

FACULTY SENATE
Minutes
April 2, 2018

Absent: Gladys Alexandre, Brian Ambroziak, Stephen Blackwell, Stan Bowie, Qing Cao, Vincent Carilli, Lt. Col. Matthew Castillo*, Courtney Childers, Chris Cimino, Dawn Coe, Chris Craig, Ramon DeGennaro, Islam El-Adaway, Kelly Ellenburg, Jennifer Franklin, Holly Greene, Rob Hardin, Heather Hartman, Silke Hecht, Sarah Huff Burnley, Sharon Jean-Philippe, Jackie Johnson, Juan Jurat-Fuentes, Michael Kilbey, Andrea Ludwig, Tomas Martín-Jiménez, Jason Mastrogiovanni, Stephen Marz, Crystal McAlvin, Jennifer Morrow*, Lisa Muller, Leigh Ann Mutchler*, John Schmisser, Reza Seddighi, George Siopsis, Jennifer Stokes, Pedro Tomás, Margarita Velandia, Brynn Voy, Stewart Waters, Brian Whitlock, Shellen Wu, Xiaopeng Zhao, John Zomchick

Present by Zoom: Chris Boyer, Lisa Mullikin, Phyllis Thompson

*Alternates: Wenjun Zhou for Leigh Ann Mutchler, Mehmet Aydeniz for Jennifer Morrow, Capt. Mark Farley for Lt. Col. Matthew Castillo

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM (E. Bernard)

E. Bernard established that there was a quorum.

II. CALL TO ORDER (B. Lyons)

B. Lyons called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

President's Report (B. Lyons)

B. Lyons noted that the Tennessee University Faculty Senates (TUFS) will meet in Cookeville later in the week. Bonnie Ownley and Martin Griffin will represent UTK. B. Lyons emphasized that despite the many external challenges, the Faculty Senate has accomplished much this year including: continuing process of re-designing the general education curriculum; work by the Graduate Council that has effectively eliminated our credentialing committee; work to make changes to chapters 3-4 of the *Faculty Handbook*; and the pilot of PLAYitOUT, which will hold four public performances later this month. B. Lyons noted that the ways in which the UT FOCUS Act will impact the university and our campus is yet to be determined. Making sure these new board members have a thorough orientation that includes information on the complexity of faculty work, the rigor of our hiring practices, annual review standards and tenure and promotion processes, the value of tenure to academic freedom, as well as normative processes of academic governance will be important. Given that there will be an absence of faculty trustees, the University Faculty Council will need to advocate for this. B. Lyons suggested that we need to begin thinking about the mechanisms that will be used to select student and faculty representation on the seven-member campus level advisory boards to ensure that the faculty representative is either an elected Faculty Senate President or someone with strong ties to and selected by the Faculty Senate Executive Council.

B. Lyons met in March with Joseph R. Stainback, who is working for Robert Nobles as the assistant Research Integrity Officer to strengthen awareness and training in Responsible Conduct of Research by looking at the institutionalization of RCR across the campus and the

creation of a clearer authorship procedure. J. Stainback has since met with Qiang He, chair of the Research Council and Michelle Kwon, chair of Faculty Affairs with the goal of looking at compliance broadly, encompassing RCR, IRB, Title IX and IT Acceptable Use Policies with the goal of considering how chapter 2 of the *Faculty Handbook* might better reflect these faculty compliance obligations as well as on the RCR website. Their efforts will likely extend into the work of the Faculty Senate next year.

B. Lyons also encouraged faculty to participate in the UT Police Department's annual re-accreditation with the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). Lyons showed a video of Abigail Washburn and Wu Fei, who performed at the Bijou Theater as part of the Big Ears Festival to reflect on the implications of the "Foreign Influence Transparency Act," which would require Confucius Institutes to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, or FARA. B. Lyons congratulated Lou Gross for his selection as the 2018 SEC Faculty Achievement Award.

