

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

**October 21, 2010
Knoxville, Tennessee**

The Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Tennessee met at 2:45 pm EDT, Thursday, October 21, 2010, in the Shiloh Room of the University Center 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 2:45 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Chairman Driver asked Dr. Katherine High, UT Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success, to call the roll.

II. Roll Call

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

Mr. Spruell Driver
Ms. Anne Holt Blackburn
Mr. John Foy
Dr. Karen Johnson
Mr. James Murphy
Mr. Karl Scheldwitz
Ms. Betty Ann Tanner
Mr. Sumeet Vaikunth

The following non-voting members were also present:

Dr. Toby Boulet
Mr. Andrew Clark
Ms. Joan Heminway
Mr. Tommy Jervis
Mr. Sammie Linton
Mr. Andrew Morse
Mr. Richard Nollan
President Jan Simek
Ms. Carey Smith
Dr. Janet Wilbert

III. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting

The Chair called for any corrections or additions to the minutes of the June 24, 2010, meeting. There were none. Mr. Driver asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Trustee Tanner moved the minutes be approved and Trustee Foy seconded the motion. No discussion took place. The motion carried.

IV. Opening Remarks by Committee Chair

Chairman Driver reminded attendees that while this meeting is open, it is a meeting with an agenda and that he will only recognize members of the Committee, other Trustees, members of UT's senior staff, and those who are presenting agenda items at today's meeting. No other business will be conducted other than items listed on the previously distributed materials.

Chairman Driver briefly previewed information on the Complete College Tennessee Act as well as the items on today's agenda.

V. Approval of Program of Study Leading to the Degree of Ph.D. in Energy Science and Engineering (UT Knoxville)

Chairman Driver stated that the CCTA called for the establishment of a joint program between UT Knoxville and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Dr. High introduced the approval of this joint program of study leading to the degree of Ph.D. in Energy Science and Engineering. The unique joint program leverages energy-related capabilities at both institutions. Most of the graduate students in the ESE program will perform research for their dissertations at ORNL in groups that are focused on the energy challenges of our time. Approximately 25 percent of the ESE students will work in research groups on the campus of UT Knoxville. The ESE program has six tracks and the majority of the courses already exist in various UTK departments.

It is expected that between 20 and 40 new students will be enrolled in the program each year. Faculty will be from ORNL as well as from UT Knoxville. No new faculty lines have been proposed. The partnership between UTK and ORNL currently provides the resources necessary to start the program.

Administratively, the ESE program will reside in the Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Graduate Education (CIRE). This center, which was approved by UT Knoxville and President Simek, will be headed by Dr. Lee Riedinger, who is here to provide additional information.

The proposal has gone through all campus level approvals and will also go through a site visit in the first week of November. Dr. Marilyn Brown, professor in the School of Public Policy at the Georgia Institute of Technology, and Dr. Phillip Parish, Associate Vice President for Research at the University of Virginia, will conduct the site visit. Subject to the completion of this site visit and Board approval of this program, the program will be placed on THEC's November agenda for approval.

Dr. High introduced UTK Chancellor Cheek for additional information and comments.

Dr. Cheek commented on the speed with which this program has been established and the quality program that has resulted. A task force was formed to establish the proposal for the Ph.D. and to establish the CIRE, which will house the Ph.D. program and faculty. Both of these things have come to fruition and the institutions have begun advertising this program contingent on Board and THEC approval. There are already 30 applicants. Dr. Cheek stated that this program is truly unique. The task force has sought out advice and counsel from many institutions and the result is a unique collaboration between ORNL and UT Knoxville. This program increases the number of graduate students as well as enhances enrollment in the STEM fields on campus. Thom Mason and UT Battelle Board fully support the creation of this program.

Dr. Cheek introduced Jim Roberto, a physicist at ORNL, who holds a new senior management position to strengthen partnerships with the University and STEM education. Dr. Roberto stated that this partnership will help graduate the next generation of leaders in Energy Science and Engineering. ORNL will gain access to excellent students and will be able to invigorate the ORNL campus with students. The university gets the ability to have more STEM students and to expand their research opportunities. DOE benefits from increased production of Ph.D. students in Energy Science and Engineering. The program has been designed to be both innovative and rigorous and responsive to national needs. To our knowledge, this is the first program of this nature.

