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

June 23, 2011
Knoxville, Tennessee

The Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Tennessee met at 8:00 am EDT, Thursday, June 23, 2011, in the Hollingsworth Auditorium of the Ellington Plant Sciences Building on the University of Tennessee Knoxville campus, Knoxville, TN.

I. Call to Order

Mr. Spruell Driver, Chair of the Committee, called the meeting to order at 8:05 am. Chairman Driver asked Dr. Katherine High, UT Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success, to call the roll.

II. Roll Call

The following voting members were present:
Mr. Spruell Driver
Ms. Anne Holt Blackburn
Dr. Toby Boulet
Mr. John Foy
Mr. Jim Murphy
The Honorable Julius Johnson
Mr. Karl Schledwitz
Ms. Carey Smith
Ms. Betty Ann Tanner
Dr. Janet Wilbert

The following non-voting members were also present:
Dr. Joseph DiPietro
Ms. Teresa Fowler
Dr. Lawrence Brown
Ms. Joan Heminway
Mr. Ross Rowland
Mr. Shalin Shah
Mr. Alex Wilson

Dr. High announced that a quorum was present.

III. Approval of Minutes

Chairman Driver welcomed everyone to the meeting and began with the approval of the minutes. The minutes had been distributed with the Board materials prior to the meeting. Chairman Driver asked if anyone had any additions or corrections. Dr. High pointed out an addition that was in the minutes. A
question had been raised at the February meeting, which the Office of Academic Affairs promptly answered. This is included in the minutes of the February meeting as a footnote, with an asterisk.

There were no other corrections or changes. Trustee Foy moved to accept the minutes. Trustee Blackburn seconded the motion. The motion carried.

IV. Opening Remarks

Chairman Driver reminded attendees that the meeting agenda was full, and that while the meeting is open to the public, it is not a public meeting. He will only recognize members of the Committee, other Trustees, members of UT’s senior staff, and those who are presenting agenda items during the meeting. No other business will be conducted other than items listed on the previously distributed materials.

Chairman Driver welcomed new faces to the committee. Teresa Fowler from UT Martin is a student trustee and currently a Sophomore Nursing student at UT Martin. She is a non-voting member of the AASS Committee this year, but will be voting next year. Also from UT Martin, Janet Wilbert, Professor of Health and Human Performance and Athletic Training Coordinator and the Faculty Senate President at UT Martin, is the new non-voting Faculty Trustee on the AASS Committee. The newest member of the committee is Tommy Whitaker of the 6th Congressional District. Chairman Driver then introduced Dr. India Lane as the new Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs and Student Success.

V. Consideration of Tenure Recommendations

Chairman Driver explained that tenure is brought before the Board each year. He then turned to the meeting over to Dr. High.

Dr. High explained the process of obtaining tenure by faculty and the process of granting tenure by the Board of Trustees. Only positive recommendations for tenure are brought before the Board for approval. Dr. High verified that all of the names on the tenure list were, indeed, positive recommendations made by the Chancellor to the both the President and the Office of Academic Affairs and that all of the appropriate policies and procedures were followed. Dr. High then submitted the tenure recommendations for approval by the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee.

Chairman Driver asked if any members of the committee had any questions or comments.

Trustee Horne commented that even though 55% of faculty are tenured, that does not mean that they are above scrutiny. Dr. High confirmed this and added that every faculty member has an annual performance evaluation and that faculty who are not performing as expected can be dismissed.

Trustee Horne suggested that one option would be to discuss professional contracts for faculty rather than tenure as some universities and colleges are now doing for efficiency’s sake.

Dr. DiPietro added that we do post-tenure review at The University of Tennessee and that there is a process if a faculty member is not performing and is tenured. Corrective measures are used first, but if the faculty member does not respond, then that faculty member can be dismissed. Tenure does not equal permanency without review.

Chairman Driver suggested that in the future it would be helpful to add the College and Departments the faculty are associated with.

There were no further questions or comments.
Trustee Boulet moved to approve the tenure recommendations. Trustee Tanner seconded the motion and the motion carried.

VI. Faculty Promotions

Chairman Driver announced that the next order of business is Faculty Promotions, and explained that, while normally Tenure and Promotions are considered one piece, the committee only approves tenure, while promotions are presented for information. Chairman Driver then turned the meeting over to Dr. High.

Dr. High explained the process of obtaining and granting promotions to faculty. There were no questions or comment.

