

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
of February 9, 2012**

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2011-2012 academic year was held February 9, 2012, at 3:30 p.m. in the Travis Room (UC 2.202) with Dr. Carola Wenk, Chair of the Faculty Senate, presiding.

I. Call to order and taking of attendance

Present: Sos Agaian, Robert Ambrosino, Manuel Berriozabal, Karan Bhanot, Kimberly Bilica, Gary Cole, Glenn Dietrich, Beth Durodoye, Carol Dyas, Robert Hard, Anne Hardgrove, Judith Haschenburger, Mary Kay Houston-Vega, Amy Jasperson, Daniel Jimenez, Drew Johnson, Donald Kurtz, Juliet Langman, Francisco Marcos-Marin, Marcelo Marucho, Alycia Maurer, John McCray, John Merrifield, Byongook Moon, Elizabeth Murakami-Ramalho, Branco Ponomariov, Anand Ramasubramanian, Hazem Rashed-Ali, Libby Rowe, Misty Sailors, Dan Sass, Rebekah Smith, Johnelle Sparks, Woodie Spivey, Raydel Tullous, Alistair Welchman, Carola Wenk, Walter Wilson

Absent: Diane Abdo (excused), Rajesh Bhargave (excused), Frank Chen, Renee Cowan (excused), Matthew Dunne (excused), Mansour El-Kikhia, Donovan Fogt (excused), Richard Lewis (excused), Emilio Mendoza (excused), Joycelyn Moody, Juana Salazar, Ted Skekel, Bennie Wilson (excused)

Guests: Yusheng Feng, Sarah Leach, Jesse Zapata

Total members present: 38

Total members absent: 13

II. Approval of the January 19, 2012 minutes

The minutes were approved.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to go into executive session.

III. Reports

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

Dr. Wenk detailed revisions of Regents' Rule (RR) 31102 on post tenure review. A 7-point resolution outlining concerns regarding RR 31102 was approved by SYSFAC on September 23, 2011. Then a SYSFAC-revision of RR 31102 addressing these concerns was approved by SYSFAC October 26, 2011 and rescinded January 27, 2012 by majority vote at the request of the UT System. The UT System task-force-revision of RR 31102 was approved by SYSFAC January 27, 2012 by majority vote, and approved by the BOR on February 9, 2012 while they met at UTSA. Next steps involve working on a model policy at SYSFAC to provide a template for each campus for their HOP policies. At this time, the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee has been assigned HOP 2.22 to work on revisions, while the Evaluations, Merit, Rewards, and Workload Committee have been assigned HOP 2.11 to work on revisions as they relate to RR 31102.

A meeting will be held on Thursday, February 16, 2012, from 10 am-noon to discuss MyEdu and to get input on the system. MyEdu is working on developing a recommendation system similar to Linked-In. The Student Government Association asked the Faculty Senate to endorse a resolution on double-sided printing as the default printing option for printers around campus. The Executive Committee endorses this resolution and the Senate consented to this resolution. A new tool available to senators on RowdySpace details all action memos taken by the Faculty Senate. For the remainder of the semester, Dr. Jesse Zapata will fill in for the Provost at Faculty Senate and Executive Committee meetings. The Provost has been given a project by the President that will redirect his time. The project will likely be announced this week. The report from the VPR's evaluation has been in for a week, and the President has it. The report has not been shared, but the President will share the report with the VPR. The Executive Committee (EC) would like to conduct a climate survey to ask faculty various question about how they feel about being at UTSA. Several other UT campuses are doing a similar survey conducted by their Faculty Senates. Data will be stored off campus and will be kept completely anonymous. The EC would be careful with reports and summaries given.

Based on HOP 10.02, the senate needs to elect an interim panel to form the inquiry panel. We need a Faculty Senate procedure to establish this panel, and the Research Committee suggests we elect members (2 from each college) until the end of the year, then next year we can elect members as a standing committee. This recommendation was approved, and the following senate members were elected to the inquiry panel: College of Architecture – Hazem Rashed-Ali and Juana Salazar; College of Business – Woodie Spivey and Karen Bhanot; College of Engineering – Drew Johnson and Emilio Mendoza; College of Education and Human Development – Juliet Langman and Elizabeth Murakami-Ramalho; College of Liberal and Fine Arts – Libby Rowe and Francisco Marcos-Marin; College of Public Policy – Johnelle Sparks and Robert Ambrosino; College of Science – Donald Kurtz and Daniel Jimenez.

