



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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

Meeting 106
22 August 2018, 4:00 pm (ET) / 3:00 pm (CT)
Meeting and Videoconference
MINUTES (unapproved)

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

UTHSC	George Cook (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Phyllis A. Richey (Campus Representative)	Present at 4:43
UTK	Misty Anderson (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Bruce MacLennan (Campus Representative)	Present
UTM	Renee LeFleur (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Chris Caldwell (Campus Representative)	Absent
UTC	Steve Ray (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Beth Crawford	Absent

Trustees (Ex-Officio voting)		
	tbd	n/a
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

Call to Order 4:04 PM (EST) by Bruce MacLennan, Chair

Steve informed everyone that Beth Crawford will be the new faculty representative from UTC.

Bruce called for the approval of the previous meeting's minutes. There were no corrections or changes needed. Misty moved to approve them. Renee seconded. Previous meeting's minutes were approved.

Bruce asked for updates on from various campuses regarding PTR. Steve said that UTC's Interim Provost is soliciting input regarding the template from the deans and the faculty senate Executive Committee and Handbook Committee.

George said UTCHS is setting up a small committee. This would be over 40 committees with 3 people on each. Not sure how they are going to do that. CAO/Vice Chancellor will be working on it there. Not deans. Their Handbook Committee will meet next week to make some decisions about how to proceed. First Senate meeting will be Sept 11, too late for review of PTR, but they might hold a specially called meeting.

Renee said UTM took a faculty survey. They are presenting the survey to Provost. From there, they will make a recommendation to senate committee.

Misty asked what questions Renee included on survey. Renee said their questions included: "Do you want PTR to occur in fall or spring?" "Should the committee be 3 or 5 members?" "Should deans or Provosts choose committees?" "Should deans or provost to be in charge of the process?"

UTK will be reviewing PTR at their faculty senate retreat later this week. Their new provost is taking the lead with a back and forth with the deans. The raw template was circulated and it was proposed that a small group of four sit down for a small workshop.

Bruce asked if Misty was going to address it at the retreat? He said he hopes discussion will happen there. Misty said they will talk about it some, but most of their discussion will be about online teaching.

Bruce asked if we should get a copy of the survey from Renee. Renee is happy to share, but said UTM is different. She was surprised that faculty did not want the vote to be anonymous. They had a significant number of responders to survey.

George said that like many medical schools, UTHSC does not have as many people hired on tenure track there.

Bruce asked if Oct. 15 is still the target date for the template/process to be returned to the system. Linda said she thinks so. She had not seen anything to suggest otherwise.

Bruce changed the topic of conversation to the BOT orientation material. He suggested that perhaps it should not be considered orientation material anymore, because the board members have been on the board for a while now. He asked if we wanted to produce some version of this document for the UFC.

Misty said she tried to collate everyone's feedback in the redo. Feedback included: articulating similarities and differences between business and universities; Faculty rights and responsibilities was shortened some; the first page is basically an index only; and generally "culling" it down.

Linda said that the rollup of three years is only on the UTK campus. Misty said she will amend that bit.

Steve indicated that he did not believe that UTC has a practice of logging all contact with colleagues when searching a new position.

George asked about the abbreviation. Which is it—PTR or PPPR? Linda said that “PPPR” as the abbreviation might go away, but we should keep the slash just in case.

Renee said the last bullet under post tenure review regarding UFC registering its concern is a confusing statement. Is it passed or will it be voted on? Misty asked for suggestions about how we should word it. Linda said the board is voting on campus procedures at the Nov. board meeting, not PPPR system wide. Misty said we need to know exactly what is being approved/voted on. Linda suggested we might want to add additional clarification so the board is not confused, since they have already approved this.

Misty repeated that we need to be exactly clear on what is being voted on Nov. 1 and how to describe that accurately. She asked about BOT 0006? “That policy has already been passed,” Renee said, then added, “Correct?” Linda responded, “Yes.” Renee concluded, “So it would be the campus policies that are being voted on.”

Bruce asked if we wanted to have an in principle vote that this is the approved UFC document or see a final draft before voting on it.

George said that he was not too clear on the business language and asked if we should run this by a business professor. Regarding the business language, Steve proposed reconsider “living with diversity” and perhaps word it in a way that was less oppositional to business. Misty suggested that it should put that in a shared value column. Steve proposed that there were other shared values, including “communication skills.”

