

Meeting 120 Minutes
Nov 7, 2019; Videoconference
11:45 am (ET) / 10:45 pm (CT)

Room 367 of the UTK Student Union, 1502 Cumberland Ave. Lunch starts at 11:30.
Parking in S30 near the Andy Holt Tower, 1331 Circle Park Drive.

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 Philip Smartt (Faculty Senate President)
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 Randy Boyd (System President)
UT Linda C. Martin (Vice President, Academic Affairs & Student Success)

Faculty Council Guests

UT Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)
Stacey Patterson

BOT John Compton (Chair)

UTM Terry Cooper

Call to Order Chris Caldwell, Chair

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Questions of, and update from, President Boyd and Chair Compton

Randy updated on extending the land grant to all campuses. The goal is to provide a ladder up. The UT Promise has been fully introduced and is receiving a lot of enthusiasm. Recipients will also get 3 different mentors – 1st for FAFSA and application processes, 2nd is for the first two years on campus (faculty, upperclassmen or administrators), and the 3rd mentor for last two years

from the community to help transition to jobs. All recipients will do community service. The plan is for 1300 upper classmen (250 already applied). Incoming freshman – goal of 700, over 2500 have applied.

John Compton stated he will meet with us including Randy Boyd as an overview, then meet with us as a UFC only group. Looking back on the first year, the Focus act and new board started a year ago. November 8 will confirm the 11th member. Board members are great and have put their heart and soul into this process. State legislature relationship is very good. Endowment has never been stronger. There is some concern about enrollment. Less high school students are coming to the market. Research dollars are increasing. Foundational to all plans and goals are the facilities. The State is doing well with providing campuses facilities as needed. Most of what the state legislature was concerned with has been addressed. Transparency and access have been increased. The Board is talking to UFC and other groups. They believe they have the voice of the organization; voices of students and voices of faculty are being listened to.

Bruce noted that we are now at 11 months and asked Randy for his observations on running a university versus a business. Randy responded that he had some opportunities in between. Public service work helped in the transition. Entrepreneurship is the biggest part of understanding the university piece. Work as public servant and with the state were strong preparation coming into this job. How are they different? Every organization has a level of persuasion to get people to move. On a scale of 1-10, business is probably a 3 or 4; in government, probably a 6 or 7; being in higher education, probably a 10. There is so much independence and there are so many different stakeholders: alumni, external stakeholders, students, legislature and taxpayers, faculty, and all staff and other workers. HE takes a lot more vision and advocacy than other organizations.

Gary inquired further about the enrollment question related to community colleges and all of the articulation agreements; are we sure we are doing as much as we could to open those gates? With the old TBR, they may have been pushed to the 4 year plus institutions of TBR. Now that those are independent, can we push our land grant status to recruit and engage those students? Increase our presence at the community colleges and make it easier for student to get through the process. John Compton agreed and mentioned his son's challenges with taking a couple of classes at Pellissippi State in addition to being enrolled at UTK.

Randy asked, how can we work closer together in the online conversation? Linda responded that we are working with a cross campus team to do just that. The UFC may be able to help. Currently it is easier to transfer from community college to UT Knoxville than from other UT schools. Approximately 84% of students who sign up for Tennessee Promise say they will do 2 years in community college and then 2 years at a university. We are losing a lot of those. We aren't really doing a good job on that transfer process yet.

Jeff asked if we have data of why only 16 % of the Tennessee promise are coming to 4 year schools. Linda stated that we are working on parsing out the data and finding why they aren't coming. Consider putting advisors in the two year schools to help guide the process.

Phillip recommended that we do it campus to campus, department to department. UTM has great success doing this. Smooth transition is seen and they know what is coming. Linda mentioned

that is also good to use the student organizations.

Chris remarked on what an excellent job Randy has been doing. We have hired a chancellor and started a president search. Randy loves being here, but didn't know how much he would. He can't imagine a bigger and better place to make a difference. If given the opportunity, he is willing to continue to do so.

John Compton stated that he will meet later with UFC directly without Randy and discussed the pros and cons of an appointment.

Chris asked that we take approve of the minutes from last meeting. All approved.

