

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING of February 10, 2011

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2010-2011 academic year was held February 10, 2011, at 3:30 p.m. in the University Room (BB 2.06.04) with Dr. Carola Wenk, Chair of the Faculty Senate, presiding.

I. Call to order and taking of attendance

Present: Diane Abdo, Sos Again, Robert Ambrosino, Yoris Au, Manuel Berriozabal, William Cooke, Renee Cowan, Beth Durodoye, Carol Dyas, Mansour El-Kikhia, MaryEllen Garcia, Robert Hard, Judith Haschenburger, Victor Heller, Amy Jaspersen, Daniel Jimenez, Kim Kline, Zlatko Koinov, Donald Kurtz, Richard Lewis, John McCray, Mary McNaughton-Cassill, Josephine Mendez-Negrete, John Merrifield, Bonnie Lyons (for Annette Portillo), Hazem Rashed-Ali, Libby Rowe, Dan Sass, Miriam Martinez (for Misty Sailors), Hatim Sharif, Ted Skekel, Johnelle Sparks, Patricia Thompson, Raydel Tullous, Alistair Welchman, Carola Wenk, Bennie Wilson

Absent: Mark Bill (excused), Garry Cole, Lars Hansen, Anne Hardgrove (excused), Palani-Rajan Kadapakkam (excused), Melvin Laracey (excused), Alycia Maurer, Jolyn Mikow, J. Mitchell Miller, Darryl Ohlenbusch, Branco Ponomariov, Anand Ramasubmaranian

Guests: John Frederick, Kelly Garza, Cory Hallam, Gerard Dizinno, Barbara Millis, Tom Coyle, Diane Walz, Rebecca Luther, Michael Ryan

Total members present: 37 Total members absent: 12

II. Approval of the December 9, 2010 minutes

The minutes were approved.

III. Reports

A. Chair of the Faculty Senate- Dr. Carola Wenk

Dr. Wenk began by sharing the Faculty Senate website address with the senators and guests. Dr. Wenk discussed recent legislative news about the budget cuts including the concern over proposed cuts of financial aid for students through the Texas Grant Program. She also spoke about THECB's new policy to only approve new doctoral programs for institutions with a six-year baccalaureate graduation rate equal or greater than the average statewide graduation rate.

<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=A2F779CD-A592-21F1-4E5FB54B90F34967>

Dr. Wenk discussed Faculty Senate Bylaw IV.5 which states the following:

“Meetings of the Senate are open to the public. Direct participation from individuals other than Senators or Ex Officio members is limited to the Open Forum.”

She also discussed Faculty Senate Bylaw IV.6 which states:

“The Senate may, by majority vote, determine to go into Executive Session, at which time only voting members of the Faculty Senate are present.”

Dr. Wenk addressed UT System Regents’ Rule 40101, 2.2 which outlines the Faculty Senate’s role in university governance. She explained that, as Faculty Senate Chair, she will report on Faculty Senate actions and is currently looking for previous semesters’ resolutions and actions memos. Dr. Wenk announced that she had eight volunteers for the IRB Committee and asked the senate to approve these individuals to serve on the committee. The request to approve this IRB committee was moved, seconded and unanimously approved. Dr. Wenk announced that the Bachelor of Science in Multidisciplinary Studies and the inclusion of ART 1103 into the Core Curriculum had been approved by the Provost and President. Dr. Wenk stated that the Criminal Background Check Stop-Gap measure was not approved; however, the retroactive CBC’s on faculty have been substantially completed without any problematic results. She stated that the Teaching Evaluations Resolution was approved with modifications. The approved resolution with the modifications states:

“Although the results of the recently adopted online course survey instrument may provide individual faculty with important formative student feedback, the instrument is currently in a testing phase. Until the validity of its results is confirmed, any attempt to use data resulting from it for summative evaluation must be done with prudence. Therefore, pending comparison of the results with previous semesters’ IDEA results, the data generated from the test phase instrument should not be considered as part of the annual performance review for 2010. Evaluation of a faculty member’s overall annual teaching effectiveness should in all other ways comply with his/her department’s established evaluation guidelines”

Dr. Frederick said the Department Chairs Council has produced a resolution to leave the decision to use the fall 2010 online teaching evaluation results for faculty evaluation up to the individual departments. He said he would accept the Chairs’ resolution if the Faculty Senate was amenable to the proposal. He stated decisions would be made by the voting members of the department.

Dr. Wenk said the Teaching Evaluation student comments for this past semester have only been sent to the faculty members and not to the Deans and Department Chairs, but the issue of who should receive the comments is still under discussion for future evaluations. She also addressed the possibility of collecting hand written student comments in the classroom for Teaching Evaluations. She stated that this issue is a matter of student privacy for the reason that if the comments are typed then they are subject to an open records request; however if they are hand written

the comments are considered identifiable and are not subject to an open records request. Dr. Wenk said that the Faculty Senate was asked to work on the policy to address issues brought up by faculty and senators for HOP 2.12, Student Evaluations of Teaching. She stated that a revised version has recently been posted on the web without Faculty Senate input. Dr. Wenk acknowledged Barbara Millis and permitted her to pass out informational handouts about services provided by the Teaching and Learning Center.

