



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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

**Meeting 102
18 April 2018
Meeting and Videoconference
MINUTES (unapproved)**

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)	Absent
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		

Call to Order 4:05 PM (EST) by Bruce MacLennan, Chair

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Minutes from meeting of 22 March 2018 approved. Special thanks to Beauvais for drafting those.

New Business

1. Update from Academic Affairs and Student Success Regarding PPPR

Linda: President DiPietro is reviewing all the feedback he's received from various academic officers regarding PPPR (Periodic Post-tenure Performance Review). The big question is what should be the minimum requirements for a PPPR dossier. Once that's determined, campuses would be able to devise their own PPPR procedures. To help set the base standards, I reviewed the procedures employed by comparable university systems in other states, reviewed the handbooks of all our peer campuses, and considered all the questions posed last month by the UFC. Once the president approves what I've prepared, the procedures will be sent to the chancellors and then the UFC. It is important that the document describe what it is NOT, as well as what it is. At this point it looks like the minimum PPPR dossier will include six years of annual reviews, a CV, and a two-page summary. Campuses would be free to demand more if desired.

Beauvais: How might the PPPR be used to improve annual reviews (APPRs)?

Linda: If there are discrepancies between annual and periodic reviews, deans would be encouraged to meet with department heads to determine reasons for these discrepancies. So, the PPPR might serve to protect faculty members who have received year-after-year of positive reviews only to get a less-than-satisfactory PPPR. The procedure might cause heads to be more forthright with faculty regarding annual performance. I found instances of some campuses dropping PPPR altogether once they found an improvement in annual reviews.

Beauvais: What's an example of an institution that dropped PPPR?

Linda: I'd have to check my notes.

Beauvais: Would it be wise to consider treating UT's PPPR as a pilot program, as something that will be assessed after, say 4 or 5 years, and discarded if it doesn't prove to be cost-efficient?

Linda: Good idea. We can't call it a pilot program, but we could include some feature demanding periodic review of the program itself.

Gretchen: Will the minimum standards be written to accommodate the different missions and faculty of the UT campuses?

Linda: Yes. That will be a governing idea in whatever version of PPPR is adopted.

Beauvais: Do we have a sense yet of how teaching will be assessed for a PPPR?

Linda: That will be up to the campuses. Most of our peers consult student evaluations, but how those are used will be left to each campus.

Beauvais (to the whole group): How many of us on our campuses employ peer reviews of

teaching? Only during probationary years?

Gretchen: At UTC the use of peer evaluation is determined by individual departmental bylaws.

Martin: At UTHSC we are considering it now. Its use (or not) will be defined by the various colleges. It's different from college to college and year to year.

Chris: At UTM we are working on a policy to require peer evaluation of everybody. Currently it is left up departments to determine whether and how to use peer evaluation. We envision peer reviews to include a review of tests, student evaluations, syllabi, etc. We are skeptical of in-class peer teaching reviews since one or two visits don't provide sufficient perspective. Experts say you need to visit eight or ten times a year, and most of us aren't willing to do that.

Beauvais: The 1997 AAUP policy paper on PPPR warns about the danger to collegiality posed by such reviews.

Linda: Yes, we don't want to institute a system that threatens collegiality.

Beauvais: The paper also emphasizes the need to develop clear criteria for evaluation. I also note in the Purdue paper the warning about how some senior faculty may be of great worth to the institution but not have qualities that can easily fit into the metrics typically employed in PPPR. An overall qualitative assessment is crucial. We need to avoid bean-counting and acknowledge that it's okay if faculty shift their energies over their careers from, say, scholarship to service. The criteria used to determine tenure should not necessary be the same as the criteria used to assess post-tenure effectiveness.

Beauvais: Linda, are there a couple of these schools with PPPR that we should consider good examples?

Linda: I'll check my notes. But I tended to harvest all the best bits from various campuses.

Phyllis: At UTHSC we have a research incentive bonus to reward faculty who are primarily involved in research. But there is no such thing for our teaching-oriented faculty. Do other campuses have a method of rewarding teaching?

Beauvais: Phyllis, you have data regarding the accomplishments of your students at UTHSC (board exam pass rates and such). Could that data be used to reward teaching?

Phyllis: Not really since the success rates on these board exams is already very high. What do the other schools do to acknowledge excellence in teaching? Is there some way to connect excellent teaching with this PPPR? Is there a way to monetarily incentivize good teaching?

Gretchen: Where would the money come from?

