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The Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee of the Board of Trustees of The University of Tennessee met at 8:30 a.m. EDT, Friday, October 9, 2015, in Hollingsworth Auditorium on the campus of The University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture in Knoxville.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Vicky Gregg called the meeting to order.

II. ROLL CALL

Dr. Katie High called the roll.

The following committee members and faculty/student representatives were present:

Mr. Jalen Blue
Dr. Susan Davidson
Dr. Russ Deaton
Dr. Joseph DiPietro
Dr. Brian Donavant
Mr. John Foy
Mr. Will Freeman
Dr. David Golden
Ms. Vicky Gregg, Chair
Commissioner Julius Johnson
Mr. Raja Jubran
Mr. John Keny
Mr. Brad Lampley
Dr. Bruce MacLennan
Dr. Roberto Mancusi
Commissioner Candice McQueen
Ms. Miranda Rutan
Ms. Hannah Turcotte
Ms. Julia Wells
Mr. Charles Wharton
Dr. Thad Wilson
Ms. Rachel Wolters

Ms. Dina Ali was absent. Dr. High announced the presence of a quorum of the voting members of the Committee. Other Trustees, administrative staff, members of the public, and representatives of the media were also present.
III. OPENING REMARKS BY COMMITTEE CHAIR

Chair Gregg welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the new Trustees and the faculty and student representatives to introduce themselves.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes of the Last Meeting
B. UT Knoxville Honorary Doctor of Fine Arts Degree, Robin Klehr Avia (Exhibit 1)
C. UT Knoxville Honorary Doctor of Business Degree, Fred Smith (Exhibit 2)
D. Grant of Tenure to Dr. Paul Dalhaimer (Exhibit 3)
E. Grant of Tenure to UT Knoxville Faculty Members under Expedited Procedures (Exhibit 4)

Chair Gregg referred the Committee to the Consent Agenda and asked if any member wished to have an item removed from the Consent Agenda. Hearing no requests to remove an item, the Chair called for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was made by Trustee Lampley, seconded by Trustee Wells, and the Consent Agenda was approved.

V. PROPOSAL FOR A PROGRAM OF STUDY LEADING TO THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF LAWS IN UNITED STATES BUSINESS LAW AT UT KNOXVILLE

Chair Gregg introduced Dr. John Zomchick, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs at UT Knoxville, who presented the proposal (Exhibit 5).

Trustee Wharton moved that the program of study leading to the degree of Master of Laws (LL.M) in United States Business Law at UT Knoxville be approved. The motion was seconded by Trustee Jubran and carried unanimously.

VI. PROPOSED STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UT KNOXVILLE

Chair Gregg asked Dr. Vince Carilli, Vice Chancellor for the Division of Student Life, to present the new Student Code of Conduct for UT Knoxville (Exhibit 6).

There was a lengthy discussion following the presentation, particularly regarding the preponderance of evidence standard of proof under the Code of Conduct. Trustees Gallimore and Wharton expressed great concern about the preponderance of evidence standard in cases of alleged sexual assault.
was additional discussion regarding the number of sexual assault reports on the Knoxville campus, as well as the jurisdiction of the Code, and feedback from the Greek community.

Dr. Carilli, Deputy General Counsel Matthew Scoggins, UTK SGA President Will Freeman, and Student Conduct and Community Standards Interim Director James Jackson offered additional information and answered questions.

Trustee Murphy requested that information on the outcome of all UT Knoxville sexual assault cases resolved in the last two to three years be provided prior to the full Board of Trustees meeting. Mr. Scoggins and Dr. Carilli agreed to provide that information.

There being no further discussion, Chair Gregg called for a motion. Trustee Golden moved that the proposed Student Code of Conduct for The University of Tennessee, Knoxville be adopted as Chapter 1720-04-03 of the Rules of The University of Tennessee, superseding the current Chapter 1720-04-03 after completion of the rulemaking procedures under the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act. Trustee Blue seconded that motion, and it carried.

VII. FALL ENROLLMENT REPORT

Chair Gregg Dr. Katie High to present the report (Exhibit 7). Dr. High presented the report on enrollment, freshman retention, and graduation rates since 2014.

There was a brief discussion following the presentation.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 am EDT.

Respectfully Submitted,

Katherine N. High, Vice President
Academic Affairs and Student Success
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

ACTION ITEM

DATE: April 1, 2016

COMMITTEE: Academic Affairs and Student Success

CAMPUS/UNIT: UT Knoxville

ITEM: Honorary Doctor of Science Degree, Thomas E. Mason, Ph.D.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval

PRESENTED BY: Jimmy G. Cheek, Chancellor, UT Knoxville

The Board of Trustees Policy on Awarding Honorary Degrees allows each campus to award up to three honorary degrees each year. In accordance with Board policy, each campus developed specific procedures for nominating and considering honorary degrees. The nominating committee includes a representative faculty group, the campus Chancellor, and the Chair of the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee of the Board. The awarding of honorary degrees must be approved by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President. UT Knoxville proposes to award an honorary Doctor of Science degree to Thomas E. Mason, Ph.D., at the Spring 2016 commencement ceremony.

Dr. Mason currently serves as Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), where he oversees a wide range of research facilities and construction projects. Since becoming Lab Director in 2007, Dr. Mason has achieved notable success not only in key scientific breakthroughs, but also through the enhancement of collaboration between ORNL and the University. For example, under Dr. Mason’s leadership, new elements of the periodic table have been discovered, the $259 million Institute for Advanced Composites Manufacturing Innovation was created, and the number of joint ORNL-UTK appointments has increased considerably.

Further, Dr. Mason is a world-renowned expert in neutron and materials science, as well as in energy programs. Because of this expertise, he has been sought to serve as a leader on a variety of national committees, panels, and other agency groups. Throughout his career, Dr. Mason has excelled as a physicist, researcher, author,
speaker, subject matter expert, mentor, and leader. UT Knoxville’s Honorary Degree Nominating committee unanimously approved his nomination, and it has the full support of both Chancellor Cheek and President DiPietro.

Supporting documentation on awarding an honorary degree to this outstanding individual is provided in the following materials.

MOTION: I move that the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee recommend the following Resolution for adoption by the Board of Trustees:

RESOLVED: The degree of Honorary Doctor of Science from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville is awarded to Thomas E. Mason, Ph.D.
March 4, 2016

President Joseph A DiPietro
University of Tennessee System
800 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0180

Dear President DiPietro:

I am pleased to nominate Dr. Thomas E. Mason to receive an Honorary Doctor of Science degree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville at the spring 2016 graduate hooding ceremony. As Director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Thom is responsible for leading the largest and most diverse science and energy laboratory in delivering scientific discovery and innovative technology for solving compelling national problems in clean energy and national security. Thom's operating responsibilities include a nuclear reactor, a high-power proton accelerator, a high-performance computing facility, and a complex array of research facilities and construction projects.

Under Thom's leadership, ORNL made several major scientific breakthroughs including discovery of new elements of the periodic table, production of fuel for NASA missions, and development of advanced materials and manufacturing processes that have enabled creation of a 3-D printed car and house. In addition, Thom was key in the discussions that resulted in the creation of the Institute for Advanced Composites Manufacturing Innovation (IACMI)—a $259 million institute supported by the Department of Energy, six states, and 122 private-sector companies. Through IACMI, ORNL and UT will play a key role in developing and deploying the next generation of composite materials. Further, in the coming years, ORNL plans to build a new billion-dollar neutron scattering facility as well as a new supercomputer called Summit, which will be the fastest supercomputer in the world.

Thom's leadership as Lab Director has been key not only to the success of ORNL but also to our success as a university. Thom has been paramount in strengthening and expanding the relationship between ORNL and the university—a relationship based on innovation, collaboration, and ingenuity. For example, since Thom became Lab Director in 2007, the number of joint faculty appointments has substantially increased. This enabled not only the sharing of expertise between ORNL and UT personnel, but it also expanded opportunities for our students to gain valuable research experience at ORNL. We have made effective use of the Distinguished Scientist program and the Governor's Chair program to bring high-profile leaders to joint positions at UT and ORNL. Our partnership to create the Bredesen Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education—which enrolled its first class in fall 2011—created a new Ph.D. program in energy science and engineering that attracts highly-qualified students from around the world.
Thom's research background is in the application of neutron scattering techniques to novel magnetic materials and superconductors. In his current role, Thom has a particular interest in exploiting ORNL's signature strengths in materials, neutron, nuclear, and computational science to drive innovation and technical solutions relevant to energy and global security. Thom was an Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellow from 1997 to 1999. He has been an Associate of the Quantum Materials Program (formerly the Superconductivity Program) of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research since 1993. He was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 2001 and a Fellow of the American Physical Society in 2007, and he was awarded honorary doctorates by Dalhousie University (2011) and McMaster University (2013).

Thom received his B.Sc. in physics from Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in 1986 and a Ph.D. in physics from McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario in 1990. Following completion of his doctorate, he held a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Postdoctoral Fellowship at AT&T Bell Laboratories in Murray Hill, New Jersey, from 1990 to 1991. Later, Thom spent a year as a senior scientist at Riso National Laboratory in Denmark where, in addition to conducting ongoing physics research, he supported the user program and developed new instrumentation. From 1993 to 1998, he was an assistant and associate professor in the Department of Physics at the University of Toronto. He joined ORNL as director of the Experimental Facilities Division of the Spallation Neutron Source in 1998 and served in that capacity until being named Associate Laboratory Director for the Spallation Neutron Source in 2001. In October 2006, following the successful completion of the Spallation Neutron Source construction project, Thom was named Associate Laboratory Director for Neutron Sciences, leading a new directorate charged with delivering safe and productive scientific facilities for the study of structure and dynamics of materials.

Beyond his position at ORNL, Thom is actively involved in his community. He chairs the Board of Directors of the Oak Ridge Public Schools Education Foundation. His leadership at the Foundation led to a major renovation of Oak Ridge High School. Thom was not just a leader on the project, but was also intimately involved in fundraising and the design of the school expansion. Thom is also the chair of the Board of Directors of Innovation Valley, East Tennessee's regional economic development partnership, and previously served on the board of Launch Tennessee—a public-private partnership focused on the creation and development of entrepreneurship throughout Tennessee.

The University's Honorary Degree Nominating Committee unanimously approved the nomination of Dr. Mason, which was submitted by Lee Riedinger, professor in the UT Knoxville Department of Physics and director of the Bredesen Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education. The Nominating Committee consisted of Trustee Vicky Gregg, chair of the Board of Trustees' Academic Affairs & Student Success Committee, myself, and five members selected by the Faculty Senate: Drs. Theresa Lee, Dean Kopsell,
Terry Hazen, Ralph Lydic, and Carol Tenopir, who served as chair of the Nominating Committee.

Furthermore, a Special Committee received the recommendation from the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee. The Special Committee consisted of Provost Susan Martin and four tenured faculty members appointed by the Chair of the Graduate Council who are not members of the Nominating Committee. The faculty members included Drs. Amy Broemmel, Eric Boder, and Lee Riedinger. The Special Committee, chaired by Dr. Donald G. Hodges, was also unanimous in its recommendation of Dr. Mason for an honorary degree.

The entire nomination process is set out on our website (http://chancellor.utk.edu/honorary-degrees/nomination-selection/) and is modeled on, and consistent with, the University of Tennessee System Board of Trustees' policy for granting honorary degrees.

I request approval to honor Dr. Thom Mason with this distinction.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jimmy G. Cheek
Chancellor

Enclosures (3)

Cc: Members of the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee
    Members of the Special Committee
    Lee Riedinger, Professor & Director of the Bredesen Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education

Approved:

Joseph A DiPietro
President, University of Tennessee System
March 7, 2016

Dr. Susan Martin  
Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor  
525 Andy Holt Tower  
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Martin,

On behalf of the Honorary Degree Nominating Committee, it is my pleasure to report that there was unanimous support for awarding an Honorary Doctor of Science to Dr. Thom Mason. The committee met recently to discuss this candidate and review the nomination packet submitted by Dr. Lee Riedinger.

With regards to voting, all members of the Nominating Committee voted in favor of awarding this honorary doctorate to Dr. Mason. The degree will be conferred to Dr. Mason at the spring 2016 Graduate Hooding Ceremony. Please let me know if you need any additional information as you move forward with this recommendation. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Sincerely,

Carol Tenopir

Carol Tenopir  
Chair, Honorary Degree Nominating Committee

cc: Honorary Degree Nominating Committee
February 24, 2016

Dr. Susan Martin
Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor
525 Andy Holt Tower
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Martin,

On behalf of the Special Committee, it is my pleasure to report unanimous committee support for awarding an Honorary Doctor of Science to Dr. Thom Mason. This was based on a committee review of the nomination packet and our discussion this afternoon.

With regards to voting, all members of the Special Committee voted in favor of awarding this honorary doctorate to Dr. Mason. Please let me know if you need any additional information. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Sincerely,

Donald G. Hodges
Chair, Special Committee
September 25, 2015

Russ Swafford  
Manager, Special Projects  
Office of the Chancellor

Russ,

Attached is a package of information to support my nomination of Dr. Thom Mason of Oak Ridge National Laboratory for an honorary degree at the University of Tennessee Knoxville. Included is my strong letter of nomination, a resume’ for Thom, and his short biosketch. I clearly view Thom Mason as an excellent candidate that we should recognize with an honorary degree.

I have agreement from three important academic leaders at UTK to write supporting letters of recommendation should that be necessary. These three people are:

Theresa Lee  
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
UTK  
Her college is the home of many of the faculty and students that overlap with ORNL and she knows the work of Thom Mason from the standpoint of his leadership in fostering this relationship.

Wayne Davis  
Dean, College of Engineering  
UTK  
His college has many joint appointments with ORNL and has enhanced its reputation and productivity by virtue of the joint opportunities between the college and the laboratory. In addition, Wayne served in 2010 as the co-chair of the task force that lead to the establishment of the Bredesen Center and the interdisciplinary PhD in energy science and engineering between UTK and ORNL.

Soren Sorensen  
Professor, Department of Physics  
UTK  
He served on the task force that established the Bredesen Center and joint PhD between ORNL and UTK and in addition served as department head of Physics through the period when Thom Mason served as an adjunct member of the Physics faculty. Soren understands well the range of Thom’s accomplishments, including those as a research physicist.
Concerning issues of conflict of interest, it is clear that Thom Mason has been a leader in building programs of cooperation between ORNL and our university, for the mutual benefit of both institutions. This has taken many forms including a large increase in the number of joint faculty between the two institutions. He also was a leader in the establishment of the interdisciplinary doctorate in energy science and engineering and the Bredesen Center in which the degree is administered. Thom serves as president of UT-Battelle LLC, which manages Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Please contact me if you would like more information on this nomination.

Sincerely yours,

Lee Riedinger
Professor of Physics
Director, Bredesen Center
The purpose of this letter is to propose that Dr. Thom Mason of Oak Ridge National Laboratory be awarded an honorary doctorate from our university. Thom is currently the director of ORNL, has a PhD in physics, and has had a wonderful and highly impactful career in scientific research and in leadership and management of science and technology. His work and leadership at ORNL have had a huge impact on the country and on UTK.

Thom grew up in Canada and received his PhD in physics from McMaster University in 1990. He then spent two years doing research at the prestigious AT&T Bell Laboratories in Murray Hill, New Jersey, at a time when it was still the top corporate-run research lab in the world. After that he spent a year at the Risø National Laboratory in Roskilde, Denmark, working on neutron scattering for fundamental physics purposes, which was his area of dissertation research. This led to a faculty position in Physics at the University of Toronto where he served for five years, got promoted with tenure, taught many physics courses, and published a great deal in materials science and neutron physics.

Thom’s reputation in the neutron scattering field increased rapidly which led to his being hired at ORNL to be the Director of the Experimental Facilities Division of the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) Project in 1998. This was a major appointment for him at a young age (early to mid 30s) and was a wise decision in view of his expertise in the physics and instrumentation for neutron scattering. The SNS was under construction and designing and building the massive instruments for the eventual experiments were extremely important. Thom did that job very well as he knew the field, works well with people, understands leadership, and is revered by all that meet him as the smartest person that anyone has ever met.

The director of the SNS project decided to leave the laboratory and return to Argonne in 2001, after ORNL had switched to management by UT-Battelle and I had gone on leave from UT to be the ORNL Deputy Director for Science and Technology. After the SNS director left, we on the ORNL management team searched the country and the world for another accelerator expert to hire to finish building this $1.5 billion construction project. While we all agreed that Thom Mason would be the SNS director once it became a functioning research facility, we felt that an accelerator builder was needed still in 2001. When we could not find such a person that would move to Oak Ridge on rather short notice to assume this highly technical role, we decided to hand this crucial job to Thom at a time earlier than we intended. Thus he became the SNS director in 2001.
What a wise decision that was to promote Thom to the SNS leadership role at that early point of time and career. Of course, he did an excellent job and got the SNS built on budget and on time, which is a rarity for a scientific facility project of that size and scope. Thom is the smartest person I have met, learns highly technical issues very quickly, and did a great job in finishing the construction of the SNS and turning it into the world’s best pulsed-neutron research facility. He was an excellent SNS director not only because he understood and impacted the technical issues of the accelerator but also because he was and is a world-renowned expert in neutron science and materials science. The SNS has become an excellent research facility for faculty and graduate students at our university and at many others.

The next step in Thom’s career also occurred at an age younger than most would expect - director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory starting in 2007, and president of UT-Battelle LLC at the same time. Thom has been a wonderful director of this large Department of Energy national laboratory and gained national prominence by his work as lab director. ORNL is the broadest energy R&D laboratory in the DOE system, and Thom has done well at becoming an expert in all aspects of energy programs. ORNL has grown markedly under his leadership in funding, breadth of programs, national recognition, and output of science and technology.

Many national panels, committees, and agencies have come calling to have Thom Mason assume a role of leadership on some highly complex topic. Once again, it is in part his brilliance that allows him to become an instant expert at whatever topic he touches. Recent examples are his successfully chairing the Committee to Recommend Alternatives to the Uranium Processing Facility Plan in Meeting the Nation’s Enriched Uranium Strategy in 2014 and the Committee to Review Plutonium Disposition Alternatives in 2015. These are national issues related to the country’s stockpile of fissionable material and do not pertain directly to ORNL programs or directions. But, Thom learned all the issues quickly and provided excellent leadership for these two nationally important committees (in addition to many others). His success in whatever arena he works has raised his respect across the country as the top national laboratory director.

Thom has also had a big impact on the UT-ORNL partnership. He has participated in this relationship and understood this from the beginning of his tenure in Oak Ridge, as he became an adjunct faculty member in our Physics Department as soon as he arrived at ORNL in 1998, when I was the head of the department. As laboratory director he greatly impacted the formation five years ago of the Bredesen Center (which I direct) and the new UTK/ORNL energy science and engineering (ESE) doctoral program. It was he and Chancellor Cheek that saw the opportunity and pitched the idea for this new interdisciplinary PhD to then Governor Bredesen late in 2009. The governor supported this idea, one-time money come to UTK for this, and I was appointed in 2010 to set up and run the PhD and new center in which it is managed.

Thom is one of the founding fathers of the Bredesen Center and the ESE doctorate, which has had a big impact on the university and the laboratory. The faculty of this doctoral program are current researchers at each institution, and Thom’s leadership and interest in the Bredesen Center has been essential for ‘spreading the word’ at ORNL and getting their most prominent research staff to become engaged in this doctoral program and mentor graduate students in dissertation research. This leadership, in addition to
that of Chancellor Cheek in promoting top UTK faculty to become involved, has resulted in a very successful interdisciplinary PhD program with currently 124 doctoral students and seven PhDs already awarded. And, on average, these graduate students are among the best and brightest I have seen at our university in my long career on the Physics faculty.

