THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE SPECIAL MEETING OF
FEBRUARY 13, 2003

The third regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 2002–2003 was held in room 4.03.08, on February 13, 2003 at 3:30 p.m. in the John Peace Library Building with Dr. James McDonald, Chair, presiding, Dr. John Rundin, Secretary.

I. Call to order and taking of attendance

Present: Diane Abdo, Rosalie Ambrosino, Ron Ayers, Guy Bailey, Gerard Barloco, Fred Bonner, Steven Boyd, Felecia Briscoe, David Bruenger, Jan Clark, Manuel Diaz, Mansour El-Kikhia, Norma Guerra, Eugene John, David Johnson, Michael Kelly, Melvin Laracey, Raquel Marquez, Kenneth Masden, James McDonald, Frank Pino, Chris Reddick, Walter Richardson Jr., John Rundin, Mike Ryan, Linda Shepard, Ted Skekel, Joseph Stafford, Minghe Sun, Yiuman Tse, Sandra Welch, Kenton Wilkinson, and Mary Lou Zeeman

Absent: Ron Binks, Stephen Brown, Aaron Cassill, Lars Hansen (excused), Ni (Phil) He (excused), Vic Heller, Paul Jacobs, Melissa Killen, David Larson, Randy Manteufel, George Negrete, Terri Reynolds, Ricardo Romo, Todd Ryska, Woodie Spivey, Armando Trujillo, and Weining Zhang

Total members present: 32
Total members absent: 18

II. Minutes of the November 14, 2002 Regular Meeting approved as revised. A motion was made to allow Dr. Robert Furhman, representative from the Graduate Council, to participate. Motion passed.

III. Reports

A. Provost – Dr. Guy Bailey

1. Current state budgetary crisis

Dr. Bailey began his report by addressing the state budget crisis and how it affects UTSA. He said the seven percent reduction for fiscal year 2003 is being handled by delaying maintenance and renovation projects, by capturing savings from recently completed building projects, and by reallocating some administrative funds. However, Dr. Bailey stressed that no departmental or college budget would be affected.

Dr. Bailey also discussed the Governor and Chancellor’s requirement that the University restrict travel and implement a flexible hiring freeze. He said all foreign travel on state funds has been prohibited, but the University is approving domestic travel to read papers at research conferences and to conduct research and University business. However, Dr. Bailey said neither the travel restrictions nor the hiring freeze would affect grant-funded activities.

As far as filling funded faculty positions, Dr. Bailey said those positions that are critical to the University are being approved. The only exceptions involve departments in which the break-even analysis for tenure-track and tenured faculty shows a pattern of losses, the semester-credit-hour production of tenured and tenure-track faculty members is below university averages, or the research productivity of the faculty is low compared to other departments.

Dr. Bailey said the University expects some budget reductions for the next biennium but the extent will not be known until the legislature approves final budgets.
2. How does UTSA rank in comparison to other universities?

Dr. Bailey said one of the ways that universities are evaluated is through agencies like *U.S. News and World Report*. In its ranking, UTSA’s reputational rank is 3.2, the highest in tier 3, and it is 18th among Master’s institutions in the west. Plus, UTSA is among the top seven or eight among public institutions. Unfortunately, there is one problem. Of the 44 institutions listed, UTSA has the worst faculty/student ratio. By Dr. Bailey’s calculations, the University needs to add 145 faculty members in order to meet state averages. He said this is something the University will continue to work on.

3. The “Break Even” Analysis and other performance measures

Dr. Bailey discussed some administrative tools that are used to allocate resources. The main one was the “Break Even” Analysis. He said this analysis was one measure of the stewardship of academic resources. It provides an indication as to whether or not the semester credit hours produced by each course and each department pay for the cost of instruction. The analysis provides a full accounting of both the state and the tuition dollars spent in academic affairs. In turn, this helps the University understand how to maximize revenue production, and it helps department chairs and deans manage their resources. However, Dr. Bailey pointed out the “Break Even” Analysis is not a salary allocation procedure. Instead, salary is determined by a faculty member’s initial contract plus all merit and promotion raises.

