

## **UTK Faculty Senate Executive Council**

Committee Reports for Consent Agenda for October 1, 2018

### **Appeals**

- No report

### **Athletics**

- No report

### **Benefits and Professional Development Committee**

Minutes: September deliberations of the Faculty Senate Benefits and Professional Development Committee and resolution proposed to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting of October 1, 2018.

#### Participants

Committee chair: Greg Kaplan

Committee: Qing Charles Cao, Eliza Fink, Silke Hecht, Asafa Jalata, Alexander Lapins, Steve McCallum, Reza Seddighi, Pedro Tomás, Stephanie Madison

In early September, 2018, the Committee was informed by Faculty Senate President Misty Anderson that a request had been made to look into the matter of whether special parking accommodations could be secured for pregnant and nursing mothers as at other universities.

After enthusiastically deciding to pursue the matter under consideration, the Committee deliberated electronically from September 14-20 about the pros and cons of plans for special parking accommodations for pregnant and nursing mothers at three U.S. universities: Cornell, Central Florida, Georgia. The Committee agreed that these plans contained several sound concepts, and also made suggestions in light of the parking situation UT. The committee agreed that the Chair would take all of this into account while crafting a resolution that would potentially provide the greatest benefits to pregnant and nursing mothers at UT.

From September 21-24 the committee considered and voted on the resolution below, which it passed unanimously (10-0 vote in favor). The resolution will be presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Council at its meeting of 10/1/18.

-----  
*Resolution the University of Tennessee (UT) Faculty Senate Benefits and Professional Development Committee for October 1, 2018 Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting*

WHEREAS, after engaging in discussion during the previous weeks, on September 24, 2018 the UT Faculty Benefits and Professional Development Committee voted in favor of supporting/not supporting the resolution below.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UT Faculty Benefits and Professional Development Committee voted 10-0 to support/not support the resolution below.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a copy of this Resolution be presented for approval/no approval at the Faculty Senate Executive Council meeting to be held on October 1, 2018. If approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Council, this Resolution will be presented for approval/no approval at the UT Faculty Senate meeting to be held on October 15, 2018.

Resolution on parking passes for expectant/nursing mothers:

WHEREAS, there is no current UT policy regarding parking passes for expectant/nursing mothers:

BE IT RESOLVED, we advocate that UT Parking & Transit Services provide a temporary parking accommodation to our students, staff, and faculty who are in their third trimester of pregnancy, or who are new mothers wishing to nurse their baby. In particular, that:

1. Faculty and staff parking permit holders in their third trimester of pregnancy be granted the option of reserving an expectant/nursing mother space in their permitted parking lot. Such spaces would be designated by UT Parking & Transit Services. This option would also be available to parking permit holders who need to secure a space prior to the third trimester due to a high risk or otherwise problematic condition. We recommend that, in order to be eligible for this permit, an applicant should submit a request in writing to UT Parking & Transit Services prior to their third trimester of pregnancy and provide a physician's note indicating a due date.

2. Faculty and staff parking permit holders who are also nursing mothers be granted the option of purchasing a permit, valid for 12 weeks after the birth of the nursing mother's baby, to park in an expectant/nursing mother space in their permitted lot. Such spaces would be designated by UT Parking & Transit Services. We recommend that this permit accommodation should be renewable for one additional 12-week period. We recommend that, in order to be eligible for this permit, an applicant should submit a request in writing to UT Parking & Transit Services.

-----  
Respectfully submitted,  
Greg Kaplan  
Chair, Faculty Senate Benefits and Professional Development Committee  
9/24/18

**Budget and Planning**

- No report; First meeting is October 8th

## **Diversity and Inclusion Committee**

Diversity & Inclusion Committee of the Faculty Senate Meeting notes:

Wednesday, 09/10/2018

Committee members in attendance: Samereh Abdoli (Nursing), Jennifer Akerman (Architecture), Brian Ambroziak (Architecture, at large), Joel Anderson (Nursing), Misty Anderson (English), Bonnie Johnson (Pride Center), Niki Labbé (Forestry), Thura Mack (Libraries), Lisa Muller (Forestry), Amber Roessner (Journalism), Casey Sams (Theater), Jessica Westerhold (Classics), Monica Black (History)

The Diversity & Inclusion committee of the Faculty Senate met on September 10. Matthew Theriot, Associate Provost for Faculty Development and Strategic Initiatives attended the meeting at the committee's invitation to talk about last academic year's Diversity Champions initiative, a report the Diversity Champions group wrote, and the future of that report.

Diversity Champions grew out of the VolVision Working Group, Matthew Theriot explained, and was organized by Interim Provost John Zomchick. Several committee members (Brian Ambroziak, Thura Mack, and Amber Roessner) served in that initiative and helped write the report. The report offered a snapshot of diversity and inclusion at the university as a whole and in each of its separate colleges and schools. Part of the report's aim was to create standards of accountability that can be applied across the board in hiring a more diverse faculty at UTK.