The role that Thom Mason has played in the Bredesen Center has extended beyond that of leadership and being a great ‘cheerleader.’ Our interdisciplinary doctorate requires a partial focus by each student on entrepreneurship or policy relative to energy. One vehicle for the latter is a grad student teaming with a faculty member to research and write a white paper on some energy-related topic. One of the first students to do such a white paper was Tracey Wellington who was awarded her ESE PhD in May 2015 and now has a policy-related position in Washington D.C. Tracey’s mentor was Thom Mason and together they worked on a topic that has now been published in the journal *Resources Policy* 42 (2014) - paper #59 on his list of refereed publications - “The effects of population growth and advancements in technology on global mineral supply.” It was amazing to me that the ORNL lab director would have the time and interest to meet regularly with Tracey and guide her and contribute so strongly to her white paper and the resulting journal article. Thom found the time to do this with Tracey and stayed in touch and guided all details in spite of his intense schedule of meetings and responsibilities.

Thom has also been a leader in various local organizations beyond ORNL. For example, he has spent considerable time chairing the Board of Directors of the Oak Ridge Public Schools Education Foundation. Through this he led the charge five or so years ago to raise money to do a major renovation of Oak Ridge High School. He was intimately involved in all details of this fund raising and then in the design of the new school. I am amazed that he found time to do this.

In summary, I nominate Thom Mason for an honorary doctorate so that we can honor him for so many accomplishments - his role as an excellent physicist and researcher, his leadership at ORNL in building the Spallation Neutron Source and then directing the whole laboratory for the last eight years, his national service on a host of committees and leadership on many sensitive issues to solve, his growing reputation as the top national lab director in the country, and the strong impact he has had on the UT-ORNL relationship. Thom is a brilliant scientist, a wonderful leader, and a person that everyone admires and loves to work with. He has already been awarded fellowship in four scientific societies and two honorary degrees from universities in Canada, and I feel it is very important for the University of Tennessee Knoxville to recognize him with an honorary degree.

Sincerely yours,

Lee Riedinger
Professor of Physics
Director, Bredesen Center
Thomas E. Mason

Thomas E. Mason (B.S. in physics, Dalhousie University; Ph.D. in condensed matter sciences, McMaster University) is director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL). Thom joined ORNL in 1998 as Scientific Director for the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) project. He was named Associate Laboratory Director (ALD) for SNS in 2001 and ALD for Neutron Sciences in 2006.

Before joining ORNL, Thom was a faculty member in the Department of Physics at the University of Toronto. From 1992 to 1993, he was a Senior Scientist at Risø National Laboratory. He held a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) postdoctoral fellowship at AT&T Bell Laboratories from 1990 until 1992.

Thom’s research background is in the application of neutron scattering techniques to novel magnetic materials and superconductors using a variety of facilities in North America and Europe. As Director of the U.S. Department of Energy’s largest science and technology laboratory he has an interest in advancing materials, neutron, nuclear, and computational science to drive innovation and technical solutions relevant to energy and global security. He is a Fellow of the AAAS, APS, and NSSA.
THOMAS EDWARD MASON
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P.O. Box 2008
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831-6255, U.S.A.
Telephone: 865-576-2900
Fax: 865-241-2967
E-mail: masont@ornl.gov
http://www.ornl.gov/ornlhome/leadership/mason_bio.shtml

EDUCATION
B.Sc. (First Class Honours), Dalhousie University, 1986
Ph.D., McMaster University, 1990

EMPLOYMENT
2007–present Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
   Senior Vice President
2001–present UT-Battelle, LLC, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, U.S.A.
   2007–present President and CEO
   2001–2007 Vice President
1998–present Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, U.S.A.
   2007–present Director
   2006–2007 Associate Laboratory Director
   for Neutron Sciences 2001–
   2006 Associate Laboratory Director
   for the Spallation Neutron Source
   1998–2001 Director, Experimental Facilities Division,
   Spallation Neutron Source Project
1998–present Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tennessee,
   Knoxville, Tennessee, U.S.A.
   2003–present Adjunct Professor 1998–
   2003 Adjunct Associate Professor
1993–98 Department of Physics, University of Toronto,
   Toronto, Ontario, Canada
   1998 Associate Professor
   1993–98 Assistant Professor
1992–93 Seniorforsker (Senior Scientist), Department of Solid State
   Physics, Risø National Laboratory, Roskilde, Denmark
1990–92 Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada
   (N.S.E.R.C.) Postdoctoral Fellow, AT&T Bell Laboratories,
   Murray Hill, New Jersey, U.S.A.
1986–90 Graduate Student, Department of Physics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, and Neutron and Solid State Physics, Chalk River Laboratories, Chalk River, Ontario, Canada

AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL INTEREST

Project Management: Key role in the U.S. Department of Energy’s $1.4 billion Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) project from inception through completion, including overall responsibility through the peak of construction to successful completion; meeting and exceeding all cost, schedule, technical performance, and safety objectives.

Scientific Facility Management: Leadership of the largest and highest performance neutron scattering facilities in the United States—SNS (accelerator based) and the High Flux Isotope Reactor (reactor based)—with a total operating budget, including ongoing projects to upgrade the facilities, of more than $250 million per year.

Laboratory Management and Science Policy: Leadership of the U.S. Department of Energy’s largest multi-program research laboratory, with an annual budget in excess of $1.5 billion and more than 4500 staff. As the Management and Operating contractor for ORNL, UT-Battelle manages a diverse portfolio of science and energy R&D spanning fundamental research in physics, biology, and chemistry through programs in climate change; energy generation, distribution, and end use; and national security. Operating responsibilities include a nuclear reactor, a high-power proton accelerator, classified activities, and a complex array of research facilities and construction projects.

AREAS OF RESEARCH INTEREST

High-$T_c$ superconductors
Heavy fermion compounds, magnetism and superconductivity
Itinerant antiferromagnets
Neutron scattering (elastic, inelastic, and applied)
Neutron scattering instrumentation, data analysis, and visualization
Transport and thermodynamic properties, high magnetic fields and low temperatures
Critical phenomena
Residual strain in engineering materials
Neutron sources

HONORS

1982–83 E. R. Faulkner Scholarship
1983–84 W. J. Archibald Prize
1983–84 R. S. Smith Scholarship
1984–85 A. S. MacKenzie Prize
1984–85 Dalhousie University Scholarship

June 2015
1985  N.S.E.R.C. Undergraduate Student Research Award
1985–86  Dalhousie University Scholarship
1985–86  G. H. Henderson Prize
1986–90  N.S.E.R.C. Postgraduate Scholarship
1986–90  H. L. Hooker Scholarship
1988–89  Dawes Memorial Fellowship
1989  Canadian Association of Physicists (C.A.P.) Lumonics Prize
1990–92  N.S.E.R.C. Postdoctoral Fellowship
1993–2011  Associate of the Quantum Materials (formerly Superconductivity)
Program of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research
1997  Macleans Magazine “100 Canadians to Watch”
1997–99  A. P. Sloan Jr. Research Fellow
2001  Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science
2002  Inductee into the McMaster University Alumni Gallery
2004  TN Business Magazine “Tennessee’s 40 Under 40”
2004  Fellow, Institute of Physics (UK)
2005  Postma Young Professional Award, East Tennessee Economic Council
2007  Fellow, American Physical Society
2008  Distinguished Alumni Award, McMaster University
2008–09  TN Business Magazine “Power 100”
2010  Fellow, Neutron Scattering Society of America
2011  Doctor of Laws, honoris causa, Dalhousie University
2013  Doctor of Science, honoris causa, McMaster University

COMMITTEES

• Chair, Local Organizing Committee, and member, Organizing Committee, for the 1997 International Conference on Neutron Scattering
• Member, Steering Committee for the Spallation Neutron Source (1997–98)
• Member, Proposal Review Committees for the DUALSPEC facility at Chalk River Laboratories and Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Inelastic Scattering
• Member, LANSCE Program Evaluation Committee, Los Alamos National Laboratory (1996–99)
• Member, External Advisory Committee on the 30 T Repetitively Pulsed Magnet for Neutron Scattering, Los Alamos National Laboratory (1996–99)
• Undergraduate Curriculum, Graduate Curriculum, Welsh Lecture, Industrial Liaison, Colloquium and Technical Services Committees of the University of Toronto Department of Physics (1993–98)
• Vice-President and University of Toronto representative, Canadian Institute for Neutron Scattering Board of Trustees (1996–98)
• Member, Canada Foundation for Innovation Multidisciplinary Assessment Committees (1998–present)
• Member, ISIS Scheduling Panel (1999–2001)
• Member, Editorial Board, Nuclear Instruments and Methods A (1999–present)
• Member, European Spallation Source Scientific Advisory Committee (2000–03); Observer, European Spallation Source Council (1999–2003)
• Member, Wissenschaftsrat (German Science Council) subcommittee evaluating the European Spallation Source (2001–02)
• Member, Executive Board, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter (2003–present)
• Member, Helmholtz Gemeinschaft Large Scale Facilities for Research with Photons, Neutron and Ions Review Panel (2004)
• Member, University of California LANSCE Division Review Committee, Los Alamos National Laboratory (2004–present)
• Member, University of Chicago IPNS Division Review Committee (2005)
• Member, various NSF review panels (LIGO, CHRNS@NIST, LENS, others)
• Member, U.S. ITER Project Advisory Committee (2006–07)
• Chair, NSLS-II Project Advisory Committee (2006–07)
• Member at Large, Steering Committee of the Section on Industrial Science and Technology, AAAS (2007–11)
• Chair, Chinese Spallation Neutron Source Science & Technology Committee (2007–08)
• Member and Chair, National Science Foundation LIGO and Advanced LIGO Review Committees (2007–present)
• Member, Paul Scherrer Institute Plenary FoKo (Research Advisory Committee) (2007–present)
• Member, Los Alamos National Laboratory Matter-Radiation Interactions in Extremes (MaRIE) Facility Advisory Board (2008–present)
• Member, Executive Committee, National Laboratory Directors Council (2009–2013)
• Member, Natural Resources Canada Expert Review Panel on Medical Isotope Production (2009)
• Chair and Member, National Laboratory Director’s Council (2009-2013)
• Member, Advisory Panel, City University of Hong Kong (2010)
• Member, External Advisory Board of the Michigan Memorial Phoenix Energy Institute (2011–present)
• Chair, Committee to Recommend Alternatives to the Uranium Processing Facility Plan in Meeting the Nation’s Enriched Uranium Strategy [UPF Red Team] (2014)
• Chair, Committee to Review Plutonium Disposition Alternatives (2015)

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science
Fellow, Institute of Physics (UK)
Fellow, American Physical Society
Fellow, Neutron Scattering Society of America
Member, Materials Research Society
Member, Canadian Association of Physicists
Member, Canadian Institute for Neutron Scattering

June 2015
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
Innovation Valley Inc. (Chairman, Board of Directors)
Oak Ridge Public Schools Education Foundation (Chairman, Board of Directors)
Launch Tennessee (Member)
Leadership Tennessee (Member Inaugural Class)
Science Standards Steering Committee (Member)
Western Governors University Advisory Board (Member)

TEACHING
1992/93 Solid State Physics, graduate course, University of Copenhagen; text: Ashcroft and Mermin; enrollment: ∼12
1993/94–1996/97 Condensed Matter I, fourth year undergraduate course, University of Toronto; text: Kittel; enrollment: ∼10 (PHY487/1487)
1994/95–1997/98 Fundamental Physics Laboratory, second year undergraduate lab, University of Toronto; no text; enrollment: ∼160 (PHY280/281/225)
1997/98 Condensed Matter II, graduate course, University of Toronto; text: Ashcroft and Mermin; enrollment: ∼10 (PHY2301)
1997/98 Research Opportunities, second year undergraduate course, University of Toronto; enrollment: 1 (PHY299)
1997/98 Experimental Methods in Physics (1 module), graduate course, University of Toronto; enrollment: ∼8 (PHY2107)
2001 Accelerator Based Neutron Sources for Materials Research, U.S. Particle Accelerator School, graduate course, Rice University; enrollment: ∼5
2000–2006 Neutron Sources, Instruments, and Detectors, National School of Neutron and X-Ray Scattering, Argonne National Laboratory Summer School; enrollment: ∼60

Theses Supervised
1994–95 J. W. L. Pang, Standardization of Neutron Diffraction Residual Strain Measurements, MSc
1994–98 C. P. Adams, Magnetic and Transport Properties of FeGe2, PhD
1995–98 J. W. L. Pang, Residual Strain in Engineering Materials, PhD
1997–98 D. Chithrani, Comparative X-ray Diffraction Study of Ce3Bi4Pt3 and Tb3Sb4Au3, MSc
PUBLICATIONS

(a) Refereed Journal Articles


(b) ) Refereed Conference Proceedings


(c) Not Peer Reviewed


INVITED AND PLENARY TALKS AT MEETINGS
(not including many contributed talks, posters, and review presentations about SNS and ORNL)


June 2015


LECTURES, COLLOQUIA, SEMINARS AND TESTIMONY

1. “Universality in a triangular antiferromagnet”
   Brookhaven National Laboratory, Jan. 9, 1990.

2. “Neutron and x-ray scattering studies of antiferromagnetism in URu$_2$Si$_2$”
   University of Toronto, Feb. 8, 1991.

3. “Incommensurate magnetic fluctuations in La$_{2-x}$Sr$_x$CuO$_4$”
   Queen’s University, Oct. 30, 1991.

4. “Neutron scattering as a probe of band structure”
   University of Toronto, April 27, 1992.
   Chalk River Laboratories, April 29, 1992.
   McGill University, April 31, 1992.

5. “Magnetism in heavy fermion superconductors and semiconductors”

6. “Magnetic fluctuations in superconducting La$_{2-x}$Sr$_x$CuO$_4$”
   AT&T Bell Laboratories, Nov. 18, 1992.
   Chalk River Laboratories, July 14, 1993.

7. “Making maps in reciprocal space: Slow neutrons as a probe of condensed matter”
   University of Toronto, Dec. 9, 1993.
   Simon Fraser University, Jan. 21, 1994.
   Dalhousie University, Feb. 9, 1994.
   University of Waterloo, Oct. 3, 1996.

8. “Low energy magnetic excitations in superconducting La$_{1.86}$Sr$_{0.14}$CuO$_4$”
   McMaster University, Dec. 16, 1993.
9. “Lectures on neutron scattering as a probe of superconductivity”
   University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Feb. 28 & Mar. 2, 1994.
   CINS Summer School, Chalk River, June 9, 1995.
   VII International School on Neutron Physics, Russia, Sept. 16, 1995.

10. “Normal state spin fluctuations in La$_{2-x}$Sr$_x$CuO$_4$: scaling and power laws”
    McMaster University, April 20, 1997.

11. “Itinerant antiferromagnetism in FeGe$_2$”
    Queen’s University, March 5, 1997.

12. “Quantum critical behaviour in the normal state of a high-T$_c$ superconductor”
    National High Magnetic Field Lab, Florida State, Feb. 12, 1999

13. “Neutron sources and time-of-flight instrumentation”
    CINS Summer School, Chalk River, June 24, 1998.

    McGill University, Oct. 22, 1999
    Indiana University, Oct. 27, 1999
    University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Oct. 26, 2000
    Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Mar. 21, 2001
    North Carolina State University, Apr., 23, 2001
    The University of Tennessee, Sept. 25, 2002.
    The University of Delaware, Oct. 16, 2002.
    The University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Sept. 8, 2005.
    University of California, Los Angeles, Jan. 26, 2006.
    Chalk River Laboratories, June 4, 2006.

15. “Neutron Sources” and “Neutron Scattering Instrumentation and Detectors”
    National School on Neutron and X-ray Scattering,

16. “Quantum Criticality and Spin Charge Separation in Cuprate Superconductors”
    Louisiana State University, Nov. 4, 1999.
17. “International Partnerships at the Spallation Neutron Source”
   National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, March 8, 2006.
   Korea Institute of Science and Technology, Seoul, Korea,
   June 4, 2008.

18. “Spallation Neutron Source: A Large Scale Facility for Small Scale Science”
   House Research Caucus, Rayburn House Office Building,

   Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY, Nov. 21, 2007.
   Helmholtz Zentrum Berlin, Berlin, Germany, June 2, 2009.
   Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Sept. 23, 2010.

20. “Science and Technology for the Energy Challenge”
   UC Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, May 22, 2008.
   Korea Institute of Science and Technology, Seoul, Korea,
   June 4, 2008.
   Jackson State University, Jackson, MS, June 16, 2008.
   Commencement Address, University of Tennessee,
   Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, Dec. 16, 2008.
   Chattanooga Rotary, Chattanooga, TN, Jan. 29, 2009.
   City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, Feb. 25, 2010.
   Atlanta Downtown Rotary, Atlanta, GA, Aug. 9, 2010.
   Guptill Memorial Lecture, Dalhousie University,
   Clark Atlanta University, Apr. 25, 2011.
   Various Institutes of the Chinese Academy of Science, Shanghai and
   Beijing, May 9–13, 2011.
   Convocation Address, Dalhousie University,
   Halifax, NS, May 26, 2011.
   University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, June 17, 2011.
   North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, Nov. 6, 2014.

   Presidential Debate Dialog, Belmont University, Nashville, TN,
   Forschungszentrum Jülich, Jülich, Germany, Nov. 4, 2008.

22. “Federal Investments in Green Technology: Outlook and Implications for our
    region”


RESEARCH GRANTS AND CONTRACTS
(* denotes Mason=Principal Investigator)

1993  *Startup Funds, University of Toronto, CA$200,000.

1993  *Seed Funds for High Magnetic Field $^3$He Facility, Ontario Centre for Materials Research, CA$50,000.

1993–95  *Experimental Studies of High Correlated Electron Systems, N.S.E.R.C. Operating Grant, CA$33,000 per year.

1993–97  *Superconductivity Program, Teaching Release, Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, CA$20,000 per year.

1994  *High Magnetic Field $^3$He Facility, N.S.E.R.C. Major Installation Grant (with B.D. Gaulin and J. Greedan), CA$210,117.

1994–95  Neutron Scattering Facilities at Chalk River, N.S.E.R.C. Infrastructure Grant (with M.F. Collins and many others), CA$55,000 per year.

1995  *Helium Recovery Compressor, N.S.E.R.C. Equipment Grant (with B. Statt, J.M. Perz, and H.M. van Driel), CA$44,007.

1995  High Field Infra-red Spectrometer, N.S.E.R.C. Equipment Grant (with T. Timusk and D. Bonn), CA$49,000.


1996–98  Neutron Scattering Facilities at Chalk River, N.S.E.R.C. Major Facilities Access Grant (with M.F. Collins and others), CA$55,000 per year.


1997–99  *A.P. Sloan Research Fellowship, $15,000 per year.

2000–01  *Design Study of a Long Wavelength Target Station at the Spallation Neutron Source, National Science Foundation, $1,400,000.

1998–2006  *Spallation Neutron Source Project, Department of Energy, Total Project Cost $1,411,000,000.

2006–2007  *Spallation Neutron Source Operations, Department of Energy, $165,000,000 per year.

2007–2012  *SNS Instruments Next Generation II, Major Item of Equipment, Cost Range $40,000,000–$60,000,000.

2005–2011  *SNS Power Upgrade, Major Item of Equipment, Cost Range $140,000,000–$160,000,000.

2006–2007  *HFIR Operations and Scientific Program, Department of Energy, $54,000,000.

2007–      Oak Ridge National Laboratory, multiple principal investigators, grants, programs, and contract, total budget >$1.5B per year.
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The University of Tennessee, Knoxville launched a strategic planning initiative known as Vol Vision in 2011, which included new mission and vision statements reflecting pursuit of becoming a “Top 25” public research university.

The following presentation describes updates to the plan as the Knoxville campus implements the next phase of this strategic initiative.

MOTION: I move that the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee recommend adoption of the following Resolution by the Board of Trustees:

RESOLVED: The proposed updates to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville Strategic Plan known as Vol Vision 2020 are approved.
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Vol Vision 2020

Adopted in 2010, *Vol Vision* set the University of Tennessee, Knoxville ("UT") on a journey to become a Top 25 public research university. This update to the strategic plan reinforces our commitment to the journey and establishes high-level direction for the next five years.

