THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
of December 8, 2011

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2011-2012 academic year was held December 8, 2011, 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: Diane Abdo, Sos Agaian, Robert Ambrosino, Manuel Berriozabal, Rajesh Bhargave, Kimberly Bilica, Garry Cole, Matthew Dunne, Beth Durodoye, Carol Dyas, Donovan Fogt, Robert Hard, Anne Hardgrove, Mary Kay Houston-Vega, Amy Jasperson, Daniel Jimenez, Drew Johnson, Palani-Rajan Kadapakkam, Donald Kurtz, Juliet Langman, Francisco Marcos-Marin, Emilio Mendoza, John Merrifield, Byongook Moon, Hazem Rashed-Ali, Libby Rowe, Juana Salazar, Dan Sass, Rebekah Smith, Johnelle Sparks, Patricia Thompson, Raydel Tullous, Carola Wenk, Bennie Wilson, Walter Wilson

Absent: Frank Chen (excused), Renee Cowan, Glenn Dietrich (excused), Mansour El-Kikhia, Judith Haschenburger (excused), Richard Lewis (excused), Marcelo Marucho, Alycia Maurer, John McCray (excused), Joycelyn Moody, Elizabeth Murakami-Ramalho (excused), Branco Ponomariov (excused), Anand Ramasubramanian, Misty Sailors (excused), Ted Skekel, Alistair Welchman (excused)

Guests: David Bojanic, Janis Bush (for Judy Haschenburger), John Frederick, Sarah Leach, Steve Werby, Jesse Zapata

Total members present: 34   Total members absent: 17

II.   Approval of the November 10, 2011 minutes

The minutes were approved.

III. Reports

A.   Chair of the Faculty Senate - Dr. Carola Wenk
Dr. Wenk said that Dan Sass and Tom Coyle from the course surveys committee have prepared an update on the course surveys. She said that data from the evaluations has been analyzed and the presentation of that data will be presented at

the next Faculty Senate meeting in January. She also mentioned that detailed slides are currently up on RowdySpace.

Dr. Wenk said that evaluations are being conducted to measure efficiency for all of the VP offices in accordance with the Chancellor's framework for excellence. The first office being evaluated by an external peer review committee is the Vice President for Research. The Faculty Senate Research Advisory Committee compiled a report with faculty input, which was presented to the external review committee and is currently available on RowdySpace. Dr. Wenk discussed a few major themes in the report including a lack of oversight in faculty input to devise processes, the practice of over-compliance and regulatory overreach, the need for a clear description of the responsibilities of administrative offices, and a possible restructuring of important duties and reporting functions within those offices. In addition, a faculty feedback mechanism should be incorporated. Dr. Wenk said that additional feedback can be sent to John Merrifield of the Faculty Senate Research Advisory Committee. Dr. Wenk said that although during a meeting with the external review committee there was no opportunity to make a verbal report of the issues from the Faculty Senate, she felt that the issues were heard and received in the meeting, and she will be following up on this matter as it progresses.

Dr. Wenk gave an update on HOP 2.36 "Hearing Procedures for Faculty Hearing Panels on Matters Relating to Nonreappointment". This applies to non-tenured tenure-track faculty members. She said that the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is currently working on revisions to the policy. She said that there needs to be a Faculty Senate endorsed procedure on how to establish the hearing panel from which the members of the hearing tribunal are chosen as set forth in Regents' Rule 31008. Dr. Wenk expects the committee to present their proposal in January. She also reminded the Senate that Core Curriculum proposals are due March 1, 2012.

For more information, the Chair's Report can be accessed at:
http://www.utsa.edu/Senate/fsminutes/2011-2012/12-08-2011/FS_chairReport_12-08-11.pdf

B.   Secretary of the General Faculty - Dr. Amy Jasperson
Dr. Jasperson mentioned that UT System Chancellor Francisco Cigarroa attended the summit recently held at the White House between President Obama and leaders of higher education. Dr. Jasperson said that she is continuing to gather information from the System on post tenure review. There is a meeting scheduled for tomorrow, and more information will be presented in January.

Dr. Jasperson said that the results of the smoking survey conducted by the Staff Council are in. The data shows that most people support some kind of change in the policy. Over half of the respondents were students. Dr. Jasperson said that the Staff Council is planning to bring the results to President Romo and to discuss what implications this may have for the campus.

Dr. Jasperson mentioned that at a meeting with representatives from MyEdu, it was confirmed that the site can be customized per a campus's individual needs.