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

http://www.utsa.edu/Senate/fsminutes/2012/02-09-2012/FS_chairReport_2-9-12.pdf

- B. Secretary of the General Faculty - Dr. Amy Jasperson
Dr. Jasperson said that the university may explore a possible alternative to the FAIR management system called Digital Measures. Please see her if you are interested in attending a demonstration of the tool. Further, the UT System is looking at a productivity dashboard to use at all UT institutions as a way to track research productivity. This is part of a new initiative at the system level that will focus on having a more efficient and accurate way to measure research efforts. (Note: Google scholar was suggested by a faculty member as another option that should be explored).
- C. Evaluations, Merit, Rewards, & Workload Committee –Mary Kay Houston Vega
Based on the work of the EMRW committee regarding the Proposed Annual Evaluation Process Model White Paper, the committee summarized two areas of strength in the white paper: 1) standardized scoring of annual evaluations and formalized workload agreements; and 2) departmental involvement and approval. Three broad areas of concerns were noted by the committee: 1) policy changes were embedded in the white paper and some of these changes were not consistent throughout the white paper; 2) developmental-specific benchmarks for faculty in an emerging tier 1 institution; and 3) best practices for annual evaluation reports needed to see what is done across and within departments. The committee proposed five major revisions to the white paper: 1) clarification of the purpose of the white paper and the evaluation process; 2) flexible, adaptable, and individualized annual evaluation reporting; 3) burdensome and time consuming documentation requirements; 4) prescriptive and weighted dimensions for each category with uneven detail; and 5) difficult so score and operationalize rubrics.

Based on the committee's review of the Proposed Annual Evaluation Process Model White Paper, the following recommendation was given to the Faculty Senate:

The Evaluation, Merit, Rewards, and Workload Committee requests Faculty Senate to approve the following.

1. The Faculty Senate accepts the EMRW Committee Report and Revised Whitepaper and recommends that they be sent forward to Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Frederick and Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Jesse Zapata.
2. The Faculty Senate will establish a process to identify "developmental stage-specific" benchmarks for faculty in an emergent Tier 1 institution in relation to:
 - a. Faculty contributions and performance expectations for teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activities, and service), and

- b. Requisite additional institutional supports that enhance faculty contributions, optimal performance, and development and build upon the strengths, expertise, and potentials of faculty members who are new to UTSA as well as those who were hired prior to UTSA's Tier 1 aspirations.
3. The Faculty Senate approves the EMRW Committee's plan to address the implications of the Whitepaper's suggested policy changes [e.g. Merit Pay Allocation (HOP 2.11, weighting of student evaluations (HOP 2.12), Voluntary Faculty Development Plan (HOP 2.11)] separately.

After some discussion, a motion was made and seconded to remove item 2a from the recommendation. This motion passed with a vote of 20 yes, 13 no, and no abstentions. The recommendation was passed unanimously with this change.

A motion was then made, seconded, and unanimously approved for the Faculty Senate to draft a resolution to voice concerns about RR 31102. Dr. Carola Wenk asked senators working on this resolution to contact her.

There was consensus to resume the meeting in open session from this point.

D. Provost's Report – Dr. Jesse Zapata

Dr. Zapata explained to the senate that Dr. Frederick designated each of his reporting Vice Provosts to take on certain duties, while Dr. Frederick is working on a special project for the President. Dr. Zapata explained that he will now be conducting the monthly meetings with faculty and will be presenting the Provost's report at future Faculty Senate meetings. Dr. Zapata said that he is happy to obtain more detailed information from Dr. Frederick if a specific issue or question arises.

