THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Of April 6, 2023

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2022-2023 academic year was held April 6, 2023 at 3:30 p.m. in the Faculty Center Assembly Room, JPL 4.04.22 and via Zoom (online meeting) with Dr. René Zenteno, Chair of the Faculty Senate, presiding.

I.   Call to order and taking of attendance.

        Present: René Zenteno, Chris Packham, Sonya Aleman, Kirsten Gardner, Alex Godet, Andrew Lloyd, Mary McNaughton-Cassill, Kerry Sinanan, Chad Mahood, Valerie Sponsel, Victor Villarreal, Hector Aguilar, John Alexander, David Beheshti, Lorenzo Brancaleon, Curtis Brewer, James Chambers, Xun Chen, Candace Christensen, Sidury Christiansen, Neil Debbage, Victor DeOliveira, Mary Dixson, Dmitry Gokhman, Zaid Haddad, Marcus Hamilton, Ying Huang, Drew Johnson, Michael Karcher, Kim Kline, Ashwin Malshe, Justin Marmolejo, John Quarles, Rica Ramirez, Lauren Riojas Fitzpatrick, Devon Romero, Gabriela Romero Uribe, Humberto Saenz, Kirk Schanze, Arturo Schultz, Maho Sonmez, Marie Tillyer, David Weber, Zenong Yin, and Tianou Zhang

        Absent: August (Gus) Allo, Kiran Bhaganagar, Whitney Chappell, Ginny Garcia, Brian Laub, Huy Le, Charles Liu, Dennis Lopez, Sue Ann Pemberton, George Perry, Branco Ponomariov, Jeff Prevost, and Zijun Wang

        Guests: Heather Shipley, Jaclyn Shaw, Jennifer Silver, Mickey Stevenson, Veronica Stoller, Carlos Martinez, Mason Hickock, Rebecca Gonzales, Debra Del Toro, Ximena Barbagelatta Grau, Angela Griffith, Yvette Milo and Debbie Howard Rappaport

        Total members present: 45   Total members absent: 13

II.   Consent Agenda
        • Approval of Minutes – March 9, 2023 Faculty Senate Meeting
        • 2023-25 UTSA Graduate Catalog
        • The Minutes and the 2023-25 UTSA Graduate Catalog were approved

III.   Reports

        A. VPREDKE Update (Post Award and GCFS Process Updates) **–** Jaclyn Shaw, Associate Vice President, Strategic Partnerships and Interim Vice President, REDKE

        Dr. Zenteno thanked Ms. Shaw and her team (Jennifer Silvers, Mickey Stevenson and Veronica Stollers for attending the Faculty Senate meeting to provide a research

overview update. ***(PowerPoint presentation uploaded to Faculty Senate SharePoint site and*** *website**)*

- Ms. Shaw introduced her team and mentioned that Dr. Mickey Stevenson is departing UTSA. She took the opportunity to thank her for her many years of service at UTSA. In addition, Research has a plan to fill Dr. Stevenson's role in the interim using a temp agency while they undergo a national search to fill the position.
- Ms. Shaw mentioned that the senior leadership at UTSA made the decision to pause the search for the new senior vice president for research (VPREDKE) and will resume the search in a few months. Ms. Shaw stated that it's important to find the right person and fit for this position. Ms. Shaw will continue on as Interim and will be happy to continue addressing matters/questions the Faculty Senate has regarding research enterprise.
- Ms. Shaw stated the completed an economic impact study of UTSA – the Economic Contributions of UTSA Report FY 2021 may be helpful to your research. Also, the Spring edition of the Discovery magazine is out in print.
- Ms. Shaw mentioned that we are in the counting year for Carnegie R1, which is a 3-year cycle. She shared a graph with information on research expenditures from FY2015-2022 to demonstrate the growth that has occurred during this timeframe and that there will be some work done across campus to maximize the Carnegie counting period. For 2023, we are 10% up from last fiscal year, which is great for the Carnegie counting period. In addition, we are awaiting the re-start of the NRUF audit which should commence in the next 30-60 days.
- Ms. Shaw provided a slide that indicated our top 5 federal sponsors:
  - NIH/HHS - $9.07M
  - DOE - $5.41M
  - NSF - $3.37M
  - DOD – $3.22M
  - ED - $1.15M
- Ms. Veronica Stoller, Interim Director of Office of Research and Finance & Operations provided an update on Post Award Administration and Grants, Contracts and Financial Services. She provided the contact information for their offices (slide 6)
- Ms. Stoller reviewed the Grants life cycle:
  - Discovery
  - Proposal development
  - Proposal submission
  - Negotiate and accept award
  - Set up "project ID"
  - Administer project
  - Closeout project

