The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2012-2013 academic year was held October 11, 2012, at 3:30 p.m. in the University Room (BB 2.06.04) with Dr. Rebekah Smith, Chair of the Faculty Senate, presiding.

I. Call to order and taking of attendance

Present: Diane Abdo, Robert Ambrosino, Maria Arreguin-Anderson, Kimberly Bilica, Mark Blizard, Natasha Burns, Fengxin Chen, Frank Chen, Renee Cowan, Glenn Dietrich, Jim Dykes, Martha Fasci, Donovan Fogt, Robert Hard, Richard Harris, Judith Haschenburger, Jerome Keating, Donald Kurtz, Juliet Langman, Melvin Laracey, Christine Linial, Francisco Marcos-Marín, Marcelo Marucho, Alycia Maurer, Byongook Moon, Elizabeth Murakami, Anand Ramasubramanian, Libby Rowe, Juana Salazar, Dan Sass, Rebekah Smith, Woodie Spivey, Patricia Thompson, Heather Trepal, Alistair Welchman, Bennie Wilson, Floyd Wormley

Absent: David Akopian, Rajesh Bhargave (excused), Anne Hardgrove (excused), Daniel Jimenez, Drew Johnson, Richard Lewis (excused), Lydia Martinez-Rivera, Emilio Mendoza, John Merrifield (excused), Joycelyn Moody (excused), Branco Ponomariov, Misty Sailors (excused), Rodolpho Sandoval, Johnelle Sparks (excused)

Guests: John Frederick, Gabriela Gonzales (for Anne Hardgrove), Rosalie Herber, Sarah Leach, Saeid Mahdavi (for John Merrifield), Nancy Martin, Sandy Welch

Total members present: 37
Total members absent: 14

II. Approval of the September 13, 2012 minutes

The minutes were approved.

III. Reports

A. Chair of the Faculty Senate - Dr. Rebekah Smith
   Dr. Smith thanked senators for their attendance at the State of the University address last week. Some of the topics discussed included the Graduation Rate
Dr. Smith said that the chair of the Research Advisory Board (RAB) will be a faculty member, and a full list of RAB members can be found in her chair’s report. She said the President discussed the GRIP cross campus teams, which include representatives from the senate’s executive committee, and she displayed a list of the topics which have already been covered at the meetings.

Dr. Smith said that she and Dr. Sailors attended the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board town hall meeting to discuss graduation rates, enrollment, and outcomes based funding. She said that a copy of the presentation may be found online.

Dr. Smith said that HOP policy 2.02 Faculty Appointments and Titles has been approved by the UT System. She said that HOP 2.11 is now out for stakeholder review and acknowledged the joint collaboration between the senate and the Provost’s office on revisions to this policy. She said that the policy continues to allow great freedom at the department level, emphasizes the importance of the department review committee, and said that an annual review will no longer trigger a faculty development plan. She thanked the senate’s Evaluations, Merit, Rewards, and Workload Committee for their work on the policy last spring and asked all senators to provide feedback. Dr. Smith notified the senate that senate-sponsored forums will be occurring on October 31st at the main campus from 2:30-4:30 p.m. in the BSE 2.102 Multipurpose Room, and on November 1st at the downtown campus from 1:30-3:30 p.m. in the DB 1.123 Southwest Room.

She announced that nearly all of the senate’s committee chairs have been elected, and the full committee lists may be found on the senate’s webpage.

Dr. Smith thanked Robert Ambrosino for volunteering to serve as the faculty representative on the chip and snack vending review committee.

She said that Human Resources has announced a retirement fair October 23rd – 25th. More information can be found at http://www.utsa.edu/hr/YourPlan/.

She encouraged everyone to participate in the University’s State Employee Charitable Campaign (SECC).

Finally, she announced that Dr. Sailors is currently out of town and will be giving her report as Secretary of the General Faculty at the next senate meeting.