In January of 2015, Provost Susan Martin appointed a Milestone Review Committee of faculty, students, and staff to refresh *Vol Vision*. The committee evaluated progress since 2010, identified challenges, and led a community-wide listening tour that engaged over 1,400 stakeholders. The group then worked with campus leadership to develop *Vol Vision 2020*.

**Objectives**

**Vol Vision 2020...**

- Outlines high-level vision, strategic priorities, metrics, and goals
- Provides a framework for college and division action planning
- Guides resource decisions since priorities are incorporated into annual planning, budget processes, resource allocation, academic program review, performance evaluations, and other processes

**Vol Vision 2020 Is Not...**

- A multi-year implementation and resource plan
- A comprehensive list of tactical actions with assigned accountabilities

UT developed 63 action plans following the adoption of *Vol Vision* in 2010. The plans outlined tactical action steps, resource requirements, timelines, accountability, and metrics. UT will follow a similar process with *Vol Vision 2020*. We will assign coordinating teams for each priority. Accountability will be assigned for major initiatives, and action plans will be developed as a next step.

An important objective of *Vol Vision 2020* is to better engage colleges and divisions in action planning. In coordination with leadership, colleges and divisions will establish corresponding strategic plans, outline tactical actions, and adopt their own metrics of excellence in support of our strategic direction.

Resource requests associated with actions at all levels will be reviewed and prioritized through the annual budget and resource allocation processes.
Progress

UT has demonstrated significant progress across the strategic priorities and metrics established in 2010. Accomplishments include, but are not limited to:

- Improved graduation rates by 9 percentage points, from 60% to 69%
- Raised first-year retention by 3 percentage points, from 84% to 87%
- Increased Ph.D. degrees by 14%
- Grew sponsored research expenditures by nearly 50%
- Increased the number of Governor’s Chairs to 14
- Narrowed faculty and staff salary gaps through five years of regular market and merit salary increases
- Achieved record-setting philanthropic giving of $235 million
- Initiated a $1 billion physical transformation of campus

Challenges

*Vol Vision 2020* does not underestimate the difficulty of the road ahead. Continued and emerging challenges include, but are not limited to:

- Revenue base more tuition dependent; continued funding challenges
- Intense competition in recruiting students, both in-state and out-of-state
- Limited and fluctuating progress in student retention
- Limited progress in graduate education
- Student and parent concern with tuition and career outcomes
- Heightened competition for sponsored research and large-scale grants
- Sustained faculty and staff salary gaps
- Affordability and support for students with high financial need

Volunteer Difference

If UT is to be successful in the long run, we must differentiate ourselves rather than imitate other universities. An important difference between the original plan and this update is a new emphasis on the Volunteer Difference and our core values (see pp. 10 to 11). Our objective is to define and build on the unique set of strengths that set UT apart from peers. *Vol Vision 2020* outlines the Volunteer Difference and imbeds these themes throughout the plan.
Strategic Priorities

Vol Vision includes six strategic priorities, which are outlined below with illustrative supporting actions. The priorities are presented in greater detail in the Strategic Priorities section of the plan (beginning on p. 16).

Priority One: Undergraduate Education

Recruit enrich, and graduate undergraduate students who are prepared to enter the global community as lifelong learners and authentic leaders

- Increase enrollment through recruitment and retention; increase number of Tennessee students and out-of-state students (up to 25%)
- Improve academic quality through Experience Learning and innovative new approaches to general education
- Improve retention by facilitating student transitions to UT in the first year
- Support on-time graduation with effective academic and career advising
- Engage alumni in student recruitment and career mentorship

Priority Two: Graduate Education

Strengthen graduate education through an emphasis on excellence and improvement of the graduate student experience

- Grow graduate programs in areas demonstrating excellence to be defined by colleges and departments
- Improve recruitment and financial support to attract excellent students
- Improve graduate student outcomes through focus on career placement and timely completion of degrees

Priority Three: Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Engagement

Strengthen our capacity, productivity, and recognition across our total portfolio of research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement

- Recognize contributions beyond sponsored research by better engaging colleges, departments, and centers to define indicators of excellence
- Improve competitiveness for sponsored research through proposal support and new strategic partnerships
- Increase student research opportunities to improve academic quality
- Invest in research and information infrastructure to support effectiveness
Priority Four: Faculty and Staff
Attract, retain, and recognize stellar faculty and staff who strive for excellence and proudly embody Volunteer values

- Continue to address salary gaps to support recruitment and retention of faculty and staff talent
- Recognize and reward faculty and staff excellence in performance through merit increases

Priority Five: Resources and Infrastructure
Develop a resource base for the future; continue transformation of campus infrastructure

- Diversify revenues through philanthropy and managed enrollment growth
- Improve operational efficiency through greater space utilization, business process modernization, shared resources, among other opportunities
- Continue to monitor and control costs
- Implement master plan to modernize campus and improve appearance in order to support recruitment and retention efforts

Priority Six: Diversity and Inclusion
Enhance diversity and inclusion to benefit our campus

- Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds
- Understand and improve campus climate to support retention and national recruitment
- Prepare students to succeed in a diverse and global workplace

Next Steps

Our ultimate success will depend on a sustained commitment to excellence and improvement as part of our institutional culture. Our objective is to incorporate this into the day-to-day work of the university rather than a periodic or one-time effort.

As we move forward with implementation, we will regularly update campus on progress against campus metrics and goals. We will provide updates on more specific action plans and progress associated with tactics. We will also report on progress at the division and college levels against their plans and indicators of excellence.
2020 Campus Goals

We continue with the metrics established in 2010 to measure progress against our priorities. The chart below shows our baseline performance, our current performance, and projected goals for 2020. We will need to formalize metrics for diversity and inclusion as a next step (illustrative example provided on p. 55).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>2020 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Equivalent 75th/25th Percentile</td>
<td>29 / 24</td>
<td>29 / 24</td>
<td>Remain at Peer Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-to-Second-Year Retention</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Graduation</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Degrees</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s/Professional Degrees</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research and Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Research Expenditures*</td>
<td>$70 M</td>
<td>$128 M</td>
<td>$227 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research Expenditures*</td>
<td>$165 M</td>
<td>$246 M</td>
<td>$436 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salary Range (Full to Assistant)</td>
<td>$108K to $67K</td>
<td>$130K to $76K</td>
<td>Narrow Gap with Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student to Tenure-Line Faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Remain at Peer Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Awards**</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Narrow Gap with Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Support Expenditures/Student</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$19,487</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Average Philanthropic Support ***</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$83.5 M</td>
<td>$110 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Research expenditures are the Knoxville area and include the UT Institute of Agriculture.
** The source for faculty awards data is the Center for Measuring University Progress (CUMP)
*** Vol Vision 2020 adopts five-year average philanthropic support. This replaces the previous endowment per student metric.
Background and Process

Background

Vol Vision is the strategic plan for the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (“UT”). The mission, vision, values, and strategic priorities set forth in this plan serve as a uniting set of principles and goals that allow students, faculty, staff, and administrators to align actions and resource decisions around a common vision.

This plan grows out of a bold “Top 25 challenge” first proposed by Governor Phil Bredesen in 2009 and continues with support from current Governor Bill Haslam. Central to our plan is more than a decade of statewide work across these two gubernatorial administrations to develop some of our nation’s most creative higher education initiatives. Programs include the HOPE Lottery Scholarship, the Drive to 55, Tennessee Promise, the outcomes-based funding formula, and, most recently, the Reconnect and Complete initiative. Our strategic plan aligns UT as a strong partner in support of the state’s commitment to improving the lives of Tennesseans through higher education.

Milestone Review Process

Provost Susan Martin convened a Milestone Review Committee in January 2015 to refresh Vol Vision for the next five years. The first phase of the process, completed in August 2015, was a strategic assessment of past progress and future challenges, accompanied by recommendations for campus consideration. In the second phase, completed in December 2015, the committee engaged more than 1,400 students, faculty, staff, alumni, parents, and other stakeholders in nearly forty meetings, forums, and online feedback opportunities to gather input on strategic direction. Finally, the committee worked with campus leadership to develop Vol Vision 2020. See Appendix A for the committee’s membership and process.
Mission, Vision, Values, and the Volunteer Difference

Mission

The primary mission of the University of Tennessee is to move forward the frontiers of human knowledge and enrich and elevate the citizens of the state of Tennessee, the nation, and the world. As the preeminent research-based land-grant university in the state, UT embodies the spirit of excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, outreach, and engagement attained by the nation’s finest public research institutions.

Vision

We seek to establish the University of Tennessee as a top tier public research university. Inherent in this vision is an acknowledgement that UT is currently a premier institution. Our vision reflects a desire to contribute to the legacy of the University and its longstanding tradition of excellence.

Journey to the Top

The journey means a long-term commitment to excellence defined as follows:

• **Public Research University.** We seek to establish UT as a top-tier public research university. Our vision balances undergraduate education outcomes with research and graduate education aspirations.

• **Excellence.** Our aspirations are broader than a single metric or ranking. The journey challenges each college, division, and department to strive for excellence and quality in programs and services.

• **Volunteer Difference.** We do not seek to imitate other universities. The journey embraces our Volunteer identity and builds on the strengths that differentiate UT from peers.

• **Commitment.** We do not underestimate the difficulty of the journey ahead. Our success will depend on a sustained commitment to improvement as a part of our culture.

We are on this journey to improve the quality of the university. Through this effort, we will increase the value of a UT degree to benefit students and alumni.
We will broaden the impact of our academic and research accomplishments. We will continue to drive economic development and support the state’s higher education attainment goals as Tennessee’s flagship university. Finally, we will position UT for long-term success in a changing and increasingly competitive higher education environment.

**Volunteer Values**

*Vol Vision 2020* evokes the Volunteer Values first outlined in 2010.

Promoting an institutional culture of continuous improvement is the key to pursuing and achieving excellence. This culture is guided by adherence to core values that define the Volunteer spirit and permeate who we are, what we do, and our approach to living and learning at UT and beyond. Though our strategic focus may change over time, we remain committed to the following values:

- **Seeking Knowledge.** The Volunteer spirit is intelligent, curious, and honors freedom of speech and the free exchange of ideas. This type of inquiry encourages intellectual growth, a lifelong pursuit of knowledge, and a sharing of this knowledge, as embodied by the Torchbearer.

- **Leading with Innovation and Integrity.** We know that solutions to modern problems arise through an understanding and application of existing data, but also through creative thinking. Volunteers value character and integrity. The best leaders foster ethical and professional behavior such as open dialogue, transparency, and accountability within their groups.

- **Advancing Diversity and Inclusion.** The Volunteer community encompasses faculty, staff, students, and alumni of different cultures and backgrounds. Respecting the contributions and strengths of each individual is integral to teamwork and to fostering a culture of inclusive excellence.

- **Engaging Locally and Globally.** Volunteers get involved. Whether acting within our local and extended communities or embracing global challenges, the UT community strives to make a difference.

- **Embracing Responsible Stewardship of Resources.** Sustainability of resources, whether in terms of financial resources, infrastructure, or the environment, is key to a healthy institution. Practicing these values at UT builds a lifelong respect for managing resources responsibly.
Volunteer Difference

Vol Vision 2020 builds on our unique set of strengths. As we asked campus stakeholders to reflect on our Volunteer identity, the following themes emerged and are incorporated throughout the plan:

• **Volunteer Community.** The Volunteer community and spirit extends across students, alumni, faculty, staff, and supporters. We are viewed as a positive workplace by faculty and staff. Our traditions of excellence, leadership, and service span over 225 years and connect the campus community as a whole. Our legacy of athletic excellence continues and contributes to the Volunteer spirit.

• **Mission.** UT is one of the few universities in the country that serve as both the state flagship and land-grant institution while also being located in an urban setting. As a flagship, we are comprehensive, valuing a balance of academic disciplines. We value access and engagement as part of our land-grant mission.

• **Academic and Research Excellence.** Our faculty expertise, academic programs, and research centers represent broad excellence across a multitude of disciplines. Our faculty include renowned scholars and leaders in their fields. Our partnership with Oak Ridge National Laboratory, in addition to those with other government, corporate, and nonprofit entities, provides unique opportunities for research and academic collaborations.

• **Student Experience.** We offer students a quality education with a wide variety of opportunities and experiences. We are a value in higher education. Our students maintain lower student debt loads than national averages.

• **Alumni Network.** Our alumni network spans more than 200,000 Volunteers across the globe with exceptional dedication to the UT community. Students frequently note that alumni connections positively influenced their decision to attend UT.

• **Place.** The Knoxville region provides UT with a dynamic environment and destination of choice —culturally rich with a healthy economic base and a location near the foot of the Great Smoky Mountains.
Progress, Challenges, and Areas for Improvement

Progress

UT has made substantial progress since the adoption of Vol Vision five years ago:

• **Undergraduate Education.** UT has maintained incoming student quality in an increasingly competitive recruitment environment. We increased first-to-second year retention and six-year graduation rates. In both metrics, we have narrowed the gap to peers. UT was recognized as a national leader in graduation and retention rate improvement with the 2014 “Most Visible Progress” Trailblazer award from the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

• **Graduate Education.** UT made investments in graduate stipends, developed innovative graduate programs, and worked to improve the graduate student experience. While UT has increased PhD degrees conferred, the number of master’s and professional degrees conferred has decreased. The gap between the peers and UT has increased in these areas.

• **Faculty and Staff.** UT has addressed both faculty and staff salary gaps through market and merit salary increases. Progress in philanthropy, including the Chancellor’s Faculty Support Challenge, has contributed to this effort. New programs were implemented to improve recruitment, support professional development, and promote a collegial work environment for faculty and staff.

• **Research and Engagement.** UT has increased both federal and total sponsored research expenditures over the past five years. Several actions contributed to this accomplishment including new partnerships, the Governor’s Chairs program, and increased support for proposal development. In addition, UT earned the “Community Engagement” designation from the Carnegie Foundation.

• **Resources and Infrastructure.** UT has strengthened its resource base over the past five years. Teaching and other support investments per student have increased. Philanthropic contributions reached record high levels last year. The campus has implemented cost savings and budget reallocation efforts. Finally, UT continues its physical transformation effort, initiating nearly $1 billion in construction projects since 2010.


Rankings

Many of UT’s colleges, departments, and programs rank very highly in the numerous higher education ranking systems. Some of these indexes rank the entire campus, while others are specific to colleges and programs. No two indexes use the same methodology and metrics.

The Center for University Measurement and Performance designated UT a Top 25 institution in its most recent rankings. UT is now ranked in 47th position in the 2016 US News and World Report’s Top Public Universities, five spaces higher than our rank at the beginning of our journey in June 2010. UT is also ranked as a value in higher education in the Kiplinger’s Personal Finance and Princeton Review rankings.

Four colleges compare favorably among public universities in their respective US News graduate school rankings as of 2015: the College of Social Work (No. 23), the College of Law (No. 27), the Haslam College of Business (No. 32), and the College of Engineering (No. 36). DesignIntelligence ranks the College of Architecture as 13th among public universities. Two colleges rank among the top public universities in US News undergraduate program rankings: the Haslam College of Business (No. 30) and the College of Engineering (No. 36). It is important to note that rankings do not exist for some colleges.

Many academic programs rank in or near the Top 25 of public universities or have achieved national distinction in their fields. These programs include, but are not limited to, the following: nuclear engineering, supply chain and logistics, sports management, clinical law training, biosystems engineering, aerospace engineering, civil engineering, electrical engineering, information sciences, art, printmaking, geography, microbiology, modern foreign languages (Spanish and Portuguese), clinical psychology, counseling psychology, anthropology, evolutionary biology and ecology, animal sciences, theatre - opera, agriculture economics, and food science. UT’s online master’s of social work program ranks second in the country. Similar to colleges, rankings do not exist for some academic programs.

In addition, the UT Libraries consistently ranks in or near the Top 25 of public universities in the annual rankings of the Association of Research Libraries.
Challenges

UT must acknowledge and adapt to a changing environment. The committee consulted with experts to identify the following trends that may impact our future:

• **Changing Revenue Base.** Like those of many other public universities, UT’s resource base has changed in recent years. Where state appropriations once accounted for the highest percentage of total revenue, tuition and fees are now the largest source. While UT has experienced strong support from the State of Tennessee, funding levels are unlikely to return to previous percentages. Federal funding for research is also expected to increase modestly or remain flat. As a result, UT will be more dependent on enrollment, philanthropy, new partnerships, and other revenue streams in the future.

• **Increasing Competition for Students.** Recruiting students in the near future will become even more competitive than it is today. As universities across the country become more dependent on tuition, many are adopting aggressive recruitment and tuition discounting strategies even as the number of college-bound students is expected to decrease. In addition, undergraduate students and parents are increasingly concerned with affordability and career outcomes. Interest in graduate education typically fluctuates and has experienced a recent national decline. This may heighten competition for graduate students.

• **Shifting Demographics.** Tennessee is less racially and internationally diverse than the United States as a whole. However, demographics of both the nation and the state are projected to become more diverse. This trend underscores the importance of positioning the campus for future competitiveness. Furthermore, employers expect new graduates to be culturally conversant and demonstrate the ability to work across differences in an increasingly complex work environment.

• **Continuing Funding Challenges.** We began our journey in the face of economic challenges in 2010. UT’s experience over the past five years demonstrates that substantive progress, even compared to better-funded peers, can be made despite lower funding levels. Funding challenges are projected to continue in the future. UT will need to continue to be resourceful, efficient, and entrepreneurial.
Areas for Improvement

The committee led a listening tour that engaged over 1,400 faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni, parents, and others regarding strategic direction. This section summarizes themes for improvement from these sessions.

Suggestions for improvement in undergraduate education related to academic and career advising, recruitment, connecting students to campus early in their experience, Experience Learning and mentoring programs, affordability, and alumni connections. Many expressed the need to grow undergraduate enrollment, including in out-of-state enrollment. Student financial support, recruitment, and career development were identified as themes for improvement in graduate education. Students also expressed the need for process efficiency, often stating that processes and services are not always coordinated and designed with the students in mind.

Many faculty expressed the need to recognize contributions beyond sponsored research. There also is support to increase competitiveness for sponsored research. We need to improve the communication of our success stories and continue to invest in infrastructure.

Faculty and staff recommend that UT continue to address the salary gap, improve professional development, and increase diversity, especially in faculty ranks. Some expressed concern with the size of the faculty and level of staff support due to the pressures of growth. Many identified the need to build new staff capabilities to keep pace with changing campus needs. There was support for a greater emphasis on staff excellence.

Participants supported continued campus transformation with progress in sustainability and accessibility. Areas for improvement related to parking and dining. With respect to technology, participants expressed the need to continue work related to information systems integration and data quality and access.

Campus stakeholders strongly supported the new strategic priority. There was a common feeling that a diverse campus profile and welcoming community are essential for student and institutional success. Students representing different backgrounds—campus veterans, African-American, LGBTQ+, and others groups—each expressed feedback to the administration regarding campus climate throughout the process.
Strategic Priorities

Overview

In this section, we present the refreshed strategic priorities, and we provide an assessment of progress against the goals established in the original strategic plan in 2010. We comment on anticipated challenges and outline strategic directions, action priorities, and goals.

In many areas, the review compares UT’s performance to that of a target peer group. This group includes the University of Georgia, Clemson University, the University of Minnesota, Texas A&M University, Rutgers University, Michigan State University, Indiana University, and Purdue University.

The data presented may not reflect the most recent year performance. Unless otherwise noted, the baseline year reflects 2009, and the year of comparative data is 2014.

For reference, a summary of the original strategic directions and goals adopted in 2010 under Vol Vision is provided in Appendix B.
Priority 1: Undergraduate Education

Progress

Over the past five years, incoming student quality, as measured by ACT scores, has remained equivalent to the target peer group. UT improved by 3 and 9 percentage points, respectively, in first-to-second-year retention and six-year graduation rates. This improvement surpassed target peers, and the gaps narrowed in both measures.

