

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

February 27, 2009  
Memphis, Tennessee

The Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Tennessee met at 10 a.m. CST, Friday, February 27, 2009, on the University of Tennessee Health Science Center campus in Memphis, TN.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Spruell Driver, Chair of the Committee, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Dr. Bonnie Yegidis called the roll, and the following voting members were present:

Mr. Spruell Driver  
Ms. Anne Holt Blackburn  
Mr. John Foy  
Ms. Brittany McGruder  
Mr. James Murphy  
Mr. Karl Schledwitz  
Dr. John Schommer  
Ms. Betty Ann Tanner

The following non-voting members were also present:

Mr. Tyler Forrest  
Dr. John Petersen  
Dr. Verbie Prevost  
Dr. Richard Rhoda

She announced a quorum was present.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 24, 2008 MEETING**

Mr. Driver called attention to two items needing correction in the minutes of October 2008. In the roll call the spelling of Trustee Hagler's first name, and on page four regarding the off-campus centers of UTM should read "Selma, Ripley,

and Parsons.” No other changes were suggested. A motion for acceptance was made by Trustee Foy and seconded by Trustee Schommer. Minutes were approved.

#### **IV. REPORT ON ARTICULATION AND TRASFER TASK FORCE**

Mr. Driver: Information Item

In 2008 the General Assembly directed the Tennessee Higher Education Commission to work with the University of Tennessee and the Tennessee Board of Regents to facilitate universal articulation of lower division transfer paths to baccalaureate majors. This legislation builds on a 2000 Act requiring the establishment of a community college transfer track of sixty semester credit hours. Dr. Yegidis gave an overview of UT’s progress regarding these transfer paths and articulation.

Dr. Yegidis: The Tennessee Legislature is concerned about the transferability of general education credits among UT and TBR institutions. This amended legislation directs institutions to develop policies that facilitate transferability of general education for students transferring from a TBR institution to a UT institution. It further encourages the development of state-wide universal articulation agreements among state institutions of higher education. Specifically, campuses are asked to develop lower division transfer pathways for the baccalaureate programs showing the highest transfer rate, beginning with Business and Psychology as majors.

The TBR institutions have established a common general education curriculum. This common curriculum allows for the ease of transfer among institutions within the TBR system. UT institutions do not have a common general education core among its undergraduate campuses at this time. A policy that gives full credit for completion of general education curriculum even when transferring between the campuses of the UT system has been absent.

UT Martin has been the leader in the system with regard to policies on the transferability of general education. Recently UTM approved policy that allows students who have completed all requirements for general education at a TBR institution to get full credit for general education at UT Martin.

Currently UTK and UTC are working with their respective General Education Councils of the Faculty Senate to develop similar language regarding the transfer of general education courses from TBR institutions.

UT Martin has adopted a similar policy regarding transfer of general education requirements for students transferring from another UT campus to UTM as well. It is anticipated that UTC and UTK will adopt these policies in the fall, 2009 semester.

The second part of the legislation and this is at the heart of the amended legislation, calls for a universal articulation of particular academic programs among public higher education institutions in Tennessee. This part of the legislation means that academic programs across the state will have the same or equivalent lower division prerequisite courses, ensuring that transfer students do not have to go back and take additional courses upon transfer to another public institution in the state of Tennessee.

With THEC's consultation, the UT and TBR systems chose to develop these universal articulated pathways for students majoring in the two largest transfer demand programs, Business and Psychology. With our academic partners in the TBR system, faculty and academic leaders at UT are in the process of working out these specific pathways. A meeting of the Business Articulation task force is scheduled for later this spring. Following the completion of the articulation programs for this major, a task force to examine the Psychology prerequisite courses will be constituted to undertake this task.

The timeline to have the Business articulation in place is Fall 2009.

Mr. Driver asked for further clarification of who is responsible for the approval of the revised transfer policies. Dr. Yegidis indicated the faculty committees of the senate have the purview of approving admission and transfer policies.

Mr. Driver added that all share a desire to see more Tennesseans consider starting their higher education career in community colleges to complete the general education requirements the first two years and then transferring to a four year institution. He then asked how this might incentivize graduating high school seniors in doing that, if this type of work is being communicated among Tennessee high schools so that our student population knows that the pathways are going to be clearer to matriculate from the community colleges to the four-year institutions.

Dr. Yegidis replied that this should encourage students to start at community colleges knowing that when they have completed their hours and have their associate degrees with general education completed, they can transfer to either a TBR four-year institution or the University of Tennessee and not have to go back and complete further general education coursework. It was also noted that

each of the three undergraduate UT campuses have articulation agreements with their respective community college partners.

