



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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

**Meeting 104
21 June 2018, 12 pm Eastern
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 via Zoom
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

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)	Present
	Linda Martin (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present
Faculty Council Guests		
	Misty Anderson (UTK Incoming Senate President)	Present
	Steve Ray (UTC Incoming Senate President)	Present via Zoom
	Renee LaFleur (UTM Incoming Senate President)	Present
	George Cook (UTHSC Incoming Senate President)	Absent
	Leigh Cherry (UT System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present
	Karen Etzkorn (UT System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present

Call to Order 12:04 PM (EST) by Bruce MacLennan, Chair

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The meeting commenced with a discussion with Pres. DiPietro.

Beauvais mentioned that UFC had met with David Miller for a preview of the Sibson salary study. He noted that there are some gaps in the data, and that the UTK senate’s comparison with R1 institutions gives a better picture. Joe observed that none of these studies is perfect, and that we should share the issues with Joe or David. Beauvais asked whether the Sibson study was worth the cost, and Joe said that the Board wanted a comparison with peer institutions.

Gretchen asked if there would be an opportunity to review the peers again (because some of them are not really comparable), and Joe replied that we will have to see what the new Board wants to do. Linda said it would be helpful to pick out peers and aspirational peers as subsets of larger groups to see if they are representative.

Sibson is still working on UTHSC salaries. The problem is that all the data is held by professional associations and proprietary.

Joe noted that UTM is financially distressed because of declining enrollment and because it is in an economically depressed area (so in effect UTM has to give some of the tuition back to the students).

Beauvais asked about the staff salary study. He noted that the UTK living wage survey shows a decrease in staff not earning a living wage, as defined by the survey. We are major employers in our markets, which should be a concern of legislators on both sides of the aisle. We impact markets as well as compete in them. He suggested that part of our mission should be to raise the economics of state. How do we think of markets for phase 2 of the study? It might be good to be 20% above the market, for example.

Beauvais asked about the size of the UT system, its funding, and whether the BAG process had been applied to it. Joe said it is applied the same way. We spent down a lot of the system reserves in early years. The growth in the budget was largely a result of federal changes (e.g., Title IX), government relations, etc. Beauvais asked about the number of system employees: is it 226 or (about) 356 as the Knoxville News Sentinel says? Joe said he was not sure where the higher number came from; perhaps it included Foundation people.

Bruce asked about the status and timeline of the PPPR framework. Joe said he would give it next week to the chancellors and CAOs for their review. Based on their input he expects to have a revised version in early July. Then the UFC will get it for comment. The goal is still to have the final framework ready for Board approval in November. Most likely, the process will not be implemented until the following AY.

Joe stated that system tenure review policies will be overarching, but the campuses can be more rigorous than the system guidelines, but “meet the spirit of those guidelines.” Beauvais pointed out that the UFC has been diligent in responding to changes that deal with enhanced tenure track review, requirement of outside review letters, etc. Many of the changes that have been proposed were fully endorsed by the UFC. However, these meant fewer changes for UTK than for some other campuses. It is important for us all to be on the same page regarding these changes, Beauvais emphasized. Misty noted that the EPPR language is uneven across the campuses. UTK is still waiting for approval of EPPR language in handbook. It is enforced, but held up in the general counsel’s office. Gretchen said that UTC’s EPPR language has already been approved and is in UTC’s handbook. There were questions by all about why the language is not the same. All seemed to agree that this is a big concern.

Misty said she believes there was a memo from India’s office after the workshop on tenure in Nashville this past fall that recommended waiting to see how EPPR (someone suggested this was actually the PPPR) worked before instituting another change. Bruce expressed a desire for a commitment to review the PPPR process to make sure it is accomplishing what it is supposed to accomplish.

Joe did not think that was a bad idea. Some units (colleges/campuses) do it well, he said, some do it poorly. Anything that ends up going to the board for approval (early tenure decisions or tenure on appointment) comes through Joe’s desk, he said, and he has to say yes or no. So this year he spent a lot of time on dossiers. It was frustrating because we are

not consistent and the rigor is not always there. His office had to request additional information beyond the files that were submitted from the campuses. They had dossiers in which CVs were old. There were inconsistent recommendations on the same document. There were two-sentence letters of endorsement from a dean, for example. He said he hopes that deans will do an evaluation of a professor at the level of a college that will say the professor is great and say why as well as pointing out shortcomings. "We've got to get better and more and uniform," Joe said. Some of the concerns the board has had about tenure review had to do with inconsistencies.