While we did not meet the goals of 90 percent first-to-second-year retention and 75 percent six-year graduation set by Vol Vision, progress in undergraduate education can be considered a success. As an indicator, UT was recognized as a national leader in graduation and retention improvement with the 2014 “Most Visible Progress” Trailblazer award from the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT Performance</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT Equivalent 75th/25th Percentile</td>
<td>29 / 24</td>
<td>29 / 24</td>
<td>At Peer Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-to-Second-Year Retention</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Graduation</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>+9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Peer Performance</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT Equivalent 75th/25th Percentile</td>
<td>28.5 / 23.5</td>
<td>29 / 24</td>
<td>+. 5 / +. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-to-Second-Year Retention</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Graduation</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS

An action plan developed in 2011 emphasized the importance of graduation in four years. To support this direction, UT adopted a new 15/4 tuition model, expanded sections in high-demand courses, and implemented uTrack. The uTrack system, supported by eight-semester graduation plans for each major,
provides students with a tool to help to stay on track for graduation. In addition, UT added professional advisors and increased access to other core support services such as tutoring. An integrated one-stop center for student service was established. UT expanded effective programs aimed at raising first-year retention rates with additional sections of Ignite Summit, new living and learning communities, and broader first-year studies programs. Finally, UT improved the use of data and analysis to identify reasons for attrition and develop more effective retention strategies.

Over the past five years, campus leadership has worked to develop a culture that values “on-time” graduation. UT’s four-year graduation rate improved 8 percentage points over the past five years. Our on-time graduation strategy should be noted for its contribution to affordability, institutional effectiveness, and degree production. This direction also supports Governor Haslam’s Drive to 55, an initiative to increase the number of Tennesseans equipped with a college degree.

Challenges

Several issues present UT with a new set of challenges in undergraduate education. As identified in strategic considerations for 2020, a pressing challenge is the increasingly competitive environment for recruiting students.

Another challenge is the growing public emphasis on career outcomes. Our students need to be prepared to succeed in an increasingly complex workforce regardless of the major and occupation they choose. Success in today’s global workforce also requires leadership skills that include an ability to effectively work across differences. This underscores the importance of Experience Learning and student leadership development. It also reinforces the need to help students gain an appreciation for different backgrounds and cultures while at UT.

We have maintained a commitment to access and affordability over the past five years. Today, nearly half of UT students graduate with no student debt. Average debt loads for UT students fall below national averages. As an indicator of access, roughly 30 percent of UT’s undergraduate students are eligible for Pell grants, much higher than target peer averages. Our future challenge will be to continue this commitment to access in light of a changing resource base.

Finally, Tennessee is the first state in the nation to provide access to free community college for graduating high school seniors. The Tennessee Promise
program is likely to have an impact on UT’s transfer student enrollment patterns in the future, but the full impact remains unknown at this point.

**Strategic Direction 2020**

_Recruit, enrich, and graduate undergraduate students who are prepared to enter the global community as lifelong learners and authentic leaders_

Over the next five years, UT will continue to admit qualified diverse students and improve the retention and graduation of those students. We strive to be within range of target peers in these categories by 2020.

We will achieve this goal by connecting students to innovative and meaningful learning experiences that prepare them for leadership in their fields upon graduation. Our objective is to equip students to make lifelong contributions to their professions and communities.

We will emphasize a quality undergraduate experience that is academically rigorous, situated in a community of care and support. Over the next five years, we will foster excellence in teaching and education innovation inside and outside the classroom. We will cultivate the leadership, communication, teamwork, and problem-solving talents of all students. We will enrich the classroom with real-world experiences, global awareness, and undergraduate research. We will also reinforce an appreciation for different experiences.

We will strengthen a culture that expects on-time graduation. This strategy is important to our ability to remain affordable, operate efficiently, and contribute to the Drive to 55. We will continue to improve academic support systems to help students remain on track to timely graduation. Over the next five years, we will emphasize effective advising to help our students explore, identify, and complete academic paths that lead to rewarding careers.

Students and alumni identify traditions, leadership opportunities, service, and connections as important attributes of the Volunteer experience. We will foster student engagement in experiences espousing the traditions of leadership and service that define our community. We will continue to engage our alumni to enrich our campus community and student experience, especially in student recruitment and professional networking.

With stronger competition for students expected in the future, our strategy to manage growth will include both student recruitment and retention. We will
proactively recruit well-qualified students and integrate retention strategies to support the success of students. We will strengthen transfer pathways to UT for veterans and those who participate in the Tennessee Promise. We will also work to diversify our campus profile through recruitment and student success.

We will continue our primary mission of service to Tennessee. We will provide an increasing number of Tennessee students with access to an affordable quality education. We will develop the talents of these students to allow them to contribute to the long-term vitality of the state of Tennessee through leadership, service, and innovation.

Finally, we will promote coordinated communication, services, and administrative processes with a student-centric philosophy. As a campus, we will encourage the highest levels of operational and cost efficiency balanced with a commitment of service to students. We will also continue to advance the use of data to improve overall effectiveness and services for students.

**Action Priorities**

Action priorities will serve as a framework to help guide efforts and resource decisions over the next five years.

**Recruitment and Retention**

- **Increase Undergraduate Enrollment through Recruitment and Retention.** Recruit and retain well-qualified students. Improve transfer pathways to UT. Increase out-of-state students by up to 25%. Continue our primary mission of access to Tennessee students.

**Education Innovation and Student Experience**

- **Innovate in Experience Learning and Education.** Pursue innovative opportunities to challenge and engage students in and out of the classroom through Experience Learning. Create a new approach to general education that reinforces Volunteer values and lays the foundation for academic success.

- **Support On-Time Graduation Expectations through Effective Academic Support Systems.** Transform our approach to advising to better serve the academic and career ambitions of students. Support on-time graduation expectations with effective student success programs,
clear paths to completion, courses when they are needed, and useful technology tools.

- **Engage Students in the Volunteer Experience.** Facilitate student transitions to UT by engaging students early in their college careers. Engage students in leadership and service opportunities that contribute to the campus, Knoxville region, and state. Emphasize student safety and wellness to enrich the Volunteer experience.

**Engagement after Graduation**

- **Emphasize the Lifelong Volunteer Network.** Encourage students to be Volunteers for Life, contributing their service and support to the UT community as students and alumni. Engage alumni to support student recruitment and career advising.

**Effectiveness and Cost Management**

- **Implement Student-Centric Communication and Efficiencies.** Coordinate to deliver communication, processes, and services from a student-centric perspective. Streamline processes for efficiency, but also improve service outcomes for students.

- **Elevate Quality and Use of Student Data.** Improve availability, reliability, and use of data to support effective decisions and manage costs.

**2020 Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>2020 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT Equivalent 75th/25th Percentile</td>
<td>29 / 24</td>
<td>29 / 24</td>
<td>Remain at Peer Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-to-Second-Year Retention</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Graduation</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators of Excellence

Indicators of excellence will engage colleges and divisions in defining specific goals for undergraduate education. Examples may include:

- **Experience Learning:** Number of students engaged in Experience Learning, quality of outcomes

- **Volunteer Student Experience:** Number of students engaged in co-curricular activities and leadership experiences, quality of experience

- **Student Learning Outcomes:** Progress in discipline-specific learning outcomes

- **Career Outcomes/Placement:** Data on first job placement or advanced education of students after graduation
Priority 2: Graduate Education

Progress

UT's progress in graduate education over the past five years has been mixed. PhD degrees conferred increased by 14 percent, from 277 to 317. Target peers also increased degree production, at a higher rate. As a result, the gap to peers increased in this metric. Since the baseline year, master’s and professional degree production decreased by 2 percent. In contrast, target peers increased in this category. Both graduate education metrics fell short of the goals established in Vol Vision: a 30 percent increase in PhD degrees awarded and a 15 percent increase in master’s and professional degrees awarded.

UT Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD Degrees</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>+40 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s/Professional Degrees</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>-34 (-2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target Peer Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD Degrees</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>+88 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s/Professional Degrees</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>+542 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS

Since 2010, UT has taken action to improve graduate education. UT raised its commitment to graduate student funding to improve competitiveness in recruitment and retention. UT’s investment in assistantships grew by nearly 24 percent, from $31.8 million in 2010 to $39.3 million in 2014. The median value of assistantships steadily increased during this time. It is important to note that the level of increase varied by department.

Highlights of accomplishments include growth in PhD and master’s degree production in STEM-related areas and the expansion of professional offerings through new online programs. The number of graduate students receiving
National Science Foundation research awards more than doubled between 2010 and 2014. UT added new interdisciplinary and dual degree programs, including an innovative doctoral program aligned with the Bredesen Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education.

Finally, UT expanded services to graduate students, including streamlined admissions processes, additional advising and mentoring programs, new leave-of-absence policies, new teaching certifications, and increased funds for travel. The Graduate School has worked with colleges, departments, and programs to increase efforts in diversity recruitment by initiating new visitation programs and facilitating stronger links to historically black colleges and universities and the McNair Scholars Program.

**Challenges**

Several issues present challenges in graduate education. On a national scale, there has been modest growth in master’s degree applications, but a recent decline in PhD applications. Trends further demonstrate that doctorate recipients are more likely to pursue nonacademic careers than in the past, which relates to the need for additional career development for doctoral students.

Over the past five years, UT has experienced an overall decline in total graduate enrollment, driven by decreases in master’s and professional degree candidates. The number of both master’s and PhD applications remained flat. However, certain programs experienced growth despite the trend.

The graduate financial support and tuition model continues to be a challenge for many academic programs. While investment in graduate student funding has increased, the majority of disciplines continue to fall below the funding levels offered at competing universities. Some departments report that the number of available tuition waivers for students limits opportunities for growth.

There typically is a high cost associated with competitive student financial support packages, especially for doctoral students, to include stipends, waivers, and benefits.

The current out-of-state tuition structure poses challenges, particularly for online programs. Due to the lower pricing strategies of online competitors, many UT programs find it difficult to compete for students outside Tennessee and grow to scale.
Strategic Direction 2020

*Strengthen graduate education through an emphasis on excellence and improvement of the graduate student experience*

Excellent graduate programs and high-achieving graduate students are hallmarks of leading public research universities. Today, UT has several graduate programs of national prominence across a variety of academic disciplines. To achieve national distinction, we will need to foster excellence in academic programs, both existing and emerging. Over the next five years, we will increase graduate degree production through an emphasis on excellence.

As a broad strategic direction, we will engage academic programs to define measures of excellence in graduate education. Recognizing that growth in graduate education requires investment, we will develop a sustainable resource model to support growth goals. In line with the core values of a flagship university, we commit to comprehensive excellence and a healthy balance of growth across disciplines. We further commit to growth at the doctoral and master’s and professional degree levels.

Over the next five years, we will encourage academic programs to develop recruitment plans for graduate education that align with academic strengths, faculty capacity, and student opportunity. We will emphasize growth in areas that demonstrate excellence. We will also encourage our faculty to integrate graduate education with areas of leading-edge collaborative research and scholarly activity, which may result in growth through innovative new programs.

We will support growth in master’s and professional degree programs. Over the next five years, we will increase professional degree programs in areas of existing and emerging student demand, which includes programs for nontraditional and working students. This direction will require flexibility in the curriculum delivery to include models that leverage online modes of delivery and alternative schedules to accommodate working professionals. We will also review the tuition model for online programs to be more competitive on a national scale.

Over the next five years, we will improve our ability to recruit an exceptional body of graduate students. Our strategy will include recruitment of diverse and global students. During our period of stakeholder outreach, graduate students expressed that accomplished faculty, quality academic programs, and innovative research opportunities positively influenced their decision to enroll at UT. While we expect that our commitment to excellence will improve our ability to attract well-qualified students over time, we will improve our tactical recruiting practices to
be more competitive for these students. We will also improve financial support packages, including stipends, tuition waivers, and benefits, to be competitive in the market.

Prominent graduate programs demonstrate strong graduate student success and career placement results. Over the next five years, we will support students in completing programs in a timely manner. We will support graduate students in evaluating career options and provide relevant training to result in competitive placement after graduation. We will also engage our alumni network, where applicable, to assist with career placement for graduate students.

Consistent with our direction in undergraduate education, we will promote coordinated communication, services, and administrative processes with a student-centric philosophy. We will also continue to advance the use of data to improve effectiveness and evaluate excellence.

**Action Priorities**

Action priorities will serve as a framework to help guide efforts and resource decisions over the next five years.

**Excellence**

- **Define and Track Indicators of Excellence.** Define indicators of excellence at the college or academic department level.

**Enrollment**

- **Increase Graduate Enrollment through an Emphasis on Excellence.** Engage colleges and departments to develop growth plans to support excellence in graduate education, including doctoral, master’s, and professional degree programs.

- **Improve Graduate Recruitment and Financial Support.** Improve recruitment of outstanding candidates by targeting well-qualified students. Improve recruitment of students from diverse backgrounds and international students. Develop a more competitive and sustainable model for graduate financial support to include investments in stipends, waiver allocation, benefits, and tuition support for students with prestigious externally funded fellowships. Evaluate tuition alternatives for online programs.
Student Success and Placement

- **Improve Graduate Student Success and Career Placement.** Ensure that graduate students complete degrees in a timely manner. Support graduate students with improved career coaching, training in teaching, and career placement support.

- **Emphasize Lifelong Volunteer Network.** Encourage graduate students to be Volunteers for Life, contributing their service and support to the UT community as students and alumni. Engage alumni to support student recruitment and career advising.

Effectiveness and Cost Management

- **Student-Centric Communication and Efficiencies.** Coordinate to deliver communication, processes, and services from a student-centric perspective. Streamline processes for efficiency, but also improve service outcomes for students.

- **Elevate Quality and Use of Student Data.** Improve availability, reliability, and use of data to support effective decisions and manage costs.

### 2020 Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>2020 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD Degrees</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s/Professional Degrees</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators of Excellence

Indicators of excellence will engage colleges and divisions in defining specific excellence goals for graduate education. High-level guidance for indicators is as follows:

- **Enrollment:** Enrollment trends, application trends
- **Student Qualifications:** Student entering qualifications, entering test scores and academic achievement (as applicable)
- **Student Progression:** Degree completion rates, time to degree
- **Student Accomplishments:** Graduate student accomplishments in research, scholarship, and creative achievement; prestigious awards and fellowships
- **Outcomes:** Career placement

Note: Indicators in graduate education may need to be tracked at the department level, depending on the college.
**Priority 3: Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity, and Engagement**

**Progress**

UT increased federal research expenditures by 83 percent, from $70 million to $128 million. Total research expenditures increased by 49 percent, from $165 million to $246 million. UT outpaced growth patterns of the target peer group in both percentage and total dollars. UT exceeded goals in federal research expenditure growth set in the original *Vol Vision*.

We note that for the purposes of this analysis the research expenditures listed below reflect the Knoxville area, to include the UT Institute of Agriculture. Since this area is integrated into the main campus organization at most target peers, the definition allows for a closer comparison.

**UT Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Research</td>
<td>$70 M</td>
<td>$128 M</td>
<td>+$58 M (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research</td>
<td>$165 M</td>
<td>$246 M</td>
<td>+$81 M (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target Peer Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Research</td>
<td>$182 M</td>
<td>$240 M</td>
<td>+$58 M (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research</td>
<td>$427 M</td>
<td>$524 M</td>
<td>+$97 M (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Several actions contributed to the increase in funded research. UT established new partnerships on multiple fronts. UT expanded its relationship with Oak Ridge National Laboratory, involving Governor’s Chairs, joint faculty appointments, and joint institutes. UT has added seven Governor’s Chairs since 2010. These efforts also included the strengthening of the Cherokee Farm.
Innovation Campus. In addition, UT greatly expanded services to support faculty pursuing large grants, centers, and multidisciplinary initiatives. We also expanded outreach efforts between faculty and federal stakeholders in DC, including program managers. UT expanded support of faculty in pursuit of funded research from corporate and foundation sponsors.

UT faculty received several prestigious awards and recognitions from federal agencies and national foundations. In addition, faculty engaged increasing numbers of undergraduate and graduate students in research opportunities. We expanded the Office of Undergraduate Research to support this direction.

UT earned the Community Engagement designation from the Carnegie Foundation in 2015. With this classification, UT reinforces the institutional importance of its engagement and outreach mission.

**Challenges**

Measuring the full impact of contributions related to research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement remains a challenge. *Vol Vision* metrics focus on research expenditures. These data points are regularly tracked by government agencies and viewed as important national comparative research metrics. However, funded research alone does not capture the full scope of faculty contributions. Measures of scholarship, creative activity, and engagement tend to be less standardized and more discipline-specific. Comparative data may not be readily available. Without a reasonable attempt to recognize our full breadth of accomplishments, we are unable to display our portfolio of achievements, engage the full potential of our faculty talent, and recognize excellence across the campus.

Projected federal funding levels present a separate challenge. Funded research remains critical to UT’s ability to raise its national profile. However, federal funding levels tend to fluctuate. Growth in federal funding is expected to be modest or flat in the near future. UT has outperformed peers in funded research gains over the past five years. Maintaining this trajectory may require UT to cultivate opportunities to work with additional federal agencies than in the past. Growth in corporate and foundation partnerships in both domestic and international markets may also be more important over the next five years.

Aligning campus with anticipated changes in strategic priorities of major sponsors will be another challenge. Sponsors are expected to increase focus on transdisciplinary and big-team research. Attention to the responsible conduct of
research is expected to continue, emphasizing attention to compliance. The importance of commercialization is another emerging trend with both government and other external sponsors.

Quality research space, facilities, and start-up packages are important to attracting and retaining research talent. As an example in support of this direction, UT is pursuing a core facilities strategy to improve the quality of research infrastructure in a cost-effective, shared environment. While UT has made progress in both areas over the past five years, peers are also investing in these areas despite projections for modest to flat growth in federal funding.

**Strategic Direction 2020**

*Strengthen our capacity, productivity, and recognition across our total portfolio of research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement*

Leading public research universities foster excellence across a diverse scope of research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement in order to contribute solutions to local, national, and global problems. As UT continues our journey, we must broaden our scope to support innovation and scholarly contributions across all disciplines. We must also enhance our commitment to engagement and service to Tennessee, aligned with our mission as the flagship and land-grant university for the state.

Over the next five years, we will recognize and celebrate contributions across the total research portfolio—in funded research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement, both in and across disciplines. We will engage colleges, academic departments, and research centers to define discipline-specific indicators of excellence to better identify the accomplishments of our faculty. Inherent in this initiative will be an expectation to track outcomes and celebrate success stories as a campus. We will also communicate our major accomplishments to national and international audiences in support of our academic reputation.

Over the next five years, we will shift our traditional paradigms to improve our ability to compete on national and international levels for large-scale research opportunities. We will pursue transdisciplinary research, which will require UT to cut across academic boundaries and disciplines to support new fields of discovery and innovation. We will seek opportunities that operate at the nexus of government, university, industry, and foundational partnerships. Finally, we will support opportunities to transition innovation into entrepreneurial ventures.
To further support our strategy to be more competitive for sponsored research, we will continue to improve proposal support for research grants and contracts. We will pursue strategic partnerships to expand our funded research opportunities. We will also deepen our relationship with current sponsors and target opportunities to partner with different federal agencies.

As a land-grant university and with the Community Engagement designation from the Carnegie Foundation, we will continue to focus on engagement as core to our mission. Engaged scholarship cuts across the missions of teaching, research, and outreach. Rather than being a separate activity, engagement is a particular approach that emphasizes campus-community collaboration. Over the next five years, we will support excellence in engagement to support this direction. We will integrate engagement with our educational mission through Experience Learning.