Dr. Rhoda commented that the TBR four-year institutions and the UT campuses are very much perceived as being very receptive to students and that will increase in the coming years.

## **V. REPORT ON RETENTION STATISTICS BY CAMPUS**

Mr. Driver introduced this issue by indicating that each year the Tennessee Higher Education Commission gathers and compiles retention statistics for both the University of Tennessee and the Tennessee Board of Regents systems. He called on Dr. Yegidis to provide an overview of these data and the information that it provides to the trustees. He also indicated that the Chancellors are available to address specific questions about retention on their campuses.

Dr. Yegidis stated that typically retention data are presented for freshman to sophomore year progression. She noted that there are four tables behind Tab 12 depicting freshman to sophomore retention data by campus and for the system overall. The first table presents retention rates for the cohort of first time freshmen from 2007 to 2008. These data are reported by campus and ethnicity, as requested in the previous board meeting in October. For UTK, the retention rate for students overall was 83.6% and for underrepresented groups was 79.1%. For UTC, freshman retention for last year was 60.8% overall, with a similar metric for underrepresented groups 58.6%. UTM freshman-sophomore retention was 70.9% overall, with nearly identical retention rate for underrepresented groups of 70.4%. In summary, retention rates for underrepresented groups at UT overall do not vary substantially from retention rates for the majority population with a possible exception for UTK.

The second table presents freshman to sophomore five year trend data for retention at UT, host to host. Host to host refers to the percentage of students who return to the same campus where they started, for example UTM students returning to UTM sophomore year. It may be seen that retention at UTK has increased somewhat over the last five years, with this year's rate at just below 84%. For Chattanooga, retention has fallen slightly to 60.8% and for UTM retention has been fairly consistent over the last five years, now at 71%. Comparisons are provided with the TBR four year institutions.

The third table (host to anywhere) presents the five year trend data for students who start at a UT campus but return to any Tennessee institution (not just a UT campus). These data are also important because we're interested in providing post-secondary education in Tennessee and ensuring that students graduate,

even if they graduate from a different institution in the state of Tennessee. Predictably, the freshman to sophomore retention rates are higher for cohorts of students who start at UT and then go to a TBR institution.

Finally, the fourth table presents the freshman to sophomore retention data for each UT campus and the TBR institutions by whether or not students maintained their lottery scholarships. These data are being provided because of a specific question raised about this issue at a previous board meeting. As is clear from these data, students who retain their scholarships return for their sophomore year with much greater frequency than those who lose their lottery scholarship support. Each of the Chancellors and their Provosts are here today to answer specific questions about retention data by campus or for any of our campuses.

It was noted that Knoxville is doing a better job at retaining students and should be commended for their success in freshmen to sophomore retention, now at 84%. Mr. Driver echoed the sentiment and then called upon Chancellor Brown to comment upon the retention data on Chattanooga.

Chancellor Brown stated that freshman to sophomore retention at UTC has been one of his strategic concerns since his arrival in 2005. The campus Provost is carefully studying it and he noted that the Provost would make some comments about this. Over the last five years the profile of UTC has changed dramatically, becoming much more of a residential campus. The student body has grown dramatically, but student and academic support services have not kept pace with the additional need. However, resources are being allocated now to serve these students and he feels sure that the results will be seen in future reports. Some strategies don't cost a lot of money, and they are doing these as well. For example, Provost Oldham put a program into place that provides a contact with a first semester freshmen who misses one class with a call or visit to that individual after having missed two classes. UTC has observed that this might make a real difference since attending class is linked with being successful in college. Chancellor Brown assured the Board that the administration is seriously concerned with the retention rate at UTC and recognize it as a critical and strategic challenge, and have implemented strategies to improve retention. He then called on Provost Oldham for his comments.

Mr. Driver asked an additional question at this point, regarding the budget presentations made the previous day and whether or not student support services to enhance retention were being considered in budget reductions. Dr. Brown assured him that this was the case.

Dr. Oldham reported on a number of projects that have be implemented over the past eighteen months to address, as rapidly as possible, the first year

retention rate issue on campus. A task force conducted a study on this issue, and concluded that in part the retention problems were due to the very aggressive growth of the campus. A new freshman advising process has been implemented and faculty and administrative resources have been dedicated to the area of student success. Also, UTC is examining other indicators of success including GPA of first time freshmen, which has increased substantially this fall. In addition, fewer students are on probation this spring semester, as compared to previous spring semesters. Retention rates take some time to improve but UTC is working diligently to address this issues.

Trustee Holt inquired about the financial support for students from community colleges and how it compares to students enrolled at UT. Dr. Yegidis responded the lottery scholarship pays differentially for whether a student is at a community college or a four-year institution because the cost of attendance is different. Dr. Petersen suggested that students get the additional support from the lottery scholarship program when they transfer to a four year or UT institution. Dr. Rhoda agreed with this.

