THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
of February 21, 2013

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2012-2013 academic year was held February 21, 2013, at 3:30 p.m. in the University Room (BB 2.06.04) with Dr. Rebekah Smith, Chair of the Faculty Senate, presiding.

I.   Call to order and taking of attendance

Present: Diane Abdo, Maria Arreguin-Anderson, Kimberly Bilica, Natasha Burns, Fengxin Chen, Glenn Dietrich, Jim Dykes, Martha Fasci, Donovan Fogt, Yongli Gao, Mark Giles, Robert Hard, Anne Hardgrove, Richard Harris, Yufei Huang, Drew Johnson, Jerome Keating, Richard Lewis, Francisco Marcos-Marin, Marian Martinello, Marcelo Marucho, John Merrifield, Joycelyn Moody, Branco Ponomariov, Anand Ramasubramanian, Misty Sailors, Juana Salazar, Dan Sass, Rebekah Smith, Johnelle Sparks, Woodie Spivey, Heather Trepal, Alistair Welchman, Floyd Wormley

Absent: Robert Ambrosino, Rajesh Bhargave (excused), Mark Blizard (excused), Frank Chen (excused), Renee Cowan (excused), Rosalie Herber, Donald Kurtz, Juliet Langman (excused), Melvin Laracey, Christine Linial (excused), Lydia Martinez-Rivera (excused), Emilio Mendoza, Byongook Moon (excused), Judith Perry (excused), Libby Rowe (excused), Rodolpho Sandoval, Qi Tian, Bennie Wilson

Guests: James Calder, Mansour El-Kikhia, John Frederick, Sarah Leach, Steve Levitt (for Renee Cowan), Si Millican (for Christine Linial), David Romero (for Melvin Laracey)

Total members present: 34   Total members absent: 18

II.   Approval of the January 31, 2013 minutes

The minutes were approved.

III. Reports

A.   Chair of the Faculty Senate - Dr. Rebekah Smith
     Dr. Smith notified the senate that the GRIP cross campus team meetings have been modified to take place once per month going forward. She said that the thematic

team meetings would be bi-weekly to speak more in-depth. She discussed the survey results from the last senate meeting regarding annual reviews and the GRIP process. She said that 78% of respondents are aware of the existence of a workload policy, but only 52% have seen it. About half of respondents currently have a signed workload agreement in place for 2013. Dr. Smith reminded the senate that NTTs should also be made aware of their workload distribution, according to HOP 2.50. She confirmed the importance of workload distributions for the process of annual reviews and said that overall ratings are generated via your workload distribution in Digital Measures. She said this is still being worked on in the system, and that faculty will be notified when it's time for them to review their information. Dr. Smith explained the difference between workload policies, workload distributions, and workload agreements. A workload policy communicates general expectations for faculty member in the three areas of teaching, research, and service as a function of whether the individual has a teaching focus, research focused, or balanced workload distribution. Each college should have a policy. A workload distribution specifies what percentage of the faculty members time should be devoted to teaching, research, and service. For instance, a balanced workload includes 40% for teaching, 40% for research, and 10% for service. A workload agreement is a document between the faculty member and department chair that is negotiated and signed and which specifies the individuals expected workload distribution plan for a given calendar year, with projections for several years (e.g. three years).

She said that 42% of survey respondents were not aware of the initiation in their department of a process for curriculum streamlining (sometimes described as catalog revisions). In reviewing the survey results on grade distributions, 60% said that their department had expectations about grade distributions (either formal or informal) and 44% take this into account for promotion and tenure reviews. Dr. Smith reminded the senate that in accordance with the GRIP, faculty should maintain rigor, but focus more on being "facilitators of student success", rather than "gatekeepers". She reported that all but 26% of respondents have had experience using the online gradebook, but only about half are currently using it. Dr. Smith said that it's important to get this percentage to 100%, in accordance with the GRIP.

She said that a report on the LEARN selection process is now posted online, which shows that there was substantial faculty involvement in the selection of the system (selection involved 48 faculty members from 30 departments). Dr. Smith has met with Dr. Sunay Palsole, Assistant Vice Provost and Director of Educational Technology to convey faculty concerns and determine a process to improve LEARN's ease of use. The senate's executive committee recommended that a "FAQ database" should be established to assist faculty members that have questions about using the system. So, through the end of this semester, faculty members may email OIT their questions, using the subject "Blackboard FAQ". Their questions will be directed to someone with expertise that can answer them, and the questions will also go into a database which will be used to form the set of FAQs. She encouraged senators to share this information with their departments.

Dr. Smith said that the UT System appears to be moving towards utilizing peer observations of teaching. She said that a senate ad hoc committee has been formed to address the creation of an upcoming policy. Dr. Smith expects the committee to present an initial report at the April senate meeting.