VII. New Admission Requirements: All Campuses

Chairman Driver announced that the next item of business would be the new admission requirements for all campuses. Chairman Driver reminded those who were on the Board in 2008 that during the February 2008 Board Meeting in Memphis at the UT Health Science Center, the AASS Committee heard a presentation by Margaret Horne of Gov. Bredesen’s office and Theresa Sloane of the Hyde Family Foundation on the Tennessee Diploma Project. That project was about education reform in our high schools to increase the rigor in graduation requirements, which are now in effect. Chairman Driver asked Dr. High to explain how the UT campuses have worked to align their admission requirements with the new graduation requirements.

Dr. High provided a brief statement about the history of these changes. In 1985, the UT Board of Trustees approved high school courses to be required for admission to UT in concert with The Board of Regents. This was done with Board and Legislative approval. By 1989 all Tennessee high school students were taking the required courses. In 2007 UT looked again at what was going on in high schools in Tennessee, and the Board of Education determined that high school graduates needed more preparation for college, particularly in mathematics. A two-year process began to revamp what was taught in high school math. Then it was decided that four years of math would be required for graduation. In addition to the math requirements, the requirements for science were changed to require additional science courses. The chart presented shows the changes in the high school graduation requirements. The Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success is now working with the Faculty Senates on each campus to ensure that the entrance requirements are the same as high school graduation requirements. If approved by the Board, these changes will go into effect in the summer of 2013.

Trustee Murphy requested clarification of the chart, which Dr. High then provided. It was explained that those classes graduating high school this year and next year will not necessarily have taken the required courses, but all students graduating in 2013 will. Dr. High explained that the reasoning behind approving these changes early is to be able to add the upcoming changes to websites and campus catalogs, so that students will not be surprised.

Trustee Blackburn noticed that UT Knoxville requires specific courses for geometry and math, and asked how different that is from what the other campuses are requiring. Dr. High explained that UT Knoxville is looking for incoming students who have taken specific high school courses, as part of its Top 25 Initiative. The other campuses have different missions and while they would like for students to take trigonometry and statistics, they will accept students who have taken a capstone math course. The ACT
organization has determined that students who successfully complete algebra I and II in high school have a 75% chance of successfully completing their first course in college math.

Trustee Blackburn then asked whose responsibility it is to be sure that high school students understand what courses they need in order to obtain entrance into UT Knoxville. She asked if it is the responsibility of the high school guidance counselors. Dr. High responded that it is, primarily, the responsibility of the guidance counselors. One of the things that the Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success is doing this fall, is providing a “Conference for Counselors” tour across the state, where UT Admissions offices from all of the UT campuses will be presenting these changes in the requirements to high school guidance counselors as well as presenting the new Universal Transfer Paths, as part of the Complete College Tennessee Act. The tour will visit Memphis, Jackson, Martin, Nashville, Chattanooga, Knoxville and Kingsport.

Trustee Blackburn commented that she is glad to hear that UT is providing the “Conference for Counselors” because the feedback she receives from guidance counselors is that they have a full plate. Advising by guidance counselors is something that needs better organization and efficiency. It is good that we are doing our part to make sure that requirements are explained clearly to those who then translate that information to the students at the high school level.

Trustee Gallimore asked Dr. High if there have been any concerns at the high school level about whether there would be the quantity and quality of teachers to fulfill these new requirements. Dr. High responded that there is some concern that there may not be enough physics teachers, which is why physics is not required at this time, only recommended. Due to the need for additional professional development, math teachers are being invited in for the summer to be sure that they have the necessary preparation to teach these higher level math courses. While there are some concerns, the Board of Education and the Department of Education indicate that they are ready for the challenge.

Dr. L. B. Brown, of UT Health Science Center, asked about the impact this would have on UT’s enrollment of out-of-state students, from states that might not have the same requirements. Dr. High responded that when high school units were first put into place in 1989, a policy was developed for out-of-state students and students from high schools not offering the required courses. Each campus can determine how the requirements are made up.

Trustee Tanner asked what media outlets UT would like to use in order to get the message out and also if it will be on the website and how soon that might happen. Dr. High responded that Knoxville currently has the new requirements on their website as “tentative.” Dr. High welcomes suggestions on how to get the word out about the changes.

Trustee Wilbert asked if there is continued discussion with Department of Education about the quality of the classes. Dr. High responded that there is, but the discussion must be approached delicately. The Office of Academic Affairs meets with the Department of Education regularly, and mutual concerns are raised and addressed. UT trains the teachers who go into the high schools. UT’s Colleges of Education seek to ensure that teachers graduating from UT are of high quality.

Dr. Dipetro stated that it is a partnership for higher education with Race to the Top and other initiatives to make sure the K-12 training is very, very adequate, if not excellent, so that when they get to UT, students don’t bump into that wall of not having the right preparation.

