



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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

Meeting 107
17 October 2018, 4:00 pm (ET) / 3:00 pm (CT)
Meeting and Videoconference
MINUTES

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

UTHSC	George Cook (Faculty Senate President)	Present
	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

Faculty Appointee to Education, Research & Service Comm. (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)	Absent

Faculty Council Guests

	Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)	Present
	Terry Cooper (Chair, UTHSC Faculty Handbook Committee)	Present
	Peg Hartig (Faculty Senate President-elect, UTHSC)	Present

Meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. (EST) by Bruce MacLennan, Chair

Beth moves for the approval of the minutes of the September 19, 2018 meeting. Seconded. Unanimous approval.

Bruce initiates discussion regarding the UFC Charter revisions.

George did not remember the revised charter edits going to faculty senates or executive committees and asked who is supposed to vote to approve them.

Bruce said that at UTK only the executive council approved, although it was presented to the senate. He said the UFC does not need approval from the executive committee of senates for bylaw changes, but we do for the charter revision. Each campus should bring it before the executive committee soon so that we can get Joe's approval before the change in presidency. UTC and UTHSC said they would work on this quickly and get it back to Bruce. Bruce notes that the next meeting is Nov. 1 with the Trustees and asks if we can have it done by then. UTC says yes.

Bruce moved discussion on to new business. Discussion commenced regarding the planning for Annual APPR, EPPR and PPPR summaries. Bruce said that we have received one annual report to compare EPPR data. Phyllis said we got the aggregate data last year. Chris said we have not received any data this year, but we have not requested it. Phyllis suggested that it might have gone to Martin Donaldson. Bruce said that it comes from Linda, but Jorge has agreed to get it.

Bruce added that we want the PPPR to be a part of this as well. "We want to see the summary data," he said. "What time of year will we be looking for that?" Jorge said that he would get an answer from Linda. Bruce said that we just want to get the conversation started. We want to know what's happening. How many incongruences are happening between the APPR and the EPPR. This whole thing was triggered by the perception that everyone was getting "exceeds expectations." We would like to see that data as well.

Jorge said that going forward there will be more scrutiny on our evaluation process. Regarding the evaluation of faculty, he noted that there are hard numbers such as publications, but there is a lot of nuance. In general there will be more scrutiny, but it gives us a chance to address the nuances.

Jorge asked, "Who did this come from in the past?" Bruce answered, "We think India got it from Dennis. We don't know who aggregated the data. This was a concern with the new EPPR because of the shorter trigger. We want to see what's happening with the PPPR are they agreeing with the APPRs? It's important to have the context."

Jorge said that it would behoove those doing evaluations to adequately justify "exceeds expectation." Phyllis asked, "Do you mean they are not?" Jorge replied that that was his understanding. Bruce added, "My impression is this is variable across campuses and departments. UTK did workshops with department heads."

Jorge said that the problem with the number of “far exceeding” or “exceeding expectations” is that institutions do not publish that info, so we can’t compare ourselves to our peers. Peg asked if we could request this from other institutions. Jorge said he was not sure how many would be willing to share, but that it could be requested.

Peg asked if we had identified peer institutions on a system level. Jorge replied, “Yes, we do have system peers.” Peg asked if they trust us enough to share.

Bruce questioned if the expectations were really comparable. He said, “It’s been difficult at UTK to have expectations that an outsider would understand.”

Jorge said that it was noteworthy that the request for these changes were brought by a previous board. We don’t know if it will continue under the new BOT, but “the scrutiny almost certainly will continue.”

Bruce said that at the UTK campus, it has been surprisingly hard to find out the number of CPRs (previous version of EPPRs). “We could never get an exact number,” he said. “We knew of some of the numbers from gathered evidence, but it took a long time to get the number. I would be very skeptical about getting those numbers from other campuses.” George added that there is the issue of privacy, particularly at smaller institutions. Bruce said that we need to try to figure out how we can get this information and that we will continue to monitor it.

No further questions or discussion on this.

Bruce noted that the next item on the agenda was the workshop that the UFC would do for the BOT about faculty. Since that was Misty’s idea and since she had not yet arrived, discussion regarding this was postponed.

