

MINUTES

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
Monday November 20, 2006, 2-3:15pm
University Center, room 218

Members: Beauvais Lyons (Chair), Basil Antar, Jennifer Beals, Muammer Cetingok, George Dodds, Joanne Hall, Julia Malia, Molly Royse, Gary Ubben.

Not present: Neal Shover, John Wodarski,

1. Approval of the Minutes of October 23, 2006.

Approved with the following revision: "There was some discussion of how to proceed regarding the issue of merit raises and the November 21, 2006 Senate resolution. George Dodds advocated against reaffirming the prior resolution, as it is already on the record. If we are to offer a reaffirmation, it ought to be part of a new resolution on the issue."

2. Report from the Committee Chair

a) Reappointment schedule of Department Heads: Beauvais indicated that Provost Holub has provided a list of department heads who will have five-year reappointment reviews this year. He has not provided a comprehensive list of heads, with the month and year of their initial appointment. Beauvais is collecting this information directly from the units, and will forward his findings to the committee.

b) Communications with Alan Chesney regarding exit interviews of faculty who leave UT. In a recent conversation with Lyons, Chesney indicated that his office has conducted exit interviews with employees who request them, however it is not a standard practice. Chesney will be able to attend the February 5th meeting of the committee to discuss the matter further. Jennifer Beals offered to review some of the literature on the subject, and forward an article to the committee. Beauvais will contact Michael Lane Morris, Director of the Human Resource Development program in the College of Business Administration to see if he has any suggestions.

3. Discussion of the Proposed Faculty Handbook change regarding ORNL-UT Joint Faculty

A copy of proposed change to the faculty Handbook was sent to members of the committee in advance of the meeting and discussed. Concern was expressed whether the proposed change to the handbook was pro forma, to reflect contract letters that have already been signed with joint UTK-ORNL faculty. Beauvais will ask Susan Martin for a copy of sample letters of appointment with such faculty. There was concern regarding which administrator will oversee the annual evaluation of such faculty members, and what are the governing bylaws. Basil said that he would draft a summary analysis. The matter will be discussed further with Susan Martin at our Feb. 5th meeting.

4. Continued discussion of October 1 Ombudsperson Report

Following on discussion of this report at the October meeting, the committee decided to do the following:

a) request that there be a central (physical and electronic) repository for all department bylaws so that the committee and the administration may review the bylaws for compliance with the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation. Beauvais will send a memorandum to President Gross asking him to request this from the Office of the Provost.

b) work with Vice-Provost Susan Martin to ensure the Manual for Faculty Evaluation has explicit procedures for the sharing of P & T reports with candidates and

subsequent responses and/or correction of inaccuracies in these reports. Consistent with the Ombudpersons' report, we recommend that every written report (by the department head, dean, and faculty review committees at the department and college level) be shared with the faculty member within 24 hours of its completion, including the faculty review committee vote. This procedure should include a time limit by which the faculty member can respond in writing, in order for this document to be added to the dossier before it goes to the next level. Further, explicit procedures should be developed for the correction of inaccurate facts in these reports prior to their review at the next level (recommendation 2)..

c) work with Alan Chesney and the Human Resources Office to develop an exit interview process for all faculty who leave the university (recommendation 3).

d) Work with the Office of the Provost to help ensure department heads and faculty mentors have the benefit of professional development (recommendation 3).

e) Work with the Office of the Provost to monitor the reappointment process for department heads (recommendation 3).

f) Work with the Human Resources Department to clarify the policy preventing UT employees from pursuing a PhD in the field in which they are teaching. (recommendation 4).

g) Work with the Office of the Provost to review the department head's manual to ensure faculty members be given an opportunity to share their perspectives concerning problems in job performance prior to enactment of changes in duties (recommendation 5).

h) Work with the Office of the Provost to establish policy to ensure written agreements between faculty and administrators are honored, even after the administrator leaves. (recommendation 6).

j) Work with the Office of the Provost to ensure that criteria for rank in the handbook and department bylaws are the primary and enduring basis for measuring faculty performance, and that if changes to these criteria are to be used, that faculty members are brought into the process of setting these performance goals (recommendation 7.1).

k) Work with Vice-Provost Martin to discuss ways that faculty are not penalized for interdisciplinary activities beyond the scope of their home discipline (recommendation 7.2).

l) Review the Faculty Handbook to determine if more specific limits should be prescribed regarding the rank of faculty on personnel committees (recommendation 7.3).

m) Discuss with Vice-Provost Martin what can be done if retention review reports and tenure votes are not in accord with one another (recommendation 7.4).

n) Discuss with Vice-Provost Martin whether the Manual for Faculty Evaluation needs to have more explicit instructions for Department Heads regarding the role of annual goals and workload percentages in guiding performance rankings. (recommendation 7.5).

These matters will be discussed with Vice-Provost martin at our February and March committee meetings.

5. Brief discussion of the Role of the Ombudsperson and FAQ documents.

Beauvais provided a corrected draft and asked other members of the committee to forward any thoughts on the documents to Kathy Greenberg. Maummer expressed concern about the role of the Faculty Ombudsperson being neutral. Julia indicated that their charge is to promote fairness, and not be an advocate for the process. The faculty have a variety of options, and the Faculty Ombudsperson helps the faculty member to understand their options, helping to facilitate their

options. Joanne indicated that any advice is for the faculty member's consideration as a resource, but is not advisory. Beauvais expressed thanks for the work in preparing this document, and felt it would help future ombudspersons.

5. Adjournment, 3:25pm

NEXT MEETING: Monday February 5, 2007, 2pm, UC 218.