

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

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

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2011-2012 academic year was held November 10, 2011, at 3:30 p.m. in the Travis Room (UC 2.202) with Dr. Carola Wenk, Chair of the Faculty Senate, presiding.

I. Call to order and taking of attendance

Present: Diane Abdo, Sos Agaian, Manuel Berriozabal, Carol Dyas, Donovan Fogt, Robert Hard, Anne Hardgrove, Judith Haschenburger, Mary Kay Houston-Vega, Amy Jasperson, Daniel Jimenez, Drew Johnson, Palani-Rajan Kadapakkam, Donald Kurtz, Juliet Langman, Richard Lewis, Alycia Maurer, John McCray, Emilio Mendoza, John Merrifield, Byongook Moon, Anand Ramasubramanian, Hazem Rashed-Ali, Libby Rowe, Dan Sass, Rebekah Smith, Patricia Thompson, Alistair Welchman, Carola Wenk, Walter Wilson

Absent: Robert Ambrosino (excused), Rajesh Bhargave (excused), Kim Bilica (excused), Frank Chen (excused), Garry Cole, Renee Cowan, Glenn Dietrich, Matthew Dunne, Beth Durodoye (excused), Mansour El-Kikhia, Francisco Marcos-Marin (excused), Marcelo Marucho (excused), Joycelyn Moody, Elizabeth Murakami-Ramalho, Branco Ponomariov, Misty Sailors, Juana Salazar, Ted Skekel, Johnelle Sparks (excused), Raydel Tullous (excused), Bennie Wilson (excused)

Guests: Jim Dykes, John Frederick, Sarah Leach, George Norton

Total members present: 30

Total members absent: 21

II. Approval of the October 13, 2011 minutes

The minutes were approved.

III. Reports

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

Dr. Wenk gave a summary of Faculty Senate actions within the last year that she has also shared with the Chair's Council. For the last academic year, the Faculty Senate revised their bylaws, formalized their expectations of duties for senators, posted more information to the web, handled online course evaluations, and reviewed 25 HOP revisions. She said that only three HOP revisions were not

approved by the Faculty Senate (2.12, 10.02, 10.06) but did receive approval from the administration. Dr. Wenk also noted the academic policies and programs that were brought to the Faculty Senate for review and approval. Dr. Wenk pointed out that current course evaluations will begin Monday, November 14.

She said that the Faculty Senate executive committee reviewed the system for the evaluation of administrators due to confidentiality concerns that were brought to the committee. She said that the MyTraining system allows supervisors to see whether or not the survey has been completed by their faculty, and that the answers are stored with the faculty member's online ID until the data is aggregated into a summary. She also noted that the questions asked on the surveys have been endorsed as a best practice by the University Leadership Council of the Education Advisory Board, a national group that works to advise university administrators. Currently, the data is not aggregated by faculty. Instead, it is categorized by male, female, chair, non-chair, and council member. Therefore, faculty falls in the non-chair category. The executive committee does not believe that this grouping system provides a true picture of feedback from faculty. For example, Dr. Wenk noted that in one case out of 429 eligible non-chair surveyors, only 136 of them were tenure-track faculty members. In order to improve the collection of data to better represent faculty interests, the executive committee recommends two resolutions. A comment was made about the security of the data and although an independent group stores the information, there are still lingering concerns about the confidentiality of the information. Another comment was made about changing the wording in the resolutions from "fully confidential" to "fully anonymous", and this wording change was incorporated. The final amended wording of the resolutions is as follows:

1. The Faculty Senate welcomes an evaluation system for administrators that solicits broad faculty input. The Faculty Senate believes that the MyTraining system needs improvement in providing anonymity for the respondents and in aggregating data by faculty. The Faculty Senate recommends that the evaluation system for administrators should be fully anonymous (which includes that the ID of respondents should never be stored nor made available to anyone at any time), and that the data are aggregated by TT and NTT faculty as separate categories.

2. The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost report to the Faculty Senate in December about (i) how the anonymity and aggregation affected the deans' evaluations this semester (including faculty response rate and aggregation method) and about (ii) how he plans to address the anonymity concern and aggregation in future evaluations. The Faculty Senate will re-examine this issue and the need for an independent survey in January following the Provost's report.

A motion was made and seconded to approve and move forward both resolutions. The motion was approved by majority vote conducted by secret ballot.

Dr. Wenk mentioned that the faculty gathering area on the 4th floor of the JPL is underway and that the Faculty Senate and the Retired Faculty Association have been asked to provide input on the new faculty club in about a week. She also mentioned that there was a misconception regarding not having faculty development leave next year, and that the Office of Legal Affairs is currently processing revisions to the according HOP policy.

