

Faculty Senate Executive Council
MINUTES
October 10, 2012

Present: Steve Thomas, David Golden, Fritz Polite, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Ralph Brockett, Guoxun Chen, Chris Cimino, Phillip Daves, Scott Gilpatric, Bruce MacLennan, Susan Martin, Steven Milewski, David Patterson, Lloyd Rinehart, Matthew Theriot

Guest: John Zomchick

I. CALL TO ORDER

S. Thomas called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

President's Report (S. Thomas)

A written summary of activities for the period September 17th through October 9th has been posted on the Senate's website.

Chancellor's Report (J. Cheek)

No report given as Chancellor Cheek was out of town.

Provost's Report (S. Martin)

- Stephen L. Mangum, the senior associate dean at The Ohio State University's Max M. Fisher College of Business, has been named dean of our College of Business Administration. He will join us on March 1, 2013.
- A new software program, used to schedule advising appointments and to maintain electronic records of advising meetings, has failed under the load placed on it as additional departments were added. All departments will be returning to their earlier, individual systems while a new, central solution is being sought. Students with advising concerns may be directed to Dr. Ruth Darling or the Provost's Office.
- Planning continues for the One-Stop Center on the ground floor of the Hodges Library. Construction is expected to begin next spring. U-Track is moving forward as well.
- John Zomchick will be joining the meeting later to discuss proposed promotion process for lecturers.
- Chancellor Cheek is still working on the post-promotion review process for professors with the hope of providing a method for merit salary increases for these individuals.
- The campus hosted a "future faculty" program the last week of September. Individuals in underrepresented groups who are close to completing work on their terminal degrees were invited to campus to meet faculty in their fields. A workshop on recruiting for diversity will be hosted in the near future.
- The fall meeting of the Southeastern Conference Academic Consortium (SECAC) will be hosted on campus next week. D. Golden is one of the representatives to the SECAC this year.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

D. Golden offered one correction to a typographical error in the minutes of the Executive Council meeting on September 10, 2012. On page 3, Lisa Schoenbach should be Alisa

Schoenbach. A motion to approve these minutes, as corrected, was made by S. Gilpatric with a second provided by L. Rinehart. The motion passed by voice vote.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Faculty Senate Representation on the Technology Fee Advisory Board (D. Matthews)

In the absence of D. Matthews, S. Thomas report that the recommendation of the Library and Information Technology Committee was for Robert Fuller and Joanne Logan to extend their term of service to the Technology Fee Advisory Board. By common consent, the committee's recommendation was accepted and these individuals were thanked for their service.

Faculty Senate Representation on the Student Life Council (M. Theriot)

M. Theriot reported that the Undergraduate Council recommended Richard Strange and Norman Magden to serve as the new Faculty Senate representatives on the Student Life Council. In answer to a question, he acknowledged that it was not decided who would serve the three-year term and who would serve the two-year term. That fact will be reported to the Executive Council at its next meeting. By common consent, the committee's recommendation was accepted and these individuals were thanked for their service.

Courses Not Taught in Four Years (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas noted that recommendations for handling courses that have not been taught in four years had not been received last year from the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council. While he was not expecting a resolution to this issue today, he will be keeping this item on the agenda for future meetings as a reminder that action was needed.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching Guide (P. Daves/S. Thomas)

S. Thomas had asked for an update on the Peer Evaluation of Teaching Guide, since this matter had been referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee in November 2011. P. Daves reported that he and L. Rinehart had reviewed the document and performed some rough calculations on the amount of faculty time that would be required on the part of senior faculty to perform the evaluations as described. Based on those figures (approximately 40 person-hours per review), the committee felt the process was too onerous and had offered suggestions for revision. When the authors of the document had been declined to consider those revisions, the committee decided not to recommend the document for inclusion in the *Resources Manual*. Of course, individual department may follow the process as presented, if they wish.

Thomas noted that, through e-mail discussions with John Zomchick and David Schumann, two changes had recently occurred. First, the Tennessee Teaching and Learning Center's website no longer refers to this procedure as being "approved." Second, the version of the procedure available from this website now matches the version available from the Provost's website and thus contains an introductory page explaining the document's history to date.

S. Martin acknowledged that, perhaps, a less detailed process might be needed. Given that the campus has a taskforce currently considering evaluation of teaching, there was general agreement to wait for the report of that task force before considering changes to this procedure. The Faculty Affairs Committee will table further work on this proposal pending receipt of the task force report.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Resolution (P. Daves)

In response to a question raised at the September Senate meeting, P. Daves obtained figures from the Office of Instructional Research and Assessment to determine how the faculty census would change with the proposed addition of lecturers and clinical instructors. The result of this analysis had been posted on the Senate's website as an attachment for this meeting. In summary, it is estimated that 17 seats would be added to the Senate. The greatest gain (five new senators) would be seen in the Arts and Sciences – Humanities caucus. Four caucuses would have two additional senators and four would have one additional senator.

Daves also noted that one revision was needed in the proposal as presented last month. The one-time election should be overseen by the President-Elect rather than the President. This amendment will be made when the proposal is considered by the Senate later this month.