There were no further questions or comments. Trustee Murphy moved to approve the new admissions requirements for all campuses. Trustee Schledwitz seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
VIII. New Admission Requirement: UT Chattanooga

In addition to the new requirements for all campuses, UT Chattanooga is proposing a modest increase in the high school GPA requirement for admission to UT Chattanooga. Chairman Driver then turned the meeting over to Dr. Phil Oldham, of UT Chattanooga, for presentation.

Dr. Oldham explained that UT Chattanooga is proposing modest increase in the admission requirement for freshmen, beginning fall 2011. This is a culmination of a series of experiments collecting data on incoming freshmen, in terms of student success and retention, as part of the Complete College Tennessee Act. The data indicate that high school GPA is the leading indicator of student success through college. UT Chattanooga is proposing an increase of a tenth of a point, to a 2.85 high school GPA, keeping ACT scores where they are. This change would affect approximately 100 incoming freshmen out of the last couple of incoming classes. Also, parallel with the automatic admission requirements proposed, UT Chattanooga has a holistic review process which allows faculty and staff to look at a student’s entire background. There was no disproportionate disadvantage to any particular demographic group. UT Chattanooga feels that this is a modest step to ensure student success.

Chairman Driver asked about the criteria where a 2.3 GPA and a composite ACT score of 21 are required. Why not raise that GPA as well? Dr. Oldham stated that this is an incremental process. They wanted to target the students who were most at risk. Dr. Oldham believes that as more is learned about incoming freshmen, additional changes may be requested over the next few years.

Trustee Loughry asked what the capacity is for UTC in terms of the freshman class. Is the current capacity being filled? Dr. Oldham answered yes and indicated that UTC is probably over-filling the capacity. Up to 2200 freshmen are expected in the fall of 2011, putting UTC at or above capacity.

Chairman Driver asked Dr. Oldham to go over the steps in place to improve freshmen retention.

Dr. Oldham discussed the following:

1) Emphasis has been placed on freshman advising, with the formation of a Center for Academic Advising and Student Success, which advises all incoming freshmen throughout the first year. Advisors at the Center are required to meet with students twice each semester.

2) A new program is being implemented during freshmen orientation in which student’s schedules are being pre-loaded based on an online survey they completed prior to orientation. The survey captures students’ test scores, their interests, history and background in other courses throughout high school. This program seems to relieve a lot of the anxiety, and puts the students on a much healthier and direct pathway toward the completion of their degree in a timely manner. Most freshmen change their major at least once, so a lot of face time helps with students’ uncertainty.

3) Another new program has also been implemented, which is called the Fast Program, to help identify freshmen that are at-risk based on class attendance. Once a freshman has missed the second class in any of their courses, faculty are asked to notify the advising center and then the student is contacted through email, by their RA, etc., in order to check on them and to see if there’s anything they need, if they are aware of any mentoring or tutoring services that may be available to them. UTC has been successful in turning about half of those students around into better attendance. In 2010, the freshmen class GPA upon completion was the highest it has been since 2000.
There were no further questions or comments.

Trustee Foy moved to approve the new increase in the GPA requirement for incoming freshmen at UT Chattanooga. The motion was seconded by Trustee Blackburn and the motion carried.

IX. VOL Vision 2015: The Pursuit of the Top 25

Chairman Driver turned the meeting over to Dr. High to present the next agenda item, UT Knoxville’s Strategic Plan.

Dr. High explained that last fall there was a presentation to the AASS Committee about UT Knoxville’s quest to become a Top 25 Research Institution. Prior to that, UT Knoxville was revising its Strategic Plan, so the presentation now being presented is the melding of the Quest for the Top 25 with the new Strategic Plan. The committee will be asked to approve the strategic plan, which contains the UTK mission statement. This board also approves the mission statement.

Dr. High asked UT Knoxville Provost, Susan Martin, to present the final version of the VOL Vision Top 25 Strategic Plan.

Dr. Martin presented the final version of the VOL Vision Strategic Plan and UT Knoxville Mission Statement for approval. The presentation covered the following areas: 1) the timeline of the process and the articulation of it with the Top 25 initiative and metrics, 2) the mission and vision statements, 3) the strategic priorities, and 4) some of the major values embedded in the plan.

1. Timeline:
   The plan began in January 2010. In semester long meetings with key campus constituencies, UT Knoxville conducted a very full dialogue with faculty, staff and students about the key elements of the mission statement and key strategic goals and priorities. This dialogue resulted, at the end of spring 2010, in a sound first draft of the strategic priorities. It was found that, as the Top 25 metrics and priorities gelled, they mapped perfectly with the mission statement. Summer and fall 2010 were spent refining and finalizing the draft now presented.

