

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting 94 Agenda,

August 16, 2017

Videoconference

4:00 pm (ET)/3:00 pm (CT)

PRESENT

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

UTHSC Martin Donaldson (Faculty Senate President)

Phyllis A. Richey (Campus Representative)

UTK Beauvais Lyons (Faculty Senate President)

Bruce MacLennan (Campus Representative)

UTM Chris Caldwell (Faculty Senate President)

Robert Nanney (Campus Representative)

UTC Steve Ray for Gretchen Potts (Faculty Senate President)

UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-voting Members

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

NOT PRESENT

Diane Halstead (Campus Representative)

Trustees (Ex-Officio voting)

Susan Davidson (Board of Trustees faculty voting member)

Terry Cooper (Board of Trustees faculty non-voting member)

UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-voting Members

UT Dr. Joe DiPietro (System President)

Call to Order Bruce MacLennan, Chair

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of minutes of previous meetings (June 21, 2017 and July 26, 2017).

Both minutes approved by consensus.

Old Business

1. Update on peer institution / salary gap project
India will send the updated peer and aspirational peer list. She encouraged members of the committee who have questions about the final list to discuss the selections with their chief academic officers.

New Business

1. Discussion of historical APPR data
There was discussion of the APPR chart emailed by India Lane. Beauvais asked about the growth in number of "Needs Improvement" category at UTC. India said that this reflects increased rigor. Beauvais said it will be interesting to see what happens in this new academic year with the triggered EPPR system. Bruce asked about the perception on the BOT that there are too many meets expectations and above. India said there are issues with making the argument that it is not a bell curve. Beauvais asked about the growth in the number of outstanding designations from UTIA – and if there may be a potential of a quota system for exceeds or outstanding. People noted that the annual reviews do not always translate in to merit raises. Phyllis made the case that in our efforts to achieve high performance among all faculty – and reach our institutional goals - and if we are being evaluated on a bell curve, do we really want the faculty performing on a bell curve? Martin expressed concern whether chairs/heads are qualified to conduct these evaluations. India noted that some members of the BOT would ask "if our faculty are so good as measured by this evaluation system, why we are not already top 25?" The issue of bylaws and criteria for rank was discussed. Not all campuses have criteria in their bylaws, nor the practice of mid-cycle reviews and outside reviewers for promotion and tenure. UTHSC has

criteria most set at the college level, with more specific, rigorous criteria at the department level. The issue of the role of the faculty in defining these criteria was discussed.

There was discussion of early and expedited tenure, which will also be discussed at the BOT workshop tomorrow. The issue of administrative hires vs. strategic senior faculty hires was discussed. The example of how to build a competitive baseball team through a farm system, rather than hiring expensive super stars was suggested.

Regarding the workshop August 17th India outlined the following topics:

- A) Granting Tenure: Evaluation of faculty and tenure, and do we have well defined criteria for rank, a good system of mentors, appropriate probationary periods, external evaluators from, peer and aspirational peer institutions, etc. The issue of who should make the final decision, and would there be a university-wide committee that reviews recommendations from the chancellors. India made that case that this will have more of an impact on UTC and UTM, which have many departments with a smaller number of faculty. Steve asked if this would be the case for all campuses. India said that the key is that there are at least two levels of committee review.
- B) Revoking Tenure: Termination procedures with EPPR, the rigor of review applied by administrators, etc.
- C) Evaluation Development: Helping department chairs improve faculty evaluation systems, best practices. etc. Beauvais noted that at UTK Heads have had training the past few years, and the number of appeals has dropped significantly. Martin asked if such training will be required. India said the board may come out of the workshop with hard recommendations requiring this of head.
- D) Academic Program Review: The board will initiate a process of determining systems to assess programs based on a variety of criteria to determine how to invest resources. A task force will be created separate from the Budget Advisory Group (BAG) to look at this, including systems of faculty workload data. Elements and Digital Measures are currently used among the campuses.

Adjournment: 5:23pm (ET), 4:23pm (CT)

Next meeting: September 20, 2017, 4:00 pm (ET)/3:00 pm (CT)

Minutes taken by Beauvais Lyons