



THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION, RESEARCH AND SERVICE COMMITTEE
November 2, 2018
Knoxville, Tennessee

I. Call to Order

Committee Chair Donnie Smith called the meeting to order.

II. Roll Call

Dr. Stacey Patterson, Vice President for Research, Outreach, and Economic Development, called the roll, and the following members were present:

Donnie Smith, Chair
John Compton
Joe DiPietro
Kara Lawson
Bonnie Ownley
Kenneth Packer
Jai Templeton

Dr. Patterson announced the presence of a quorum. Other Trustees, administrative staff, faculty members, students, members of the general public, and representatives of the media were also present.

III. Requests to Address the Board

The Chair recognized Dr. Jon Shefner to speak on "Faculty Perspectives on Governance, Participation in Policy, and System/Campus/Legislature Relations." Dr. Shefner is Professor and Head of the UTK Sociology Department and member of the Faculty Senate, AAUP, and United Campus Workers. Dr. Shefner described the mission of the modern land grant university as to lift up the communities and states where they are located and said the faculty takes this responsibility very seriously and asked the Board to do so. He asked the Trustees to remember two crucial things: first, faculty members are excellent stewards of state resources and safe keepers of its children; and second, the faculty provides expertise to assist the Board in its work. He urged the Trustees to reach out to the faculty to obtain the best available knowledge and counsel about UTK. He also urged



the Trustees to recognize that members of the staff are experts and as much a part of the core mission of the University as the faculty.

The Chair recognized Dr. Anne Langendorfer, a member of the UTK Faculty Senate and United Campus Workers, to speak on "Teaching and Learning Environment at UTK." Dr. Langendorfer said she is a non-tenure-track faculty member and teaches four writing-intensive classes each semester. She said non-tenure-track faculty at UTK are paid less, and are required to teach more. She invited Trustees to shadow her for a day.

The Chair recognized Ezekiel Streetman, a UTK student, to speak on "the Interim President." Mr. Streetman expressed concern that the Board does not take the student body seriously and urged more opportunities for free speech by students. He apologized for his actions and those of others at the meeting where Randy Boyd was appointed interim president, but he urged greater opportunity for students to be heard before decisions are made.

The Chair recognized Kara Gilliam, a UTK student and former Governor of the Tennessee Intercollegiate State Legislature, to speak on the "Effects of Restructuring the Board through the FOCUS Act." She voiced concern about the loss of a voting student trustee and presented a signed petition with 200 student signatures to change the student trustee to be a voting member of the Board.

IV. Education, Research and Service Committee Charter

The Chair called the committee's attention to the proposed charter for the Education, Research and Service Committee Charter. The Chair asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee approve and recommend the committee charter to the Board of Trustees for approval by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Ms. Lawson so moved, and Commissioner Templeton seconded. Hearing no questions or discussion about the proposed charter, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

V. Campus Policies and Procedures Governing Application for Tenure before the Sixth Year of the Probationary Period

Dr. DiPietro explained that in revisions to the Board tenure policy approved in March 2018, each campus was directed to develop policies and procedures to govern a faculty



member's application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period (also referred to as "early tenure"), and consequences associated with a candidate's failure to receive tenure upon early application, and to submit the policies and procedures for approval by the Board no later than the last regular Board meeting in 2018. Upon approval by the Board, the campus policies and procedures are to be published in the faculty handbook.

With the exception of UTK/UTIA, each campus submitted the required policies and procedures for Board approval at this meeting. Dr. DiPietro explained that as a result of miscommunication and misunderstanding within the Provost's office due to leadership transitions, proposed policies and procedures governing early tenure for UTIA/UTK were not submitted to the Faculty Senate for review and therefore have not been submitted for Board approval. He recommended approval of an extension for submission of the required UTIA/UTK policies and procedures until February 15, 2019 for Board consideration at the March 1, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Rhodes asked why there is no uniformity among the campuses on early application for tenure. Dr. DiPietro responded that there are cultural differences between campuses, noting as an example that at the Health Science Center, a faculty member can apply for tenure after only one year, but at the other campuses only after two, three or four years. He also said negotiating early application for tenure in exceptional cases is a key factor in recruiting excellent faculty. Chancellor Schwab added that tenure is essential in running academic programs at a health science center and is more important than compensation packages during recruitment.

