if it involves both. Trying to get conversations started across boundaries where conversations don't always happen.

Jorge—hoping that successful projects (re: student success) will be funded in the future with other funds.

Misty—what is the faculty incentive beyond general good heartedness? How to incentivize? How to find the time, effort?

Linda—maybe we strongly encourage release time.

Linda—the Provosts are very excited about the opportunity. We will find what works and what doesn't.

Linda leaves 4:12

Bruce dismisses as 4:18

Breakfast meeting 7:02-7:50

Randy, Beth, Jamie, Linda, Chris, Bruce, Renee, Misty, Bonnie (late), Phyllis, Jorge, Terry, John Compton

Summary

- graduate education in Knoxville—Bonnie—tremendous room for improvement. Policies to grow + reputation +their importance to research mission.
- RSO policy—as faculty advisors, as close to the students. (DEPENDS on what’s in packet).
- Increase in graduation rates—Renee and Martin—where admission standards are lower. Not an end in itself. What we want are more educated students, so don’t let the grad rate drive rate the real conversation
- Possible System-wide interaction among faculty in problem/graduation undermining courses.
- UTHSC—need more resources for faculty. HAVE GEORGE or the president elect take that one??
- Round with Steve and Beth for UTC’s issues.
- Importance of open forums—praise for the system we have, the results we get. Positive things about shared governance and transparency.

College level committee.

ORCID—

Terry?-Initial application is time consuming. That’s the biggest concern. The problem is not unwillingness, but difficulty. I. e. they are not linked to NIH.

Phyllis—But it can track all of their scholarship. It’s a global think. If follows the faculty member no matter which institution they are affiliated with. To have this at the institutional level, if it is from the institutional level down, rather than an individual doing it all. That makes it more efficient.

Misty—a lot of formats promise auto populating, but they don’t always work. But I think the idea that we need to be gathering better data is good. We are all on board for those things.

John—is there not an off the shelf best practice.

Linda—There is not. Across the country there is no standard.

Misty—the conversation is so important on the front end. No matter if its elements or Digital Measures. When there’s no conversation at the system level, it can look like it’s not being done.

Phyllis—Knoxville already has ORCID. The question becomes efficiency of scale. Can other campus have access to this and it being cost effective for all.

Jorge—this is not an area where we want to get behind.

Graduation rates/student success.

Renee—as we increase enrollment rates, what will the success rates be in the end. Do we have the tools necessary to accomplish what we need with increased enrolment? Student success involves faculty and that’s not what we always get from the student success center.

Terry—multiple ways to get student success.

Misty—the relationship with professor is the number one indicator of student success. Commitment to tenure is an investment. A student success summit where you don't have a lot of faculty—you are missing something.

John--Can we get a review of UTC, UTM, UTK re: student success? And what is best practice regarding this.

Randy—addressing issues for at risk students.

Linda—here's the key—we are doing most of the things that GA state is doing, but not as intentional because we don't have the data. They have real-time data. Sometimes we don't know until the end of the semester. Didn't swipe meal cards, class attendance, etc.

Misty—the technology can be transformative.

Renee—professors don't always have the time to manage all the data input with everything else they have to do.

Jorge—the way we are most diff from GA state is the data infrastructure.

John—this would suggest we need a CIO. Someone to turn to and say solve this problem.

Linda—Colorado State has also had a big turnaround.

Randy—we've got to wake up every day saying this is the most important thing.

Randy—Linda and her team have half a million for faculty to come up with student success initiatives.

Linda—some of these might start small, but they could be scalable?

Bonnie—could we recruit someone from GA state or Col state?

John—There might be someone (CIO) in the corporate world that is tired of corporate world.

Misty—open forums are incredibly welcome and they really do make a difference

Randy—wish we had more time for more. They are some of the most productive times I've had.

Misty—we elected Chris as president of UFC yesterday. Campus new FS presidents are listed.

Advising

Misty—internships

Randy—desire on the board to standardize policies. That standardization has made us late on some of these policies because of the nuances of each campus. So we decided to create a template, but let campuses edit from the template. I don't think we can have a standard policy. We will not create a policy to stop sex week. Sex Week will go on.

MISTY—

John—the board has to be careful getting involved in day to day operations—that's why we have administrations.

Graduate education

Bonnie—our graduate education is a huge part of our research mission. Our faculty are paying for graduate students out of their funds.

Phyllis—at all campuses.

Terry—the cost for graduate students is increasing. Basically we are being priced out of the market. There is so much stress on the research grant.

John—graduate programs across the country are starting to decline. I'd like to see a big picture view of what's happening post-grad.

Linda—different disciplines are increasing and decreasing at different rates.

Bonnie—if the dept has well qualified applicant and all they are lacking is assistantships, there should be some sort of program to help with this.

Randy—leaves with a commitment to shared governance.