2. Mission and Vision Statements:
   The mission statement presented for approval focuses on UT Knoxville as a public research university and articulates a three-pronged mission: teaching, research and creative achievement, and outreach in public service. It also speaks to UTK’s aspirations to join the top ranks of similar universities in the country, in a way similar to the Top 25 Initiative.

3. Strategic Priorities:
   The vision statement or VOL statement stands for: value creation, original ideas, and leadership. Dr. Martin then listed the following strategic priorities and described how each one aligns with the Top 25 Initiative:
   1) Recruit, develop, and graduate a diverse body of undergraduate students
   2) Educate and graduate increasing numbers of diverse graduate and professional students
   3) Strengthen our capacity and productivity in research, scholarship, and creative activity
   4) Attract and retain stellar, diverse faculty and staff
   5) Continually improve the resource base to achieve campus priorities
4. Values:
The value statement tries to articulate the principles that define the volunteer spirit. Among these values are diversity, civility and globalization. Globalization, since the beginning of the "Ready for the World" program, has become very much embedded in the way UT Knoxville approaches the education of students. Each year, more students study abroad, and a number of study abroad and other opportunities have been developed to become more globally involved. In terms of diversity, it continues to be tracked on the Knoxville campus in both faculty and students, and this year there is a special initiative in line with the 50th anniversary of African American achievement, including the Life of the Mind program. Dr. Martin then showed a video that illustrates the thoughts behind the civility initiative.

A question was raised regarding strategic priority number five. Since the endowment is now consolidated, how is the endowment segmented out per student at UTK? Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, Chris Cimino, explained that UTK is working with the treasurer's office to look at the endowment for just UTK, and then that number is divided by the number of FTE students on the Knoxville campus. For further clarification it was asked if gifts designated for UTK are taken out of the endowment and then used for students at UTK.

Chancellor Cheek commented that undesignated gifts can still be designated for the campus, and that in looking at the endowment, there is very little money that is completely undesignated for the System.

There were no further questions.

Trustee Murphy moved to pass the new strategic plan and mission statement for UT Knoxville. Trustee Boulet seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Trustee Blackburn commended Dr. Martin on her presentation and Dr. Cheek for the initiative for civility, as this is an important message for students and everyone. She congratulated them on an "A++" presentation.

Chairman Driver asked when the video would be shown to students. Dr. Martin responded that freshmen are required to attend orientation and they attend a presentation which includes this video.

Margie Nichols commented that the video has been on TV stations, is currently on the UTK website, and it was locally made and produced, including students/staff.

X. Revision of Campus Rules under Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act

Chairman Driver provided explanation of the procedure for any change in rules, according to Tennessee State Law. Each rule change must be a separate action item and for each there will be a vote. In this meeting the six separate action items will be voted upon at once, but in the full board meeting, a roll-call vote will be taken. Chairman Driver then asked Dr. High to explain the changes to the committee.

Dr. High stated that in January of 2011, the Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success met with the staffs of the various student affairs offices for a two and a half day retreat. It was known that the student handbooks needed complete revision. During this retreat, approximately fifteen people took twenty years of policy, revised it, and reached consensus on what the standards of conduct needed to be for every student at every campus at the University of Tennessee. This was a tremendous amount of work. Six rules need to go forward for a vote in order to create a uniform set of standards that all students need to abide by. Dr. High then announced that Matthew Scoggins will present the new rules.
Mr. Scoggins began by stating that there are currently four different standards of conduct on the campuses. In some cases the same misconduct has been described in four different ways. The campuses have different numbers of standards, but this is misleading because some of the campuses group several standards into one. The student affairs officers went through the codes of conduct, standard by standard, in order to make it more uniform. If approved, UT campuses will have one set of standards using the same language for all UT students.

For purposes of efficiency, the twenty-nine standards were broken into five groups. Those five groups are as follows: dishonesty offenses; offenses against persons; health and safety offenses; property offenses; and offenses relating to the general operation of the university.

1.) Dishonesty offenses: There’s really nothing new in this area in terms of the standards. The language has been made more consistent. The most important change is in the area of academic dishonesty, where, currently, it just says cheating or plagiarism, but now in the honor statements there is a list of nine or ten examples of what cheating is.

2.) Offenses against persons: This is the area where the standards really had become outdated, particularly in the areas of harassment, sexual assault, and invasion of privacy. The new language adds these offenses and gives students clear notice of exactly what is prohibited conduct in those areas.