## **VI. REPORT ON GRADUATION STATISTICS BY CAMPUS**

Mr. Driver introduced the next item by stating that each year the Tennessee Higher Education Commission gathers and compiles graduation statistics for both the University of Tennessee and the Tennessee Board of Regents and asking Dr. Yegidis to provide an overview of these data.

Dr. Yegidis reported that the six year graduation rate is how institutions typically report graduation rates, as presented in this item. She noted that UT is engaged in a process of developing benchmarks for both six and four year graduation rates, but the historical data we currently have is on six year graduation rates.

The first table is a display of the six year graduation rate for UTK, UTC, and UTM. It's labeled Fall 2002, so it may seem it isn't current data but it represents a cohort of students who graduated in 2008. For UTK, the six year graduation rate for the students who entered in the Fall 2002 was 58.2%, for UTC it was 39.5%, and for UTM, 45.9% for an overall UT average of 52.2%. There is also a comparison provided with the TBR institutions.

A question was posed about the organization of the data and Dr. Yegidis clarified the presentation of information in the tables. The next table presents the six year graduation rates for students who start at UT and finish at any Tennessee institution within six years with the comparison of our TBR institutions. In addition, data summarizing the U. S. News and World Report rankings was

provided to the Board for discussion. These data provide comparisons of national peers with each of the UT campuses for retention and graduation rates.

A question was asked to explain why graduation rates are lower for host to host cohorts compared with host to anywhere. Dr. Yegidis responded that students who start one place but finish in a different institution still finish and complete the degree. The host to host data will always represent a smaller subset of students who start and finish at the same institution. Dr. Petersen added, from his perspective the second number is the one that is most valid because why penalize with data a student who for one reason or another decides to move between institutions and still succeeds. If a Martin student after two or three years wants to move to Chattanooga or Knoxville or a TBR institution and still pursue their education and get their degrees, there shouldn't be a penalty. The host to host is such an easy number to get because it's all contained in one place, but the host to anywhere statistic is a more appropriate measure of student success, because it doesn't matter where students finish, only that they succeed.

A question was asked about how community college students who transfer to four year institutions do as compared to freshmen cohorts. Dr. Rhoda responded that students who are in community colleges and fail to complete, can go on and do other things and we are not able to determine whether those students want to go to a university or go into the workforce.

Dr. Petersen indicated that our campuses do gather information about the graduation rates of community college transfers as compared to freshmen cohorts. Mr. Driver commented that it would be helpful to encourage students to attend community college and then transfer to a four year institution or one of the UT campuses.

There was substantial discussion about encouraging community college graduates to transfer as upper division students to four year institutions and universities. Chancellor Rakes added that students who complete an associate degree have a better chance of being successful in four year institutions than those who transfer in without the AA degree. Dr. Petersen asked Chancellor Rakes for a comparison on how transfer students do at Martin as compared to native students and also asked Dr. Simek about the successfulness of transfer students at UTK. Chancellor Rakes indicated many times transfer students do better because they're a little older and when they get to college they know what they want to do. Ones who have completed a full associate's degree are probably a little better off, certainly, 10-20% better. Another trustee noted that this is consistent with the data that has been presented in the form of host to anywhere.

## **VII. REPORT ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM CONSOLIDATIONS AND POTENTIAL DISCONTINUANCE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS**

Mr. Driver reported that each campus has been in the process of reviewing academic programs for possible program consolidations and discontinuance given the financial constraints that presently confront our state. He asked Dr. Yegidis to provide an overview of this information that has been developed thus far, starting with the system-wide framework.

Dr. Yegidis referred to the two lists located behind Tab 13 stating that the Chancellors reviewed these lists yesterday during their budget presentations. The first list that is dated February 9 was constructed during the budget reduction exercise by the campuses and shows a list of possible program consolidations for each campus. None of these consolidations have been completed at this point; they are under discussion. The faculty in these units have been consulted. It is the proposal of each of the campuses that these consolidations would take place if still needed effective July 1, 2009.

Trustee Murphy stated that this is an information item so that the trustees all know where the campuses are going on this particular issue, which is part of the whole reason the budget sessions were moved up in the schedule. This allows time for the Board to have advance notice to what might happen on each particular campus. He commended the campuses for moving the process up, creating these lists and working with these possible program consolidations. UT may be facing some very tough choices and everyone needs to be focused on these particular items, and be prepared to act at the June meeting.

Trustee Murphy further emphasized the necessity of future cuts and encouraged the trustees to pay close attention to this information so that they will be prepared and ready to take action at the June meeting. He again commended the administration and the campuses for their work on these issues.

