

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Of October 12, 2023**

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2023-2024 academic year was held October 12, 2023 at 3:30 p.m. 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, Alex Godet, Chris Packham, Mike Baumann, Sonya Aleman, Mary Dixson, Ginny Garcia-Alexander, Andrew Lloyd, George Perry, Valerie Sponsel, Victor Villarreal, Hector Aguilar, Edwin Barea-Rodriguez, Mark Bayer, Xun Chen, Sidury Christiansen, Neil Debbage, Victor DeOliveira, Glenn Dietrich, Jimi Francis, Kimberly Garza, Dmitry Gokhman, Zaid Haddad, Marcus Hamilton, Jie Huang, Michael Karcher, Kim Kline, Huy Le, Jusung Lee, Dennis Lopez, Justin Marmolejo, Alex Mejia, Valeria Meiller, John Quarles, Rica Ramirez, Humberto Saenz, Stephen Saville, Maho Sonmez, Marie Tillyer, Jelena Todić, Zijun Wang and David Weber

Absent: John Alexander, August (Gus) Allo, David Beheshti, Cristian Botez (excused), Curtis Brewer (excused) Kirsten Gardner (excused), Ashwin Malshe, Harry Millwater (excused), Branco Ponomariov, Jeff Prevost, Lauren Riojas-Fitzpatrick (excused), Devon Romero, and Kirk Schanze

Guests: Heather Shipley, Lisa Campos, LT Robinson, Carlos Martinez, Brian Evans, Karma Chavez, Lisa Jasinski, Nathern Okilwa (for Curtis Brewer), Ximena Barbagelatta Grau, Angela Griffith, Yvette Milo and Debbie Howard Rappaport

Total members present: 42 Total members absent: 13 Substitutes present: 1

II. Consent Agenda

- Approval of Minutes – September 7, 2023 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Minutes of the Faculty Senate were approved.

Dr. Zenteno welcomed all of the guests attending today's meeting. He introduced Lisa Campos, Vice President for Intercollegiate Athletics and LT Robinson, Sr. Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students who led a brief discussion and Q&A session on the [Everyone Wins](#) campaign which provides detailed information on the proposed increase to the athletics fee students will be voting on later this month (October 25th and 26th).

III. Reports

A. Intercollegiate Athletics Q&A Session – Lisa Campos, Vice President for Intercollegiate Athletics and LT Robinson, Senior Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students (*PowerPoint presentation uploaded to Faculty Senate SharePoint site and [website](#)*)

- Ms. Robinson thanked the Faculty Senate for the invitation and to speak briefly about the proposed athletics fee. She stated the partnership between student affairs and athletics has been beneficial for the entire university as they have found through their work with students that a strong connection to the university provides a sense of belonging for the students and that connection translates into a persistence in college. In addition, prospective students are becoming more aware of UTSA through the national recognition athletics provides and that greatly benefits the entire university.
- Dr. Campos reiterated her thanks to the Faculty Senate for providing time to answer any questions regarding athletics and the proposed fee increase. She stated the process began last spring with visits to various leadership and student organizational groups to gather information on what athletics was doing well and what areas needed improvement and that was where the fee originated. Athletics also received feedback on the \$1.50 per credit hour increase (capped at 12 hours per semester) and many believed this was the correct amount to ask for from the students.

Dr. Campos stated they have visited with student organizations and classes to ensure students are well-informed regarding the proposed fee increase prior to the October 25-26 vote. She further stated building the brand identity utilizing athletics and the national exposure it brings to an institution can assist in recruiting the best faculty, students and staff. As an example, she indicated that UTSA had a 5.5 billion audience last year through newspaper articles, nationally televised athletics games, etc. which translates into over \$200 million in ad equivalency. This adds value to degrees and experiences of students and alumni.

In addition, athletics is engaged in the Classroom to Career initiative as well. The department has 165 students employed and about 100 students who are volunteering. The students are conducting research in nutrition and kinesiology. Furthermore, athletics has students majoring in a wide-range of subjects, including data science. Athletics also wants to utilize proceeds from the fee increase to invest in the Spirit of San Antonio band (SOSA) as they are a part of the game-day experience. Other student benefits that will come from the proposed fee increase can be found in the Student Benefits portion of the PowerPoint.