Dr. Lee Riedinger provided more information on the program as well as information on the evolution of the relationship between UT and ORNL. This collaborative Ph.D. program has passed all of the campus hurdles. Three-fourths of the students will work at ORNL and will be compensated with a good stipend of \$28,000 a year. The curriculum will be different from that in the chemistry or physics department. There will be a core curriculum and six tracks. ORNL and UTK will also partner with recruiting efforts and prospective students will interview in March.

Trustee Schledwitz noted that he has served on the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee for five years and that this program seems to be one of the more exciting new initiatives that has been presented.

Dr. Cheek recognized Dr. Carolyn Hodges, Dean of the Graduate School, for her work on the task force and in keeping the group on a strict timeline.

Trustee Murphy commented that we owe Dr. Cheek and Dr. Thom Mason a great debt of gratitude for this program, which would not have come to fruition without their diligent work to put this proposal together. Part of Top 25 initiative is growing graduate students and the CCTA legislation also addressed this. This type of program proposal would normally take a couple of years to develop.

Chairman Driver asked for a motion to approve the proposal for a program of study leading to the degree of Ph.D. in Energy Science and Engineering. Trustee Murphy made the motion, which was seconded by Trustee Johnson. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Approval of Additional Signatures on University of Tennessee Diplomas

Item VI. was withdrawn.

VII. Approval of Centennial Diploma for UTHSC

Chairman Driver introduced this item and Dr. High provided an overview of the proposal to enhance for 2011 the UT Health Science Center diploma. The Health Science Center is celebrating its centennial in 2011 and wishes to award degrees with a diploma signifying this special event. The diploma would have the same wording and signatures as usual, but, for 2011, the UTHSC diploma would feature a banner across the top announcing its centennial.

A motion to approve the Centennial Diploma for UTHSC was made by Trustee Foy and seconded by Trustee Johnson.

Trustee Gallimore asked if there will there be any changes in the wording on the diploma. Chairman Driver stated that there would be no changes in the wording, just this one enhancement for the UTHSC Centennial.

Trustee Murphy stated that there was a proposal to change the wording on the diplomas, but that proposal was withdrawn.

Trustee Tanner asked if the example shown was the exact banner that would be used or if the committee would just be approving the wording of the banner. Dr. High stated that the banner on the example shown indicates the precise wording that will be used, but that the banner on the diploma itself will have a gold leaf.

After this discussion, Trustee Driver called for a vote and the motion carried.

Trustee Schledwitz explained why the proposal to change the diploma was withdrawn. The issue deals with who should sign the diploma for each campus. Dr. High suggested that we look at this more thoroughly and come back with a proposal at a future meeting.

VIII. Report on Academic Program Approvals and Terminations

Chairman Driver introduced the report on Academic Program Approvals and Terminations and asked Dr. High to present this report. Dr. High discussed the academic program inventory that was distributed in the June Board materials. The summary report that is presented today was inadvertently left out of the June Board materials.

Dr. High explained that every new degree program is approved by this board and THEC prior to implementation. Until recently, academic terminations were decided at the campus level and reported to the Board at the end of the academic year. Sometimes accreditation issues required that a masters program become a doctoral program, resulting in the termination of a masters program and the simultaneous establishment of a doctoral program in the same discipline. Physical therapy at UTC is an example of this: in 2002, we terminated the masters in physical therapy and in the same year we approved a doctor of physical therapy.

Dr. High further explained that sometimes a program may be terminated because of under-subscription. As a matter of efficiency, if a program did not enroll a robust number of students, we terminated it. The faculty in that program determined there was no longer a need for it. In 1992, we terminated a masters program at UTM in Educational Psychology and Guidance because of under-subscription. Two years later, the need increased, so the program was reactivated. The programs are constantly monitored. In 1996, the Ph.D. in Industrial Organization Management was terminated because the discipline changed. In these instances, neither students nor faculty are adversely affected.