Mr. Driver thanked Vice Chair Murphy and introduced the next item.

Dr. Yegidis stated that on the other side of the list dated February 9 is a list of programs that will be reviewed over the next several months to a year with a possible recommendation of discontinuance coming forward. This is not a list of programs that will be cut, but it is a list of programs that will be reviewed this year by each campus. She added there is a normal curricular review process in place at each of our campuses that regularly reviews the productivity and impact of academic programs. In some cases programs are on this list because they came through the normal curricular review process. In other cases, the Dean or the faculty or the Vice Chancellor of a campus questioned whether or not a



program continues to be needed and whether it is productive, and these questions might also trigger a review of the program.

This year, THEC provided all the state institutions with a campus level report on low-productivity programs. This report is not produced annually but periodically, and provides another opportunity to review the place and the productivity of academic programs. It presents trend data of low producing programs where low producing is measured by the number of graduates that come through a program within a five year period of time. There are some good reasons why programs might be on the list. One possibility is that it is a new program and it's not really been in place very long, other times a program is on the list because it is not defined well and it really needs to be consolidated. Chancellor Rakes mentioned that yesterday with respect to Secondary Education at UTM. In some cases there are programs for which there is low student demand. When reports like these are received by the system, they are distributed broadly to the chancellors, the academic vice chancellors and provosts, with a request to review the data. Each of the provosts and chancellors is doing that and has independently also identified these programs on the lists that are included within this part of the agenda. No decisions have been made to terminate these programs; but they will be reviewed this year and any recommendations for discontinuance, reorganization and/or revision would come to this committee in June for action.

Mr. Driver recognized Trustee Wharton, who stated that this has been a difficult year for UT. He suggested to the board that as we try to deal with these hard issues we're going to have to deal with this together and move on to preserve this great university. A faculty leader cautioned the Board about which programs should be evaluated and how these determinations are made. Dr. Petersen added that it is imperative to ensure that what is evaluated is the program and not just one or two people in that program. Academic program discontinuance is based on the program itself and not the faculty in it. There was a considerable discussion about distinguishing between the quantity of students who move through a program, and the quality of a program per se.

#### **VIII. PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF UTK COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK BY CLOSURE OF MSSW PROGRAM LOCATION IN MEMPHIS**

Mr. Driver stated that there has been a request to remove the next item from the agenda – and it is therefore removed. The rationale for this is there is a great deal of new information that has just been brought to the attention of several members of the Board and there is a new Chancellor in Knoxville. The program that was to be considered today, situated in Memphis, is actually a part

of a larger program that is headquartered at Knoxville on the UTK campus, and the Chancellor has asked for additional time to review this proposal, on the basis of the additional information that has been forthcoming.

Trustee Hagler made some comments about the presence and importance of the social work program in Memphis. The College of Social Work has become the anchor for the social work community for the hospitals that are in Memphis. It is important that this Board examine the reach of the program, the overall budget, the impact that the closure or the consolidation or the elimination of the program has on the student population and the community. Trustee Cates agreed with this point.

Trustee Schledwitz applauded Chancellor Cheek for his willingness to table this item. He stated that it is his understanding that prior to this coming before the Board today, that registration has been closed to this program for next year. He asked for confirmation of this and clarification that the registration would be reopened. If not, in fact a policy of closing this program has been made without committee review.

Mr. Driver stated that in consultation with Dr. Yegidis and with the General Counsel that since this matter is being removed from the agenda, nothing has changed in terms of the operation of this program or should be changed until this matter is brought before the Board. If there has been any communication of a suspension of enrollment, that must be corrected. Mr. Driver welcomed the Chancellor to say anything about this if he wishes, but, it is the understanding of the Chair that this program has not been impacted or affected at all, subject to further review and study.

Dr. Cheek confirmed that this was his understanding as well and deferred to Provost Susan Martin for further information. Dr. Martin explained that the Memphis location of the College of Social Work has students currently enrolled and the location cannot be closed because of our obligation to the students. What is currently lacking is the resources to admit a new class of students in the fall. If the location remains open with the current resources, due to the budget reduction, a new class could not be admitted.

Trustee Schledwitz expressed his concern about closing admissions without any action by this committee or the Board. He questioned under what authority this decision had been made and asked if we are accepting new students right now for fall of 2009. Dr. Martin stated that we are not.

Trustee Schledwitz further expressed his concern that a decision had already been made if we are not accepting new students. Dr. Martin stated this is a suspension of admissions right now and not a closure of a program.

