



**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL  
MEETING 50- Minutes  
March 25, 2015  
4 p.m. EDT Videoconference**

**UT Faculty Council Voting Members (Quorum, 5 voting members), established)**

UTHSC	Phyllis A. Richey (Campus Representative)	present
	Martin E. Donaldson (Faculty Senate President)	absent
UTK	Joanne Hall (Faculty Senate President)	present
	Candace White (Campus Representative)	present
UTM	Brian W. Donavant (Faculty Senate President)	present
	Jenna Wright (Campus Representative)	present
UTC	Susan Davidson (Faculty Senate President)	absent
	Jennifer Ellis (Campus Representative)	present

**Trustees (Ex-Officio voting)**

Thad Wilson (Board of Trustees faculty voting member)	absent
David Golden (Board of Trustees Faculty non-voting member)	absent

**UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-voting Members**

UT	Dr. Joe DiPietro (System President) (absent)
UT	Dr. Katie High (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)

**Faculty Council Guests**

UT	Dr. India Lane (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)
----	--

**Call to Order**

Candace reminded everyone of the importance of minutes and requested approval of the minutes from March 10 and February 25. Both were approved with minor corrections. Brian Donovan will clarify the paragraph regarding the UTM campus report.

**New Business**

**Task Force for president's budget model points 1 and 6:** The first meeting was held earlier today. Emphasized was the need for thoughtful and quality implementation of any new policy at the department head level (i.e. in doing quality performance reviews). Much of the substance and detail regarding tenure/post tenure/performance standards and practices eventually reach departmental bylaws. Brian asked whether the review might expand to include promotion practices. Discussion included that promotion naturally/implicitly will come into the conversation because it all relates to performance reviews and tenure. Jenna reinforced the need to balance the outside group as guides with high level of internal work.

Naming of the initial planning group which will form the actual work group on performance/tenure matters was discussed, including whether the name should emphasize "tenure" or "performance." "Academic freedom, responsibility and tenure task force" seemed in alignment with the name of the BOT policy.



**Administrative salary information:** Candace requested information from the President on March 6 and met with Dennis Hengstler recently regarding these research questions. Questions discussed included:

- Has the number of administrators increased since 2005?
- Is average salary for administrators closer to market value than other groups?
- The data are not available yet but likely will support the sense that administrative numbers and salaries are rising faster than faculty salaries

India mentioned a similar study done approximately 10 years ago, comparing the rate of increase in senior administrator salaries, which were hard to track, versus to those of faculty. Senior salaries were certainly rising at higher percentages than the average faculty salary. Criticism of that report included that faculty have the opportunity to move up through ranks to make salary gains whereas administrators do not. There was also criticism regarding the inclusion of John Shumaker's salary, which was an outlier at the time. India will try to relocate the data.

### **Old business**

**Employee Engagement Surveys:** Candace reported on EES and CAB reports going out to campuses this week. Chancellor Cheek has reported at UTK but other campuses do not have a report. More specific data requests need to go through each Chancellor. Linda Harig in HR will facilitate getting this data from other campuses if needed.

- UTK rating of shared governance by faculty has improved from 50 to 55 but still falls in the "fair" category. Candace hopes the group will share their shared governance items results. Brian noted that shared governance items dropped from 74 to 66 at Martin (also noted the other items). Notes that the senior administrators' perceptions re: shared governance are going up in contrast.

It was noted also that deans should be sharing this information at the unit level, and we may need to push to get this. Brian assessed data on his campus was declining, not improving. Phyllis and Thad said that shared governance in terms of the faculty communities should be transparent, but also enforceable.

**Joint resolution:** There was considerable discussion of the proposed joint resolution regarding policies and faculty handbooks (which is currently in rough draft form).

- Brian expressed concern about the overall value and anticipated outcomes of the resolution, especially given resolution or initiative fatigue among faculty senates.
- Candace responded that the resolution serves as a record of concern and keeps the issues of shared governance and transparency on the radar/agenda of the Board and others.
- India suggested this resolution should be simple, to the point and not overly specific
- Phyllis shared a suggestion from Thad regarding establishing faculty committees that could render enforceable final decisions regarding other faculty. Candace and India responded that faculty does not have that delegated authority.
- Phyllis raised the issue of situations where faculty and administrators reach an impasse. India reinforced that there are certain points where administrators, charged with the financial and general health of the institution, would have the authority to override; however, no one wants to be in the situation to have to move something forward without faculty support. Tenure-related policies got to BOT and then to handbooks
- India commented that the draft is probably too broad at this point and should emphasize the key concerns/purpose – that 1) faculty should be consulted and engaged in policies affected faculty appointment, evaluation, promotion, tenure and termination; and 2) those policies should appear in faculty handbooks and 3) be consistently interpreted/applied. Phyllis added that as a matter of academic freedom the faculty should always be



consulted through the faculty senate. The point was made that faculty should be engaged strongly in governance including policy and procedure discussions.

- Phyllis asked whether faculty handbook changes could be sent for Board approval without faculty senate approval. India and Katie said that while that could happen, it would be avoided as much as possible. Candace Pointed to the process that handbook items go through -- General Counsel and administration ultimately makes the final push. Others said that while these steps are required, the faculty senates should definitely be involved. India pointed out that hypothetically state law could create a need to change something regarding faculty appointments but in opposition to the efforts of the faculty senate, and we would have to follow. Usually, thought, we report handbook revisions to the board with the language "faculty senate, provost, chancellor, etc. all concur. All supported the general assumption that handbook changes should not happen suddenly by administration. Jenna commented that the handbook takes precedence over bylaws changes.
- There was some discussion on departmental and college bylaws and their consistency with faculty handbooks. So far, systematic review of these bylaws has proven daunting to administrators and faculty senates alike.
- Candace suggested moving discussion of the resolution to email and suggested further work on the language, with the tentative goal to get a resolution to senates in the fall and to announce to BOT in fall and that it would be a means of setting an agenda for the future. Brian stressed that there should be unity of all four campuses regarding the resolution.

Our next meeting is April 15; May 14 meeting will be in Nashville. India will organize the President's availability and meals for the May meeting.

Adjourned 5 p. m.

Joanne Hall  
Secretary

---