3.) Health & Safety: There really is not anything new in terms of what the campuses consider misconduct. There is a major change in terms of clear notice being provided to students, prohibiting this kind of conduct. The new language provides clarification by explaining exactly what a weapon is and also makes the alcohol policy much clearer.

4.) Property offenses: Nothing much changed in this area. A couple of the campuses did not have information regarding the misuse of information technology. This is a section that is rather lengthy but clearly defines what prohibited misconduct consists of on campuses.

5.) Offenses relating to the general operation of the university: This group of offenses can impact the day to day operation of the campus. There were two key changes here: 1) the old standard just stated “disorderly conduct” as an offence, but now a clear definition is provided of what disorderly conduct is; and 2) the current standards say “don’t violate university policy,” but the new standards say “don’t violate university policy” and then adds a list of about fifteen policies that students need to comply with.

On top of agreeing to twenty-nine uniform standards of conduct, the student affairs officers were able to agree on language addressing other key topics that support the standards of conduct. This came about as a result of a discussion about what questions come from parents, what questions come from students and what areas of the standards are unclear to the student affairs officers. For example, one of those questions is “why does the university care about student conduct?” Now, a new introductory statement has been added that provides seven reasons why the university cares about a student’s conduct. A section of definitions has been added. Jurisdiction is a key area. All students need to know where the standards of conduct apply, particularly in the area of off-campus misconduct and in relation to what the university’s relationship is with the criminal justice system. In the area of penalties there are some guiding principles that have been added in terms of assisting administrators and student conduct boards in applying the penalties in any type of misconduct.

In conclusion, Mr. Scoggins talked about how the changes would be communicated to students. One of the ways it will be communicated is through student handbooks and orientation but not just by giving out student handbooks and expecting them to read it. At the next summer orientation, there will be discussion about the new conduct codes. Additionally, the new codes will be discussed in residence hall
meetings, through online communication and, email blasts. There are seven or eight different ways that students will be alerted to these expectations and many of these are often already being addressed.

Trustee Stansberry commented on the prohibition of alcohol on university property and asked if the standards would clearly define what constitutes university property, because he has noticed alcohol in areas of campus which appear to be university property.

Mr. Scoggins said that there is a definition of “university property” which includes property owned by the university or property rented by the university. The problem with this is the matter of enforcement. It is a manpower issue. It is not that the rule doesn’t apply on certain areas of property on campus; it’s just a matter of enforcement.

Trustee Blackburn commented that the misuse of information technology seems to be a very broad category. She went on to ask how broad it is and if there were some examples that could be provided.

Mr. Scoggins gave the following examples: stealing someone’s password; interfering with network in terms of downloading something or doing something that would slow down the entire university network; putting a virus out into the email system; copyright violation by downloading illegal music; impersonating someone else in an email. There are at least ten different types of this misconduct listed in the standard, Standard 16. The university has a policy that describes the acceptable use of information technology that applies to all faculty, staff and students which is referenced in the code of conduct and has been developed by the Information Technology offices.

Trustee Blackburn asked to what extent students were involved in the changes. Mr. Scoggins replied that Knoxville had a group of students that served on a subcommittee. Martin and Chattanooga worked with their SGA students. Chattanooga also worked with some of the RAs. Memphis also had a committee of students and worked with SGA. The standard on information technology is currently in the rules, so the language has not changed much, but more specific examples have been added.

Dr. Boulet asked if hacking into an email account is listed as an example of an offense, to which Mr. Scoggins replied that it is listed as “unauthorized entry into another person’s account.”

Dr. L.B. Brown commented that, coming from the College of Pharmacy, he sees a lot of issues with high school and college age students selling, as well as using, prescription drugs. He asked if the actual standard contained a better description of “improper use” of prescription drugs.

The standard on prescription drugs, which is a new piece that is not currently in any of the campus standards, does go into more detail, describing the misuse of prescription drugs as well as the buying and selling of prescription drugs.

Trustee Murphy pointed out that the slides presented were a very high overview of the standards. But if you actually go through and read the rules, they do go into pretty good detail. He went on to commend the Student Affairs officers and General Counsel’s office for doing something that was needed: adding detail and description to the rules. The concern is now making sure people read these rules. The rules are now clear about what a student can and cannot do. However, it is necessary to be sure that students and parents know and understand these rules. He commented that as a BOT member, he is frequently contacted by parents who are concerned that their student is being sanctioned for conduct violations that they do not understand. He suggested having a place on the website where this information is readily available and where students can ask questions, so that the information is available for those who have the time to read the rules.
Trustee Cates questioned whether there will be a simple version available for students, which they might be more likely to read. Dr. High responded that the simple version is the twenty-nine standards, which are pretty clear and are only one or two sentences long. The part that students are less likely to read is the part containing the information about the procedures that the campuses use if a student is found in violation. However, the procedures are very important for the student groups which deal with these violations and the student conduct officers. Once a student is in trouble, that student will be made aware of the procedures.

