



UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

Meeting 109

01 November 2018, University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTIA)

12:00 pm (ET) / 11:00 am (CT)

Meeting and Videoconference

MINUTES

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

UTHSC	George Cook (Faculty Senate President)	Absent
	Phyllis A. Richey (Campus Representative)	Present
UTK	Misty Anderson (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Bruce MacLennan (Campus Representative)	Present
UTM	Renee LeFleur (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	Chris Caldwell (Campus Representative)	Present
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	Dr. Joe DiPietro (System President)	Present
	Linda Martin (System Office of Academic Affairs and Student Success)	Present

Faculty Council Guests

	Randy Boyd	Present
	David Golden	Present
	Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)	Present
	Karen Etzkorn (AA&SS)	Present
	Leigh Cherry (AA&SS)	Present
	Ashton Braddock (AA&SS)	Present

Meeting was called to order at 12:23 p.m. (EST) by Bruce MacLennan, Chair.

The meeting started with comments by President Joe DiPietro. Joe indicated that he had been meeting frequently with Randy Boyd. He also said that Randy had been to all the campuses. Joe and Randy have met 2-3 hours/week since he was endorsed and elected. Randy has been “drinking from the firehose,” but has been getting up to speed. “He will do well and be very engaging. He will serve two years and we will see what will happen after that.” Joe said that the Governor will make another appointment fairly quickly to fill out the governing board, after that the local boards will be filled quickly. Joe added that the General Assembly could agree not to act at all. There might be a sense that the new governor would want to make his own appointments.

Joe said that the budget hearing process will be delayed due to the change in administration. It may be pushed back until late February. There is interaction with THEC about what they are proposing, but there might not be complete congruence, he said. Whoever is elected governor will make adjustments. He said that 0-2.5% will be the range on increase to both tuition and fees. It is not clear how much capital outlay or maintenance will be available. The next governor will make the decision.

Capital outlay and maintenance is always a last dollar thing, Joe stated. “I’ve argued every year that they shouldn’t do it that way,” he said. “The problem with these big projects is that when you have to have every dollar in the bank, everything slows down. If it could be allocated ahead, you could build things more quickly.” Joe has suggested that Randy talk to the new governor and the new finance commissioner about this. There is worry that the economy could worsen, leaving partially completed buildings. Joe added that Mr. Boyd is a very successful entrepreneur with a lot of ideas.

Bruce asked, “Do you know what his thoughts are about our relations with the legislature—say Sex Week?”

Joe answered that Randy’s already had some conversations about those things. “It’s important to work on those kinds of things early,” he said. “Sex Week is interesting. If we got sued and lost, would it go away?—no. I’d like to say that we could work with the students to tone down, but that will likely not work.”

Misty said that the two new student leaders are of a different stripe, but “I don’t want to get anyone’s hopes up.”

Joe said the current board went through a confirmation process where this was a central item on the senate side that they had to struggle through.

Chris asked, “Do you know what position they took?”

Joe said, "Yes, you can look this up. John Compton had a 45 minute discussion, largely dealing with Sex Week. You always have to pivot to the first amendment. It doesn't matter if we like it. We've been sued and lost these kind of cases. It comes down to the first amendment. The other thing that's happening is that the comptroller has been asked to look at this. They should have a report by end of December. I'm hopeful that it'll help. The allegation that we didn't communicate clearly is wrong. We provided two huge notebooks to the general assembly. We've communicated a lot. There is a sense that they'd like to put this thing to rest and move on. That's a reason the comptroller is looking at it. They are supposed to come up with recommendations and a report that we should receive in December."

Linda asked Joe how it would be best for UFC members to interface with the new president? "How can they best engage and be helpful for the new president?"

Joe said for UFC to give any advice to him and he will bring the information to him—especially about things concerning faculty. "I think Mr. Boyd could use your input greatly concerning the academic side of the organization," Joe said. "Mr. Boyd will bring in strong business skills. Meeting with him would be helpful. Especially in presenting the differing cultures at different campuses. Our current board is comprised largely of CEOs. They will create a set of rules for their corporation, and they are all the same. Our rules for tenure are all different—specific to the campus. It's like how you treat children differently. Different approaches at different institutes." He cited the example of post tenure review where "we sent a template, but the differences became important." He added, "I think those are some of the cultural things you can help him with. When he comes to your campuses, he will engage with you."

