FACULTY SENATE NEWSLETTER

February 2000

The Faculty Senate has numerous standing committees that address such major issues as educational policy, faculty affairs, the budget, and faculty/staff benefits as well as matters related to the operation of the Senate itself. At times, certain standing committees respond to pressing issues of concern through subcommittee work. For instance, see below Bob Glenn's note about the Manual for Faculty Evaluation and the subcommittee established within the Faculty Affairs Committee to facilitate continuous review of the best practices policy set out in that document. At other times, the Senate President may choose to form ad hoc committees, the sole function of which is to investigate new procedures, policies, or problems that merit concerted and undivided attention and to suggest immediate actions. I have appointed three such committees this year, and their initial reports are included in this latest installment of the Newsletter for your consideration.

• Professor Mary Papke
President, Faculty Senate

❀   ❀   ❀

Committee on Honorary Degrees
Professor Joe Trahern, Chair

The ad hoc Committee on Honorary Degrees held its first meeting on December 6, but because of illness and last-minute conflict only three of the six members were present. Those three discussed the charge to the committee and developed a set of questions for consideration at the next meeting. Among them was the issue of confidentiality in the identification and selection process as well as in the announcement (many institutions make the choices known for the first time at commencement). It appears at first glance that some recommendations for modification of the selection process may be appropriate, but this and other issues involving criteria and procedures will be discussed more thoroughly at the next meeting on February 28.

Committee on Evaluation of Administrators
Professor Norma Cook, Chair

This Committee has been charged to study the process of review of administrators. Establishment of the Committee was a result of the Senate Executive Council's discussion at their July 14 meeting of seven reforms suggested by last year's Standing Committee. A report of those proceedings appears in the Minutes posted on the Senate web page.

The Committee began its work by formulating an overall approach to addressing its charge. The initial focus was to consider the purpose of the reviews, taking a fresh look at what the faculty wishes to achieve. This would be followed by an examination of questions related to the best way to achieve that purpose.

In the deliberations thus far, the Committee has identified the results of the process as an essential factor. Thus, one goal is that the process must ensure that the time invested in reviews will have a reasonable impact.

The Committee is also identifying points at which the implementation of the process gets bogged down and is exploring possible ways to solve the problems. Examples of specific issues which have emerged include whether there should be a standard timeline for each review with a procedure that begins automatically, whether a simpler standardized questionnaire applicable to all administrators should be adopted, and whether revisions are needed in reporting the results of completed reviews.

Another major concern referred to the Committee is the question of which administrators should be reviewed. A two-part approach to this

Contents

Calendar

Senate Meetings
(Shiloh Room, 3:30 p.m.)

March 6, 2000
April 3, 2000
May 1, 2000

Executive Committee
(605 Hodges, 3:30 p.m.)

March 13, 2000
April 17, 2000

Board of Trustees
June 13–15, 2000
(Board Room, Andy Holt Tower)

Committee on Technologically-Enhanced Delivery of Instruction
Professor Marla Peterson, Chair

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Technologically-Enhanced Delivery of Instruction is charged with identifying campus activities related to the use of technology in the delivery of both on-campus and off-campus (distance education) instruction. The President of the Faculty Senate requested that we "secure a place at the table" for the representation of faculty views as policy issues and other plans for technologically-enhanced delivery of instruction are discussed. In establishing parameters for what this particular committee is about, it may be useful to think of this committee as the "Technology for Teaching" ad hoc committee.

With the committee membership consisting entirely of faculty, it is understandable that the committee is interested in pedagogy and policies. Questions related to pedagogy include topics such as quality of instruction, uses of appropriate technology for particular types of content with specific types of audiences, and class size and its relationship to instructional effectiveness. In the policy arena, the committee is trying to ascertain how various campus committees are addressing topics such as intellectual property rights and the circumstances under which faculty ownership or joint university-faculty ownership of course materials would prevail; quality control and academic freedom considerations if certain courses reach large, geographically dispersed audiences; professional development; faculty load; cost/benefits; and amount of faculty input into selection of equipment and design of effective classrooms.

