THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
of November 8, 2012

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2012-2013 academic year was held November 8, 2012, 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, David Akopian, Maria Arreguin-Anderson, Mark Blizard, Natasha Burns, Glenn Dietrich, Jim Dykes, Martha Fasci, Donovan Fogt, Robert Hard, Anne Hardgrove, Richard Harris, Judith Haschenburger, Drew Johnson, Jerome Keating, Donald Kurtz, Richard Lewis, Christine Linial, Francisco Marcos-Marin, Marian Martinello, Lydia Martinez-Rivera, Marcelo Marucho, Alycia Maurer, Joycelyn Moody, Elizabeth Murakami, Anand Ramasubramanian, Libby Rowe, Misty Sailors, Dan Sass, Rebekah Smith, Johnelle Sparks, Woodie Spivey, Patricia Thompson, Heather Trepal, Alistair Welchman, Floyd Wormley

Absent: Robert Ambrosino (excused), Rajesh Bhargave, Kimberly Bilica (excused), Fengxin Chen, Frank Chen, Renee Cowan (excused), Daniel Jimenez, Juliet Langman (excused), Melvin Laracey (excused), Emilio Mendoza, John Merrifield (excused), Byongook Moon (excused), Branco Ponomariov, Juana Salazar (excused), Rodolpho Sandoval, Bennie Wilson (excused)

Guests: John Frederick, Rosalie Herber, Sarah Leach, Nancy Martin, Dale Truett (for John Merrifield)

Total members present: 36   Total members absent: 16

II.   Approval of the October 11, 2012 minutes

The minutes were approved.

III.   Reports

A.   Chair of the Faculty Senate - Dr. Rebekah Smith
Dr. Smith introduced the newest ex officio member of the senate, Dr. Marian Martinello, Chair of the Retired Faculty Association. She mentioned the senate

sponsored faculty forums last week on HOP 2.11 which were very productive. She said a report would be presented later in the meeting which will include feedback and proposed changes to the policy. In addition, she said there were two policies recently approved at the UT System level, HOP 9.47 Use of residential conference centers and HOP 2.51 semester credit hours. Dr. Smith said that the Graduate Council had approved the 2013-2015 Graduate catalog last spring and that final reviews were completed this semester. The GRIP Cross Campus teams are still at work, and Dr. Smith presented a list of the topics discussed so far. She said that senate members Mark Blizard and Francisco Marcos-Marin have agreed to serve on an early alert team, formed by Ken Pierce, to assist students in getting support early-on to help correct their performance and improve student advising alerts. She said that senate member Heather Trepal has agreed to serve on the committee reviewing the Employee Assistance Program contract renewals.

For more information, the Chair's Report can be accessed at:
http://www.utsa.edu/Senate/fsminutes/2012/11-08-2012/Senate Chair Report 110812.pdf

B.   Secretary of the General Faculty – Dr. Misty Sailors
Dr. Sailors discussed the ongoing encryption efforts which were brought up at the most recent SYSFAC meeting. She said that the Chief Information Security Officer and the Senior Attorney and System Privacy Officer attended to communicate that desktops, thumb drives, mobile devices, sub awards (flow down), and anything containing data related to the "mission of the university" will be encrypted. She mentioned the there was a lengthy conversation among the SYSFAC members, but the lawyer present at the meeting reiterated that all university data (whether on a personal or university-owned device) must be encrypted. She also said that there is a new Institute for Transformational Learning which has been funded by the UT System at $50 million. The institute will offer competitive grants to enhance higher education, create high quality online courses, cultivate PPP, and advance the UT System's efforts to help working adults complete their bachelor's degrees. Dr. Sailors said that there has been a new Hazing and Alcohol Initiative formed at the System-level, which includes a task force and recovery funds to be sent to the System's academic campuses to assist with this initiative. She said that a peer teaching recommendation/policy has been sent to the campuses for feedback, and that the System is looking at training and evaluation of department chairs.
Dr. Sailors said that she and Dr. Hard attended the Texas Council of Faculty Senates where Kirk Watson (District 14 Senator) discussed the relationship between public school accountability and higher education. He asked the council to question what they are doing/can do to create value, and also look at ways to be more frugal. She said that Catherine Parsoneault from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board was in attendance to discuss two reports: the Low Producing Program report (which Dr. Sailors will share once received) and the Community College Transfer report (which Dr. Sailors has placed on Rowdyspace). She mentioned some news from other UT System institutions, and shared the theme of

the conference, "How do we garnish community support in light of what is happening to higher education in Austin?"