B. Secretary of General Faculty- Dr. Amy Jasperson

Dr. Jasperson stated that she had some information from SYS FAC but that there had not been a University Assembly meeting yet to report on. Dr. Jasperson said the UT Board of Regents called a special meeting and decided to dissolve the partnership between UT Brownsville and Southmost College. She said the system has been working on research briefs to educate people about various aspects of higher education that might be misunderstood. She said one of the briefs dealt with graduation rates and developing better metrics to measure student achievement and progress. Dr. Jasperson said Texas has the fourth largest budget shortfall in the nation. She said the legislative committees dealing with higher education in the Texas legislature have been announced. Dr. Jasperson said that budget cuts, as a percentage, at UTSA are less relative to other campuses. She said the filing deadline for bills is March 11, 2011, and the biannual revenue estimate will be received in May. She said SYS FAC has worked on a number of resolutions; one which was recently passed was the Concealed Firearms on Campus Resolution. She said they are working on a larger resolution dealing with Criminal Background Checks, not just the stop-gap measure. She said there were some legal questions and they are currently waiting for some responses from the system to address these questions. Dr. Jasperson said a resolution was passed several years ago on financial exigency to integrate more faculty input into decisions on financial exigency; Sys Fac proposes the same approach for the issue of program closures in Regents Rule 31003.

C. Provost's Report-Dr. Frederick

Dr. Frederick said that new parking structure's construction would begin March 1, 2011. He said that parking will be relocated in other lots and said that full details are available on the Parking Office's website. Dr. Frederick said that the structure will house the Visitor's Center, Communications Office, Alumni Office, two coffee shops, and a logo wear shop. He said he is hearing more about Tuition Revenue Bonds, especially for UTSA, being a campus in need of new buildings. He said the Chancellor is trying to ensure the campuses have the flexibility to determine how they will take the budget reductions. He stated UTSA took the warnings very seriously on budget reductions, and he is hopeful that the state Legislature will take action to correct the budget deficit. Dr. Frederick said UT System is in the process of creating a Faculty Productivity Report, and he believes the faculty will be pleased with the stance the system is taking and said the report essentially states that the faculty work very hard and produce a lot. Dr. Frederick stated that in regards to Teaching Evaluations, he preferred to not use them at all rather than only using the "good" results. He said he is not in favor of using bad data for the evaluations and is still working to determine consistency

with prior IDEA Survey results. He suggested that faculty go back to their departments to discuss other ways to evaluate teaching, and not solely rely upon Student Teaching Evaluations. He addressed the issue that occurred during the past semester with the online Teaching Evaluations with students who had dropped the course being invited to survey the course.

- D. Evaluations, Merit, Rewards, and Workload Committee- Dr. Amy Jasperson
Dr. Jasperson said her committee and Dr. Coyle's committee's area of responsibility overlap on course evaluations. She said her committee wanted to provide feedback and make sure that any issues faculty were having with course evaluations were relayed and communicated. She said that some of the problems were caused by technical glitches and OIT has taken steps to ensure these issues will not happen again. This includes the issue that students who had dropped the course were invited to take the survey. She also mentioned multiple instructor issues and said they are being worked out. Dr. Jasperson said the student response rate was around 30% (varying by college). Dr. Jasperson said the committee is addressing these and other issues that needed attention. Dr. Jasperson directed the Senate to the following link if they had questions about course evaluations.

http://www.utsa.edu/oit/projects/onlineCourseEvals_Fall2010.html

Dr. Jasperson said one of the improvements to this semester in how students are contacted regarding evaluations is that the students will not only get the email invitation but the surveys will be available on ASAP as well.

- E. Committee on Course Surveys- Dr. Tom Coyle
Dr. Coyle gave a brief introduction of himself and his committee and said he wanted to solicit feedback from the faculty senate. He said that HOP 2.12 was updated without their knowledge. He said the committee worked on three issues regarding this policy. He said the first was whether Student Teaching Surveys should be required in the summer and said the committee did not believe they should be required. He said this decision was based on the fact the faculty are generally on a nine month contract. He said the second issue was if a faculty member did teach during the summer, would the faculty member be able to have his/her class surveyed, and the committee believed he/she should be able to be surveyed but the results should not be used in annual merit evaluations. He stated that the third issue involved the possible distribution of student comments to Department Chairs and Deans. He said the committee decided they should not be given to the Department Chairs or Deans but only to faculty members as it has been done historically. Dr. Coyle went over the wording for HOP 2.12, Section A, which was proposed by the committee. See Appendix A.
Additional motions were made to make amendments to the committee's recommended wording:

A motion to amend the wording in HOP 2.12, Section A.9 from "surveys" to "quantitative" was made, seconded and voted in favor of. The new approved statement reads as follows:

“Quantitative results will be retained by the Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness.”