Renee begins the discussion concerning the summer expectations for nine-month faculty. She mentioned the varying expectations regarding orientations in the summer. “Some faculty think they should not be required to do this because it happens in the summer,” she said.

Beth says UTC does pay faculty a small stipend for orientation. Steve confirms that it is usually \$75 per day.

UTHSC only has 12 month faculty—except for those that are on the UTK campus. Those UTHSC faculty at UTK can choose either a nine or 12-month contract. Only a few choose the nine-month contract, so summer expectations are not really an issue there.

Bruce said he was not sure how UTK handled summer expectations, adding that it probably varies from unit to unit. He noted that it is mostly adjunct faculty teach summer courses at UTK. He doesn’t know if there is remuneration for other summer activities. Faculty there do get paid to teach summer courses.

Renee asked if summer orientation duties are “required” at UTC. Beth and Steve said that it is not. Volunteers are solicited or department heads on 12-month contracts do it.

UTM is looking at UTK and UTC’s handbooks to create language about requiring faculty members to work in the summer.

Phyllis asked, “Isn’t it a tradition that faculty can get a ‘buy out’ if they have a research grant for summer work? Can’t they buy their time in the summer?”

Bruce replied, “We are unpaid for the summer months, so you certainly could pay yourself in the summer months which is different than a ‘buy out,” which would include a reduced course load. It depends on how much work you want to do and how much grant support you have. So a ‘buy out’ is kind of a different thing than paying yourself in the summer.”

Bruce said he will do some more research on it across the UTK campus because it varies from department to department.

Bruce gave Jorge the floor for an update from him.

Jorge said that there was a lot of energy going into preparing for first meeting of the Board. Linda is going to present the handbook changes. “It’s exciting—lots of change,” he said. “New board, new president.” Because everything is on one day at the next Board meeting, Linda can’t make it to the UFC dinner, so Jorge will represent the System for her. He said there are 64 colleagues registered for the summit. One of the questions being asked is how to blend student affairs in the interest of student success. He said that soon-to-be President Randy Boyd is very interested in meeting with the UFC, adding that we might try to schedule a meeting where everyone can be present.

Phyllis said that the UFC has traditionally met with new presidents. Her first UFC meeting ever was in Nashville in a meeting with Joe. UFC used to meet with Joe once if not twice a year. This is the first year in a long time that we have not done it at least once in Nashville at the governmental relations office.

Jorge said, “It’s different to meet someone in person, so that is a great idea—to meet Mr. Boyd in person.” Bruce suggested that another alternative would be to have him at the November meeting and to have Joe introduce him to us.

Phyllis said, “That’s fine,” but she would “prefer our very first introduction to the new system president to be on equal footing—not on anybody’s campus.” Bruce said that he thought it would be a good idea to get the Nashville meetings going again.

Phyllis said “just not on noon on November 13 since she will be presenting at a conference in Nashville.”

George said, "We will have to work around Mr. Boyd's schedule anyway."

Bruce asked if the proposed meeting with Randy would be the same as our Dec. meeting.

Phyllis replied, "I wasn't thinking that, but should we have our December meeting at the same time since we will all be in the same room?" "If we could," Bruce said. "Since we are off schedule already since we are meeting with the board." Phyllis said, "It's certainly a good idea."

Bruce said, "Let's find out when Randy can meet with us and we can answer that question."

Jorge said that was all for academic affairs. Chris asked him, "Do we know who the faculty representative on that committee you are combining is?" Jorge said he was not sure of the composition of that committee. Chris replied, "It's supposed to be announced tomorrow so someone knows." Misty, who had recently arrived, said that her understanding was that UTK's chancellor will forward two names to be considered. Bruce said that since they will be a UFC member, it'd be good to let them know that they will be a UFC member. Misty said, "I asked my Chancellor about that this morning. Asked him to let us know as soon as it's known, so it will likely be tomorrow before we know."

Bruce, changing topics, said, "Now that Misty is here we should talk about the workshop, which was her idea."

Misty said that this was something we had talked about in May. "I don't have anything more," she said. "I just made the request. I want to make sure we are in our right lane as senate presidents."

Bruce asked if the brochure was in the hands of the board. Jorge replied that it was. It was sent electronically, he believed. Bruce confirms that Linda said that was true. He wanted them to get a hard copy too, but he hasn't heard that that has happened.