Chancellor Angle said campuses need flexibility to recognize previous experience, but he emphasized that the standard for granting tenure is not different because it is granted early.

Chancellor Carver explained that UT Martin is predominantly a teaching institution, and evaluation of teaching is a key factor in the tenure process. He said UT Martin's policies do allow for tenure consideration after one year, but three years is the norm for early tenure applications.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTC policies and procedures governing early tenure and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTC policies and procedures



governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Mr. Compton so moved, and Ms. Lawson seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTHSC policies and procedures governing early tenure and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTHSC policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Ms. Lawson so moved, and Mr. Packer seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

Turning to the President's recommendation that an extension of time be granted for submission of the UTIA/UTK policies and procedures governing early tenure, the Chair asked if a member of the committee would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board approve an extension of time until February 15, 2019 for submission of the UTIA/UTK policies and procedures to govern application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period.

Commissioner Templeton so moved, and Mr. Compton seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTM policies and procedures governing early tenure and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTM policies and procedures governing application for tenure before the sixth year of the probationary period by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Ms. Lawson so moved, and Mr. Compton seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.



VI. Campus Procedures for Enhanced Tenure-Track Review

Dr. DiPietro described a revision to the Board tenure policy, approved in March 2018, requiring an enhanced review of tenure-track faculty members in the third or fourth year of the probationary period. In adopting this policy revision, the Board directed the campuses to develop procedures for the enhanced review – including specification of the required contents of the materials to be reviewed – and submit the procedures to the Board for approval no later than the last regular Board meeting of 2018. Upon approval by the Board, the campus procedures are to be published in the faculty handbook.

With the exception of UTK/UTIA, the campuses have submitted proposed procedures governing enhanced tenure-track review for Board approval at this meeting. Dr. DiPietro explained that as with early tenure policies and procedures, miscommunication and misunderstanding within the Provost's office resulted in a failure to submit enhanced tenure-track review procedures to the Faculty Senate for review therefore have not been submitted for Board approval. He recommended approval of an extension for submission of the required UTIA/UTK procedures until February 15, 2019 for Board consideration at the March 1, 2019 meeting.

Dr. DiPietro explained that an enhanced review around the mid-point of the probationary period gives the faculty member an opportunity to improve in specific areas or provides early notice that the grant of tenure is not a likely outcome, allowing the faculty member to explore other career opportunities.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTC procedures governing enhanced tenure-track review and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTC procedures for enhanced tenure-track review by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Commissioner Templeton so moved, and Mr. Compton seconded. Hearing no questions or a request for discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTHSC procedures governing enhanced tenure-track review and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:



I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTHSC procedures for enhanced tenure-track review by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Mr. Compton so moved, and Ms. Lawson seconded. Hearing no questions or a request for discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

Turning to the President's recommendation that an extension of time be granted for submission of the UTIA/UTK procedures governing enhanced tenure-track review, the Chair asked if a member of the committee would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board approve an extension of time until February 15, 2019 for submission of the UTIA/UTK procedures to govern enhanced tenure-track review.

Professor Ownley so moved, and Commissioner Templeton seconded. Hearing no questions or a request for discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTM procedures governing enhanced tenure-track review and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTM procedures for enhanced tenure-track review by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Ms. Lawson so moved, and Mr. Compton seconded. Hearing no questions or a request for discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. Campus Procedures for Periodic Post-Tenure Review of all Tenured Faculty

Dr. DiPietro provided background and a description of the March 2018 revision of the Board tenure policy requiring all tenured faculty to receive a comprehensive performance review no less often than every six years (sometimes referred to as "post-tenure review"). In adopting the policy revision, the Board directed the President to recommend for Board approval post-tenure review procedures for each campus no later than the last regular



Board meeting in 2018. Upon approval by the Board, the campus procedures are to be published in the faculty handbook.

Dr. DiPietro explained that the system administration developed a template of procedures including all the minimum requirements stated in the revised tenure policy but allowing each campus the flexibility to tailor its post-tenure review procedures to be consistent with existing structures and campus culture.

[Ms. Lawson was excused from the meeting at approximately 9:20 a.m. due to a previously scheduled conflict.]