Further discussion about the ramifications of suspending admissions occurred and the need for further vetting. Chancellor Cheek stated these are some of the reasons why the item is withdrawn from the agenda at this time. He reinforced the need for more communication and information gathering before a decision can be made.

Mr. Driver agreed that a close examination needs to occur at every level when considering program discontinuation. Mr. Driver also commented that it is very important for the leadership to look at how the needs of our citizens are being met state-wide and that entails looking at what types of programs are being delivered by the Board of Regents institutions as well in our state.

Another trustee commented on Trustee Schledwitz's concerns about admitting new students and advised that a review of this program occur quickly so that potential students are not lost, if the decision is to retain the program. He also stated that we should be honest with any new admits about the potential closure of the program.

Chancellor Cheek stated his agreement and explained this issue was brought up yesterday and that was when they requested that the item be tabled. Chancellor Cheek assured the trustees that their approach will be to very thoroughly investigate the issues discussed, but he also stated that the decision up to this point has gone through all the proper processes. He further stated that it is understood that this program will not be terminated until the Board determines whether they support such a recommendation.

Trustee Horne provided some statistics relative to child poverty in Shelby County. He expressed his support for keeping the program because of the direct affect of the Social Work program on the community.

Mr. Driver asked about the status of admissions in the other programs that are being reviewed for possible discontinuance, and asked specifically about the Bachelor's Program in Health Information Management, Aviation Systems, and Industrial Engineering, and the possible suspension of Electrical Engineering at UTSI.

Dr. Yegidis informed the committee that Deans and Provosts across the system have made decisions about limiting enrollment as a part of the budget reduction, and that is ongoing. Most of the programs referenced on this list as possible

program consolidations are mergers of academic departments, which yield savings in administrative costs, not closures per se. In response to Mr. Driver's question, Dr. Yegidis explained the major in question at UTSI exists on the Knoxville campus and therefore students will still have the opportunity to be admitted.

Dr. Petersen stated the programs that are listed on these lists are not in our current budget reduction. He further explained these programs are not part of the \$66.4 million proposed cut because academic programs take time to phase out to meet needs of currently enrolled students. These lists of possible consolidation and discontinuance assist us in looking at how we can potentially evaluate programs earlier in the process so we don't have to do these sorts of things going forward in the future. Dr. Petersen stated that Governor Bredesen has given both Dr. Petersen and Trustee Murphy instructions about implementing permanent budget cuts in July. The cuts need to be strategic, as they will be permanent budget reductions.

Mr. Driver thanked the committee for their discussion on this topic.

#### **IX. SYSTEM-WIDE PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE**

Mr. Driver introduced this item found behind Tab 14 of the notebook. Each campus is in the process of reviewing academic programs for possible consolidations and discontinuance. Dr. Yegidis provided an overview of this information at this time and asked the Chancellors to contribute to the discussion as well.

Following the last board meeting Dr. Yegidis' office and the Office of the General Counsel put together a system-wide procedural framework to guide the process of discontinuing academic programs. The framework recognizes that each of the campuses already has a committee in place, comprised of faculty leaders, staff, and administrators, working with the Chancellor on identifying academic units/programs that might be discontinued. Board policy allows for the discontinuance of academic programs but does not specify the process or procedures by which to guide this process. With this fact in mind a procedure has been created and is presented here for review. Board policy states that program discontinuance should be made only after careful review of the needs and effectiveness of the program as compared to the needs and goals of the campus, the institute, the university, and the State of Tennessee. Discontinuance of academic programs is approved by the Board of Trustees, following recommendation by this committee.

One of the issues in creating this framework is finding agreement on the definition of a program for every constituency on campus. As a starting point, the standard definition of an academic program used by the federal government – the Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code was chosen. Most academic programs have a CIP code that is a label for an academic program, major or concentration. The proposed framework uses the CIP code to define an academic program, as well as allowing for any unit with a unique and identifiable function within such a program to be identified as an academic program. UT has programs across the system that do not fit neatly within CIP codes, and thus an expanded definition of a program is needed.

The system-wide framework is designed to provide some consistency and fairness about the manner in which the procedures are undertaken by each campus. Each of the campuses or institutes has been asked to identify their own procedures that might provide more detail, and tailored more directly to the campus. In addition to the system-wide framework, there are also specific campus based procedures.

The framework mandates that any proposal or possible discontinuance provide supporting documentation. The framework asks for the contribution of the program to the mission of the university and to the campus, as well as its contribution to accreditation, the progression of students to graduation, the impact of faculty scholarship, the demand within the state for the program, and unique contributions that programs may bring to the campus. The University is also looking at possible duplication with other campuses or other institutions in the region. Cost, demand, impact on external constituencies, and the impact of any program discontinuation on faculty and staff are all important factors to consider.