  Post awards starts at Setup a Project ID and ends at Closeout Project. Their office also collaborates with Financial Affairs and Gift Administration.
- Ms. Stoller outlined the service levels their office is trying to achieve (slide 8).
- Ms. Stoller provided metrics to the Faculty Senate. FY 2022 their office supported 298 PI's. Currently (to-date), their office is supporting 322 PI's. Total Active Projects – in FY 2022, they supported 784 projects, to-date, their office is up 86 to 840 projects. Their office has a dedicated sub-award person to monitor, billing

and collecting. In 2022, 76 sub-awards were processed for $6.5M. To-date, their office has processed 48 sub-awards at $3.97M. Ms. Stoller stated at this rate, she expects their office to surpass FY2022.

- Ms. Stoller stated that her team has taken the feedback provided by faculty and developed a plan to provide better service – to be proactive vs reactive (slide 11). She also provided some of the steps for invoicing and financial report process (slide 12) which is a lengthy process. At this time, they are working on over 3K projects. They are actively working with Huron to catch-up on the backlog. Some of the closeouts date back to 2012. One of the priorities is to work with Huron to prioritize the fixed-priced closeouts and return the residual distributions to faculty.
- Ms. Stoller stated their office prepared 213 financial reports in FY2022 and have already prepared 144 reports. At this pace, they are certain to exceed the number of reports from FY 2022. Ms. Stoller stated that one of the improvements their office has made is in the project set up/modifications area. In November 2022 they revised their process and activating and giving PI's access to their project funds within 10 days of setting up their accounts.

Q&A Session with Ms. Shaw and Ms. Stoller

Question – Can you provide clarification on access to the accounts – is that 10-12 business days?
Answer –   Yes, that is correct. It is business days, not calendar days. Also, as long as all of the proper documentation has been submitted and checked.

Question – UTSA is growing very fast, how are we planning to address the growth in the future?
Answer – One of things we have done is to increase the job postings in the area of post awards and grants, contracts and fiscal services. Post Award Administrations is one office and GCFS is the second office and some services from PAA occur in GCFS. VPREDKE has increased some of the staffing lines at this time while assessing the structure of where we are at and where we need to be in 3-5 years and Huron is assisting with that assessment and may include some reorganization. Huron is also making those comparisons with our peers above us so that we can be properly staffed as an R1 institution should be. We have completed Phase One contract with Huron and we are currently in Phase Two with Huron, which is about identifying the long-term changes and automation tools to make things more efficient.

Question – With regard to the fixed price contracts and unspent monies—are you planning to go back to those that are very old and try to collect or are you going to use the experience and improve processes and move forward?
Answer – We're going back to 2012 to review those contracts with Huron and try to demarcate and draw the line because the return on investment may not be worth trying to recover receivables. In many cases you simply cannot recover those monies. But, the last time Huron was here there was a lot of work that was accomplished from 2012-2018. If you have a fixed price contract in that cycle, please reach out to Veronica Stoller and she will research for you.

Question – Could you give an updated on the hiring and the pause to find the VPREDKE? How will this impact the operations and implementation of post award administration and other long-term topics you've discussed that are taking place now?

Answer – The President and Provost are thinking about the work that has to take place to hire a Sr. VP for REDKE. The office has been working hard to implement improvements which we may want to get taken care of before we bring some one on board to move us forward. I believe they are taking their time to find the right person for UTSA and that's a good fit with the senior leadership team. VPREDKE team is not going to take the eye off the ball on what is needed to get accomplished to improve the office and support faculty. As far as timing, Ms. Shaw believes the leadership wants to take a few months to re-group before resuming the search.

B. Dr. Zenteno thanked Dr. Valerie Sponsel, Academy of Distinguished Teaching Scholars (ADTS) representative to the Faculty Senate for providing an update on the work conducted by the FTT Faculty Task Force. (***Handout uploaded to Faculty Senate SharePoint site and website***)