The Chair recognized the interim Provost for UTC, Dr. George Hynd, to present the proposed UTC post-tenure review procedures. Following the presentation, Mr. Compton asked how faculty at UTC have reacted to the requirement of post-tenure review. Dr. Hynd responded that many are familiar with post-tenure review from their service at other institutions and that for most, it is not an issue. He added, however, that there was concern on the part of some faculty who were tenured some time ago when the emphasis of tenure review was primarily on teaching.

Mr. Rhodes asked Dr. DiPietro to explain the difference between the annual performance review process and post-tenure review. Dr. DiPietro responded that part of the rationale for post-tenure review is a check on the annual review process to ensure it is as rigorous as it needs to be. He said the former Board reviewed annual performance review data showing that very few tenured or tenure-track faculty members receive a rating of "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory."

Mr. Compton asked what rewards would be available if a faculty member receives an outstanding post-tenure review. Dr. DiPietro said the post-tenure review would provide a basis for department heads and deans to consider a salary increase based on merit similar to the increase awarded at the time of promotion from associate to full professor.

Ms. Miles asked how much weight is given to annual performance ratings in the process of considering a candidate for tenure. Dr. DiPietro responded that annual ratings play a key role. Ms. Miles noted that there is concern about the rigor of those reviews and thus about the process of granting tenure in the first place. Dr. DiPietro responded that he believes department heads do a better job of evaluating tenure-track faculty members during their probationary period; the real concern is with performance reviews after tenure is granted. He added that he supports post-tenure review because he believes it will make the institution better. He emphasized his strong support for tenure and the importance of tenure in recruiting the very best talent.



Ms. White asked whether post-tenure review will solve the problem of less-than-rigorous annual performance reviews or whether the annual review process also needs to be addressed. Dr. DiPietro acknowledged that addressing the annual performance review process is important, noted that training of department heads is critical, and said increased training is being offered.

Professor Ownley said that as a faculty member, she is frustrated by faculty members who are not pulling their weight because that means she has to do more. She noted, however, that some department heads are reluctant to deal with an underperforming faculty member because of the potential for the faculty line to be redistributed to another department. She also said faculty members have a negative perception of a "meets expectation" rating, considering it as a grade of "C." She suggested that the committee needs to delve into the annual review process further to determine what factors are at play.

Dr. DiPietro acknowledged Professor Ownley's valid points but responded that if a department head is concerned about losing a faculty line, the head should engage with the dean and negotiate to keep the line. Professor Ownley added that the student-faculty ratio at UT Knoxville is much higher than at peer institutions and puts pressure on the faculty.

Mr. Rhodes said the very high percentage of faculty who receive a rating of "exceeds expectations" or "far exceeds expectations" is difficult to understand and questioned whether the expectations need to be recalibrated or whether different nomenclature should be used.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTC post-tenure review procedures and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTC procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Mr. Compton so moved, and Commissioner Templeton seconded.

The Chair called for any questions or discussion about the UTC procedures. Mr. Compton asked Chancellor Angle if the post-tenure review procedures will put the campus at any advantage or disadvantage in recruiting. Chancellor Angle responded that they would not, adding that post-tenure review is standard practice at a number of



institutions, including those where he has served previously. He also said the potential to reward outstanding faculty members could have a positive impact.

Ms. Woodson asked the Chancellors to address whether there is any link between post-tenure review and improvement in student success. Chancellor Angle responded that annual student evaluation of faculty teaching is a part of the annual review process. He added that ensuring the course content has the appropriate outcomes is managed separately from the individual faculty performance review. Chancellor Davis concurred that student teaching evaluations are an important part of the annual review process and thus the post-tenure review process. Chancellor Carver said student teaching evaluations help to identify areas where there may be an issue impacting student success.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair recognized Dr. Lori Gonzalez, UTHSC Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Student Affairs, to present the UTHSC post-tenure review procedures. Concerning annual performance reviews, Dr. Gonzalez noted that the UTHSC post-tenure review procedures require the review committee to make a formal judgment on the quality of the annual performance reviews, and her office would intervene with the department chair as necessary.