Dr. Campos stated that the proposed fee increase is a \$1.50 per credit hour increase (capped at 12 SCH). If you are a senior, graduating in Spring 2024, it is a \$18.00 investment. If you are a freshman, the proposed fee would increase the cost over eight semesters to approximately \$300 from the current \$240. However, Dr. Campos believes the ROI will be 100 fold.

Q&A Session with Dr. Campos and LT Robinson

Question – Can you explain the math for the proposed fee increase? Is it based on 15 SCH?

Answer – Dr. Campos stated that the proposed fee increase is capped at 12 SCH. Currently, students are paying \$20 per credit hour for the athletics fee, which is capped at 12 SCH or \$240 per year. If approved, students would pay \$258 the first year. The fee would go up incrementally by \$1.50 over five years to reach \$27.50 per credit hour (capped at 12 SCH) by 2027-2028 (there is a slide in the PowerPoint with the proposed athletics fee).

Question – Is there an additional fee for football?

Answer – Dr. Campos stated there is no additional fee for football. Students receive free access to all sporting events at UTSA.

Question – Is there any data you can share about these conversations that have taken place with the students? How has this data been collected to follow this particular course of action?

Answer – Dr. Campos stated they conducted focus groups, met with the Student Government Association (SGA), President's Student Advisory Council (PSAC), Rowdy Crew and other student organizations and gathered written information from those conversations. Some of the information was related to the proposed fee. The other student organizations they met with was related to questions surrounding what athletics was doing well and what could be improved.

Question – You mentioned students indicated they want more give-away's and more fun. Do you have data to indicate this is backed by a consensus from students and not from a "perceived" need?

Answer – Dr. Campos mention this information was gathered from the groups and organizations they met with last spring. For example, the Greek organizations wanted to know how the university could make tailgates more entertaining. VOICES, which is a community service organization, wanted to know how to incorporate more community service events with athletic events, etc. Dr. Campos stated her office will be happy to share their written notes with the Faculty Senate.

Question – Can you elaborate on your comment regarding the \$300 investment throughout a student's undergraduate career and the 100-fold return?

Answer – Dr. Campos stated that is referring to the 5.5 billion audience that athletics is getting exposure to coupled with the brand identity recognition which adds to the return on investment. Those two items are part of the intangible investment, along with adding value to the student's degree. The tangible part is seeing increased enrollments through the national recognition and visibility. Dr. Campos provided another example with UT-RGV students voting on a fee to add football to their athletics program. She does not believe it is a coincidence that UT-RGV is looking at what UTSA has accomplished and how the university has changed since adding football to our set of athletic programs. UTSA has seen an increase in alumni engagement and an increase in donor engagement since adding football to our programs.

Question – How was it determined that an increase in student fees was the best way to address the financial needs for this project? Have all other options been taken in to account and considered?

Answer – Dr. Campos stated athletics receives funding from ticket sales and donors/fundraising and they will continue to work towards increasing those areas. She explained that before adding football, the athletic fee that began in 2004 accounted for 60% of the operating budget. The athletics fee was increased in 2011, but has not been increased since then and now only accounts for 35% of the operating budget. Dr. Campos stated that through sponsorships, donations, and media rights they have been able to manage the budget, but like all other FBS schools, Group of 5 conferences, it is not uncommon to have student fees as part of the operating budget.

Question – Is there any action, or ask, you are requesting from the Faculty Senate?

Answer – Ms. Robinson stated that the purpose of the visit to the Faculty Senate is informational, but our aim is also to clarify any myths that may be out there.

B. Academic Affairs Update – Heather Shipley, Interim Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (*PowerPoint presentation uploaded to Faculty Senate SharePoint site and [website](#)*)

Dr. Shipley announced UTSA was recertified by *Excelencia* in Education with the Seal of *Excelencia*. The certification is completed every three years and it recognizes UTSA's commitment and ability to accelerate Latino student success which was announced at the end of September. UTSA joins a group of nine institutions that were recertified and earned the Seal. In addition to the Seal, the Graduate School's *Keep Running With Us* program was named a 2023 Examples of *Excelencia* finalist.

Dr. Shipley provided an update on the market retention and compression adjustments program. This is a project that the colleges engage in each year with existing or extra funding they have to address market and salary compression for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Some colleges are able to address market and salary compression for their FTT faculty. Details regarding the project are included in the presentation.