Misty pointed out that up until the Focus Act, the president sat on the board and UFC met when the board met. Now it's different.

Joe responded that president is not on the board due to the open meetings law, saying that he would have to ask someone else to talk to board members about big issues because it was illegal for me to do it. That's why it is the way it is and why the Governor is not on the board.

Joe said that the relationship between UFC and the president needs to be stronger since we don't have an advisory seat. Linda added that Randy is willing to do that.

Joe said that the agenda is big for the Education, Research and Service Committee (ERSC). Bonnie asked if there was any discussion about the board meeting more often. Joe said the board members would probably reel since they maintain very busy schedules.

Misty said, "I guess Bonnie is the bridge now" because she is the faculty representative on the ERSC. "I just want to make sure we take advantage of communicating from UFC without being out of our lane."

Bruce said that in the past "we've not been discouraged from having contact with the Board members."

Joe said that it depends on the issue. "I think it would be better to go through your president. That would be the protocol. I don't care if you want to talk to them at a board meeting in a corner. The first thing they are going to say if you approach them is ask the president what do you think about this."

Bruce asked, "What else should we be worried about?"

Joe said that the chancellor's search at UTK is going to happen. Wayne does not want to stay beyond next summer. "It was in the best interest of the institution to start that up. Plus I could help Randy with this. We've gotten that underway. You'll hear more about that from him in December. How do you feel about using a search firm?" Bonnie answered, "I think they are valuable." Jorge asked, "Is that not typical at the UT system?" Joe said, "Yes, we typically use them, but not always." Misty said that she has mixed feelings about using them, adding that "there is a similar pool that's being passed around from institution to institution."

Joe said, "It's not about the money, really. Let's say that Randy's decision is that they run without a search committee. You'll be getting calls from search firms. So if you get into it and your hot calls are not going well, I guarantee you that you can get a search firm overnight. There is the ability to move forward very quickly. They'll probably have a handful of people that they could suggest immediately. I don't know what Randy is going to do."

Bonnie expressed concern about getting background on people

Joe said that some search firms are good at it others not. "It's really up to us to do our due diligence."

Misty said that going without a search firm would be a chance to encourage faculty members to put names forward.

Chris said that the law requires that the main board set up a reporting procedure for the local board to submit three things each year. "Is that being done?" he asked. Joe replied, "Yes."

Chris asked, "Would the system set up a structure to support the local boards or would it be done by the campus?" Joe replied that he envisioned that would be done by the campus.

Joe said that the other thing he wanted to alert the UFC to is that "Deb and I are working with donors to start the leadership institute." Bob Smith is leading and organizing it. They are hoping to get a permanent endowment to cover the cost.

Chris asked, "Is there anything you would advise us not to do?"

Joe replied, "You've got to have trust. When stupid mistakes fracture trust, it's really frustrating. That happens on both sides. Trust is imperative. When fractured, it takes time to

fix. I regret that that has happened from time to time." He added, "Be truth tellers, not just tell me what you think I want to hear."

Bruce expressed to Joe that "hopefully you will have a lot less stress."

Joe said, "It's been a privilege, but the pace has been at breakneck speed. I think we have built a great team. They will give the new president great advice. We are in good shape. It's great to leave with the place in really good shape. It's hard to leave, but that's life. We will be back from time to time."

Bruce asked if Joe will be president emeritus. Joe said that depends on how they vote.

Joe left the meeting 1:08.

Break.

Upon return from the break, Phyllis asked about Joe's tour dates.

Nov. 14 and 15 were stated as the dates for Joe's tour. Beth said that Joe would be at UTC on Nov. 14 at 3:30. Renee said he would be at UTM at noon. Linda will let UFC know what the schedule is.

Linda said, "One of the things that I've spoken very strongly about is that when Randy goes to each campus, it is important to speak to the UFC representative and spend time in faculty spaces." When he visits, she recommends that he does not just attend a reception, but go to a faculty lab, find out what's going on across campus. She suggested we invite him to a class. "He is all about rolling up his sleeves and learning about what each of the campuses are doing," she said. "It will be very valuable for him to do that on each campus. In fact, he's coming here this afternoon because he understands the role that UFC plays. The other thing that he's interested in is engaging the board more with the campuses when they are meeting at different campuses. The UFC reps would be very useful in planning visits to various campuses."