She said that faculty feedback is needed for the site to be appropriately customized for UTSA's use. One function that is currently included is the ability to rate a course by its perceived level of difficulty. She said they are trying to develop better ways to categorize courses (such as required versus elective courses) to provide more meaningful and accurate data. Dr. Jasperson said that grade distributions are already available through open records requests but could now be provided by the university or UT system which will yield more official data and less student-generated data. Dr. Jasperson said that although UTSA is not one of the 3 pilot test campuses (UT Austin, UT Arlington, and UT Permian Basin), it is a good idea to be looking at how this will eventually affect UTSA. She said that a MyEdu meeting is scheduled for next week so any feedback is appreciated and noted that there is an aggressive schedule for implementation for the pilot campuses.

C.   Provost's Report – Dr. John Frederick
Dr. Frederick reported that memos had been sent out to deans before Thanksgiving asking them to begin soliciting applications for faculty development leave for next year. He said that the office of legal affairs is still reviewing the policy, but no major changes are expected and that the process for submission is similar to previous years. Dr. Frederick expects to obtain the lists of faculty members on leave next year before fall teaching schedules are established. He encouraged faculty members to notify other colleagues and said that it is up to the individual colleges to notify the Provost's office of faculty requesting leave.

Dr. Frederick said that PPE and promotion and tenure reviews are near completion. Promotion and tenure notification letters are expected to be sent out before the winter break. Dr. Frederick said that the dean evaluation processes have been completed for the three deans up for review – Dean Perry, Dean Agrawal, and Dean Williams. There was a response rate of approximately 40-75% for each which is a good rate for an online survey. Dr. Frederick updated the Faculty Senate on the status of the resolution that was recently sent to him regarding the confidentiality of evaluations for administrators. He has asked the compliance office to look at how to capture user data and remove any identifying information that may be present. Dr. Frederick stressed that the compliance office has always kept this information entirely confidential and said he will do everything possible to ensure that no identifying information connects back to a respondent.

Dr. Frederick mentioned the review last week for the office of research and the processes they are responsible for overseeing. He said that the flowchart used for travel reimbursement needs work and that he would attempt to simplify the process as much as possible. Dr. Frederick also noted that his office (Academic Affairs) will be mapping their processes to be reviewed in the summer in an attempt to make the processes as smooth and streamlined as possible. He is currently encouraging other VP offices to do the same.

Dr. Frederick said that he is planning to create an academy for distinguished teachers and recently held a meeting with the Regents teaching award winners to look at what may be accomplished by creating this group. The group agreed that the road to Tier 1 comprises both research and good teaching. Dr. Frederick explained that the two are linked because they are both forms of learning. He said that a Tier 1 institution is a Tier 1 learning institution which applies to both faculty and students. Dr. Frederick hopes that the academy will help unify this concept to use as a model to drive the university forward in future activities. A Provost retreat is being planned and Dr. Frederick expects to provide the Senate with an update in the spring.

D.   Evaluations, Merit, Rewards, & Workload Committee – Mary Kay Houston Vega
        Dr. Houston Vega said that the committee analyzed the proposed annual evaluation process model white paper which can be found on RowdySpace. She asked faculty members to share their departments' documents and guidelines on merit, evaluations, workload, etc. Dr. Houston Vega noted that this was the committee's first deliberation and they have set their next meeting for January 20th. She explained that the committee had an overall consensus on two areas:
        1) The voluntary faculty development plan should be removed from the proposed annual evaluation model. A performance improvement plan is already set out in HOP policy 2.22 and in the Provost's PPE guidelines. Therefore, the members oppose instituting a similar policy on an annual basis.
        2) The proposed guidelines should be more flexible to accommodate departments of different sizes and their various disciplines. The committee agreed that the scoring model is currently problematic. Instead, the proposed criteria's emphasis on quantity and quality should include the amount of time and effort invested by the faculty member as it relates to their research and service activities. To achieve this, each department should determine the correct distribution model related to teaching, research, and scholarship activities.
        Dr. Houston Vega said that the committee also supports an emphasis on faculty governance with a faculty review process, including a committee with rotating membership every 2-3 years. The white paper is lacking a clearly stated purpose needed to communicate its use. The committee finds it unclear if the proposal should be interpreted as guidelines or as a policy. In addition, some of the terms within the paper need to be defined, such as the word "expectations" to determine if this applies to faculty workload or service and scholarship expectations. Dr. Houston Vega said that the guidelines overlap with current policies and need to be made more cohesive to obtain a full picture. The committee believes that the definition of a reasonable development and annual review should be focused around the university's expectations to becoming a Tier 1 institution. Dr. Houston Vega said that it may be helpful to simplify the paper or make a generic template to prevent the annual review process from becoming too burdensome. She said that the Provost had solicited input from stakeholders (faculty, deans, and department chairs) over the summer and that more input from stakeholders is still needed. Dr. Houston Vega said that open forums will be conducted for additional

faculty input in the spring of 2012. All recommendations will be compiled and presented in a report in January. She said she would compile a list of the departments that have participated and those that have not yet participated to send out to the Senators. Committee members said that they believe that the purpose of the white paper is to improve the annual review process and provide a framework to consistently evaluate faculty across the university without being overly restraining. Dr. Houston Vega reiterated that any input can be sent directly to her.