President Elect's Report (M. Anderson)

M. Anderson is pleased to report that all Senate elections except the College of Social Work have been completed. The Faculty Senate will have 32 new senators and 14 new alternates. This was one of the most robust turnouts for elections in living history. M. Anderson provided thanks to B. Lyons and B. Ownley for working hard for the university in good times and bad. Next year, M. Anderson will focus on how faculty can harness our collective voice to reclaim the story of the university. A series of micro-videos, under the #UTellOurStory, sponsored by the Senate and the Chancellor, will begin to launch on social media, each one featuring a professor and student. This is an important change campaign to demonstrate the value of public education to the public and the legislature. M. Anderson noted that the Faculty Senate will continue to stand up for faculty and for the kind of university we know we can be. One example of such leadership and vision is the new PLAYitOUT project. Handbills were distributed. The script is funny, authentic, and based on interviews with students and faculty here about their experiences of community, exclusion, and hope. The Faculty Senate, Provost's Office, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Department of Theatre are proud sponsors.

UTK Chancellor's Report (B. Davenport)

B. Davenport extended her congratulations to L. Gross for SEC Faculty Award. She thanked all who participated in Hike the Hill in Heels for sexual assault awareness. The Chancellor noted being proud of all that has been accomplished this year despite being on defense on several issues. She looks forward to telling our story in bigger and bolder ways. Consultants from 160/90 have been hired by the University to help with marketing. The Chancellor indicated that she has not lost sight of VolVision; yet, there is much in the VolVision that needs to be updated. Metrics need to be refined and the peers need to be updated in the strategic plan. The Chancellor shared her vision of the strategic plan as a living document. In terms of revenue, reaching the Top 25 is a huge challenge. There is little clarity about how the Top 25 goal was set. The Chancellor expressed concern about what people don't know about UT, noting that we welcomed the largest class in recorded history in the fall. We also had our largest fall to spring retention, with 95.4% of students retained between fall and spring semesters. Overall, the enrollment and academic profiles of our students are incredibly impressive. There will be future emphasis on recruiting more out-of-state, international, and graduate students. Access also needs to be a goal. The bridge program was doubled to 209 students. The Chancellor noted that \$1.2 million was raised for the Chancellor's Transformation Fund - used for micro-grants to

support at-risk students. For example, if a student gets a 2.8 or 2.9, the fund will cover the gap and give them a year to get the HOPE scholarship back. Investments are also going into student advising, student success and recruiting transfer students. These categories will be built into VolVision in the future. The Chancellor recognized that growth cannot occur without new faculty; as such, she announced a plan to hire 100 new faculty lines. The University typically hires 50-75 faculty/year on average. Research expenditures have increased by 11%. She said that the outcome of the post-tenure review policy was as expected. With regard to the Focus Act, the Chancellor is seeking input on the advisory boards. We need individuals who will advocate for UTK. The Chancellor expressed that she was pleased at the strength of the pool for the Provost search; there should be a decision in the near future. Budget planning is underway. L. Gross noted that there has been skepticism about how hiring 100 new faculty will be feasible financially. He asked about what planning has been done in order to afford this? Chancellor Davenport responded that a 3% increase in students brings in about \$1.5 million in tuition money. This is how we will afford the faculty hiring. She said that 17:1 is the faculty to student ratio is too high. So, next year there will be an addition of 20 new faculty. This addition will be above and beyond those who are part of the cluster hire. L. McKay said that he was pleased to hear that we are continuing with VolVision and, as a member of the original task force, asked that the Chancellor engage the former committee members for any revisions that are made to the document.

IV. MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The minutes of the March 5, 2018, Faculty Senate meeting were moved for approval by M. Anderson and seconded by K. Baker. The minutes were unanimously approved.

The Faculty Senate Executive Council meeting minutes of March 19, 2018, were included as an information item.

