

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Wednesday, March 7, 2012
Rio Grande B
2:30 PM

Tom Ingram, Faculty Senate Chair
Toni Sol, Chair-Elect
Joe Kongevick, Secretary
Douglas Klahr, Parliamentarian
Cheryl Anderson—Nursing
Randal Basham--Social Work
Robert Bing--Criminology/Crim Justice
Miriam Byrd--Philosophy & Humanities
Dan Cavanagh – Music
Thomas Chrzanowski—Biology
Mark Cichock--Political Science
Minerva Cordero-Epperson—Mathematics
Reni Courtney—Nursing
Tap Efendi—Accounting
Jennifer Fox--Student Congress
Sarah Frisof—Music
Brian Horton -- Communication

Haiying Huang--MAE
William Ickes -- Psychology
Seiji Ikeda--Art
Judy LeFlore--Nursing
Carl Lovely – Chem/Biochem
James Campbell Quick--Goolsby/Management
Barbara Raudonis--Nursing
Joseph Sabbagh – Ling/TESOL
Amy Tigner -- English
Jodi Tommerdahl – C&I
Michael Ward--Economics
Lewis Wasserman--Educational Leadership
Matthew Wright--CSE
Robert Young--Sociology Anthropology

Call To Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Faculty Senate Chair Tom Ingram.

Chair Ingram: I appreciate everybody being here today we have a full agenda. A quick reminder to give us your name and your unit so that we can be sure that it is in the record correctly.

Remarks by President Spaniolo: President Spaniolo is out of town today.

Remarks by Provost Elsenbaumer: I don't have much to talk about today but I did want to mention a little bit about some of the articles you may have seen recently in the Texas Tribune and this morning in the Star Telegram from Bob Ray Sanders. I thought he had an excellent article about graduation rates and all this talk that's going around the state about first time/full time freshmen graduation rates from six years to four years and how we have to improve them and how basically no consideration whatsoever for the different types of institutions across the state and what the student populations are that we serve. And whether or not those metrics are really meaningful for everybody in the same way for all academic institutions. I am hearing more talk at UT System about trying to move more away from these first time/full time freshmen metrics and look at what are the outcome measures that are important for an academic institution that matters in our community. The discussion now is starting to circle back to how many students we are actually producing with degrees across the state and if you look at UT Arlington metrics we raise a lot and that is what matters in society. And so I think that over time we will see more discussion certainly moving away from four year graduation rates, almost everybody now pretty much say that's no longer a meaningful metric and are looking more at six year graduation rates. But taking into account the fact that institutions like UT Arlington serve transient and

part time students as well, so we are going to see more of that as time goes on. I hope you will see that UT Arlington will be put in a much more favorable light in respect to the real outcomes that is reasonable for an academic institution.

Q: Cichock - POLS: Do you see that there is any possibility that we revamp the programs because of graduation rates that they are going to get any kind of different treatment or maybe more accepted when they are submitted to Austin. For example programs that are on the cusp.

A: Provost: The coordinating board is now looking at raising the threshold for low performing programs, I think all of this seems to be taken into account. When you have a very large organization that's providing a very large number of degree programs there is always going to be a few degree programs down to the one percent level where there are going to be some issues over time. When you look at low performing programs at an institution what composition of low performing program is it's total, is it five percent of proposal performance or is it 25% or 20%. I don't know how to shift that discussion but I think we need to start asking. The highest degree of the five percent programs are low performing, one percent of your programs are low performing, I don't know where it is going to.

Q: Young-SOCI/ANTH: Low performing, that term is misapplied when just talking about the numbers of graduates. I want to understand why it has to be that arbitrary shouldn't there be some consideration given to the cost of benefit analysis. It's not that I can see costing the university a whole lot more to have let's say a masters program producing five graduates a year and in fact they are producing good qualified graduates they are helping us move toward Tier One status with that. So on one hand they are saying we want the high quality to go to tier one on the other hand they are saying we are going to cut graduate programs because of the number of graduates they are producing. I just don't see calculus there.

A: Provost: No but your point is very well taken but it actually goes to the point I think I was trying to make that if you have 25 of 1 percent programs that are low performing removing them does not do anything for the economics of your exclusion. We still have the faculty who are still teaching other classes so what is the impact, what is the financial impact—save money, probably not.

Q: Young – SOCI/ANTH: What is behind that in the first place, you have any idea?

A: Provost: I really don't. But even when you talk about graduation rates and we talk about numbers of student being graduated, it is not just about how many students you graduate but it is relative to know the number of seats you have occupied. How many students you actually have enrolled and how efficient are you with an average count. That really is not a representation. If you look at the numbers over the last three or four years, the average is between 4.2 and maybe 4.5 years, we are producing somebody with a degree. That's not so bad. We are turning seats over every 4.2 to 4.5 years with a degree.