Bonnie said, "The UFC needs to get him on the calendar, right?"

Linda said that he will meet with UFC before each Board meeting. "But what are other opportunities? I mentioned to him the idea of meeting in Nashville. You will find him very accommodating."

Misty asked, "When is the summit (CSAOs and CAOs) happening?" Linda replied the 6th and 7th of November. Phyllis asked if we could get the results of the survey? Linda replied, "Sure."

Delayed introductions are initiated.

Linda introduced Karen Etzkorn, Ashton Braddock and Leigh Cherry and highlighted how they have worked for us. Karen has been working on Academic programs (new and modifications), does research, surveys, and transfer research. Leigh is the coordinator for student success initiatives. She worked a lot on the summit. She also works on transfer-related initiatives, not just in the system, but from community colleges, other institutions, and reverse transfers. Linda pointed out that adult learner initiatives and Tennessee Reconnect are taken care of by another staff member—Nancy Deitrich. Ashton Braddock just started in August. She is interested in the Academic Affairs side of things and is working on the summit. She will be here for 10 months.

Jorge began in September as Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Student Success. Jorge said, “One of the things that came through in the survey was that the website could be improved so we are working on that. We are going to try to do a chat feature on the website for instant feedback.” He said he is excited about the work the office is doing. “I’ve never been around a system where there is a pride of place. I’ve seen this in Knoxville and Chattanooga and I will make it to other campuses. This work matters a lot to me.”

Bonnie Ownley introduced herself. She is a professor at UTK. In 2016-17 she was the UTK/IA faculty senate president. Currently, she is the president of TUFS. She has been appointed to the ERS Committee. Linda pointed out that we have a student, Kenneth Packer, on the ERS Committee. Phyllis said that Peg Hartig knows Kenneth and speaks highly of him.

Bruce MacLennan introduced himself. He is a UTK Associate Professor. He is the UTK Campus representative and the UFC Chair. He is also a past faculty senate president

Renee LaFleur is the Director of UTM’s Women’s Center and the Faculty Senate President.

Misty Anderson is an English Professor at UTK. She serves as UTK’s faculty senate president.

Steve Ray is UTC’s faculty senate president, chair of UTC’s theatre program, and the UFC secretary.

Phyllis Richey is the campus representative from UTHSC in Memphis. She is a Professor in the College of Medicine. She has been on the senate and UFC for quite a while. “Today is my anniversary of being with UTK for 28 years,” she said. “My journey through the UT system has been enlightening since I started as a staff member, then a faculty member. It’s been enjoyable seeing all facets.”

Beth Crawford is an Associate Professor at UTC. She has been at UTC for 32 years and 1 month.

Chris Caldwell teaches Math at UTM. This is his 35th year at Martin.

Bruce initiated the approval of minutes from the previous meeting. Beth moved to approve. Misty seconded. Approved unanimously.

Bruce reported that the executive committees at UTC, UTK and UTM had approved the changes to the charter. Phyllis did not know if the HSC had approved these, but will check with George. They can vote on this at the full senate meeting on November 13. Bruce requested that they vote before Joe steps down. Once that is done, Bruce will deliver the changes to Joe through Linda for his approval.

Bruce moves on to PPPR updates. All of these from each campus were going before the board the following day.

Linda pointed out that the PPPR policies will go before the ERS Committee, but will not be a consent agenda item at the board meeting. Donnie Smith, the chair of the committee, will call on Joe to present these. Joe will talk about the process and each CAO will talk about their campuses' processes and how their campus is different. Then the ERS Committee will vote. The committee chair will then take that recommendation to the full board. Joe will give background to the full board. CAOs will not speak at full board, but the board can ask questions.

Bruce asks what the time frame is for starting the PPPR process on campus. Linda thought it was fall of 2019.

Phyllis asked about the report from the EPPRs. Bruce said, "When the EPPR procedure was instituted, we arrange with academic affairs to produce a historical report (five years) summarizing the number of EPPRs and their outcomes. We received one of those."

Phyllis asked who received it. Bruce said the UFC received it from India. Phyllis said that each campus was supposed to get an aggregate report. But she did not believe her campus received anything. Bruce said he did not think that the UFC got anything after that first year and suggested it might be due to turnover in leadership.