Leading research universities engage students in innovation and discovery. We will improve the integration of research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement in our undergraduate programs to promote innovation and problem-solving skills. We will also provide our graduate students with meaningful opportunities to work with our faculty in order to make substantive contributions.

Finally, we recognize the need for research support and infrastructure if we are to be effective in our pursuits. We will implement a campus master plan that increases the amount and quality of research space. We will also pursue core facilities to provide research infrastructure and equipment in a more cost-effective environment. Finally, we will enrich a culture that values compliance with regulations and requirements of sponsored research.

**Action Priorities**

Action priorities will serve as a framework to help guide efforts and resource decisions over the next five years.

**Excellence Across the Total Research Portfolio**

- **Define and Track Indicators of Excellence.** Engage colleges, academic departments, and research centers to define indicators of excellence in research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement. Track and report significant accomplishments of faculty across disciplines.
• **Recognize Excellence and Celebrate Success.** Recognize and support excellence across different disciplines and in transdisciplinary efforts. Enhance communication vehicles to promote innovation and scholarship accomplishments on a national and international scale to enhance the reputation of the university.

**Paradigm Shifts**

• **Support Transdisciplinary Research.** Continue to support transdisciplinary research through initiatives that promote teaming and integration across disciplines. Evaluate opportunities to align faculty evaluation and promotion processes to recognize and promote excellence in transdisciplinary research.

• **Promote Government, Industry, University, and Foundation Nexus.** Encourage a holistic approach to partnerships at the government, industry, university, and foundation nexus. Strengthen our research teams to pursue large-scale opportunities aligned with these partnerships.

• **Support Entrepreneurship and Commercialization.** Support opportunities to transition research discoveries to entrepreneurial ventures and other commercial opportunities where appropriate.

**Excellence in Sponsored Research**

• **Improve Proposal Competitiveness.** Continue to enhance the necessary proposal support for faculty to be competitive for funded research opportunities.

• **Develop Strategic Partnerships.** Continue to leverage regional assets and explore new alternatives for growth, including nonfederal and international sponsors.

• **Expand Federal Sponsors.** Pursue opportunities to partner with additional federal agencies in sponsored research to expand our opportunities. Strengthen relationships with existing partners.

**Engagement and Outreach**

• **Support Excellence in Engagement.** Continue to support excellence in engagement. Engage campus in tracking and communicating efforts.
Integrate engagement in educational mission through Experience Learning.

**Education Mission**

- **Increase Student Research Experiences.** Improve opportunities to engage undergraduate students in undergraduate research as part of Experience Learning. Improve the graduate student experience to include more opportunities to contribute to research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement.

**Effectiveness and Cost Management**

- **Improve Research Infrastructure.** Improve research infrastructure through core facilities, libraries, and other essential campus-wide infrastructure. Implement core facilities and other shared resources where possible.

- **Enrich a Culture of Compliance.** Continue to enrich an institutional culture that values compliance with federal research standards and requirements.

**2020 Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>2020 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Research Expenditures</td>
<td>$70 M</td>
<td>$128 M</td>
<td>$227 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research Expenditures</td>
<td>$165 M</td>
<td>$246 M</td>
<td>$436 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicators of Excellence**

Guidance for indicators of excellence in research, scholarship, creative activity, and engagement to be defined and tracked at the division or college level* include:

- **Scholarly Outputs:** Books, chapters, publications in specific journals, citations, h-index for faculty, invited lectures, etc.
- **Sponsored Research:** Proposals submitted awards, expenditures, outputs, etc.

- **Creative Activity:** Exhibitions, displays, etc.

- **Engagement:** Partnerships (type, impact area, geographical area), outputs and products, etc.

- **National Awards and Recognitions:** Prestigious awards and recognitions received by faculty, students, and staff

- **Commercialization:** Patents, licenses, etc.

*Note: Indicators of excellence may need to be tracked at the department level, depending on college, and include research centers.*
Priority 4: Faculty and Staff

Progress

Over the past four years, UT has invested $56 million in market and merit increases to address both faculty and staff salary gaps. Since UT has increased salaries at a higher rate than peers, the gap narrowed in faculty salary over the past five years.

With respect to additional goals, both UT and peers have increased faculty awards since 2010. Compared to the baseline year, UT has improved from 20:1 to 19:1 in this metric. While UT did not fully accomplish its goals in the first phase of the journey, we are better positioned to attract and retain stellar talent as a result of progress.

### UT Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Faculty Salary Range (Full to Assistant)</td>
<td>$108K to $67K</td>
<td>$130K to $76K</td>
<td>$22K to $9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Awards</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student to Tenure-Line Faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target Peer Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Faculty Salary Range (Full to Assistant)</td>
<td>$120K to $73K</td>
<td>$134K to $82K</td>
<td>$14K to $9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Awards</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student to Tenure-Line Faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A lower ratio is typically considered more favorable in this metric

Source: American Association of University Professors (Faculty Salary Range), Center for Measuring University Performance (Faculty Awards), National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS (Undergraduate Student to Tenure-Line Faculty).

UT has made strides in improving faculty support. The Chancellor’s Faculty Support Challenge resulted in $21 million in new commitments and contributed
to sixty-six new funded professorships. Today, more than 170 faculty members, representing nearly 16 percent of faculty, are supported through professorships.

Since 2010, the total number of full-time tenure-line faculty increased by 4 percent with the addition of more than forty new faculty lines. These gains included an increase of Governor’s Chairs, to a total of fourteen. UT also increased the number and percentage representation of female faculty and minority representation.

UT increased support for faculty in pursuit of national awards. Four members of our faculty have been admitted to the National Academy of Engineering or the National Academy of Sciences since 2010. UT faculty have received more than sixty prestigious national awards over the past five years, including National Science Foundation Career Awards, Fulbright awards, National Endowment for the Humanities awards, and American Council of Learned Societies awards. Our faculty members were recognized with thirteen NEH fellowships over the past decade, ranking fourth in the country among public universities.

UT expanded programs and services to improve our work culture and climate. STRIDE@UT and the Future Faculty Program were established to encourage faculty diversity. UT initiated department head workshops aimed at improving leadership abilities. New career pathways were structured for non-tenure-track faculty. UT also began new programs to encourage collegiality, including Faculty Pub, Faculty Appreciation Week, and Mic Nite.

With regard to staff compensation, UT has been able to offer market, merit, and equity increases over the past five years, which have been instrumental in closing some market gaps. Campus leadership has also increased the starting salaries of its lowest-paid workers. Career paths have been added in five areas: Police Department, Audit and Consulting Services, Creative Services, Advising, and Accounts Payable.

To support a broad culture of dialogue and transparency, an Employee Engagement Survey was distributed in 2011 and again in 2014 to communicate what the campus can do to become a better place to work.

Challenges

Sustaining the narrowing of the salary gap for both faculty and staff will be a challenge over the next five years. While improvements have been made, UT will
need to continue to address this issue with merit and market adjustments to remain competitive for talent. Significant market gaps also remain within staff compensation.

As a national trend, non-tenure-track and part-time faculty positions grew at a much more robust rate than tenure-line positions. At UT, non-tenure-track faculty as a percentage of total full-time faculty increased from 22 percent in 2010 to 27 percent in 2014. The committee acknowledges the important contributions of this segment in teaching, research, and engagement. While progress has been made, more attention is needed in career paths, compensation, and professional development.

Staff members are essential partners in faculty and campus productivity. Following national trends, UT’s workforce needs are expected to evolve and grow in complexity. Professionals will be in higher demand to support UT’s expanding needs in areas such as advising, compliance, data analysis, and information technology, as examples.

UT faces several workforce development challenges. We will need to provide the campus with adequate levels of staff support while also adopting the appropriate mix of skill sets for campus needs. We will need to develop the capabilities of our current staff and recruit and retain top staff talent by offering compensation at or above market means, career paths, and professional development support.

**Strategic Direction 2020**

*Attract, develop, and retain stellar faculty and staff who exemplify our values and strive for excellence*

The pace of our future progress will largely depend on the contributions and accomplishments of our faculty and staff talent. Strategic direction in the original *Vol Vision* priority emphasized faculty excellence. *Vol Vision 2020* engages non-tenure-track faculty and staff in a similar commitment to excellence.

To this end, we will strive to provide competitive total compensation packages to faculty and staff. We will work to develop a regular system of market and merit increases to manage salary gaps. We will improve our performance management approach to ensure that excellence is identified and rewarded at all levels. We will work to enhance commitment to the values that define our university culture. Through these efforts we aspire to be recognized as a workplace of choice, characterized by collegial community.
An important attribute of leading public research universities is an accomplished and nationally respected faculty. Over the next five years, we will actively recruit for top faculty talent on a national level, which will require competitive salary and start-up packages. We will support the professional progression and development of faculty at all levels and career stages, including both tenure-line and non-tenure-line faculty. We will seek to recognize and reward excellence for those who excel in teaching, achieve national recognition in their disciplines, and/or make exceptional contributions to the campus.

Over the next five years, we will emphasize a similar level of excellence in our staff. We will build the staff capabilities required to meet the growing challenges and complexities of a research-intensive university. We will actively develop the skills of our existing staff. We will also competitively recruit top talent on a national level to supplement our team in areas of critical need.

**Action Priorities**

Action priorities serve as a framework to help guide implementation actions and resource decisions over the next five years. The action priorities that follow are organized in faculty and staff categories due to the different nature of the issues and related actions.

**Faculty**

- **Continue to Address Salary Gap and Start-up Packages for Faculty.** Continue to address the faculty salary gap to target peers by monitoring competitiveness of the total package for new faculty hires, including salary and start-up, as well as providing regular market and merit salary increases for current faculty.

- **Improve Faculty Recruitment and Retention.** Continue to develop enhanced strategies to assure the successful hiring of a stellar diverse faculty. Enhance existing programs for dual-career faculty. Support programming aimed at work-life balance. Maintain a commitment to a civil, collegial, and inclusive campus culture.

- **Support Faculty Productivity and Reward Excellence.** Improve coaching and incentives to support faculty in pursuit of national awards. Encourage performance evaluation practices that reward excellence. Promote campus discussion on diversifying workloads of tenured faculty.
to recognize different emphases in efforts over the course of a tenured faculty member’s career.

• **Improve Faculty Development.** Enhance initiatives to support career progression and professional development for faculty at all levels through innovative training, development, and mentoring programs. Provide leadership training for interested faculty.

• **Support Non-tenure-track Faculty Excellence and Professional Development.** Continue to develop consistent institutional practices for promoting non-tenure-track faculty involved in research, teaching, and engagement. Improve professional development opportunities and better integrate non-tenure-track faculty into campus culture.

**Staff**

• **Address Staff Salary Gaps.** Provide competitive total compensation through a regular system of market and merit salary increases and competitive benefits for staff.

• **Improve Recruitment and Retention.** Improve recruitment to assure the successful hiring of a stellar diverse staff, both locally and on a national level, as appropriate for roles. Support programming aimed at work-life balance. Maintain a commitment to a civil, collegial, and inclusive campus culture.

• **Improve Professional Development and Career Growth.** Improve professional development opportunities to help current staff grow into evolving roles. Provide effective career paths, set clear expectations, and perform regular position analysis to support staff development.

• **Emphasize Excellence in Performance Management.** Improve the current system of performance management and evaluation to better recognize and reward excellence.

• **Recognize Excellence.** Implement a series of awards and recognitions for staff members who exemplify excellence and make noteworthy contributions to the campus community.
2020 Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>2020 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salary Range (Full to Assistant)</td>
<td>$108K to $67K</td>
<td>$130K to $76K</td>
<td>Narrow Gap with Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student to Tenure-Line Faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Remain at Peer Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Awards</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Narrow Gap with Peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus Strategy Metrics

UT will track and report on appropriate metrics at a campus level for faculty and staff, respectively, on the following topics:

- Employee Engagement Survey
- Workplace Excellence Metrics
  - Compensation Gaps
  - Recruitment Outcomes
  - Retention Patterns
Priority 5: Resources and Infrastructure

Progress

Teaching and support investment per student increased by 21 percent. However, UT remains in a lower comparative position than peers. While UT made strong gains in endowment per student, comparative peers started at a much higher position due to longer-term endowment strength. Despite a significant increase in this metric, the total dollar gap to peers has widened.

Vol Vision outlines 2020 goals to increase teaching and support expenditures by $8,200 (50 percent from baseline) and endowment per student by $24,000 (nearly 170 percent from baseline). Even with substantial five-year progress, we are not on pace to meet these goals. However, UT is in a stronger position today as a result of the gains over the past five years.

UT Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Support</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$19,487</td>
<td>+$3,387 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures/Student</td>
<td>$14,380</td>
<td>$24,058</td>
<td>+$9,678 (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target Peer Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Support</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
<td>$27,200</td>
<td>+$2,900 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures/Student</td>
<td>$38,400</td>
<td>$55,580</td>
<td>+17,180 (45%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS and Audited Financial Reports (Teaching and Support Expenditures); Council for Advancement and Support for Higher Education (Endowment)

Progress in development and alumni giving has allowed UT to more expeditiously move forward with our strategic priorities. Our alumni and friends are excited about the journey and are investing their philanthropic resources at rates greater than we have ever seen, in both total gifts received and a growing donor base. UT
received nearly $235 million in private and corporate gifts last fiscal year, making it the most successful fundraising year in campus history. In fiscal year 2015, more than 39,000 donors boosted private support by 79 percent over the previous year.

The recent physical transformation of campus is a visible indicator of progress. UT has initiated nearly $1 billion in construction projects since 2010. As an important part of this transformation, UT has also incorporated new campus beautification and landscaping efforts to improve the campus’s appearance. This transformation represents a much-needed upgrade of physical infrastructure to include research space as well as residence hall modernization, which is expected to have a positive impact on recruitment and retention.

Sustainability remains a priority. UT’s carbon emissions per gross square footage have decreased over the past five years, indicating gains from environmentally sound initiatives. The Make Orange Green initiative contributed to this success.

Advancement in information technology has allowed UT to improve instructional technology and systems to support data-driven decisions. To improve support for faculty, UT increased professional support for online and hybrid course development and delivery. The state of technology in the classroom has also improved through a series of upgrades. UT improved systems and reporting to support access to quality data. Progress includes the implementation of a new student system, development of an institutional data set to improve student data reporting, and implementation of several new systems to increase productivity. Based on a recent survey, IT services met or exceeded campus expectations in connectivity and access, collaborative technology, and IT support.

UT has routinely implemented administrative cost savings measures and identified opportunities to reallocate resources. Sample actions include nearly $5.5 million in implemented recurring savings associated with facilities, information technology, auxiliary services, and transportation, among other areas. An additional $4.2 million was reallocated through the budgeting process for strategic uses in academic units.
Challenges

As noted earlier, several challenges relate to UT’s financial resources. We continue to fall behind target peers in comparative funding levels. This will be one of UT’s most pressing challenges over the next five years.

Our challenge will be to pursue growth in different sources of revenue than in the past, which will require more emphasis on enrollment and philanthropic support. Another challenge will be continuing to improve the efficiency of our operations and manage costs. We recognize that opportunities exist to work more efficiently across divisions and units and improve scheduling to better utilize existing space capacity. We have made progress on the integration of our systems and use of data to support decisions. However, these challenges remain for the campus.

While our physical transformation reflects our aspiration to upgrade campus facilities, deferred maintenance remains a challenge. UT will have a sustained challenge in managing an aging physical infrastructure. Over 50 percent of UT’s campus was constructed during a low-quality period prior to 1990 and requires continued renovation. UT faces a large deferred maintenance backlog requiring higher levels of reinvestment.

While advancements have been made in information technology, rapidly growing demands eclipse funding available to accommodate needs. Keeping pace with increasingly complex technology requirements is a continued challenge, as is maintaining high levels of IT security. UT will need to balance growing requests for increased bandwidth, data system integration, instructional technology, and reporting capabilities with limited staff and funding to deliver projects. However, IT continues to be an area of competitive importance. Peers continue to invest in infrastructure, enterprise systems, and instructional and research technology.

Strategic Direction 2020

Develop a resource base for the future; continue transformation of campus infrastructure

As we aspire to become a leading public research university, resources have been and will be critical to our advancement. The pace of our future progress will depend on our ability to make strategic investments. Over the next five years, developing a strong resource base that will enable us to accelerate progress and campus transformation will be a strategic imperative. Additionally, cost
management and efficient operations will be essential to our ability to maximize the strategic impact of existing and new resources.

**Resources**

Over the next five years, we will increase revenue from multiple sources to strengthen our resource base. We anticipate that the primary drivers of revenue growth will be enrollment and philanthropic support. We will grow enrollment through recruitment and strong retention and graduation rates. We will also diversify our student mix to include more students from out-of-state and international markets.

We will raise the level of philanthropic contributions to the university. We reached record highs this year and plan to continue this trajectory over the next five years. To achieve these aggressive goals in enrollment and philanthropic support, we will engage the campus in these efforts. Student recruitment, retention, and fundraising will be the responsibility of all colleges, divisions, departments, and units.

In addition, we will increase competitiveness for research grants, contracts, and partnerships. We project growth in sponsored research as outlined in this plan. We also acknowledge the opportunity for long-term gains from an emphasis on entrepreneurship and commercialization of research. It is important to note that while sponsored research offers the university an opportunity to share a portion of costs related to research with external sponsors, total costs are not fully recoverable.

We will require continued financial support from the State of Tennessee. As the state flagship university, our ability to provide Tennessee students with quality affordable education depends on state support. To align our actions with state priorities, we will improve in categories outlined in the Complete College Tennessee performance-based funding formula.

Finally, we will challenge our self-supporting strategic business units (auxiliaries) to increase net contributions to the university. Units in this area include residence halls, dining operations, bookstore, and athletics.

As the second component of our resource strategy, we will operate more efficiently as a campus to better allocate resources and manage costs. We will continue to align resource allocation with strategic priorities. We will regularly examine existing resource commitments to identify opportunities to reallocate resources to higher strategic uses. We will continue to improve our annual budget.
planning process and program review practices to incorporate data-driven assessment and align resource commitments with strategic priorities at all levels.

We will engage the campus to identify and implement cost reduction and avoidance opportunities across all administrative areas. We will also improve the utilization of our existing physical assets through advances in space and schedule management. We will improve our operational efficiency by modernizing and automating our business processes. We will pursue organizational efficiency opportunities by sharing administrative and professional resources across units to maximize efficiency and manage workloads.

Campus Transformation

The transformation of campus through advancement in both physical infrastructure and technology is essential to our strategy in all areas, from the ability to recruit well-qualified students to the infrastructure needed to compete for sponsored research on a national scale.

Over the next five years, we will continue with physical infrastructure improvements through the implementation of our campus master plan. We will maintain a commitment to sustainability, which will contribute to long-term cost avoidance through enhanced energy management.

We also commit to developing a technology master plan to align with campus transformation efforts. Over the next five years, we will continue to advance the state of our data and systems to provide information essential to effective management of the university. We will continue to maintain a safe and secure computing environment while providing reliable access to the network. We will maintain high levels of support and services for technology integral to instruction and research activities.

Action Priorities

Action priorities will serve as a framework to help guide efforts and resource decisions over the next five years.

Resources

- **Diversify Revenue Base.** Diversify revenue base through philanthropy and managed enrollment growth. Evaluate new opportunities for revenue growth.
Effectiveness and Cost Management

- **Continue to Align Resource Allocation with Strategic Priorities.** Continue to align annual planning, budgeting, and resource allocation practices at all levels with *Vol Vision 2020*. Continue to evaluate opportunities to reallocate current resources to greater strategic priorities through continuous improvement.

- **Improve Operational and Organizational Efficiency.** Continue to engage campus in efforts to reduce or avoid costs through operational and organizational efficiencies. Improve efficiency of business processes through modernization, streamlining, and automation. Identify and implement opportunities to share resources across units.

- **Improve Space and Asset Utilization.** Engage campus to improve utilization of classroom and other space. Evaluate opportunities and incentives to better align class times and locations to maximize the use of quality space throughout the day.