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

B. Provost’s Report – Dr. John Frederick

Dr. Frederick gave an update on the reorganization of the research division. As interim VP for Research, he said that his leadership transition began in February when he met with research, staff, and faculty groups to have collaborative discussions on improvements to the division. He said that a proposal was drafted and reviewed with the President in April.

Dr. Frederick said that the proposal can be found online at – http://research.utsa.edu/files/Research_Enhancement_Proposal_2012.pdf.
In addition, a research enhancement implementation team has been created to work with the Provost to implement the various recommended changes. Over the summer, substantial restructuring took place within the division and most positions have now been filled. Dr. Frederick explained that in the past, three people reported directly to the VP of Research; now there are eight people which report to the VP of Research. He said that various research administrative processes have been reviewed and efforts are being made to streamline the processes. Some of these processes include processing grants, low risk contracts, moving to paperless processes, handling research policy formulation, and the revamping of the research website.

He then gave a brief overview of the various areas that report to the VP of Research. The Senior Associate VP for Research, Marianne Woods has had two new positions added to her reporting structure. These positions include a research concierge (to assist with locating appropriate services) and a research ombudsman (to try and improve processes that may not be working). A question was asked regarding the concierge’s role in the grants process. Dr. Frederick said that the RAB will be providing input to streamline the grants process to prevent any delay in this process. He said that the Office of Sponsored Project Administration has become less centralized, and now includes six research service centers (RSCs) to work with various areas. He said that the service centers will now handle all pre-proposal processes and the final proposal will go directly to the appropriate agency. The Office of Research Integrity has worked to create an IRB taskforce which will look at existing processes and compare them to other universities’ best practices. In addition, UTSA is preparing for AAHRPP accreditation. Dr. Frederick said that this office plans to offer training, in order to empower researchers, with some occasional audits if necessary. He said that UTSA’s Research Integrity Officer, Marianne Woods, is required by the federal and state government to oversee compliance with the increased regulatory burdens and must make sure that all rules are being followed and fines are avoided with respect to operational audits. He said that the Commercialization/Tech Transfer Office has discontinued UTSA’s partnership with the South Texas Technology Management group (STTM). A new office has been created to handle the negotiation of existing licenses, staff appointments, and to provide full services for disclosing, patenting, and licensing intellectual property. Dr. Frederick said that the Office of Research Support is a new subdivision of the VPR office, and will support faculty research development, house a new undergraduate research office, handle seed/travel grant programs, and provide infrastructure support for research. Dr. Frederick said he is looking for a faculty member actively engaged in research who could fill the position as the head of the office.

He mentioned the two Research Advisory Groups:
The President’s Research Advisory Board (formerly the Research Advisory Council) is charged with advising the President on general research issues, advising the VP of Research on research administration issues, and advising the Provost on academic issues related to research. He said that this is an autonomous group which sets their own agenda (with some suggested input from the Provost) and elects their own chair. The Deans Research Council provides
oversight of the research centers/institutes, engages in research strategic planning, and engages in research development, such as external partnerships and opportunities. A question was asked regarding how the administrative costs have changed due to the restructuring. Dr. Frederick said that there are fewer people in the research area, but not all positions have been filled yet. Also, he explained that the Research Service Centers are now classified as academic support through the colleges (as opposed to institutional support), so they don’t count within the administrative cost ratio. Another question was asked regarding how pre-award and post-award administration is divided up, and Dr. Frederick explained that it’s generally not. The idea is to cross-train the service centers to do both. He said that the ultimate signatory authorities on proposals are the directors of the service centers, which should aid in a more expedited process. A final question was raised regarding account reconciliation. Dr. Frederick said that the grants accounting office still operates under Business Affairs, but will be working with the research service centers for quicker processing.

C. Nominating, Elections, and Procedures Committee – Dr. Juliet Langman

Dr. Langman said that her committee had one modification to the senate’s bylaws. The committee’s proposal is to add the chair of the Retired Faculty Association (RFA) as an ex officio member to the senate’s structure. The senate was notified via email of the proposed change on September 18th. The senate voted to unanimously approve the addition of the RFA chair.

D. Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee – Rebekah Smith (for Johnelle Sparks)

Dr. Smith said that HOP 2.22 is out for stakeholder review and mentioned three concerns received by the committee. The first concern is the use of the four categories; however, this provision is required by Regent’s Rule 31102. Another concern is that an unsatisfactory rating could potentially be applied to service. Once again, the Regent’s Rule requires a review of all areas of responsibility, but the committee recommends that departmental guidelines should provide clarity to prevent unjustified evaluations in any category, including service. The final concern involves no mention of merit as a possible positive outcome. The committee’s recommendation is to modify section IX.C.2 (adding the statement shown in bold) - “The CPE result may also be used as the basis for nomination for awards, additional merit payment or increase, or other forms of performance recognition.” The senate voted to approve this recommendation and Dr. Smith said she would send it forward to Dr. Zapata.

E. Curriculum Committee – Dr. Jerome Keating

Dr. Keating said that his committee reviewed 3 proposals for the senate:

1. In regards to the twenty core curriculum proposals which were previously rejected and resubmitted, the committee recommends to put forward nine course proposals. The remaining proposals had been reviewed and rejected multiple times, so they were not recommended for approval. There was concern regarding some of the rejected proposals as necessary for inclusion in the core curriculum, and Dr. Keating said that an appeals process is being
developed. In addition, the courses may be resubmitted for inclusion in the 2015 course catalog. The senate voted to approve this recommendation as it stands (i.e. accept the 9 proposals and reject the 11 proposals as recommended by both Core Curriculum Committee and the University Curriculum Committee).

2. The committee reviewed a proposal for the Academic Inquiry course for the core curriculum, which will be a mandatory course for all freshmen students. The committee recommends that the proposal be tabled pending a final recommendation from the committee. The senate voted to unanimously approve this recommendation.

3. Dr. Keating explained the university’s need for a BS in Microbiology Immunology, due to a high demand within the community. There will be no new faculty members needed for the program, and three new courses will be required to meet all degree requirements. The proposal was unanimously approved.

IV. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

V. New Business

- Sandy Welch – Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness

Dr. Welch said that the UT System Chancellor’s dashboard lists student success as a major initiative, to be accomplished by improving retention rates and encouraging more participation of non-cap students. She said that UT Austin plans to eliminate the cap program in 2014, so that all entering freshman will be declared as official UTSA students. Dr. Welch said that other universities, or “baseline peers” were used to compare statistics (including Florida International and Toledo). Factors such as average SAT scores, graduation rates, and high school rankings were taken into account. She said that an annual review will be conducted by the UT System to monitor progress. Dr. Welch said the GRIP goals for the 2021 cohort are to improve the 4-year graduation rate to 25% and the 6-year graduation rate to 60%. She said that the mission for accomplishing this is to remove the barriers to student success. She identified the “three P’s” of change: programs, practices, and policies, and expressed the importance of faculty in these efforts. She mentioned that faculty representatives from the senate’s executive committee are currently participating on the cross campus teams, allowing for varied perspectives and expertise. She pointed out the 4 factors and 26 strategies on the tasks/responsibilities handout and expressed the need for individual faculty devotion, including an alertness to student needs, formal/informal mentoring, and awareness of the negative and positive impact of the three P’s
at all divisions and levels. Dr. Welch informed the senate that ½ of UTSA’s freshman class this year graduated in the top 25% of their high school class. She notified the senate about the importance of freshmen starting at UTSA, pointing out that a student will not count within our 4-year graduation rate if they take a summer class elsewhere before beginning their first semester at UTSA. In addition, she encouraged faculty to stress the importance of 15-18 semester credit hour course loads to students, so that they will have a better opportunity of graduating within 4 years.

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.