Upon the Chair's call for any questions or discussion about the UTHSC procedures, Mr. Packer noted that the average rating assigned by reviewers will likely differ from one division to another and asked whether ratings are calibrated across divisions. Dr. Gonzalez responded that ratings have not been calibrated but that the review committee's judgment on the quality of annual reviews will provide an opportunity to address that subject.

Mr. Rhodes applauded the fact the post-tenure review process at UTHSC will look at the quality of annual reviews and suggested other campuses should consider doing the same. Vice President Martin explained that the template procedures provided to all the campuses requires looking at the quality of the annual reviews and addressing situations in which the annual reviews are not consistent with the post-tenure review.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTHSC procedures for post-tenure review and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTHSC procedures for periodic



post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Mr. Compton so moved, and Mr. Packer seconded. Hearing no further questions or discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair recognized Chancellor Tim Cross to present the UTIA post-tenure review procedures. Following the presentation, Mr. Compton asked how the UTIA faculty have reacted to the requirement of post-tenure review. Chancellor Cross responded that although some may feel it will take time away from their core mission activities, most feel good about the opportunity to have their cumulative six-year performance reviewed. Mr. Compton followed up by asking whether the UTIA faculty voted on the post-tenure review procedures, and Chancellor Cross explained that the procedures were voted on by the Faculty Senate, which includes representatives of the UTIA faculty.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTIA procedures for post-tenure review and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTIA procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Commissioner Templeton so moved, and Mr. Compton seconded. Hearing no further questions or discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair recognized Dr. David Manderscheid, UTK Provost, to present the UTK post-tenure review procedures. Following the presentation, Mr. Compton asked whether approximately 100 faculty members would be undergoing post-tenure review every year. Dr. Manderscheid responded that because faculty who are retiring or who have gone through a promotion review will be exempt, his best estimate is that 60-75 post-tenure reviews would occur in a given year. Mr. Compton added that he understood that the Provost would bear the bulk of the administrative burden, and Dr. Manderscheid agreed but added that he would be working closely with Vice Provost John Zomchick on the reviews. He said that although the numbers are a little daunting, he is prepared to take it on and believes centralizing the responsibility in the Provost's office is important to achieving uniformity and being able to make comparisons across colleges.

Chancellor Cross explained that UTIA and UTK shared their respective procedures to ensure they were as similar as possible and noted that there are far more similarities than



differences in the two sets of procedures. Dr. Manderscheid added that the input of the Faculty Senate significantly improved the procedures, making this an example of how shared governance should work.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTK procedures for post-tenure review and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTK procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Mr. Compton so moved, and Commissioner Templeton seconded. Hearing no further questions or discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair recognized Dr. Philip Cavalier, UTM Provost, to present the UTM post-tenure review procedures. Following the presentation, Mr. Compton ask why, given the much smaller number of faculty at UTM, responsibility for the post-tenure review response lies with the dean and why the dean appoints the review committee. Dr. Cavalier responded that the dean is responsible for managing the logistics of the review but the results will roll up to the Provost. When Mr. Rhodes asked whether the Provost can overrule the dean, Dr. Cavalier said the Provost can go to the department head and dean and say he disagrees with their conclusion but that he must have very clear reasons for doing so. Mr. Rhodes asked whether an appeal of the Provost's conclusion at UTK would be to the Chancellor, and if so, whether that would work at UTM. Dr. Chancellor Carver said ultimately an appeal to the Chancellor is available at UTM. Mr. Rhodes reiterated that he is not clear on why responsibility for post-tenure review would not be with the Provost at UTM, like at UTK. Dr. Cavalier responded that the Chancellor and the Faculty Senate thought this was the best way to proceed at UTM. He added that he feels the chief academic officer should be the last stop on this matter of academic judgment but that issues of process could be appealed to the Chancellor. Vice President Martin clarified, however, that the template procedures the President provided to the campuses require the Chancellor to indicate concurrence or non-concurrence with the post-tenure review determination, whether it is made by the dean or by the chief academic officer.