Misty asked "Why not address inconsistencies by unit when you know the units that are not compliant?" This is a unit problem and not a uniform problem with the faculty. Joe said they have certainly talked to those people a lot. In the majority of cases, it was just a matter of getting more information. But in the past we have not been doing it consistently. We have had errors, sloppiness and a careless approach.

Beauvais agreed that that is concerning. If we are defining the problem as a lack of department head thoroughness and a lack of clarity and rigor in terms of standards for rank, then that is the problem. He added that UTK has worked to address this problem in their handbook. The PPPR process adds a whole other machine on top of that. He's worried that it is taking good people who are doing good work and adding additional labor on them. He expressed concerned for faculty members. He said he was not against post-tenure review. He is for making sure our current post-tenure review is working so we don't need to add this other machine. Beauvais asked, "What does this other machine look like?" He stated that it seems to involve five years of annual review, a two-page cover letter, and a committee of three people, at least one who comes from another discipline. Joe said, "That is a document that we plan to get to you by July."

Gretchen said she does not think anyone should leave our provost office a dossier looking like what Joe described. It is incumbent on Dr. Pietro and our board to tell our chancellors that this just needs to get fixed, she said. Joe said that the buck has been passed. Beauvais and Misty replied that the buck has now come all the way back to the faculty. Misty asked, "Why is it not incumbent on the provosts and deans to fix this?" Joe replied, "It is." Department Heads, Deans, Provosts, Chancellors are responsible. Not faculty. Faculty members should not be responsible for the careless approach to some of these. He emphasized it was only some of these, although he was surprised by the quantity of sloppy dossiers. Gretchen asked if Joe could give us a percentage. Misty concurred and asked if he could describe "units." Are these departments or whole colleges? Joe responded that that is hard without "laying someone out." The total numbers are relatively modest, he said. He continued, saying he was prepared to tell the board we have confidence in the ones we are passing forward. We have great confidence you should support these if they have been vetted by his office and sent forward. But in the vetting, there were problems that were discovered, even inaccuracy in the reporting of the vote, some even had vote tally columns transposed.

Linda said that sometimes the committee vote was misstated by the department chair. Joe said, "It's not the faculty that I'm upset with." The faculty member does the best job they can to put their dossier together, but it is this system that in some cases, not all, is lax. Joe stated that "the attitude is 'I know her. She's a good faculty member. A good friend so

we will promote her.’ This kind of vindicates this board’s attitude now that we are tenuring people without much care and it’s really embarrassing to me.”

Beauvais suggested, “so it is less than 10% of the cases?” Joe answered, “Yeah, that’s probably correct.” Linda indicated that less than 10% of the cases have big issues, but more have small issues, such as letters that aren’t signed.

Joe said that on University positive votes (i.e. 10-0, 12-0-1), his office has not had time to dig through those. They moved them forward because the votes were strong. Linda lost sleep trying to get through all the documents. Phyllis said it sounds like is that this has been a painful, but productive process. “I’m glad you are unable to uncover this lack of consistency and folks just not doing their job,” she said. “We as faculty and the UFC as a group have been carrying the torch for transparency. We want more transparency from our administrators. This is just a perfect example of transparency. It has been beneficial in uncovering some real needs for improving the whole process.” She then asked, “What is the plan moving forward to intensify the training for administrators doing the evaluations as well as going up through the administration at the different campuses processing all this?” Joe said we are already doing department head annual evaluation training, but participation can sometimes be minimal. Phyllis says, “Our chancellor made it (dept. head evaluation training) mandatory.”

Joe said the other thing he worries about is how administrators deal with difficult conversations and conflict. That could be part of the problem. Some faculty members might be moved forward rather than having the difficult conversation. The general consensus among the UFC members was that having those difficult conversations is part of the job. Beauvais said he thinks that some department heads have a hard time being candid when faculty members don’t meet criteria. Joe said that we are making progress—i.e. outside letters. “If you aren’t doing this consistently,” he said, “It compromises the value of the tenure that we give faculty members who work hard and do great work.” Phyllis agreed and says, regarding sloppiness, that if that had been a grant proposal, it would not have even gotten a review. That is how department heads should approach it.

Linda said that she obtained departmental bylaws in order to review the dossiers, so she could evaluate them properly. Some letters had no narrative at all. “I didn’t want a quality faculty member to be overlooked because their review was sloppy,” she said.

