



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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

**Meeting 101
March 22, 2018
Meeting and 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)	Absent
UTC	Gretchen Potts (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Gavin Townsend (Campus Representative)	Present

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
	Linda Martin (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present

Faculty Council Guests

UT	David Golden, (Special Assistant to the President)	Present
UT	India Lane (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present
UT	Leigh Cherry (Coordinator of Student Success Initiatives)	Present

Call to Order Bruce MacLennan, Chair

Leigh Cherry, who assists Linda Martin was introduced to the members of the Council.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of minutes of previous meetings (Feb. 21, 2018; Feb. 26, 2018)

Approval was moved by Gretchen and seconded by Martin. Minutes approved.

New Business

1. Update from Academic Affairs and Student Success and Proposed Tenure Policies

David Golden was available to address questions. The development of the EPPR process was discussed as a model to follow for policy development. David said the board feels we do not currently have a rigorous post-tenure review process. Martin made the case that the application of annual performance reviews has been inconsistently implemented. Bruce said what is of concern about this proposal is that faculty have not been involved in the process. Bruce noted that the answer may be that we need better department head training. Martin stressed the need to honor the EPPR process to determine how it is working before adding an additional administrative burden. Phyllis was concerned this effort is to create an additional level of review that would be redundant. Linda said the board considers the proposed PPPR a check and balance on the system. The case was made that this is the responsibility of a dean. Martin said the process introduces a great deal of extra work. Phyllis stressed that PPPR could be a check and a balance on the APPR process.

David said he did understand the concerns about the additional workload. Beauvais noted that since EPPR requires a review committee of five faculty members, what was their expectation for the number of committee members for PPPR, saying with 3 members one-half or more of the tenured faculty would be involved annually. Linda said that, based upon her review of peer institutions, about 95% of periodic post-tenure reviews at peer institutions are based on the annual review materials and few additional documents. Terry made the case that we are making assumptions about how this will be done. He used the phrase “Faculty Accomplishments and Accountability” as a way to constructively frame this issue for periodic reviews. Beauvais stressed that an PPPR should be built from the APPR materials, noting that UTK uses a 3-year rolling period as part of the annual reviews. Phyllis made the case that all of our work, grants, publications, etc. involve various forms of outside peer review. Gretchen noted that outside reviews for promotion and tenure focus on research, and PPPR would also require attention to teaching a service. There was discussion of what peer reviews represent for various disciplines. Less rigorous publications or conferences should have less weight in evaluations.

There was discussion of how to make sure the APPR system has more rigor. Bruce stressed the issue of who is doing the evaluation, comparing heads/deans and provosts to a peer system. Phyllis said this all boils down to the burden on the reviewing body. Martin stressed that the solution must fit the problem, that the university should focus on the few under-performing faculty. It was stressed that deans and provosts should monitor the process if the APPRs are not rigorous. It was noted that deans and provosts currently sign off on every annual review.

Martin also noted that there are checks and balances as programs do through program reviews. India said that the administration knows how complicated the program system is currently, and that there is not a single metric that can be used to assess every program. India said that although there are lingering concerns about the process by which this new policy was proposed, we need to separate that conversation from the important focus and discussion on the policies and procedures that will be developed if the current language proceeds.

It was noted that the tenure policy is not on the consent agenda, so will be voted on at both the AASS meeting and the full board meeting.

Linda said that the board is concerned that too many faculty are receiving annual reviews in which they are exceeding or far exceeding expectations. At UTC, Gretchen said that heads have been told that no more than 20% are exceeding or far exceeding expectations. Phyllis noted that in higher education, our performance does not fall on a bell curve, mentioning that we always try to improve. David said that across the whole system, last year only 13 tenured faculty fell below “meets expectation for rank.” Chris asked what about the 10% industry standard for weak performance that can result in termination? Gretchen asked if we have data from peer educational institutions regarding what level of termination of tenured faculty members takes place. India said that the UT system does have some information, and there will be an effort to do a better job of compiling this data in the future. India said that they do have some data that 10% of pre-tenure faculty leave the university before their tenure decision and 2% are denied tenure. It was noted that in many disciplines there are hundreds of applicants, and the investment in pre-tenure faculty is significant. The focus of the discussion was on how to amend the proposed PPPR process so that it is based on the annual review materials.

