



UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
Meeting 114
17 April 2019
3:00 pm (CT) / 4:00 pm (ET)
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)	Absent
	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)	
Faculty Council Guests		
	Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)	Present
	Peg Hartig	Present

Meeting called to order at 4:05 by Bruce.

Approval of minutes. Mr. Boyd began by discussing the UT Promise, including sharing reasons why we are doing this. We are a Land Grant university. The goal is to let students and families know that if they meet the academic requirements, they can come to a UT school. He stated

that we will take care of the money. He mentioned that the second most important thing is the mentorship part of the process. It is critical for these students to have someone who cares about them and believes in them to help them stay engaged. As it relates to the cost and early feedback on the program, he states that 95% say it's great. He mentions that the other 5% ask about other issues related to funding (room and board, books, etc.). He mentioned that Rice University has done this and they raised the money. We are going to try to build an endowment like they did. The result is that we will get more students coming to UT; we will have more students retained; and we will have more graduates with low debt. We are very excited about what we are doing and how important this is. There will be a big kickoff sometime in September. He briefly mentioned the 6 objectives we started the year with.

Bruce asked about the number of students who can graduate without debt, how many students currently have hundreds of thousands of debt. Misty mentioned that faculty are deeply committed to this issue. She recommended that we reach out to faculty to assist with this initiative as they are already engaged with and committed to their students. Jorge mentioned that Academic Affairs expects to identify mentors from faculty to keep them engaged. Misty also mentioned that we should ensure this is an opportunity to volunteer, not a job requirement. Bonnie mentioned ensuring that students are also aware of all other opportunities that are available to them, including research opportunities. There is a perception that education is not as much of a value as it used to be. We need to identify how we can get students excited about the learning part of the process. Mr. Boyd mentioned the continuous learning process we are engaged with. Beth mentioned the conceptual idea about learning versus education. Education sometimes seems to be all about the faculty and the staff, whereas learning is specifically about the students and their success.

Misty asked about ways that we can work to approach the ongoing faculty issues in a manner that does not appear to be based in self-interest for the faculty, but more about the quality of education that comes from tenure and academic freedom. These are student issues that need to be approached as such in that they are related to student success. She mentioned academic freedom, which is a student issue as much as it is a faculty issue. How do we shift the talk about what faculty do while also showing that these issues are about students as well?

Bruce asked about projections of how many more students will be added. Mr. Boyd mentioned that we expect 1600-2000 new students system wide; 80% UTK, 15% UTC, and 5% Martin.

Misty asked about the room and board question. Can we partner with organizations within our communities to help with the housing issue? Are there community partnerships available with housing groups? Mr. Boyd mentioned that currently, options for room and board coverage is only available in Knoxville. Renee mentioned that Martin does have a number of affordable housing options.

Mr. Boyd provided an update on the Search process for UTK Chancellor. He stated that we have 4 really great candidates. Our goal is to find who will be the best at the job, recognizing that nobody is perfect. The search committee will get everybody's input during this process.

One thing that is related to this hire is that we (UT) are going to have a really aggressive legislative strategy for next year. We need to go to all legislators in June to start selling what we want. We need to have all of our asks in order and be first to the table. By November, all of our desires and plans are part of the foundation. We want to be first to the table. We have a thorough process. We may ask for more money for a Hope retention grant to help people get back on course. Misty agreed that this process would help our graduation rate. Mr. Boyd wants us to hit the ground running on the legislative agenda. Bonnie mentioned looking at the transfer requirements and how difficult they are. Looking across the SEC, UTK transfer process is very hard. The Knoxville Provost is looking at this issue; how can we help students to move through the process? This will require faculty senate involvement as it will be a curriculum change. Other SEC rules are more lenient than we are about what can be accepted in the way of transfer coursework. Misty and Bonnie both shared on this issue. Mr. Boyd is meeting with Linda Martin to find ways to make it much more seamless to move across the campuses. Jorge added that he can add about that in his report from Academic Affairs.