Misty said it is important as we look at this and think about where the problem is that we identify that these are administrator problems with the tenure process because it comes back to the faculty member, even if it is a light and not burdensome process.

Beauvais said that as a minimum standard, there should be a feedback loop to reform department heads or deans who are not effectively evaluating. Maybe a few years of PPPR could help reform annual performance reviews and the culture of assessment and after a few years we would not need it.

Phyllis said that whereas EPPR is there to make sure there isn’t a false negative, this second review level is there to make sure there is not a false positive. Both reviews speak to improving the quality of our faculty.

Beauvais said that in terms of regular tenure review process, all faculty members' recommendations for tenure at UTK, except two members who were not approved, were positive. On all other campuses, all faculty members recommended for tenure were approved. Joe stated that he does not see negative recommendations. Beauvais said that it was important to frame it for the board this way. Joe indicated that we are framing it that way. Beauvais asked if the numbers of those not recommended can be presented at tomorrow's meeting.

Linda, to Beauvais, said, "So what you are asking is that when this is presented, that the board understands that there are others that drop out along the way." Beauvais confirmed this, adding that he is worried that the board has the perception that this is a rubber stamp club with low benchmarks. Linda added that the board has asked for this information about faculty members who were turned down for tenure and that this is exactly the place where there is an obligation to provide that information.

Chris said that it's easy to count those that are turned down, but not those that drop out along the way. We need a method to count those that never go up for tenure. Phyllis added, "What about those that were appealed?" Are appeals registered and the reasoning they were or were not overturned? Discussion followed regarding those faculty members who appeal or sue.

Joe said we had a lot of tenure recommendations that were slam dunks, but that he imagines the board will have questions like "How do we have all these zeroes (in the vote)?"

Misty said these are numbers that we could gather, meaning those who did not go up for tenure or who were coached out. Those numbers can be seen in a basic examination of the number of faculty hires compared to those that went up for tenure, she said. Linda agreed that this is the best way to measure the data.

Beauvais gave this hypothetical example: "Professor Smith" was recruited from a pool of nearly 300 candidates for a prized position. She was given a huge startup budget and given no teaching her first year in order to start her lab report. The university has invested a great deal in her. She has achieved NSF funding. She is recognized as an excellent teacher. What are faculty members in her department supposed to do? She even took on extra advisees. So, of course 12 faculty are going to vote positive for her. "That's a response to the board when they ask why there was a 12-0 vote for her and think that looks fishy," he said. "We are celebrating her success and our investment in her."

Linda said we have gathered this information in the past, but we had trouble at the department level because there were other reasons people gave for leaving. Some of those were coached away, and no one wanted to say that. We should just report those that came in and those that left before tenure, assuming some left for legitimate reasons.

Misty said that some members of the current board reference the bell curve as the proper metric here, which is both a discredited human behavioral statistical theory and not very appropriate to a case where, working off Beauvais' hypothetical, you are already vetting from a pool of 300 people who have PhDs in the discipline. We need to make sure we are pushing back with legitimate and substantive arguments and information and not just saying "Oh, we'll look into that." Faculty need to feel that the administration is providing a proper

defense—a “reasonable, valid, statistically accurate defense of what we do.” Otherwise you will hear more faculty concern.

Chris said sometimes an anecdote or single faculty member can offer a more effective response than the statistics.

Joe said we can certainly put a document together—the shorter the better. A thousand-word briefing addressing the concerns Beauvais raised. The UFC members concurred that it could and should be less than a thousand words.

Beauvais brought up a position paper he has written that raises concern about the distribution of meeting materials. Some materials get put up early, others are late. Joe does not like that some go out at the last minute. Beauvais suggested that we agree that we can change that. Joe said he does not disagree. He said there is no doubt that at the system level we need this information much earlier. We have to have an expectation to get through those earlier.

Phyllis asked when the deadline date is for the system to receive faculty tenure information from the campuses. Is it in May or before? Linda was not sure, but said that they get things after the “drop dead” date and even then they are not complete. Phyllis said she does not see how her college can do anything any earlier. “I can’t imagine doing a P&T report in August,” she said. Linda said that it is happening plenty early in departments, but delayed after that. We should look at how we can facilitate that, Linda said.