Chair Driver recognized Tim Rogers, Vice Chancellor of the Knoxville campus. Dr. Rogers said that he would like to amplify what Mr. Scoggins said regarding student input. There was a lot of student input, including student government presidents, graduate students and students serving on subcommittees, as well as faculty senate input and the dean of the College of Law, appointed by Joan Heminway. With respect to publication, the information will be presented to students on the various campuses during orientation and through other various venues but also to parents. Dr. Rogers mentioned that there is a lot of input and output in the way of marketing.

The Chair then recognized Dr. L.B. Brown who asked where social media conduct (i.e. Facebook and Twitter) is included within the document. Mr. Scoggins explained that, from his perspective, if any of these offenses can be committed in person, they can also be committed on Facebook or Twitter. However, UT has to be careful about how that is addressed, in terms of the First Amendment. Harassment and cyber-stalking are listed, but the standards don’t directly mention Facebook or Twitter or social media.

Trustee Murphy asked if he could make one motion to adopt all six motions as shown in the materials. Ms. Catherine Mizell approved this and Trustee Murphy made the motion to approve all six motions. Trustee Boulet seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Ms. Mizell thanked Mr. Scoggins for his tremendous work on this project and mentioned that he is a great example of what this board and what this committee is about. He was one of two top graduates from the Knoxville College of Business and was the top graduate in the College of Law. He has been on General Counsel’s staff since 2008 and has been an excellent member of the team. Ms. Mizell expressed her pride in Mr. Scoggins and his work.

Chair Driver followed Ms. Mizell’s comments by commending the efforts and the work of Attorney Scoggins and asked for show of appreciation from those in the room.

XI. Proposal for a Program of Study Leading to the Degree of Doctor of Social Work

Chairman Driver provided a brief overview of the proposed program, the Doctor of Social Work, adding that the two external consultants who reviewed the program gave it extremely positive marks and that the program was looked on favorably by the reviewer at the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. He then called on Dr. Susan Martin, Provost for the Knoxville campus, to provide additional information.

Dr. Martin added the following information. This is a doctoral program designed to prepare practitioners, people typically with the master’s of Social Work, for more advanced clinical work or to assume leadership positions in their fields of social work. An extensive market research study was done in order to ascertain the need for individuals prepared with this doctorate. Social work is a very fast growing field and there is a great deal of need both in Tennessee and nationally for social workers prepared to practice at this advanced level and to exercise leadership. There was a rigorous process of review for this program, including visits from external consultants as well as a visit from THEC. Everyone
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was very enthusiastically in support of this program. This will allow UTK to contribute to the well-being of individuals in Tennessee, especially in the rural areas where there is a great need for service. It also serves UTK’s Top 25 Goals by allowing the production of more doctoral students, and doctoral students who will be very, very competitive because it looks as though this will allow UTK to be a real leader in this area, as there are only a handful of programs like this nationwide. Dr. Martin then opened the floor for questions and mentioned that both Dean Sowers and Dr. Patterson were also available to answer any specific questions.

Trustee Wharton asked if the tuition has been set at the right level to help cover the costs.

Provost Martin responded that at this point tuition is where it needs to be because the program is being supported through reallocated resources that came about from the closure of the Memphis location. She agreed with Trustee Wharton that they will need to follow this closely, to remain sure that tuition is set at the level it needs to be at.

There were no other questions. Chairman Driver then asked Dean Sowers and her team to stand for recognition of their hard work in putting this proposal together.

Dr. High added that while procedures require that the Board approves the proposal before it goes to THEC, Dr. High has received word that once the proposal arrives at THEC, it is expected it will be approved.

The motion to approve the proposal was made by Trustee Murphy and seconded by Trustee Blackburn. The motion carried.

XII. Merger of Two Departments in the College of Veterinary Medicine

Chairman Driver introduced a discussion of the merger of two departments within the College of Veterinary Medicine. In an effort to increase efficiency and effectiveness, the College of Veterinary Medicine is proposing the merger of two academic departments. He then turned the meeting over to Dr. High to present the information.