Related to the Chancellor search, Misty stated that she is encouraging people to do the feedback form and wants to know who sees the feedback information. Mr. Boyd said they will be as transparent as he can. There is a disclosure on the feedback form. Misty stated that she is really asking more about Committee access to the information. Mr. Boyd stated he is having his cabinet (Chancellor's cabinet) provide commentary about the candidates. He has asked if anyone in the group of 4 is totally unacceptable. He discussed the process for the meetings and call backs. In addition, the SGA is engaged, they are searching social media and making reference calls. Overall, he is looking at all the pros and cons from the search committee and the cabinets. Misty stated that this information is helpful to her. She wants to ensure that the feedback forms are paid attention to and the feedback is used. Mr. Boyd stated that they will be exhaustive in the process and promised that the feedback will be used. There is no predetermined candidate. It is currently a dead heat with everyone having a 1 in 4 chance. All of them have said they are ready for this challenge. None of them have backed out at this time.

Misty said thanks for our patience with that process and with all of the focus on the UTK Chancellor. One of the things that Nolan said was that if UT Knoxville gets a cold, we all get the flu. She is trying to help ensure that we don't get the flu.

Bruce switched to the Agenda to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Motion to approve from Bonnie, second from Beth. No corrections were put forward and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Misty posed a question about continuing to pursue some type of UFC/Board relationship. Perhaps we can have an orientation, a reception, or provide additional documents. The Critical University Studies group is looking at the state of higher education. We need time for the UFC to have some type of interaction with the board members. What do we do about the relationship with the board? How do we get a way to interact with them directly? The good

news is that Bonnie now has access to the information (Diligent?). The conversation we had previously has had an impact. Had we not talked to the Board, that access would not have happened. The new rep (replacing Bonnie) will come from Martin. Misty asked what others think about the idea. Could we ask for a 30 minute orientation/presentation with the board members? We did the document. What can we do next? Phyllis brought up the idea to have an informal meeting/reception with the UFC and the board with perhaps a short presentation and then an open forum type approach. Here are the things we want (are asking for). We might be so bold as to say, we believe the voting faculty trustee needs to be reinstated. We would like to tell the board that we want their support on that. But we also want the opportunity to talk to the board about the things they have questions about. It would also be nice to tell them about the hot topics that are of concern to faculty if we can get the opportunity. We are here to engage with the board on any topics they want to learn more about.

Bruce mentioned that one reason we had talked about a social setting was to not get too confrontational about faculty issues. Perhaps we can start with the student issues. Bonnie shared that there has been some discussion on the board about this. Phyllis mentioned that perhaps we could back ourselves into the discussion by reviewing all of the things that we have been discussing for the past several years (EPP, etc.):

- What is it that board/members/etc. are looking at when they look at the dossiers or evaluation packets for the tenured faculty?
- What does each citation stand for? We recognize that we have multiple disciplines, each doing things their own way.
 - What does it represent on impact, time, contribution, etc.
- Share the impact factors of these single lines in a CV or dossier.
- Do board members understand the rigor of a grant award and what all went into the process to get the grant?

We would like to be reassured that they understand what all of these represent. Bonnie mentioned that this new board is not going through the typical process of RTP. They only see special cases such as administrative hires or early tenure cases. They have stated that they have been impressed with what they have seen. They have not had any questions about whether these people deserve tenure/promotion.

Bruce brought up the PPPR process and there was mention that there has been some discussion that this may go away in a couple of years. Do we take this opportunity to address this with the new board, acknowledging that we recognize that this process, with the focus act and new board policy, comes under their purview? We can share with them exactly what is the anatomy of a dossier or a CV.

Misty asked if we could pursue something with a lighter touch for the board. What if we imagine something informal, perhaps a 10 minute presentation which will get them to the material? We can share that all of the issues we want to share about are fundamental to student success. We can walk them through tenure process and the credentialing. We can let them know that we are here to help them understand faculty issues and also to answer any

questions they may have. We can search for a 45 minute to 1 hour spot in their schedule (with coffee, tea, or wine). We can also pitch the return of the faculty trustee while making sure they know that we are here to help. Bruce stated that the timeframe is right now. If can get the board on board, then can start to work with the legislature. Bruce agreed that the timeframe is right for this now as well. Phyllis mentioned that the planning for PPPR is happening now – the horse has already left the barn. We need to look toward to the coming 2-5 year plan. In the interim, what can we do to prepare in advance for potential grievances and other potential problems going forward? Beth mentioned that the first time this board will review the majority of this information will be next year as the first round of PPPR documents come forward. We need to be able to brief them now before all of this comes forward.

