

Revised October 19, 2011; originally submitted October 13, 2011

Faculty Senate HOP Committee

Report on Review of Proposed HOP Revisions:

2.22 Periodic Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

2.25 Development Leave Program

2.33 Faculty Proficiency in English

9.23 Procedures Governing Private Gift Solicitation, Acceptance, and Management

2.22 Periodic Performance Evaluation (PPE) of Tenured Faculty

Relevant to faculty? Yes.

Major point(s):

1. Specific types of faculty leave that will or will not be considered in the 6-year PPE timeline needs to be provided. We recommend that not only are common faculty leave categories listed, but also that the option for additional categories of faculty leave be included. Whether or not unique leave situations would stop the 6-year PPE process should be at the discretion of the Provost.
2. How to handle Faculty Development Leave (FDL) in 6 year PPE assessment. In Procedures (II. Review Process and Timetable. A. Review Frequency, pg 2), item #6 now does not allow for exclusion of FDL years from 6 year PPE timetable. In other words, a year FDL will not extend the PPE for an additional year. This policy change seems to be in line with acceptable university practice. Our rationale is provided below.
 - a. FDL involves a competitive application process, which includes a list of expected FDL activities and outcomes. While the FDL may yield future publications, etc., the achievement of proposed outcomes should hold weight in the overall PPE performance of the faculty.
 - b. Faculty salary during the leave is paid by the university (half for a 1 year FDL or full for a half year FDL). Therefore, it seems reasonable that such faculty efforts be included within the PPE timetable.
 - c. Faculty are eligible for FDL after 2 consecutive years of university service. The FDL may be half of an academic year or a full academic year. In this regard, the PPE period would include at least 5 years of traditional university effort.
 - d. Unpaid leave, medical leave, or assigned full-time administrative positions are not counted towards the PPE. While there was some

concern about the PPE “clock” stopping for administrative positions, we are aware that the evaluation process for administrators is detailed in HOP policy 1.03.

Minor point(s):

1. #4 under A. Review Frequency needs to reflect the changed #6 point. Perhaps the wording for #4 could be more specific. We recommend re-wording this point.
2. #3 under B. Faculty members were opposed to the use of the word “cohesive” as 1) no definition is provided and 2) not all faculty are on annual workload plans. We recommend removal of this word.
3. In section III. Outcome or PPE. B., the term “short-term” should be removed. We recommend removal of this term.

2.25 Development Leave Program

Relevant to faculty? Yes.

Major point(s):

1. none

Minor point(s):

1. none

2.33 Faculty Proficiency in English

Relevant to faculty? Yes.

Major point(s):

1. RESPONSIBILITIES. Office of ESL Services. What is the “developmental plan”? This proposal should clearly define such a plan since the faculty member assigned to complete it will have to pay for the plan. We recommend that this aspect be clarified.
2. It is not clear whether the initial Faculty Proficiency in English Form (attesting whether English is or is not their primary language as part of the faculty recruitment packet) is in English. If a new faculty member misunderstands the question, then they are cleared to teach? While the footnote #1 states that the test may be required following complaints from students, we recommend that this aspect be clarified.
3. Department chairs make the determination of need for the UTSA Oral Language Proficiency Test? In order to secure faculty members, could chairs

be inclined to avoid the test and possible “developmental plan” accompanying test failure? We suggest reconsidering this aspect of the proposal.

- a. As stated in PROCEDURES. D., the State of Texas requires faculty enrolled in a “designated developmental plan” to pay for the test and the development plan.

Minor point(s):

1. In DEFINITIONS, Faculty Member description suggests that all faculty are teaching a course for credit. Research Assistants and Research Associates do not. We recommend a change to reflect the positions that do not teach courses.
2. In DEFINITIONS, Faculty Member description includes student teaching assistants. Because of the hardship of imposing the costs of possible development plans, this inclusion does not seem fair. We recommend that student teaching assistants be exempt from such a procedure.

9.23 Procedures Governing Private Gift Solicitation, Acceptance, and Management

Relevant to faculty? Minor.

Major point(s):

1. none

Minor point(s):

2. none