Phyllis said that after the UFC received it, she believed that the next point in the process would be that each campus would get information to their senate presidents.

Linda said, "We will track that down and get it to you. Are you saying that you want all campuses?" Bruce said that UFC needs all campuses, but that campuses do not need other campuses. Bonnie suggested that it would be more interesting to see it by department, rather than by colleges. Bruce said that it would be good to have an APPR summary along with the EPPR.

Linda said that some campuses have been slow to get it to them. Campus leadership changes probably affected this. She added, "One of the things that would be interesting for you to engage on your own campuses—would it be helpful to have a four or five point system? Some campuses have departments that enter the information differently. Even the numbers are opposite—five equals good and/or bad. Do we want everyone to have the same point system?"

Bruce said that UTK revised that whole thing, getting rid of numbers and expressing it all in terms of expectations. “I would advocate for everyone to do that,” he said.

Phyllis said, “We’ve had this discussion that each campus has different scales. And no one wants to give up their system.”

Linda said that the other thing about that is that if we have different scales, we need to resist the temptation to put it in an aggregate chart. Rather we should have separate charts without numbers—nomenclature only.

Chris said that years ago it was four point systems for everyone, then went to five, but people got upset about the number of threes for everyone. Then ten years ago, the system let campuses choose.

Linda said, “Regardless, we will get those and not equate or use numbers, since it will be distributed beyond here. I will also find out about EPPR.”

Bonnie pointed out that EPPR is not in the UTK handbook. Misty said they are working on it though. She added, “We are going to mandate that board mandated language is not voted on by the senate.”

Chris said, “I viewed it as you were voting on ‘how’ it was put in the handbook?”

Bruce pointed out that EPPR language was much more specific than the last template. Beth said that campuses should just make sure that the senate knows that they cannot vote down Board language. Steve agreed.

Bruce said that when the EPPR issue was voted in, one of the things we wanted to do was get a historical report to track it. “Just a summary,” he said. “Number of EPPRs and outcomes of them. I think it’s important to do the same with the PPPR. I’d like to see some regular schedule for this to happen.”

Linda pointed out that campuses have different schedules for APPR and PPPR. Bonnie was concerned that the workflow did not falter when there was changeover in administration.” There was discussion about who used to ride herd on this workflow. Linda said that she would find some answers. Bruce offered to send Linda the last time we got an EPPR report. Misty affirmed that this is “just good baseline material for UFC to review.”

Chris directs the discussion back to the point system. “When we went back to four points, we labeled them differently—‘professional’ etc.,” he said. Bruce said, “We’ve been getting departments and colleges in shape in regards to what it means to ‘meet expectations.’” He added, “It’s really critical in terms of EPPR to have information about what it means to meet expectations.”

Chris said there were difficulties in how the new number system was implemented, which meant some people did not get merit who should have.

Renee said, "We are having issues. We had to rewrite our bylaws in terms of what we mean by these terms."

Randy Boyd and David Golden, Assistant to the President, joined the meeting a 2:10 p.m.

Everyone introduced themselves.

Linda started the discussion stating, "The group talked about how we can be an advisory group to the president." She then asked Randy, "Is there anything you would ask of the group?"

Randy replied, "I'd rather just ask you how can I help you? In organizations, I have a philosophy that we will be successful no matter what if we take care of our customers—parents and student. We do that by taking care of people that interface with customers—faculty and staff. We want students to leave with their dreams fulfilled. There are schools that graduate at a higher rate. If faculty are not engaged with the students, they are not happy and the students aren't happy. How can we make sure that faculty are the most engaged—the best place to work in America? Let's start with an aspiration? Ten years ago, I set the goal to make Knoxville the most pet-friendly city in America. Do we say we have the best institutions at which to work? I'll be the champion and supporter."

Bruce said, "Maybe ask what keeps them from being happy or what disrupts?"

Randy proposes "what if" thinking. Which obstacles can we change?

Bonnie says there are also processes that faculty and staff think could be done more efficiently in terms of both time and money.

Misty said, "That's a logical place to start—how can we play smarter here? The UTIA has just launched a system to ask faculty what one thing we can do to make your life better. Tell us three things you like. Three things you don't like. And we listen. So we really want to do this as well. There are really big ways to change people's lives."