Senate Officers

President
Mary E. Papke   4-6934
304 McClung Tower   papke@utk.edu

President-Elect
Robert W. Glenn   4-1923
105 McClung Tower   glenn@utk.edu

Immediate Past President
M. Mark Miller   4-4452
330 Comm. Building   mmmiller@utk.edu

Secretary
G. Samuel Jordan   4-4329
313 Ayres Hall   gjordan@utk.edu

Parliamentarian
Norma C. Cook   4-7067
101 McClung Tower   ncook@utk.edu

Distribution of Full-Time Instructional Faculty,
1999–2000

	Intervals	Pr.	Ao.	Ai.	In.	Le.
1.	$150,000 and Over	2				
2.	145,000 – 149,999	2				
3.	140,000 – 144,999	3				
4.	135,000 – 139,999					
5.	130,000 – 134,999	4				
6.	125,000 – 129,999	7				
7.	120,000 – 124,999	9				
8.	115,000 – 119,999	7				
9.	110,000 – 114,999	4				
10.	108,000 – 109,999	2				
11.	106,000 – 107,999	1				
12.	104,000 – 105,999	6				
13.	102,000 – 103,999	3				
14.	100,000 – 101,999	3				
15.	98,000 – 99,999	4				
16.	96,000 – 97,999	3	1			
17.	94,000 – 95,999	7				
18.	92,000 – 93,999	7	2			
19.	90,000 – 91,999	10	2			
20.	88,000 – 89,999	10	3			
21.	86,000 – 87,999	12	2	1		
22.	84,000 – 85,999	12	2			
23.	82,000 – 83,999	17	1		1	
24.	80,000 – 81,999	12	1	1		
25.	78,000 – 79,999	18	5			
26.	76,000 – 77,999	13	5			
27.	74,000 – 75,999	12	6	1		
28.	72,000 – 73,999	22	4	2		
29.	70,000 – 71,999	24	5			
30.	68,000 – 69,999	27	7	2		
31.	66,000 – 67,999	33	6			
32.	64,000 – 65,999	31	9	2		
33.	62,000 – 63,999	21	15	5		
34.	60,000 – 61,999	25	20	3		1
35.	58,000 – 59,999	21	27	1	1	
36.	56,000 – 57,999	25	18	7		
37.	54,000 – 55,999	26	16	8		
38.	52,000 – 53,999	18	11	2		
39.	50,000 – 51,999	13	16	4		
40.	48,000 – 49,999	12	28	3	1	
41.	46,000 – 47,999	7	31	11		
42.	44,000 – 45,999		26	18	1	
43.	42,000 – 43,999		21	25	2	1
44.	40,000 – 41,999		15	22	4	1
45.	39,000 – 39,999		4	31	7	
46.	36,000 – 37,999			18	8	5
47.	34,000 – 35,999			6	6	1
48.	32,000 – 33,999			2	6	1
49.	30,000 – 31,999			1	6	
50.	Below 30,000			1	40	1
51.	TOTAL	495	309	177	83	11

Committee on Evaluation of Administrators
(cont. from p. 1)

issue is being taken: (1) to identify a philosophic rationale for making such determinations, and (2) to consider whether the rationale calls for streamlining the current list.

Several documents posted on the Senate web page at http://web.utk.edu/~senate/FacEvalAdms.html provide information about faculty evaluation of administrators. These include a Tennessee State University document, a UTK AAUP Chapter Statement, an August 1992 Committee Report of UTK Administrator Review, the Committee Manual, sample instruments for a Department Head and for the Dean of Libraries, and a reference list. When the report of the Committee is available, it also will be posted for your consideration and feedback.

The Committee welcomes your ideas and comments about the evaluation of administrators process at any point during our deliberations. We invite you to contact any of the Committee members: Grady Bogue (bogue@utk.edu; 4-6140), Mike Combs (mcombs@utk.edu; 4-7553), Norma Cook, Chair (ncook@utk.edu; 4-7067), Josette Rabun (jrabun1@utk.edu; 4-3269), Ron Yoder (ryoder@utk.edu; 4-7266). You also may attend meetings of the Committee which are posted on the Senate web page as they are scheduled.

Committee on Technologically-Enhanced Delivery of Instruction
(cont. from p. 2)

The Committee began its work by identifying key World Wide Web sites that relate to technology and instruction and placing links for these sites on the Faculty Senate home page (http://web.utk.edu/~senate/DistanceEduc.html).

