

May 7, 2012

Faculty Senate HOP Committee

Report on Review of Proposed HOP Additions or Revisions:

2.02 Faculty Appointments and Titles

2.40 Administrative Grade Change

2.50 NTT Faculty Recruitment, Evaluation, and Promotion Process

2.51 Semester Credit Hour

5.09 Class Attendance

Also:

4.22 University Marketing

5.18 Travel or Events that Involve Students and Other Non-employee Participants

2.02 Faculty Appointments and Titles

Faculty Senate HOP Committee recommendation: REJECT policy pending suggested changes.

2.02 Relevant to faculty? Major.

Major point(s):

1. Part IX Procedures: 2. Nontenure and Nontenure Track Academic Titles:
 - a. (intro paragraph & subsections a-e) Limitation of appointments to less than 1 year for Lecturer II and up to 2 years for Lecturer III is perceived by many faculty stakeholders as restrictive and potentially detrimental to ongoing UTSA programs and departmental strategic (and catalog) planning. Furthermore, the option of longer appointments for Lecturer I-III will help attract and retain outstanding faculty and benefit student success through continuity of course teaching.
 - i. **Committee suggestion: Please consider 1 semester-1year appointment options for Lecturer I, 1-2 year appointments for Lecturer II, and 1-3 year appointments for Lecturer III.**
 - b. (subsections a-e) Numerous concerns have been voiced that current Super NTT without terminal degrees could be subject to demotions (per proposed wording) – either immediately or when they are up for re-appointment. Would these individuals be grandfathered into the Senior/Distinguished Senior Lecturer titles despite not possessing a terminal degree? If not, would a transition period be appropriate in order to avoid disruption of NTT faculty contributions to academic programs?
 - i. **Committee suggestion: Please consider exceptions and/or exemptions to the terminal degree requirements for Lecturer III, Senior Lecturer, and Distinguished Senior Lecturer for exceptional non-degree qualifications or teaching/service performance.**

- ii. **Committee suggestion: To avoid demotions of NTT currently serving in a Lecturer III (or higher) position but without terminal degrees, consider describing a “transition period” in Section X. Special Instructions for Initial Implementation.**
 - c. Terminal degrees are required for tenure-track faculty. Why then in subsection e is the Lecturer I “experience and qualifications are comparable to those of faculty members in the untenured, tenure tract positions.” Yet, Lecturer I do not need a terminal degree. This point has been questioned by several faculty stakeholders.
 - i. **Committee suggestion: Please consider the wording of the Lecturer I position. We understand that this description may reflect the UT Regent’s wording and, thus, may not be changed.**
 - d. (subsection j Research Titles) Three comments/questions have arose with respect to the Research Faculty title (below). **This committee suggests that consideration to these important and appropriate issues be strongly considered for the HOP policy.**
 - i. What are the roles and responsibilities as well as rights of research faculty to serve on MS or Doctoral committees?
 - ii. There does not seem to be a clear, university-recognized, career path for the efforts of research faculty.
 - iii. Research faculty should be represented or have the opportunity to be represented in departmental, college, and university levels. There should be research faculty representation
- 2. Minor point(s):
 - a. Section II. Rationale: The statement “Detail regarding expectations for faculty in existing titles is included as well.” reads ambiguously.
 - b. If ABD have a one academic year appointment, should the appointment of Lecturer II (section IX. B. 2.d.) in the sentence prior be 1-2 semesters?
 - c. Section IX.B.2.e: Lecturer I change “...tract...” to “...track...”.
 - d. Section IX. 2. NTT TAs does not make sense if TAs are not considered faculty while NTT are.
 - e. Are Emeriti considered faculty? Should there be a reference to that policy if appropriate?
 - f. Section IX.B.2.f.: How is the “last phase” of doctoral programs defined for Assistant Instructors?
 - g. What are the qualifications for a Faculty Associate title?

2.40 Administrative Grade Change

Faculty Senate HOP Committee recommendation: ACCEPT policy with suggested changes.

2.40 Relevant to faculty? Minor.

Major points(s):

1. There are no defined time points for appellate chain steps (Chair, Dean, etc.) in the grade change process. It seems appropriate to include such details in such a policy.

