

MINUTES approved 2-6-06
Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
Monday November 21, 2005, 2-3pm
University Center, room 216

Members Present: Beauvais Lyons (Chair), Basil Antar, Jennifer Beals, Muammer Cetingok, George Dodds, Les Essif, Bart Rohrbach, John Wodarski

Members Absent: Joanne Deeken, Bill Dunne, Ed Jepson, Charles Norman,

Invited Guest: Susan Martin

1. Approval of the Minutes of October 10, 2005

Minutes were approved with the following change: "Basil: expressed concern why all faculty who meet expectations for rank should not have an across the board raise that matches other state employees."

2. Manual for Faculty Evaluation

Susan Martin talked about the involvement of the Faculty Affairs Committee (via sub committees), the Ombudsperson, and a sub-committee of the Council of Deans in developing the new Manual for Faculty Evaluation. She expressed particular thanks to the active role of the Faculty Affairs Committee over the past two years in suggesting changes that are reflected in the new Manual.

Muammer Cetingok suggested to Susan Martin that the incoming faculty be informed about the faculty evaluation process in its most current form as part of their orientation meeting every year. She strongly agreed. There was some discussion about the timetable for review of proposed changes to future editions of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation and the role of the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Faculty Senate and the Council of Deans in such revisions. Beauvais Lyons mentioned an October 1999 Faculty Senate resolution requiring senate approval of any proposed changes. Susan Martin indicated that any future changes would be minor, and guided by Board Policy and the *Faculty Handbook*, a document that does have Faculty Senate approval. Susan targeted the spring as a time when final revisions can be determined in preparation for the next edition of the Manual. Basil suggested that a report listing any changes should be compiled, and Susan agreed that having a record of revision to the Manual, as is done with the *Faculty Handbook* would be useful. George Dodds expressed concern that faculty preparing promotion and tenure documents should receive changes to the Manual as early as possible. Susan stated that since changes will be minor, faculty could use the current Manual for Faculty Evaluation as a guide for preparing their dossiers, and make minor revisions as required. John Wodarski indicated that there continues to be some confusion in his college about the Manual. Susan Martin discussed the ways that the Office of the Chancellor has worked to inform department heads and deans about the new Manual. Beauvais indicated that the Department Head Manual, which addresses many issues related to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, will be the subject of the committee's

February 6, 2006 meeting. Les Essif expressed concern that without final approval by the Faculty Senate, unacceptable changes to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation might result.

Below is a list of changes that Susan agreed to include in the next edition of the Manual for Faculty Evaluation for release in the Fall of 2006 (subsequent to review and approval by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs):

A) The appendixes (A,B,C) on “Best Practices for the Review of Faculty Teaching”, “Best Practices for the Evaluating Faculty Research, Scholarship and Creative Achievement” and “Best Practices for Evaluating Faculty Service” would not be listed as appendixes to avoid confusion with other appendixes in the document. Instead, they would be called “Best Practice Documents.”

B) Susan acknowledged that these documents in the current manual do not reflect suggestions made last year by Faculty Affairs, the Research Council and the Teaching Council, as well as a “Best Practices on Faculty Mentoring” document prepared by the Professional Development Committee. She promised that these revised documents would be reviewed by the Vice Chancellor, the Council of Deans, and her office in preparation for inclusion in the next edition of the Manual.

C) The introduction should state the scope of the manual based on the sentence that appears at the beginning of the Faculty Handbook (1.1): “This manual contains material that applies to all faculty in The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, faculty in the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture, and faculty at the University of Tennessee Space Institute.”

D) Page 33 (B.1.e): Add the word “if” to: "If a summary of student comments is included, the summary should include "the best liked" and "the least liked" qualities." Note: This change has already been amended to the current Manual.

E) Page 37 (F.2) While the sample letter to external evaluators indicated this principle, a sentence will be added that states “Letters to external evaluators should include the criteria for rank in the department, college and university.”

F) In Part V (A.1) on Cumulate Review will reference *Faculty Handbook*, Chapter 3.8.3 in addition to Board Policy.

G) Pursuant to discussions among Deseriee Kennedy, Beauvais Lyons, Susan Martin and Anne Mayhew, six changes to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation were agreed to that are designed to integrate the goals of the QEP into the annual review, promotion, and tenure processes. These changes will be reviewed by the Vice Chancellor, Chancellor and the Council of Deans prior to inclusion.

Introduction, page 1, last paragraph, add:

In addition, faculty and administrators are encouraged to participate in the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan for International and Intercultural Awareness

(QEP). The QEP provides that, discussion of the importance of international/intercultural expertise and experience should be incorporated into tenure, promotion, and annual review statements.

Page 8, § II, b add:

The summary may include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience.

Page 8, § II, B, 3, a, I add:

and may include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience.

Page 33, Appendix B – Teaching, 2 other indicators) add:

h. any evidence of expertise or experience in international or intercultural activities.

Page 35, Appendix C – Research, 5 add words in italics:

Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments (identify patents, new product development, *international and intercultural expertise or experience*, new art forms, new computer software programs developed, etc.).

Page 36, Appendix D – Service, 2, a, iii add words in italics:

Record of contributions to the University's programs, at home and abroad to enhance equal opportunity, *cultural diversity and international and intercultural awareness*.

H) With the implementation of the new Chapter 7 of the *Faculty Handbook*, Part II (Annual Evaluation of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty) of the Manual, B.2 should state that compensated outside activities are to be documented and approved each year in discussion between a faculty member and a department head, but that such activities are not part of the annual review process and may not be submitted for institutional responsibilities of a faculty member in research, teaching and service.

The committee also discussed concern regarding inconsistency with which various departments and colleges are complying with the Peer Review of Teaching requirement in the new Manual. It was suggested that the Office of the Chancellor might foster a better understanding of this expectation by holding a forum next semester on this topic, offering some examples of how the peer review of teaching works in some departments.

Beauvais Lyons thanked Susan Martin for her willingness to work with the committee in making the Manual a better procedural document.

3. Adjournment: 3:05pm

