



UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

Meeting 118 Agenda
Sept 18, 2019
Videoconference
4:00 pm (ET) / 3:00 pm (CT)

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

- UTHSC Peg Hartig (Faculty Senate President)
Martin Donaldson (Campus Representative)
- UTK Gary Skolits (Faculty Senate President)
Bruce MacLennan (Campus Representative)
- UTM Chris Caldwell (Campus Representative)
- UTC Jamie Harvey (Faculty Senate President)
Beth Crawford (Campus Representative)

Faculty Appointee to Education, Research & Service Committee (Ex-Officio voting)

- UTM Jeff Rogers (Board of Trustees ERS Committee faculty appointee)

UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-voting Members

- UT Linda C. Martin (Vice President, Academic Affairs & Student Success) -

Faculty Council Guests

- UT Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)
- UT Stacey Patterson (Vice President, Research, Outreach, and Economic Development)

Call to Order Chris Caldwell, Chair

President Boyd was unable to join us today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of minutes of previous meeting

Old Business

None

New Business

Quick question from Jeff about ERS priority of issues (referred to the email prior to agenda). Academic Affairs reported that there are many collaborations that we can do to establish a common mission. There was a question from Martin about what type of collaboration? Is it mostly research? Linda stated that it will include all types of collaboration. The Board is noticing that we all do things differently. Our goal is to find ways to do some things the same way, and achieve this through collaborations. For example, immunizations policies and processes are different for different campuses. When is the appropriate time/process to require? How can we

work together to streamline processes when possible?

Stacey reported on existing collaboration at the different campuses. There is a fair amount, but not as much as we would like. More collaborative incentives would be helpful.

Jeff mentioned that service collaborations could be added as well. We do similar things, but don't know about each other and what we are doing. Stacey responded that there are lots of opportunities for collaboration on an educational front and how we deliver learning. Linda mentioned that UFC could be very valuable in thinking about the barriers to success of collaboration. Bruce stated that faculty have to support this collaborative effort. We need to remove false perceptions and any software barriers. Perception becomes reality. Jeff mentioned faculty credentialing for campuses. Linda stated that we can identify some of those opportunities for collaboration and bring them to the light.

Chris asked everyone as we think of more of these examples, please contact Jeff and let him know.

Update from Academic Affairs and Student Success

Linda stated that Stacey Patterson is also here to make a research update.

Linda reported that this week, there is a big teacher preparation meeting, legislators, campus reps, faculty, department heads. They will be discussion how we work together as a system for teacher preparation processes. UTK is doing some innovative things, as are other campuses. They don't often talk together, so this is a good opportunity.

Linda stated that there will be a November summit on mental health and wellness to empower faculty to identify students of concern. What are best practices to meet needs of student mental health and wellness? Health Sciences has helped with the planning of this event, and students, faculty, and campus leadership teams are working together to get help to students when they need it.

Linda updated the group that the external review report is due in 30 days. The initial report provided before they left was very positive. The group identified some opportunities for process and streamlining (before Provost level, letters signed, files complete, etc). The Provost should have all of the pieces needed when the decision gets to him/her. Perhaps we can have a college level person to sign off that all is complete and there is uniformity in what is coming out of the college. The external committee was very interested in the UFC. They thought this was such a wonderful idea and none of them had seen such a group at their institutions. They appreciated the recognition of differences and nuances amongst the campuses and really enjoyed that. They were complimentary of UFC passion and pride. After the final report is received, we will work together with campuses for action plans. Through the external review team, we will have identified things around the country that might assist in our processes.

Jorge reported on the Skyhawk retention summit. At that event, the UTM SACSCOC liaison proposed a statewide network of SACSCOC liaisons to promote collaboration and dissemination of best practices, Jorge is working with THEC to get this initiative off the ground. The eventual

goal is a conference in the summer of 2020. SACSCOC was positive about the idea. We can work together to create a positive picture. Bruce wondered if collaborations can be pushed to other levels as well. ABET groups have talked across the state. SACSCOC liaisons may work together with many of these groups. The name of the group will be Tennessee Accreditation Network. This collaboration could spread from there. Jeff mentioned that at the annual meeting, lots of people are involved, however the university president may not be involved early in the process. We should make an effort to invite the university leadership to the table earlier in the process. This is a first step.

AA reported on the UTIA/UTK process. There is a Board meeting in two weeks to discuss. UTK and UTIA are accredited as a single institution. Neither of the institutions is a land-grant... only together do we have a land-grant institution. We will now be able to report expenditures and research as a single campus. Standing alone, UTK is 72nd as public institution and UTIA ranks 123rd. If together, we would be 46th in public institutions. This is not a place where we can game the rankings.

Stacey provided a few highlights about the following:

Pre-award colloquium - all the teams come together for two days and talk about processes. One example is that we have moved to Cayuse. The group discussed challenges with processes and how to update in order to remove barriers that those offices see. They also discussed reporting processes and what can be done better, as well as audit findings related to state contracts. Some issues were identified. They are also reviewing new regulations and contract revisions related to foreign input. Bruce interested to see how it works out. He specifically mentioned the Chinese influence; how does it translate into day to day operation. We are all happy to collaborate; we just need to ensure policies and procedures are above board and upfront.

Insight software – this program looks at publications, citations, etc. The spent 6 months cleaning up all the data that the program pulls from various sites. We will be rolling out the results in the next couple of months for review and to look at how we use/report these data. How much are we publishing? Who are we publishing with? Where are we publishing? Where are we not publishing? This will be a valuable tool for collaboration. Bruce asked about the folks from Humanities. There is some concern that we can't find their data in these databases. Will this software work for all disciplines, or just for the sciences? Stacey responded that it is heavy toward science/stem because those databases are more open and public. The team reviewed seven different software packages to get the broadest scan, and Insight was the one that got us the closest. The question was posed whether it reviews book chapters, and Stacey responded that yes it does. We have included people from all campuses in this discussion and weighed the costs with the features. Jorge mentioned that when we think about scholarship in the arts, it is hard to imagine a database that would include everything. Some creative works, such as works of art, would be harder to capture in a database. It was also mentioned that 98% of research funding is from the STEM areas.

Oak Ridge institute at UT – the first steering committee met last week. They appointed an 11-member committee from both groups and a governor's chair. In summary of the meeting, the foundational principles were discussed, people were close on the topics, everyone understands the

issues in similar ways and is eager to jump in with ideas for overcoming barriers. There is a foundational excitement about making this different than it has been in the past. Bruce stated that we have to ensure we understand about the things that were tried in the past and didn't work, and why.

Chris called for any additional discussion items.

Jamie stated that she learned that 9 students at UTC have attempted to commit suicide in this first few weeks of class. This is a national epidemic. Stacey responded that ORNL concerned with this as well as a visiting student committed suicide this week. This is a big issue that faculty and staff need to know how to respond to for our students of concern. Bruce brought up that we need mental health opportunities for faculty in addition to students. Linda responded that this is being worked on. Jorge brought up care for unsuccessful tenure/reappointment candidates that may relate to mental health.

The meeting was adjourned.

Next meeting: Oct 16, 2019