Update from Academic Affairs and Student Success

Stacey reported that we have preliminary numbers for NSF. We will put in a system wide high according to preliminary numbers. All campuses moving in a positive direction. They are working on developing a committee for putting faculty research data on the transparency dashboard. Members of all campuses will be represented. The process of faculty self-reporting creates some challenges. How do we on any given campus ensure that we are reporting similar things in similar ways? Bruce asked what indicators we are looking at. Stacey responded that currently we have different systems for different campuses. They use Elements at Knoxville, while Digital Measures is used on other campuses, but different instances on each campus. Cayuse is system wide for funding of research. We are looking at metrics like publications and presentations, but this is hard to do because it is not part of the evaluation process for everyone...not uniform. Bruce mentioned there are scholarly concerns about the validity of these systems. Gary stated that Elements system is not entered by faculty, and what it pulls isn't always 100% accurate. Stacey said they are really looking to make sure they are categorized and expenditures and other categories are captured. Over time, the dashboard will become more inclusive.

Stacey provided a brief update on the institute, stating that President Boyd will give a brief update at the Board meeting on where we are. Stacey has given 14 talks about the process. The steering committee has been hard at work – 14 members with representation from both sides. They are looking at governance, strategy of implementation, and impact. Both groups will have equal representation for everything we do. Some of these are conversations that have never happened before. The committee will present a recommendation report to Donde, Thomas Zacharia, and Randy by December of this year.

Bruce asked if there are there any specific plans to do a formal retrospective every so often. Stacey stated that the draft plan has an annual evaluation and course correction process. The budget model is dependent on mutual success. If we are not making the progress, then course corrections will be required quickly. Gary asked who would receive that evaluation. Stacey said that the organization reports jointly to the lab director and the UTK provost.

Stacey also reported that next week the One UT collaboration and innovation opportunity will be announced. Randy is providing seed opportunities for faculty and staff to promote innovative collaborative ideas to educate, discover, and connect. This grant opportunity is open to all UT faculty and staff, with up to \$50,000 to seed any idea. \$1.5 million total available. \$500,000 for

each category. Bruce asked who is evaluating the application. This will be Stacey and Linda. The rubric will be published. Jorge. Feedback will go to all applicants. The due date is February 3. Awards will be made on April 6.

Linda reported for Academic Affairs. They have finally finished with the UTK-UTIA listening sessions – 20+ town halls all over the state. The report is published in the Transparent UT website.

Institutional Research will now report to Linda. Tonja's position will not be rehired. David Miller got HR and IT. One goal will be to help provide decision support. There are new committees working on the departmental profiles process. Beth asked about the other related committees. Linda state that she will get that information out.

Phillip asked a question about the UT Online across system processes. Linda met with the chancellors this morning. How do we create a mini consortium? We will give campuses control of access. UTC would review our online offerings and they could be listed across the campuses. Tuition dollars would be exchanged behind the scenes – financial aid – grades from teaching campus to the student's home campus. The goal is to create a seamless opportunity for students. If faculty say courses would not count, they would not appear on the list available to students. Each campus can set controls for seats and how many available. Campuses control the access. Faculty control the curriculum. They are working on the mechanics – how do we make it work. One of the surprises was how relatively small our online footprint is at this time. So much opportunity and so much more we can do. Linda will send updates to everyone. A team will be put together with faculty and leadership representation along with ideas to try at various campuses.

Linda mentioned that as a system, we need to look at faculty as a cohort – how many make it to tenure and what happened to those who didn't make the 6 years. How do we help faculty to be successful? Why are they leaving? Bruce mentioned that we should think about not just official reasons for leavings, but consider that we may also get feedback from the department about why they left. Linda agreed that having a sense of that will be helpful. Terry stated that we might want to get the same information for those you lose after tenure. Non-tenure track faculty concerns were also mentioned and Martin asked how the system is working with nontenure for these processes? Linda stated that we are having these conversations on the campuses for career ladders for the nontenure track faculty.

Bruce asked how PPPR is going across the campuses. LM stated that it is happening now. We will take a look in a couple of years, then may say we do not really need this. The shop is being minded.

Chris asked what we are doing as faculty to evaluate your tenure processes on our campuses. He did a survey of everyone who went up for tenure. Asked them was the procedure followed? Did things happen on time? Are campuses going through bylaws? Martin stated that this is a formative evaluation process. Linda stated that we may see areas for opportunity in the external review of tenure process report. Jorge stated that when he thinks of things at the system level, it is for the systematic review of the processes. Linda stated that general council is now working with the system level process to scan for inconsistencies; they are still cleaning up those

processes.

A reminder was given that breakfast is Friday, November 8 at 7:30 am and the UFC is invited.

Chris called for adjournment.