Mr. Compton asked whether changing the UTM procedures to place responsibility for post-tenure review with the Provost would require a re-vote by the Faculty Senate, and Dr. Cavalier said it would. Vice President Martin explained that the option of placing responsibility for the post-tenure review process with the deans was included in the



template the President provided to the campuses. Dr. DiPietro added that the UTC procedures also place responsibility for post-tenure review with the dean.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the proposed UTM procedures for post-tenure review and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the UTM procedures for periodic post-tenure review of all tenured faculty by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Commissioner Templeton so moved, and Professor Ownley seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

Dr. DiPietro recommended that at some point in the future—perhaps after three or four years—the committee should request a report from the campuses on how the post-tenure review process is working and how it might be improved. He added that the committee eventually needs to tackle the faculty workload report and the University's business intelligence capability to provide data necessary to assess faculty productivity.

The Chair responded that he agrees wholeheartedly with the need to review the post-tenure review process at some point in the future and hopes the result will be a conclusion that the annual review process has improved sufficiently that post-tenure review is no longer needed. He also concurred in the need to have adequate and accurate data to assess faculty productivity.

VIII. Tenure upon Initial Appointment for Three UTHSC Faculty Members

Dr. DiPietro presented his recommendation that the Board grant tenure to three UT Health Science Center faculty members upon initial appointment. Under the tenure policy revisions adopted by the Board in March 2018, only the Board can grant tenure to a faculty member upon initial appointment without serving a probationary period at a University campus. The tenure policy includes the following additional requirements for granting tenure upon initial appointment: (1) the candidate must have been tenured at the institution from which he or she was recruited; or other exceptional circumstances warrant the grant of tenure upon initial appointment; (2) documentation that the candidate could not have been successfully recruited to UT without being considered for tenure upon initial appointment; and (3) documentation of compliance with the minimum tenure review and recommendation procedures required by the Board tenure policy and any further requirements established by the campus. Chancellor Schwab



recommended to the President that tenure upon initial appointment be granted to the following faculty members:

A. Paul Hauptman, M.D.

On October 1, 2018, Paul Hauptman, M.D., began employment with the UT Health Science Center as Dean of the Graduate School of Medicine at the UT Medical Center in Knoxville, with a concurrent faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine (within the College of Medicine). Dr. Hauptman was recruited from the Saint Louis University School of Medicine, where he was a tenured Professor in the Department of Internal Medicine and Assistant Dean for Clinical and Translational Research.

The President confirmed that Dr. Hauptman satisfies all requirements for tenure upon initial appointment, including (1) that he could not have been successfully recruited from his faculty appointment, with tenure, as Professor of Internal Medicine in the Saint Louis University School of Medicine without being considered for tenure upon initial appointment at UTHSC; and (2) that all required tenure review and recommendation procedures were followed by the campus.

B. John Lynn Jefferies, M.D.

John Lynn Jefferies, M.D., was named Co-Director of the newly formed UT Methodist Institute for Cardiovascular Science and Chief of the Division of Cardiovascular Diseases, effective July 1, 2018, with a concurrent faculty appointment as Professor in the Department of Medicine, within the College of Medicine. Dr. Jefferies was recruited from the University of Cincinnati, where he was Professor of Adult Cardiovascular Disease and Pediatric Cardiology, an untenured appointment, and also Director of the Advanced Heart Failure and Cardiomyopathy Services in the Heart Institute at Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center.

Dr. Jefferies did not hold tenure in his faculty appointment at the University of Cincinnati, and therefore Chancellor Schwab articulated another exceptional circumstance warranting the grant of tenure upon initial appointment. The primary focus of Dr. Jefferies' recruitment was to serve as Director of the newly formed UT Methodist Institute for Cardiovascular Science, a position requiring status as a world-famous clinician. As Director of the Institute, Dr. Jefferies is not only responsible for leading current faculty members who have tenure, but also for recruiting exceptional faculty members who are tenured at another institution and for recruiting and making tenure recommendations with respect to tenure-track faculty. For this reason, it is essential that the Director of the Institute hold a tenured faculty appointment. Further, Dr. Jefferies' academic credentials unquestionably meet, and even exceed, the criteria for



tenure at UTHSC. The President confirmed that all required tenure review and recommendation procedures were followed by the campus.