E.   Committee on Handbook of Operating Procedures – Dr. Donovan Fogt

Dr. Fogt discussed the committee's review of HOP 2.45 "External Faculty Fellowships and Supplemental Salary Funding (SSF)". He said that the committee reviewed this policy because there is no current policy that deals with Supplemental Salary Funding. He said that the review went out to all Senators to get input from each department and the committee organized their concerns into 4 themes:

1. No justification of policy – the committee finds it unclear why the policy is in place and how it fits within federal and state laws for faculty salaries and support.

2. Conflicts with UTSA vision / Tier 1 status – Dr. Fogt said that the committee agreed it did not seem to coincide with UTSA's Tier 1 vision to limit these prestigious awards to faculty members.

3. Clarity of supplemental salary funding support as it relates to eligibility/timing – the policy places restrictions on these awards for faculty that have not served at least 2 years in their current position; it also limits the number of awards or supplementation received in five years to one per faculty member.

4. Clarity of determination procedures for SSF support – the committee finds it unclear who is in charge of determining the recipients of supplemental funding and how the criteria are determined.

Dr. Wenk said that a meeting was scheduled with the Provost next week to address these questions. She said that a revised version of the proposal will likely be presented in January to the Senate, however since the current stakeholder review deadline is December 26th the Faculty Senate is required to provide feedback before this date. The committee's recommendation is to reject the current version of the proposal and make revisions to improve its clarity. The committee recommendations were approved unanimously.

The HOP committee also reviewed HOP 4.30 "Criminal Background Checks". Dr. Fogt said that this is a revised HR policy that was sent out to stakeholders including the Faculty Senate whose main concern centers around protections for existing employees. Dr. Fogt said that his committee does not believe five days to respond to adversities in a criminal background check is an adequate amount of time. The issue of fingerprinting was also mentioned due to the fact that mandatory fingerprinting had been removed in the new proposal. It was

speculated that this was due to cost issues. The committees' recommendation is to accept the current amended policy with pending changes in the clarity of policy procedures. The committees' two revisions include: more appropriate operating procedures to be disseminated to the stakeholders, and to revise the five-day time period to make it more realistic. The committee report was approved and it was mentioned that any feedback or comments can be forwarded to Dr. Jasperson who will send them on to Barbara Centeno.

F.   Curriculum Committee – Dr. Raydel Tullous
Dr. Tullous discussed two proposals that were reviewed by the Curriculum Committee.
1. BS in Hotel and Restaurant Management – Dr. Tullous said that this is a joint degree between UTSA and the Conrad N. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management (CNHC). The committee found this proposal to be relevant due to the lack of an established hospitality program in San Antonio and the importance of San Antonio as a tourist destination. She said that there is currently job demand as well as student demand for this type of program. It would include the same requirements as previously required by the BBA in Sport, Event, and Tourism Management, with no additional faculty or extra courses needed to be added at UTSA in the foreseeable future. The Curriculum Committee voted 12 in favor of approving the proposal with one no response. Therefore, the committee resolves to approve the creation of a BS in Hotel and Restaurant Management. A motion was made to approve and the floor was open for discussion. Dr. Bojanic was present at the meeting to explain some of the program's benefits. He said that the program would bring more students to the downtown campus as well as service the other local colleges, such as the Culinary Institute of America located at the Pearl Brewery and St. Phillips. Involvement with these schools would cover most of the interactive cooking courses and other higher level courses. He said that this would save UTSA the cost of lab fees. Dr. Bojanic said that there would be a minimal financial expenditure and faculty time required on UTSA's end. One task UTSA would be charged with is the reporting of student graduation rates to the coordinating board. He said that students who are interested in the program must apply and be accepted to both schools (UTSA and CNHC) and will have both listed on their degree as well. The proposal to approve the program was unanimously approved by the Senate.
2. BBA in Entrepreneurship – Dr. Tullous explained that this degree is not completely new, but is being modified due to changes in the department. She said that there is currently a BBA in Management with a Small Business & Entrepreneurship concentration, but that the proposal aims to establish a full degree in Entrepreneurship. Some of the modifications include changing the prefixes of the course titles and adding four new courses. She said that a minor in technology will also be included within the department. The Curriculum Committee voted 12 in favor of approving the proposal with one no response. There was a motion to approve and there was no discussion.

The proposal to approve the program was unanimously approved by the Senate.

