



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE, CHATTANOOGA, MARTIN, TULLAHOMA, MEMPHIS

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

Meeting 65 Minutes
September 21, 2016
Videoconference
(Approved)

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

UTHSC	Terry Cooper (Faculty Senate President)	present
	Phyllis A. Richey (Campus Representative)	present
UTK	Bonnie Ownley (Faculty Senate President)	present
	Bruce MacLennan for Candace White (Campus Representative)	present
UTM	Bob Bradley (Faculty Senate President)	present
	Robert Nanney (Campus Representative)	present
UTC	Joanie Sompayrac (Faculty Senate President)	present
	Diane Halstead (Campus Representative)	present

Trustees (Ex-Officio voting)

	Susan Davidson (Board of Trustees faculty non-voting member)	absent
	Jeff Rogers (Board of Trustees faculty voting member)	present

UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-voting Members

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

Faculty Council Guests

UT	India Lane (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	present

Call to Order 4:05 PM EST by Phyllis Richey

Minutes of August 17, 2016, meeting were approved.

Old Business

1. Update on EPPR: Katie reported that she attended the last of the Faculty Senate meetings last week in Memphis to gain input regarding the policy elements of EPPR. She ran the feedback by Toby to see if we need to reconvene the task force or make cosmetic changes. Toby felt strongly that the changes (mainly clarifications) would not violate or change the current policy element.

Toby sent the policy elements to Joe and asked him not to approve but to accept them, and he did. Lela will now take those elements and put them in the format that fits the rest of the Tenure and Academic Freedom policy. Katie said that Lela and she have met several times to make them clean, clear and true to the input. This is a two-part process involving a policy portion and a more detailed portion called Appendix F consisting of procedures to be followed in implementation of the policy.

Katie expects Lela to get it back to her soon, after which she will look it over again and send it to Joe, the chancellors, CAOs and the Senate presidents. That will then become the document that goes to the Board for inclusion in the policy for consideration at the October Board meeting. Katie hopes to send it out to everyone by the end of the week, at which point it's public and free to share. India said we are not sharing it for wordsmithing, but if we see an obvious error, let her know before we share with others.

To handle questions as we share the policy, Katie and India will prepare a FAQ list. We are encouraged to share expected questions. The EPPR policy will become effective July 1, 2017.

2. Update on bylaws change: Bruce said the proposed change involves Article 2: Membership and Election. The change essentially states that if any member of UFC is unable to attend a meeting, he/she will ask the immediate past Faculty Senate president to attend as an alternate.

All were in agreement that a previous email regarding the change would serve as the first reading. On a motion by Joanie, seconded by Terry, the second reading was approved unanimously. With the bylaws now amended, India will send us the official wording. Phyllis will then send that email with the new policy to India and copy Doree.

New Business

1. Introduction of new UFC faculty representative: Joanie introduced Diane Halstead as UTC's new campus representative. She said Diane has been at UTC for 20 years and very is active on campus. She is also a member of the Faculty Senate.

2. Updates to UFC membership into on our website – Phyllis asked us all to update our information on the UFC website. Those updates should be passed along to Doree.

3. EPPR “next steps” – Phyllis asked for suggestions for addressing ancillary issues that have been identified on each campus during the process.

- Terry said there is a lot of skepticism on campuses about the new policy and about annual

reviews in general. One way to engender trust is to be as transparent as possible. We could provide the data in a way that is meaningful to the various faculty at the various campuses. That would include the percentage of those who fall into the various evaluation categories.

- Phyllis said that some are asking about the plan to evaluate EPPR in two years. Katie said that our policy changes are our best efforts to anticipate what will work going forward. It was deemed best to look at it after a year and then two years out, at which point we should have some data as to how well the process worked.
- Phyllis said others on her campus asked that if we're changing the way we're doing things and putting that much power in the CEO, can we as a campus see the stats regarding EPPR while still keeping confidentiality as to names?
- Bruce said the most common question on his campus is how many cases there are and how do they work out.
- Robert expressed concern that if stats/outcomes were made public, even without using names, faculty could be identified because of such a small data set, especially on a smaller campus like UT Martin. Joanie and Katie agreed that such a small data set could be revealing as to identity.
- Joanie said the perception by some on her campus is that it's an attempt to purge faculty, but she said it's really an attempt to help faculty and redirect them when they have gotten off track. Diane said that the policy does make possible tenure revocation rather than remediation, however small that possibility is.
- In other discussion, the question arose about recourse for administrators if they get bad reviews or have one bad year. Katie and India said administrators can be dismissed at any time. They are evaluated by their supervisors each year.
- Phyllis said some are still concerned that one problem year can trigger the EPPR process and asked how we are going to recruit and maintain the best faculty under those circumstances. She said the same should be true for administrators.
- Jeff said he has no qualms with giving an exemption to administrators. They have different roles. If you have an administrator with problems, you don't want to wait 18 months to deal with the problem. But that's the minimum window for faculty. He said the EPPR policy is humane with enough of a threshold, and from the standpoint of the Board, we need a mechanism to handle faculty who don't do a good job. It provides a lot of checks and balances for due process.
- Diane said the policy is fine, but the key is faculty who become administrators (dept heads and deans). The policy should also apply to them. Jeff said it would be unfair to be judged by two policies.

- Phyllis made a motion that the UFC work to recommend the next steps to help foster more EPPR acceptance from faculty as a whole system wide. After more discussion, Jeff said that the UFC should monitor the situation, but it's not our job to create buy-in. Let it roll out, and as we receive feedback, we can respond. He said that the buy-in is the job of administrators. Phyllis said we will revisit this as old business during our next meeting

4. Campus reports -- Phyllis reminded everyone to submit annual campus reports.

5. Update from Academic Affairs and Student Success – Katie gave a brief report on items coming before the Board in October.

6. UFC meeting during October BOT in Knoxville- Because Joe will not be able to join us nor will Katie or India if we meet on the morning of Thursday, Oct. 13, we need to determine the most feasible plan to meet when most are available. Perhaps it will be a face-to-face meeting with others joining online. Doree will send out a survey to determine our availability.

Next meeting: TBD October 13 or 14, 2016, at BOT meeting in Knoxville.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:27 PM EDT.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert Nanney
UFC Secretary