Dr. Zapata said that new guidelines have been distributed by the Department of Health and Human Services for the disclosure of conflicts of interest. The UT system has been looking at the guidelines and has developed a template for UT system schools to utilize in order to construct a policy which will be incorporated into the HOP. Dr. Zapata expressed the administration's concerns regarding various elements of the template. He said that the system has gone beyond what the new federal guidelines require and that there are two options available on how to handle disclosures. The first option allows the institution to gather the information and make it available to public on request. The second option requires the institution to post the information online, making it readily available for the public to obtain. The template expands the information to all faculty, regardless of whether or not the research is funded or grant-sponsored. He said that the new guidelines original intent was to deal with concerns rising out of medical schools that involved physicians and pharmaceutical companies. Another condition of the guidelines would require PIs to report specific dollar amounts used (such as consultation activities and royalties), something that is currently not required. The new guidelines would require more staff time as well. Dr. Zapata said that Dr. Frederick would be sending a copy of the template to department

chairs for feedback. He explained that feedback is needed quickly because the template must be incorporated into UTSA's HOP by May. The office of the Vice President for Research is working on this and it was mentioned that the senate's research committee would also be involved in providing feedback.

Dr. Zapata said that the Provost is in the process of setting up a distinguished teachers academy, which will be comprised of the President's Distinguished Teaching Award winners. The advisory committee, which is made up of recent winners is currently working with Dr. Frederick to set up an induction process and create by-laws. The group is expected to have a board that will advise Dr. Frederick on various teaching issues at UTSA, such as how to improve teaching at the university, ways to mentor young faculty, etc.

Dr. Zapata mentioned that the Top High School Scholar Dinner would be taking place this Friday, and is being hosted by Lisa Firmin and the Provost's office. The goal of the dinner is to increase the number of top high school students attending UTSA. Dr. Zapata said that so far 98 students have registered to attend, which is an increase over last year. In addition, Dr. Frederick and Dr. Paine are hosting a dinner tomorrow that allows department chairs and deans to meet with prospective students. According to Dr. Firmin, the first event held last year contributed to a 10% increase in fall 2011 freshman who ranked in the top 20% of their high school class.

Dr. Zapata explained to the senators that the college of liberal and fine arts (COLFA) has gotten so large, that it will have split commencement ceremonies on Saturday. He said that COLFA and the college of public policy will share a ceremony on Saturday morning, and COLFA and the college of architecture will have their ceremony on Saturday afternoon.

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

Dr. Smith said that her committee reviewed HOP 2.36 Hearing Procedures for Faculty Hearing Panels on Matters Relating to Nonreappointment at the previous senate meeting. She reminded the senate that this policy applies to non-tenured tenure track faculty members. She said that the HOP policy requires a senate-approved procedure for selection of members of the standing committee, from which tribunal members would be drawn. After further review and discussion, the committee confirmed that 50% of the standing committee members can be appointed by the senate and 50% are to be appointed by the President. Therefore, the standing committee could not be a senate committee as was previously discussed.

The committee's first resolution was to establish the procedure to elect standing committee members. It was recommended that members be elected at the first senate meeting of the academic year. The committee suggested that the senate elect two tenured faculty members from each college. These members don't have to be faculty senate members, but they also cannot hold administrative positions. A motion was made to approve the committee's process to elect standing committee members and the motion was unanimously approved.

Dr. Smith said that the committee received the version of the policy sent out for stakeholder review with track changes and recommendations. She said that this version incorporated many of the committee's suggestions from December, but there are still some issues to be addressed. The committee would like to include the process for electing standing committee members within the policy itself. In addition, the Regents Rule outlines that one member of the selected tribunal participants must be chosen from the senate-elected standing committee members. The committee's suggestion is for the tribunal to include two senate-elected standing committee members to allow for greater representation. The last recommendation is to change the wording in section 1E to read "the individual that the complaint has been made against" versus "the administrator" to promote consistency throughout the document. The committee proposes that the senate endorses these changes, pending the revisions discussed. A motion was made and was unanimously approved.

Dr. Smith said that the committee's final recommendation concerns the revision of Regents Rule 31008. The rule allows for a hearing panel for tenured faculty members, with the option of an alternative dispute resolution. The committee believes that non-tenured tenure track faculty members should have same option as well. Dr. Smith said that her committee is proposing that section 6.2 be amended to allow for a hearing tribunal and non-binding alternative dispute resolution, in cases of non-renewal of non-tenured faculty members. A motion was made and was unanimously approved.

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.