C.   Provost's Report – Dr. John Frederick

Dr. Frederick said that UTSA has recently appeared in a list of the top 400 universities as recorded by the Times of London. Out of the 400 universities, he said that 111 are American universities, and 70 of the 111 are public universities. He said that one of the metrics used to determine the ranking is citations on research publications, and thanked the faculty for this contribution to the university.

Dr. Frederick discussed the governor's $10,000 degree initiative. He said that some institutions, including Texas A&M San Antonio have accepted this initiative and now offer a $10,000 degree (Texas A&M San Antonio's degree is in Cyber Security). Dr. Frederick provided a breakdown of the method used to obtain a $10,000 degree. He said that students must earn around 30 semester credit hours in high school through dual credit classes, then take a majority of classes at a community college, finishing the last 30 credit hours at a university. He said that the types of students who are willing and able to be this ambitious during their high school years, are often more likely to get a full scholarship offer to a 4-year university. Therefore, he said that UTSA doesn't plan to participate in offering a $10,000 degree, but UTSA students can still get one (with any major) through demonstrating financial need. He said that 36% of UTSA students that graduated last year were able to obtain a degree for less than $10,000 (through financial aid, scholarships, and pell grants).

He discussed the tuition revenue bonds (the financing system used by the state to build new facilities) being considered by the UT System, and said that UTSA has requested a new science building. This building, with updated labs and additional classroom space, is needed to accommodate the growing number of science and engineering majors. Dr. Frederick said that science buildings are the only types of buildings which are being considered for funding by the UT System at this time.

Dr. Frederick discussed the GRIP, and its mission to improve graduation and student success rates at UTSA. He said that UTSA's current 4-year graduation rate is 12%, and UTSA's current 6-year graduation rate is 30%. He said that the university is being more selective in the admissions process, and currently has a 75% acceptance rate. In addition, he said that 3 years ago, a third of the freshman class came from the top quarter of their high school class, and this year more than a half have come from the top quarter. In the past, the burden has been placed on faculty to be the university's "gatekeepers" for student success. Going forward, Dr. Frederick plans to shift the role of faculty members to be facilitators, and utilize gatekeeping at the admissions level. He said that UTSA's main obligation is to help students succeed once admitted, so faculty are encouraged to determine what kind of assistance students may need, such as tutoring or developmental courses, without lowering the university's overall standards. A question was asked regarding extending the use of pre-majors, and what happens to those students who may not be making it in specific majors. Dr. Frederick said that he

expects more pre-majors to come, and intends to utilize the Multidisciplinary Studies degree to give students more options. He said that this degree is currently available and is often chosen by honors students to customize their studies. Dr. Frederick hopes that over time, some of the degree combinations created by the Multidisciplinary degree may be adopted as degree programs.

D.   Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee – Dr. Johnelle Sparks
Dr. Sparks gave an update on the PPE process for the past academic year, as required by HOP 2.22. The report stated that 86 cases were scheduled for review in 2011-2012. 73 were conducted, with 70 faculty members receiving an overall satisfactory rating. Of the 3 faculty members with unsatisfactory ratings, one retired, and the other two will continued to be monitored by their department chair and dean. Dr. Sparks said that of the 13 that were not reviewed, 3 retired, 2 resigned, 4 were deferred in accordance with HOP 2.22, and 4 were reviewed/approved for promotion to full professor effective 9-1-2012.

