



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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

**Meeting 110
19 December 2018
4:00 pm (ET) / 3:00 pm (CT)
Meeting and Videoconference
MINUTES**

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

UTHSC	Peg Hartig (proxy)	Present
	Phyllis A. Richey (Campus Representative)	Present
UTK	Misty Anderson (Faculty Senate President)	Absent
	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	Present

Education, Research and Service Committee (ERSC)		
	Bonnie Ownley	Present
UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members		
UT	Randy Boyd	Present
	Linda Martin (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present
Faculty Council Guests		
	Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)	Present
	David Miller	Present
	Gary Skolits (UTK)	Present

Meeting called to order by Bruce MacLennan, Chair.

Linda suggested a change of the agenda order so that Randy and David could speak first

Randy began by talking about his top objectives. His #2 objective is making sure that students succeed. The argument was made with multiple (41) legislators—in order to achieve 55, we have to have more students graduate. They have to be engaged and supported. Randy said that he got buy in from the legislators. He also announced that UTK has hired a Vice Chancellor for Diversity.

Randy said that on the preceding Monday, it was announced that David Miller along with representatives from other campuses will do top to bottom review of who is doing what. They will look at how we can optimize. He stated he wants very clear and transparent accountability, value for money, and an optimized system.

Randy said that one of the things the he hears is that legislators do not feel that they know what is going on at UT. He proposed “Transparent Tennessee.” He said that we are doing a good job already, and that 90% of the stuff we talk about putting out there is probably public already. Still, this effort seems to have gotten some good support from stakeholders and improves our brand.

Randy asked if there were other topics that needed discussing.

Bruce said that in regard to transparency, it would be best to include faculty on these decisions. In some cases we have senate bylaws that prohibit verbatim transcription. Randy replied that legal council will be involved to make sure we do not contradict bylaws. Linda added that there will also be a committee.

Bruce said that there have been concerns about having the board material available in a timely fashion. Randy said that that issues seems to be more administrative and said that we just have to be more strict with suppliers of information so that they get it to us. Linda added that sometimes we are waiting on one campus. The question then becomes, “Should we go ahead and release info even if it is not complete?” Randy said that Catherine Mizell seemed OK with that. “We shouldn’t hold up everything because we are missing one thing,” he said. David added that the board is also getting things at the last minute. Randy said, “We take your point and we are on it.” Bonnie agreed that we shouldn’t wait. David added that the publication of tables might leave a campus blank.

Bruce said UFC is hoping to producing more material for the BOT to help them understand faculty affairs and translate academic terminology if it is valuable. He suggested a Question and Answer format, adding, “We want to be a resource to help you and the board understand.” Randy responded, “That is great. Let me think about the format.” Linda added, “When we are meeting at Martin, Chattanooga, wherever, taking time to meet in classrooms, meet students, has been discussed as helpful.” Randy said, “Wouldn’t that would be good to have the BOT at

every meeting attend a lab or classroom? This Board of Trustees would absolutely love that. They are doing it because they love students.”

Bruce told Randy that “we hope you attend UFC as much as possible. You are a member and will receive agendas.”

Phyllis said that we have talked about meeting at a central location like Nashville. “I think we all want that and Linda is working on it,” she said. Linda said, “It’s up to you to determine which time works best for you, and I’ll work with Randy to set that up. We will get together on that.”

Phyllis said, “We are talking about exposing the Board members to different things. What, if anything, can we as UFC do as a follow up to the four page document? Addressing issues directly concerning faculty. Is there anything we can do to interact with the Board of Trustees to help them have a better knowledge of what faculty members do and what we go through in our evaluation process.” Randy replied, “I don’t really know what the board members know or don’t know. We can survey the board members and set some priorities. Start with asking them and seeing what they want to know.” Linda said that “most of the ERSC members have sat down with me, and I’ve walked them through the faculty evaluation process. Most of them have said they had no idea how extensive that process is. I try to reinforce this with the Board of Trustees as well.”

