



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE

KNOXVILLE, CHATTANOOGA, MARTIN, TULLAHOMA, MEMPHIS

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

Meeting 93
July 26, 2017
Called Videoconference
MINUTES

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

UTHSC	Martin Donaldson (Faculty Senate President)	present
	Phyllis A. Richey (Campus Representative)	present
UTK	Beauvais Lyons (Faculty Senate President)	present
	Bruce MacLennan (Campus Representative)	present
UTM	Chris Caldwell (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Robert Nanney (Campus Representative)	present
UTC	Gretchen Potts (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Diane Halstead (Campus Representative)	Absent

Trustees (Ex-Officio voting)

	Susan Davidson (Board of Trustees faculty voting member)	Absent
	Terry Cooper (Board of Trustees faculty non-voting member)	Present

UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-voting Members

UT	Dr. Joe DiPietro (System President)	Absent
UT	India Lane (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present

Faculty Council Guests

UT	David Miller (System Office of the President)	Present
UT	Dennis Hengstler (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present

Call to Order 4:00 PM EST by Bruce MacLennan

Minutes of Meeting 92, June 21, 2017 were not presented for approval.

New Business

1. Discussion of UFC Engagement with the Peer Institution Selection Process

In advance of the meeting Dennis Hengstler emailed three documents:

- Suggested Criteria for Selection of Peer Institutions (approved in June by the BOT)
- Comparable and Aspirational Peer Group Development. This document outlines the process of developing a list of potential peers.
- Institutions for Consideration as Peers or Aspirational Peers. This document has rankings for each campus with anywhere from 24 to 48 institutions on the short list for each campus.

David Miller talked about the process and criteria for establishing peers for UTK, UTC, UTM, UTHSC and UTIA. Originally the BOT had asked for this information by the June 17th meeting, but gave additional time to present the listing for the meeting on August 4th. He noted that key to this process is to help maintain competitive salaries for the campuses.

David stressed the importance of setting the criteria first. At the June BOT meeting criteria were approved, but they gave the campuses some flexibility in proposing any amendments to the criteria when the final list is presented. David credited Dennis for doing most of the data collection and in collaborating with each of the campuses. He referred to the Comparable and Aspirational Peer Group Development document to show how they are considering narrowing the pools of potential peers.

Dennis talked about the Suggested Criteria for Selection of Peer Institution document that was approved by the BOT. This lead developing an initial list. On page 3 of the Criteria document they then collected data from all of the institutions on this initial list. Using this information they to ranked the institutions from high to low. All of the criteria are weighted equally. They then met with the provosts to see what the campuses thought were the priority criteria. On the second page of the narrative (#7) listed how a more workable list of institutions was compiled for each campus. Beauvais asked about how geographical factors will inform the next phase of selection process. Gretchen remarked that southern geography was used to shorten the initial list for UTC and UTM. David said they are looking at where the campuses compete for faculty, staff and students, and that geography is one factor in the selection process.

David asserted that there should not be a fixed number of peers, but create a band of peers above and below each campus to determine a final list. David said that the other issue is whether there will be one or two lists. The BOT asserted there should be two lists, one of peers and one that is aspirational. When salary studies are done, data will be collected for both groups. Gretchen asked about the shelf life of the list, which David said was open-ended. It was noted that in the

past THEC determined peers on a ten-year cycle. In response to a question from Terry, Dennis indicated where each campus stood on the ranked list of potential peers: UTK below Iowa State, UTC below N. Alabama, UTM below Arkansas Tech, UTHSC below U. Texas HSC – Houston, UTIA below Tennessee. Regarding what other universities use a UT campus as a peer, David said that in 2012 the *Chronicle of Higher Education* published a study listing the peer groups that universities use. The study reveals that universities tend to include more aspirational universities in their peer sets. Dennis did indicate that the legislature currently does not use peer data as part of the funding formula. David talked about using ERI (Economic Research Incorporated) calculations to minimize cost of living differences when comparing salary data after the peers are determined.

David noted that the UT System does not have a peer group. Starting this year they are in the process of developing a set of 9-10 peers. That list includes Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, Massachusetts, LSU, Rutgers, Illinois, Alabama, and Texas Tech.

The board will have a presentation and vote on Friday August 4th, with the goal of 12-15 peers and 5 aspirational peers for UTK, UTC, UTM, UTHSC and UTIA.

There was some discussion of how salary data will be compiled for future salary studies.

2. Updates from Academic Affairs and Student Success

India Lane reported that the requested trend date for performance evaluations for faculty will be sent soon.

The BOT retreat to be held August 17th will focus on tenure, post tenure review and academic program review. India stressed the importance of AAUP principles in this context. She said that Interim Provost John Zomchick, who has been involved in the tenure process at every level will be present at the retreat as a resource to address questions. They will also look at the use of NTTF on the campuses. As part of the retreat the BOT will look at specific cohorts of faculty from 7-10 year ago and their progress toward tenure. She said that about 2/3 of faculty in the cohorts achieve tenure. Based some data collected, about 10-15 percent were denied tenure and the balance left the university for other reasons. She said there will be an effort to do a better job of tracking why people leave the institution. Gretchen asked if supervisors complete a report when someone leaves a job. Terry said that it would also be useful to include information from peer, departmental faculty as well. India noted that because this involves personnel matters, there can be limitations on the process. There was additional discussion of the exit interview process, if HR should conduct these, and the potential value of having a face-to-face interview rather than completing an on-line survey. Beauvais suggested for the sample cohort it would be useful to use Linked-In or Google to track the current career status of those who left the university or were denied tenure.

One issue that was discussed was that the BOT would benefit from having information on the

search process, its length, the size of the pools and the investment of resources during their probationary period of review. Terry spoke about the cost of start-up packages for new faculty, etc. as a significant factor and investment by the university.

India also spoke about BOT concerns about the difference in the tenure review processes on the campuses. She asserted that mid-cycle and peer reviews will be required, as well as the need to have at least two levels of review outside of the department. She said the use of external reviewers is inconsistent across the system, and should be tightened up.

India said she can give an update on the retreat at our next meeting on August 16th. She also said there is a new effort in the Tennessee Legislature to undermine tenure.

Next meeting: August 16, 2017

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 PM EST.

Respectfully submitted,
Beauvais Lyons
UFC Member