E.   Evaluations, Merit, Rewards, and Workload Committee – Dr. Rebekah Smith
Dr. Smith said that she is giving the report since a committee chair has only recently been elected (Richard Harris will chair the committee). She gave the senate some updates on the HOP 2.11 policy. Most recently, she said that the policy is currently under stakeholder review. The policy as it currently stands allows for greater freedom at the department level, emphasizes the importance of the department review committee, and includes many protections for faculty. An important change from the white paper and earlier versions of the proposed policy is that the removal of wording that would have allowed for an annual review to trigger a faculty development plan. During the faculty forums, there was some confusion among faculty about workload agreements (and it was indicated that a formal policy/guideline may be needed). In addition, there is concern about peer reviews (faculty review committee giving other faculty members low ratings in order to benefit themselves). A suggestion from the committee was made to "continue to include peer review in the policy, but Senate should monitor the process (for instance, through the grievance process which is already monitored) and revisit this issue as needed." After some discussion, a motion was made in the senate and a vote was conducted to revise the policy and include language to make a peer review NOT optional, i.e. mandatory for all departments. There were 3 votes opposing and 26 for, and the vote passed. Another issue discussed was the numerical scale used for performance reviews, and the committee suggested to "allow a range of scores for each category and set minimum values as indicated in revisions to Table 1". This would allow for more numerical room (unequal distribution) to account for more variability within the categories (especially the "meets" and "exceeds" categories). A motion was made to vote, and the senate voted to approve the table below to include in the EMRW report:

Range: 0 to 5	
Exceeds	3.5 – 5.0
Meets	2.0 – 3.4
Fails	1.0 – 1.9
Unsatisfactory	0 – 0.9

The Senate also approved recommendations for additional changes including wording to distinguish ratings, not rankings in the review process; wording to clarify that departmental assessments of faculty potential are not only introspective; and additional wording for FMLA leave to strengthen the section. The Senate discussed, but did not make a decision on two other issues: wording to consider adding a 36-month review period to include a faculty member's strongest years for merit and wording to clarify the relationship between effort and an unsatisfactory rating. These will be considered by EMRW committee who will present final recommendations for the Senate vote.

F.   Curriculum Committee – Dr. Jerome Keating

Dr. Keating said that the University Curriculum Committee discussed the Academic Inquiry course and had some new information to present to the senate. The Academic Inquiry course should assist in fostering freshmen retention and success, as students will be required to enroll in this course during their first semester. The committee recommends that the Academic Inquiry and Scholarship course be approved as the designated course in the University Core Curriculum under the Language, Philosophy, & Culture component and that this component be expanded to 6 semester credit hours. The Faculty Senate unanimously approved the committee's report.

Dr. Keating said that the second proposal the committee reviewed is for a Certificate Program in Data Center Design from the College of Engineering. The certificate program was developed in response the National Security Agency (NSA)'s request, and was developed by Dr. Shadaram. More detail may be found in the committee's report on Rowdyspace. The committee recommends that the Certificate Program in Data Center Design be approved. The Faculty Senate unanimously approved the committee's report.

IV.   Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

V.   New Business

- Dan Sass – Committee on Course Surveys

  Dr. Sass said that his committee met to discuss the Provost's request to include written comments on student course surveys. The committee recommends that the request be approved, pending Scantron's ability to remove the comments immediately. It is anticipated that this change will occur next semester. Dr. Sass said that Scantron would send the written comments to the faculty member only, and they would be removed immediately. It is at the faculty member's discretion whether or not to to include the comments on their evaluations, but if they do so, the comments will be subject to public records. There was some concern about the security of sending the comments via email, and an option was recommended for Scantron to provide a link to the faculty member for greater security. Dr. Sass also mentioned that legal affairs confirmed that if a policy is in place, the comments can't be accessed anyway. The committee made a motion to vote, and the senate voted as follows:
  17 voted yes, to include the written comments on course evaluations and accept the committee's language as is
  13 voted no, do not include the written comments on course evaluations and reject the committee's language as is
  Therefore, the senate voted to accept the committee's language and include the written comments on course evaluations.

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 5:40 pm.