Dr. High presented the following information:

The state funds that are allocated to the College of Veterinary Medicine have been reduced from 16.7 million dollars to 14.9 million dollars for the upcoming fiscal year. In response, the college leadership reviewed the positions as well as the organizational structure within the college to respond to the loss of revenue and to try to increase efficiency. After months of discussion and meetings with the faculty and staff in the college, the college recommended to merge the department of Pathobiology with the department of Comparative Medicine, resulting in a new department called Biomedical and Diagnostic Services. The merger provides for cost savings because one department head position can be eliminated and it also creates an opportunity because they have taken the various diagnostic labs within the college and merged them into this new department. Once the merger takes place, this will allow the college to seek national accreditation of its diagnostic laboratories. The proposal has the support of the faculty and staff of the College of Veterinary Medicine, the dean, Chancellor Buddy Mitchell and President DiPietro. This merger is presented to the Committee for action. THEC has been advised of the merger, and with Board approval it will be approved by the Higher Education Commission. Dean Jim Thompson of the College of Veterinary Medicine is present to answer any specific questions.
There were no questions raised and Trustee Foy moved to approve. Trustee Blackburn seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

XIII. Revisions to Chapters 4 and 5 of the Faculty Handbook: UT Knoxville

Chairman Driver introduced the next item of business: changes to the UT Knoxville Faculty Handbook and revisions therein regarding non-tenure track faculty appointments. He briefly described the procedures required by Board Policy regarding changes to campus faculty handbooks and called upon Dr. High to provide further explanation.

Dr. High explained that this motion deals with the section in the UT Knoxville Faculty Handbook that addresses how the appointments, promotions, dismissals, etc., of non-tenure track faculty are administered. Concerns were raised by various constituencies who called for clarification of these policies and procedures. The policy covers three general areas: 1) the appointment period of non-tenure track faculty, 2) ways to promote non-tenure track faculty, and 3) termination procedures for non-tenure track faculty. Provost Susan Martin was introduced to present additional information.

Dr. Martin began by thanking the faculty senate for working on these proposals. The changes will allow UT to engage critical members of faculty for more extended periods; that is lecturers, clinical faculty and research faculty. These extended periods can be up to three years for some, and for others up to five years. It allows UT to provide some guarantee of employment to ensure that UT has the best people in place. Also in this proposal, a new title for lecturers has been added in order to provide a career-path for critical teaching faculty. It is essential that UT has high quality teaching faculty for students, and this allows for promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer and distinguished lecturer. The process of promotion, to be implemented in the coming year, will be based on portfolio review and performance.

President Dipietro commented that this is very vital to the university at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. He applauds the faculty senate, Provost Martin and Chancellor Cheek for tackling this project. He added that this helps prevent other universities from stealing away talented people.

Trustee Boulet moved to approve the proposed changes to the UTK Faculty Handbook. Trustee Murphy seconded the motion. The motion carried.

XIV. Diploma to Commemorate 125th Anniversary: UT Chattanooga

Chairman Driver presented the proposed new commemorative diploma for UT Chattanooga. At the meeting of the Executive and Compensation Committee of the Board in January, it was approved to change the signature lines of the diplomas. They now include the signatures of the governor, the campus chancellor, and the graduating student's dean. UTC would like to emboss an emblem on the diploma to commemorate the anniversary year. He then introduced Dr. Phil Oldham, Provost at UT Chattanooga.

Dr. Oldham explained that this is an attempt to celebrate UTC's 125th anniversary. The new diploma would be an important part of the celebration. It would be used over the course of the next three commencement periods: August, December and May at UT Chattanooga. The addition of the emblem is the only change being requested.

Trustee Foy moved to approve the change, which was seconded by Trustee Blackburn. The motion carried.
XV.  Realignment of Recruitment Strategies: UT Martin

Chairman Driver presented the Realignment of Recruitment Strategies for UT Martin. UT Martin is situated in the Northwest corner of the state and faces unique challenges in terms of recruiting students from within 100-150 miles of the campus. Most schools rely heavily on recruiting students within that 100-150 mile radius, but if those students are from another state, the cost of tuition can be prohibitive. Chairman Driver then introduced Chancellor Tom Rakes of UT Martin to present the topic as an information item for the committee.

Chancellor Rakes presented the topic from a heads-up planning approach, noting that the Finance Committee would be the committee to vote once the official proposal has been made. However, the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee might find it interesting from the perspective that UT Martin can no longer continue to do business as it has been. Times have changed and the Complete College Tennessee Act has changed the way the campus operates. Some may refer to this as a business model or a private model, because the approach is new and more aggressive.