Jorge mentioned that the tone that drove the concerns about the tenure and promotion process was the tone from the previous board. He need to be wary of protesting too much at this time. However, he also mentioned that for the first time, the SACSCOC standards have continuous evaluation of the board as a requirement. This is new in the revised Principles. In light of that and continuous improvement, a board might review this process and want to work with the faculty for this process. This might give us a way to have a demonstration of the value the faculty might bring to the board.

Misty agrees that this is a good pathway. She also wants to bring up graduate education in Knoxville and the real need for solutions. Bruce stated he wondered if graduate education needs have the visibility that would be necessary. With the bigger focus on undergraduate education, would this be something the board would even be aware of. Jorge agreed that what we have seen/heard about has been mostly about undergraduate education.

Bonnie has an idea about a possible format for a meeting with the board. Bonnie asked if we were to highlight an issue on the campus, one that we know a faculty voice would help with the issue, what might that be. Renee brought up the discussion about the increase in graduation rates. The board is already talking about wanting to significantly increase graduation rates. It will be important for everyone to understand what that really means at a campus like UT Martin where the admission standards are not as stringent as they are at UT Knoxville. Admission standards relate to graduation rates. Does the board understand this? What would raising graduation rates really entail in light of this information? This may not be as simple as they may believe.

Bruce mentioned that one opportunity might be to discuss what would really be included in raising graduation rates, what it would really take. This would include academic preparedness as well. Renee acknowledged that no remedial programming is allowed at Martin, though we may have summer programs that meet these needs that are not considered as remedial. Misty stated that this also has everything to do with the ongoing transfer and articulation agreement issues. If a student wants to move from one campus to another, what conversations have occurred across the campuses for how we look at that process? We need to find ways we can look at how we could work on this together. If the board understood these challenges and that the target of the metric in and of itself is not enough, they might be better prepared to help us

move forward. Bruce stated that we need to look at the results/data that may need to be explored in order for us to get there. Discussion ensued that we need to be able to show the difference. Jorge mentioned that we could potentially have someone from each campus discuss the nuances of what it would mean to pursue a 1% increase in graduation rates from that campus. Bonnie shared that we also need to explain that the barriers to student success may be different on the different campuses. Renee mentioned that so much more goes into this than the board may be aware of. There are academic barriers as well as first generation students and other potential barriers. Any life hiccup can derail the academic career. UT Martin is having a retention summit on the UTM campus to discuss best retention processes. How can we best retain students and help them to get to graduation?

Phyllis mentioned that graduation rate is not the problem at the Health Science Center. They have other issues. She and Peg mentioned that they would like talk to the board about availability of resources to the faculty to help them do their jobs better. Chris mentioned that he would like to raise an idea that 1% is probably not the right number if we want to talk to the board. We potentially need to talk about a considerably higher number to get their attention. Misty brought up that we would need to be more narrative and less quantitative as we bring up these issues. We need to share that faculty insights into these core problems are going to be important in order to solve these problems. We need to make a more general bid to be helpful and not focus on the specific numbers.

Bonnie stated that what may be important is having someone going through the process who can help them through the stumbles in academic life. What we need to show to the board is our value; we need to frame our issues in terms of student success.

Phyllis brought up that what we need to come back to is what is the focus of the University Faculty Council? That focus is to advocate for and represent the faculty and the concerns of the faculties on the campuses. Although students are important, we should perhaps not get down into the weeds about student concerns. We should focus on what we need to do to help faculty be more successful. Focusing on faculty issues as a whole from a higher level view. Peg brought up that what we may need to focus on is how we need to promote the initiatives of our campuses. This may include promotion of research, promotion of faculty, promotion of scholarship, and this could also be used to focus on student research; research also informs education.