Dr. Shipley wanted to share the data with the Faculty Senate to demonstrate the effect of market retention and compression. Also, she is aware faculty compensation is one of the Faculty Senate's priorities and is cognizant of the memo that was sent at the end of last academic year recommending changes to the promotion and tenure increments. Dr. Shipley also mentioned the ad hoc committee convened by previous Provost Espy which included deans, department chairs and representatives from the Faculty Senate to review promotion and tenure, CPE, department chair and FTT's compensation. She is currently reviewing the data and will report back to the Faculty Senate once she has had ample time to digest the information.

Dr. Shipley provided information regarding the university's National Impact Travel Award program for faculty and staff which is open to T/TT, FTT faculty and college or academic support division staff. The main change to this program is that FTT will be fully reimbursed. There is no requirement for matching funds by the college or support unit.

The [Academic Affairs](#) website contains more information regarding the travel award program.

Dr. Shipley provided an update on SB 17 and reminded the Faculty Senate to refer to the email that was sent out to the UTSA community on August 28, 2023 acknowledging this is a challenging matter. She further stated the university is adhering to our core values as we navigate the process while obtaining guidance from UT System.

Dr. Shipley reviewed the Implementation Timeline which can be found on her slides. She stated we are approaching the October 18th date where the PAIR team shares their preliminary recommendations to the Executive Leadership Review Committee. That group will consult with the Advisory Group who will submit recommendations to the President. He will review, make determinations and action plans, if needed, all by the due date of January 1, 2024 so that the university can be compliant with the new law. Dr. Shipley stated this all began with the campus-wide stakeholder working group who collected, screened and submitted programs, activities and initiatives that are subject to SB17 and to look at the next steps in this process. Dr. Shipley mentioned that the team has just received the information. At this time, she is unable to inform anyone of changes that may or may not take place at this time.

- Will UTSA's status as an HSI change due to SB 17? No—Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) are defined in federal law (the Higher Education Opportunity Act, Title V, 2008). As SB 17 is a state law, it does not impact UTSA's HSI designation.

Dr. Shipley discussed how the university will be engaging students in understanding SB 17. LT Robinson, Sr. Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, and her team will pattern the topic similar to the PAIR process to review with students. The messaging and communication to students will center around the following:

- Roadshow/Information Sessions to SGA and other Sponsored Student Organizations and Registered Student Organizations;
- Community gatherings/townhalls;
- Discussions with the *Paisano* editorial team;
- Outreach through strategic social media; and
- Meetings with Staff Senate & Student Affairs Leadership team to share/train on talking points.

Dr. Shipley shared the following website with the Faculty Senate which includes an FAQ guidance from UT System:

[SB 17 website](#)

Additional questions should be directed to the PAIR team at PAIRTeam@utsa.edu

Dr. Shipley provided an update on SB 18. She reminded the Faculty Senate of the UT System Regents' Rules that were updated: 31002, 31007, 31008 and 31102. In addition, Dr. Shipley mentioned the university would be forming a committee to review HOP changes or clarifications based on SB 18. The committee will be composed of 3 senators, 2 chairs, one dean, AVP Kelly Nash and staffed by Katie Meersman in Academic Affairs. Dr. Shipley also reviewed the Charge to the Committee, which has been expanded, based on the faculty rights and responsibilities, to include that faculty members are free within

their respective field of studies to pursue teaching and research. The committee will review the changes to the Regents' Rule, how that affects our HOP policies, but to also look at how that affects faculty members abilities to pursue teaching, research and scholarship in their respective field of study. The committee will provide recommendations to revisions of UTSA's existing policies and procedures and also propose/create new policies and practices to clarify and codify the pursuit of knowledge and how best to communicate these changes to the faculty.

Dr. Shipley announced the Save the Date for the Season of Thanks reception for all Academic Affairs faculty and staff which will be held on Monday, November 6, 2023 from 11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in the H-E-B Student Union Ballroom on the Main Campus.

Q&A Session with Dr. Shipley

Question – Where can we access the report or data related to the Market Retention Compression Adjustment analyses? Is it possible to obtain a copy of the “dashboard analysis of the R1 and R2 salary medians by CIP code”?

Answer – Unfortunately, we cannot provide specific information related to the market retention compression adjustment analysis as that information would contain personal information. However, you can reach out to your specific Dean and ask questions on how they conducted the process. You can also check IPEDS or CUPA for the R1 and R2 salary medians by CIP code.

Question – Can you provide clarification regarding some of the language in SB 17 & SB 18 with regard to faculty teaching certain subjects, public speaking or their research?