Phyllis said, “Perhaps we use the four page document as a guide to choose which topics they want covered. Also the grant process. Even with all the education Linda and Jorge are able to provide, wouldn’t it be beneficial if we could share what a single grant represents? The grueling process, yet different for different disciplines. The rigor of grants and publications that each single item on our CV represents. Would that information be something that the Board of Trustees would want to learn more about?” Randy said, “Perhaps I have got this backwards. Perhaps the UFC could give us a menu of items that you want the BOT to know about.” Phyllis replied, “Perhaps its grants, publications, etc.” General consensus that we should do that. Linda suggested that for the Board to see the broad range of different disciplines would be good as well.

Phyllis noted that as we have talked about APPR, EPPR, PPPR, we have been looking at the rigor in the different disciplines. She said, “I’ve become more passionate about the fact that my colleagues are not just giving me a pass because I’m their buddy. These are my peers that evaluate me on a regular basis.” Bruce added, “I think the public has a very little understanding of what we do which is probably based on their experience in high school.” Randy said that just having that broader understanding of what the workday/year looks like would be good, adding, “There is a workload study that is looking at the courses that are being taught. We need to do a better job of communicating this to the board and the general public.”

Bonnie noted that on the Knoxville campus, we are evaluated on research and service. Phyllis added that education is only one of the things we do. Randy replied, “I get that, but what about

the emphasis on teaching?” Bruce said that “a good teacher who is a bad researcher will never get tenure.” Randy asked, “How do we add extra incentives to faculty to teach better?”

Renee noted that the emphasis on teaching is different on each campus, stating that at UTM, the faculty teach more. “When you teach a 4/4 load, it’s hard to do your research and service,” she said. Beth said the same was true of UTC. “Even though we are reversed (in emphasis on teaching vs. research) from UTK. Sometimes it feels like we are expected to have R1 level research at UTC.” Bruce asked, “Do we want to have more of an emphasis on teaching at UTK or more research at Chattanooga?” Phyllis stated, that “clinical care takes a lot of time for faculty at UTHSC. They might not have time for research.”

Randy said, “What we talked about for the last ten minutes would be very helpful for the Board of Trustees from a faculty workload level—how it’s different at each campus.” Bruce added, “and even within a single unit. So we might need to get granular on this.”

Randy turns the meeting over to David, saying that “the most important thing is system efficiency—we need a little patience, but we are working on it.”

Randy left at 4:35

David addressed the members, saying, “You have to be continually refining processes—particularly on operations that are easy to measure—when you are implementing new systems. What we haven’t done effectively, is clarify in a shared services environment who does what/shares what. And accountability for it. Most of the issues that cross my desk boil down to finger-pointing about what has not gone well. What I’ve learned in my two years here is that we provide a lot of services centrally. What’s getting lost is ‘who does what?’ and ‘is something better performed at each institution or performed centrally?’ If it’s done centrally, what gets lost? What is core to each campus, and is nothing lost if it’s done centrally? ‘Top to bottom’ is a bit overreaching, so we need to look at specific areas such as capital projects, marketing and communications, IT, purchasing, and HR.”

Bonnie said, “IT, marketing and communications seem to be the most important to me. Why don’t we have enough programmers? That’s important these days.” David replied, “I’ve been concerned about the number of systems on different campuses with different software.”

Phyllis said that “the programmer issue is a perfect example of the item I added to our agenda under New Business. F and A allocations from two different colleges has been a problem because IRIS does not accommodate it. That has been low on the priority list.” David said that he had heard that about HR as well. Bruce added, “We couldn’t pursue different grants because it involved another campus, and the grant office couldn’t handle it.” David said, “I’m sure we will not have a *short* list of things that need addressed. We need to do a cost benefit analysis on these issues.” Bonnie said, “They often purchase software and don’t have people who know how to use it.”

Gary said that “we have an efficiency study going on here (at UTK), yet I don’t see any faculty members on that group. How can we get efficiency if the end users are not involved? Doing an efficiency study is a wonderful thing, but we have an effectiveness issue here where we talk about being competitive, and we have an efficiency study going on without the end user involved.”

