

**Commission for Women
Minutes
Thursday, March 5, 2009**

Attendance:

Pam Hindle (chair), Kathryn Ellis, George Hoemann, Maxine Thompson Davis, Alan Chesney, Denise Harvey, John Nolt, Joy DeSensi, Rose Parker, Jillian Keally, Nancy Howell, Tammi Brown, Jenny Richter, Margie Nichols, Kerri Lovegrove, Laura Stansell, Cheryl Travis, Mary Papke, Joy DeSensi, Jimmy Cheek

Pam Hindle called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m. The agenda was as follows:

- I. February Minutes**
- II. Report from the Faculty Senate – John Nolt**
- III. UT Notable Woman Committee – Denise Harvey**
- IV. Interim Vice Chancellor Margie Nichols**
- V. New Book by Margaret Sallee**
- VI. Chancellor Cheek**
- VII. Old Business/New Business**

The attendees briefly introduced themselves because there were a few new members.

- I. February Minutes** – The February minutes were presented for consideration. Deb Haines moved to approve the minutes and George Hoemann seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. Report from the Faculty Senate (John Nolt) –

John Nolt began his report saying that very little had changed since our last meeting. He said that the Faculty Senate had not learned much at the Board of Trustees' meeting and that the numbers he presented at our last meeting regarding budget cuts and position losses are still the operative numbers.

Nolt announced that the faculty gender study for this year will be abbreviated because the office responsible for it is swamped. The office has told him that nothing has really changed (no one has gotten raises, etc.).

Nolt reported that when the procedure for program terminations went before the Board of Trustees last week, it had a feature in it that no one had seen prior to that time. He said that programs are defined in terms of CIP codes – code that goes sub-departmental. Nolt's understanding of this was that you could close a portion of a department with a particular specialty – not necessarily a minor or anything "defined." Nolt is very disturbed by this. The way the language now reads, Nolt said, you can eliminate "units" that are not evaluated as such.

Nolt believes that this type of program closure could be used to target narrowly a certain group of faculty, or even an individual faculty member.

Chancellor Jimmy Cheek said he thought that Toby [last name?] was at the meeting representing the Faculty Senate and that there was an amendment made about CIPs. Nolt said that the amendment was essentially toothless. Cheek did not think the amendment had anything about a CIP code – Nolt thought that was in the amendment. Margie Nichols thinks Cheek is correct. Cheek thought “they” were satisfied when that change was made – Nolt said Toby was not satisfied and the faculty representation was not satisfied. Mary Papke thinks the Faculty Senate should promote each department finding out what the CIP codes are for that department. Cheek said they are a classification for what that department is – he thinks that most departments choose what code they are in. Cheek did not think there are sub-CIP codes – Nolt and Papke said there are, that there are subcodes of the CIP codes. Nolt thinks the way the document reads is that anything that has that CIP code or subcode could be evaluated. Cheek thought it was for the department, not the subcodes. Nolt said that is the way it should be, but that is not the way the language reads. Nolt said that the concern is that this is a way to target “subparts” of departments. Cheek and Nolt agree that there should be clarification.

III. UT Notable Woman Committee (Denise Harvey) –

Denise Harvey gave a brief report on the UT Notable Woman Committee on behalf of Margaret Crawford who was unable to attend the meeting. Harvey said that Crawford asked her to remind everyone to vote promptly. She said that the UT Notable Woman Award was established in the fall of 1995 and that the award is meant to recognize outstanding women connected with UT. This year there are three finalists – the information Harvey presented about the three finalists is not public information for the minutes. Mary Papke noted that there was a very strong pool to choose from this year. This year’s award is being offered to an Alumna so the committee was looking at who has brought something back to the university. Papke said that is nice to see that so many people are nominating people for these awards now.

Harvey said that everyone needs to vote by Thursday, March 12, at 4:00 in order for the decision to be made in time for the Chancellor’s Honors Banquet.

Nancy Howell asked about the category for next year and Harvey said she thinks it is Faculty/Staff.

IV. Interim Vice Chancellor Margie Nichols –

Interim Vice Chancellor Margie Nichols briefly discussed her goals and the current goals of her office. She said that their biggest initiative right now is trying to get the message out (in a unified way): 1) quality, 2) value, 3) 99% of students with aid, and 4) mission to preserve quality and to invest in the future. Her office is in the process of writing those messages in a “clever” way. Their constituencies are the governor, faculty, parents, students, staff, and the community. The actual message may be different to each, but the overall point is the same. Nichols believes

that the simpler we can make it and the more united we are in the message, the better it will be. The university plans to use e-mails, videos, etc. – a comprehensive media campaign – to get the message out. Nichols said she met with the SGA Senate yesterday and got a lot of student volunteers to get the message out. One of the best lines she has heard came from a student – “If you ask me if I want to pay more money, I’m always going to say no.” Her point was that you have to be more specific – show that paying more money has a point (i.e. to keep quality faculty).