- **Integrate Systems and Improve Quality and Use of Data.** Enhance functionality and integration of enterprise systems and other important information systems. Improve quality and availability of data to support institutional effectiveness and costs management initiatives.

Campus Transformation

- **Implement Campus Master Plan.** Continue with physical transformation of campus as outlined in the campus master plan. Continue efforts in sustainability. Ensure campus is accessible for all faculty, students, and staff.

- **Develop and Implement a Campus Information Technology Plan.** Develop and implement an information technology plan to support transformation efforts and align with the campus master plan. Address strategies and resource needs related to services provided to campus, enterprise systems and reporting capabilities, technology infrastructure and security, research technology, and instructional technology.
**2020 Goals**

**UT Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2010 Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Comparative</th>
<th>2020 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Support Expenditures/Student</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$19,487</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Philanthropic Support</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$83.5 M</td>
<td>$110 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For *Vol Vision 2020*, we are adopting more effective metrics to gauge progress in philanthropic support. Average philanthropic support provides a current view of performance. The previous endowment per student metric was subject to market fluctuations. The new approach will allow us to measure our progress against peers in a more tangible and meaningful way.

**Campus Strategy Metrics**

UT will track and report on appropriate metrics at a campus level on the following topics:

- Effectiveness and Cost Management
  - Resource Reallocation
  - Space Utilization Metrics
  - Implemented Cost Savings and Cost Avoidance

**Indicators of Excellence**

Indicators of excellence apply to the division level, as appropriate. High-level metrics should address:

- **Resources**: Appropriate indicators for sources revenue (e.g., enrollment, philanthropy, outcomes-based funding)
- **Campus Transformation**: Physical infrastructure, information technology
Priority 6: Diversity and Inclusion

Due to its growing strategic importance to the future of our campus, diversity and inclusion represent the sixth strategic priority in *Vol Vision 2020*. In the original *Vol Vision* plan, these initiatives were integrated across the strategic priorities. Our objective with this strategic priority is to provide an institutional framework to align future actions.

This priority initiated as a recommendation from the Milestone Review Committee and was further reinforced by support from the campus community. Students, faculty, staff, alumni, parents, and others expressed strong support for this direction during the stakeholder engagement phase.

It is important that diversity be understood in broad terms. For the purposes of the strategic plan we adopt the American Association of Public and Land-grant Universities Commission for Access Diversity and Excellence statement: “Diversity can be broadly defined to include all aspects of human difference, including, but not limited to race, gender, age, sexual orientation, religion, disability, social-economic status, and status as a veteran.”

We also adopt the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ definition of inclusion: “Inclusion is the active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity—in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect—in ways that increase awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions.”

Progress

In this section, we comment on the change in the demographic makeup of campus. Where possible, we compare UT to populations at target peers. We also comment on socioeconomic diversity, disability status, and status as a veteran based on available, self-reported data.

**Students.** Over the past five years, UT has made progress in gender and racial diversity in the undergraduate student body. The campus increased the number and percentage of female students. This percentage is slightly higher than target peer averages. The number and percentage of students from diverse populations also increased over the past five years. However, UT’s undergraduate population is less racially diverse and less international than populations at target peers.
With respect to graduate student enrollment, the percentage of female students remains slightly higher than target peer averages. Similar to the undergraduate population, UT’s graduate population is less diverse than peers'. A notable gap exists in the percentage of international graduate students in comparison to peers.

Nearly 30 percent of UT’s undergraduate students are eligible for the federal Pell grant program, which is higher than the 22 percent average at target peer groups. This demonstrates that compared to peers, UT has a higher percentage of students from socioeconomically challenged backgrounds. An estimated 25 percent of UT’s freshmen cohorts identify as first-generation students, with neither parent possessing a four-year degree. Roughly 7 percent of students in these cohorts were from families with neither parent having progressed to college.

In most recent reporting, UT made nearly 700 accommodations with students based on special needs or disabilities.

As of fall 2015, more than 500 students reported status as a veteran. More than 900 students are receiving veterans benefits based on status as a veteran or family of a veteran.

**Faculty and Staff.** UT has made progress in the number and percentage of female tenure-line faculty. UT compares favorably to target peers in this area. UT has also experienced an increase in representation from diverse populations; however, UT is less racially diverse in tenure-line faculty compared to target peers.

UT compares favorably to peers in the diverse makeup of its executive team. With respect to staff demographics, UT has a less diverse gender balance and racial mix than peers.

**Challenges**

Our goal is to support a community that is welcoming to all. Our challenge is to understand the dynamics of our campus climate. This plan provides action steps to gauge our campus climate as a regular practice.

Students and parents are increasingly concerned with career outcomes tied to their investment in higher education. Today’s graduates must be more prepared to engage in a national and international workforce than in the past. Our
challenge is to create an educational experience that results in students being more culturally aware and equipped with the leadership skills to work across differences.

Demographic trends show that both Tennessee and the nation are likely to experience growth in diverse populations in the near future. This projected change will have an impact on the future pool of prospective students and candidates for UT’s workforce. Our current challenge is to strengthen our collegial culture today to position the university for the future.

We also expect growth in demand from both graduate and undergraduate students who transition from the military as veterans or as children and spouses of veterans. The demand from adult learners is expected to increase. Furthermore, we anticipate growth in demand from students requiring special accommodations. Our challenge is to build a welcoming environment for all students, including those with nontraditional profiles.

As an additional challenge, the regulatory environment related to diversity and inclusion in higher education is expected to grow in complexity. Regulations associated with Title IX, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and other landmark legislation require proactive leadership, campus education, and a culture of compliance.

**Strategic Direction 2020**

*Enhance diversity and inclusion to benefit our campus*

Over the next five years, we will work to recruit and retain well-qualified undergraduate and graduate students from diverse and global backgrounds. We will improve our pathways for transfer students to support veterans, adult learners, and other students from non-traditional backgrounds. We will provide support for students with socioeconomic challenges. We will work to ensure that the campus is accessible and responsive to students who may have special needs or disabilities.

We will also work to recruit and retain faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds. We will ensure that the sense of community and commitment to professional advancement that defines our Volunteer community extends to our entire workforce.

We aspire to provide an educational experience that prepares our students with capabilities to lead in their professions. This direction began with our previous
quality enhancement plan, Ready for the World. Over the next five years, we will work to integrate exposure to and appreciation for different backgrounds into the curriculum and in co-curricular opportunities. We will support our students in developing the leadership and teamwork skills to effectively work across differences. These skills are highly valued by leading corporations, nonprofits, and governmental institutions. We will also encourage our faculty to carry out research, scholarship, and engagement to advance issues related to diversity, inclusion, and access.

As a foundation for this strategic priority, we will actively work to understand and improve our campus climate to the benefit of students, faculty, staff, alumni, and visitors. We will reinforce our commitment to develop a respectful, safe, inclusive, and welcoming campus environment.

**Action Priorities**

Action priorities will serve as a framework to help guide efforts and resource decisions over the next five years:

**Campus Profile**

- **Recruit, Retain, and Support the Success of Students from Diverse Backgrounds.** Improve recruiting and retention efforts to increase enrollment of undergraduate and graduate students from diverse and global backgrounds.

- **Recruit and Retain Faculty and Staff from Diverse Backgrounds.** Recruit, retain, and support the professional development of faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds.

**Campus Climate**

- **Understand and Enhance Campus Climate.** Establish a baseline understanding of campus climate. Engage students, faculty, staff, and alumni to identify innovative ways to promote inclusion and understanding across campus.

- **Promote Education and Training.** Develop effective education and training programs to support awareness and inclusion.
Education and Research

- **Prepare Students for Success in the Global Workplace.** Enhance the curriculum to support intercultural and international understanding. Improve cultural awareness through an emphasis on international experiences, including study abroad.

- **Support Research and Engagement.** Encourage faculty to engage in research, scholarship, and engagement in the areas of diversity, inclusivity, and accessibility.

Effectiveness and Cost Management

- **Enrich a Culture of Compliance.** Continue to enrich an institutional culture that values compliance and strives to maintain the highest level of compliance with federal and state regulations.

Metrics

UT will track and report metrics at a campus level on the following topics:

- **Campus Climate Survey.** A campus climate survey will be developed and administered on a regular basis to understand stakeholders’ perception of the UT environment. The survey will be designed to help UT identify areas of strength and challenge in order to engage the campus in specific actions to improve the campus climate. The survey will be structured to track progress over time.

- **Campus Profile Metrics.** Campus profile metrics will be developed to track progress. At this time, the campus profile metrics are limited to self-reported information. As a result, the campus profile metrics include information on gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, first-generation status, status as a Veteran, and disability accommodations.

The summary chart in this section is an illustrative list of campus profile metrics. This chart is intended as a starting point. These metrics are likely to evolve and improve over the course of the next five years.

With respect to the illustrative metrics, the definition of minorities includes individuals identifying as Black or African American, Hispanic of
Any Race, Asian or Pacific Islander, Two or More Races, or Native American or American Indian. This information is self-reported.

For the purposes of student retention and graduation, the campus profile metrics also outline Under-Represented Minorities (URM). This grouping includes individuals identifying as Black or African American, Hispanic of Any Race, Two or More Races, or Native American or American Indian. URM is commonly used in higher education reporting with many universities and federal institutions using this approach.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Strategy Metrics</th>
<th>2010 Comparison</th>
<th>2015 Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-to-Second Year Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented Minorities</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six-Year Graduation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented Minorities</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Eligible</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Generation Status (First-Time, Full-Time Freshmen)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Parent with Four-Year Degree</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Parent Progressed to College</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive/Administrative Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Veterans Status</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Receiving VA Benefits</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability Accommodations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Accommodations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metrics and Implementation

Excellence Framework

The Excellence Framework includes three categories:

**Comparative Metrics.** These metrics, adopted in 2010, allow UT to set performance goals and compare progress to a set of target peers. For comparative purposes, the target peer group includes the University of Georgia, Clemson University, the University of Minnesota, Texas A&M University, Michigan State University, Rutgers University, Indiana University, and Purdue University. The approach to metric and peer selection is further explained in Appendix B: Vol Vision Background.

**Campus Strategy.** Campus strategy metrics align with strategic priorities. These metrics may be customized for UT. The goals for these metrics may be to demonstrate improvement rather than to benchmark or narrow the gap. Campus strategy metrics will address the following areas: Faculty and Staff Excellence, Diversity and Inclusion, and Effectiveness and Cost Management.

**Indicators of Excellence.** Indicators of excellence evaluate progress in excellence and quality at the college and division levels. While guidance is provided Vol Vision 2020, we recognize that colleges and divisions should define these metrics. Indicators of excellence should be regularly tracked and incorporated into strategic planning efforts at colleges and divisions. Indicators should also be high-level and aspirational. If peer data is readily available, comparison to an appropriate peer set is encouraged. Indicators will address the following areas, at a minimum: Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education, and Research and Engagement.
**Implementation**

*Vol Vision 2020* serves as a framework to guide campus, college, division, department, and unit strategies, actions, and resource decisions.

Institutional effectiveness and resource allocation practices should align with *Vol Vision 2020*. These practices include annual planning, budget processes, assessment, and academic program review. College and division strategic plans and tactical action priorities should also align with the plan.

As illustrated in the graph below, the goal is to connect three dimensions to ensure that the strategic plan is integrated into the day-to-day work of the university.

The following implementation guidance will be important to progress and change:

- **Accountability.** A successful approach to implementation will balance campus-wide initiatives with college and division actions. Where possible, accountability for progress should be assigned. For initiatives requiring campus-wide change, executive sponsors and cross-functional teams should be appointed to coordinate actions. The key to implementation success will be the engagement of vice chancellors and deans to envision
and implement strategic plans and tactical actions that align with *Vol Vision 2020*.

- **Campus Engagement and Effectiveness.** Due to its growing importance to the future of the university, UT will need to engage all campus stakeholders in responsibility for enrollment, student retention, and philanthropic success. We will also need to emphasize reallocation and campus-wide effectiveness as important crosscutting strategies, which should be the responsibility of all vice chancellors and deans.

- **Communication.** As noted throughout *Vol Vision 2020*, we will need to recognize excellence and improvement across campus. Stakeholders frequently suggested that we “tell our story” to support our reputational goals. This means communicating success stories to local and national audiences with an emphasis on areas of academic excellence and research innovation.

- **Progress Reporting.** Progress should be regularly reported to campus stakeholders against strategic priorities in *Vol Vision 2020*. It is also recommended that divisions and colleges provide annual reports of progress against their strategic plans and indicators of excellence in the future.
Appendix Materials
Appendix A: Milestone Review Committee and Process

Provost Martin appointed Milestone Review Committee members who represent campus stakeholders, including faculty, staff, and students. A list of committee members is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Dean Steven Smith, Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Benner, Associate Dean and Director, College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Cox, Professor and Associate Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Dean, Professor, Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Golden, Professor, Food Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine Luther, Professor and Associate Dean, College of Communication and Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry McKay, Professor, Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annette Ranft, Professor and Senior Associate Dean, Haslam College of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beth Schussler, Associate Professor, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tina Shepardson, Professor, Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional and Staff Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Life: Frank Cuevas, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Executive Director, University Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Advancement: Lee Patouillet, Associate Vice Chancellor, Alumni Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing and Communications: Erik Bledsoe, Creative Services Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity and Inclusion: Rickey Hall, Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research: Janet Nelson, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of Research and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance and Administration: Jonee Lindstrom, Associate Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletics: Jon Gilbert, Senior Associate Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources: Mary Lucal, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Students: Beverly Banks, Loren Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Students: Jeremy Auerbach, Nathan Meek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provost’s Office: Serena Matsunaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Research: Denise Gardner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective

The role of the Milestone Review Committee is to complete a high-level strategic assessment of the Vol Vision strategic plan. The committee is also charged to lead community engagement discussions to gather feedback from campus on strategic direction for 2020.

Process

The committee established a three-phase process to refresh the strategic plan. Work began in February 2015 with a goal of completion by December 2015.

The first phase was designed to provide campus with a fact-based assessment of progress against goals established in Vol Vision. In addition, the chancellor and provost proposed the following questions for consideration during the process:

- How do we increase academic rigor and improve graduation rates in undergraduate education?
- How do we elevate and increase research, scholarship, and creative activity among our faculty and graduate students?
- How do we increase the diversity of our faculty, staff, and students?
- How do we minimize costs, manage resource trade-offs, and increase efficiency of the university?
- How do we utilize technology to enhance student learning and student achievement?
- How do we increase emphasis on globalization and sustainability?

The committee met from February to June 2015 to evaluate accomplishments in the five priorities included in Vol Vision, consider the strategic questions, and evaluate external trends that may have implications for UT in the future. The committee then summarized its observations in a report to serve as a foundation for campus engagement.

The second phase of the process, completed in December 2015, focused on stakeholder engagement. The committee engaged more than 1,400 students, faculty, staff, alumni, and parents in the feedback process. Nearly forty forums, meetings, and online feedback surveys were completed. The feedback was provided to the committee throughout the fall semester to inform the development of the working draft of the strategic plan.

In the final phase, the committee worked with UT leadership to revise the strategic plan and produce Vol Vision 2020.
Appendix B: Vol Vision Background

Vol Vision is the original strategic plan for the University of Tennessee. The plan was developed in 2010 to establish the vision, values, strategic priorities, and goals to guide the university through 2015.

The Vol Vision process engaged hundreds of campus stakeholders in focus groups and discussions regarding the future of the university. During this process, the university accepted then-governor Phil Bredesen’s Top 25 challenge. To supplement the Vol Vision campus engagement work, a separate task force was appointed to develop an approach to the goal.

The effort contributed a set of recommendations related to a new peer set, areas of focus, and metrics to Vol Vision. The task force selected peers based on rankings, AAU membership, research performance, and institutional characteristics similar to UT’s. Three peer groups were established. The Top 25 target peer group more closely reflected UT’s institutional characteristics and served as a reasonable comparison set. A broader aspiration group reflected high-end performance thresholds. The current peer group consisted of three universities with performance levels similar to UT’s during the time of the task force evaluation.

The task force then adopted a set of twelve metrics that extended beyond undergraduate education to reflect research university aspirations. Areas of focus included undergraduate education, graduate education, research, faculty, and resources and infrastructure. The task force evaluated frameworks associated with the different national rankings (e.g., U.S. News and the Center for Measuring University Performance) and criteria for membership in the Association of American Universities. Since the objective of the task force was to evaluate UT’s position relative to its peers over time, it was necessary for metrics to be regularly reported by UT and for comparative peer data also to be regularly reported by reliable sources. The final gap analysis provided a comparative assessment of UT’s relative standing to the target group across the five dimensions.

The work of the task force was incorporated into Vol Vision. The strategic plan outlines five strategic priorities, which align with the five dimensions and metrics identified by the task force. The strategic plan also makes use of the task force recommendations on peer groups.
Peer Groups

### Schools by Grouping

**Top 20 US News Rank (Count – 16)**
- University of California – Berkeley
- University of California – Los Angeles
- University of Virginia
- University of Michigan – Ann Arbor
- University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill
- University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign
- University of Wisconsin – Madison
- University of California – Davis
- University of California – Santa Barbara
- University of Washington – Seattle
- Pennsylvania State University
- University of Florida
- University of Texas – Austin
- The Ohio State University
- University of Maryland – College Park
- University of Pittsburgh

**#21 – #30 US News Rank (Count – 8)**
- University of Georgia
- Clemson University
- Purdue University
- Texas A&M – College Station
- University of Minnesota
- Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
- Indiana University
- Michigan State University

**#31 – #39 US News Rank (Count – 3)**
- Auburn University
- Iowa State University
- North Carolina State University – Raleigh

---

**Gap Analysis, 2010 Baseline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Focus</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>UTK</th>
<th>Top 25 Target Group</th>
<th>UTK vs. Top 25 Target Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Education</strong></td>
<td>ACT Equivalent (75th/25th Percentile)</td>
<td>26/24</td>
<td>28.5/23.5</td>
<td>- 4 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention Rate (1st to 2nd Year)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>-6 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-15 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Education</strong></td>
<td>Number of Ph.D. Degrees</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>-209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Master’s and Professional Degrees</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>-285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Federal Research Expenditures</td>
<td>$70 M</td>
<td>$102 M</td>
<td>-$32 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Research Expenditures</td>
<td>$165 M</td>
<td>$427 M</td>
<td>-$262 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td>Avg. Tenure-Line Salary Range</td>
<td>$67 to $109 K</td>
<td>$73 to $120 K</td>
<td>-$6 to $12 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Tenure-Line Faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Awards</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Resources and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Teaching and Support Expenditures/ Student</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
<td>-$8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endowment/ Student</td>
<td>$14,380</td>
<td>$38,400</td>
<td>-$24,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIORITY 1: UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
Recruit, develop, and graduate a diverse body of undergraduate students who, through engagement in academic, social, and cultural experiences, embrace the Volunteer Spirit as lifelong learners committed to the principles of ethical and professional leadership.

- Continue to attract first-year students with ACT scores equivalent to Top 25
- Raise first-to-second year retention rates from 84 percent to 90 percent in 2015
- Raise six-year graduation rate from 60 percent in 2010 to 75 percent in 2015

PRIORITY 2: GRADUATE EDUCATION
Educate and graduate increasing numbers of diverse graduate and professional students who are equipped to address the pressing concerns of their fields, to extend the frontiers of knowledge, and to contribute to the public good through service to the academy or their professions.

- Increase the number of PhDs awarded by 30 percent, from 277 in 2010 to 360 in 2015, with the goal of 486 in 2020
- Increase the number of professional and master’s degrees awarded from 1,845 in 2010 to 2,000 in 2015, with the goal of 2,130 in 2020

PRIORITY 3: RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY
Strengthen our capacity and productivity in research, scholarship, and creative activity to better educate our students; enhance economic, social, and environmental development; support outreach to our various constituencies; and extend the reputation and recognition of our campus.