In complying with this framework, any program that will come to this committee for possible discontinuance would provide these data. The process includes faculty consultation because faculty are the authors of academic programs, the developers of courses, and the primary instructors. There will be review at the campus level and then by the system. Only after these stringent reviews will the proposal come to the Board for action. This framework allows for a timeframe that is shorter than traditional academic program review, perhaps a review within three or four months. Requests for program discontinuance would normally come at the June Board meeting following the review. There is a Board policy on appropriate notice to faculty should a program be discontinued.

Dr. Yegidis offered to answer questions about this procedural framework and shared the suggestions that the Faculty Council has developed. The document is still in draft because of the importance of feedback from this committee and the

Board. There is also ongoing consultation from the Faculty Senate leadership, and the University Faculty Council, which represents the leadership of the faculty senates.

Mr. Driver asked Dr. Yegidis to speak to the first page of the final draft that of the framework, specifically with the additional language that should address a question raised by Karen Johnson.

Dr. Yegidis provided a brief overview of the suggested language changes which include the addition of a final sentence in the first paragraph. This sentence states that “an academic program or function, must serve as an entity for which there may be an expectation for an evaluation of the entity’s function and performance as a whole separate and distinct from the annual evaluation of the members of the entity”. This language was suggested because there was a concern that programs be evaluated separately from the annual performance evaluation of a faculty member. Dr. Yegidis then deferred to faculty trustee, Dr. Schommer, to provide his comments on this.

Trustee Schommer stated on behalf of the faculty that they are aware of the very serious budget cuts, and the need for the Chancellors to make decisions about academic programs. The faculty concern was that the original language did not distinguish between an individual faculty member’s performance and the performance of a program. In defense of tenure, it needs to be absolutely clear that programs are being cut, not based on an individual, and that the individual that is in the program should be very aware of this action.

Mr. Driver thanked Trustee Schommer and asked for any additional comments.

Dr. Johnson followed up on the point raised by Trustee Schommer and stated that those that work at the Health Science Center were not aware that they were a part of a particular program. It seemed that this was a tenured faculty member that wasn’t performing and therefore, the handbook should be followed for the evaluation of individual faculty performance.

Trustee McGruder suggested that a student representative be added to each of the campus-based committees.

Mr. Driver requested that the procedure be amended to include a student representative.

There was a discussion about the implementation of the framework if approved and when programs would actually be recommended for discontinuance according to the procedures.

Dr. Yegidis reminded the committee that the decisions being made today were not about discontinuing specific programs, but about adopting a framework so that campuses can move forward with a list of programs that will be reviewed and evaluated and that they have a consistent process by which to do that.

A question was raised about whether there is a process in place to review academic programs.

Dr. Yegidis indicated there is regularly scheduled academic program review. She distinguished this process from academic program review in terms of the focus of the review that is on the strength of the program, quality, and accreditation status. Program reviews do not necessarily include an analysis of costs and other metrics about program performance. That is one of the primary purposes for adopting the proposed framework.

Dr. Petersen stated that he was not certain of the procedures that have been followed before but was aware of previous recommendations to discontinue programs that have come before the Board. Dr. Petersen deferred to Dr. Katie High because of her previous work in Academic Affairs.

Dr. High provided an historical perspective. Every June this committee receives a report that has a listing of all the new programs that have been approved. This committee has always approved any new programs, not necessarily concentrations but the committee always approved majors. That same report every year has a list of programs that were discontinued. She did not remember having prolonged discussion about the discontinuation or merging of programs. Those were typically done at the campus level based on recommendations of the faculty. In the current environment program, discontinuance may affect the tenure appointment of faculty, thus the need to involve the Board.

Dr. Yegidis stated that the issue before the Committee today is the approval of this procedural framework. A vote to approve provides the campuses an opportunity to move forward with their planning processes; a vote to deny will send all back to the drawing board for some further work.

Trustee Murphy stated that this framework would work even for programs where no faculty are being terminated. The steps in the proposed process are all necessary. If no faculty will be terminated by the closure of a program, it would not be necessary to include all of the steps involving faculty.

Mr. Driver stated that he echoed Trustee Murphy's comment and further recognized a motion by Dr. Rhoda and asked for a second.

Trustee Murphy asked that Trustee McGruder's amendment be included.

Dr. Yegidis stated that the language submitted by the faculty would also need to be included.

Trustee Murphy seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

**X. CAMPUS PROCEDURES TO IMPLEMENT SYSTEM-WIDE PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE**

Mr. Driver referred the committee to Tab 14 for the campus procedures except Chattanooga, whose information was provided today.