Bruce said, "The question is do we need to do more—try to meet face to face? Assuming we can get approval to do it. Any thoughts about a workshop with the board?"

George said that it would not be a bad idea to have the board meet with the UFC. Misty agreed, saying, "Being in a room with people, however brief, would be great. I don't know if it's a pipe dream to meet with them in the November or February meeting." Phyllis asked, "Could we have a reception outside of the regular meeting?" Jorge said it would be difficult to get a good turnout for a reception since most of the board members plan their calendars a year out. November would be difficult since that meeting is getting quite full, he said.

Bruce said that it seems like scheduling it with one of their meetings would mean that we are all in one place. Phyllis added, "I meant a reception in conjunction with one of the board meetings." Bruce replied that the only problem is that they have their own receptions.

Misty asked “Do we need to go through Linda?” Jorge replied, “Academic Affairs is the liaison between the faculty and the Board.”

Bruce confirmed that that was his understanding as well—“that we work through Linda who would ask the president who would ask the board.”

Peg said that one of the questions to Linda might be—“We would like to do this. Do you see another route?” Phyllis asked “What is the appropriate conduit? Misty makes a great point in light of the new structure of the board. Now that the president is not a member of the board.”

Misty said, “I feel like we are a bit ‘through the looking glass’ in light of the new structure and the fact that we do not have a faculty trustee.” Jorge said, “I’ll convey this question to Linda and she should have an answer.” Bruce said that it is plausible that it will go through Joe.

Chris said, “I’m not convinced that we have something to speak to the BOT that is worthwhile. Are we just going to repeat what we’ve already sent them?” Misty replied, “I would think we would just present a short presentation, then Q and A.”

Chris said that that would work only if they have questions. “Do we have any indications that they have questions?” he asked. Misty replied, “I sure hope they do.” Chris said, “I just don’t want to annoy them.” Phyllis added, “That’s what I was getting at with the reception idea—less about what we want to tell them. More social—this is who we are, please feel free to let us represent the faculty to you.”

Jorge said, “It’s natural in a situation like this to make the unknown known. The board is very interested in what we are doing on the campuses. Maybe we could work in the campus UFC representatives at those meetings during the visits—in addition to a reception/workshop.”

Phyllis posited, “Wouldn’t it be good if we met them first—before they visit?” Misty said that that would be ideal. She said that the “UTK senate had a small reception at a sports event and invited two board members. So two board members met senators, who were warned not to politic, just to get to know everyone.”

Bruce noted that the February meeting is in Martin. “That might be good since it is not in Knoxville,” he said, adding, “I think we will know more after November 1 meeting.”

Phyllis said that the other idea might be far-fetched. She asked, “Are there other meetings scheduled between now and then where it would be appropriate for us to converge?” Jorge replied, “I don’t know their schedule.” Bruce said, “It’d have to be a full board meeting.”

Beth said that February really would be a good time.

Misty said that since the board no longer grants tenure, it’s more important to get to know Randy Boyd. “Maybe we could formulate two or three things to highlight,” she said. “I don’t

want to waste their time.” Bruce added that we are really just opening the communication channel.

Misty said, “John Compton has said on numerous occasions that he wants more communication—people feel like they can communicate with the board. That’s the ‘lane’ question. Exactly how does this work?”

Bruce said, “I think what we need to do is try to come up with a reasonable plan for some sort of social meeting with the board at their February meeting. What form would that take, not be a burden on them, but to make it the best opportunity we can have.”

Misty asked, “So that’s a request we would make of Linda and ask her to focus on that?”

Jorge replied, “My impression is that the channel won’t change—go to Linda who will go to the president.”

Phyllis said, “If we can meet with Randy Boyd sooner rather than later, that’s something we could bring up with him.”

Bruce said that Linda will be important during this transition. Misty added, “I want this to be effective and not waste a lot of time.” Bruce said that Linda has been great in advising us on protocol

Bruce asked Jorge, “Do you know where we stand on having campus plans for PPPR?”

Jorge said that the CAOs will give a brief overview to the board of how each campus has interpreted the board’s policy differently. There is not a formal presentation at this point to discuss how each campus differed on the template.

Misty asked, “Does that mean that the board will not be formally accepting the language?”