C. Scott Strome, M.D.

On October 1, 2018, Scott Strome, M.D., began employment with the UT Health Science Center as Executive Dean of the College of Medicine, with a concurrent faculty appointment in the Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery. Dr. Strome was recruited from the University of Maryland, where he was a tenured Professor and Chair of the Department of Otorhinolaryngology in the School of Medicine.

The President has confirmed that Dr. Strome satisfies all requirements for tenure upon initial appointment, including (1) that he could not have been successfully recruited from his faculty appointment as Professor, with tenure, in the Department of Otorhinolaryngology in the School of Medicine at the University of Maryland; and (2) that all required tenure review and recommendation procedures were followed by the campus.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the grant of tenure to Paul Hauptman, M.D. and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend to the Board that tenure be granted to Paul Hauptman, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the UTHSC College of Medicine by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Mr. Compton so moved, and Mr. Packer seconded. Hearing no questions or a request for discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the grant of tenure to John Lynn Jefferies, M.D. and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend to the Board that tenure be granted to John Lynn Jefferies, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the UTHSC College of Medicine by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Mr. Compton so moved, and Mr. Packer seconded. Hearing no questions or a request for discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.



The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Resolution in the meeting materials concerning the grant of tenure to Scott Strome, M.D. and asked if a committee member would make the following prepared motion:

I move that the Education, Research, and Service Committee recommend to the Board that tenure be granted to Scott Strome, M.D., in his faculty appointment in the Department of Medicine within the UTHSC College of Medicine by adoption of the Resolution presented in the meeting materials.

Mr. Compton so moved, and Mr. Packer seconded. Hearing no questions or a request for discussion, the Chair called for a voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.

IX. Overview of UT-Battelle, LLC (Oak Ridge National Laboratory)

The Chair recognized Dr. Stacey Patterson, UT Vice President for Research, Outreach, and Economic Development to introduce Dr. Thomas Zacharia, Director at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, who presented an overview of UT-Battelle, LLC and the importance of the UT-Battelle relationship to both ORNL and the University. UT-Battelle holds the U.S. Department of Energy contract for management of ORNL. Celebrating its 75th anniversary this year, ORNL strives to be a premiere research institution. Its mission is to deliver scientific discoveries and technical breakthroughs needed to realize solutions in energy and national security and provide economic benefit to the nation. The annual budget for UT-Battelle in 2000, when the contract was first awarded, was \$600 million, and it has grown to the current budget of \$1.4 billion. ORNL has approximately 4,000 employees and hosts over 3,200 research guests annually. There are over 200 joint appointments between UT and ORNL and four joint institutes. ORNL's partnership with UT is a major asset, building strength in strategic research areas, attracting world-class staff and students in key fields, and leveraging resources to serve shared goals. The current contract for management of ORNL expires in April 2020, and a decision by the Department of Energy regarding an extension of the contract is expected in the next three to four months.

X. Overview of the University's Service Mission

The Chair announced that due to time constraints, the overview of the University's service mission would be deferred to the next regular meeting of the committee.



XI. Overview of the Institute for Public Service

The Chair announced that due to time constraints, the overview of the Institute for Public Service would be deferred to the next regular meeting of the committee.

XII. Report on Enrollment and Other Indicators

The Chair directed the committee's attention to the Report on Enrollment and Other Indicators in the meeting materials, noting the following key items:

- Total enrollment over all UT campuses has exceeded 50,000 students (at 50,810). This represents an increase in undergraduate enrollment across all campuses as well as an increase in graduate enrollment at UTK and UTHSC.
- Undergraduate application numbers have increased at all UT campuses, as have average entering ACT scores. The yield rate (percentage of students accepted who actually enroll), however, has declined at all UT campuses.
- Although UTM showed a decline in the six-year graduation rate from 2017 to 2018, all other UT campuses showed an increase. The system-wide six-year graduation rate is now 61.1% (up from 59.6% for 2017).
- UT has surpassed its State Master Plan Goal in baccalaureate degrees awarded with 8,103 undergraduate degrees awarded for 2018.

The Chair suggested that committee members review these important metrics because they capture trends, highlight favorable changes, and serve to identify opportunities for improvement.

XIII. Other Business

No other business was brought to the Chair's attention prior to the meeting, and therefore the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Tim L. Cross".

Tim L. Cross
Chancellor, UT Institute of Agriculture