



11-4-2009

Faculty Senate - November 4, 2009 Faculty Affairs

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_committeemins



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate - November 4, 2009 Faculty Affairs" (2009). *Minutes, Senate Committee Meetings*.
http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_committeemins/16

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes, Senate Committee Meetings by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate, Faculty Affairs Committee
November 4, 2009**

Present: Lora Beebe, Roxanne Hovland, Mary K. McAlpin, Steve Thomas (Chair), Yang Zhong.

S. Thomas called the meeting to order approximately 1:05 PM in room 212 of the John C. Hodges Library.

Minutes from meetings on April 6, 2009 and October 14, 2009 had been distributed in advance of the meeting. R. Hovland moved that the minutes from April 6, 2009 be approved as presented. The motion received a second and passed by voice vote. M. McAlpin moved that the minutes from October 14, 2009 be approved as presented. The motion received a second and passed by voice vote.

For those not present at the meeting on October 14th, S. Thomas read the charge for the committee as given in the *Bylaws* of the Faculty Senate. He then reviewed the various documents distributed by e-mail in advance of the October 14th meeting. (For full list, see the minutes of that meeting.) There was general discussion of the topics the committee would be seeking to address this year.

S. Thomas directed attention to the three action items listed in today's agenda.

a. Proposed Changes to *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, Part IV, B.4
(distributed by e-mail on October 13, 2009)

S. Thomas reported that procedures for obtaining external letters of assessment for the tenure and promotion process were revised in July 2007 and are now available from the Provost's website. These procedures should replace the present process, found in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, Part IV, B.4. The document he distributed in advance of the meeting showed both the current text of Part IV, B.4 and the proposed revision, which would replace the present Part IV, B.4 in full.

M. McAlpin voiced a pair of concerns with the new process that will solicit 8-10 letters in the attempt to include no fewer than five external evaluation letters in the dossier. In some cases, where the candidate has a highly specialized subject area of expertise, it might be difficult to identify that many appropriate evaluators. She said that she had also been told that individuals serving as evaluators for some seeking promotion to associate could not serve as evaluators when that same person would later seek promotion to professor. S. Thomas agreed to seek clarification on the latter concern. Y. Zhong moved to approve the proposal as presented, provided the concern about reusing evaluators provided to be false. The motion received a second and passed by voice vote

b. Proposal Concerning "Best Practices" Statement Concerning Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty (distributed by e-mail on October 28, 2009)

When several committee members reported not being ready to discuss this document, S. Thomas asked that comments be sent to him by e-mail before the next meeting.

c. Proposed Revision to Form on page 45 of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (distributed by e-mail on October 30 2009)

S. Thomas explained that the revision to this page (entitled **Summary Sheet: Recommendation for Promotion and/or Tenure**) had been requested by the chancellor. The present approve / disapproval checkboxes for the Department Head, the Dean, the Chief Academic Officer and the Chancellor would now be accompanied with signature lines. L. Beebe moved to approve the change and to refer the matter to the Faculty Senate for action. The motion received a second and passed by voice vote. By common consent, S. Thomas will draft an appropriate resolution to accompany the draft document.

S. Thomas asked about preferred dates for the committee's next meeting. December 4th was suggested and seemed generally acceptable. S. Thomas will poll the full committee by e- mail.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Thomas