Committee members were interested to know from Matthew Theriot whether the report would be released and/or how it will be used on campus.

Matthew answered a variety of questions about the DC initiative, concerning for example the demographics it examined, and how various colleges and schools defined diversity within their own units. Matthew expects the DC report ultimately to be released to the campus community. The committee also discussed what information it had concerning the future home of the Pride Center.

## **Faculty Affairs**

Summary Report for September 24, 2018 Meeting

Committee Members: Michelle Kwon, Chair, Misty Anderson, Monica Black, David Butler, Jennifer Fowler, Todd Freeberg, Nathalie Hristov, Beauvais Lyons, David Patterson, Phyllis Thompson

1. Enhanced Post-Tenure Performance Review (EPPR)
  - a. 9-14-18: Submitted committee comments to EPPR proposed changes to the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.
  - b. 9-19-18: Received John Zomchick's comments to our comments.
  - c. 9-20-18: M. Kwon email to J. Zomchick approving his comments. Discussed routing proposal to Office of General Counsel (OGC) and Chancellor before Faculty Senate consideration. Obtained committee input via email.
  - d. 9-24-18: Okayed routing of EPPR procedures to OGC.
2. Post-Tenure Periodic Performance Review (PPPR)
  - a. 9-17-18: First reading of PPPR campus procedures developed by university administration with input from Faculty Senate leadership, including committee chair.

3. Chapter 4 Revisions to Faculty Handbook
  - a. 9-23-18: Received OGC comments to revisions approved by the Faculty Senate to Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook*.
  - b. 9-24-18: Forwarded comments to Laurie Knox and Crystal McAlvin, co-chairs of Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee, to get their comments. After incorporating their comments, will forward to committee for their input.
4. Academic Bullying
  - a. 10-2-18: Updated draft of academic bullying definition for inclusion in Chapter 2 of the *Faculty Handbook* to be considered at committee meeting.

### **Graduate Council**

#### **[Draft of August 23, 2018 Minutes](#)**

#### **Summary of Graduate Council's Meeting**

1. Dr. Aydeniz welcomed the new council members, provided an overview of the council's charge and the structures. Dr. Aydeniz introduced the chairs of GC standing committees. Chair of each committee introduced themselves and provided an overview of the responsibilities of the committee, the committee meeting calendar and how each committee functions.
2. Dr. Aydeniz explained the electronic review and approval process for the Graduate Council Minutes. This new procedure allows the Minutes to move forward expeditiously, first to Faculty Senate for approval and then to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Within a week of the Graduate Council Meeting, the Minutes are sent electronically to all on the Graduate Council to read and review. The Council members will have one week to read, and respond with feedback, revisions and edits.

The Minutes will be sent again the next week to only the voting members, along with the voting link. The voting members will have one week to review and submit their vote of 1) approve, 2) not approved, or 3) abstain. When the votes are received, Catherine will notify the Graduate Council Chair and Dean Thompson of the results and that they can move forward to the Senate Executive Committee

3. Dean Thompson provided an overview of the **Administrative Reports and Announcements details can be found in the minutes (link provided below)**.
  - \$100K for the Student/Faculty Research Awards – we'll be available and the announcement has been sent.
  - The Chancellor has set aside \$1M in support for graduate stipends. Dean. Thompson is working with the Provost and Deans on the rollout of those funds.
  - Working on ways to develop more consistent messaging related to graduate education at UT
  - Possible carry over money to put towards recruitment efforts for the coming year
  - Formatting project for all the graduate programs listed in the Graduate Catalog

### **Library and Technology**

- No report.

### **Nominations and Appointments**

- No report.

### **Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee**

September 24, 2018

At our first meeting of AY2018-19, the committee reviewed the sections of a draft version of the MFE (Section VI on the Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty). Questions regarding the difference between the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluations were raised. The committee formulated a plan in order to address the gaps in the draft regarding language that is inclusive to all NTT members, not just lecturers and brainstormed how we could best create a document that 1) provides clear procedures and policies for evaluation and promotion of NTTF that is also 2) universal and inclusive to all NTT positions.

It was proposed that we make two separate documents – one MFE and then an additional best practices document for hiring and promoting NTTF. Ultimately, we agreed that this would be a work in progress that could be best tackled if a few members were assigned to work on smaller sections within the document. Thus, it was decided that C. Craig would work on the procedural and process language within the main document (MFE). The best practices for evaluations as well as dossier requirements could be included as appendices. D. Aaron and K. Gehrman would work on the research requirements that NTTF should be evaluated on. S. Wall, J. Tourville, and K. Jones would collaborate on the service requirements and A. Ho, A. Langendorfer and W. Jennings would collaborate on the teaching requirements.

