



**UTK Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting**  
**Monday, November 7, 2022**  
**3:30 pm – 5:00 pm**  
**Student Union Room 377**

**Minutes**

I. Call to Order at 3:32 pm

In attendance: K. Baker, E. Bernard, M. Brannen, J. Chyz, C. Clark (for C. Castille), T. Freeberg, T. Fridman, M. Gimmel, M. Griffin, J. Heminway, N. Hristov, B. Issa, D. Kelly, A. Langendorfer, J. Laughter, B. Lyons, S. Madison, D. Plowman, A. Roessner, A. Schoenbach, E. Schussler, M. Scoggins, M. Stanley, A. Steiner, L. Whitnah, and J. Zomchick.

II. Approval of Minutes

a. Faculty Senate Executive Council Meeting Minutes [October 3, 2022](#)

Motion to approve by Lyons. Second by Heminway.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Minutes were approved. 15 in favor. 0 against.

III. Announcements (E. Schussler)

The President thanked everyone for the work they have done this fall in just three meetings. There is a google spreadsheet on process issues faculty are facing that was sent out a few weeks ago. It will be live until November 14. Caucus chairs should be sharing the link. So far there are 300 responses and the data will be compiled and shared with appropriate parties. There is a special session booked for Wednesday, November 30, 3:00 pm – 4:30 pm in 262B in the Student Union to allow the Faculty Senate, and perhaps others, to discuss issues outside of formal meetings.

IV. New Business

a. Faculty Handbook (J. Laughter; M. Stanley)

- Clean copy: [Approved Chapter 4 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments](#)
- Tracked changes [Chapter 4 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments \(with Edits and Comments\)](#)

These changes have been discussed and approved by the NTT Issues Committee and the Faculty Affairs committee, but still need the approval of the Office of the General Counsel (OGC). We will vote to move these forward to the full senate.

Laughter clarified that the lawyers have not looked at this and might ask for significant changes. Stanley stated that this has been a long process that began in Fall 2020 and has been in collaboration with D. Kelly and other administrators. The NTTF issues committee has been in charge of these particular changes. Langendorfer gave an overview of the changes. These changes regularize and clarify language and change the hiring time, duration of appointments and renewal times for NTTF. There was a change planned in the titles for NTT teaching, research and clinical faculty but that has not been finalized yet. These changes have been consistent with the NTTF task force recommendations. Lyons asked about the OGC and if there was better staffing in that office now since it would be problematic to bring this to the senate without OGC approval. VP Kelly has a meeting with the OGC for this next week but can't guarantee that this will be done before the senate meeting. The Chancellor shared that they have not yet hired another attorney for the OGC but she has encouraged them to make this a priority. The Provost reminded the EC that if the OGC doesn't approve this, it will have to go back through the senate process. President Schussler reminded the

body that a discussion now and at the senate meeting will help clarify issues in the document. Lyons suggested we include this as an informational item in November and then have a vote in February. Stanley said that the committee would like to have this ready for the Board of Trustees and we might miss this. Roessner asked if we could do an on-line vote in January. This will be discussed later.

The president then asked for specific concerns and suggestions. Lyons suggested the addition of line numbers. Whitnah feels that the document is ready to be sent on to the senate. There was a question about titles and Langendorfer reiterated that this is a complicated issue that is not addressed in these revisions. Schussler asked if there is any concern about the three-year window for promotion. Issa commented that the initial appointment has been clarified as “up to three years”. Is this dependent on the hiring unit? Yes, it is. Madison asked about the non-renewal letters. Will NTTF get renewal letters? Every renewal will get a letter from the dean. Non-renewal letters will come earlier.

Schussler will send this on the senate and see if the OGC has responded by then. If we are able to vote and approve at the next meeting, J. Laughter suggested that voting on changes suggested by the OGC will be clearer and easier. A January vote is possible as well. All these documents are available to the public.

The EC voted to send this to the faculty senate on November 21.

15 in favor, 0 against.

b. Institute for American Civics Courses ([Letter from M. Wanamaker](#))

Wanamaker responded to questions from the October senate meeting about the two proposed courses for the IAC. The EC will not vote but will ask questions and clarify the issues before this is brought to the senate. She asked if the letter attached answers these questions. Langendorfer stated that the main question was about the impact of these courses and if there will be a negative impact on other units. Wanamaker said that the institute should not harm any unit, only augment the university’s mission. The courses are designed to have many faculty from other units teach them. These courses were not designed to be cross-listed because they are interdisciplinary. Langendorfer suggested that cross-listed courses are by nature interdisciplinary, so why wouldn’t the civics courses be cross-listed? The courses proposed do not appear in any department curricula. Wanamaker feels that cross-listing gives students flexibility at upper levels. Since they are two hundred level courses, what opportunity exists for students at this level? She also said that other departments would have to do the cross list. No one has spoken to other departments about this option and the BAM model will complicate things. Cross-listing gives departments some financial gain. Cross-listing might give students more interest in the civics model if it is cross-listed in their major. Zomchick would like a conversation about the curricular innovation and the BAM model. He feels we should focus on serving students rather than on the money made by departments. Zomchick stated that if we look only at money then we stifle curricular innovation. He finds that cross-listing might not be appropriate if much of the material is outside of the departmental purview. We have the obligation to think about students first. Schoenbach responded that unfortunately these decisions are built into the budget model. This is our new reality. There are ways to reach many students and connect them to other departments. She suggested that bringing more faculty into the decision-making process will increase faculty buy-in. Wanamaker stated that faculty were invited to contribute in May but that was unsuccessful. There have been a lot of conversations to include faculty in many departments.