Since 2008, as the University began to prepare for severe budget reductions, all program terminations that had any impact on students or faculty were brought to this board for approval. The audiology program is an example of that. In 2008, both the Au.D. in Audiology and the Ph.D. in Speech and Hearing were terminated in UTK. But simultaneously, both of those programs were approved at UTHSC.

The document before you serves as our internal database, which the campuses update each spring. THEC also has a database of all academic programs offered on our campuses. We work throughout the year to keep these databases accurate.

Since 1981, when we first started maintaining this document, 139 programs have been terminated; 78 have been approved. We do monitor for redundancy, effectiveness, and efficiency in academic programs.

Chairman Driver stated that this report is in response to a question raised by Trustee Schledwitz at the June meeting.

Trustee Loughry asked for clarification relative to how we handle program consolidation. How do we track those types of changes? Dr. High explained that individual programs are tracked through the Academic Program Inventory and CIP codes. This document in front of you gets a little fuzzy if a program is changed but not terminated. We're trying to establish a more thorough database to keep track of those very changes.

Trustee Loughry commented that this report helps prove to stakeholders that we are good stewards of the academic programs and resources.

President Simek noted that the report is a historical document but it does show that we are mindful of what programs the University needs or needs to cutback. The implementation of the Banner System and other developments will allow us to give you a more dynamic view of this process.

Chairman Driver commented that in reviewing the table, there are several STEM majors that have been terminated. He asked if we are getting out of STEM majors. President Simek answered that those changes probably reflect when a discipline is collapsed with another one and how the industry changes. Those changes may reflect an evolution of the disciplines. Dr. Boulet affirmed President Simek's statement with an example of a change in the degree designation for Mechanical Engineering from M.E. to M.S.

Joan Heminway, President of the UTK Faculty Senate, asked if there are other drivers for program terminations (other than low producing program reports).

Dr. High stated that THEC does not have the authority to terminate programs, but they can get our attention. In addition, this Board does not usually recommend terminating a program. When a program is approved, we are required to meet enrollment projections, and THEC monitors this process. Another driver is the program review that occurs on campus. UTK has a 10 year program review cycle involving an external reviewer. There is an internal mid-cycle too review as well.

IX. Status Report on Universal Transfer Paths in Compliance with the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010

Chairman Driver explained that one of the requirements of the Complete College Tennessee Act was a mandate to develop universal transfer paths for all two- and four-year public institutions in the state. Chairman Driver asked Dr. High to provide this report.

Dr. High reported that the UT and TBR institutions are working on completing 38 transfer paths

by the end of the academic year. At this point, 11 transfer paths are finished with plans to finish the remaining ones. The establishment of these pathways is a big achievement and has been accomplished in a very collaborative way. Dr. High provided an overview of the Biology transfer pathway. If a student takes the courses outlined in the transfer paths and graduates with an Associate's degree from any community college, he or she will be admitted to any four-year institution at the junior level. The only exception to that, which was specified in the legislation, is UT Knoxville, which will maintain its selective admissions. You can see that if a student intends to transfer to UTK, he or she must take even more specific math and science courses.

These transfer paths are very clear and will be posted on all institution websites and distributed to all academic advisors.

Trustee Murphy asked if community colleges will offer the classes that are specific to the UT Knoxville requirements. Dr. High explained that in most cases, the community colleges will offer these courses, but there are a few community colleges that are very small and don't have the required course offerings. Those community colleges will have to tell their students that they cannot take all of the required courses at their institution.

Chairman Driver asked if there is a way to provide these courses through distance education and get them into the community colleges. Dr. High stated that the Board of Regents have a strong online program but she would need to explore those offerings further. Trustee Loughry asked if an individual could be a student at Motlow Community College but take specific online courses through Middle Tennessee State University. President Simek responded that yes, this kind of collaboration and access is part of the CCTA.

Trustee Blackburn asked if there is any priority given to students already at UTK to take certain hard to schedule courses over the students who would be transferring in with an Associate's degree. President Simek stated that if a student applies to UTK with an AA degree and has done general education and pre-major coursework at their home institution, the student will go directly into upper division courses just like a native student.