Dr. Wenk said that a key take-away from her Chair Council presentation was to have better communication between the groups. Going forward, each group agreed to have a representative attend the other group's meeting and give a short report about what is happening. There was agreement from senators that Dr. Wenk ask Raydel Tullous to serve as the Faculty Senate's representative. Dr. Wenk mentioned that the University HOP Committee is currently working on restructuring the HOP chapters, and that more information on the changes can be found in the chair's report folder on Rowdyspace. Lastly, she said that there was a miscommunication in approval of the Regents Rule 90000 series on intellectual property. Dr. Wenk explained that the proposal was accidentally routed to the Research Advisory Committee where it was approved, although according to Regents Rules it should have been approved by the Faculty Senate. There are concerns from faculty regarding the new section specifying that the Board of Regents will retain the right to use teaching materials for 1 year after a faculty member has left the university. The main concern is the possibility of this information being exploited, in particular for non-tenure track faculty members. This matter has been brought to the UT system for consideration.

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

http://www.utsa.edu/Senate/fsminutes/2011-2012/11-10-2011/FS_chairReport_11-10-11.pdf

[Due to time constraints the report of the Secretary of the General Faculty was moved towards the end of the meeting]

B. Provost's Report – Dr. John Frederick

Dr. Frederick addressed the Faculty Senate regarding evaluations of administrators. He encouraged anyone with questions to ask him and reiterated that the evaluations are completely anonymous and will remain anonymous. He expressed his desire to keep the process fair and equitable. He also addressed a question regarding a faculty member's ability to answer questions about a Dean that the faculty member may not know very well. He said that there is a description provided from the Dean summarizing their accomplishments and changes they have implemented that will allow their faculty members to judge their effectiveness. An "N/A" evaluation category has also been recently added. Dr. Frederick noted that response rates for the evaluations have been greater than 50% on most evaluations and he appreciates the faculty participation.

Dr. Frederick said that the annual evaluation process has been worked on for the past 6 months and he is still looking for input. A white paper has been sent out and he anticipates a meeting early in the year. At that point, he said work will begin on re-fashioning HOP 2.11 to reshape and improve the annual evaluation process. He noted that spring of 2013 would be the earliest use of the new process.

An additional topic he discussed was the graduation rate improvement plan, which must be submitted before the university can request any change in tuition and fees or propose any new PhD programs. Dr. Frederick explained that one element is admission standards and he explained how they impact the graduation rate. He gave a statistic that 10% of students admitted are in the top 10% of their class and 10% of students graduate in 4 years. In addition, 30-35% of students admitted are in the top quartile, and approximately 30% of students graduate in 6 years. Dr. Frederick said that 45% of this fall freshman class is made up of students in the top quartile which is a great gain from past years largely due to some incremental changes in admissions criteria. He explained that multiple changes to the admissions criteria were not planned, but were made due to input from the UT System. Dr. Frederick mentioned that a study had been done which showed that high schools scores correlate with college completion rates; however, SAT scores have virtually no correlation, yet it is necessary to have in the graduation rate improvement plan. He said that the plan had other components as well, including academic components, student support service-oriented components, advising, Freshman Focus Initiative, mentoring, etc. He expressed that faculty also play an important role to student success. Dr. Frederick encouraged the faculty to think about ways they can be proactive in student success and to help students finish their degrees sooner, perhaps by adding a new ad hoc student success committee or brainstorming with other faculty members. Dr. Frederick noted that the current 4-year graduation rate is at 10%. He said he would like to raise it to 25% within 10 years, but will continue to be proud of each student who graduates regardless of the time it takes them.

- C. Academic Policy & Requirements Committee—George Norton (for Bennie Wilson) Mr. Norton confirmed that this is the 3rd time revisions to the freshman admissions criteria have been brought to the Senate at the request of the Regents. He explained that the UT system has a requirement for publication for 1 year of a new policy in advance of its application, which is why a quick review was needed. Mr. Norton said that it is important to give the greatest time possible to the rollout which would be starting this spring if the criteria are approved. The new criteria would not be implemented until the fall of 2013. He expressed the committee's objective in trying to get on the first available UT System docket to achieve these goals. He noted that some committee members believed the revisions to be too quick after having just approved previous revisions, but that it was necessary to stay on the timetable.

He explained that the new revisions include raising the total SAT score by 50 points in each category and introducing recommended minimums for each

category (as opposed to absolute denial points). The proposal continues the automatic approval for those students in the top quartile of their high school class. Students in the 2nd quartile will have guaranteed admission with a certain SAT score, and will now have the benefit of a recommended minimum in order to be reviewed. This will widen the number of applicants considered. Mr. Norton also explained that out of all courses taught in mathematics, 27% are developmental courses, which shows that many students are unprepared to do college level math. In order for students to test out of developmental courses, the current SAT score needed is 1070 or better.