Jorge answered, “No. The intent is they will take action.”

Steve gave an update from UTC regarding the template language. He noted that UTC’s Provost had worked closely with the Handbook Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Language was proposed and voted on by the senate. The final language was divided into three parts. The first two parts passed unanimously. The third part, which was about PTR, passed by a slim margin.

UTM gave their update regarding the template. They voted. By the time it went to the senate everyone understood it. And it went through. That doesn’t mean that everyone was happy, but it was the lesser of evils.

Misty said that UTK had a unanimous vote in favor of the changes. “I was shocked,” she said. “I was bracing for a protest.”

Bruce asked where UTHSC was on the template language.

George said their senate was 93% in favor. Renee (?) added, “We also had a resolution to call for a reconsideration of the policy, but we separated it from the vote on the policy. It also passed unanimously.”

Phyllis said, based on the conversation/discussion, that seven percent of faculty wanted to know why we are even doing this. George added, “and why are administrators being excluded?”

Bruce said that it’s going to be important on all of our campuses to keep track of how much effort and time will be spent on PTR. Perhaps the committee should keep a timesheet of “billable” hours, he suggested.

Phyllis agreed, saying, “I think that’s what they are thinking—billable hours.”

Jorge said, “The way I look at what is happening with these processes is essentially that the new board is taking on initiatives from the previous board. I would look at it as an opportunity to convey to the new board about what faculty do—their productivity. Some faculty have very heavy advising loads, some edit national publications—things that provide context for the board. They will realize how busy the faculty members are if we can capture that in information for the board.”

Phyllis added, “They think that everyone gets ‘exceeds expectations.’ Rigor includes peer review, how you got that grant over a period of years (vetting, critiques, etc.)—that is the rigorous evaluation far beyond what they are even considering should happen. I wish we could give them examples in broader strokes about what it takes to get a grant, a peer-reviewed publication, etc.”

George agreed, saying, “Yes. We are getting evaluated every paper, every grant.”

Misty asked Jorge, “So who is supposed to do this. Should the system not advocate for us? Otherwise we look very self-interested.”

Jorge noted that Linda herself is relatively new, adding, “When I’ve been with Linda, she does advocate for our faculty very strongly. I think she takes quite seriously working with Randy Boyd. From my perspective, AASS does advocate for the faculty. But there is a shuffle going on.”

Bruce noted that “Katie and India did that too and felt frustrated.”

Misty noted that Linda has been learning it all on the fly because she is relatively new to the system. “Are there things that we need to supply?” she asked. “I get nervous about the self-advocacy piece.”

Jorge replied, “Yes, it sounds defensive when we have nothing to be defensive about. I don’t think we need to be defensive with the new board. John Compton’s remarks have been very proud of the work that the faculty is doing.”

Phyllis said, “This is a great point. I just had a new grant start that is a planning grant, which is asking focus groups of our future financial participants—asking them, ‘What is it you need?’ Perhaps we start with Randy and treat it as a focus group opportunity. We ask: how can we help you help us?” Peg said that that would be a very positive approach.

George said, “I spent five years reviewing federal grants. You just don’t realize how much time that takes.”

Phyllis said, “I’ve just been invited to serve on my first study session for the Department of Defense. It meets the week before Christmas.”

Peg thought it was important to convey “the idea that we want to understand you and, ‘How can we help you understand us?’”

Phyllis added that we are the UFC we advocate for faculty across the system. We should ask the Board, “How can we help you?” she said.

Bruce continued the thought, saying, “We are all on the same team. How can we work together to make this thing work better?”

Phyllis suggested that the Board of Trustees are “getting sick and tired of self-promoting and it’s a new board coming in that might have already been warned.”

Misty said, “I don’t want to be involved in self-advocacy.” Chris summed this discussion up, saying, “We have a lot of agreement on that.”

Phyllis asked Bruce to summarize where we were on things.

Bruce said that the next UFC meeting is November 1 with Joe. There will be lunch with him with discussion afterwards. Zoom will be available for those that cannot travel to Knoxville. Then we will try to arrange to meet with Randy in Nashville toward the end of the year. We need to cook up more concrete plans to meet socially with the board in February, working with Linda on this.

Bruce adjourned the meeting at 5:23.