Beauvais said that reports affiliated with BOT minutes are not on the website any more. In keeping with the spirit of transparency and open governance, those need to be reinstated. He knows you can request them, but the Open Records Act indicates what is considered best practices. Chris asked what happened to those reports. Did something just go wrong? Was it intentional? Beauvais said we’ve gone back and looked for historical documents and could not find them. Some links no longer work. It just does not seem like best practice to have to track someone down. Someone added that if you are of a suspicious mind, it makes you question why they are not there. It could just be broken links, they offered. Beauvais said that if it is a mistake, the system’s numerous IT folks should be able to correct that.

Misty brought up the BOT orientation. In the May 10 BOT meeting in Nashville, the issue came up about individual board members being contacted by a faculty member. “We need to respect proper channels,” Misty stated. “I don’t want to overwhelm the new board and I want healthy communications.” She asked Joe, “Do you have advice on how to make sure we are communicating appropriately and honestly with each other?”

Joe said the UFC needs to be able to talk to him or Linda. He said he thinks it would be healthy for UFC members to have conversations/relationships with board members. “Some of you are close friends with current board members. That’s fine,” he said. “Should you contact them individually? Certainly.”

Bruce asked Joe to give us a look at the next year—what we should be on the lookout for or planning for. Joe said the new board is very talented. They will have to elect a chairperson and a faculty member to the AASS committee. He expects some appointments to campus

boards would be made this summer some time. Some may be recess appointments. "You know the hot button issues for legislators," he added.

Beauvais said, "I can well imagine that as you are envisioning your campus level boards or recess appointments, I think about colleagues who have retired. . . You know, having someone on board who has experience in academia in some way. . . Finding people that have experience inside and out of academia would be appropriate." They would be great assets to the campus boards and the additional seats that are open.

Joe points out that there will likely be a 30-35% change in legislators and a new governor.

Conversation turned to the relationship between the outgoing board and incoming board and the "sunset." Joe confirmed that the "sunset" is not about extending the current board. It's a routine "sunset."

Chris asked Joe, "What is your five-year future?" Joe answered, "One of the first conversations I'll have with the new board is transitions. Once they are seated and have a chairman, my preference would be to be done sometime in early January." "My contract goes through June." He indicated that with all the change in the general assembly and the administration in the state, he does not think it is optimum to have a "lame duck" president who will stay until June. He added that it would be better for the institution to have a new woman or man in this position to begin building relationships with the new administration.

Beauvais asked about the specially-called meeting of the board in Aug. Where and when will it be? Joe said it is his understanding that it will be August 1 in Nashville. The Board Secretary has been working on new policy, new documents, new bylaws, etc. Beauvais offered that this is a good time to put in the bylaws that the agenda will be provided five days in advance of a meeting.

Joe said goodbye at 1:33 p.m.

Meeting called back to order 1:51 EST

Minutes from meeting of 16 May 2018 were approved with minor corrections approved.

Beauvais moves for approval. No objections or corrections.

Old Business

1. Revision of UFC Charter and Bylaws

Beauvais moved to treat all changes simultaneously. No objection. Martin seconded. No discussion. There was a unanimous vote to approve the revisions to the UFC Charter and Bylaws.

Bruce noted that the UFC website needs updating with new bylaws.

New Business

1. Election of Chair

Phyllis wanted to make sure that Bruce MacLennan was continuing as chair of UFC. In order to make sure there was no confusion, Phyllis moved to confirm Bruce as the continuing chair. Gretchen seconded.

Beauvais noted that Chris Caldwell should be considered a great asset when nominating future chairs. Chris has served a three-year term on the UFC and is finishing his term as President of UTM Faculty Senate. Beauvais recommended that chairs come from campus representatives, instead of faculty senate presidents, due to the level of difficulty in being both the Chair of the UFC and a faculty senate president. Phyllis indicated that it has been an “unwritten rule” for the UFC Chairs to come from campus representatives, rather than faculty senate presidents.

Typically, chairs are rotated among campuses. Bruce (UTK) is the current chair. Phyllis (UTHSC) was chair last year. Bruce was the chair before Phyllis, but only because he filled in for Brian (UTM) who left.

There were no objections to Bruce continuing as chair. Bruce was elected to continue as chair.

2. Introduction of New Members

Members present introduced themselves: Bruce MacLennan (UTK, faculty elected representative), Gretchen Potts (UTC, Faculty Senate President), Renee LaFleur (UTM, Faculty Senate President-elect), Leigh Cherry (UT System, Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success), Martin Donaldson (UTHSC, Faculty Senate President), Chris Caldwell (UTM, Faculty Senate President), Linda Martin (UT System, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success), Karen Etzkorn (UT System, Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success), Beauvais Lyons (UTK, Faculty Senate President), Misty Anderson (UTK, incoming Faculty Senate President), Phyllis Richey (UTHSC, Campus Representative), Steve Ray (UTC, incoming Faculty Senate President)

UTC will select a one-year replacement for Dr. Gavin Townsend. This replacement will be selected by the UTC Committee on Committees. The new campus representative for UTC will have a one-year term.