- Increase federal research expenditures by 50 percent, from $70 million in 2010 to $105 million in 2015, with the aim of $182 million in 2020
- Increase total research expenditures by 50 percent, from $165 million in 2010 to $247.5 million in 2015, with the aim of $427 million in 2020

PRIORITY 4: FACULTY AND STAFF
Attract and retain stellar diverse faculty and staff who will proudly represent our campus, execute our mission, embrace our vision, exemplify our values, and collaborate to realize our strategic priorities.

- Increase average tenure-line salary range to meet the mean for our peers
- Increase the number of faculty awards from ten in 2010 to thirty-two in 2020

PRIORITY 5: INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES
Continually improve the resource base to achieve campus priorities by carefully balancing state revenues, tuition, and private funding, and by embracing stewardship of our campus infrastructure and a culture that values sustainability.

- Increase operating expenditures/student by an additional $8,200 by 2020
- Increase endowments/student by an additional $24,000 by 2020
UT Martin proposes the following revisions to its Faculty Handbook:

A. **Additional UT Martin Procedures for Consideration and Grant of Tenure** (Section 2.8.5, Item 6) – addition of language to clarify the process for providing the tenure candidate information regarding recommendations made at each level of consideration.

B. **Procedure for Promotion Review** (Section 2.6.3, final paragraph) – addition of language to clarify the process for providing the promotion candidate information regarding recommendations made at each level of consideration.

C. **The Faculty Voice** (Section 1.8.1, Item 1. Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion of the Faculty) – addition of wording to include providing the advisory committee with copies of recommendation documents from the chair or dean when their recommendation(s) differ from those of the committee.

D. **Appeals through the Faculty Relations Committee** (Section 4.4.3) – relocation of a paragraph outlining the next step for appealing a negative decision by the VCAA to the end of Section 4.4.2 Appeals through Administrative Channel.

E. **Amorous and/or Sexual Relationships with Students** (New Section 5.3.2) – addition of a section addressing amorous and/or sexual relationships between faculty and students. The change also includes revision of the title of Section 5.3 to reflect the broader content included in the section.
The proposed revisions, presented on the following pages, have been reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate and Chancellor Smith. The proposed revisions have been further reviewed and are recommended for approval by the General Counsel and Secretary, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success, and the President.

MOTION: I move that the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee recommend adoption of the following Resolution by the Board of Trustees:

RESOLVED: The proposed revisions of the UT Martin Faculty Handbook are approved as presented in the meeting materials.
Revision A

2.8.5 Additional UT Martin Procedures for Consideration and Grant of Tenure

Under normal circumstances, the review process in tenure consideration begins in the spring term and is complete upon the action of the Board of Trustees in June of that academic year. Academic Affairs provides a checklist for use in the preparation and review of the tenure dossier. The procedure used for tenure recommendations is reviewed annually by the Personnel Policies Committee.

1. A calendar established annually by the VCAA should be followed during the development of tenure recommendations.

2. The department chair or dean shall notify in writing all faculty members in his/her unit who must be considered for tenure review in that academic year. If the candidate is a department chair, then the Dean of the college of the candidate's department shall assume and execute, as specified in both the Faculty Handbook and the department's bylaws, the duties normally performed by the department chair in the tenure process.

3. Candidates who wish to be considered for tenure shall prepare a dossier in support of the request. The candidates may seek assistance from the dean/department chair for preparation of the dossier.

4. Tenure advisory committee. A tenure advisory committee to the chair/dean shall be formed using the following procedures. (If the situation in the instructional unit makes the process unworkable, an alternative procedure approved by the departmental faculty shall be submitted to the VCAA through the dean for review and approval.)

A tenure advisory committee, consisting of at least three tenured faculty members, shall be elected to review each candidate. The faculty of each department/college has the option of selecting one or more members from outside the department/college. The names of those serving on this advisory committee shall be submitted to and approved by the VCAA. The committee is advisory to the chair who should not be a member nor participate in the deliberation.

The chair shall provide the committee or the tenured faculty with such materials relevant to the candidate's tenure as the group may request. The chair of the tenure advisory committee shall notify each candidate in writing of the opportunity to appear before the committee. The appearance should occur after the committee has completed its examination of the tenure materials, but before a formal vote on the request.

The candidate shall have the opportunity to inspect all of his or her personnel files and materials to be considered during the evaluation of the tenure application.

5. Tenured Advisory Committee’s Recommendation. As outlined in the Board of Trustees policy, departmental bylaws will govern the tenured faculty’s consideration of a candidate for tenure. The tenured faculty shall meet to debate and discuss the tenure candidacy with a formal vote taken and recorded using the process outlined in the departmental bylaws.

The Tenure Advisory Committee, after considering an application, shall submit to the chair a written and signed recommendation. Unless otherwise specified in the departmental bylaws, a majority of the Tenure Advisory Committee must vote in favor of tenure in order for the recommendation to be considered favorable. 27 UT Martin checklist for tenure process: www.utm.edu/departments/acadaff/policies.php. 28 Section 2.8.6 The Tenure Advisory Committee may recommend to:

a. Grant tenure;
b. Defer the tenure decision (unless at the end of the mandatory probationary period); or
c. Deny tenure.
If the group recommends to defer the tenure decision prior to the end of the probationary period, and the faculty member chooses not to defer, the tenured faculty's recommendation to defer will be considered a recommendation to deny tenure. If the faculty member agrees with the recommendation to defer, and the chair concurs, the tenure review process stops for that academic year.

6. The faculty member applying for tenure shall be promptly notified in writing of the recommendation at each step of tenure consideration by the official making the recommendation. In the event of negative recommendation, the UT Martin administrator must include a copy of the explanation provided in the recommendation form. A copy of this communication shall be forwarded to the VCAA at the same time. [At each step of consideration below the president, the committee or official making a recommendation will provide the tenure applicant a complete copy of all recommendation documents as they are being forwarded to the next committee or official. In the event of a negative recommendation below the level of dean, a copy shall also be forwarded to VCAA.]

7. Possible Outcomes.

   a. Tenure granted. When tenure is granted by the Board of Trustees, notice of such action (including the effective date) will be sent by the Chancellor to the individual, his/her chair and dean, and the VCAA. Within one year after the granting of tenure the VCAA will return the Tenure Review Portfolio to the faculty member.

   b. Tenure denied. Any faculty member who is considered, but not recommended, for tenure will be notified in writing by the Chancellor that the recommendation has not been forwarded to the President. (Only positive recommendations are forwarded to the President.)

      i. Upon receipt of such notice the faculty member may discuss the reasons for the tenure denial with the faculty member's chair, dean, or director. In addition, the faculty member has the right to advisement by the VCAA as to the reasons for the tenure denial. Such reasons are given solely to assist the faculty member in professional growth and development. A decision not to award tenure is in no sense judgment of incompetence. Not all competent persons meet the high standards necessary for tenure, nor are all those who meet such standards automatically fitted to serve needs of the University's programs.

      ii. Terminal appointment. Any faculty member who is considered for but not recommended for tenure by June 30 of the final year of the faculty member’s probationary period will automatically receive an additional terminal appointment of up to one academic year, consistent with Board policy.

      iii. Appeal procedures. A faculty member may initiate a grievance and appeal procedure within one year of the date of the tenure decision or at any time before termination of employment, whichever occurs first (see Chapter 4)

Approved:
PPC: 17 Aug 2015
Senate: 22 Sept 2015
Chancellor: 12 Oct 2015
Revision B

2.6.3 Procedure for Promotion Review

A. Preparation for the Promotion Process

1. A calendar established annually by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should be followed during the development of promotion recommendations. At a minimum, the calendar should include the dates for the following steps:

a. The candidate prepares and submits a promotion dossier.

b. Promotion advisory committees meet with their dean or director.

c. Promotion advisory committees submit negative and positive recommendations to the department chair.

d. The department chair submits his/her negative and positive recommendations to the dean.

e. The dean submits his/her negative and positive recommendations to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

f. The Vice Chancellor submits his/her negative and positive recommendations to the Chancellor.

g. The Chancellor submits his/her positive recommendations to the President.

UT Martin's Academic Affairs website stores this calendar, the tenure and promotion application formats, and other information.16

2. The department chair or dean shall notify in writing all faculty members in his/her unit who have initially met the appropriate time-in-rank guidelines (see Section 2.6.2) that they are eligible for consideration of promotion to the next academic rank.

3. Candidates who wish to be considered for promotion shall prepare a dossier in support of the request. The candidates are strongly advised to seek assistance from the dean or department chair for preparation of the dossier. The candidate shall have the opportunity to inspect all personnel files and materials to be considered during the evaluation of the promotion application.

B. Process for Promotion Review

1. A promotion advisory committee shall be formed using the following procedures. (If the situation in the instructional unit makes this procedure unworkable, an alternative procedure approved by the departmental faculty shall be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs through the dean for review and approval.)

a. The promotion advisory committee is elected by the faculty in consultation with the chair or dean. The promotion advisory committee shall have at least three members. The faculty of each department/college has the option of selecting one or more members of the committee from outside the department or college. The names of members serving on this committee shall be submitted to and approved by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
b. A promotion advisory committee shall be constituted so that each individual is considered only by committee members who are tenured and have a rank higher than that of the candidate.

c. The committee is advisory to the chair who normally should not be a member nor participate in the deliberation. The department chair shall provide the committee with requested materials relevant to the candidate's promotion.

d. The chair of the promotion advisory committee shall notify candidates in writing that they have the opportunity to appear before the committee. The appearance should occur after the committee has completed its examination of the promotion materials, but before a formal vote on the request.

2. The promotion advisory committee’s written recommendation shall be submitted to the chair/dean. A majority of the promotion advisory committee members must vote in favor of promotion in order for the recommendation to be considered favorable.

3. The chair develops the final recommendation for the departmental level with serious consideration of the recommendation of the promotion advisory committee. In the event of disagreement, the chair should explain the decision to the promotion advisory committee frankly and openly, and the chair must give the committee an opportunity to attach a dissenting report to the recommendation. In any event, the faculty vote should be reported and explained to the dean.

4. The recommendation of the department head shall be reviewed by the dean of the college. The dean may establish a college-wide committee for review of promotion recommendations. The recommendation of a college-wide committee shall be advisory to the dean.

5. The recommendation of the dean shall be reviewed by the VCAA.

6. The recommendation of the VCAA shall be reviewed by the Chancellor. The Chancellor shall forward only positive recommendations to the President.

7. If the President concurs in the positive recommendation of the Chancellor, he or she shall award the promotion and report the action to the Board of Trustees.

The faculty applying for promotion shall be notified in writing by each campus official making a recommendation. An explanation for any negative recommendation should be included. A copy of this communication should be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the same time. [At each step of consideration below the president, the committee or official making a recommendation will provide the promotion applicant a complete copy of all recommendation documents as they are being forwarded to the next committee or official. In the event of a negative recommendation below the level of dean, a copy shall also be forwarded to the VCAA.] A candidate who has been denied promotion may consult with the immediate supervisor for the purpose of receiving recommendations that would enhance the chances for future promotion. A faculty member may appeal a negative promotion decision (see Chapter 4).

Approved:
PPC: 17 Aug 2015
Senate: 22 Sept 2015
Chancellor: 12 Oct 2015

1.8 Shared Governance

1.8.1 The Faculty Voice

The voice of the faculty in University governance is indispensable. Its advice cannot be lightly given or lightly received. Everything depends upon the collegiality, mutual respect, and sensitivity of the faculty and the administrative officers. The officers are colleagues who have been assigned specific administrative responsibilities. The faculty are colleagues whose advice and counsel must influence the exercise of those responsibilities. The employer both of faculty and of officers is the Board of Trustees, which has delegated to each a set of specific responsibilities that can be successfully discharged only with the support and counsel of the other.

Faculty members have the right to contribute to campus and university discourse that is at the heart of the shared governance of the campus and the university. When contributing to campus and university discourse, at any level within the university or the community at large, faculty members have the freedom to raise and to address, without fear of institutional discipline or restraint or other adverse employment action, any issue related to professional duties; the functioning of academic units, the campus, or the university; and department, college, campus, or university actions, positions, or policies.

The use of University stationery, telephones, and other resources for personal or extramural activities of any extended nature is prohibited, as is the use of the faculty member's University position or title in connection with the expression of purely personal, unofficial views. Only under such conditions can the faculty enjoy mutual confidence within its own ranks or command the respect and support of the larger society. The faculty member's professional conduct is subject to The University of Tennessee "Statement of Policy on Misconduct in Research and Service" which is available online.8

The most direct responsibility of the faculty in University governance is to determine the shape of the academic programs. A less direct, but no less important role of the faculty, is to advise the officers whose duties are described above about certain administrative matters that are intrinsically related to the vitality and credibility of the University. These matters include (but are not necessarily limited to) the five areas listed below. The administration and faculty will both encourage and actively protect such dialogue. Both faculty and administration will carry out discussions with collegiality, civility, and respect.

1. Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion of the Faculty. The chair or dean is expected to consult with faculty in a full and reasonable manner before he/she:

   a. undertakes a search for new faculty or authorizes a departmental committee to initiate such a search;

   b. recommends the appointment of new faculty; or

   c. recommends the retention, termination, promotion, or tenure of faculty.

Details of the procedure for faculty involvement in tenure and promotion decisions are found in Chapter Two of this Faculty Handbook. In these decisions, the chair or dean is obligated to seriously consider the recommendations of the faculty. In the event of disagreement, the chair or dean must [share with the committee a complete copy of all recommendation documents to be forwarded to the next official and] explain to them frankly and openly the decision he/she has reached[.]; and [The chair or dean must [also] give [the committee] them] an opportunity to submit, along with his/her recommendation, a dissenting report if they so desire. In any event, the faculty vote must be reported and explained to the dean.
2. **Assessment of Faculty Performance.** Faculty members are expected to have a direct role in the construction or revision of evaluation forms and procedures pertaining to faculty performance.

3. **Resolution of Grievances in Faculty Affairs.** Administrators or colleagues may assist in the resolution of faculty conflicts, grievances, and complaints at various levels. (See Chapter Four of this Faculty Handbook for formal grievance procedures.)

4. **Selection and Evaluation of University Administrators.** Participation in the selection and evaluation of administrators is one of the most important ways in which faculty judgment influences the governance of the University. Faculty participation is essential because all administrators who have responsibilities touching or affecting the academic programs of the University must understand and respect the values of the academic profession and its commitment to freedom in open and objective inquiry. Faculty advisory committees are created to render advice to the campus administration and University-wide administration about appointments. In addition, the faculty of each academic unit plays an important role in the evaluation of its administration.

5. **Determination of University Priorities and Budgeting.** Faculty members are involved in establishing major institutional priorities and goals. This particular participation occurs through the Faculty Senate and through special committees appointed for the task. The Senate, through its committees on curricula, recommends to the Chancellor the establishment or termination of programs. Faculty judgments about the costs of these programs affect this deliberation and, in turn, are affected by the judgments of the faculty as to the pedagogical and intellectual soundness of such proposals.

---
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4.4.2 Appeals through Administrative Channels

To initiate a grievance through administrative channels, the faculty member must write a letter to the official at the first administrative level where a contested recommendation or decision was made. The letter should (a) notify the administrator that a grievance is being made, (b) outline the nature of the grievance, and (c) state the desired action. The administrative channels through which a grievance may progress include: Department Chair or the academic unit head; Dean of the college to which the faculty member belongs; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Chancellor; and President. At each level, the administrator ideally should inform the faculty member of his/her decision in writing within thirty days. If the grievance is not resolved at the first administrative level where a negative recommendation or decision was made, the faculty member may pursue the grievance through each succeeding level of administration. Upon receipt of a negative decision by an administrator at one level, the faculty member will have thirty days to initiate an appeal to the next level.

[When a faculty member who has initiated a grievance through administrative channels receives a negative decision by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the faculty member may appeal the Vice Chancellor's decision to the Chancellor directly or request review by the Faculty Relations Committee prior to the Chancellor's review. The Vice Chancellor's decision shall include notice to the faculty member of his/her right to request review by the Faculty Relations Committee. The faculty member will have thirty days from receipt of the Vice Chancellor's decision to request a Faculty Relations Committee review.]

A. Appeal Procedures for Non-Reappointment of Probationary Faculty Member

A decision not to reappoint a probationary faculty member may be appealed to a committee consisting of the faculty member's chair, dean, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. After receiving any material the faculty member chooses to present, the committee will recommend to the Chancellor whether the initial recommendation should be supported or reversed. An action not to reappoint a probationary faculty member without the minimum advance notice specified in Section 2.7.1 of this handbook may be initiated only for cause.

4.4.3 Appeals through the Faculty Relations Committee

When a faculty member who has initiated a grievance through administrative channels receives a negative decision by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the faculty member may appeal the Vice Chancellor's decision to the Chancellor directly or request review by the Faculty Relations Committee prior to the Chancellor's review. The Vice Chancellor's decision shall include notice to the faculty member of his/her right to request review by the Faculty Relations Committee. The faculty member will have thirty days from receipt of the Vice Chancellor's decision to request a Faculty Relations Committee review.

To initiate the review [an appeal through the Faculty Relations Committee], the faculty member must submit a letter to the chair of the committee and provide a copy to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The letter should (a) indicate that an appeal is being made, (b) outline the nature of the appeal, and (c) state the desired action. The chair of the Faculty Relations Committee in consultation with committee members and the Chancellor will determine if the faculty member's complaint both lies within the scope of the Committee's jurisdiction and merits consideration. If so, the chair will initiate a complete review of the matter.
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5.3 Faculty/Student Relationships in the Classroom

5.3.1 Faculty Responsibilities to Students

Faculty members have the responsibility to discharge their duties in a fair and conscientious manner in accordance with standards generally recognized within the academic community. As a minimum, these standards include:

1. meeting class commitments when scheduled and informing students in advance of scheduled absences;
2. utilizing a portion of the first or second class period to discuss plans for the course. This presentation should include: a general outline of the course as to content or topics to be studied; a description of the kinds of learning activities expected; guidelines for the type and expected amount of course work; a description of the means for evaluating student performance; and an explanation of expectations regarding academic integrity that specifies penalties for plagiarism and cheating and stresses the seriousness of such behaviors;
3. encouraging acceptable academic conduct by all members of the academic community at all times;
4. informing classes, in advance of any evaluation, of the permissible materials or references allowed during evaluation;
5. taking thorough precautions against student cheating on examinations or other required class work;
6. basing all academic evaluations upon professional judgment and academic achievement in accordance with the university's policies regarding equity and diversity;
7. performing grading duties in a timely manner and encouraging consultation with students concerning any grade they feel to be incorrect;
8. being available to students on a regular basis for consultation and advisory services—office hours should be scheduled, posted and met;
9. respecting the confidentiality of student information contained in University records and refraining from releasing such information according to FERPA requirements;
10. abstaining from the exploitation of any professional relationship with students for private advantage, and from soliciting the assistance of students for private purposes in a manner which infringes upon such students’ freedom of choice;
11. giving appropriate recognition to contributions made by students to research and publication;
12. refraining from any activity which involves risk to the health, safety, and welfare of a student except with the student's informed consent and, where applicable, in accordance with University policy relating to the use of human subjects in experimentation (contact the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects for more information);
13. respecting the dignity of students individually and collectively in all academic contexts; and
14. exercising flexibility in course requirements to allow students to make up work for which legitimate excuses have been properly presented.

The above responsibilities of University faculty should not be considered inflexible or all-inclusive, but rather as general guides. Each faculty member should become familiar with expected standards of professional conduct through observation of and consultation with colleagues within the University community. Every faculty member is expected to familiarize themselves with and abide by the UT Code of Conduct.