Answer – Dr. Shipley mentioned those items will be covered in this process and that UTSA leadership is awaiting guidance from UT System. Dr. Shipley mentioned there is a section in SB 18 that referred to dismissal of faculty which was very broad. Through this committee, we can better define our processes.

Question – Has a definition of “moral turpitude” been provided or will it be provided to faculty?

Answer – The goal of this process is to provide a better understanding of SB 18 and UTSA leadership is awaiting guidance from UT System. However, moral turpitude does have a legal definition and there are set things that go with that, but we are waiting to hear from UT System.

Question – I appreciate steps UTSA is taking to educate students about SB 17. Are there similar support systems being put into place for faculty who are feeling concerned about teaching or speaking about research related to DEI?

Answer – Academic Affairs will be getting back to you on helping faculty. Academic Affairs is working with Faculty Success to develop those materials.

C. American Association of University Professors Update – Dr. Brian Evans, Interim President, Texas Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and Dr. Karma Chavez, UT Austin AAUP Chapter Officer and UT Austin Provost SB 17 Implementation Committee member; Mr. Antonio Ingram, Assistant Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund & Civil Rights Lawyer was also invited, but was unable to attend

Dr. Zenteno thanked Dr. Evans, who has attended our Faculty Senate meeting before, and Dr. Chavez for attending the Faculty Senate meeting to discuss SB 17 and SB 18. Dr. Zenteno also welcomed Mr. Carlos Martinez, Chief of Staff to President Eighmy at UTSA, who has been engaged with the Faculty Senate from the beginning regarding these two legislative bills.

Dr. Evans introduced himself and stated he is speaking for himself as a private citizen and as a representative of the Texas AAUP. He also mentioned he is a faculty member at the University of Texas at Austin.

Dr. Evans reviewed the history of AAUP, having been founded in 1915 to develop principles of academic freedom, tenure and shared governance. In 1940 and 1966, AAUP worked with presidents and governing boards to develop the Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom & Tenure. UTSA is a member of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, which co-authored principles on academic freedom and tenure. UTSA is also part of the American Council on Education. Dr. Evans stated that tenure is a major protection for academic freedom. He stated that shared governance includes shared decision-making and due process which also helps protect academic freedom.

Dr. Evans discussed Senate 18 which includes three parts:

- Defines tenure as continuous employment;
- Defines 10 reasons to dismiss a tenured faculty member through regular policy and procedures; and
- Defines summary or immediate dismissal of a faculty member

Dr. Evans mentioned that within the 10 reasons to dismiss a tenured faculty member, many are vague. However, the bill allows for institutions to develop their own policies for regular dismissal. Also, new in the bill is post-tenure review which can lead to dismissal of a tenured faculty member. Dr. Evans stated it will be important for university committees who are developing institutional policies to review the reasons for dismissal and provide clarity/definitions within the vagueness of the legislation. Many are a list of violations that do not address intent, severity or frequency of the violation.

Dr. Evans discussed the third part – summary of dismissal of a faculty member. He stated it was optional, but SB 18 provides minimal set of protections. In addition, the process for the dismissal seems to be the faculty member receives a letter from an administrator, meets with the administrator, the faculty member is dismissed and then the faculty member can file a grievance. Dr. Evans recommended defining intent, severity and frequency for any policy relating to dismissal whether it is through regular policy or summary or immediate dismissal of a faculty member to ensure due process.

Dr. Evans mentioned that Texas Tech has a very good model policy on how to implement SB 18 ([Texas Tech Faculty Senate Model Policy](#))

Side note: Dr. Evans presented without slides. However, he provided a link to a recent Texas AAUP presentation concerning SB 18:

<https://aauputaustin.files.wordpress.com/2023/09/new-texas-tenure-law-1.pptx>

Dr. Karma Chavez introduced herself and noted that she is speaking for herself as a private citizen. She stated the NAACP Legal Defense Fund was integral in partnering with AAUP organization throughout the state during the legislative session and was disappointed that Mr. Ingram's flight was delayed and unable to attend today's meeting.

Dr. Chavez commented regarding SB 17. She did not review the law as it seemed that everyone was familiar with the legislation. Dr. Chavez wanted to focus on how it relates to UTSA.