Randy said, "It'd be great to have the faculty help with governmental relations even."

"What would you stop/start/continue?" he asked. "Some things are working well. What would you stop? Efficiency is not doing more with less, but doing the things you should be doing."

Bruce said that "efficiency is different in a research context—there might be a longer period where you are gathering information and processing. There might not be an obvious output immediately."

Randy said that student retention and graduation is a metric that we are watching.

Phyllis pointed out that at HSC, “we are a bit unique. We don’t have a problem with graduation. Our metric is first time board pass rate.”

Randy affirmed that that made sense.

Bruce said that here at UFC we are able to address the differences between the campuses. He added that we are eager to help in any way. We can help disseminate information as well.

Randy said, “I’m not going to be the best speaker or the smartest or biggest expert, but my goal is to be the best listener. That’s what I strive to do in every case. I’ll give you my mobile number. You are welcome to call or text at any time. Let me know what not to do.”

Phyllis suggested that “academic vocabulary and business vocabulary are similar, but there are differences and we can help with the native lingo.”

Randy discussed his objectives. “As I see it so far, I see 6, possibly 7, primary objectives. It’s not my plan to be here long term. The short term plan gives me a sense of urgency.”

The objectives:

1. Select a great chancellor for UTK—a generational leader for stability and . . .
2. Do the same thing for my replacement, which will start in the fall of 2020.
3. Growing our talent output—11,000 graduates system wide. The most important thing we do is create talent for our state. Two ways to do that—a) graduate more that show up. Match Florida at 87%. Why can’t we do that? And b) provide more opportunity for people in our state and outside our state
4. Improve our research—Oak Ridge National Lab will be integral. It is the best national lab of the 16 national labs. Yet, we are ranked 80th in research.

Bruce suggested that Randy talk to the people at UTK about Oak Ridge as well. “We’ve been talking about that for a long time.”

5. Improve our brand. Community engagement—land grant heritage. Highlight community engagement better. This gets to our brand. Set an example that inspires change. Work across the system. (On addiction and opioids, for example.) Randy said he had just spent 18 months in Tennessee, hearing the people of the state say that the legislators just did not get it. Higher Ed talk was almost always negative. “Their impression isn’t good. The great news is that we are engaged in the community and doing a lot of great things that we need to let people know that we are doing.” There are a couple of flash points that always get focused on. The legislators say that is what their constituents bring up.
6. Top to bottom review of how the system supports the campuses. Reset the relationship between campuses and the system.
7. (optional) Create a new strategy to put this into place? Randy suggested that this might need to wait for next person to take this on. He might not dive into this, since it would take up most of his effort.

Randy said that he is looking forward to getting started. “Every day I learn more about what this great enterprise does, I get more excited.”

Bruce said, “There are a lot of good things, but we wait in dread for the next legislative session.”

Randy replied, “I will be your point guy. I know most of them and have worked with them on Tennessee Promise and Tennessee Reconnect. I recognize that political capital can be used up quickly, but I feel that most of them have some confidence in me.”

Bruce said, “We used to meet with Joe in Nashville—a more central location. We would like to do that.” Randy replied, “I want to focus on being one of the most open and accessible presidents. I’d be open to that, but from a point of protocol—everyone can talk to me at any time, but I will not go against their supervisor, so I will be connecting with chancellors and provosts.”

Linda reminded the group that Randy apologized for having so little time, but she had recommended to him that even a little time was important.

UFC members expressed appreciation for his time, then Randy, along with David, left the meeting.

Misty stated that “it’s a fairly global list that he (Randy) has.”

Linda said, “I probably get 10 emails and texts a day from him. He cares deeply about people and about UT. He can talk about how each of the campuses are different.”

Renee said, “One of the concerns that we have is that we had a gubernatorial forum where he mostly focused on tech when asked about education. The public statements he made during the race will be a bit for him to overcome.”

Linda replied, “I don’t hear tech from him in daily conversation.”

Bonnie added that “in conversation with David Hawk—he emphasized not merely what students can do, but that they can think.” Linda affirmed this, saying, “They need both.”

Misty said, “I’ve collected a whole archive of material about how businesses want thinkers (i.e. English and philosophy majors). We are going to have to make the argument for the non-tech education.”