- Dr. Sponsel provided an overview of the ADTS NTT Faculty Committee which was established in 2012, which is also when the ADTS was formed (committee now referred to as the FTT Faculty Task Force). Any member of the ADTS who was interested in the welfare of the NTT/FTT faculty could participate on the committee, which consists of 9 members representing 4 colleges.
- Dr. Sponsel provided a timeline regarding the new titles and promotion guidelines which has been and continues to be an ongoing process. Input was gathered from many stakeholders. See Slides for details on timeline. Process began with:
  - o 2014 – Committee conducted focus groups of FTT Faculty;
  - o 2015 – Prepared white paper "Moving Towards One Faculty at UTSA." (paper remains on Provost's website). Paper outlines concerns of NTT Faculty;
  - o 2016 – 2019 – Committee continues work, updated white paper, meeting with Dr. Espy, reviewed data from aspirant institutions, and drafted revised policies and procedures in conjunction with Academic Affairs; Working group consisted of the group from ADTS, several department chairs and the 8 NTT faculty senators; and
  - o 2020 – Changes were made to HOP 2.02 Faculty Appointments and Titles and HOP 2.50 Fixed Term Track Faculty Recruitment, Evaluation and Promotion Processes and approved in November 2020.
- Changes that were adopted from the process:
  - o NTT faculty are now called FTT faculty. Dr. Espy suggested to define the faculty based on what they were not based on what they were not- hence the change in the title to Fixed Term-Track faculty;
  - o New titles including Professor of Instruction Series; and
  - o New university-wide process for promotion for FTT faculty which mirrors the process of tenure-track faculty; packets are due on Jan. 31st each year for review during spring semester.
- Dr. Sponsel mentioned after the first round of promotion almost all FTT faculty received new titles and 120 FTT faculty were promoted effective Fall 2021. During FY2022, the FTT Task Force conducted additional focus groups and while faculty were grateful for the changes, there was still confusion about the process. During

the next round of reviews 80 FTT faculty were promoted effective Fall 2022. Almost 30% of the FTT faculty have received promotions. We have about 700 FTT faculty.

- Dr. Heather Shipley, Sr. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs reconvened a working group to review HOP 2.02 and 2.50 and recommended clarifications and small changes to those policies, which were approved and adopted in March 2023. In addition, she conducted two workshops for promotion-eligible FTT faculty. The modifications to the policies included:
    o Senior lecturers can be part-time or full-time;
    o Implemented college-level committees (CRC) for promotion review; and
    o Colleges can set eligibility time-frames for promotion of part-time FTT faculty.
- Dr. Sponsel re-iterated this has been a ten-year process and could not have occurred without support from many people and input from various stakeholders. In addition, there is ongoing efforts to help with peer mentoring and development of promotion materials, grant proposals, etc.

Q&A Session with Dr. Sponsel regarding FTT Faculty Task Force

Question – Are the titles, Professor of Practice and Professor of Instruction the same titles? One seems to require a terminal degree while the other one can have a terminal degree or professional experience.
Answer – No, they are not the same title. They are two different series. Yes, they both involve teaching, but as you state the Professor of Instruction requires a terminal degree but the other difference is that the Professor of Instruction series is a full-time appointment whereas the Professor of Practice series may be a part-time appointment and often these instructors, especially in the College of Business, work during the day and then teach classes and bring their professional experiences into the classroom. In terms of have students perceive them, they are both teaching faculty, but they have been appointed to different titles, which may also be how the job was advertised. It also may be related to whether or not the faculty were going to be full-time or part-time or whether or not the faculty member holds a terminal degree.

Question – If someone is in currently a senior lecturer and has been in that role for some time, how long do they need to wait before they can apply for the assistant professor in practice?
Answer – There are timelines in HOP 2.50 to determine the length of service a faculty member is in before they are eligible to apply for promotion. The modifications of HOP 2.02 and HOP 2.50 gave colleges some flexibility, especially in Business and the professor of practice series.

Question – The AFEM committee has been discussing this matter and it seems currently there is more requirements for service, including post-grad supervision, for FTT faculty and we would like more clarification to ensure the terms are consistent with their contracts. In addition, is the service being counted, weighted and rewarded accurately? One of the questions the committee has is in regards to faculty who have been in the lecturer title for years and must wait another four years to apply for promotion – how can we address that past service? How do we balance the changes in FTT positions and the impact of service requirement of tenured faculty in terms of advising dissertations and other matters? We

did raise the question of what the R1 requirements are for post-graduate supervision are—it seems there are ongoing variations and practices and the need for findings of this committee to be determined and presented to their department heads.

Answer – The hope was there would be a uniform policy for the entire university. After two cycles of review, some colleges wanted to be able to have their criteria for promotion. There are FTT faculty that are part-time, so there is the matter of how do they fit into the promotion process. The new version of the HOP 2.50 provides for a college review committee, not just a department review committee, so that adds some flexibility into the promotion process.