Trustee Murphy noted that, previously, students were getting an AA degree and then still needed additional hours to get even sophomore status at a four year institution. This won't happen now with these transfer paths; the students will be ready to enter at junior status.

President Simek stated that faculty have had these discussions about what students need to complete the AA degree and be ready for Junior status. The next level of this discussion will focus on the quality of courses at the community colleges and how students will do at a four year institution compared to a community college.

Dr. High introduced Dr. Toby Boulet, a member of the Board of Trustees, who has served on one of these transfer task forces.

Dr. Boulet stated that the purpose of the transfer paths is to provide a consensus curriculum so that students with an AA degree can then complete a four-year degree at any public institution. Dr. Boulet represented UTK in the Mechanical Engineering transfer path meeting. All Mechanical Engineering programs are accredited by ABET so the curricula has the same pieces, but each institution packages things differently. The Mechanical Engineering group crafted a pre-major with 24 hours, not 18, so that the community college student will have to take 66 hours before he/she can transfer to a four-year college at junior standing. The student

would then have 62 hours remaining for a four-year degree in Mechanical Engineering. The transfer meeting was completed in less than 2 hours. Discussion was civilized and cordial. The outcome is that students now know what they need to do. It was an effective process. Community colleges now face having to deliver these courses or encourage students to go elsewhere to get the classes they need.

Dr. High introduced Phil Oldham, who has been coordinating these efforts for the UT System this fall.

Dr. Oldham stated that Dr. Boulet captured the process very well. The spirit and attitude from the faculty has been exceptional. There have been some discipline specific issues, but overall it has been a smooth process. The real benefit is the truth in advertising component for students. Students will know what the requirements are from their first day. Another great benefit is that faculty across two systems get together to talk about how they do things on their campuses. We will need to develop a process to keep these dialogues open because the transfer paths will need to be revisited on a regular basis. We have completed 8 of 14 transfer paths on the schedule for the fall. Music wasn't able to be resolved because of the heavy performance aspect and diversity among programs. We may face a similar problem with art, but the overall goal is to have all transfer paths completed by the end of the year.

Trustee Hall asked if there was a process in place to keep these paths updated. Dr. Oldham answered that there is not yet, but that putting a process in place will be the next step. President Simek stated that we now have a model of how to do these transfer paths and that we will need to monitor how it works for a little bit longer. Once we understand nuances, we can institute a process with TBR to annually review the transfer paths. This process has been smoother than anyone thought it would.

Dr. Wilbert asked where allied health will fall. Dr. Oldham stated that there is a pre-professional category but that most of those disciplines will be addressed next spring. Dr. High further explained that the majors have been addressed in order of transfer activity.

Dr. Wilbert also noted the use of four digit course numbering on the transfer paths. Are we moving to using four-digit course numbering? Dr. High explained that those are the community college course numbers since those courses will be taken at community colleges. Dr. Oldham noted that TBR has common course numbering for their general education courses.

X. Overview of Accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Chairman Driver stated that last winter at the Board meeting in Martin, the committee heard a presentation on SACS accreditation by Dr. Bonnie Yegidis. In addition, Betty Ann Tanner has been attending some of the SACS meetings at UTM. Chairman Driver asked Trustee Tanner to share her experience at the UTM meetings.

Trustee Tanner provided an overview of her experience in working with the UTM SACS accreditation group. The accreditation process is a 10 year cycle. Dr. High added that an institution is accredited in year one and the mid cycle review occurs at year five. Institutions start a year in advance to compile information for each of the reviews. Trustee Tanner stated that the accreditation process works to maintain the credibility and integrity of the campus. This is an arduous task that requires a great deal of time, data, and review. Trustee Tanner stated that it has been informative to see how the process works for our institutions.

