Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee
September 14, 2018

Present: Doug Aaron, Chris Craig, Kristina Gehrman, Anne Ho, Will Jennings, Karen Jones, Laurie Knox, Anne Langendorfer, Crystal McAlvin, Jennifer Tourville

Absent: Stephen Marz, Scott Wall

C. McAlvin called to order at 3:05. Members introduced themselves, their positions, and their departments.

L. Knox opened the discussion with New Business Item #2 on the Agenda: Formulating questions about how "Elements" works/should work for NTTF
       -C. McAlvin explained to the group how this topic discussed at the FS Retreat and the NTTI Committee was tasked to look into this.
       -Survey has been sent out to NTTF at UT asking about whether or not lecturers were required to use Elements, etc.
       -Similar survey was sent to the department heads asking whether or not they require their NTT members to use Elements
Currently, there is a lot of information to be analyzed from the survey responses

L. Knox explained that Faculty Senate President Misty Anderson felt it would be helpful if the NTTI members came up with solid questions to ask in order to illuminate the relationship between NTTF and Elements.
       -Opening questions: Who is using Elements? Who enforces this?

A. Ho noted that at the reception for David Mandersheid on September 13, 2018, Elements was explained to her as a tool to collect aggregate data regarding the amount of research and various information that UT faculty members produce.
       -Point raised by L. Knox: If a large percent of those employed by UTK that are NTT are *not* using the Elements system, then they don't have the actual numbers/information.

K. Gehrman discussed how Elements does not include reports from other systems/cites. Example: student feedback is not included in Elements. Elements is supposed to be a comprehensive system and yet there is a lack of integration which can negatively affect all faculty members.
       -Question raised by A. Langendorfer: Is Elements the *best* way to report the work of teaching faculty?

W. Jennings discussed his personal experience with being evaluated for promotion. He explained that he was almost denied promotion to distinguished because he lacked "departmental service" in areas that were not required or even available to NTTF at the University. Additionally, his "teaching innovation" was questioned. His evaluations from students were perfect but it did not fit within the specific criteria of "teaching innovation" evaluation.

C. Craig: 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?

L. Knox: 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?

K. Gehrman: There are fields in the red asterisks that you have to fill out, i.e., the number of students in classes. However, if you only get reviewed every three years then you're likely to forget to keep up with this information.

A. Langendorfer: From this morning, Mandersheid made a point of saying, "Remember I'm a Mathematician and I understand that numbers can be used for good *and* evil" and referencing Cathy O'Neil's 2016 book *Weapons of Math Destruction*
      -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?

C. McAlvin suggested the group move to the first item under Old Business – the Manual for Faculty Evaluation document.

      The committee reviewed the sections they have created so far on the September 14, 2018 draft of 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. The committee brainstormed how they 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. K. Gehrman proposed they make two separate documents – one MFE and then an additional best practices document for hiring and promoting NTTF. C. Craig seconded this idea. Ultimately, the committee 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.

      After the tasks were divided up, C. McAlvin ended the meeting and informed the committee that she would send an email to poll the members in order to decide on the next meeting date and time.

Future Tasks
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