She notified the senate of a new policy currently under development. HOP 2.XX "Rehire of TT as NTT" has been assigned to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, which will present a report at the March senate meeting.

Dr. Smith gave a brief update on the last Department Chair's Council meeting. She also said that the Student Government Association is holding elections on March 5th and 6th, and will be hosting a "Day at the Capitol" on February 28th. She also reminded the senate that a notification will be sent out on March 1st to vote electronically on the proposed bylaws changes (votes are due on March 6th).

For more information, the Chair's Report can be accessed at:
http://www.utsa.edu/Senate/fsminutes/2013/02-21-2013/Senate_Chairs_Report_Feb_21_2013.pdf

B.   Provost's Report – Dr. John Frederick
Dr. Frederick briefly discussed some of the activities taking place at the UT System level among the Board of Regents in order to address how these actions have an impact on UTSA as an institution. He said that the legislature wishes to reconvene its panel on higher education to review how the Regents are governing higher education and its leaders.

He described an incident that appeared in the media involving a student not being able to obtain their degree due to an outstanding residence hall cleaning fee. He said that although the issue was resolved, it did still appear on the news and required the involvement of UTSA's President, the Chancellor, and the Chairman of the Board of Regents.

Another recent incident that reached the UT System involved a hard drive that was stolen from a faculty member's car. The hard drive contained student information covered by the FERPA law. The Board of Regents is now pressing for a response on the matter. Dr. Frederick said that he is requesting that faculty keep all student information on the Cloud through the I-drive or on Blackboard going forward. He is aware of the current issues with Blackboard and said that he will attempt to do what he can to ensure that any difficulties are improved on. Dr. Frederick said that instituting the use of the Cloud to protect student information will also protect faculty members from the possibility of an issue like this arising again. Using the Cloud will enable faculty to easily access the information anywhere they have internet access, requiring a secure password. He shared a draft memo and said he is open to faculty input. A question was asked if excel could be used to store the information, which is possible as long as its password protected. Dr. Frederick related the use of Blackboard back to the GRIP initiatives and said that it is the recommended system, and will help in the effectiveness of the new early alert system. A faculty member made a recommendation that this should also apply to graduate students as well. Dr. Frederick said that encrypted flash drives are available for use, and said that he is working to implement the

most secure and convenient solution to this issue. He thanked the faculty again for their understanding and cooperation.

C.   Curriculum Committee – Dr. Jerome Keating
Dr. Keating said that his committee reviewed two proposals:

1) Minor in Public Administration – the proposal is to move this minor from the department of political science and geography to the department of public administration. Dr. Keating said that there will be a phase-in period to allow current students to complete the minor within the political science and geography department. He said that the minor will have similar requirements as it previously did, and will be implemented for the 2014-2015 catalog. The curriculum committee recommends this proposal for approval. The senate unanimously approved the committee's recommendation.

2) B.A. in Global Affairs
Dr. Keating said that this is a new degree proposed by the department of political science and geography, which will allow the opportunity for students to study global dynamics, trends, and implications. The need for this degree has developed due to an aging population and the need for professionals to fill various positions in the global setting; also due to growing international nonprofit job opportunities; an increasing local need; and the degree is in alignment with UTSA's strategic plan and global initiatives. The curriculum committee recommends this proposal for approval. The senate unanimously approved the committee's recommendation.

D.   Research Committee – Dr. John Merrifield
Dr. Merrifield said that his committee was charged with reviewing the COI/COC policy after an extension was granted in order to allow more adequate time for review. The committee is proposing two items:

1) The policy should address nine-month appointments, and the research committee concurs with the recommendation from the University Conflict of Commitment Committee to include the following language:
"During time in which the faculty member does not have an appointment (e.g., in summer for a faculty on a nine month appointment), the faculty member is not required to seek approval for outside activities except as required by HOP XXX Intellectual Property."

2) The policy should include a statement that addresses the timeline for an approval request:
In section IV: "Disapproval must be in writing. Failure to assert disapproval within twenty business days of the submission of the request for approval shall constitute implicit approval."

The senate voted, and unanimously approved the committee's recommendation.

E.   Committee on Academic Freedom & Tenure – Dr. Johnelle Sparks
Dr. Sparks said her committee is providing the grievance procedure timeline, as peer evaluations for annual reviews are beginning soon. Dr. Sparks said that she

has not yet received any feedback on changes to the timeline, but that suggestions may still be submitted. She encouraged the senators to share this timeline with faculty members in their department so they will know the process (for informal and formal actions) going forward. There was a suggestion made to improve the timeline; perhaps clarifying the verbal notice section (which should read "within less than 40 days").

IV.   Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

V.   New Business

There was no new business.

VI.   Open Forum

VII.   Adjournment

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and unanimously passed at 4:55 pm.