Linda turned the conversation back to the document to be approved in November. Misty asked, “Do we have the numbers or math about how all these committees are going to work?” Linda said other universities had five-member committees with one “at large” member from the discipline of the tenured professor.

George said UTHSC had looked at that model—where there is one group for each college then only one person from the department of the professor is added. The real problem, he said, has been in the medical fields. They do not want reviewers who do not know their field. Still it would save some on the number of people involved.

Bruce asked Linda if she can provide guidance for campuses since she has gathered information about how other schools have done it. Linda said she did not really do that, but that she could make a few phone calls and get more information and ideas for us. Bruce asked her to also see what others have tried that failed. Misty said she heard

from a colleague at another institution who said that this type of PTR has imploded there.

Phyllis joined the meeting.

Misty asked for any additional information regarding the orientation document to be sent to her soon. She will send it to a business colleague to look at it. Then she will send it back to us.

Bruce recommended that we vote to approve it. Steve proposed an email vote for the document. Misty asked for a timeline because it was meant to be for the BOT orientation. Bruce asked when she thinks she can have it done. Misty said she could have it ready by Monday. Bruce said we will vote next week after we receive it.

Bruce moves conversation on to next item—the Academic Affairs Committee, now called the Education, Research and Service Committee. Bruce proposed a minor revision to put in the correct name of the committee in the bylaws. All agreed that we will vote on that in September.

The last item on the agenda was an update from Linda. She said she did not have a lot of news to share about the new board. Misty asked if there are guidelines for the ERS committee representative. “Should it be a UFC alum, since they are representing everyone?” she asked. Phyllis said that she thought that in May or June we had a tentative game plan to proceed on as we had with the faculty trustee to follow the same line. This would make Terry Cooper the member. Misty pointed out that the BOT specified that this time the position will come from UT Knoxville. Linda confirmed that Phyllis was correct about the original discussion, but the BOT had specified the new member come from UTK. Then it will rotate after that, she said. Misty, returned to her initial question about who it should be. Bruce asked if it is left up to campuses or if there is a unified process. Linda said she did not know yet. She had asked the question, but did not know the answer yet.

Phyllis said that “research” was added into the title for a reason. Linda said “Oak Ridge” did not have a place to fit in, adding, “We have a larger mission.”

George asked, “Are there other committee changes?” Misty said there are four committees.

Linda said that only two were mandated. There used to be much more.

Linda said she has been working daily with THEC to move program modifications and curriculum forward. She added that Jorge Perez will be joining the System. Jorge and Linda will both meet with UFC at first, but eventually only one of them might be joining us. Phyllis told Linda that “we certainly don’t want to lose you.” She pointed out that UFC used to work with both Katie and India, unless one of them could not make it. Linda said she plans to continue to participate. Phyllis added that she imagines that Jorge will provide an invaluable voice as well. Historically both positions have

participated with UFC, she said. She would like to see that continue. Linda told everyone that “you will all enjoy working with Jorge.” He’s an ACE fellow. Phyllis pointed out that he has an IT background, which makes him unique in the position.

Misty agreed that these skills will be useful for our conversations re: EAB. Phyllis stated that “we are in an era where IT is essential to our existence.”

Misty asked, “With the presidential search coming up, what is the job description?” Linda said the description is decided by the board, “not that they will not engage with the faculty.” Phyllis suggested that UFC should consider actually sending forward a request for involvement in the process. “If we don’t ask, we won’t know,” she added.

Misty agreed that it would be good to make a bid to be an advisory body. “Of course it’s their decision,” she said, pointing out that the BOT made a point about transparency and access. She thinks we can offer that in a very respectful way.

Phyllis asked Linda if this should be made to the Board or to them via Joe. Linda said it would make sense for UFC to send the offer to be involved to the board. She was willing to send it forward to Catherine. Phyllis said she does not want it to be perceived as overstepping, whether it is to the board or through Joe. Linda said she will check on this so that we do not get started on the wrong foot.

Bruce asked if there was any further business.

Misty asked Renee to send everyone her survey questions.

Linda asked why Renee did not ask if a faculty member indicates an intent to retire, do they still do PPPR? Renee said she felt that UTM faculty would want retiring faculty not to go through PPPR. George said, “We assumed the CAO would make arrangements in special situations of retirement.”

Linda said she was interested in how the campuses will differ regarding the survey questions.

Linda informed everyone that all BOT meeting dates are now posted on the website and suggested that everyone should get them on their calendars because they have changed a bit.

Bruce adjourned the meeting at 5:12 p.m.