

Meeting 119  
Oct 16, 2019; Videoconference  
4:00 pm (ET) / 3:00 pm (CT)

**UT Faculty Council Voting Members (Quorum, 5 voting members)**

- UTHSC Peg Hartig (Faculty Senate President)  
Martin Donaldson (Campus Representative)
- UTK Gary Skolits (Faculty Senate President)  
Bruce MacLennan (Campus Representative)
- UTM Chris Caldwell (Campus Representative)  
Jamie Harvey (Faculty Senate President)
- UTC Beth Crawford (Campus Representative)

**Faculty Appointee to Education, Research & Service Committee (Ex-Officio voting)**

- UTM Jeff Rogers (Board of Trustees ERS Committee faculty appointee)

**UT Faculty Council Ex-Officio Non-voting Members**

- UT Linda C. Martin (Vice President, Academic Affairs & Student Success)

**Faculty Council Guests**

- UT Jorge Pérez (Associate Vice President, AA&SS)
- UTHSC Richard Smith (Faculty Senate President Elect)

Chris Caldwell called the meeting to order.

Minutes for the September meeting were approved.

**New Business**

Academic Affairs report – Linda reported on the External P&T committee. The final report has been submitted and will be shared soon on the Transparency UT website. A working committee will be put together to look through that document and identify next steps/action items that can be addressed. Overall, it was a very positive meeting; there are some opportunities to streamline for faculty and for the review process. Linda will send link to UFC

Linda stated that during the exec meeting of BOT, D. Smith reported on the faculty workload report. Academic Affairs had a meeting with D. Smith and walked through the nuances and lack of comparability of those items by campus/department/etc. D. Smith reported to the executive committee of the board that the tool was best used by Department Heads and Deans who are looking at allocation and this is not something the board needs to address. D. Smith recommended that Provosts convene the Deans and talk about how different departments and colleges use this information and be prepared to talk about some of the differences and nuances. The group will talk to board and then can put this issue to rest. They do want to know a bit more about how different campuses do it differently and why.

Departmental profiles are being worked on by a cross system committee. This information is the outward facing real-time information.

Tonja Johnson took a job at Alabama and has left UT. Her position is not being refilled at this time. Those pieces have been shared at the system level. The new HRO will pick up some parts of Tonja's role. As of Monday, October 14, IR at the system level reports to Linda (Dennis' group). This will be very helpful going forward as many of the requests for information do not always have an AA view/lens. This could help System AA to provide context and some organization around the requests to the different campuses for data. AA will be going out to the campuses to see how they interact with IR. What needs are being unmet? What can be done better?

AA and Student Success review of the new program process was cumbersome and convoluted and the review and revisions of the process have been improved.

UTK/UTIA Reunification report is being finalized and will be given to Donde and Randy next week. Listening sessions were held all across the state, as well as a survey and an open portal for comments. Jorge mentioned that some of the sessions were very lively and passionate. Lots of issues were able to be discussed and dealt with. Some of the things that everyone thought were transparent were not necessarily so in constituents' viewpoints. Gary agreed and stated that his only suggestion is that the President should state what was just said, it would go a long way to helping alleviate the mistrust that was developed. It might be good for President Boyd to find an opportunity to state how well the process worked before the board meeting, if possible.

There is a new innovation grant at the system level. There will be a teaching innovation grant first, then research, and outreach and engagement. There will be a call for proposals by the end of the year. \$500,000 is being provided for each of the areas. Proposals will be due early in the spring to get those dollars approved and engaged. There will be an incentive for grants that are able to combined two or more areas.

There was a Teacher Prep meeting earlier this year with all campuses, THEC, and TBR included. Legislators were excited and engaged in the event.

There will be a Mental Health Summit in November. The Provosts put forward names. You should let AA know if you want to be involved. Among the topics to be discussed are telemedicine, counseling, how we provide care, and how our campuses get the resources they need to meet the needs of students. Jorge added a bit about counselor fatigue on the campuses. Student to counselor ratios are not ideal at this time. Linda mentioned that we will work on how we can make a meaningful difference. Jeff posed a question about whether there is any discussion about the limits of the university's responsibilities to our students. Are we responsible for everything for them? Is there any discussion as to when and what the limits may be? Linda stated that boundaries may be talked about at the meeting. We are obligated for their mental health. There was a brief discussion about what our legal obligations are, ethical, moral. The safety and wellbeing of our students are important and we have to know where we put our resources. What we do as administrators has changed radically. The current boundaries appear to be more and more responsibility to the institution. Linda reported that some institutions are being sued and losing for situations that have not been addressed. Gary mentioned a case at Stanford

about students who had a problem that is being litigated right now. We have to do a better job, but we can't do everything.