UFC Recommendations on Post-Tenure Review for AASS Committee

We support the recently enacted Enhanced Post-Tenure Review (EPPR) policy as constituted. It was developed over a two-year process that was based on (1) identifying a problem with the previous Cumulative Performance Reviews (CPR), (2) determining the best way to solve it, and (3) involved appropriate, qualified trustees, administrators and faculty.

We share the concerns of the Board of Trustees regarding the rigor and consistency of Annual Planning and Performance Reviews (APPR). Improvements should emphasize clearly developed criteria for rank for every academic unit, mandatory department head training, and more thorough accountability by deans and chief academic officers to overseeing the process.

We look forward to working with the UT System and campus administrators to develop a Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Review (PPPR) system that is efficient and effective in using university resources to protect our core missions of research, teaching and service. We agree that issues to be addressed include (1) clearly defining the problem, (2) developing policies and procedures that protect academic freedom and, (3) holding all tenured faculty to the highest standards of performance.

2. Discussion of Institutional Peers

Gretchen noted that on the UC peer list, that one of the universities, Florida Gulf Coast University does not have a tenure system. Gretchen is especially concerned how this might inform any comparative pay studies. Linda said the peer list may need to be reviewed at regular intervals, possibly every 5 years.

Beauvais asked about whether the goal of being a Top 25 Public University was still an aspirational goal for UTK. India said that the board is skeptical of the goal given lack of progress towards it. Beauvais said that the next annual salary study will show that UTK will have made

significant salary progress with this new set of peers.

The issue of comparing the UT system to other systems in terms of compensation and staffing levels. India said that David Miller is working on this. Beauvais said he hoped that the UFC could get information on this issue from the UT system to make sure the UT system is right sized.

Gretchen asked about the relationship between the chief academic officers and the UT system. There was discussion about this in relation to current provost searches at UTK and UTC.

3. Bills Impacting Higher Education:

SB2260/HB2115: UT-FOCUS Act

<http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx?BillNumber=SB2260>

The question of the UFC is an issue with the formation of the Campus Advisory Boards. Chris said he hoped that on many campuses it would be the Faculty Senate President and so clear connections to the UFC would be established. India said the UFC is not mandated by board policy, and reports to the system president.

SB1754/HB1738: Trustee Conflict of Interest Bill

<http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx?BillNumber=SB1754>

Gretchen got an email from a legislator asking her opinion on the bill. Linda and India said they are not aware if UT has a position on this bill, which limits gifts and services, apart from food and hotel to a \$250 value limit.

SB2180 /HB2230: Transparency in Higher Education

<http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx?BillNumber=HB2230>

India said this will be taken care of by being amended so that students can allow parents to gain access to their records. She also noted that any student could allow their parents gain access to their passwords which is in violation of Acceptable Use Policies.

SB1846/HB1754 Humanities Elective - Economics

<http://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx?BillNumber=HB1754>

Gretchen said that this would adversely impact some of their social sciences majors. India said that they are more concerned about THEC advocating for a state-wide common general education.

Next meeting: April 18, 2018. Chris expressed concern about the development of board tenure policies if these are approved tomorrow. It was proposed that UFC could play a helpful role in making sure there is continuity, with current presidents, president-elect, and UFC campus representatives, appropriate committee chairs (such as Appeals, Faculty Affairs) chief academic officers and other campus administrators, Office of General Counsel, as well as Linda and India.

Adjournment at 4:29pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Beauvais Lyons
UFC Member