

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
of January 19, 2012**

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2011-2012 academic year was held January 19, 2012, at 3:30 p.m. in the University Room (BB 2.06.04) with Dr. Carola Wenk, Chair of the Faculty Senate, presiding.

I. Call to order and taking of attendance

Present: Diane Abdo, Sos Aгаian, Manuel Berriozabal, Karan Bhanot, Kimberly Bilica, Renee Cowan, Glenn Dietrich, Beth Durodoye, Carol Dyas, Robert Hard, Anne Hardgrove, Judith Haschenburger, Amy Jasperson, Daniel Jimenez, Juliet Langman, Richard Lewis, Francisco Marcos-Marin, Marcelo Marucho, Alycia Maurer, Emilio Mendoza, John Merrifield, Joycelyn Moody, Elizabeth Murakami-Ramvalho, Libby Rowe, Juana Salazar, Dan Sass, Rebekah Smith, Johnelle Sparks, Raydel Tullous, Alistair Welchman, Carola Wenk, Bennie Wilson, Walter Wilson

Absent: Robert Ambrosino, Rajesh Bhargave (excused), Frank Chen, Gary Cole, Matthew Dunne (excused), Mansour El-Kikhia, Donovan Fogt (excused), Mary Kay Houston Vega (excused), Drew Johnson, Donald Kurtz, John McCray (excused), Byongook Moon (excused), Branco Ponomariov, Anand Ramasubramanian, Hazem Rashed-Ali (excused), Misty Sailors (excused), Ted Skekel

Guests: Tom Coyle, Julius Gribou, Sarah Leach, Ken Pierce, Steve Wilkerson

Total members present: 33

Total members absent: 17

II. Approval of the December 8, 2011 minutes

The minutes were approved.

III. Reports

A. Chair of the Faculty Senate - Dr. Carola Wenk

Dr. Wenk said that the current Non-tenure track faculty member serving on the Executive Committee is on leave for the semester and that an election must be held

in the Senate to find a replacement. Bennie Wilson volunteered and was elected to the Executive Committee by unanimous approval to fill the position.

Dr. Wenk mentioned the new Graduation Rate Improvement Plan (GRIP) and Tuition and Fees Proposal and included a link where more information could be found: <http://www.utsa.edu/financialaffairs/TuitionFees/committee/agendas.html>.

She said that there were student representatives and Faculty Senators that attended the forums held to discuss the tuition and fees proposal. Dr. Wenk said that the student leaders that attended were in agreement with the proposed increases.

Dr. Wenk said that an OIT subcommittee has been formed by the VPR'S Research Advisory Committee and she directed anyone with comments to contact John Merrifield, chair of the Faculty Senate's Research Advisory Committee.

For more information, the Chair's Report can be accessed at:

http://www.utsa.edu/Senate/fsminutes/2011-2012/01-19-2012/FS_chairReport_1-19-12.pdf

- B. Secretary of the General Faculty - Dr. Amy Jasperson
Dr. Jasperson said that a UT System Faculty Advisory Council meeting is set for next week. She said that the University Assembly is also scheduled to meet next month. Dr. Jasperson told the Senate that they could expect an update on the status of MyEdu and a PPE status update from the UT System.
- C. Provost's Report – Mr. Julius Gribou (for Dr. John Frederick)
Dr. Wenk introduced Mr. Julius Gribou, Executive Vice Provost from the VPAA's office to present the Provost's report for Dr. Frederick. Mr. Gribou said that there has been a total of 22 sign-ups for the Voluntary Separation Incentive Packages (VSIP) and that the deadline to apply had been moved to January 17th by 5:00 p.m. He said that the program has the potential to generate additional faculty positions and expects the additional funds to be allocated from the top-down to address specific needs of the departments.
Mr. Gribou said that the Graduation Rate Improvement Plan (GRIP) is currently available on the financial affairs website and can be accessed within the strategic plan presentation update. He said that approval from the UT system and the coordinating board has the potential to create 40 new faculty positions, which should improve the student-faculty ratio.
He also mentioned the recent technical difficulties involving student course surveys, which led to a low response rate. Mr. Gribou said that this issue was discussed in the Chair's Council meeting, and that work is being done to find out how to get a better response rate. He stressed the importance of the evaluations in the faculty review process and anticipates continued work to improve any technical issues.
Mr. Gribou mentioned the recent retreats held by the Provost. The Chair's retreat was held to address organizational and progress issues related to GRIP, such as issues with registration and room availability. The retreat held with the Regent's Outstanding Teaching Award winners provided insight on improvements as well as great moments in teaching. Some of these topics included new faculty

orientation and the teacher's advisory board. Mr. Gribou said that Dr. Frederick is currently working with this information to present it to faculty soon.

