

January 12, 2012

## Faculty Senate HOP Committee

### Report on Review of Proposed HOP Revisions:

#### 2.03 Emeritus Academic Titles

#### 2.35 Academic Program Substantive Change

#### 9.11 Reproduction of Copyrighted Materials

---

### 2.03 Emeritus Academic Titles

Relevant to faculty? Yes.

Major point(s):

1. Section IX. A. 2.: What is the minimum for “given distinguished..... over an extended period”? Is this 10 years? 5 years? 25 years? Recommend: **Clarify or provide an example of the most commonly-used definition of “extended period”.**
2. Section IX. J. 8.: Are restrictions governing the PI of a grant or project receiving compensation for their work through the award? **If so, we recommend that this is noted and referenced as appropriate.**
3. Section IX. A.: Instead of explicitly stating that senate membership is not allowed, it would be more appropriate to note that Emeriti are not considered as members of the General Faculty as defined in HOP 2.01 (and, thus, automatically ruling out Faculty Senate membership. **Recommend: Reword to indicate that Emeriti are not considered as members of the General Faculty.**
  - a. On a related point: Except for ex-officio membership on University bodies (e.g., Secretary of the General Faculty is an ex-officio member of the senate), no faculty member is “entitled” to serve on the Faculty Senate or any other body. **Recommend: Use preferred term, “eligible” in place of “entitled”, keeping with existing policy.**
  - b. Additionally, retired faculty (including, one can assume since it is not explicitly stated, Emeriti) may be hired as NTT faculty after their retirement. Generally, NTT faculty are eligible to serve on the senate and other university bodies. In such a case, which policy takes precedence? **Recommend: That this point needs to be clarified.**
  - c. Finally, in situations such as Emeriti acting as PI, would they be eligible to serve on a university advisory committee such as the Research Advisory Committee? Similarly, if the Emeriti were acting in an administrative capacity (e.g., VP of a special collection or center),

would they be excluded from consideration for related university bodies? **Recommend: Clarify the entire topic of Emeriti eligibility to university bodies.**

Minor point(s):

1. Section V.: Are there additional governing policies in addition to the UT Regent's Rules and Regulations?

## 2.35 Academic Program Substantive Change

Relevant to faculty? Yes.

Major point(s):

1. This policy does not describe "substantive changes to academic programs" but rather "appeasing SACS".
  - a. This policy does not address the nature of changes, the policy of changes themselves, or how the scope of these changes or policies align with the university's desire to best serve students and academic mission as opposed to serving SACS.
  - b. It is important that this policy's scope be clearly defined such that there is no overlap with related UTSA policy.
  - c. **Recommend: Rename this policy to more accurately reflect intent: "SACS alignment".**
2. How is "substantive" defined by SACS? By UTSA? Who determines whether a change is "substantive"?
  - a. Section IX. B. Guidelines: While guidelines are provided that SACS considers "substantive", **we recommend that substantive changes be define or listed so that SACS substantive changes and UTSA (Regents and Coordinating Board) substantive changes are compatible and avoid conflict.**
  - b. **Recommend: Clarify the distinction of "substantive" to stay consistent with other existing UTSA or regents policies.**
3. Section VIII. Timeframes for various offices don't correspond to those listed for the same offices under Section IX. Procedures. These timelines are difficult to follow. HOP policies should be as user friendly as possible. **Recommend: Re-write sections for clarity and consistency.**
4. Throughout: Is the office of associate dean well defined across campus? Are deans obligated to field an associate dean and assign them such responsibilities? **Recommend: Clarify the designation of Associate Dean in this process.**
5. Section IX. B. 6.: Don't other policies dictate the procedures for closures of programs? If so, should they be cited and mentioned here? **Recommend: Consider mentioning and/or citing respective policy(ies) if appropriate.**
6. A concern that these changes currently are not reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Should the Dean of Undergraduate Studies seek approval from the

Faculty Senate regardless of whether or not this step is/is not required by SACS.

- a. Related: HOP 2.01 states that the faculty senate exercises the authority...: Specifically, in the case of 3.4.1 Academic program approval and 3.4.10 Responsibility for curriculum.
- b. Again, this demonstrates this policy's separation of SACS and the internal best interests of the university.

Minor point(s):

1. Policy needs to be proof-read for inconsistencies in acronyms and capitalization.
2. Section I. Change Institute for Texas Cultures Campus to Hemisphere Park Campus (per Section VII. "Off-campus sites". Or vice versa.

### 9.11 Reproduction of Copyrighted Materials

Relevant to faculty? Yes.

Major point(s):

1. Why have all of the guidelines on classroom use, etc. deleted? What copyright guidelines should faculty follow now? **Recommend: Add classroom use of material that may be copyrighted in classroom applications. Specify how the use of such classroom applications is allowable under this or other policies.**
  - a. **Essentially, this policy could also point users (faculty and others) to appropriate guidelines, policies, or regulations to help encourage faculty and other to use copyrighted materials and in the most appropriate manner.**

Minor point(s):

3. none