How will faculty to teach the courses be identified? The institute faculty will be faculty from the new Baker School. Once the courses are approved, faculty will be sought across campus to teach these courses. How will tuition revenue be distributed? The revenue will go to the department teaching the classes. IAC courses will go to the Baker School.

A concern is that these courses duplicate already existing courses. Wanamaker clarified that the courses are designed to be unique. It would be helpful to have this spelled out for the full senate meeting.

Someone said it is very helpful to hear the context of these decisions. Is there a way faculty can see syllabi? Syllabi are not required for adding courses, but they can be shared. Proposals are available on the Provost’s website since both courses were submitted as VolCore courses. Sharing the content of the prior conversations with other departments would address many of the concerns. Syllabi were developed in consultation with many faculty at UT and at other universities.

How does the funding for the institute and the Baker school work? Is there a financial incentive for departments to work with the IAC? Sharing faculty appointments gives the academic research to the

departments and policy research to the institute and school. The joint appointments will work for both units since faculty can be jointly funded. The tuition income is more complicated.

There was confusion around approving minutes and if a line-item veto is possible. What happens if parts of the minutes are vetoed? They go back to Undergraduate Council and then back to the Senate. BAM has changed how we look at these things but the senate votes to make sure process has been followed, not to challenge how courses are created. Since there is no BAM curricular committee, it feels like it has fallen to the senate to consider finances as well as process but that should not be the senate's job. Wanamaker feels that the IAC should not have a separate approval process.

There is still concern about what the IAC is. It needs to be clear that the IAC is a serious academic program. Since we are still new to the BAM, we don't have a culture of how this works. Faculty will worry less about the impact of BAM once we have been doing it for a while. Does the IAC not have its own funding? Will student revenue not go to other departments? This is not the case. The IAC functions as part of the Baker School and under the BAM model the same way as all other units.

c. Retention Review (D. Kelly)

VP Kelly presented the idea of potentially removing the requirement for a yearly retention vote for pre-tenure faculty and asked if these changes are worth pursuing. This proposal comes from a task force of deans and faculty. Currently all tenure-track faculty have an annual review, an annual retention review and an enhanced review before tenure. All TT faculty must be renewed every year per board policy.

In the last review cycle there was one TTF who fell short. In general there are 1-3 every year who fall short of expectations. No one fell far short of meeting expectations. In the past four years everyone has been retained. There has never been more than one non-retention per year in the last 10 years. So is a vote needed?

In the SEC no one does votes every year except UT. There are annual reviews but no votes. The retention vote has generated issues around a lack of standards on these votes. Sometimes there are just a few people who always vote no. Not all faculty participate uniformly in the process so negative votes get magnified. This may not be the best way to be sure that TTF are making adequate progress.

The by-laws state that TTF must receive the votes without any justification for no votes or an idea of who has voted negatively. The annual review should be enough, especially if a committee is looking at the annual performance. Annual negative votes mean that the issues cannot be addressed in a year and chills the TTF's ability to engage with senior faculty. Many faculty don't take these seriously so the votes are not always meaningful. Enhanced 3<sup>rd</sup> year review is more meaningful and all deans at UT support this change. This is a way to reduce the workload for faculty and DHs. Currently there are two parallel reviews, annual review and retention review, this would get rid of the retention review except in the third year.

Lyons offered that the annual retention reviews should follow the departmental standards for rank which are clear. The retention meetings keep faculty informed about TTF progress. Pre-tenure faculty deserve a serious review every year. Faculty might not participate if they are not voting. Dean Lee said that not every department is fully engaged. She found that just voting on the enhanced review will most likely increase participation. The department head by themselves should not be doing annual reviews alone. Annual reviews are more significant if departments have a performance review committee that informs the head.

There is no formal proposal yet, but they are asking if they should move forward with one.

Issa shared that the yearly retention vote is not good and is demoralizing and anxiety provoking every year. The work is duplicating the annual review process. He is in support of this change.

Hristov stated that the mentoring comments are more important than the vote.

Steiner likes the idea of collective mentorship or mentoring committees but this doesn't happen often. This change might make things better.

Fridman stated that voting is detrimental on many levels.

Heminway clarified that the 4<sup>th</sup> year review is a good guide for tenure progress and we should not get rid of that. The mid cycle review would not go away. Can we improve this review? We need to be clear on exactly what we are voting on and that there are clear standards for the vote.

For some senators the retention reviews are positive since they are presented by the mentor who is an advocate for the TTF and it creates a culture of collective engagement.

Lyons suggested that Faculty Affairs create a forum and create a recommendation or proposal. The body is in favor of pursuing this further.

This should not be brought to faculty senate until there is a concrete proposal.

d. Teaching and Learning Committee: Student Distress (L. Whitnah; B. Issa)

This issue was postponed until later, perhaps to the November faculty senate meeting or the special session on November 30.

V. Old Business

None

VI. Information Items

a. Faculty Senate Minutes from [October 17, 2022](#)

b. Graduate Council Minutes from [September 29, 2022](#)

VII. Adjournment at 5:20 pm

Respectfully submitted by Millie Gimmel

Prospective Agenda Items for Spring 2023:

a. Upcoming Faculty Handbook Revisions (J. Laughter)

Faculty Role in budgets (§1.10)

b. Virtual test proctoring (M. Brannen)

c. Intellectual property rights for online courses (E. Schussler on behalf of AVP J. Steele)

d. BAM information (E. Lukosi, T. Fridman)