A motion was made, and seconded to amend the wording of HOP 2.12 Section A.2 from:

“Faculty may choose to be evaluated during the summer terms, but the survey results will not be required for performance evaluations.”

to

“Faculty may choose to be evaluated during the summer terms, and results may be used for performance evaluation when requested by a faculty member.”

The motion did not pass. A motion to accept the report with the first approved amendment was made, seconded and passed by majority vote.

F. Committee on Handbook of Operating Procedures –Dr. Robert Hard for Dr. Melvin Laracey

Dr. Hard stated there was a revision on HOP 2.44, about minors in laboratories, but the committee received no comments and moved forward. He said for HOP 6.01, appointments to University Standing Committees, the committee commented that the selection procedures should involve the Faculty Senate whenever possible and keep in mind federal regulations regarding Institutional Review Boards (IRB). Dr Hard addressed HOP 2.20, regarding faculty travel and how funds should be allocated. A motion was made that the current language in HOP 2.20, Section C.3.b remains in the revised version (See Appendix B):

“Only one trip per faculty member in any one Department will be funded until all eligible applicants have been funded.”

The motion was seconded, and passed by a majority vote.

G. Academic Policy and Requirements Committee- Dr. Bennie Wilson

Dr. Wilson said the committee recommended approval of the College of Architecture Admission Policy (See Appendix C). The recommendation of the committee was seconded and approved by a majority vote.

H. University Curriculum Committee- Dr. Raydel Tullous

Dr. Tullous said that at the previous meeting there was not enough information regarding the proposed merge of the Level I and Level II Science areas in the core curriculum. She said she received a report from the Core Curriculum Ad Hoc Subcommittee, which presented two options. She said the committee resolved that the Level I and Level II Science areas should remain as they currently are. This motion was seconded to approve the committee’s report and passed by a majority vote. Dr. Tullous addressed the addition of SOC 2023 to the Core Curriculum in Domain V and said the Department Chairs of Sociology and Biology agreed to

change the name of SOC 2023, Drugs in Society, to SOC 2023, Social Contexts of Drug Use, in order to offer both courses in the Core Curriculum. She said the committee resolves to include SOC 2023 into Domain V of the Core Curriculum. Approval of this report was seconded and passed by a majority vote. Dr. Tullous said there was no change to the report from the December meeting regarding PHI 2043. She said the committee had already voted to not include PHI 2043 into the Core Curriculum in Domain II. The committee's report was seconded and passed by a majority vote to not include PHI 2043 into the Core Curriculum Domain II.

I. Consent Calendar

- Consent was given for the Graduate Certificate in Technology, Entrepreneurship and Management, which had received approval from the Graduate Council.

IV. New Business

- A. Rob Robinson, Assistant Vice Provost & Director of Educational Management
- Dr. Robinson stated that Blackboard 8th Edition, currently used at UTSA, has been deemed end of life by the Blackboard Company. He stated that a learning management system (LMS) is critical at UTSA. He stated that there is no perfect platform; however, decisions need to be made on how the new LMS will be used and what would be the optimal set of specifications for the system. He stated that UTSA has a limited number of options because of its size, some of its technical infrastructure, and the fact that some systems will not operate at the scale UTSA needs it to operate. He stated that the pain of transition encompasses two issues: the first is moving courses to the new LMS and the second is willingness to be trained on the new system. He asked for email input from the senators and other university faculty and asked for interested faculty to email him about serving on a committee to make decision about the next LMS. Dr. Robinson stated that Blackboard's end of life goes into effect in January 2013. He stated that he hopes UTSA can go through the entire process from selection through training by summer of 2012. He stated that Blackboard has a new system, Blackboard 9, and some other universities are moving to this LMS for ease of transition. He said Moodle, an open source product, is also an option.

V. Open Forum

There was no discussion.

VI. Adjournment

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and unanimously passed at 5:38 PM.

Appendix A.

February 4, 2011

Dear Carola,

I chair the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Surveys. Our committee will brief the senate during its meeting on Thursday, February 10.

Our report will focus on our review of HOP 2.12, Student Evaluations of Instruction. The current version of the policy, posted January 13, 2011, is at:

<http://utsa.edu/hop/chapter2/2-12.html>

Section A of the policy describes procedures relating to the surveys.

Below is Section A of the policy as amended by my committee. Notes are in brackets.