Dr. Chavez reviewed the demographics currently at UTSA (broad brushstrokes) She admitted she was leaving several groups out of her data points:

- 47% - faculty are White
- 21% - faculty are Hispanic
- 58% - faculty are men

Tenured faculty:

- 54% - faculty are White
- 15% - faculty are Hispanic
- 68% - faculty are men

Tenured-Track faculty:

- 33% - faculty are White
- 26% - faculty are Hispanic
- 53% - faculty are men

Dr. Chavez noted that more than one-half of our faculty are not on a tenure-track status. UTSA's student body is about 60% Hispanic and 20% White.

Dr. Chavez included this information to point out that, based on the data, UTSA's faculty are hired due to their excellent qualifications, but an expansive body of research in education and organizational development suggest there are biases which may be prevalent in the hiring process. She stated the two most noteworthy are: 1) affinity bias, which is a tendency to prefer individuals who are similar to or appear to share professional qualities, motivations, backgrounds and experiences with our own; and 2) similarity bias, which refers to a strong preference to individuals who exhibit a cultural, social or experiential background that are similar to ourselves.

Dr. Chavez indicated that UTSA's hiring practices of our tenure-track faculty by race and gender more closely resemble our student body, which is a goal something to strive for; however, the limitations of SB 17 are going to make that goal more difficult with its insistence on color-blindness and gender neutrality hiring. Dr. Chavez mentioned that in the guidance from UT System, and in the law, there is the use of the words "preferential" and "special." A "special" benefit refers to the term condition opportunity or privilege that is unavailable or substantially better than what is available or provided to others. It furthers states that opportunities open to all do not become a special benefit. A "preferential" consideration refers to treating someone more favorably than others, which is a straightforward definition, but it is embedded throughout the guidance.

As SB 17 is implemented, Dr. Chavez believes that institutions should consider how to go about challenging the meaning of these two terms in light of the factual demographics at each institution, especially when faculty will be serving on hiring committees.

Q&A Session with Dr. Brian Evans and Dr. Karma Chavez

Question – Can someone please explain the process for adopting the law into our HOP policies?

Answer – Carlos Martinez, UTSA Chief of Staff, confirmed that The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will submit the law into the Texas Administrative Code which then is sent out for review and comments for a period of time. Once that is adopted that will serve as the guidance we will receive from UT System as they will amend the Regents' Rules which are sent out to the institutions who then adopt changes to their own HOP policies and procedures. Mr. Martinez reminded the Faculty Senate the university has a process for amending or creating HOP policies.

Dr. Evans suggested reviewing the Texas Tech policy if UTSA plans to add the summary dismissal policy as they have developed wording for that part of the policy.

Question – Where can we find training we can use to educate ourselves to recognize and call out the biases you referred to earlier?

Answer – Dr. Chavez stated that unfortunately we are unable to contract out to conduct training as of January 1st. However, she has been reading literature on the types of biases to become educated. LinkedIn may have training, which is still legal to use.

Question – Have the other UT System institutions been receptive to clarifying the terms “intent, severity and frequency”?

Answer – Dr. Evans is not aware what other UT System institutions may be doing at this time. Also, although he is not currently serving on UT Austin's Faculty Senate, he has raised the issue with his own Senate as a private individual. He is aware policies are being developed at UT Austin and will be happy to get back to us as they are being developed.

Question – With regard to AAUP, one of the member benefits is liability insurance, can you elaborate on that for us?

Answer – Dr Evans stated he purchased liability insurance years ago for general concern. AAUP membership has an option for liability insurance. Texas Faculty Association or Texas Associate of College Teachers has professional liability insurance built into their memberships. If you join AAUP you will need to purchase professional liability insurance separately. <https://www.aaup.org/membership/join>

Question – As a member of the SB 18 committee representing the Faculty Senate, I am most concerned about the summary dismissal process and the autonomy of each institution to decide if they will codify a summary dismissal into their HOP. How much freedom does each institution actually have to make that decision, as the law seems to imply? What might be the best resource to clarify this?

Answer – Dr. Packham mentioned that he will provide clarification during his Secretary of General Faculty Report as this point came up during the FAC meeting. He stated there is a sense at UT System that there should be consistency in the broad framework in how to manage SB 17 and SB 18 but the details of how it is implemented should be left to each campus.

Dr. Zenteno mentioned that there is some ambiguity with the law, but UTSA may have some degrees of freedom to establish and adopt policies and procedures within our own HOP. However, we may need to wait on UT System for guidance.