Jeff mentioned the UTK campus effect of the recent Princeton review. There were student dissatisfaction issues in the report. Linda does not have any concrete information at this time. The new chancellor will be reviewing satisfaction results/reports (students as well as faculty and staff). We will focus on periodic review, not just yearly snapshots. Jorge will send a link to the group. One problem may be the student perception of what is being done about these issues. Additionally, it takes a while for the culture to change and new perspectives to come through on survey. Bruce asked about the campus climate survey that went out a couple of years ago. Linda stated that the narrative brought up a lot of points. The campus Chancellors were held responsible for how they would respond to those surveys and their reports. Gary mentioned that we might like to see the Chancellor's reports on how they would deal with them. There was a question about the Pride Center loss of funding. Jorge mentioned that the Pride Center was not funded by state dollars. This was not a campus choice; it was the legislature. There was a brief discussion that this sets a tone, as does the concerns that were raised about the location in the center. The building space issue has been resolved, but would be a potential culture problem. Once a reputation is out there, it is difficult to resolve it. One comment in a legislative session can put this issue back in the limelight. Jorge stated that the upside is that it cannot get much worse. Gary stated that this reflects the need to share the message of what has been changed and how things have been made better. Perhaps Sstem can take steps to assist with this process to document and share what has been fixed. Jorge mentioned the support provided by President Boyd. Gary agreed and stated that it might be a positive thing to have that mentioned publicly and loudly. We compete nationally, any reputation can be very harmful if we do not address these issues. Bruce stated that this also impacts faculty. The System is in a unique position to point out the revisions and fixes that have been accomplished.

Chris brought up the preparation for the upcoming UFC and board meeting. Bruce asked a question about the issue of independent reviews in the RTP process. Linda stated that you look at information at every decision point, and there should be an independent review at that time. AA had issues where the department head was writing the initial letter, and then each next level stated simply, I concur or simply copied the paragraph and agreed. If these other levels are only copying and concurring, that is not showing a true independent review. We are better than we were. Crawford asked about the specificity of what needs to be included in the narrative. Cann AA pull actual language and share that during the evaluation training. Linda responded that this is happening, including showing some sanitized copies of the not so good examples.

Gary asked if the evaluation of a dean includes some information about how well they evaluate the department heads. Linda responded that this has not happened in the past, however it may happen going forward. With the post tenure review, we may begin to see some patterns. Bruce mentioned that especially in a situation when someone has been treated badly, it went right up the chain in that manner. Everyone up the level did lots of concurring. Now everyone in the chain has a stake in any bad decision that was made. This makes it that much harder to correct. It is a disservice to the faculty member, who really deserves a real review and authentic

assessment. Jorge mentioned that after 20 years at another institution, he sees that these are issues that are occurring across higher education. He is glad that we are doing what we are across the system and that we are committed to improving. Chris asked if we have considered recording some of the training sessions. Gary mention that faculty are held accountable for mandatory training and we should be able to do same with leaders of the evaluation process.

Chris asked for other business to be discussed.

Linda provide an FYI for the November 7 meeting. Randy and John Compton plan to be there for part of our meeting. She asked that we think about what the group may want to discuss with them. Gary mentioned that we may wish to ask about the board perspective for the upcoming legislative session. Bruce said we have sometimes had Anthony or someone from that office come to the Board meeting to talk to them. Linda said if we see a bill coming forward that may impact, we work to identify any questions or issues that could be addressed. Perhaps we could have Anthony give a 30,000 foot view.

Chris asked a question about what happens if you try to truncate a search. Randy initially stated that he will not stay in this position for long. What are his plans at this time? This may be a question for us to ask in the upcoming meeting. Linda agreed that this is the appropriate place for that question to be asked.

Linda reported that lots has been accomplished in relation to the UT Promise. We have 1100 plus applicants at this time. The goal is growing the endowment to be able to fully fund the initiative. High dollar donors are being recruited for that fund. In a month, we will be rolling out the application for current students to opt into the promise.

The meeting was adjourned.