Bonnie added, “It’s not only the experience in the classroom, but the professional development that they get at a four year school.”

Misty asked, “Do other campuses have formalized in their curriculum moments where students look outward?”

Renee said that at UTM, every program will have a major oral/written assignment, collaboration, critical thinking, etc. They are also focusing on increasing service learning, internships, and other high impact practices (HIPs). She points out that this is all in the early stages of development.

Steve said that UTC is having more serious discussions about HIPs, including internships, study abroad and community engagement. Beth notes that this is in the strategic plan at UTC, “but the problem has been how to document it.”

Linda said that APLU is doing a national survey about the advantage of a liberal arts education. Misty said that Pew and Gallup are also doing something similar. “It wouldn’t be surprising to find a higher level of mistrust of Higher Ed in Tennessee. This could light a fire under all of us in regard to experiential learning, HIP, etc.”

Linda said that THEC has become much more engaged in examining new programs. ETSU had proposed a law school and was not approved. Discussion centers on duplication, financial responsibility, and career opportunities. “We are getting more and more pressure not to duplicate programs or be a financial burden and that graduates have jobs—providing evidence that a program is needed.”

Linda noted that the “low-producing programs” list is based on the number of graduates, which is not same as underperforming. THEC is rethinking how they look at the health of the unit. Student credit hours (SCH), numbers of minors, how they contribute to General Education, will all be a part of the rethinking about the health of an academic unit. “I think they are thinking about the right things,” Linda said. “Every time they verify numbers for us, I always ask for institutions to provide more numbers than simply graduates.”

Linda said that an example on the UTK campus is Physics. “Their graduate numbers are low, but look at their contributions. If we have concerns about an academic unit, what should really concern us?” Bruce asked, “Do they look at research productivity?” “No, they don’t,” Linda replied.

Bonnie said that at the TUFS meeting “we met with the ETSU people, who were frustrated. They knew that UTK and one of the local privates had lobbied against their law school.”

Linda said, “That’s unfortunate. It will make it harder for collaborations in the future.”

Bonnie said, “If faculty were asked what are the barriers to collaboration—that would be an interesting question.”

Chris asked, “Have they produced a new list of low producing programs?”

Linda replied, "Not yet, but they will produce a new Academic Program Review in January."

Chris asked, "Will they change the criteria?"

Linda replied, "Not this year, but they might soften the language."

Misty said, "Terminology is very important—especially since our board has little background in education." Linda added, "The other issue related to annual performance reviews is percentages in various categories. If you have the top department in the country is that really fair?"

Discussion continued about "weapons of math destruction" and "data vs. qualitative." Discussion included the difference across disciplines regarding publications, research, creative activities, etc.

Phyllis said, "The message is that one size does not fit all. It needs to be discipline specific recognition." Misty added that "it could reinforce mediocrity if 'one size fits all' is pushed." Bruce concurred, "Counting these things just isn't effective, even in the sciences. Having discipline-specific expectations is important."

Jorge said, "We all understand this, but it's hard to convey to non-academic people. It's important for us to contextualize, not just the quantitative data, but the qualitative side, which is more important."

Misty asked, "How do we communicate that?"

Jorge replied, "Whatever it takes. I don't think this resides in Elements or Activity Insight."

Discussion resumed about a unified annual performance review scale. Can we standardize this? The bottom part of the scale is the same and EPPR is based on this. Phyllis noted that "it's only the top categories that are different." There was general consensus that department head training would solve many issues related to this.

Bonnie said that she attended UTK department head training. Some people there complained that they had been told that if someone gets "meets expectations" in any category, they cannot receive an "exceeds expectations." Steve confirmed that this has happened at UTC as well.

Misty said, "This is a place where the system has a role to play where units are out of sync with each other." Linda said, "We don't know about it until we hear about it from you."

Linda suggested that the department heads that attend the training are those that are doing well usually. "My question," she added, "is 'what system is in place to hold the dept head, and administrators accountable?'"

Bruce said that during the EPPR discussions, he had proposed that if everyone in a department gets "far-exceeds expectations," then there is a problem.

Bonnie said, "Let us see the aggregate APPRs." Linda said, "We will get those." Jorge noted that this is where being part of a system is a benefit. "We can compare," he said. Misty added, "and think of that as advocacy for faculty."