[5.3.2 Amorous and/or Sexual Relationships with Students]

A faculty member shall not have a consensual amorous and/or sexual relationship with a student who is not his or her spouse and who is simultaneously enrolled in a course being taught by the faculty member or whose academic or work performance is subject to supervision or evaluation by the faculty member.
Any member of the campus community who may be uncertain about the propriety of a relationship should consult with department chairs, deans, supervisors, managers and/or the Equity and Diversity Officer. These administrators will take all necessary and appropriate measures, beginning with informal steps, to address and correct problems stemming from amorous and/or sexual relationships. If informal steps for resolution are unsuccessful, formal disciplinary sanctions, up to and including dismissal, will be pursued.

Approved:
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THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

INFORMATION ITEM

DATE: April 1, 2016

COMMITTEE: Academic Affairs and Student Success

CAMPUS/INSTITUTE: UT Martin

ITEM: Update on UT Martin Accreditation Status

PRESENTED BY: Robert M. Smith, Interim Chancellor

Background:
The University of Tennessee at Martin received notice in December 2015 of the decision by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) to place the university on probation for the next 12 months pending corrective actions to address.

The Commission’s Board of Trustees determined that we had not finished the documentation necessary to address five recommendations from its last campus visit in 2013. In specific terms, the university had not "closed the loop" on learning assessment. We know students receive an outstanding education at UT Martin as evidenced by regional and national rankings, successful graduates and positive contributions to the region's economy. However, we must be more effective in documenting these outcomes.

Action Plan:
The plan is to fulfill the requirements specified by SACSCOC and submit a progress report in early fall 2016 that will remove the probation condition on accreditation.

The first step was to clarify those segments of the University out of compliance and accelerate their development of the necessary missing documentation. SACSCOC provides a judgment of the entire university when in fact many of the academic programs and administrative support service units have more than sufficiently met the requirements of assessment, evaluation, and have implemented improvements in their programs as SACSCOC expects. Typically, those programs and units have completed this process as part of accreditation by other professional councils such as education, nursing, engineering, business, and others.

Since the SACSCOC standards are based on the commonly accepted cycle for continuous program improvement, the University’s next step is to test every unit’s satisfaction of that cycle prior to the end of the spring 2016 term. The test will assure programs and units can identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which they...
achieve those outcomes, and provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.

The Commission has appointed a team to visit the campus October 4-6, 2016. Following their campus visit, the team will submit a report of their findings along with our rejoinder to the Commission.

A decision by the Commission is expected to be announced at their meeting, December 3-6, 2016.

**Progress:**

Full-day workshop sessions were held January 5-7, 2016 to expedite their compliance with SACSCOC expectations. Over 200 representatives from all academic units as well as administrative support services met for at least one full day during the three days of workshops where they developed common templates to identify the documentation missing in the monitoring reports and launched their work to be in compliance.

January 13, Interim Chancellor Smith conducted an Open Forum for faculty and staff to a standing room crowd to present the nature of the challenge and the steps to a successful solution.

January through March, departments and programs have been developing their materials. March and April’s budget review hearings have been focused on how the departments’ budget decisions are aligned with the University and University of Tennessee’s strategic plans and requests for funding are based on assessed needs.

February saw the development of a new web page with consolidated information about SACSCOC accreditation as well as the professional program accreditations. The web page also included the assessment plan for 2015-16, an archive for the newly developed assessment newsletter, and all university-wide assessment committees. A portal is available for university personnel to access reports and additional department and unit information. See: [http://www.utm.edu/assessment/assessment.php](http://www.utm.edu/assessment/assessment.php)

February 23, 2016, the outside consultant conducted a day-long review of the progress of the university and presented his recommendations for next steps. The outside training consultant was also on campus to help programs develop their materials needed for the end of the term submissions.

In May, another round of workshops will be held along with a second visit by the outside consultants.

The following calendar was approved by the Chancellor’s Staff to serve as a recurring commitment to the cycle of continuous improvement and, thereby, ongoing compliance with SACSCOC accreditation requirements.
The UT Martin Annual Planning, Assessment, and Reporting Calendar provides an overview of the activities and reports that establish the foundation for the university’s data-driven decision making process. The planning and assessment goals and the activities and reports in the calendar that follows reflect the university’s mission:

The primary purpose of The University of Tennessee at Martin is to provide a quality undergraduate education in a traditional collegiate atmosphere characterized at all levels by close collaboration among students, faculty and staff. In addition, the university is dedicated to meeting lifelong educational needs by providing graduate programs, distance-learning opportunities and other creative endeavors. Furthermore, the university is committed to advancing the regional and global community through scholarly activities, research and public service.

UT Martin’s commitment to establishing a strong culture of mission-focused planning and assessment extends throughout the institution. The activities and reports are listed under specific functional areas to show primary responsibility for planning, assessment, or reporting. However, overlap of the data and processes exists between the different areas, and the calendar activities are not considered mutually exclusive. Collection and analysis of data occurs over time and often begins in the weeks and months prior to the submission of reports as listed in the calendar. The calendar is intended to provide a guide toward achieving the overall planning and assessment goals.

Planning and Assessment Goals

◆ To ensure institutional effectiveness through broad-based, mission-focused planning
◆ To integrate UT Martin Annual and Strategic Plans with UT System, THEC, Complete College Tennessee, and Tennessee Drive to 55 plans and initiatives
◆ To integrate mission-focused planning and assessment with UT Martin’s budgeting process
◆ To sustain a campus culture for planning, assessment, and data-informed decision-making among academic and non-academic units at all levels
◆ To utilize research-based assessment data to inform and guide planning and to foster improvement (closing the loop)
◆ To involve all faculty and staff in planning and assessment processes in an appropriate manner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Units</th>
<th>Non-Academic Units</th>
<th>Institutional Data &amp; Reports</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Chancellor/Chancellor’s Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Winter Assessment</td>
<td>• Winter Assessment Workshop</td>
<td>• Delaware Cost Study</td>
<td>• Units use goals of UTM Strategic Plan, unit goals, and assessment data to develop budget requests</td>
<td>• Mid-Year Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>• Review unit progress on Strategic Plan annual goals</td>
<td>• BOT Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review progress on Strategic Plan goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feedback provided—</td>
<td>• Feedback provided—administrative support, educational support/student affairs,</td>
<td>• WIA Quarterly Student Report</td>
<td>• Units submit budget requests to VCs</td>
<td>• Enrollment Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research, service, and</td>
<td>and service</td>
<td>• THEC Enrollment Editing</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop Planning Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general education reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>• AAUP Faculty Compensation Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual Spring Open Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CUPA Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>• UT Board of Trustees Action Items submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• IR – Student Data to HR</td>
<td></td>
<td>• UT Board of Trustees Informational Items submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HR Salary Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SACS COC Institutional Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td>• Non-accredited Program Review self-studies due</td>
<td>• Workload Report</td>
<td>• VCs submit budget requests to VCFA</td>
<td>• Review mid-year budget projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment Coordination Committees provide reports to Assessment Oversight</td>
<td>• Department Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend current year adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>• IPEDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational Programs &amp; Student Learning</td>
<td>• Administrative Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research and Scholarly Activities</td>
<td>• Educational Support Services &amp; Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outreach &amp; Community/Public Service</td>
<td>• Outreach &amp; Community/Public Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vet Tech Program annual report due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td>• Non-accredited Program Review on-site visits</td>
<td>• ACT Class Profile</td>
<td>• Draft proposed budget prepared</td>
<td>• Review budget proposal and make recommendations to Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual Performance Review conference reports due</td>
<td>• IPEDS – NCAA Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty Senate Annual Spring Faculty Meeting report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual Performance Review conference reports due</td>
<td>• CSRDE Survey – Section 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peterson’s Graduate Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CGS International Graduate Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preliminary Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Units</th>
<th>Non-Academic Units</th>
<th>Institutional Data &amp; Reports</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Chancellor/Chancellor's Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review progress on goals</td>
<td>• Review progress on goals</td>
<td>• IPEDS</td>
<td>• Requests for student tuition and fees due to UT System</td>
<td>• Review progress on goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment Oversight Committee makes recommendations to Chancellor</td>
<td>• Assessment Oversight Committee makes recommendations to Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget revisions for Probable Budgets due</td>
<td>• Review of institutional data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review research and service data and feedback</td>
<td>• Review research and service data and feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-accredited Program Review on-site visits</td>
<td>• Non-accredited Program Review on-site visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Response to five-year review committee recommendations due</td>
<td>• Response to five-year review committee recommendations due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Departmental end-of-year progress reports due</td>
<td>• Unit assessment reports due</td>
<td>• US News – Main Survey</td>
<td>• Submit proposed budget to UT System</td>
<td>• UT Board of Trustees Action Items submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Programs &amp; Student Learning</td>
<td>• Administrative Support Services</td>
<td>• ABET – Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>• UT Board of Trustees Informational Items submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research and Scholarly Activities</td>
<td>• Educational Support Services &amp; Student Affairs</td>
<td>• CSRDE – STEM Survey – Sections II and III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach &amp; Community/Public Service</td>
<td>• Outreach &amp; Community/Public Service</td>
<td>• Peterson’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual Plan Goals for next fiscal year due</td>
<td>• Annual Plan Goals for next fiscal year due</td>
<td>• Distance Learning Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment Day workshop</td>
<td>• Assessment Day workshop</td>
<td>• Learning Disabilities Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment Committee reports posted</td>
<td>• Assessment Committee reports posted</td>
<td>• Peterson's Financial Aid Survey</td>
<td>• UTM receives general education data results, MFT data results</td>
<td>• UTM receives general education data results, MFT data results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotion and Tenure process ends</td>
<td>• Assessment Committee reports posted</td>
<td>• US News Distance Learning Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Update Tuition and Fees on Surveys:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wintergreen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Princeton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Barron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UTM Fact book - Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Historical Enrollment Updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NSSE Peer Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Units</td>
<td>Non-Academic Units</td>
<td>Institutional Data &amp; Reports</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Chancellor/Chancellor’s Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-academic and Student Affairs units review assessment reports and close the loop</td>
<td>• Institutional Research and Evaluation Survey</td>
<td>• Budgets and Responses to Budget Requests distributed to budgetary units</td>
<td>• Strategic Plan annual reports due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• WIA Quarterly Student Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>• VCs complete divisional Annual Plan Progress Reports on preceding year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CSRDE – Transfer Survey Section IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>• VCs develop divisional Annual Plans for upcoming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Princeton UG Entrepreneurship Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Computer Science ABET Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• THEC Enrollment Editing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• THEC Performance Funding Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SACS COC Financial Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>• Fall Opening Faculty Meeting</td>
<td>• Best for Vets Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalize UTM Annual Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College and Departmental Retreats to review data and close the loop</td>
<td>• US News</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Update UTM Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Online Undergraduate Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Online Graduate MBA Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disseminate updated Strategic Plan to all units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Online Graduate Education Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UTFI Annual Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>• Faculty performance review conference reports due</td>
<td>• Workload Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess actual fall enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SLO reports due</td>
<td>• Departmental reports including General Education and MFT results analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>• UT Board of Trustees Action Items submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General Education reports due</td>
<td>• Military Advanced Education and Transition Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>• UT Board of Trustees Informational Items submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• THEC Enrollment Editing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Military Friendly School Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UT BOT Student Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• IPEDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Reporting Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Institution Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Common Data Set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UTM Fact book – Student Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Financial Aid Shopping Sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### October
- Assessment committee reviews program SLO reports
- Research and service reports due

### Institutional Data & Reports
- WIA Quarterly Student Report
- ACT - CSRDE
- Peterson’s College Graduate Survey Phase I
- IPEDS
  - Institutional Characteristics
  - Completions Survey
  - 12 Month Enrollment Survey
- Delaware Results Analysis
- UTFI Endowment Reports

### Budget
- Revise budget based on enrollment data
- Revised budget to UT System
- Initial budget revisions due

### Chancellor/Chancellor’s Staff
- Review of institutional data
- Faculty Senate Annual Fall Faculty Meeting report

### November
- Feedback on program SLO reports
- Assessment committees review research and service reports
- Committee on Instruction reviews general education reports

### Institutional Data & Reports
- Common Data Set Financial Aid
- UTM Fact book – Financial Aid
- CGS Graduate Enrollment Applications
- Barron’s Survey
- UT BOT retreat information
- NSSE Data Analysis
- FSSE Data Analysis (5 yr. cycle)

### December
- Tenure/promotion process begins

### Institutional Data & Reports
- Best for Vets – Business School
- Annual Survey of College (College Board Survey)
- Delaware Cost Study Course Information Work
- SACS COC Enrollment File

### Chancellor/Chancellor’s Staff
- Mid-year progress reports on Annual Goals
# Glossary of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AACSB</td>
<td>Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAUP</td>
<td>American Association of University Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>Accreditation Board for Engineering Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>American College Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Common Data Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>Council of Graduate Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRDE</td>
<td>Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>College University Professional Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSE</td>
<td>Faculty Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Graduate Record Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>Graduate Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>Major Field Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA</td>
<td>National Collegiate Athletic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>Reference Data Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS COC</td>
<td>Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACUBO</td>
<td>Southern Association of College and University Business Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEC</td>
<td>Tennessee Higher Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTFI</td>
<td>University of Tennessee Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCFA</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCs</td>
<td>Vice Chancellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIA</td>
<td>Workforce Investment Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Becoming An Engaged University

In the ongoing movement to increase accountability in higher education, prospective students and parents are asking colleges and universities to prove, beyond traditional metrics, the value of a college degree. These students want to know more about the ways each institution will uniquely prepare them for today’s knowledge-based economy, and whether the significant investment they are making will have the long-term effects they desire.¹

In investigating what characteristics are related to satisfactory outcomes, Gallup and its partner Purdue University found that the type of schools these college graduates attended -- public or private, small or large, very selective or less selective -- hardly mattered at all to their workplace engagement and current well-being.

Instead, through the Gallup-Purdue Index, Gallup and the colleges it supports found six critical experiences in the undergraduate experience that linked workplace engagement and overall well-being. Each of these experiences contributed significantly to the graduates’ engagement in their workplace and their feelings of general well-being and did so by a per-element factor of two to three times those students who did not have these experiences. The relevant experiences clustered in two areas:

**EMOTIONAL SUPPORT**
- Had a professor who cared about me as an individual
- Had a professor who made me excited about learning
- Had a mentor who encouraged my goals and dreams

**EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING**
- Had a job or internship where I applied what I was learning in class
- Worked on a project that took a semester or more to complete
- Was extremely involved in extra-curricular activities

Astonishingly, less than 3 percent of the graduates reported having had all six of these experiences during their time in college. Just 6 percent of graduates strongly agreed they had the three key experiential experiences, and only 14 percent of graduates strongly agreed they were provided the three key areas of support from professors.

When asked if their college or university prepared them for life outside of college, the following relationships among these six emerged for those who said they “Strongly Agreed”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None of the 6</th>
<th>One of the 6</th>
<th>Two of the 6</th>
<th>Three of the 6</th>
<th>Four of the 6</th>
<th>Five of the 6</th>
<th>All 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Strongly Agreed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, 75 percent of those who “Strongly Agreed” that they had all six of these experiences at their college graduated in four years!²

Given that our past successes delivered on many of these six experiences, we were already familiar with these elements. For decades, programs and departments had developed distinguished reputations for one or more of these experiences. In fact, we often stated in our own terms some of these experiences as a means to recruit both students and the faculty. We were (and are) proud of being student-centered, and we recognized we had the capacity to deliver on all six of these experiences and strive for our students to be among the 3 percent.

Given this evidence from the Gallup/Purdue Index, we identified the advantages of enhancing these six experiences by careful design, not by chance. We also could see an opportunity to deliver a data-driven identity as one of America’s uniquely distinctive undergraduate universities.

However, we also recognized we had been neither intentional nor strategic in delivering this approach. Beginning in August 2015, the proposition for envisioning this focus as the University’s distinction in the marketplace and as a driver for building an internal consensus for solving some of our problems was presented to the faculty and staff. Organized under the title, “A Bold Agenda,” we collectively embarked on an endeavor to deliver on the promise that we can identify a uniquely valued education through efforts to strengthen these six experiences for our students.

Beginning in fall 2016, we will begin using the Gallup/Purdue Index as an assessment of our graduates and to track our success in achieving these six experiences. The Index will give us data to create actionable plans for improvement. Previous Gallup/Purdue clients such as the University of Virginia, The Ohio State University, and Robert Morris University report positive results in creating cultures of engagement for students and employers.

Work by faculty and staff over the past several months has helped inventory work we are doing in each experience area and created initiatives in others. You will meet both students and faculty who are engaged in delivering an Engaged University. Your panel presenters are:

Dr. Todd Winters, Dean of the College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences and Professor of Animal Sciences in the Department of Agriculture, Geosciences, and Natural Resources.

Ms. Maryanna McClure, Senior General Agriculture with concentration in Animal Science in the College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences. She is from Dyersburg, TN, and was a USDA UG Research Fellow at the U.S. Meat Animal Research Lab in Nebraska last summer. Faculty mentor is Dr. Jason Roberts, Associate Professor of Animal Science Veterinarian and Director West Tennessee Animal Diseases Diagnostics Lab.

Ms. Rebecca Lund, Junior Accounting major in the College of Business and Global Affairs. She is a University Scholar from Martin, TN. Has traveled to Super Bowl with the sport management program and England with the Honors Program. Her mentor is Dr. Richard Griffin, Retired Professor of Accounting.

Mr. Drake Williams, Senior Chemistry major in the College of Engineering and Natural Sciences, from Paris, TN. Drake is engaged in a student/faculty research project with Dr. Robbie Montgomery, Associate Professor of Chemistry. He has been accepted to graduate school at Mississippi State to pursue a Ph.D.

²“Great Jobs Great Lives, The 2014 Gallup-Purdue Index Report,” Gallup, Inc., 2014. (All data citations from this source.)
Becoming An Engaged University
When a **student** is trying to decide between an elite Ivy school, a public university, or a small private college, what should he or she consider to help make the decision?

When an **employer** is evaluating two recent graduates from different backgrounds and institutions, what should distinguish one applicant over the other, and why?

When **colleges and universities** are setting internal strategies, designing new programs and curricula, and working to attract future students, what should they do?
Gallup-Purdue Research

• **The study found that the type of schools these college graduates attended (public or private, small or large, very selective or less selective) hardly matters at all to their workplace engagement and current well-being.**

• **Instead, the study found that support and experiences in college had more of a relationship to long-term outcomes.**
Gallup-Purdue Research

• **GALLUP FOUND 6 ELEMENTS:**
  ✓ 3 RELATED TO **faculty support,**
  ✓ 3 RELATED TO **experiential learning** THAT ARE CORRELATED WITH **LONG-TERM CAREER AND LIFE SUCCESS,**

  **BONUS:** 75% who strongly agree they had all six of these experiences graduated in four years
Faculty Support

• **Provide support and feedback**
  - Mentor relationship

• **Promoting the Faculty/Young Scholar Relationship**
  - Establish Joint faculty/student research
It Is All About Our Students

• Ensuring real-world Applications
  o Only 13% of Americans strongly agree college graduates in this country are well-prepared for success in the workplace. Gallup, April, 2015
    ▪ Capstone courses in all majors
    ▪ Required internships or equivalent

• Creating living-learning communities
  o “Even in the least coordinated, most basic, learning community model, students show more positive outcomes (first semester GPA, retention, first-year experience) than nonlearning community students.”
    Martha L. A. Stassen, 2003
Presenting:

• **Dr. Todd Winters**, Dean of the College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences and Professor of Animal Sciences.

• **Ms. Maryanna McClure**, Senior General Agriculture with concentration in Animal Science in the College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences.
  - Her mentor is Dr. Jason Roberts, Associate Professor of Animal Science Veterinarian.

• **Ms. Rebecca Lund**, Junior Accounting major in the College of Business and Global Affairs.
  - Her mentor is Dr. Richard Griffin, Retired Professor of Accounting.

• **Mr. Drake Williams**, Senior Chemistry major in the College of Engineering and Natural Sciences, from Paris, TN. Drake is engaged in a student/faculty research project.
  - His mentor is Dr. Robbie Montgomery, Associate Professor of Chemistry.