Gavin: During the era of CPR some years ago, faculty were rewarded with a one-time \$2,000 bonus. We might not be able to afford that now, but perhaps a \$500 bonus for enduring PPPR

would be possible?

Beauvais: I want to come back to this notion of the PPPR providing a sort check and balance to the APPRs. Frankly, if you have a well-functioning APPR system, you don't need PPPR. Perhaps it would be helpful to view these PPPRs as a review of the APPRs (and thus department heads), rather than an assessment of individual faculty. There should already be embedded in the APPRs the means to reward faculty for excellence in teaching and research. We already have merit pools. I would hope that one of the best outcomes of PPPR is enhanced department head training.

Linda: Do we want to have the BOT develop a uniform PPPR procedure for the whole system, or empower the individual campuses to craft the details?

Gretchen: Given the uncertainty of the composition of the BOT, it's important we leave the details to the campuses.

Beauvais: We especially need to consider things like how a PPPR might trigger an EPPR (enhanced post tenure performance review). Best if we leave such details to the campuses.

Chris: Linda, will the new PPPR policy include a clear statement of purpose?

Linda: That's what I'm drafting. It might not be part of the policy itself, but it will at least frame it.

Chris: Do you have anything you can add to what we already know about the nature of the policy?

Linda: Nothing I can share now, but nothing that will come as a surprise later.

Chris: What about a timeline? When will PPPR be put in place?

Linda: We expect it to be approved in the November BOT meeting. Before then, we want each campus to review the policy thoroughly. We should have something to you by the first part of May.

Beauvais: A reveal in May makes it possible for the UFC to review it, but not the larger faculty. The summer is a bad time to generate faculty "buy-in" for anything.

Linda: If the policy isn't overly prescriptive, would it be really hard to get faculty input by November?

Beauvais: If indeed the policy is flexible and minimal, it is possible for faculty senates to address the thing in August. But given that three of our campuses will have brand new provosts, it will be quite a challenge.

Linda: I will be glad to visit the campuses over the summer to help get the provosts and senates

up to speed.

Gavin: Linda, how will the BOT measure the success of PPPR? Are you providing a metric for the BOT to help them assess the worth of the policy? Will you suggest an appropriate number of triggered EPPRs to indicate success? How will the BOT know the system is working?

Linda: Great question. PPPR is there to assure the public that we faculty are not just slapping each other on the back with our annual reviews. I anticipate that PPPR will be seen more as a means to assess departments rather than individuals. We hope the BOT will view PPPR as an objective means to assess APPR.

Gavin: But won't PPPR cause deans to pressure heads to be more negative with their annual assessments of faculty?

Phyllis: I had a meeting with Vicki Gregg, a member of the BOT's academic affairs committee, and I asked her if the BOT was aware of how we faculty naturally "cull the heard" with our annual reviews. Why wouldn't we expect faculty who have tenure to meet or exceed expectations every year, given what they had to go through to get tenure in the first place. Vickie replied that it didn't happen that way in business.

Linda: If we haven't managed to dissuade a questionable junior faculty member from applying for tenure, then it reflects poorly on the whole department. Denial of tenure is something to be avoided with proper coaching and mentorship.

Phyllis: Why not put the new BOT members through a tenure review simulation to help them understand academia?

Linda: If you could develop it, you could probably sell it.

Beauvais: BOT orientation is going to be critical this summer when members will be invited to participate in UTK's faculty senate retreat. Once the UTK faculty senate develops some guidelines for this orientation, we'll share it with the UFC.

Bruce: Given the complete makeover of the BOT this summer, orientation will be key.

Linda: Look at it as an opportunity to deal with a clean slate.

Gretchen: Remember that the old BOT fell into disfavor among state legislators because of Sex Week and all. Legislators might pressure the BOT to remain at arm's length regarding academic influence.

Phyllis: True, but the complaints that legislators had about the BOT had nothing to do with tenure and faculty review. So there still might be an opportunity to educate them about tenure.

Chris: Linda, will promotion reset the PPPR clock?

Linda: Yes.

Chris: What if they fail to secure promotion? Will THAT reset the clock?

Linda: Good question. We haven't figured that angle yet. But a PPPR might actually help a faculty member who fails to get a promotion. PPPR would force the administration to re-review the materials and enable the faculty member to plead his/her case.

Phyllis: how would that work procedurally?

Linda: Take the case of a faculty member who fails to be promoted and then, say, two years later is the subject of a PPPR. That would enable another group of faculty – independent of the Rank and Tenure Committee – to objectively review the dossier. The PPPR might conceivably disagree with the folks involved in the earlier promotion rejection and recommend in favor of the candidate.