After this point in the meeting, Martin was Phyllis’ proxy for votes, since she had to leave.

3. Remembering Gavin Townsend

The memorial resolution from Health Sciences honoring Dr. Gavin Townsend was presented by Bruce as a model for our resolution. Gretchen felt that the Health Sciences resolution encompasses Gavin’s work with the system. The Health Sciences resolution was edited to reflect its coming from UFC. Gretchen and Bruce will coordinate to mail the resolution to Dr. Townsend’s wife. Gretchen will mail the resolution to UTC Chancellor Dr. Steve Angle.

The resolution was unanimously approved. Gretchen recommended that individuals send their own contributions, but include in the memo a reference to Dr. Townsend’s service to UFC.

4. Update from Academic Affairs and Student Success and Discussion of THEC Academic Program Productivity Review (Linda Martin)

Gretchen began discussion regarding reverse transfer by stating that there are only certain times of year that students can do a reverse transfer and asked, “Why?” Leigh replied that it

is set up in a cycle in order not to overwhelm the staff. Institutions can work outside the cycle, but it makes institutional tracking difficult. Leigh said that the website had been redesigned to make the process clearer. She will send the website to everyone.

Linda asked Leigh to speak about having just hosted their second transfer summit in February. It included registrars, etc. Around two hundred people attended. Transfer pathways were discussed at the transfer summit.

Linda said they were working on EAB (Academic Performance Solutions). They were about midway through the third stage of that, which is getting information back to campuses for them to review. Each campus has designees for "ground truthing." Next is a training phase at campuses. UT Chattanooga has been using this for some time. Perhaps we can have someone from Chattanooga come and talk about how it is working there, Linda suggested. There will be lots of training regarding course bottlenecks, how to be strategic about when to offer courses, how that affects interrelated classes, etc. Dennis in the system office has been working with faculty on faculty workload credit for courses such as team teaching, faculty coordinator, mentoring, supervision of graduate students, etc., rather than relying solely on student credit hour data. Linda said they are looking at how we help people understand this part of the faculty load and time commitment. Dennis is working on a narrative with CAOs regarding expectations for each course.

Beauvais asked Gretchen how this is working with Banner at UTC. Gretchen replied that EAB is only as strong as the numbers you give it. UTC pulls five years of data and uses it mostly for advising, predictive analytics, and funding formulas. She stated that it is important for student success data because of its notifications for students, advising notes, and because it synchronizes with Outlook Calendar. APS is a different part of EAB than the student success part that UTC mostly uses.

Linda stated that EAB is great for student credit hour data, program review, facilities use and other data used for funding formulas, etc. That's why it's going system wide. It is a board initiative. Misty asked if EAB/APS captures the data for faculty workload? Linda said it doesn't and that that is why Dennis is using EAB to build upon for his data/processes. The hope is to build our own in-house system that captures that. She can have Dennis come talk to the UFC.

Misty asked how much does EAB cost? Linda was unsure, but stated that it is only on a one-time, three-year contract. Misty suggested that the board should realize that this could be an expensive initiative. Linda said she did not think it will be continued beyond the three years. Misty asked what were the specific problems or questions that this is supposed to address. Linda replied that it was providing the tools for campus leaders to make the decisions they need to make regarding enrolment management, faculty need projections, course offerings, modeling projected enrolment, and comparison with national data. Gretchen asked if this goes along with the THEC "low-producing program"? Linda replied no. THEC is revamping. Linda stated that she has communicated to THEC that the number of graduates a program produces is not the only indicator of "production". There are other ways, such as general education SCH, numbers of minors, and various unique aspects. Music, she said, is always on the low-producing program because Music is "very individualized." THEC is working on revamping its current calculation based on five-year graduation rates. The Commission is very concerned about low-producing programs. We

will see more pressure about these programs and they will not be easily explained away. She said the message is very clear from the Commission that they are going to take a closer look at this. The CAOs are very aware and the old explanations might not suffice. Misty suggested that we do not know what kind of arguments the system is willing to make on our behalf. But we must have those arguments against unreasonable metrics.