V. MINUTES OF THE GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE COUNCILS

The minutes of the Graduate Council meeting of February 8, 2018, along with the summary report, were included with the agenda. A. Nebenfuehr moved approval, G. Kaplan seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

The minutes of the Undergraduate Council meeting of February 27, 2018, along with the summary report, were included with the agenda. M. Griffin moved approval, C. Sams seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Proposal to Revise the UTK Faculty Senate Bylaws for TUFS and COIA Representatives (B. Ownley)

B. Ownley presented the resolution for second reading and action. Approved, R. Abedi abstained.

Discussion of Board of Trustees New Policies on Tenure (B. Lyons)

B. Lyons compiled a PowerPoint presentation and led a summary discussion of the new board policies on tenure covering ETTR, APPR, EPPR, PPPR and CPRAPR- Comprehensive Performance Review Based on Findings of an Academic Program Review. He flagged a few policy changes of note. There have been some small changes to the EPPR process in Appendix E, mostly involving voting processes on review committees. While one can come up for early consideration, six-year

probationary periods will be the norm for all tenure-track hires. Regular tenure cases will be decided by the UT President; all early and expedited tenure cases will be decided by the UT BOT. Context is important. Based on the small numbers of faculty who receive rankings below meet expectations through APPR, the UT BOT believes that annual rankings of faculty are not rigorous enough. In consultation with Joe DiPietro, each campus is to develop a PPPR process for approval at the November 2018 BOT meeting. B. Lyons indicated that we have a need to define the problem; as such, he has asked UT VP Linda Martin to provide the Provosts and the UFC with the following information to assist in policy development, (1) Historical data on APPR rankings by campus, college, and academic unit, (2) data on the number of CPR reviews that were initiated for each campus over the same time period, (3) examples of best practices of PPPR policies from other universities. The UFC has advocated for Clarity, Consistency, Candor, and Compassion in implementation of faculty reviews. To ensure clarity of criteria, he has advocated that chief academic officers on each campus should complete an audit to confirm that all college and unit bylaws have appropriate performance criteria by academic rank. Each campus should also establish an annual comprehensive department head training program with an emphasis on faculty evaluations. Evaluations of department heads should provide an opportunity for faculty to give input into the effectiveness of the annual evaluations. He expressed concern regarding the composition and timeline for the campus level PPPR policy drafting task forces. According to the new Board policy, campuses will need to complete the development of a PPPR policy prior to the November 2018 BOT meeting. B. Lyons suggested starting this before the end of the summer. Questions that need to be considered: 1) what materials should the review be based upon to ensure the effective and efficient use of effort for the faculty member under review?; 2) what is the best size and composition of PPPR committees to ensure appropriate disciplinary expertise and effective use of faculty and administrative effort?; 3) what process will be used for the selection of the faculty members conducting reviews?; 4) what form of evaluation should there be to evaluate effectiveness of teaching?; 5) how does the policy address cases where the faculty member under review is determined to be performing at an overall ranking that is higher than the ones assigned through the APPR process?; 6) how does the policy address cases where the faculty member under review is determined to be performing at an overall ranking that is less than the ones assigned through the APPR process?; 7) when would a review involve the solicitation of reviewers from outside of the university?; and 8) how will standard rights of appeal apply if a faculty member disagrees with the review committee's findings? Further, as the reviews involve personnel information, what provisions are made to ensure the confidentiality of the reviews? Might this be a case for having a campus level review committee with appropriate disciplinary expertise? Could raises or bonuses be allocated to top performing faculty reviewed through this process? Another question is whether the name of the PPPR system should be changed to reflect a commitment to both formative and summative objectives. One option proposed has been faculty accomplishments and accountability reviews.