Dr. High introduced Dr. Mary Albrecht, who presented information on why we have accreditation, who does it, the philosophy behind it and the process involved. Dr. Albrecht explained that accreditation is necessary for institutions to receive and distribute financial aid and maintain the level of quality and respect that other regionally accredited institutions maintain. Accreditation is grounded in certain values:

- that higher education institutions have primary responsibility for academic quality
- that institutional mission is central to all judgments of academic quality
- that institutional autonomy is essential to sustaining and enhancing academic quality
- that our higher education enterprise thrives on decentralization and diversity of institutional purpose and mission
- that academic freedom flourishes only in an environment of academic leadership of institutions

Accreditation is about quality assurance and continuous improvement: it is based on continuous assessment, planning, and implementation. The 10-year cycle of accreditation involves:

- Year one:
 - Full compliance certification document per SACS guidelines
 - Off site review
 - On site review
 - Response to negative findings
- Year 5:
 - Prepare mini compliance certification document per SACS guidelines
 - Off site peer review
- Year 10
 - Full compliance certification document per SACS guidelines
 - Off site review
 - On site review
 - Response to negative findings

SACS is known as being the toughest regional accrediting body.

Dr. Albrecht reviewed the accreditation for the UT campuses – UTC, UTM, and Big Orange U (UTK, UTHSC, UTIA, UTSI, UTIPS). The next reaffirmation for each campus is: UTC – 2011, Big Orange – 2015, and UTM – 2013.

The Compliance Certificate document required for reaffirmation is a self study that involves addressing 12 core requirements, 14 comprehensive standards, and 7 federal requirements.

Trustee Loughry asked for clarification on why we instituted Big Orange. Dr. High stated that former President Wade Gilley was charged with how we could restructure to get into the Top 25. He thought counting UTHSC and UTK together would position us better. This structure was difficult to get this through SACS. President Simek stated that he thinks this is one of the places where Wade Gilley was correct. This combination does make a difference with our reputation and how we account ourselves.

Dr. High stated that at the last Board meeting, we discussed the need for a Trustees committee for accreditation. She suggested instead of an additional trustee committee that trustees take part in SACS accreditation by:

- Reviewing key elements of the self-study document
- Reviewing the visiting team's report
- Reviewing the institutional response to the report

These documents will be posted on AASS website for trustees to review and comment on. Significant findings will be brought to the attention of the Academic Affairs and Student Success Committee.

Trustee Murphy stated that Trustees need to know where we are in the accreditation process and suggested that a regular report through this committee will be sufficient.

Dr. Oldham stated that one aspect of accreditation that hasn't been mentioned is the Quality Enhancement Plan. There is an expectation from SACS that the BOT has some awareness and endorsement of QEP. This is something to consider.

Dr. Albrecht provided an overview of the Quality Enhancement Plan and discussed UTK's Ready for the World initiative. The QEP asks how you make your institution better, how you transform your institution. Dr. High referenced the passports on the tables today and explained that the passports are part of UTK's QEP – Ready for the World. More information on these initiatives will be made available to the Trustees.

Trustee Hall asked if there is a standard requirement by SREB for Board involvement.

Dr. Albrecht answered that there is no standard requirement for BOT involvement.

Trustee Loughry stated that the Association of Governing Boards is looking at board involvement in accreditation because of the stewardship charge of governing boards.

Dr. High stated that we need to do a better job of explaining SACS and other accrediting bodies for programs and disciplines. Trustee Murphy stated it might be helpful to have a presentation on these other types of accreditation. Dr. High stated that this information will be part of the new formula funding.

There was discussion on the difference between SACS accreditation and discipline specific accreditation. There are dozens of accrediting bodies that review specific programs. SACS accredits institutions, not specific programs.

President Simek stated that one of the challenges we will face in the next few years will be proprietary schools that come to the legislature saying they are accredited and should have the same rights and privileges for transferability. They will do this so that they gain access to lottery funds. Trustee Blackburn asked if we are positioning ourselves to be able to handle that challenge. President Simek stated that yes, as best we can, we are preparing for the challenge but that it will be a substantial political move. We will have support in fighting this initiative with TBR and the private institutions in the state.

XI. Other Business

Catherine Mizell announced the time change for the reception at the Baker Center.

Trustee Driver expressed thanks to Katie High for keeping this committee on track and for leading the staff efforts for the presidential search. She has done an outstanding job.

XII. Adjournment

Chairman Driver adjourned the meeting at 4.45 pm EDT.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine High
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and
Student Success