Dr. Evans provided the following emails should anyone have any questions:
aaup.texas@gmail.com; karmachavez@gmail.com; and aingram@naacpldf.org

He also provided the following links:

AAUP [Statement on Collegiality](#)

AAUP [Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#)

D. Secretary of the General Faculty – Dr. Chris Packham

Dr. Packham updated the Faculty Senate on the UT System FAC meeting he and Dr. Zenteno attended on October 5-6, 2023 in Austin, Texas. He provided background information regarding UT SysFAC and their purpose. Dr. Packham's slides can be found on the Faculty Senate's SharePoint site. The documents embedded in his slides have also been uploaded to the FS SharePoint site.

One of the documents is regarding shared governance which was written in 2016. This may be useful as campuses begin discussions surrounding summary dismissal about professionalism and collegiality which is one of the catch-terms in SB 18.

Dr. Packham also included the Summary of Legislation Impacting Higher Education from the 88th Legislature- Regular Session and asked the Faculty Senate to review.

Dr. Packham reviewed the process of changes as several need "rule making"

- Rulemaking is initiated by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, likely to occur in January, 2024;
- THECB sends out to Governing Boards; UT System will discuss with each campus and comment on the Rules;
- Rules are implemented into the Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Regents' Rules are updated; then finally UTSA HOP policies will need to be updated.

Dr. Packham stated that THECB and UT System are in conversations; however, noted that this a difficult period of time while we wait to receive the rules from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

[UT System BOR Adopted Changes for Tenure](#) – August 23-24, 2023 Board of Regents' Meeting

Dr. Packham provided guidance for SB 17 and a draft model for SB18 and asked those who are serving on those committees to please review these documents which are on the Faculty Senate SharePoint site.

Dr. Packham also stated that UT SysFAC voted on a Professionalism and Collegiality statement. Since this is one of the clauses of SB 18, Dr. Packham wanted to provide the statement. The one in his presentation is the draft version while the final version is being coded.

Dr. Packham serves on the Executive Committee as the founder and Chair of the Research Committee at SysFAC. The SysFAC Research Committee met with the new Associate Vice Chancellor for Research who plans to connect the UT System Schools to conduct research symposia. In addition, there are general talks on how to improve post-doc and graduate student support and developing a request for a UTS-bloc for publication charges.

Finally, Dr. Packham promoted the eclipse which will be occurring this weekend in San Antonio. If anyone needs glasses, you may stop by AET 3.328!

E. Chair's Report – Dr. René Zenteno (*PowerPoint presentation uploaded to Faculty Senate SharePoint Site and [website](#)*)

Dr. Zenteno reminded the Faculty Senate that the Executive Committee is working on updating the By-Laws and hopes to have a draft version by the end of the month. The goal is to have a final version by January for the Faculty Senate to vote on. Dr. Zenteno stated that the changes are relatively minor, with one change of removing the office of the Secretary of the General Faculty. Those responsibilities would now move to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Zenteno mentioned that he, Dr. Packham, Dr. Perry, current chair of the Research Committee, and Dr. Godet, former chair of the Research Committee and current Vice Chair, met with Dr. JoAnn Browning, Interim VPREDKE. It was a productive meeting and Dr. Browning is checking her schedule to see when she can attend a future Faculty Senate meeting to address some of the priorities the Senate has concerning research.

F. Committee Reports

Budget Committee – Mary Dixon

Dr. Dixon, Dr. Zenteno and the Budget Committee met with Sheri Hardison, the Senior Associate Vice President for Financial Affairs and CFO, to review the Faculty Senate priorities. They shared the faculty compensation memo Dr. Shipley mentioned earlier in the meeting. They also discussed the need for administrative research support, including travel within the departments. There was discussion about the BSC models and the effects it has had – good and bad since being implemented. There was a brief conversation regarding administrative costs, how they have increased over the years, justification to those costs and how they are benchmarked. Finally, there was a general conversation regarding faculty salaries, including FTT salaries, market retention and compression so that we can ensure departments can recruit faculty to UTSA as their place of choice. Dr. Dixon mentioned she will be serving on the IRM Committee so she will have a better understanding regarding that model, how monies are allocated, and how faculty voices are heard within the departments/colleges.

University Curriculum Committee – no report

Graduate Council Chair – no report

HOP Committee – no report

Research Committee – no report

Academic Freedom, Evaluation and Merit Committee – no report

IV. **Unfinished Business – None**

V. **New Business – None**

VI. **Adjournment:**

There being no further business, a motion was made by Dr. Mike Baumann and seconded by Dr. Mary Dixson; the meeting concluded at 5:00 PM.