Phyllis: Wouldn't such a procedure create another layer of scrutiny on the committee involved with promotion?

Linda: Yes.

Beauvais: We have much to discuss. Maybe we need to start our next meeting an hour earlier?

Group response: Sure, except for Gavin, who expects to be in the jungles of Peru on May 16.

Beauvais: We'll need to get a draft of the minimum PPPR standards a week before the 16th.

Linda: I'll see what I can do.

2. Coordination of UFC and Campus Advisory Groups

Bruce: As proposed, the faculty representative on the new Campus Advisory Committee (CAC) will be selected by our respective faculty senates.

Gretchen: I recall that the language indicated that the decision was up to the executive committee of the faculty senates. At UTC our executive committee has already decided that the past president should be the designated faculty rep on UTC's CAC. This makes sense because the past present has few duties and yet is up-to-date with the goings-on of the senate. The UTC senate will vote tomorrow to formalize this arrangement.

Beauvais: We at UTK were thinking about appointing the current president to the CAC, but past-president makes sense too. Just as long as the representative is elected to the job and not just appointed.

Beauvais: We also need to consider the student rep, presumably the president of SGA. Also on the CAC would be the president of the campus's alumni organization.

Bruce: has UTM or the UTHSC thought about how to constitute your forthcoming CACs?

Robert: I like Gretchen's idea.

Phyllis: We certainly need to develop something better than to just accept volunteers. We need to appoint people who have been elected to some leadership position.

Beauvais: I'm worried about how the UTIA CAC will be constituted since it was not addressed in the FOCUS Act. Also, as with UTC's proposal, what happens if the past president can't or won't serve on the CAC?

Gretchen: Our bylaws provide a means to deal with such a case. I'll send everyone what we've drafted and will put before our senate tomorrow.

Beauvais: We no longer have any faculty trustees on the BOT, not even any non-voting trustees. This will cause us to amend the UFC Bylaws, which we can do in May. The change means that we will go from a body of ten members to a body of eight.

Bruce: Unless we want to consider doing something different.

Phyllis: The faculty rep on the CAC and the faculty rep on the UFC could be one in the same person.

Beauvais: In that case, you'd have someone there for three years.

Phyllis: Will the constitution of the CAC be determined by each campus or will we have a system-wide policy?

Bruce: The law allows each campus to decide individually.

Phyllis: Won't that potentially cause a situation where one campus might have more CAC/UFC representatives than others?

Beauvais: Good point. I also see a problem where some campuses would have the same rep on both the CAC and the UFC, and others would not. The potential lack of a link between the two committees could be a problem. Another issue: can senate presidents continue serving as non-voting members of the Academic Affairs and Student Success committee (AASSC)?

Phyllis: It might be best if we adjust the UFC bylaws to not include every CAC's faculty representative on the UFC. The Academic Affairs faculty rep should rotate from campus to campus and be tied to the UFC.

Beauvais: We are assuming the rotating representation we have now would be continued by the new BOT. It's possible the BOT would leave it to the president to appoint a faculty member not affiliated with the UFC. We need to encourage the BOT and/or the president to allow us to

continue as we have. That would mean Terry would be the next faculty non-voting member serving on AASSC.

Bruce: Even if the BOT empowers the president to select the faculty rep for the AASSC, we should ensure that person is, or becomes, a member of the UFC. Any other thoughts about how we should adjust our bylaws?

3. Lecturer titles and levels across the system

Gretchen: Based on data gathered from surveys of non-tenured full-time faculty at both UTK and UTC, the non-tenure rep on the UTC senate has proposed new titles for the different levels of lecturers. I expect the suggested new titles will be approved by the senate tomorrow.

Beauvais: At UTK the language for the lecturer levels is passed but still under review by the General Counsel. We are a bit frustrated by the delays in that office. What is the experience of the other campuses with their counsels?

Gretchen: Our in-house lawyer is easy to work with. It can be a slow process, but he's already reviewed the language the senate will consider.

Beauvais: So, UTC has a career ladder for lecturers?

Gretchen: We do now. Our former provost set aside money (maybe \$200K) to lift our current pool of lectures onto the new career ladder.

Bruce: At our next meeting we need to choose officers for next year and review new bylaws language. It'll be a big meeting.

Adjournment at 5:17 pm.

Next meeting: 3 PM EST (1 hour earlier than normal), 16 May 2018

Respectfully submitted,
Gavin Townsend
UFC Secretary