Dr. Yegidis explained that the campus procedures submitted have been reviewed by the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of General Counsel to ensure that they are consistent with the system-wide framework. She referred back to the previous discussion on the development of the system-wide procedure including the need to revise the language in the campus documents to reflect the language of the faculty council regarding the definition of a program, and also the addition of a student representative to each of the campuses.

Each of the campus procedures was briefly described. UTK procedures basically provide for the adoption of the system-wide framework. UTM's procedures were also consistent with the system framework, as were UTHSC. UT Chattanooga provided their procedure today which is consistent with the system-wide framework. Chattanooga is requesting approval of their document in spirit, pending the final approval of their Faculty Senate.

Trustee Murphy asked how UTC would deal with program termination in the meantime.

Dr. Petersen stated that it would be possible to approve it on the condition that the faculty approves it. If the faculty doesn't approve it they will not be able to terminate any programs.

Dr. Oldham suggested that UTC would follow the system guidelines in the absence of specific campus guidelines.

Trustee Murphy stated his agreement with Dr. Oldham.

Mr. Driver asked for any questions. Trustee Murphy made a motion to approve the campus procedures with the amended language requested by the leadership



of the faculty council and including the amendment to add a student representative to each of the campus committees. For UTC, he suggested the procedure be approved, subject to faculty approval. If the faculty doesn't approve it then UTC would revert to the system framework. The motion was seconded by Trustee Foy and approved.

Dr. Johnson stated that there is the additional point of amending the language of Chattanooga's proposal to include the language previously added to the system-wide framework.

Trustee Murphy amended the previous motion to revise the procedures so that they be consistent with the system procedures, which would include the amended language. The motion was seconded by Trustee Foy and the motion was approved.

**XI. PROPOSAL FOR A PROGRAM OF STUDY LEADING TO THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MATHEMATICS (UTC)**

Mr. Driver referred the committee to the information behind Tab 15. This committee and the full Board of Trustees must approve proposals for development of new academic programs, and this next item is a proposal for a Masters of Science Degree in Mathematics at UTC.

Chancellor Brown discussed the program of study and stated that this small program addresses two strategic objectives of this Board, of President Petersen, and his executive team. One of the objectives is the enhancement of mathematics proficiency and the improvement of math education in public and private high schools of Tennessee. The other objective is to contribute to economic development in the southeastern region of the state of Tennessee by offering graduate training in mathematics that would serve business majors, engineering majors and other technology programs. The proposal is cost neutral. Chancellor Brown introduced the Department Head of Mathematics who was available to answer any technical questions about the development and the demand for this program. It requires no increase in faculty members. It actually will produce savings in the budget projections because graduate students in mathematics can then also be teaching assistants in sections of developmental mathematics. The department has a number of students in developmental mathematics that must be taught.

Mr. Driver asked for any questions. Trustee Foy made a motion to approve this program of study. The motion was seconded by Trustee Blackburn and approved.

**XII. PROPOSAL TO CREATE THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION IN THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES (UTK)**

Mr. Driver stated that this committee and the full Board must approve proposals for new academic programs and turned this item over to Dr. Yegidis.

Dr. Yegidis explained that this proposal is for the formation of the Graduate School of Education. This administrative overlay for three strong programs in the College of Education would help provide national visibility to an already outstanding college so that additional external resources might be leveraged. Dr. Yegidis introduced the Dean of the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences, Dr. Bob Rider, and the Associate Dean, Dr. Lynn Cagle, and asked them, along with Chancellor Cheek, to make any comments about this proposal.

Dr. Rider began his comments by thanking Dr. Yegidis, President Petersen, and the Board of Trustees. Dr. Rider explained that if the committee approves this proposal and it goes on for approval by THEC, it will take three departments and put them in a structure called the Graduate School of Education. It will be the only Graduate School of Education in the southeast. The primary purpose is to increase the visibility of the education side of the college to attract more and better students, to provide an opportunity to compete more favorably for external funding, and to also attract, recruit, and retain the best faculty across the country. This is also a cost neutral proposal and has the potential to increase resources to the college by attracting external funding, and by also creating a naming opportunity for the school.

Mr. Driver asked for any questions. Trustee Foy made a motion to approve this proposal, Trustee Schledwitz seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

**XIII. AWARDING OF HONORARY DEGREES**

Mr. Driver explained that the Board of Trustees authorizes the awarding of honorary degrees to recognize individuals who have benefited the institution or society through outstanding achievement or leadership. Tab 17 contains the information and the policy and procedures for awarding honorary degrees. There are two items to consider under this tab. Before proceeding to the second honorary degree, Mr. Driver asked Dr. Petersen to defer to Trustee Bill Carroll to make some remarks leading up to that proposal of the second honorary degree.