Linda pointed out that in a lot of states that have gone this route, the institutions change to “concentrations.” The problem with that is that you use the same resources whether it’s a concentration or a major and it disadvantages the student because they do not have that as a major.

Misty asked if there has been any discussion about the new normal of a student’s attending three institutions to finish a degree. Linda said she thought that THEC was looking at some of that and beginning to track students.

Beauvais asked how minors or double majors fit in. Linda answered that minors do not fit in at all, but they are generating data about minors.

Beauvais suggested that with the establishment of LGIs, it is conceivable that we will have more counterparts in the state responding to THEC audits. It makes it harder to communicate with a unified voice in defense of programs. What has been Linda’s experience working with other folks and the LGIs in terms of how she has a concerted coalition in response? Does she have conference calls? Linda said they do not have conference calls, but they have meetings on emerging issues. Beauvais proposed that Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS), which represents the 10 four-year public institutions in the state, would be a great resource for this. Misty concurred and asked if there were out of state groups that can provide resources. Linda said that she has contacted colleagues around the country. Misty asked if that was a more informal network for Linda. Linda responded, “Yes. But the nice thing is I can usually get information fairly quickly.”

Linda informed the group that they are getting ready to do interviews for India Lane’s position. They are interviewing three candidates. Everyone is invited to the interviews—the more the merrier—even incoming UFC representatives. THEC has been represented in the process as well.

Gretchen said she had heard there is going to be a revamping of Tennessee Promise because the numbers may be down. Leigh Cherry said there were a lot of applications for the new grant for Tennessee Reconnect. She offered to share more information about Tennessee Reconnect with the group. There was general agreement that there are problems with Tennessee Promise, but no one had specific information regarding any changes.

Linda left at 2:49 EST.

5. Discussion of Board of Trustees Orientation Material (Beauvais Lyons)

Beauvais started by saying that the document he compiled was simply an effort to unpack the conversation in the previous meeting. He felt there was general agreement and that Terry’s comments in his letter were good regarding how to reset relationship with the new

board members. How we do this as the UFC or on our individual campuses? We had three areas in our minutes, he said, but he added “Faculty Governance” as a fourth. He did amend the “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” by adding “faculty workload” based on UTK’s Interim Provost having a request about faculty workload from the board.

Beauvais felt there may be a lot of people bending the board members’ ears. Perhaps we should, as Terry suggests, not be at the head of the queue in order to not get drowned out. UTK will invite new board members to their campus (Aug. 24) for a conversation. We should discuss academic freedom, tenure, faculty rights, responsibilities, workload, etc.

Martin asked if this could piggyback on the board training that Linda was talking about. Misty indicated that she thought that it would be a good idea to have UFC representation at that training session. Martin felt like that would be a more important venue because there would be more board members there. Beauvais proposed that we might get some pushback on this. The FOCUS Act dictates that THEC implement board training. Catherine Mizell sent a letter detailing areas to be included in the training. There were a lot of training areas. In her letter, according to Beauvais, she indicated that if it was necessary to supplement information it would be done by the board office.

Beauvais said that Dr. DiPietro had previously stated and had confirmed over lunch today that we could contribute to helping board members gain the perspective of faculty. Beauvais continued by quoting the 2009 Association of Governing Boards’ report that recommended including faculty in the governing board’s orientation so that faculty and boards can learn about each other. Members of the UFC could clearly benefit from being present and learning more about the responsibilities of the trustees.

Beauvais said the 2009 Association of Governing Boards’ report, cited by the governor in support of the FOCUS act, recommended that if a board already has a faculty member on it, then a faculty member should remain on the board.

Beauvais feels that helping board members understand recruiting and retaining faculty is of utmost importance. Every faculty-level search is like an executive level search. Faculty searches can have more candidates than provost searches. These are more qualified people. Misty added that they are specifically qualified. Bruce added that we only invite the top 1 or 2% to campus. Beauvais said the recruiting and retaining of faculty is an important story to tell. Competition from other campuses is always a threat in regard to retaining faculty members.

Leigh Cherry said that it appears that we have different mandates from Catherine Mizell and Dr. DiPietro concerning our role in giving input to the new board members. She noted that Dr. Pietro seemed supportive.

Misty had mocked up a document defining tenure. She said it does not cover Beauvais’ four areas. She handed out copies of her document which includes the core values that the UTK faculty affirmed. She said the document is specific to UTK, but it could be modified to represent UFC.