Chancellor Rakes went on to provide background information, as follows: Three years ago, UT Martin commissioned a study from a group called Stamats, which was a marketing study where students were interviewed about what they were looking for in a college and how they made their selections. In addition, one year ago, UT Martin surveyed sophomores and juniors with similar information coming forward. Another group called Hanover Research Council also conducted a study comparing out-of-state tuition rates to other schools. Since then this information has been shared with some trustees, alumni groups, and various boards, in order to get as much input as possible, and to see what the reaction is, because this is a different way of looking at how a public institution goes about recruiting.

This model involves undergraduate, not graduate, students and is intended to raise the academic profile of the campus, to protect Tennessee resident students at UT Martin, and will also help in meeting the new requirements of the Complete College Tennessee Act. Based on outcomes, some changes are needed in the way UT Martin recruits students. Chancellor Rakes went on to provide a Powerpoint presentation demonstrating the need for the realignment of UT Martin’s recruitment strategy and what the outcomes would be if the strategy is changed.

Chairman Driver recognized Trustee Schledwitz who commented that he applauds Chancellor Rakes for thinking outside of the box.

Talbott believes that this will be a philosophical discussion for the Board about what advantages a Tennessee resident deserves at The University of Tennessee. He stated that this will be a much larger discussion than trying to resolve the issue at this meeting.

President Dipietro reminded the committee that this topic is presented for information only at this time. Chancellor Rakes agreed with Trustee Talbott and reassured the committee that priority is given to Tennessee residents.

Trustee Stansberry expressed strong concern about taking the limited resources in higher education for the purpose of educating out-of-state students.

Trustee Wharton commented that he was impressed with the presentation. He stated that students who attend school in Tennessee tend to stay in Tennessee and that it would be good for the state to bring in and keep smart people. Additionally, capacity seems to be fixed, so by reducing capacity, programs and people would be cut.
Trustee Stansberry agrees that a case could be made, but it needs to be clear how it is in UT and the state’s economic advantage to do this.

President DiPietro recalled a conversation with Chancellor Rakes regarding regional campuses which are UT Martin’s competitors and how they provide in-state tuition to students from Martin, putting UT Martin at a disadvantage. Chancellor Rakes stated that Arkansas State now has a location ten miles from the Martin campus, offering classes in Union City, and provides competitive tuition to students in the area, meaning that Martin is losing Tennessee residents to out-of-state schools and thus believes that this is why the new model makes economic sense.

Trustee Cates offered his support of Chancellor Rakes’ presentation but believes that this will be a philosophical debate because of the aspiration to raise the academic level at UT. He added that other high achieving state schools, such as North Carolina, etc., all have a reasonably high out-of-state component. He believes that if UT is serious about elevating the academic profile, then this issue must be confronted.

Chancellor Rakes pointed out that three of UT Martin’s peer schools are North Carolina institutions, and they are among the lowest tuition base because North Carolina puts more money into higher education. Chairman Driver thanked Chancellor Rakes for the presentation and encouraged the committee to think over it for later review and possible action. The Powerpoint presentation will be available on Boardbooks for Trustees.

Trustee Schledwitz commented that he believes that the Board needs a robust discussion on this topic. He asked to leave one final thought: Martin has a unique challenge because it has a shrinking population base that is not getting any better.

Chairman Driver echoed Trustee Schledwitz’s comment. The idea of the seven contiguous states is something to be considered in further discussion.

XVI. SACS Updates

Due to time constraints, Chairman Driver announced the removal of this item from the agenda, but the materials have been included in the Board materials and Dr. High will send follow-up information as needed.

XVII. Comprehensive Listing of Academic Programs

Chairman Driver presented this as the next action item on the agenda. Dr. High presented the item, providing background information and information on the procedures pertaining to the Comprehensive List. The entire list is provided in the Board materials. Additionally a summary has been provided at the end of the List so that trustees may easily see program additions and terminations since the count began in 1980. UT has terminated 142 programs and approved 75 in that time. The approval of the Comprehensive Listing is an action item.

Chairman Driver pointed out that the summary was added in response to comments and inquiries made by Trustee Schledwitz, and he noted his appreciation of Trustee Schledwitz’s insight as well as the response of the staff.

Trustee Murphy moved to approve the Comprehensive List. The motion was seconded by Trustee Foy. The motion carried.
Trustee Murphy expressed his appreciation at being able to look at programs that are no longer viable.

XVIII. Authorization to Confer Degrees

Chairman Driver presented the process of the Board granting permission to the president to confer degrees.

Trustee Blackburn moved to approve, and Trustee Murphy seconded. The motion carried.

Chairman Driver noted that there was no further business and thanked everyone for their participation.

Trustee Foy moved to adjourn. Trustee Schledwitz seconded that motion and the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Katherine N. High
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success