V. NEW BUSINESS

2013-2014 Meeting Schedule (D. Golden)

D. Golden presented a draft schedule for the 2013-2014 meetings of the Faculty Senate and Executive Council. The dates for Senate meetings as outlined in the *Bylaws* do not conflict with any religious holidays or administrative closings. Three exceptions were noted to our general practice of holding the Executive Council meeting two weeks in advance of the Senate meeting.

- September 2, 2013 (two weeks before the September Senate meeting) is a closed day for the University; suggested alternative: Tuesday, September 3, 2013.
- January 20, 2014 (two weeks before the February Senate meeting) is a closed day for the University; suggested alternative: Tuesday, January 21, 2014.
- April 21, 2014 (two weeks before the May Senate meeting) falls within Passover; suggested alternative: Wednesday, April 23, 2014.

A motion was made by P. Daves to accept the 2013-2014 meeting schedule, with these suggested alternatives for the Executive Council meetings. A second was provided by L. Rinehart. The motion passed by voice vote.

Possible Agenda Item for Faculty Senate Meetings (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas reported that, during breaks in the Senate Retreat, he had been approached by two senators with similar suggestions, namely that time should be allotted at Senate meetings for general discussion of major issues facing the campus community. Examples offered include approaches to on-line education/distance learning and barriers to the development of interdisciplinary programs. While he did not feel we could do so at every meeting, perhaps we could do so once per term? By common consent, he will make this suggestion at the October Senate meeting. P. Daves noted that first and third Thursday afternoons at the Faculty Pub were another possibility that should be promoted. D. Patterson also mentioned the Senate's listserv as a medium for discussion.

Minutes of Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council Meetings (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas asked for clarification as to when the minutes of meetings of the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council should be presented to the Senate; when they are first released or after they are approved by the Council? The general consensus was to wait for Council's approval.

Promotion Procedure for Lecturers (S. Thomas/J. Zomchick)

John Zomchick, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, presented information on draft procedures for the promotion process for lecturers to the new rank of senior lecturer and (eventually) from

senior lecturer to distinguished lecturer. When the Board of Trustees first approved the senior lecturer rank for non-tenure track faculty, the Senate had allowed the Provost's office to do the initial round of promotion reviews while the procedure was being developed. A total of 47 lecturers were promoted as a result of that review. The present draft, a refinement of the process used that year and patterned on the promotion process for tenured or tenure-track faculty has been presented to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review and comment. The plan is to add the procedure to the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* where it will be readily available to all lecturers and the departmental faculty conducting the first level of review. In view of the fact that approval by the Board of Trustees could not be obtained in time to conduct promotion reviews this year, Zomchick requested that the Senate extend its provisional provision for one more year. A motion was made by P. Daves to allow the Provost's Office to conduct lecturer promotion reviews this year while the Faculty Affairs Committee considers the draft procedures. S. Gilpatric offered a second to the motion. The motion passed by voice vote.

New Employee Code of Conduct (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas reported receiving an e-mail message, dated October 2, 2012, from Bill Moles, Director of the Compliance of the Office of Institutional Compliance for The University of Tennessee System. The message concerned a "new employee code of conduct" developed by The University of Tennessee that was placed in effect on July 1, 2012. The message requested assistance from Thomas, in his role as President of the Faculty Senate, to help in "communicating about the code to those you represent."

There was general agreement that it was disconcerting to learn in this manner about such important action which had been taken without any input from faculty members. D. Patterson suggested that this concern might be appropriately shared during the University of Tennessee Faculty Council (UTFC) meeting scheduled for next week. By common consent, he was asked to request that this matter be added to the agenda for that meeting.

Thomas stated that he would share this message and any information gained during the UTFC meeting at the October Senate meeting.

Assignment and Use of Self-Authored Texts (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas reported that he had been contacted by a faculty member concerned about a situation that had occurred four or five years ago. That situation involved a second faculty member who was coordinating multiple sessions of an undergraduate course and had used a self-authored text when alternatives were available that would have been less expensive for students. The first faculty member had referred a statement from the American Association of University Professors outlining pros and cons of professors assigning their own texts to students. Thomas stressed that this particular incident had been investigated and resolved, but there remains the more general issue of balancing the rights of individual faculty members while protecting students from even the possibility of abuse. He stated his plan to have the Senate's Graduate Assistant survey our peer and aspirational peer institutions, to gauge the extent to which they have addressed this concern and the type of procedures and processes employed. The results of this survey would be shared with the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration and possible action.

Caucus Chairs (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas reported that 15 of our 16 caucuses have reported the selection of a chair. The final caucus was at an impasse because none of the active senators had volunteered or nominated anyone else. After discussing a few alternatives, there was general consensus supporting the appointment of a chair based on a random drawing by S. Thomas.

Process for Appointment to CPR Committee (S. Thomas)

S. Thomas reported that, per communications by a faculty member with the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Faculty Senate may soon need to assist with the formation of a Cumulative Peer Review (CPR) Committee. The *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (Part V. C. 1, page 29) indicates that a CPR Committee "shall be composed of ... and at least two additional members shall be selected based on nominations by the Faculty Senate (one of which shall be from outside the department)." Similar wording is found in Appendix C: "... and at least two additional faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate (one departmental faculty member [same or higher rank] and one non-departmental faculty member [same or higher rank])." However, there is no indication of the method by which such nominations should be made. Thomas asked if anyone present could shed more light on recent practice, but no consensus was obtained.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment was moved and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.