Beauvais indicated that it is his opinion that at this next board meeting “we want to say thank you, we appreciate your service.” There is general consensus on this. Martin

proposes that in future board meetings we should partner with Linda. Misty thinks we should be ready to address issues at the Aug. 4 meeting, if needed.

Martin asked how we should proceed. Bruce proposed that we read Misty's document after the meeting. If we agree it's a good starting point, then we could modify it into something more campus-neutral.

Bruce asked when the BOT orientation meeting is. There was no clear answer, but Dr. DiPietro should be asked. Beauvais asked if we could be invited to participate. Misty said we should at least have a document for the BOT.

Beauvais suggested that we should agree to have an ad hoc committee, comprised of current and new UFC members, to be part of a communications thread to develop a brief for new board members. Martin said that it is not necessary to get it into their hands at or near orientation, but definitely before they start making policy decisions (before the November board meeting). Beauvais said that perhaps September or October would be a target date. Beauvais asked if we should use a Google doc that everyone edits. Discussion regarding format ensued. Karen said that she is the Sharepoint administrator for her office. Her email is etzkorn@tennessee.edu. She stated that only one person at a time can edit a Sharepoint document, whereas Google Docs allows for multiple editors simultaneously. Gretchen suggested using One Drive. Chris thought that, due to compliance issues, One Drive is allowed, whereas Google Docs is not.

Beauvais said he will send Karen a document with his four areas and asked which software we will use. There was general agreement that One Drive was the way to go.

Misty volunteered to write a paragraph or two regarding the "Promotion and Tenure" section of Beauvais' four areas, modifying the language in her current document. Beauvais agreed to draft language about "Faculty Rights, Responsibilities and Workload." Bruce will write about "Recruiting and Retaining Faculty." Martin will draft language regarding "Systems of Faculty Governance." Gretchen will set up a document called "New Board Orientation Draft" for people to submit sections and edits. The goal for first drafts is July 15.

6. Campus Reports

UTC

Gretchen presented UTC's Annual Report, covering the resolutions passed this year and recommendations from committees. It is posted on UTC Faculty Senate's website. She said there was 100% submission of committee annual reports. Each committee was given a charge by the Executive Committee. Many recommendations that came forward came from these charges. For example, Academic Standards decided the faculty senate should be looking at grade distribution. The Budget and Economic Status Committee was really active. They focused mainly on faculty compensation. The Course Learning Evaluations Committee focused more on outcomes. It is in a pilot phase. The Faculty Handbook Committee was charged with examining to look at including faculty mentoring.

Unfortunately, with everything else they were working on, they did not get to look at faculty mentoring. The Non-tenure Track Committee very active. They have a whole chapter in the new UTC Faculty Handbook. Beauvais said UTK had no specificity of letter of appointment or description of their duties. So this year they added language to protect non-tenure track faculty.

Bruce said it sounded like UTC's Faculty Senate accomplished quite a lot this year.

Gretchen added that several pedagogy sessions were sponsored by the faculty senate and they were well attended. She also said there were a number of recommendations passed by the faculty senate. Recommendations were passed regarding the spending of online fees, the scheduling of part of term courses, and the selection of peer institutions.

UTHSC

Martin highlighted their work. The Handbook Committee was very active. Faculty grievances were down. The Faculty Senate pushed for training of department heads. Their Chancellor made it mandatory. As a result of following consistent rules, the grievances are down.

Beauvais said that UTK has seen appeals go up, probably as a result of EPPR, where previously appeals were down.

Martin discussed their new training of new faculty senators. This training will include getting new senators together, explaining the promotion and tenure process, discussing faculty responsibilities, and having committee chairs explain what each committee does.

Misty said UTK has a full day retreat with the full senate with breakfast and lunch, costing approximately \$6000. Administrators come through and talk about different issues. It is also the first committee meeting. Beauvais said it helps them launch their year.

Misty reiterates that each campus should extend invitations to the new board members to see who would come to their retreats and listen.

Martin said they are still thinking about how their faculty representative for the advisory board will be determined. The dean turnover at UTHSC has been considerable and notable.

UTHSC is working on starting a memorial service. They are also working on a gubernatorial forum the day before primary elections. UTHSC has a new strategic plan and mission.

UTK

Beauvais presented UTK's report. He noted their personnel changes, pointing out that there is currently no Vice Chancellor of Communications. They successfully recruited a new Provost. Interim Provost John Zomchick will return to the Provost's team.