Bonnie mentioned that we could address student success in terms of research problems. Phyllis asked how we bring up ways that the board can help the faculty to identify the resources needed to move forward with this. What message can we share with the board and request better resources and support in order to do our jobs better? Bonnie provided a specific example from the standpoint of research in terms of grants. What she needs is to focus on the science of the grant and bring in a professional grantwriter to write the content, a graphic designer to design the materials, and shift the time requirement for these components from the faculty allowing them to focus on the science. Phyllis stated that one of the primary objectives of this board is to increase research. She would prefer that we send messages and

open dialogues to look at these research opportunities and load issues and faculty issues and not get down in the weeds.

Peg brought up the thought of how we achieve student success without doing the research needed to ensure best type of delivery. Just as a simple example, what has to happen with online education to create success for students? Misty mentioned that this is another big issue. We need to be sure we are framing the faculty issues as student success issues and then focus the content about what we define as faculty issues. We don't need to make a specific ask at this time. We need to share with the board that we are here to help and to advise the board in any way they need us. If this is a ten minute presentation, that could lead to a conversation, that may be the approach. Bonnie brought up that we are already addressing the mission and how it relates to research, which is a board focus. That is part of what the board has already learned about. Compton mentioned at the last meeting that he is just now beginning to wrap his head around the whole research thing and how to understand what an important cause that is.

Phyllis asked Beth to weigh in. Beth asked if we can we look at Boyd's six strategies and find out ways that we can take down from that what can the faculty do to achieve those six strategies? How can the faculty contribute to the six strategies? Identify things faculty would need to do to assist those strategies. Show how faculty can contribute to these things.

Misty brought up that we are trying to identify a list. Student success, UTK Graduate education, increasing graduation rates – perhaps focus from UT Martin, UTHSC needs resources for faculty, including research. Then perhaps we can begin to talk to them about tenure. This may be a here is how the rubber meets the road. Perhaps look back at the document we already created for them and pull out some repetition of the information about tenure. We are looking at how much we can potentially cover in 10 minutes. Bruce mentioned that one goal we might have from this would be for them to leave with "Oh, I never thought about that." Give them a little deeper perspective so that they can see the value of the faculty perspective. Misty said that if this generally makes sense to us all, the next step is to ask for the timeslot. Could we ask for a brief spot to have a short presentation and a meet and greet to talk informally? Base our presentation on the fact that we want to assist the board in any way that they see fit.

Phyllis stated that if you look on the website at our purpose (UFC), it states that we actively participate in the strategic planning, serve on any task forces, advocate for budget and other issues on the campuses. The Board has heard of us and knows the basics of what we do, but have we been formally introduced and given opportunity to present and offer the resources we have? Maybe that is the way we approach it. Get that invitation to get faculty involved.

Bruce said that if all agreed with that, then the next step would be to have Linda try to find us a spot. Misty thinks is time for us to make the ask. Phyllis asked to confirm what it is we are asking? Is it going back to the original thought? Bruce agreed that we ask about making the short presentation and a potential meet and greet. Bruce stated let's ask and see what we get. Not at the actual Board meeting, prior to or between meeting. Phyllis suggested that we say the

UFC would like some time with the board, what are our options. Bruce agrees that it would have to be around the meeting. Misty says she can whip up a brief version of this request and beginning take at the slides. Bruce says that the shorter it is and the less we ask for, the better chance we have. Phyllis asked who should make the pitch, Bruce or Linda or Jorge, what are the options?

Jorge asked Bonnie how this might this play through the ERS committee, because one of their roles is to inform the board about these issues. Perhaps we should ask them. Bonnie can ask Donny if the UFC can get some time with the board. Jorge agreed and Bruce confirmed that Bonnie can work with Donny to see if this is possible. Misty will come up with template and notes. Jorge will also brief Linda about this concept. Bruce mentioned that this way it can come bottom up through the board. Then potentially the ERS committee could request to meet with the UFC.