David stated, “You will not hear me use two words ‘efficiency’ and ‘cost-savings.’ I use effectiveness. Those other studies have been done. In terms of input, our hope is that there is campus wide input, including faculty. But you can’t have a working group of 18 people with representatives from each campus. These working groups should be getting information from faculty.” Bonnie asked, “How do they get information from faculty?” David replied, “So far nothing has been set up.” Bonnie added, “A suggestion box would be useful.”

David said he is asking the working groups to document the current work flow (policy, statute, etc.) and agree on what it is. They will also document the difference between practice and policy/statute requirements. He said, “We should be putting these things out for public comment. A lot of people are concerned that this is some attempt at workforce reduction, but I’m far more concerned about recruiting and keeping good staff.”

Bonnie brought up the issue of salary equity. “Salary studies do not address gender inequity,” she said. “We might not have the talent to do that in-house. It’s very concerning.” David replied, “From the data file delivered from each campus, it can be done.”

David said that the other Hot topic coming out of UTK Faculty Senate is “What is the system budget?” He said, “They sent us a list of questions. I’m not sure how we are going to slog through this, since we sometimes compare different numbers. We are willing to do that.”

Bruce asked, “What is the cost of the system, and what is the benefit, and how do they relate to each other?” He stated, “That’s what they are trying to ask about and they want to see some numbers that quantify that. You can probably answer that question.”

David said that of the system admin budget of 55 million dollars, 15 million is passed through but has nothing to do with system administration at all. “Some monies just go through our budget,” he said. “I’d like to get at what is the core issue. I always think it’s a waste of time to debate something that is easily demonstrable. Could we get to the substance of the question?” Bonnie replied, “Communication and trust is really the underlying question?”

David said, “It’s a complete open book. I don’t think there is anything that isn’t shown or that someone doesn’t want to show. There is a system charge in this system. About 38% of overall system admin budget. Of that 11 percent is personnel. 89 percent is operations.” Bonnie replied that “campuses just want to make sure we are getting value for money.”

David asks for other suggestions from UFC. “I’m a bit hesitant about sitting down with a particular campus’ senate and bypass that campus’ administration,” he said. “I’d prefer to sit

down with this group.” Bruce suggested that David put materials together to answer questions that arise, using the UFC as a sounding board.

David notified the group that he has changed our “peers” from UTK peers to “system” peers—systems that are similar in size and scope. In regard to “shared services,” Linda pointed out that “some of the things we call ‘system,’ other institutions call ‘campus.’”

David added that “if we could reduce size and cost, the campuses and/or the system could use those funds. I just want to be transparent.”

David expressed the wish to be invited back to talk about budget, etc. David leaves at 5:08

Linda continues the conversation, saying, “I’d like to suggest, think about an overarching overview of this particular item. I’m sensing that we are heading in the right direction, but you all are not getting the answers that you want. What things would be most helpful for us to understand, concerns that are expressed?”

Bruce said that we can pull together some of our issues on each of our campuses.

Linda asked that we not send a whole laundry list, but “maybe three things. And we invite him back to do a 15 minute overview on a particular topic, then that would lead to other questions and help you get the kind of answers that you want.”

Linda said that the bottom line is “if it isn’t an advantage to be part of a system then why does it exist?” “The top to bottom review will reveal some of these,” she said.

Jorge said, “It’s interesting that we are in a state where the TBR schools are now clamoring for some sort of centralization. If the whole is not greater than the sum of its parts. . . There is a lot of evidence that these systems have a purpose. But we have a really good example of what happens when you take a centralized board and break it up into LGIs. I would argue there are advantages with the centralization.”

Linda said, “I can capture what I’m hearing you ask for and put that together and send it to David after I send it out to you for feedback.”

Linda brought up two old business items. “I provided the memo that the chancellor’s got,” she said. “It has created a lot of questions directly back to Catherine. Are there other questions? I think we are painting in a broad brush. If you have concerns, bring it to your chancellor. Make sure you take issues to your chancellor.”

Bonnie told Linda, “I appreciate what you did—that is transparency. I was also pleased that if the campus considers you a fulltime faculty member, that’s most important.”