There was a vote of no confidence in the President that did not pass in a 52 to 22 vote. Their Executive Council pushed for a vote of censure for particular actions by the President, specifically how he terminated their Chancellor and the lack of transparency about outsourcing. The Senate passed it, 72-17-1. They also wanted the President to say, as he did later in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* article, that they do in fact have a post tenure review. It is not that they do not have a post tenure review—they now have an additional system of post-tenure review. Beauvais recommends reading Misty's value statement. They did a "Living Wage Report" salary study. There were proposed changes to the handbook.

UTK has both a faculty ombudsperson and a staff ombudsperson. They asked the ombudsperson to give a report because appeals were down and they thought this might have been due to the actions of the ombudsperson. Departmental bylaws were audited and $\frac{3}{4}$ of departmental bylaws are in compliance with the faculty handbook. They hope to finish that this year. The ombudsman identified conflict/crisis management, but also department head training as reasons appeals were down. The general education redesign did some things with education that require all students as part of their capstone/senior year experience that translates their disciplinary expertise to address a real-world problem. These can be implemented into courses or it could be supplemented with a non-curricular project. Misty said the general education redesign distributes general education courses up through the major. Beauvais added that some of the general education courses are part of the “culminating experience.” These might be in upper level studies.

Beauvais said that for years their faculty senate has been underfunded. Their Chancellor approved a comparative analysis with other faculty senates. Seven peer institutions responded to a survey, and they learned that their budget is well below their peers. So the Chancellor committed to adding \$20,000 to the previous \$48,000. Misty and Beauvais get buy outs for two courses each. They are hoping to convince their incoming Provost to continue this funding.

UTM

Chris presented UTM's report.

UTM has a new strategic plan. They also have a new faculty evaluation system. The goal of this is to generate a single number that's supposed to be consistent across all disciplines. It is a weighted system with ranges of percentages of effort for roles (i.e. Teaching) and components (i.e. Preparation). This new system might be put into Digital Measures. This new system has been created in response to the campus giving too many high ratings. Another problem is that no college on campus had bylaws. UTM is pulling themselves out from an unfortunate hole.

Additional Discussion

Beauvais initiated discussion about the forthcoming requirement of peer review of teaching as part of the tenure dossier and a discussion of bylaws. He suggested one way of adding value to all the campuses is to create comparative showcases of what peer review looks like, so that each of us do not have to reinvent the wheel. Perhaps the UFC could take this on.

Beauvais said that the best bylaws mirror the structure of the handbook they are relating to. Perhaps we create templates or checklists. UTK has posted all bylaws. Bylaws should be accessible for transparency. Leigh Cherry asked if Linda's office should help facilitate the bylaws and their accessibility. Karen talked about deficiencies in dossiers that came to their office from different campuses. They are working on a dossier checklist. Beauvais said bylaws need criteria for rank, protocols for governance, and criteria for evaluating non-tenure track faculty.

Beauvais brought up that there are three candidates to replace India coming in next week. He thinks a good question to ask them is how to ensure continuity and best practices in evaluations of instruction having to do with the peer review of teaching. Gretchen points out that, according to the resumes of the three candidates, one is a full professor and the other

two are associate professors and one of the associates just got tenure. This is concerning. Karen assured everyone that they did get the three best people in the final pool. Gretchen asked how, from a faculty perspective, are we supposed to respect someone in that role if they barely have the scholarship that the rest of us are required to have? Karen said that this position has a lot of responsibilities, the bulk of which deal with state-wide initiatives that are run from their office, e.g., reverse transfer. When it comes to tenure, Linda will be the one that is reviewing. Gretchen asked if the role is being changed, since India's role was quite involved with the UFC, which included heavy discussions about tenure. Karen said they were not looking for an exact replacement for India. Gretchen asks for the job description to be resent for the UFC members to review. Karen says it can be resent. She assured the attendees that only Linda would be the one reviewing tenure dossiers and speaking on behalf of tenured faculty. The person in this position is not necessarily going to be the person the UFC will talk to about tenure issues, Karen said, "That would be Linda." We would not, she continued, send someone to represent your group that does not have tenure or does not have the qualifications.

7. Determine UFC calendar for AY 18-19

Bruce asked if we wanted to continue with the third Wednesday of the month at 3 p.m. CST/ 4 p.m. EST. This time was approved unanimously.

Gretchen moved to adjourn. Beauvais seconded. There were no objections.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:43.