C. **University Leadership Report** (Legislative Update) **–** Carlos Martinez, Senior Vice President for Institutional Strategic Planning, Compliance Risk Management, and Office Operations, Chief of Staff

- Dr. Zenteno thanked Mr. Martinez for attending the Faculty Senate and providing another update on legislative bills that affect higher education which are being review by the Texas House and Senate.

- Mr. Martinez mentioned this is the 96th day of the legislative session and the last day is scheduled for May 29, 2023. The House is reviewing the budget bill which has over 300 amendments and they will spend a lot of time reviewing those amendments. The Senate will present its version of the budget bill soon and both will go to conference committee which will take until end of May to resolve. It does include a rider which does prohibit the use of appropriated dollars for DEI initiatives.

On the Senate side, two bills that have garnered attention by the Lt. Governor:

  - SB 8 – relates to public education and vouchers
  - SB 9 – teacher pay raises bill
- These bills are scheduled to be discussed today by the full Senate today, which is interesting. Mr. Martinez stated SB 17 (DEI) bill is also scheduled to be heard today and there is a Senate rule that you cannot hold subcommittee hearings while the full Senate is in session, so that subcommittee hearing will be placed on hold.

- SB 18 – tenure bill was voted out of the subcommittee and moved forward to the committee. The Senate is more flexible at suspending its own rules and may go to the Senate floor soon. It came out of committee with no amendments.
- SB 16 – CRT is out of committee and forwarded to full Senate and can be called at any point for debate. It may be heard at any point.

- Mr. Martinez stated this is a time you will see members of the House and Senate use the media to state that time is running out on their bills and there will be disagreements among the legislative members. The members will also use this time to ask a lot of questions. There are also deadlines the legislators need to make—not constitutional deadlines, but deadlines for bills to be placed on various calendars.

(side note: You can view active Texas Bills via the following website: LegiScan)

Q&A Session with Mr. Martinez regarding the legislative update

Question – Is SB 9 – teacher pay raise only for public school teachers?
Answer – Yes, it is related to public school teacher salaries.

Question – While we acknowledge these bills are in process, is it possible to share with Faculty Senate the actions UT System is undertaking to protect DEI and tenure?
Answer – We work closely with UT System on these initiatives, but I currently do not have a list of actions undertaken by the System on these bills. UT System have people on the ground at the Capitol, as we do, to work on these issues and to highlight how important these matters are to us.

Question – Do we have any information on the House's position on some of these issues?
Answer – There have been a few media reports on the Lt. Governor and Speaker of the House expressing what their priorities and we have yet to hear that tenure and DEI issues are a priority for the House, which is what we thought. The Speaker has his own high priorities he is focusing on which are important to us, including maintaining the flexibility we enjoy now.

Question – SB 18, as it is iterated right now, will end the granting of tenure by any higher education institution effective 9/1/2023. While the language may change, what plans or actions is UTSA taking should tenure end for colleagues who have yet to receive tenure appointments?
Answer – It's an issue for all of higher education. Mr. Martinez doesn't want to speculate what the final bill will look like at this time. It's in very draft form and the administration will work internally and with UT System and the Coordinating Board once the bill has been finalized. As far as plans in the event tenure is impacted as it is currently written, we do not have that plan yet.

D. Chair's Report – René Zenteno (h*andout uploaded to Faculty Senate SharePoint site and website)*

Dr. Zenteno provided an update from the University Leadership Council which included:

- Re-cap of the legislative update presented by Carlos Martinez;
- Faculty Senate and the Department Chair's Council will convene for a joint listening session to discuss the Strategic Plan Refresh summary. The meeting will take place on Tuesday, April 11th from 3:30 – 5:00 p.m. in the Regents' Room (Main Bldg., Room 3.106). The presentation will be interactive, so please bring a phone, tablet or laptop. Also, the meeting will be conducted in person only;
- Provost Espy has offered to host an end-of-year reception for the Faculty Senate and Department Chair's Council on Wed., May 3rd – more information to come on that event; and,
- Next general meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on May 4th (side note: it has been decided this meeting will take place online via Zoom).

E. Secretary of the General Faculty – Chris Packham

Dr. Packham mentioned he and Dr. Zenteno will be attending the final UT System Faculty Advisory Council meeting for the year which will be held in Austin on April 27-28, 2023. He believes this meeting and others he will be involved with will contain lively conversations surrounding the legislative issues which have been discussed today.