Since there was little time for the Senators to review the proposal, a motion for an electronic vote made, seconded and unanimously approved.

D. Consent Calendar – Jim Dykes (for Kim Bilica)

Mr. Dykes said that the MS in Advanced Materials Engineering proposal was presented at the November 1st Graduate Council meeting. The changes from the previous proposal were very minor. He mentioned that one hallmark of the proposal is that it is interdisciplinary. The program takes building blocks or courses already in place and restructures them. He said that the program would fall under both the electrical engineering department and the biomedical engineering department in the College of Business. Mr. Dykes explained that the program is truly multidisciplinary because it has two tracks, one in materials and one in biomedical. The committee supported the proposal and it was unanimously approved in the Graduate Council. The Faculty Senate consented to the MS in Advanced Materials Engineering proposal.

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

Dr. Fogt said that his committee had no major issues with HOP 9.47: Use of Residential Conference Centers. Dr. Fogt noted that this rule is designed for the summer months when these centers could be generating more revenue. He said that his committee found the proposal to be vague in some places. Some examples of this are how faculty are prioritized or not prioritized over non-university affiliated groups, and what the exact meaning of non-university sponsored events is. It is unclear if a conference brought in by a faculty member would be university sponsored or not. The committees' recommendation is to accept the proposal. The committee report was unanimously approved.

F. Curriculum Committee – Dr. Hazem Rashed-Ali (for Raydel Tullous)

Dr. Rashed-Ali said that the Curriculum Committee has been reviewing a current draft of the undergraduate catalog over the last few weeks. Each section has been split up among the committee members to review and a set of changes has been developed. The committee report has complete details on the changes. Dr. Rashed-Ali asked if there were any additional comments and there were none. He directed anyone with additional comments to email himself or the Curriculum Committee chair, Raydel Tullous. A motion was made to approve the committee's changes to the undergraduate catalog which was seconded and unanimously approved.

G. IRB Committee – Dr. Richard Lewis

The IRB committee met recently to develop a strategy to take a comprehensive look at the regulations surrounding the IRB at the university. This is in conjunction with changes in Washington and recent changes in institutional research regulations at the UT system. The committee plans to look at factors such as the consistency of this university's IRB when it comes to interpreting IRB regulations and how are they interpreted. Dr. Lewis said that his committee plans to create an informational white paper with recommendations that will serve as a full comprehensive review of the IRB. Dr. Lewis said he will keep the Faculty Senate posted on the plan as it develops.

H. Secretary of the General Faculty - Dr. Amy Jasperson

Dr. Jasperson said that the Board of Regents held a meeting today, but the post-tenure review policy did not appear to be on the agenda as expected. Dr. Jasperson thanked the faculty for their input and said she would continue to follow-up. She reminded the Senate about the staff council smoking survey that has recently been circulated around campus. She said the survey is now closed but gave some statistics that were communicated in the University Assembly meeting on Tuesday. She said the Staff Council is working on the final tally. Dr. Jasperson pointed out the two resolutions recently passed by the Student Government Association (SGA). The first resolution opposed hate crimes on campus and was in response to a hate crime that took place over Halloween weekend off campus against a UTSA student. The second resolution responded to a recently published article in the Huffington Post where UTSA was named as the 2nd most unhappy campus for freshmen nationwide. The SGA resolution rejected this characterization. A copy of SGA's resolution can be accessed at the following location:

<http://www.utsa.edu/assembly/uaminutes/2011-2012/SGA%20UTSA%20Pride%20and%20Spirit%20Resolution.pdf>.

In addition to these resolutions, SGA wants to establish a roadrunner statue as a symbol of pride on campus and they are currently looking for donations to assist in funding this effort. Dr. Jasperson reminded everyone that Green Fund applications are being accepted and more info can be found at greenfund.utsa.edu. Dr. Jasperson said that a report from Sandy Welch and Ken Pierce on the FAIR system was given at the last University Assembly meeting. Improvements are being made to make the system more faculty-friendly, including adding the ability to customize faculty vitas, and allowing access to editing the vita section all year long. In addition, faculty members will have the ability to link their FAIR CV to another version of their CV. Dr. Jasperson reminded everyone that the last UTSA football game is November 19 and urged them to attend to support the team. The game scheduled for Saturday, November 12th will also be streamed live on campus.

IV. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

V. New Business

There was no new business.

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 5:08 p.m.