

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting of November 24, 2008

Present: Joan Heminway (Chair); Max Cheng; Roxanne Hovland; Norman Magden; Julia Malia; Molly Royse; Steve Thomas; Yang Zhong; Sara Gardial (by invitation); Scott Simmons (by invitation)

The meeting was held in the Faculty Lounge of the College of Law at 2:00 p.m.

I. Unfinished Business

A. The minutes of the October 27, 2008, meeting were approved as amended.

B. Unit Bylaws Posting Project—Update on Compliance Checks

S. Simmons reported on compliance issues with departmental bylaws as a result of the unit bylaws posting project. The bylaws of the following campus units were examined for compliance with 25 components from the *Faculty Handbook*: College of Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources, Animal Science, Biosystems Engineering & Soil Science, Entomology & Plant Pathology, Anthropology, Political Science, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology (EEB), Marketing & Logistics, Accounting & Information Management, and the School of Communication Studies. Half of the bylaws were found to be inadequate and not in compliance with the selected components of the *Handbook*. The Provost needs to be aware that problems exist across campus with numerous units' bylaws. It is evident that educational sessions re. bylaws are needed for deans and department heads. S. Gardial will be in charge of enforcing compliance.

J. Heminway noted that it is mandatory for a department's or college's bylaws to be consistent and in compliance with the *Faculty Handbook*. Good bylaws are important for performance reviews and outlining a department's promotion and tenure procedures. It is important for a department's bylaws to be cross-referenced with the *Handbook* when possible. All faculty will benefit if their unit's bylaws are complete and in compliance with the *Faculty Handbook*.

The Unit Bylaws Posting Project is now complete. J. Heminway will send S. Simmons' report to the Committee. The Committee thanked S. Simmons for his good work on the project via a formal resolution. S. Thomas made the motion to approve and it was accepted unanimously.

C. *Faculty Handbook* – Department Head Reappointment

The resolution re. department head reappointment was approved by the Faculty Senate on November 17, 2008. On November 18, 2008, it was forwarded for recommendations from the Interim Chancellor and the Vice President for Agriculture.

D. *Faculty Handbook* and *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* – Annual and Retention Reviews – Annual Review Timing Change

The resolution related to the timing of annual reviews at UTK was approved by the Faculty Senate on November 17, 2008. The timing change goes into effect now.

E. *Faculty Handbook* and *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* – Cumulative Performance Review

Discussion on this topic was deferred to at least January.

F. *Faculty Handbook* and *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* – Annual and Retention Reviews – Further Proposed Changes to Annual Review Process

Discussion continued regarding proposed changes to the annual review process. J. Heminway presented rewording for Section 3.8.1 of the *Faculty Handbook* which will bring the section into compliance with the UT Trustees' Policies Governing Academic Freedom Responsibility, and Tenure. "Faculty Annual Evaluation Report" is used to replace references to "narrative." This change is needed since a narrative may not always be written.

Other changes to the annual review process were discussed which involved the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (Part II), beginning with page two of the draft document circulated for the 10/27/08 meeting. It was agreed that all the review material should go forward at the same time with nothing communicated up the line prematurely. J. Heminway has concluded that the four evaluation categories – exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory – cannot be expanded to five since the four categories are expressly called for in the UT Trustees' Policies.

J. Heminway will rewrite the annual review document to reflect the changes discussed at today's meeting and from her meeting with S. Gardial. The revisions will be distributed prior to the next meeting.

S. Gardial noted that it is the responsibility of the Faculty Affairs Committee to help get the faculty review and evaluation processes right. Her goal this year is to clarify the processes so that there will be no appeals from faculty re. process. There is a need to discuss standards too. Workshops on faculty evaluation will be planned for deans and department heads prior to the next evaluation period. A checklist is needed for the process.

G. *Faculty Handbook* and *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* – Annual and Retention Reviews – Proposed Changes to Retention Review Process

Committee members are to read the retention review document in preparation for the next meeting.

The next Committee meeting will be in January. Let J. Heminway know if Mondays at 2:00 p.m. are no longer good for meetings next semester.

Respectfully submitted,

Molly Royse