

MINUTES

Faculty Affairs Committee

Monday August 31, 2020, 3:30-5:00pm

Members Present: Beauvais Lyons, Julie Andsager, Thomas Berg, Cheryl Greenacre, Justin Jia Brian Krumm, Mary McAlpin, Kai Sun, and Jessica Westerhold.

Members Absent: Elizabeth MacTavish,

Guest: Diane Kelly, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Approval of the Minutes: [April 13, 2020](#) approved

Attachments:

- 2020-21 Faculty Affairs Committee Goals
- July 24 Memorandum from Provost Zomchick
- UT Board Policy Revisions – Title IX
- Cost Estimate of PPPR Reviews
- Essay by Beauvais Lyons “Thoughts on the Importance of Retention Reviews”

Business:

1. Discussion with Diane Kelly regarding her Faculty Affairs goals for the upcoming year. Having been in her new role for the past month, Diane identified four areas that she hopes to focus on this year, (1) review of systems, process and work flow related to faculty affairs, (2) establish a task force to examine non-tenure track faculty titles and types of duties, (3) create a working group focuses on APPR processes, including timeline, implications of COVID-19 on annual evaluations, and (4) strive to address the hiring and retention of under-represented faculty. There was discussion about the impact of COVID-19, and ways it might disproportionately impact faculty considering their discipline of personal circumstances.
2. Consideration of *Faculty Handbook* changes in compliance with new BOT Policies or editorial corrections as outlined in memos dated November 11, 2019 and July 24, 2020 memoranda from John Zomchick to Beauvais Lyons. Recognizing that board policies are governing, all of the items below were approved to be forwarded to the Executive Council and then the Faculty Senate for first reading and subsequent action with areas where clarification may be helpful **highlighted in yellow.**

1.6.6 Reappointment of Department Heads

During the term of office of the department head, he or she serves at the will of the dean. If a department head is not reappointed, the dean shall begin the process of selecting a new department head in accordance with Section [1.6.4. 1.4.4.](#)

Reason for change: This change corrects an erroneous cross-reference.

3.11.4.2 Extension of Probationary Period

For good cause that is either related to procedural error or results from a significant disruption of University operations that has impeded the faculty member's opportunity to conduct required research or other scholarly activity, teaching, and/or service, the university and a tenure-track faculty member may agree in writing to extend a six-year probationary period for a maximum of two additional years. The proposed extension must be approved in advance by the chief academic officer, the chancellor, and the vice president for academic affairs, the president (or designee), and the General Counsel (or designee).

Reason for change: This change updates our policy in order to bring it into agreement with Board policy (BT0006), which was revised at the Board meeting on March 27, 2020.

Faculty Affairs Committee is expressing concern regarding the timeline when such requests for extension need to be submitted for approval, and if a faculty member is limited to a one-year interval for such requests.

3.12.2.7 Options to Contest Termination

The rights provided in this paragraph 3.12.2.7 are in lieu of any other rights of grievance or appeal in this handbook ~~or any appeal to the president.~~

Reason for change: This change updates our policy in order to bring it in agreement with Board Policy (BT0006), which was revised consistent with the UT Focus Act.

3.12.3.7 Options to Contest Termination

The rights provided in this paragraph 3.12.3.7 are in lieu of any other rights of grievance or appeal in the handbook ~~or any appeal to the president.~~

Reason for change: This change updates our policy in order to bring it in agreement with Board Policy (BT0006), which was revised consistent with the UT Focus Act.

3.12.3.8 Expedited Procedure for Termination or Suspension without Pay in Certain Cases of Misconduct

In the following cases of alleged misconduct by a faculty member, the chief academic officer, after consulting with the chancellor, the president of the university, and the president of the Faculty Senate or the Faculty Senate Executive Council, may invoke an expedited procedure to accomplish termination or suspension without pay,

Reason for change: This change brings our policy into agreement with Board policy (BT0006), which governs when there are contradictions or differences between it and the handbook. The pertinent section of Board policy reads as follows:

8. Expedited Procedure for Termination or Suspension without Pay in Certain Cases of Misconduct

In the following cases of alleged misconduct by a faculty member, the chief academic officer, after consulting with the Chancellor, the President, and the President of the Faculty Senate or the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, may invoke an expedited procedure to accomplish termination or suspension without pay, . . . (BT0006, Appendix C, §8)

Faculty Affairs recommendation to change text to read: “and the president of the Faculty Senate or in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Council,”

3.13 Disciplinary Sanctions Other than Termination for Adequate Cause

. . . It shall also inform the faculty member of his or her right to appeal the proposed discipline or to request a review by the Faculty Senate Appeals Committee in accordance with the provisions of this chapter or to ~~the president through~~ the chancellor.

Reason for change: This change updates our policy in order to bring it in agreement with Board Policy (BT0006), which was revised consistent with the UT Focus Act.

4.5 Promotion of ~~Lecturers~~ Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Reason for change: Section 4.5 pertains to all non-tenure-track faculty. The recommended change should have been made when we revised chapter 4 last year. It is an editorial correction, which can be made administratively.