Bruce moved the group on to the next item, which is revision of the board policy on early tenure. Misty mentioned that there is a loophole that has been discussed at the Provost level at UTK. It is not from the Senate per se. If someone requests extra time on the tenure clock, they have been advised to go ahead and take the time, and then if not needed, they don't take it. Now because of the new policy, this is being seen as early tenure. Two of Misty's advisees are now being counted as going up early because they didn't need the time because they are coming up on their original clock date. The reason was stated is that because the clock date is changed in IRIS, and if you change it, you can't go back and mess with IRIS and change it back. We need to work on the solution; it is a Title IX issue. Is there a collective recommendation for us? This will come up at the administrative level. Bonnie stated that this is more common than you might think; two women in her department have been affected. Phyllis asked if the date can be changed in IRIS in the first place, why can't it go back and change again. Misty said that was her question as well. She is concerned about the whole concern and wants to know if the UFC should take this up as an issue. Phyllis agreed that we should look at this as a UFC issue. This may be very confusing for the board as they will be looking at 6 years of service. Phyllis stated that this should be pretty straight forward. If your date is set, and if go up before, then that is early tenure. Issue is not can the date be reset; it is what are the policies and procedures in place to document and justify the changes. We need to make sure we are looking at the policy and the issues. Misty stated that she suggests that this is a chance for the UFC to make a statement of concern about this issue. This is now board policy and it will affect real world issues. Bruce stated that the board policy is reasonable, however it is the way it is being interpreted.

Phyllis agreed in principle, but suggests that we don't look too specifically; that we should not present something to the board that is gender specific. There are other cases that may not be just about pregnancy. Bonnie mentioned that there are cases where promises were made to faculty when they arrived that a lab promised was promised and two and four years later, these have not come to fruition. Bonnie mentioned that the policy says extension for time, not just on pregnancy. Phyllis stated that there are many different levels and we need to look at them.

Chris brought up that we should look at the level of a statement that software should not dictate policy. Are we taking interpretations of what the software will do or do we check with the company and find out how other universities work these situations. Missy asked if we can ensure that we make a consolidated statement from the UFC that we get back to the chancellor's recommending that software should not subvert policy. We have a motion by Phyllis, second by Bonnie. This motion was passed unanimously.

Misty will email this recommendation to Linda, copying Jorge and email to Bruce. Each Faculty Senate president will be responsible to deliver to their respective chancellor. Phyllis asked since Bruce is chair, should this come from him. Bruce will send out. The resolution is from the UFC. Bruce will also send to all of us so that we can share with our respective chancellors.

Resolution 1 – It has come to the faculties' attention that even though university policy allows for a faculty member to request, and be granted, an extension for probationary term leading to tenure, and even though the requesting person is not required to use this extension, if the tenure clock date has been extended in the IRIS personnel tracking system, this extension cannot be reversed in the IRIS system. Subsequently, if a candidate asked for an extension and then did not need to use this extension, the system adjusted date makes it appear that the tenure seeking faculty member is now going up for tenure "early" even if they are operating on their original probationary period. The University of Tennessee University Faculty Council makes a recommendation that any software utilized by the university should not subvert the needs and professional requirements of the university.

Jorge provided his update from Academic Affairs. As President Boyd mentioned, leadership academy meeting is being held in Baltimore and UT is sending a group of chief academic officers from the campuses with primarily undergraduate students. The project is called One UT for campus change. It is about seamless transition. We have done a survey of students identified as change students to see if we can find ways to make the process more seamless. Posters have come out at the meetings. These campus change students are internal transfers, not to and from other non-UT schools.

We may all be aware that in the fall of last year, there was a summit of chief academic officers and about chief student affairs officers. Next fall, the summit will be about mental health of students. The intention is to have some external voices and representation from all campus. When this was discussed, the CAOs and CSAOs stated it was a top need. Academic Affairs is really excited about working with that. Bonnie asked why there is no real training for faculty to deal with students. Jorge mentioned that this type of thing may come out of the meeting and this is a real opportunity. Phyllis gave a shout out for UTHSC president award winner for community connection – Kathy Gibbs.

Jorge stated that Linda recently led a faculty performance workshop with department chairs and received good feedback at UTK. They are coming to Chattanooga and Martin in June with this workshop. It is focused on the faculty evaluation process and exceeds and far exceeds

evaluations. Jorge attended and one of the definitions that came out was “meets expectations of excellence.” This might be a better definition for meets. This would require a real culture shift. Bruce ask who attended these meetings. Jorge stated it was department chairs. Bruce asked if it was all or many, however Jorge didn’t know exactly how many.