- A. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness will organize and oversee administration of the student evaluations of teaching
 1. The survey will be administered during the fall and spring semesters. [The HOP currently states, "The survey will be administered each semester."]
 2. Faculty may choose to be evaluated during the summer terms, but the survey results will not be required for performance evaluations. [This is a new item.]
 3. The Faculty Senate has oversight over any modifications to the survey format or process.
 4. Only organized classes with five or more students will be surveyed. [Minor change.]
 5. Evaluations will be conducted after two-thirds of the semester has been completed. [Minor change.]
 6. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness will administer the survey, in accordance with University policy.
 7. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness will provide summaries of the survey results to each faculty member whose classes are surveyed.
 8. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness will provide summaries of the quantitative results to each Department Chair for the faculty in the department, for use by the Chair, the Dean, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and appropriate faculty advisory committees. Student comments will be released to the instructor only. [The last sentence relating to student comments is not in the current policy.]
 9. Survey results will be retained by the Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness.

The current text of Section A is appended to the bottom of this report.

Our committee wrestled with three issues:

(1) The first was whether surveys should be required during summer terms (in addition to fall and spring semesters). The committee decided that surveys should not be required during summer terms (see above, (A)(1)(2)). The logic was that faculty have 9-month appointments

during fall and spring and that surveys should be required for this period only. Prior versions of the HOP have required surveys during fall and spring only.

(2) Another issue was whether faculty who teach during the summer could choose to have surveys administered during summer terms. The committee decided that faculty who teach during the summer could choose to have surveys administered in the summer—but that the results should not be used for performance evaluations (see (A)(2)). Its reasoning was that feedback from the summer could be used to improve teaching but, since faculty are appointed during fall and spring, only fall and spring results should be used for performance evaluations.

(3) A final issue was whether student comments should be released to chairs and deans. The committee decided that student comments should not be released to chairs and deans but be released to instructors only (see (A)(8)). This decision was based in part on faculty concerns about the privileged nature of student comments and how “outlier” comments might influence evaluations. The decision is also consistent with past practice.

Our report next week will focus on the three issues described above. Thanks for all your hard work on behalf of the senate and the faculty.

Best,
Tom

Thomas Coyle, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology

Appendix

Section A, HOP 2.12, as Currently Posted in the HOP

A. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness will organize and oversee administration of the student evaluations of teaching

1. The survey will be administered each semester.
2. The Faculty Senate has oversight over any modifications to the survey format or process.
3. All organized classes with five or more students will be surveyed.
4. Evaluations will not be conducted before two-thirds of the semester has been completed.
5. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness will administer the survey, in accordance with University policy
6. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness will provide summaries of the survey results to each faculty member whose classes are surveyed.
7. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness will provide summaries of the survey results to each Department Chair for the faculty in the department, for use by the Chair, the Dean, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and appropriate faculty advisory committees.
8. Survey results will be retained by the Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness.

Appendix B.

2.20. This proposal, regarding allocations for academic travel by faculty, was circulated to the Faculty Senate for comment on January 6. Comments are due by February 14.

Current HOP 2.20 seems to not reflect current college and department practice, because it provides for the appointment of “College Academic Research Committees.” The current provision then provides that these committees make decisions on “travel applications from faculty members of the College on the basis of the quality and potential importance of the papers.” Current 2.20 also provides, in section 3(b), that “only one trip per year per faculty member in any one Division will be funded until all eligible applications have been funded.”

Proposed 2.20 provides that the “college dean and/or department chair . . . allocates funds to faculty based on policy.” It then provides as follows:

A. Academic Travel Purpose

1. The academic travel policy of each college shall support the mission and vision of UTSA.
2. Academic travel approval and funding shall be evaluated based on the alignment of the travel request with University mission, vision and policy, and College policy. Consideration will include:
 - a. The quality and importance of the original research to be presented,
 - b. The quality of the venue in which the research to be presented, and
 - c. The purpose for the requestor’s attendance (if not presenting a paper).
3. The academic travel policy, and travel approval and funding provided, if delegated to the department, shall align with the university mission and vision.

Some comments have been received from faculty regarding these proposed changes. The common objection is that the new language would permit departments to move away from current practice of funding one conference trip for each faculty member, to a competitive, potentially less equal system where travel proposals would be weighed in terms of perceived significance to the “University’s reputation, mission, and vision.” The concern is that this will “make the process far more political and arbitrary,” as one commenter put it.

Appendix C.

Report of the Academic Policy & Requirements Committee regarding the proposed COA admission policy.

At the Feb. 10 meeting, I intend to make the following motion on behalf of the Committee:

“The Committee moves for approval of the COA proposal to holistically manage candidate entry to architecture programs, and recommends highly that the college considers publishing for potential candidates indications of the levels of qualifications, e.g., GPA, SAT/ACT, high school ranking, etc., that enhance chances for selection to these programs.”

Bennie
Chair, AP&R Committee