

**Minutes of the Faculty Assembly Meeting
September 24, 2003**

Members Present:

Crater, Kimble, Kupersmidt, Sheth, Whitehead, Keefer, Antar, Steinhoff, Parigger, Coleman, Kimberlin, Carruthers, Solies, Reddy, Moulden

Members Absent:

Davis, Lewis, Pujol, Vakili, Collins, Flandro, Garrison, Jensen, Muehlhauser, Hailey, Smith, Renaudo, Chen.

The agenda consists of two items: 1) Faculty Governance and 2) Faculty Accountability. Ken Kimble (President elect) took Lloyd Davis' place today. He distributed AAUP guidelines for Faculty Governance. The point was made that 1) precedes 2) and that first treating 1) will facilitate treating 2). 1) Appears to be an ongoing problem for a number of institutions. The handout indicated 7 key indicators of the state of shared governance.

1. Climate for Governance
2. Institutional Communication
3. Board's Role
4. President's Role
5. Faculty's Role
6. Joint Decision Making
7. Assessing Structural Arrangements for Governance

Ken commented that in our case the UTK administration plays the role of the board.. 1. and 2. were regarded as particularly relevant to our situation.

Basil reported on the retreat of Faculty Senate. He noted that now our role will be clarified in the new Faculty Handbook (UTSI will be explicitly mentioned). The new faculty handbook will try to separate policy from procedure. The location of tenure is not settled To be clarified later.

Chris noted that the research committee rules imply shared governance. He states this is not done.

It was commented that there was no Faculty input on the revitalization plan from the outset. We were asked to comment on a more or less finished document.

Basil continued on report of Faculty senate retreat:

- a) J. Johnson noted that things are in disarray but will be straightened out He and Eli Fly will serve concurrent terms.. (17 on UT Pres search committee)
- b) Crabtree gave a report on the State of the University. He listed cost/student at UTK, med school and brought special attention to our cost per student. No number of Inst. of Agric. was given. John C. pointed out that his comparison was not fair as it did not take into account mission dependence.

A distinction was made between The U.T. and U.T.

Ken recapitulated on Handout and asked for opinions: (Given below)

It was expressed (by Ralph I believe) that we need to have freedom for making comments without fear of retribution of any kind. John suggested that the fear was more of confrontation than retribution. Different points of view on this were expressed. E.g. raises vs. performance raises.

Threats to tenure were considered to be one form of retribution. It was stated that performance guidelines have reduced the strength of tenure.

It was asked if our guidelines are compatible with those of UTK. Basil pointed out that communications between us and Faculty Senate indicated that our guidelines must be part of our bylaws. The question exists whether we have bylaws. We define them to be our policy and procedures.

It was pointed out that our performance reviews had substantial faculty input in their setup. It was inferred that Crabtree made our pre 12/2002 guidelines same as U.T.K. policy. In particular, 2 Unsatisfactory or any combination of 3 U's or N's (needs improvements) in a 5 year period would trigger a cumulative review. The annual review is the same as before and there does exist an appeals committee.

The new procedure will be same here and at UTK. Performance standards may differ however. We can propose changes in those standards however. (Stated by John C. I believe). John pointed out that there was no collective input on them or the guidelines although there were a number of individual comments.

It was stated that alternative proposals on performance guidelines were needed.

A comparison was made by Dr. Reddy between UTSI and U. Texas.. Our was substantially below that of their engineering dept.

John commented on earmarked funds and noted that how they could be sustained is an important issue.

Seth suggested that our next meeting be longer, say at fall break. That was agreed upon. (In fact it was voted upon in favor of this). The main topic: How to grow in the context of self governance. It was pointed out that a review (or revamp) of our revitalization plan should precede same on performance standards. John S. pointed out that we need data to have good beginning on that.

He also requested the following addition to the minutes:

A number of parallels were drawn between UTSI and Knoxville that I said I did not believe were correct.

The main point is that faculty requirements are totally different:

1. Teaching is important. However, without an active research program, a faculty member may not be able to teach up to date research results required for advanced graduate courses. Since there are no undergraduate courses, such a faculty member would not be that useful.
2. The many negative comments from Knoxville concerning UTSI, including the very high cost per student, I believe, show that we are in danger of being closed down unless our research funding increases drastically. This puts great importance on doing research that is good enough to be funded.
3. Thus, I believe that research should form the basis of a UTSI faculty evaluation standard at UTSI.
4. Though, as stated in the meeting, faculty standards may be used in Knoxville only to eliminate exceptionally poor faculty, and hence only as a rare, last ditch resort, I think at UTSI they should be used to - - uphold faculty standards.
5. Knoxville has another means of reducing faculty - eliminating departments. We do not apparently have that option: although Knoxville may exercise it - on us!

Thus, I think that the correct use of faculty standards is now necessary at UTSI. We cannot take the state funding as an "entitlement" that will continue without excellent research.

Submitted by Faculty Secretary
Horace Crater