IV.   Unfinished Business

    G.   Steve Werby, Information Security Officer
          Mr. Werby introduced himself as UTSA's Information Security Officer and said he had started at the university last fall. He previously worked in the department of corrections at Virginia Commonwealth University. Mr. Werby said that a key goal of the Office of Information Security (OIS) is to balance information security needs with UTSA's mission by ensuring that the right governance and policy structure is in place. He said that everyone plays a part in information security since most incidents are not due to technical failures, but are often the result of human errors. Mr. Werby noted the four OIS functional areas:
          1) risk management, 2) systems security (related to passwords and antivirus issues to university-wide systems such as Banner), 3) threat management (what attacks may occur internally and externally), and 4) awareness, outreach, and consulting. Mr. Werby said that his office can provide guidance on assessing and reducing risk, educating and training employees, and assisting with incident response. Questions or other inquiries can be sent to Mr. Werby directly or emailed to informationsecurity@utsa.edu.

V.   New Business

    H.   Grievance Committee
          • Jesse Zapata and Beth Durodoye

          Dr. Wenk noted that the grievance policy requires a report to be given annually to the Faculty Senate by the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Support and the Chair of the Grievance Committee. Dr. Durodoye, chair of the committee said that the grievance policy can be referenced in HOP 2.34. She took a moment to acknowledge Bennie Keckler for her contributions to this report. Dr. Durodoye said that the charge of this policy is to assist with and remedy concerns from faculty members. She said that the policy covers areas such as merit, duties, performance evaluations, denial of faculty privileges, and suspension without pay. The areas not covered by the grievance policy are sexual harassment, retaliation, discrimination, and promotion and tenure. Dr. Durodoye said that the committee is composed of one representative from each department and eight Presidential appointees. She conveyed that the policy is actually a two-pronged process including both informal and formal procedures. The process begins when the faculty member attempts to connect with the other party (who the grievance is against) through a verbal approach. If the issue is not resolved, then the faculty member may file a written complaint to the other party. If an agreement cannot be reached at this point, the grievance committee chair will form an informal sub-

committee (composed of 3 members randomly chosen from the grievance committee) to conduct negotiations among both parties in an attempt to resolve the issue. If an agreement still cannot be reached, the formal process begins. The sub-committee will submit all information to the college's dean for a resolution; then the information is forwarded to a review panel (composed of 3 members randomly chosen from the grievance committee) to review the material and recommend specific actions. The final step in the formal grievance procedure involves sending all information to the Provost who will make a final decision on the matter. Dr. Durodoye gave a brief summary of the committees' work. She said that the committee handled six cases between September of 2010 and August of 2011. The cases included both informal and formal grievances. She said that a majority of the cases have been closed; there are only two that are continuing on this year. Dr. Durodoye noted that most of the cases brought forward to the committee involved the issues of merit and performance evaluations.

Dr. Zapata, Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Support discussed more about the process and procedures necessary for filing a grievance. He said that it is important for both parties involved to understand the process. Dr. Zapata noted that there are some issues which are not covered by the grievance process as Dr. Durodoye mentioned earlier. For these grievances, he said that other offices may need to be consulted, such as the compliance office or Equal Opportunity Services (EOS). In addition to these exceptions, any non-reappointment grievances are sent directly to the Provost. Dr. Zapata said that this version of the grievance policy has been utilized for past two years. He said that this most recent version of the policy encourages discussion and negotiation at the informal level if possible. He also stressed that the subcommittee is not a hearing panel and that the charge of the subcommittee is to encourage open discussion without making any decisions on the case at hand. Dr. Zapata said that he may begin reviewing the policy with the Provost to address necessary issues and make revisions as needed. One of the issues with the current policy is that it is tied to an administrative action which does not allow for grievances to be reported between faculty members. In addition, the timelines associated with the policy only apply to the written compliant which must be filed 40 days after the administrative action occurred. This does not take into account the time for a verbal complaint to take place. Dr. Zapata said that the policy as it stands does not require the faculty member filing the complaint to contact the grievance committee until a subcommittee is needed. If the policy were modified so that the grievance committee was aware of all informal actions and discussions taking place, the committee could pass along necessary information including timelines to the parties involved to improve the efficiency of the process. Dr. Zapata believes this may also help to enforce the importance of faculty members following each step, since there is often hesitancy to complete the first two. Each step must be completed for the grievance process to be initiated. He said that formal procedures are initiated 90 days after the 1st verbal discussion takes place between both parties involved. If for some reason, the faculty member cannot reach the chair for a discussion or meeting, they can request to appeal the deadline. Dr. Zapata answered a question regarding the selection of grievance committee

members. He explained that each department develops a procedure for selecting a member to serve on the committee for a two year staggered term.

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 5:25 pm.