Other tools to measure performance include analyses of semester credit hours, majors, and external research funding.

Dr. John Rundin asked how much of the University funding comes from state allocations?

Dr. Bailey responded that state appropriations account for 52% of the University’s revenue.

Dr. Rundin said he had asked the question because the chancellor is pushing flexible tuition. As a result, does that mean the University might be faced with determining tuition rates?

Dr. Bailey responded that tuition rates are set by the legislature. If the flexible tuition is implemented, students with family incomes less than the state average of $41,000 and who attend school full time will be paid by the state. In addition, each university will be able to set its own tuition rates. Dr. Bailey added that in the past, the legislature has been very hesitant to give up control of setting tuition; however, with the current budget crisis, their attitude could change.

Prof. Diane Abdo asked for clarification regarding plans for non-tenure-track faculty.

Dr. Bailey responded that the University does not anticipate cutting back on non-tenure-track faculty; instead, they will try to absorb enrollment growth without adding any more faculty members.

Dr. Walter Richardson, Jr. asked about the likelihood of another round of Post Tenure Review legislation.

Dr. Bailey said he had heard nothing and could not imagine anything other than money would be discussed. He added that the University has three priorities when it comes to the expenditure of money: increasing faculty salaries, hiring new faculty, and student success efforts.

Dr. Bailey said that the University might someday be put in a position where it has to choose between increasing salaries and hiring new faculty. At that point, he will come to the Faculty Senate for advice.

Dr. El-Kikhia asked about a rumor that insurance funding for non-tenure-track faculty will have to be paid from departmental budgets.
Dr. Bailey responded that the University added two million dollars into the non-tenure-track pool this year to cover enrollment growth. To explain, the way it works is a budget is submitted at the beginning of the biennium in the legislative request and the state pays that. If the budget is exceeded, the University must pick up the cost. This year, UTSA exceeded the benefit cost by $900,000. As a result, it will have to be factored into the budgets for next year. Plus, Dr. Bailey pointed out the Business Office did not account for the fact that graduate students who work 20 hours a week get benefits, and that has to be managed as part of the budget.

Dr. Ted Skekel asked if the University gets more money back if it has a higher percentage of out-of-state or international students. If so, where does the extra money go?

Dr. Bailey said the money goes in with the tuition and fees. One way to increase revenue sources is by dramatically increasing out-of-state tuition, but the University does not have enough out-of-state students or international students for that to be much of a revenue source.

B. Senate Chair – Dr. James McDonald
1. Dr. McDonald said he would entertain a motion to rearrange the committee reports so the Nominations and Elections Committee could go first in the Committee Reports section of the agenda. **Motion made and approved.**
2. Dr. McDonald asked for discussion on the Faculty Senate resolution that he introduced in the December meeting. It was not voted on at that time due to lack of quorum. The resolution urges the University Assembly to develop its own mechanism for electing members to its body. It also recommends that the faculty membership to the Assembly not be composed exclusively of Faculty Senators, but rather membership should be opened up to the General Faculty. During discussion, Dr. McDonald noted if the resolution passed, the University would not have to redo elections; the representation from the Senate to the Assembly would continue as elected during the current year. **Motion made to approve the resolution. Motion passed.**
3. Dr. McDonald discussed a policy change in terms of how teaching evaluation materials are distributed back to faculty members. The new policy is that faculty will receive the quantitative material as usual, but the student comments are being stored electronically and hard copies of the surveys would be retained by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Dr. Melvin Laracey asked if the evaluation forms would be made available to anyone else. If so, will the University notify students of this change?

Dr. Kenton Wilkinson responded that the comments would only be accessible by the faculty member who is the subject of the evaluation. For that reason, everyone should be very careful with their Banner ID’s and passwords. Further, some suggestions have been made to change what the students are told.

C. Secretary of the General Faculty – Dr. Mansour El-Kikhia

Dr. El-Kikhia reported that the inaugural meeting of the new University Assembly was held last month. An ad hoc committee, chaired by Dr. Michael Kelly, was appointed and charged with making recommendations to modify the bylaws. Dr. El-Kikhia also notified everyone that they would receive an assessment packet by e-mail. He asked all faculty to complete the survey and return it to UT System since it is imperative they know how UTSA faculty feel about important issues.