Papke said that in the past, Development has worked on the message that we desperately need money by choosing not to tell people about departments that have strong endowments. Papke said that many departments have incredible strengths. Papke thinks it would be better to ask departments to say one really strong thing about themselves; that may help. Papke said, “Money goes where money is.” Nichols thinks you can balance showing that you have strengths that are endowed, but also not making it sound like you don’t need money. Nichols says that they have to look at the big picture – what’s good for everyone. Nichols noted that important information is delivered in a lot of different ways – you can deliver the message in a lot of different ways to different groups, but ultimately the information/message has to be the same.

Cheek said he thinks Papke had a good point. He says that “they” hear too many negative messages from us too many times. We need to tell them the “bad” – but we really need to be telling them how well things are going and to give them examples of what is going well. He says that then you can talk about how underfunding may impact those good things. Cheek added that the average family of the students who come here earn \$120,000 per year – they can afford a tuition increase – there are a lot who spend money on things that we think are not a very high priority. We have to say it is critical to us to have the kind of faculty we want because of the quality of education this institution offers. Student Georgia Varlan is the most articulate student he has ever met – she chose to come here because UT offered her so many opportunities. Papke noted that even with a raise in tuition, we have scholarships in place to help those who cannot afford the increases. The tuition raise is about \$250/semester – think about what all these students spend \$250 on.

Harvey asked what Nichols expects students to do with this information. Nichols thinks students have some of the best messages. She says her office wants the students to speak for us. She says that the message needs to come from a lot of different voices. Harvey asked if staff would be included – she thinks a lot of them don’t know this information, the four points that Nichols started with. Nichols said absolutely.

Cheek mentioned it is a question of how you get to all these different groups of people. He said you also have to be careful about what is sent in email because this is a public record state.

Papke is happy to hear that something is being done – she thinks we need a new narrative.

Nichols talks to Chloe [last name?] every day – she is going to do a big story on the four things mentioned at start.

Hindle said that the CFW believes that one of the strengths of the university is the commitment to diversity. She asked Nichols why that is not part of the four messages Nichols mentioned at the beginning. Nichols said she thinks we are trying to keep things simple, but right now the mission is to get the money. So diversity may get “lost” right now in the message. George Hoemann said that confirms his worst fear – he thinks that when times are tough our values matter the most. He says diversity cannot be a second thought because then we will never make the progress that everyone in this room wants to make. He says that if we cannot advance what makes us good now and potentially great in the future, he wonder what is the point in the getting the money. He is very concerned that we will lose track of what makes us good. Harvey said she thinks diversity could be part of the bullet on “quality.” Cheek said that these four points are only the first message they are trying to get out – he is also going to put out the priorities he has established for the campus. This priority list is going to include diversity. Cheek also thinks that in the next few weeks there will be actions that deal with diversity. Nichols says the other thing is that there are 4 bullet points, but that there are “details” within those points. Hoemann said that it has to be more than just dollars and cents. Papke said that we should emphasize not losing what we have already accomplished.

Nichols said three African American students from Memphis told her that they came here for the diversity.

Joy deSensi added that we do not want to lose the value of diversity that is already here.

V. New Book by Margaret Sallee –

Margaret Sallee, a new member of the CFW, said that she edited her new book, *Establishing the Family-Friendly Campus: Insights on Success*, with her colleague.

She said that a range of polices are available – emergency child care, lactation rooms, breast feeding support, etc. She said that this is not an issue of just getting the programs in place; it is an issue of the culture and whether it exists on the campus.

Hindle would like for us to have a dialog on this campus. She asked if Sallee would host something and Sallee said absolutely. Hindle said that she and Kathryn Ellis would talk to her about setting something up.

Harvey asked Sallee if there is any information in her book about non-traditional families. Sallee asked if she means in terms of single parents, same sex, etc.? Sallee said that it depends on the institution. Harvey would like to see UTK address some of those things.

Alan Chesney said that in putting together a workshop, **Sarah Gardial** should be talked to.

VI. Chancellor Jimmy Cheek –

Cheek first said that he appreciates the opportunity to come to this meeting.

He first mentioned that UT is going to recognize Dolly Parton with an honorary degree. He added that only two people have been recognized this way in 214 years. Cheek does not think that is a very good record. He also said that only one person has been honored with a distinguished alumnus award. Cheek said that the process for such honors is currently going through a revision. At UF he personally nominated at least 3 people a year for distinguished alumnus. He also nominated people for honorary degrees. He said that he was successful in both areas.

Cheek said that UTK will have a clearer and easier process for making such nominations. He thinks the CFW should think about nominations for these types of recognitions. He challenged us to nominate our fair share.

Hindle agrees that this would be a great opportunity to push forward women.

Cheek said it is embarrassing to have a school that is 214 years old that has only had one distinguished alumnus.

VII. Old Business/New Business –

There was no other old/new business.

Pam Hindle adjourned the meeting at 1:03 p.m.

Submitted by Kathryn Ellis