Mr. Gribou said that a new building is in the works to fill out the block that houses the North Paseo Building (NPB). He said that the VP of Business Affairs office looked at the cost of rent and space being utilized at University Heights and came up with a more cost-effective alternative similar to the NPB. He said that the savings could generate more faculty positions. The design for the new building is currently being worked on and the coordinating board is reviewing the request for funding for the project. The new building would house various administrative departments, including the office of Business Affairs, University Advancement, OIT operations, and would include additional class and faculty offices. Information systems, cyber security, and computer science would also occupy a portion of the new building. Ten or twelve 25-seat classrooms are planned, which would satisfy a goal of the Freshman Initiative plan that requires classrooms for cohorts of 25 students. The 5-story 35,000 square-foot building will be located parallel to the NPB. Mr. Gribou said that the timeline for this project is very short, with the building being completed in the fall of 2013 and classrooms set to be utilized in the spring of 2014. He noted that UTSA's Master Plan Management Council has stayed with the master plan that was originally adopted.

D. Consent Calendar – Dr. Kim Bilica

Dr. Bilica informed the Faculty Senate of the Certificate in Digital Learning Design that was approved in the Graduate Council. She said that it is a 15-hour certificate which will be housed in the Department of Educational Psychology in the College of Education and Human Development.

E. Curriculum Committee – Dr. Raydel Tullous

Dr. Tullous said that the Curriculum Committee reviewed the proposed BS in Biochemistry. She said that the health care industry in San Antonio has experienced an economic impact of 14.5 billion in 2009, which is expected to continue. Dr. Tullous mentioned that the only Biochemistry degree program in San Antonio is currently at Trinity, with a PhD program offered through the Health Science Center. The degree would require 120 semester credit hours and would be administered by the department of chemistry. One new faculty member is required (the position was already approved last year) and one part-time administrative assistant. The committee voted 12 in favor and 1 no response. There was a motion to approve and the BS in Biochemistry was unanimously approved.

F. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee – Dr. Rebekah Smith

Dr. Smith said that her committee considered an initial draft of HOP 2.36: Hearing Procedures for Faculty Hearing Panels on Matters Relating to Nonreappointment. This policy currently applies to non-tenured faculty members. She noted the committee's concerns, one of which is a hearing tribunal that consists of faculty members ruling on legal issues when not trained to do so.

There is also concern over whether “tribunal” is an appropriate term to be used, since the term “tribunal” implies that a decision is made. The committee is solely making a recommendation or report to the President who makes the final decision. The majority of the committee’s concerns refer to portions of Regents Rule 31008, and cannot be removed or modified. Therefore, the committee is proposing to make a statement which does not endorse the HOP policy. In addition, the committee is recommending a procedure outlining how members of the standing panel are chosen. Members of the standing panel are then selected by the President if a tribunal is formed. There were various comments among senate members regarding the standing panel members being chosen by the department chairs versus the faculty from the respective departments, before being appointed by the Dean. It was noted that the Regents Rule language implies that this same process may also apply to faculty members terminated for cause after receiving tenure. Therefore, the senate agrees to establish a procedure that could apply to both tenured and non-tenured tenure-track faculty members. Dr. Smith said that any additional comments can be sent to her to revise the procedure for selecting standing panel members. In addition, a new resolution will be prepared to send to the UT system to express the Faculty Senate’s concerns over Regents Rule 31008.

G. HOP Committee – Dr. Walter Wilson (for Dr. Donovan Fogt)

Dr. Wilson said that the committee reviewed three HOP policies. The first was HOP 2.03 Emeritus Academic Titles. The committee felt that a statement needs to be included to clarify what extended period of service to the university is needed to obtain this title. In addition, clarification needs to be made regarding Emeritus professors that may be a principal investigator on a grant and how this is dealt with in the policy. The last problematic section involves the types of university responsibilities that an Emeritus faculty member would be eligible for, such as the possibility of serving on the Faculty Senate if the professor holds a NTT adjunct status.

The second policy the committee reviewed was 2.35 Academic Program Substantive Change. The committee believes that the title of this policy should be changed to more accurately reflect the intent of the policy, which is SACS alignment. They also believe that this policy should conform to other mentions of substantive changes at the university to follow accreditation standards. There are some procedures and timetables within the policy that could be better clarified. Also, the committee seeks a better understanding for the designation of associate deans on a campus-wide level. Finally, the committee believes that the Faculty Senate, which is not mentioned in this policy, should be included in the processes outlined.

The last policy that the committee reviewed was 9.11 Reproduction of Copyright Materials, which involves the legal issues of using copyright materials. One issue that is not dealt with in the policy is the extent that copyright materials can be used in the classroom and in what way. Providing some guidelines for use may help to clarify this issue when it relates to faculty teaching.