- a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider that in addition to the 90-day student appeal time limit; there are time limits for the (Section VIII. Responsibilities) faculty, chair, dean, and VP/dean.**
2. Stakeholders feel there should be some way for students to appeal grades beyond the 90 days in special circumstances (e.g., deployment, serious illness, etc.).
 - a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider adding wording suggesting the opportunity to appeal grades beyond the 90 days in special circumstances.**
3. Section IX.A. does not clearly delineate the grievance policy in the info bulletin.
 - a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider adding statement to the effect that faculty have primary responsibility in giving grades.**

Minor point(s):

1. Section IX.A: "...must be..." is not consistent with "...may..." in info bulletin.

2.50 NTT Faculty Recruitment, Evaluation, and Promotion Process

Faculty Senate HOP Committee recommendation: ACCEPT policy with suggested revisions/additions.

2.50 Relevant to faculty? Major.

Major point(s):

1. Section IX. B. 1.d.i.: Faculty in the relevant titles are required to teach 4 courses per semester... In reality, the standard should be stated as 12 workload credits per semester to account for the variances in teaching large sections, graduate courses, team-teaching, re-aligned faculty workloads, etc.
 - a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider changing this wording to reflect the necessary workload requirement as opposed to the 4 course definition.**
2. How do hybrid courses work into the workload for teaching section recommendations? As stated, "Distance learning sections do not count as separate classes" but hybrid course contact time may involve considerable faculty contact time outside of this designation.
 - a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider describing how hybrid course teaching will work with this policy.**

Minor point(s):

1. Sections II and III: Use of the classifications "Lecturer, Professors in Practice, and Professors of Research" include sub-classifications (e.g., III, Assistant, Associate)
 - a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider adding "...all levels of..." prior to "Lecturer..." in sections II and III.**
2. IX.C.1.c.: Typo. Change "Lecturer IIII" to "Lecturer III".

2.51 Semester Credit Hour

Faculty Senate HOP Committee recommendation: ACCEPT policy as is.

2.51 Relevant to faculty? Major. *****Note: this is a new policy required by SACS*****

Major point(s):

1. Faculty stakeholders have emphasized that the instructor is not to be faulted when students do not fulfill the expected time outside of class responsibilities. While it is difficult to make a global suggestion as to capturing such a tone in the proposed policy, a small, but relevant, revision may help.
 - a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider changing the Semester Credit Hour section description to “Hence, a standard 3 semester credit hour lecture class...for a semester, including assignments and study time expected to involve at least an average of 6 hours of student time outside of the classroom.” (We also suggest deleting “activities” from this sentence.)**

Minor point(s): none

5.09 Class Attendance

Faculty Senate HOP Committee recommendation: ACCEPT policy with suggested changes.

5.09 Relevant to faculty? Major.

Major point(s): none

Minor point(s):

1. For clarity, the committee suggests revising the definition of Class Attendance to “It is the instructor’s responsibility...in the course syllabus. Unless otherwise stated in the instructor’s course attendance policy or unless an absence is excused in accordance with this policy...are expected.” Also, correct the “ta” to “a” in the last sentence.
2. Section IX.E: A reference to Section A.1. is stated for “more information”. It is unclear how A.1. provides more information. The committee recommends removing this reference.

4.22 University Marketing

Faculty Senate HOP Committee recommendation: ACCEPT policy with suggested changes.

4.22 Relevant to faculty? Minor.

Major point(s):

1. Part IX Procedures, I, states: "All email communications with external audiences are subject to the review and approval of University Marketing". Faculty stakeholders feel that the prospect of surveying faculty email for marketing purposes seems like a dramatic and unethical overreach. Furthermore, this policy would adversely affect faculty members' ability to establish new collaborations outside of the university as well as ongoing outside collaborations.
 - a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider removing this point from the procedures of this policy.**

Minor point(s):

1. Are we allowed to use the UTSA logo/name in our lecture slides for classes? For professional presentations outside of the classroom? For that matter, can we even wear a UTSA shirt when giving the presentation? These questions point out the importance of being able to use the brand which we represent (i.e., what would UTSA be without the efforts from its community members advancing the University's mission?).
 - a. **Committee suggestion: Please consider clarifying this in policy by stating the University's policy towards UTSA community member using their own brand.**

5.18 Travel or Events that Involve Students and Other Non-employee Participants

Faculty Senate HOP Committee recommendation: ACCEPT policy as is.

5.18 Relevant to faculty? Minor.

Major point(s): none

Minor point(s): none