Linda addressed plans for APPR, EPPR, PPPR reports. “Those charts that you get are provided to the Board of Trustees,” she said. “I hear from the board that there are a lot of Far Exceeds, Exceed, and they think there should be more ‘average’ or ‘meets expectations.’ I don’t see a heavy-handed response, though. I think if we can show that there is accountability and that we are doing what we are supposed to do, we will be in a good place with this board.”

Bruce followed up by saying, “In addition to the board’s perspective, the UFC would also like to have this historical data, particularly EPPR. We would like to keep track of that.”

Linda asked, “Do you need something beyond that chart?” Bruce replied, “I don’t think so.” Linda said, “We get that from various campuses.” Bonnie said, “I’m concerned about what is going to happen on the UTK campus.”

Discussion continues about the rigor of faculty evaluation.

Linda said, “We are looking at how we remove barriers. We’ve got exciting discussions about joint degree programs. If we continue to do that, we can leverage that full opportunities that exists across our campuses.”

Linda turns over system update to Jorge at 5:39.

Bruce returns the meeting to the agenda.

Beth moves to approve the minutes. Phyllis seconds. Unanimous approval

Phyllis does not know if UTHSC have approved the charter changes. She will get an answer from George.

Bonnie said, regarding salary data, “Sibson’s process for calculating is proprietary and they focus on looking at salaries by rank with peer institutions. UTK has a faculty member that has developed an evaluation system. Lou Gross found that when you correct for variables, women are making 80 cents on the dollar. That difference is primarily due to a small number of departments. This was reported to the system in 2016. There was no follow up with the problem departments. Your institutional research office should be able to do this, but the UTK provost said they can’t do it. So that’s what we want—that kind of analysis done.” Bonnie added that the system has said that each campus should be able to do it since we have the data.

Renee said, “We are doing research on merit pay/market pay, and we have found some serious issues. I was able to request a document from HR that gave me a list by college of the faculty members, their rank, their current salaries, and department, but not gender. So I have that information. It would seem like you all should have access to that information.”

Bonnie said that “for a long time we could not get access to that information. These are concerns.”

Bruce said that salary studies should be easier to do since they are public, but performance reviews are not.

Bonnie reiterated that “this should be easy and done every year,” adding, “It’s alarming that they did not do a gender analysis in the Sibson report.”

Phyllis leaves at 5:49.

Conversation continues regarding the problem with the data analysis. Some members wanted all campuses to use the process outlined by Lou Gross at UTK, but Sibson could have a problem with that since their process is proprietary. Bonnie said, “Each campus pays for the Sibson report. Why can’t we get a gender report?”

Steve explained evaluation problem at UTC, where merit raises have been based on faculty evaluation ranking, but there have been limits/quotas for how many faculty in a department could receive “exceeds expectations.” He also pointed out that department heads could only give a ranking as high as “meets expectations” and that they “recommend” “exceeds expectations” for a given faculty member to the dean who then decides to give the ranking or not. Bruce says that at UTK, the department heads assign all evaluation levels. Renee says that at UTM, distribution of merit pay was “all over the place,” with major differences between colleges.

Bruce said that the conversation was really about two issues—evaluation about what kind of work you are doing and how merit pay is assigned. He said, “You would hope that merit pay would be coordinated with the evaluation, but a head/dean might be juggling other things that are not merely quantitative. Do we want to try and standardize the ranking scale? The other is a harder problem—a more consistent way of applying merit raises.”

Bonnie asked the group, “Don’t your handbooks have some language about merit decisions”? Renee said UTM’s handbook was not followed, adding, “We didn’t know how the merit raises were decided.” Bonnie said that was not “transparency.”

Steve said he will ask for help from UFC as he continues to look into the evaluation levels and merit raises at UTC.

Renee pointed out that UTM recently moved to a 4-level evaluation.

Bruce said that the reason that UTK went to a 5 point system was because one year faculty members could only get a merit raise if they received “exceeds expectations.”

Chris’ item was postponed until next time.

Bruce Adjourned at 6:07 p.m. ET.