The meeting was called to order by President Ed Park at 12:05 PM on January 7, 2013. The minutes were approved as submitted.

Members present: Louisa Balazs, MD, PhD, Maggie DeBon, PhD, Denis DiAngelo, PhD, Bob Foehring, PhD, Scott Jackson, DVM, William R. Morris, MD, Edwards Park, PhD, Fruz Pourmotabbed, PhD, Larry Reiter, PhD, Renate Rosenthal, PhD, Claudette Shephard, MD, Laura Sprabery, MD, Thad Wilson, PhD

Guests present: Susan Senogles, PhD

New Business

1. Campus Day Care Center
   The present day care center has been taken over by St Jude. The administration has been contacted, and there are steps being undertaken to address this issue. Space is being sought and a survey has gone out to identify the needs. This day care would be a UTHSC-run entity. The committee was encouraged to respond to the survey and to pass this information on to their respective departments so that the needs can be documented. Apparently students, staff, and faculty were included in the survey mail-out. It was suggested the post-docs be included in the survey, too. “Women in Science” group was another group that should be contacted.
   The question arose as to whether others who would not need to make use of the day care should respond to the survey. The feeling was that this would not be helpful, as the actual needs were the most important. Others thought that the availability of this facility would be a good recruitment tool for faculty and graduate students.

2. Simplified Educational Activities Reporting Tool
   A new draft of the Simplified Educational Reporting Tool and the Addendum for the College of Medicine was passed out. The major changes in this revision were: (1) Supercourse course directors had not been included; (2) Content directors were added; and (3) a Special Category that added discretionary activities to be determined by the Chair of the Department. Much discussion followed.
   a. One important activity specifically not counted in this document was preparation time for lectures and courses. This was felt to be a significant expenditure of time by the faculty, particularly in the face of revising the curriculum, that was not credited to the faculty.
   b. There were noted discrepancies between the Addendum for the College of Medicine and the main body of the Tool.
   c. The question as to the origin of the 480 hours as 100% teaching effort was again raised, as in DFAC’s response to an earlier draft of the same document. This was not thought to be appropriate for this campus but rather seemed to be based on undergraduate institutions. Even among undergraduate institutions, few other than community colleges expect their faculty to teach four courses per semester. Two courses per semester is the more usual standard at the University of Tennessee, including UT Knoxville, UT Chattanooga, and UT Martin, for undergraduate as well as for graduate faculty. If any institutional standards are to be used, it was proposed that they should be drawn from UT itself, not from community junior colleges with little relevance to a graduate school campus.
   d. The possibility of this metric being used in the faculty evaluation process was brought up. A small teaching assignment by the Chair might be seen as a negative if this metric was used for evaluation purposes.
   e. 10% effort for mentoring was not thought to be sufficient. Research-based faculty, it was felt, would be negatively impacted by this metric.
   f. It was felt that the purpose of this tool had not been well articulated. If it were planned to capture just how much the faculty is teaching, then perhaps a survey of the
faculty or a review of the courses in the Catalog would give a more accurate assessment of the actual hours devoted to teaching.
g. It was suggested that the administration be asked the following questions:
   1. What information is needed?
   2. What will it be used for?
   3. Why not let the Chairs collect this information and report to the Dean and Chancellor?

h. It was the DFAC's feeling that, whatever the final product was, it should be approved by the faculty.

3. The question was raised about the amount of salary increase specified as a result of promotion of a faculty member. Apparently there is some confusion about the exact policy, but no new information was available. It was moved and seconded that a minimum of 10% raise be given when a faculty was promoted. This motion passed without opposition.

4. A final comment was made about the negative impact of the lack of Procurement Cards to faculty. This will likely be brought up at a later meeting.

Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 12:54 PM on January 7, 2013.
Respectfully submitted,
William R. Morris, MD
For the Secretary