Dr. Petersen provided an overview of the first proposal from the Chattanooga campus to award an honorary degree of Doctor of Philosophy to Gen. B. Bell as a result of his record as a Army General as well as his service to the community.

Dr. Petersen stated his support of this recommendation to an outstanding citizen and American.

Mr. Driver asked Chancellor Brown if he had any comments to add.

Chancellor Brown echoed Dr. Petersen's comments. General Bell was the commander of all the Allied Forces in Europe, the commander of all Allied Forces in Korea, and retired two years ago. He is truly an outstanding American leader.

Mr. Driver asked for any discussion. Trustee Murphy made a motion to approve this item; the motion was seconded by Trustee Foy and approved.

Mr. Driver recognized Trustee Carroll to speak to the next honoree.

Trustee Carroll made some comments about Dolly Parton. He explained that he has known Dolly for 35 years and she has never forgotten her roots in Sevier County. She was recently named Ambassador to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park for their 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration to occur this year. Dollywood is Sevier County's largest employer, with approximately 3,000 employees, and Dollywood helps everyone who is involved in the tourism industry. Dolly Parton comes from a large family of twelve children and she certainly takes care of her family in Sevier County. Last, but not least, Dolly loves and really cares about children. To quote Dolly, "God wouldn't let her have kids so all kids would be hers."

Dr. Petersen added that not only has she made a significant impact to the Child Literacy Program but also as an American business woman. She is internationally respected for her work in literacy for children, and we support the Knoxville campus' recommendation to award her a Doctor of Humane and Musical Letters degree from UTK.

Dr. Cheek stated that UTK hopes the committee will approve this request.

Trustee Murphy stated that he would like to make this motion, in Trustee Carroll's place since Trustee Carroll is not a committee member. Mr. Driver confirmed that a motion was made by Trustee Murphy and seconded by Trustee McGruder. The motion was approved.

#### **XIV. UPDATE ON STUDENT RECREATION FIELDS (UTK)**

Mr. Driver called upon Chancellor Cheek to provide an update on the student recreation fields for UTK.

Chancellor Cheek deferred to Vice Chancellor Tim Rogers as he has been working on this project for many years. Dr. Cheek noted that the SGA President Jeff Wilcox was present also to participate in the discussion and the plan.

Mr. Rogers gave the following report: There has been a long-standing problem with the adequacy of recreation fields for use by students at UTK. There are only two lighted recreation fields for approximately 27,000 students. The proposed resolution is to use the space currently occupied by housing for married and family housing on Sutherland Ave. The current facilities are comprised of 700 units, of which approximately 600 are currently occupied. These buildings are over 40 and 50 years old and sorely need rehabilitation and renovation. However, these costs would likely price out the current residents. In addition, there is an abundance of housing available locally and for that reason we do not need to restore these aging facilities. The current residents of this housing community can locate affordable housing within the community. The property provides space for several recreation fields and with plenty of space for parking. The site is accessible to the existing greenway and allows students access to campus via the Ag campus. The University's transportation system services this site and would continue providing transportation to campus. The proposed rec fields will provide multiple venues for different purposes. There is also an opportunity to partner with the city and county to accommodate their needs for additional parking as the rec fields are relatively close to West High School.

For the last several years, UTK has raised the student activity fee. Currently the fee is \$250.00 per semester. In consultation with student leadership, UTK expects to raise the fee next year to \$300.00. A number of peer institutions have an activity fee within this general range. Mr. Rogers called upon Jeff Wilcox, the Student Government President at UTK for his comments.

Mr. Wilcox indicated that he was strongly interested in the development of the proposed rec fields and, of all the options that were evaluated by the leadership of UTK, this was clearly the best site for the new rec fields. He stated that he was in full support of this proposal, and he also expressed his concern that current student residents of the community would have to be relocated.

Trustee Blackburn inquired about what will happen to the families that are being displaced, noting that some of these residents are international students. She asked if the University planned to assist them in any manner. Mr. Rogers responded that indeed the University would be providing assistance to these students by providing referrals to housing resources in the community.

Mr. Driver asked if the City of Knoxville is making any kind of contribution to the maintenance and upkeep of the rec fields, proportional to their planned use of

the facilities. Mr. Rogers indicated that UTK is in discussion with the Mayor's office but no concrete discussions about this have taken place at this point in time. However, relationships between the University and the city and county are very positive and this is something that will be explored.

Mr. Driver indicated this discussion was an information item only. He expressed his thanks to the campus leadership and to Dr. Petersen for making this option available for the students.

**XV. OTHER BUSINESS**

None

**XVI. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

---

Bonnie L. Yegidis  
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success