In keeping with its charge, the Committee will be issuing reports to the Senate that contain:

1. The extent to which faculty are playing major leadership roles on campus committees dealing with policy issues related to technologically-enhanced delivery of instruction;
2. Lists and explanations of various campus units and committees that are dealing with technologically-enhanced delivery of instruction; and
3. Identification of major issues that need to be addressed by the campus and the Faculty Senate in relation to technologically-enhanced delivery of instruction.

At the February 7 meeting of the Faculty Senate the Committee will be issuing its first report which will include information related to Items 1 and 2. The Committee has identified three campus task forces/round tables that are playing key roles related to instructional technology. To date, the Committee has focused on these groups rather than specific administrative offices. These three groups include:

Information Technology Task Force. Chair: Linda Painter. Members: Elizabeth Aversa, Richard Bayer, Bob Leiter, Susan Metros, Aubrey Mitchell. This Task Force reports to the Chief Academic Officer and is "charged with the exploration, development and promulgation of a consensus information technology plan that would move UTK from an interested party to a national leader in IT through integration of technologies in our teaching, research and service."

Information Technology Round Table (IT Round Table). Chair: Faye Muly. This group appears to have an e-mail list of about 50 members that includes all college deans and many administrators. Very few faculty members are on the mailing list *but it should be emphasized that the IT Round Table Chair has been extremely helpful and extended an invitation to all members of the Ad Hoc Committee to come to meetings of the Round Table.* In contrast to the IT Task Force, which reports to the Chief Academic Officer, the Round Table reports to the Chief Information Infrastructure Officer. It follows, then, that this group is primarily interested in infrastructure efforts—some of which support instruction.

Teaching and Learning with Technology Round Table (TLTR). Co-Facilitators: Paula Zemel and Gina Roberts. This group is affiliated with the National TLTR organization whose mission is to address fundamental questions for teaching and learning with technology. Of the 31 individuals on the 1999-2000 contact list, 16 are faculty. The higher representation of faculty on this committee (in contrast to the IT Task Force and the IT Round Table) may be influenced by the fact that there is a heavy focus on "best practices" (effective and efficient uses of technology across the curriculum).

Subcommittee on the Faculty Evaluation Manual

A subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee will make periodic reports to the Senate concerning proposed changes to the *Faculty Evaluation Manual.* For more information, please contact the subcommittee chair, Professor Eric Drumm (edrumm@utk.edu; 4-7715).

Senate Web Site

Among the recent additions to the Senate's WWW site (http://web.utk.edu/~senate/home.html) are the following items:

- web.utk.edu/~senate/Archives.html: Minutes of Senate and Executive Committee meetings from the beginning of the modern Senate (Jan. 1973) to the present, with selected documents from 1969 to 1973.

- web.utk.edu/~senate/CompositeTenure.html: The composite version of the Trustees' 1998 revision of UT tenure policies and existing *Faculty Handbook* language. For links to related documents, see web.utk.edu/~glenn/UTTenurePolicy.html.

- web.utk.edu/~senate/PierceReport1980.html: An extensive report by former Senate President Carl A. Pierce on "The Economic and Educational State of the University, 1979–1980."

- web.utk.edu/~senate/Report-Nixon-Graham.html: A 1970 report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Visit of President Nixon to the Billy Graham Crusade.

- web.utk.edu/~senate/Women_in_HE72.html: 1972 speech by Sheila Tobias on "Women in Higher Education."

From the Senate Archives …

Excerpt from the 1976 report of the Senate Committee on Funding for Higher Education (web.utk.edu/~senate/Report-StateFunding-1976.html):

If it is to become a significant force in support of increased funding for higher education:

1. The *faculty must first educate itself* on the alternatives of taxation and issues regarding state appropriations for higher learning.…

2. The faculty must develop the means by which to *educate the voting public* about the alternatives to existing tax programs and the need for tax reform.…

3. The faculty must establish and *maintain a close relationship with state legislators* and hold them accountable for their actions in presenting or responding to bills concerning appropriations for higher education.…

4. Finally, we recommend that this *Faculty Senate develop plans* for implementing the above general recommendations. There can be no quick and easy solution nor can faculty members delegate their personal responsibilities to some small group to accomplish the task. Being informed on issues, presenting a more favorable image to the public, and staying in contact with legislators is everyone's responsibility.