More discussion about scales/points in terms of annual evaluations of faculty members.

Misty said the solution is not going to be numerical, but rather human. Phyllis added, "We have an enormous percentage of our faculty that are clinical—how do you measure the value of their teaching of future doctors? We have a growing number of non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. What do we do about them?"

Linda said that there are number of institutions nationwide that are establishing restrictions to numbers of NTT. Steve asked if these restrictions are coming from the faculty or administrations. Linda said, "Some from administration. This can be driven by the Higher Education commissions of the state—limits on SCH taught by non-tenure track faculty."

Steve asked, "How does our general population feel about their students being taught by non-tenured instructors?" There was general consensus that "tenure" is a negative word.

Renee pointed out that Joe had mentioned the possibility of creating an outside group to look at tenure procedures.

Linda said that some outside people had been looked at, but there was just an initial inquiry about it. Some people seemed interested. It seemed to stall because of the board transition. "That's the top of my list of things to find out. They might uncover some of these inconsistencies. They might be able to 'groundtruth' the problem to find out if the process is good."

Chris was concerned that it could be used as a tool by certain groups, depending on who the outside group heard from. Bonnie said, "That's where you have to trust." Linda said, "If we really want to improve what we are doing, we need to let them discover whatever they discover."

Misty [Bonnie?] said that TUFs is looking at things like "there are no grants without tenure," "national security has always relied on tenure," etc. She will share that list. Linda suggested that maybe this group can combine those things into a list that can be used to make arguments.

Bruce said that "some of our stakeholders have a skeptical view of state funding, so that might not be a good thing." He added that "one of the fundamental problems that we face is that something that is good for one group might not be good for another group. i.e. gender-neutral restrooms."

Discussion ensued about gender-neutral restrooms at different institutions.

Bruce returned to the agenda and concluded it had been covered.

Bruce asked if there were additional questions.

Chris asked, regarding the local boards, “Has it been determined what is a ‘full-time’ faculty member is?”

Linda said, “How it’s entered in IRIS is not an issue according to Matthew Scoggins. Joe agreed. Linda says it depends on the argument that the campus makes. If the faculty say that this person is a faculty member, then it should count.”

Chris replied, “I just don’t want system lawyers to say later that this person must be kicked off. I’d like for them to say, we will go with what the faculty decides.”

Linda said she had asked Matthew what the intent of the language was. “He said it was so that no 100% administrator, who had no idea about what is going on with the faculty, could be representing the faculty,” she said, adding that she will push for an answer on this.

Misty informed the group that UTK is having an election of the faculty senate for the local board faculty representative.

UTM has not set a policy yet.

Bruce floated another question: “How often should UFC meet with Randy in Nashville?” Linda said that if we met at every board meeting, it would be three. “Do we do two Zooms and two Nashville meetings?” Phyllis said the meetings with the president have historically been once in Fall and once in Spring. At least once every academic year. Bonnie suggested that “more often is better.”

Linda asked, “Is it helpful for him to come to the first 15 mins of every UFC meeting? He can say no and we can still have the Nashville meeting.” Misty said, “I’d say the first 30 minutes.” Chris noted that “there were a lot of times that if Joe had been there last year it would have helped.” Phyllis pointed out that “Joe was also good about calling a UFC meeting if he needed us.”

Phyllis added, “I could be content with one meeting in Nashville in the fall and one in the spring between the Board meetings, with the option of having more meetings.” Bruce said, “I’d like to see him invited to every meeting.” Chris agreed. Linda said, “I’ll tell him. I’m sure he’ll be open to that.” Bruce said that “since he’s new, it’ll be good to try it out.” Chris added that “it’ll be necessary for trust as well.”

Phyllis asked Linda, “Are you going to pursue a meeting in Nashville with him in December?” Linda replied, “I don’t think that’s possible.”

Chris asked, “So how often?”

Linda summed up the discussion: “I hear that we should invite him to every UFC meeting, with two meetings a year in Nashville.”

Phyllis asked, "What about asking him to think about how we can help him before the meeting, so that he can send questions/concerns to us ahead of time so that we could work on it?" Bruce said, "I'll also make sure he gets the agenda and the call for agenda items." Phyllis said, "I don't want him to feel like he's tied to our agenda for a discussion point." General agreement that he should not feel tied to our agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 4:03.