Bruce mentioned that in the past, the ones who attend are the ones who don’t need to attend. Phyllis brought up the previous discussions about working with the university to have training for department heads be mandatory for chairs. This has been an ongoing UFC discussion. Perhaps this is the time for the UFC to suggest that evaluation training be mandatory. Jorge said this is not a bad idea and is certainly in the UFC wheelhouse. Peg mentioned that some of this information is already available as an online module. Phyllis stated that it is more important that it is mandatory for all those who evaluate faculty. This may be more than just department chairs. On UTHSC, division chiefs may evaluate faculty but are not the chair. Jorge said that if chairs have attended training and understand the shift to “meets expectations for excellence” but deans have not have heard this and may not have bought in, there may be a disconnect. Jorge will take these comments back to Linda to discuss, especially the option for an online module. Additionally, a department head might need to revisit the training information at a later date. Phyllis stated that this should be from the top down. If you evaluate any faculty member at any level, you need to be trained – from Deans on down. Peg said that this should be mandatory training of all faculty evaluators. Jorge agreed that it should be everyone who is involved in the cascade. Phyllis made a motion of this statement. Beth asked if this should also be up to the Provost and the Chancellor. Jorge mentioned that the chief academic officers are very aware of this issue and the chancellors are too. Bruce asked if we want to make the motion that this be on an annual basis. Peg stated that we need to recognize that there is a shift of who is a department chair from time to time. Phyllis made this as a motion. Jorge advises to not do any period mention.

Resolution 2 – Based on discussion about department heads (and others who evaluate faculty members) and their understanding of and skills related to the evaluation process, the UFC recommends that the University implement required (mandatory) training of all faculty evaluators. In addition to Department Heads, the UFC recommends that this training should be required for anyone who participates in the evaluation of faculty at any level of the process.

Beth will clean it up and send to Bruce, then he can send it out to everyone to see if they agree with the wording.

Jorge reported that the last Tuesday of every month, the Academic Affairs and Student Success Office convenes a meeting of all SACSCOC liaisons. As they have evolved, they have transitioned to include IR colleagues. The point is to allow us to collaborate across the campuses in creating brain trust of the campuses and accreditation ramifications. One of the things this group has been working on is a way to get feedback from the liaisons while the legislature is in session. UTHSC is coming up on their reaffirmation for SACSCOC accreditation. The group is creating narratives for the standards, templates that all of the campuses can use and modify as needed.

This might be one area where we can most demonstrate our collaborative efforts. Linda and President Boyd went to a meeting in Martin where the liaison there asked about accreditation across the state. We are all SACSCOC accredited and UT System can be a leader in the process and provide resources to all. Bruce asked does the board understand SACSCOC accreditation process. Jorge stated that they will get an introduction with the upcoming. Jorge did a fellowship before he came here where the system sent an observer to any situation where a campus did not get reaffirmation. This is not something we have done at UT. It has been proposed to a number of groups. This signals to SACSCOC that the system cares. Bruce reiterated his question about board understanding of what accreditation really means. Jorge says probably not, not all understand the importance, however they will after this next reaffirmation. Also, the new standard that involves the board will require them to respond in a way they have not previously had to do.

Jorge also brought up the UT Promise that President Boyd brought up. Also, Jorge noted that we do now have Diligent access for Bonnie. Additionally, we always have new programs that Academic Affairs is working on. UTK has 8 new programs, UTC and UTHSC each have one new program in the works, none currently at UTM. Misty confirmed that these are academic programs and asked if they constitute majors. Jorge read some of the list (medical physics, global studies, architectural design, public health) and yes are majors. There were some questions about what departments are involved. Jorge said he will share an email. Bruce asked what about low performing programs. Bonnie stated that this comes out the first of the year.

Bruce mentioned that the other side of any new programs is the low performing program. Some majors have lost numbers, however sometimes new programs that may be similar may be pulling from other majors. Jorge mentioned that they are working at those reports. He also stated that Linda is accompanying a UTK chancellor candidate, which is why she missed the meeting. The meeting was adjourned.