M. Griffin asked whether there has been any serious thought given to how review committees will be constituted given that approximately 100 people will be reviewed each year? B. Lyons responded that more than half of the tenured faculty would have to be involved in the process if committee were composed of three faculty members. G. Skolits noted that the hope is to assemble the cost statistics on this initiative. L. Gross noted that a cost estimate already exists at over \$800,000, and that this information was communicated to the Board of Trustees in a letter from former Faculty Senate Presidents mailed on March 16, 2018. M. Black asked why faculty should spend an enormous amount of our time to fix a policy being imposed upon us. B.

Lyons replied we should only engage in a process of policy development if the key questions posed to Linda Martin are answered. J. Shefner asserted that this is an attack on faculty, stating that in our efforts to get these answers, we need to keep open what our options are if we get nonsense in response. If we do get an answer, he said that it will be a business model answer, which is to get rid of 5% of the faculty each year. He stated further that this is the imposition of a model that has nothing to do with educational excellence. B. Lyons responded that we need to consider all options before us in this process. The faculty will be the ones who will be asked to create this policy. J. Shefner suggested that we call the UTK President to the Faculty Senate and inquire about why this was done. There were other documents included with the agenda, BOT Resolutions from March 23, 2018, with Effective Dates of New Tenure Policies, and Considerations for the Implementation of Periodic Post-Tenure Review at the University of Tennessee.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Presentation of the Annual Faculty Salary Study (L. Gross, K. Baker)

Documents presented included: Presentation of the Faculty Salary Study, UTK Salary Survey Comparison, Academic Year 2016-2017, and Faculty Salary Survey Appendix. L. Gross thanked K. Baker who helped compiled this in a very short amount of time on behalf of the Faculty Senate Budget & Planning Committee. When the data were received from OIRA a few issues were noted which are discussed in the report. The overall objectives of these studies over the years have been to: 1) provide a comparison of average faculty salaries for units and ranks across UTK faculty, along with salary ranges; 2) provide a comparison of average faculty salaries at UTK to appropriate peer groups; and 3) provide a historical comparison of average salaries to UTK peer groups. K. Baker provided a summary of the data at a glance.

Comparisons were done differently this year when compared to last year. The new data compares UTK to: 1) Research 1 Universities (63 schools); 2) comparable peers (11 schools); and 3) aspirational peers (6 schools). There was a question posed about whether we should include comparisons for UTIA faculty given that UTIA has different comparable and aspirational peer groups from UTK. The change in comparison peer groups from those used last year produced great changes in the UTK salary comparisons, in which UTK salaries are comparatively generally much higher than the comparisons in previous years. Since the new comparison groups have much smaller numbers of institutions, the report focused on comparisons to the much larger group of Research 1 Universities. The report provides a breakdown on UTK salaries by department as well as a ratio of UTK to R1 salaries, by department.

L. Gross noted that there are several cases in comparisons to comparable and aspirational peers for which there is either not a comparable unit or what is apparently only a single or two other institutions being compared to. This is a problem as such a comparison is often not representative of what would arise for the comparison to the larger R1 group. L. Knox wants to point out that things would look a lot worse if the data included NTT faculty salaries. While lecturer salaries were made available many years ago, these were just salaries for UTK faculty, and without any available comparison salary figures from peer groups, NTT faculty salaries were not included in the report in recent years. It was noted that training of department heads would be very beneficial because of how determinations are made in the raise pools. With regard to issues of gender inequity, these issues were addressed extensively in the Committee report last year and were not repeated this year. One result from the current report is that the percentage raise was highest on this campus for associate professors. The committee is not sure if this was deliberate or an anomaly.

Presentation by Candidate for Faculty Senate President-Elect (G. Skolits)

A candidate bio and statement were included in the meeting materials. G. Skolits noted that the university is constantly subjected to other people's agendas. These agendas are high-stakes. If we do not address, face, and call these out, our public education system is in great danger. G. Skolits noted that his background has been in assessment and evaluation. Paper ballots were distributed at the meeting and collected.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Thanking the senators for staying past 5 pm, the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m. by B. Lyons.

Respectfully submitted,
Sadie Hutson, Faculty Senate Secretary