Lastly, Laurie Knox and Crystal McAlvin decided to take on the following:

1. Create a space so those in the committee could collaborate and list the questions they would like to have answered regarding Elements
  - Who is using Elements? Who enforces this?
  - Is Elements the *best* way to report the work of teaching faculty?
  - What are people *actually* looking at when they are evaluating us? And how can we create a system that allows us to easily document these things?
  - Elements provides macro data that could be used not as a measure of activity but quantitative *productivity* – Why aren't they using that information to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each department?
  - If Elements is not the best way to note the activity and work that we do, then why do we have to use it when it's not helpful for NTTF?
2. Get clarification from M. Kwon regarding the Faculty Affairs update on Chapters 3 and 4
3. Continue refining the language within the MFE draft
4. Analyze information from the survey responses

### **Research Council**

The Research Council met on September 12.

The assignments of the membership of the various sub-committees were discussed and agreed upon. The purpose of the RC was discussed. The main part of the meeting consisted of a discussion of which topics the RC should focus on over the next year. That discussion is currently being followed up via email.

Some of the issue of most interest seem to be: a) Campus/System interactions in the research sector, b) UT's Research Budget, c) UT/ORNL research interactions, d) UTK/UTIA research interactions, e) Core facilities, f) Graduate student support and f) reviews of campus-wide centers.

### **Teaching and Learning Council**

The Teaching and Learning Council meet September 24, 2018. Here is the agenda and brief description of our meeting.

(1) Chancellor's Excellence in Teaching and Advising Awards: We explained the Awards process and announced the good news that R.J. Hinde is working with us to obtain administrative assistance for the Teaching Award from the Chancellor's office.

(2) Reference guide for teaching and learning: At the retreat, we spoke about how there are so many faculty resources for teaching on campus that it might be useful to compile them in one place as a tab on the Faculty Senate webpage and a one-page flier mailed to department addresses. At the meeting, Faculty Central was mentioned as a place that keeps a compilation of teaching resources. We will be looking at these pages and seeing if any further resources could be added. Then, we can link to them on the Faculty Senate webpage. One committee member is looking into the efficacy of mailed fliers.

(3) Hosting a presentation/reception for new Gen. Ed. offerings: At the retreat we spoke about hosting a reception/presentation at the Hodges Library for faculty who want to learn more about the new Gen. Ed. curriculum. With the recent delay of implementation until Fall 2021, it might be better to host this reception next Fall.

(4) Online training options for faculty: We began with the questions: Are there sufficient opportunities for online training? What other types of optional online training might be useful? What might be the incentives for faculty to participate in optional online training?

Online training suggested:

- Best practices for faculty mentoring graduate students
- Stride training
- Diversity: Chris Lavan let us know that the Diversi-tea workshops will be webcast this year. This is an excellent online option for those whose schedules do not allow them to attend the events in person.

Other thoughts about online training: One external incentive (beyond internal motivation) is consideration in the annual review and promotion process. One benefit to online training is the ability to fit it into your schedule.

Committee members will brainstorm other online training options.

(5) Teaching Squares: 'Teaching Squares' are comprised of four faculty members from different disciplines who visit each others' classes and meet together to discuss and reflect on their own teaching practices and how they can adapt other practices into their classrooms. We will meet with the TLI to see if we can join with them to pilot a Teaching Squares program.

## **Undergraduate Council**

### **September 11, 2018, Minutes**

Submitted by Robert Mindrup, Chair

#### **Summary report:**

- Welcome and introduction of membership and committee chairs occurred along with discussion of the electronic approval process of minutes, and discussion of proxy appointments.
- **Academic Policy** – No report.
- **Advising** – Information items only. Items for discussion included report that 2<sup>nd</sup> year funding for the Volunteer Experience Advising Model was approved. Information was presented about the implementation of Banner 9. The new pilot dismissal policy was discussed. The policy would allow students dismissed from the university for the first time with a cumulative GPA of 1.50 or higher and with fewer than 15 deficiency points to persist into the following semester after successfully completing the SOAR program.
- **Curriculum** – Several corrections to the 2018-2019 catalog were made including: removal of duplicate requirements or correcting prerequisite requirements for courses that have been dropped or archived, or correcting a registration restriction that was causing students difficulty when they tried to register. All items were approved by the UGC without opposition. In addition, informational items related to discussion of how Experiential Learning subcommittees may determine the details of how courses are verified as meeting the best practice guidelines.
- **General Education** – Drafts of the statements of purpose and learning objectives of the new general education categories were presented and feedback was received. Development and final approval of the statements of purpose, learning objectives, and course submission forms are expected by the end of Fall 2018.
- **Appeals** – No report.
- **Associate Deans** - No report.

## **University System Relations Committee**

- Summary Report for September 24, 2018 meeting will be provided at the November 5<sup>th</sup> Executive Council meeting