F. Committee Reports:

University Curriculum Committee – no report

Graduate Council Chair – Victor Villarreal

Dr. Villarreal stated the Graduate Council is continuing its discussion related to FTT faculty serving as sole chairs of master thesis committees. The next step is for each graduate council member to take this topic to their respective departments to see what further discussion or changes are warranted, other recommended changes and prepare to vote when appropriate. Second item is a new discussion that SACSCOC stipulates only faculty with terminal degrees are allowed to teach graduate courses. SACSCOC does allow for exceptions if faculty have appropriate alternate credentials, expertise or experience, in the specific area of the course to be taught. But, in those situations, we need to provide good evidence of the exception. We need to be aligned with SACSCOC principles so that we are complying.

Budget Committee– Kirsten Gardner

Dr. Gardner updated the Faculty Senate regarding the memo on promotion and tenure raise recommendations. The memo was sent to Academic Affairs and was well received. Both the memo and the response are on the Faculty Senate SharePoint site. Dr. Gardner read two highlights from Dr. Espy's response:

- She thought it was a thoughtful recommendation and thanked us several times; and,
- She has charged an ad hoc representative committee to research the compensation practices, not only for P&T increases, but for CPE, post-tenure review, shared administrative service across UT System and beyond.

Dr. Espy invited Dr. Gardner and Sidury Christensen to participate on the ad hoc committee and the committee is hoping to produce the data in the next few weeks.

Dr. Gardner and Dr. Zenteno met with Dr. Espy and Dr. Shipley regarding the IRM discussion and whether or not the Faculty Senate needed to submit a formal request. At this time, it was decided no formal request was needed. It will be a good faith request and the deans will distribute that information via a townhall or newsletter, etc. However, if we notice a gap in lack of information, the Faculty Senate can revisit submitting a formal request for information on the IRM.

Question – I forwarded the memo to my colleagues and many were pleased, but a few wondered if the raise is approved, is it retroactive to those who just received P&T, would it go back to those who received P&T within the past five years, or does it begin 2023-24 and going forward? It would boost faculty morale if the changes could be retroactive at least to the ones who just received promotion and tenure.

Answer – Your point is well taken and one that was considered. The goal is to move the goal post forward. We may need to submit a second request to Academic Affairs to address when to implement the changes, such as retroactive or beginning with a current year and going forward.

HOP Committee – no report

Research Committee – Alexis Godet

Dr. Godet – continuing on with Jaclyn's presentation today. Research is updating the dashboard and offering training to faculty. There is a pilot in KCEID so we will be able to notice the efficiencies and if they are working. Their office will be offering one-stop training which will be offered when faculty need it and won't have to wait on it. The faculty have raised an issue regarding the reconciliation process in Sahara and Jaclyn is going to look into seeing if it can be more user-friendly.

Academic Freedom, Evaluation and Merit Committee – Kerry Sinanan

We are in a holding pattern with regard to the legislative bills and being able to take concrete action. One proposal came up during the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was to ask the AFEM Committee to consider writing another resolution in more broad support of tenure and explain what tenure is as many of our students and community members do not fully understand tenure. Dr. Sinanan quoted from AAUP website

> "The principal purpose of tenure is to safeguard academic freedom, which is necessary for all who teach and conduct research in higher education. When faculty members can lose their positions because of their speech, publications, or research findings, they cannot properly fulfill their core responsibilities to advance and transmit knowledge."

Dr. Sinanan asked the Faculty Senate if they were in favor of voting to task the AFEM Committee to draft a resolution that would outline the function of tenure in higher education along these lines?

Dr. Zenteno reminded the Faculty Senate that they cannot support or oppose any legislation as a body from UTSA. We can discuss tenure and academic freedom, which is what Kerry is proposing.

There was discussion among the Faculty Senate regarding the merits of publishing a resolution which would be a public document. It was stated that Senate resolutions are a statement of values and using a public platform to share those values. Also, while there may be things the faculty cannot do at this time, developing a document that outlines tenure, what it really means, sharing it with students and community members is something the Faculty Senate can do at this time.

It was decided at this time to ask the AFEM committee to begin drafting the resolution. Per the Parliamentarian there was no need to vote on drafting a resolution. The Executive Committee would review and approve the draft resolution. Once approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the resolution would be reviewed and voted on by the entire Faculty Senate.

IV. **Unfinished Business – None**

V. **New Business - None**

VI. **Adjournment:**
There being no further business, a motion was made by Alex Godet, seconded by Lorenzo Brancaleon and the meeting concluded at 5:01 PM