5.3 Appeals through the Administrative Channel

Any faculty member may initiate a written appeal with his or her administrative leader. If resolution of the problem is not achieved, the faculty member has the right to request review at successively higher administrative levels, up to the chancellor. ~~president~~ (University Bylaws: Article V, Section 7).

Reason for change: This change updates our policy in order to bring it in agreement with Board Policy (BT0006), which was revised consistent with the UT Focus Act.

3. Discussion of Email from Mia Romano, Faculty Senator and Lecturer in MFL on August 27: In the Coffee with the Provost I just brought up the discussion of changing the title of Lecturer to become a "Professor" title more like "Professor of Instruction" or "Teaching Professor" with the same 3 ranks that the TT has. I am on the A&S Dean's Advisory Committee, and back in April she brought up her desire to pursue this, and we

spoke at length in our summer meeting as well about details (such as having it also apply to lectures with MA degrees (in MFL, 3/4 of the lecturers do not have PhDs). The Provost indicated he hadn't heard much about this, but Dean Lee says she was hoping "very soon" to draft something to send to the Provost. While a title change wouldn't mean a change to salary, many lecturers feel it would be an important action. I think the title change and that change to the lecturer promotion line from 5 to 3 years that the Provost wants to pursue are important actions.

The committee had a spirited discussion about NTT Faculty Issues, including how to differentiate the current titles such as Lecturers from Professors of Practice who may have identical workload distributions, and the possible title of Professor of Teaching, especially for NTT faculty who do not hold the terminal degree in their disciplines. There was also discussion of the appropriate probationary period for promotions, moving from 5 to 3 years. Beauvais proposed that members of this committee, and the Faculty Senate Non-Tenure Track Issues Committee would be good liaisons to the NTTF titles and duties task force that Diane proposed to create. Both Jessica Westerhold and Mary McAlpin offered to serve.

4. Discussion of the new PPPR policy, the cost estimate of the policy last year compiled by Lou Gross. Beauvais noted that UT Board Chairman John Compton said at the June board meeting that they would take up the issue of post-tenure review at their October meeting. Diane said that John Zomchick had shared the cost estimate report with Vice President Linda Martin.
5. Discuss ways to encourage and monitor compliance with new NTTF evaluation policies outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*, 4.3, page 60:

“Clear documentation of responsibilities and assigned workload is critical to the evaluation, reappointment, and promotion process for NTTF members. As is the case for tenured and tenure-track faculty, the performance of all teaching, research, clinical faculty, faculty of practice, and extension faculty members will be evaluated annually, with a written record of the evaluation maintained in departmental and human resources files. The criteria for evaluating non-tenure-track faculty for purposes of hiring and retention must be adopted by a vote in accordance with departmental bylaws and made available to all faculty. Each NTTF will be informed, in writing, of the percentage of effort that they are expected to devote to teaching, service, and research/professional development as well as whether the faculty member’s position is contingent upon their ability to secure external funding. This documentation will be provided by the hiring unit to the NTTF at the time of initial appointment and again each time the faculty member is reappointed. As needed throughout their terms of appointment, faculty members will have the opportunity to discuss their responsibilities and request adjustments in their assigned workloads. This annually updated written record of workload distribution and responsibilities will become part of the NTTF’s evaluation records.”

Concern was expressed that not all department heads were aware of this change to the handbook. Diane said that handbook changes were presented to the heads last spring by John Zomchick, and that she is working with Deb Welsh and the Department Head Forum to help ensure better communications. Beauvais observed that in communicating information on the bylaws to handbook compliance three years ago to the Department Head Forum, that heads who are involved in the forum operate in greater compliance with faculty handbook than those who were not involved. Concern was expressed about ensuring institutional oversight of evaluation processes to protect the university from future litigation.

6. Discuss Lyons' essay on Retention Reviews, and ways to work with the Office of the Provost to communicate this for this evaluation cycle.

Members of the committee shared their experience of mentoring and retention review processes. It was clear that there was a great deal of variability, and in some cases, tenured faculty did not have access to a probationary faculty member's materials, or that a meeting of the tenured faculty did not take place as required by the Faculty Handbook (3.11.4.5). There was discussion about the meaning of an annual vote on retention, the role of the mid-cycle review, and the ways that tenured faculty members communicate advice to probationary faculty through a narrative compiled by the tenured faculty from comments made at the retention review or as part of the comments section of their ballots. It was agreed that better department head training was needed, and more thorough oversight of the retention review process by deans.

Adjournment at 5:03pm by consensus.

Future Agenda Items to Discuss with Diane Kelly on Monday September 28:

1. Steps needed to bring the bylaws of all colleges and departments into compliance with the *Faculty Handbook* since the [October 18, 2018 audit](#). Significant changes to the Faculty handbook
2. Review the list of "[Other Policy Documents](#)" from Section 1.11 of the *Faculty Handbook*.
3. Review the [Appendix I](#) section of the *Faculty Handbook*, some of which might be removed and listed elsewhere.
4. Work with the NTTF Issues committee on issues related to handbook policies (5.6) regarding the termination of non-tenure-track faculty members.
5. Explore options for early retirement incentives to avoid furloughing faculty.

Future Meetings:

Monday September 28, 3:30pm

Monday October 26, 3:30pm

Monday November 23, 3:30pm