D. Committees
1. Nominating, Elections, and Procedures Committee – Dr. Deborah Schwartz-Kates

Dr. Schwartz-Kates said two new standing committees had been approved in the revised bylaws. The first committee deals with the budget; the other deals with merit, evaluation, and rewards. She said both committees are important because they provide the opportunity for faculty to enter into the dialogue of upper administration in these important areas. All of the members that were nominated have agreed to serve except one faculty member from the College of Sciences.
Nominations and terms of office:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Ken Masden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Woodie Spivey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Elizabeth De la Portilla</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Ron Bagley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal and Fine Arts</td>
<td>Frank Pino</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Aaron Cassill</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Chris Reddick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Ken Masden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Yiuman Tse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynthia Lengnick-Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Leung</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Howard Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Shoho</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Fred Hudson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal and Fine Arts</td>
<td>Thad Bartlett</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Coyle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deanna White (NTT)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Kay Robbins</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fengxin Chen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motion** made to accept the slate as presented by acclamation. **Motion approved.**

2. Academic Policy and Requirements Committee – Dr. Steven Boyd

Dr. Boyd began by discussing the recommended research space policy utilization statement. He said it was an attempt to establish a clear set of guidelines for reviewing the use of research space. According to Dr. Boyd, the process will start March 1, 2004 since it is too late to begin this year. Dr. Boyd asked for some guidance from the Faculty Senate on whether the review should be annual, biennial, or triennial. The decision was made for the review to be triennial. Other changes that were made were: 1) add number or quality of grants in the amount in the first bullet and, 2) delete what was perceived to be redundancy in the third bullet. **Motion** made to accept the report as revised. **Motion approved.**

Dr. Boyd reported the Academic Policy and Requirements Committee recommends rejecting the proposal for a Maximum Hours Policy submitted by the Associate Deans’ Council. The Committee was especially concerned about the restriction for summer registration. If a student registered for a four-hour course in a five-week term, the limit of 6 semester credit hours would not allow the student to register for another three-hour course. The Faculty Senate concurred with the
recommends the rejection of Dr. Boyd’s committee and rejects the proposal from the Associate Deans Council.

3. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee – Dr. Fred Bonner

Dr. Bonner said his committee was charged to look at third-year review policies for the University. Some of the issues that confronted UTSA were developing viable parameters to address the review policies, coming up with standard procedures across the various colleges and departments, and establishing a clear and concise timeline for review processes. As a first step, Dr. Bonner said the committee contacted the various colleges and asked for feedback from the department chairs. They found that most departments followed the guidelines stipulated in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, chapter 2.10, section K. The second step was to contact a number of universities to get an idea of what they were doing with their review policies. The committee learned that most did not have a general template. Instead, decisions are confined to their respective departments. The information from both steps was aggregated into the Proposed Guidelines for Third-Year Review. In the document, Dr. Bonner said there is an opening statement that lists purposes and outcomes of the process. Then, an outline illustrates how the process compares to the tenure process. Dr. Bonner encouraged the Faculty Senate to forward information and feedback via email to Fbonner@utsa.edu.

IV. Old Business
   1. Budgeting and Forecasting – Dr. Sandra Welch

   Tabled until the next Faculty Senate meeting

V. New Business
   1. Dr. Joe DeCristoforo, Assistant Vice President and University Registrar

   At the training seminars for Web for Faculty, Dr. DeCristoforo said the two most commonly asked
   questions were: 1) Is it possible for faculty to upload grades from any spreadsheet? and, 2) Can the
   Requirements for Removal of Incomplete form be made electronic and incorporated within the Banner
   Web for Faculty system? Dr. DeCristoforo said he submitted high-priority work requests for those two
   items. Ideally these modifications will be operable by the end of the Spring 2003 semester, but no later
   than the end of the Fall 2003 semester. He added that no specific timeline has been set for Banner to begin
   enforcing prerequisite courses.

VI. Meeting adjourned

Comments or questions to spottorff@utsa.edu
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