H. Committee on Course Surveys – Dr. Dan Sass

Dr. Wenk introduced Steve Wilkerson, Associate Vice Provost for Institutional Research. Dr. Wilkerson said that there was an upgrade from Scantron that was implemented last fall, but when the course surveys were administered, students couldn't access them due to an application memory leak. He said that OIT staff sent smaller batched emails and had someone monitoring the server 24/7 to ensure that users had access. As a result of this, he said the period to complete the course surveys was extended. Dr. Wilkerson said that the fall 2010 semester had a 38.7% response rate, the spring 2011 semester had a 41% response rate, and the fall 2011 semester had a 35.6% response rate. Although 25% had previously been reported for the fall 2011 semester, he assured the Faculty Senate that the new percentages were the final figures after close-out. Since then, OIT has installed a patch and software to load-test the system and ensure that it can withstand the load resulting from many users. Dr. Wilkerson said that they are accomplishing this by applying the Banner model to this application to implement testing on a larger scale. One new spring enhancement that he mentioned is the ability for students to complete their course surveys with a smart phone or iPad. Dr. Wilkerson addressed a concern about the cost of the Scantron program relative to the recent problems encountered. He said that the new system is a greener alternative with a lower administrative cost and a lower overall cost than IDEA. He stressed that the application of the new patch should eliminate any future technical issues.

Dan Sass gave a presentation from the course evaluation committee. He noted that the fall 2005-spring 2010 IDEA data were combined because there were no differences between those years and then compared to the online fall 2010 and spring 2011 data. Dr. Sass indicated that instructor ratings had decreased as a result of collected course evaluations online. While unadjusted instructor ratings were a little lower with online data, the differences were more noticeable among the various colleges. Dr. Sass said that the 1, 2, and 4 ratings did not change much between the two systems, but there was a higher number of 3 ratings (a middle score) and fewer 5 ratings (the highest or best score) with the new online system. Alternatively, scores that had been adjusted were higher with IDEA than online, and there was once again a significant difference between the colleges. Dr. Sass said that a key trend to take into consideration is that an increase in response rates for the course surveys seemed to yield an increase in favorable instructor ratings. This may be something to improve on going forward, since online evaluations have lower response rates.

Dr. Sass said that overall course ratings were also similar between the systems, but were once again inconsistent across colleges. He said that among the percentage of course ratings by category, there were more 3 ratings and fewer 5 ratings with the online system. The data once again showed that a higher response rate will yield a higher course rating.

Dr. Sass said that the committee looked at the average response rate for classes (the unweighted mean) between all classes regardless of class size when analyzing the data. He said that this rate dropped 6% when evaluations were completed online.

Dr. Sass said that the committee also looked at adjusted scores (relative to class size) and there was not much difference when looking at the averages. However, there was a large variability in the different scores. He said that it is unclear what formula the IDEA system used to adjust its scores. A common trend with the IDEA adjusted scores was lower ratings for faculty that taught many smaller classes and higher ratings for faculty that taught larger classes. This was consistent with overall course ratings as well. The comment was made that this information should be taken into consideration when calculating merit and looking at the effect of adjusted versus unadjusted scores on the results between different size classes. With the move to online surveys, faculty who teach small courses show scores similar to the recommended IDEA scores (the unadjusted scores) but scores for faculty teaching large courses are lower than the recommended IDEA scores (adjusted scores). Dr. Sass said that these data have not yet been analyzed between undergraduate and graduate courses. He reminded the senate that spring course evaluations will take place April 9th – 16th.

For detailed information on this presentation:

http://www.utsa.edu/Senate/fsminutes/2011-2012/01-19-2012/Course%20Evaluation%20Committee_course%20survey%20results.pdf

- I. Evaluations, Merit, Rewards, and Workload Committee–Dr. Judy Haschenburger (for Mary Kay Houston Vega)
Dr. Haschenburger said that the committee has received over 135 comments and changes to the original annual evaluations white paper, which they are currently compiling into a revised white paper. In addition, Dr. Haschenburger said that the committee is in the process of reviewing departmental annual evaluation policies and college workload policies. She provided a list of the departments who have sent in their policies. She urged those who were not listed to send their department policies to Mary Kay Houston Vega. She also said that it would be helpful for departments which have no written document to send in an email indicating this. Dr. Haschenburger said that the committee is planning to present a revised white paper and recommendations at the next Faculty Senate meeting in February. Any additional comments can be sent to Mary Kay Houston Vega.

- IV. Unfinished Business
There was no unfinished business.

- V. New Business
There was no new business.

- VI. Open Forum
There was no discussion.

- VII. Adjournment
There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and unanimously passed at 5:10 pm.