Q: Wasserman – ELPS: What has been given to more restrictive screening at the outset of admissions so that if you let's say, this sounds harsh but, you got rid of the lower 20% how would you measure that in the admissions process? Clearly there are people that are undertaking debt who are incapable perhaps of pursuing graduate college work. I hope that doesn't sound too cynical but if you got rid of the lower 20% or 25% let's say now you are educating a more capable or more prepared student body. Your numbers will go up in terms of percentages completed and probably will not be disserving the people who are not admitted because they are not going to make it anyway and the only thing you will have to show for it is tolerance. My question is has that been debated and is there any movement in that direction?

A: Provost: You want to meet the metrics. You teach to the test so if you want to improve your first time full time freshmen, you are absolutely right you admit students that have 3.0 grades and have 450 SATs. Those are high performing students but I don't think that is what defines UT Arlington. I think that is the dilemma that we have that we want access to our institutions.

Q: Wasserman – ELPS: But to be honest we are not talking about people that get six hundreds on the verbal or math we are talking about substantially low performance to the math and it is not like you would be making this an elitist institution by establishing a more rigorous admissions criteria. And so that sort of begs the question it's not a matter of 600 on the verbal there's a large stock of people who are not in that league. Again it doesn't seem to me that would be the worst thing to do not just for the university but for the students who are disadvantaged.

A: Provost: this institution isn't just about the students academics performance. Success is also a lot about life issues and how economic issues and how much a student has to work. I think it is frightening that 75% of our students are working a very low fraction 30-44% are working thirty hours or more. That is a huge disadvantage for those individuals not that they are not academically prepared it's where do you get the time? How do you find the time to do everything you need to do if you are to succeed. It is a multidimensional problem and how we address it. I don't think looking at first time full time freshmen numbers is looking at the individual that we have at our institution and the individuals we serve at our institution. I think we have to help students more than we are and I think many of you know that since University College opened two years ago our retention rates have gone up significantly. We are doing those things right and hopefully as we continue to do them we will start moving our numbers up for first time full time freshmen. We will start looking better and we will get up to a certain point.

Q: Nelson - BIOLOGY: More a plea than a question OIT has apparently instituted a program where if a computer does not access the network within some unknown period of time it is disconnected.

A: Provost: Yes we understand; let me say it is being worked on. I think this is a very good point. We are working on it.

Provost Elsenbaumer exits the meeting

Chair Ingram: We are at quorum per Senator Klahr

Three sets of minutes from October 5, 2011, November 2, 2011 and February 8, 2012 were approved.

Reminder that we follow the academic calendar, let your department admin know if they are putting together the elections for fall 2012, they should be held this spring so that we would know who the incoming senators are and where you can serve. Each term is a two-year term you can be elected back to back up to three terms for a total of six years before you rotate off. If you have any questions please feel free to contact us.

We have some required actions that we have to take action on, so I recognize Senator Quick who will present his resolution that was sent to you.

Senator Quick – MANAGEMENT/GOOLSBY: The gist of the resolution is to congratulate the president and the university for the standing up of College Park Center. We had some positive feedback from Fort Worth and other places and we have seen the national press on it and I think that is a good thing for. I am going to put that on the table.

Chair Ingram: Dr. Quick's resolution to congratulate the president and the university was approved.

Chair Ingram: If you haven't been over to the Center take some time to go. Thanks again Dr. Quick.

Major item; our own Dr. Dan Formanowicz who most of you realize is former chair of the senate but also past chair past president of the UT System FAC and has been in on all sorts of stuff this is one of the

issues on the Conflict of Interest Committee that he is on he has some interesting comments presentation for us so I will turn it over to him.

Dr. Formanowicz: I am circulating the conflict of interest policy that the UT System forwarded to all the campuses back in December for everybody to look at. I want to give you just a little bit of history on that thing and talk to you about what is going on. Basically about a year and half ago a task force was formed to redo the conflict of interest policy that consist of the medical campuses have already have been done, this was a task force for the academic campuses it included the VPs for Research from Dallas, San Antonio, Pan Am, El Paso, Provost from Austin as well as myself, a couple of lawyers from UT System. We were presented with what was going on in the medical campuses with the policy that they had just put in place and told what they wanted us to do was look at it and adapt it for the academic campuses. We spent about three hours trying to tell them that it wasn't going to work with the policy that they handed us and it was pretty unanimous among us. We made a number of suggestions to it, sent some emails back and forth with suggestions as well. Then work on that kind of died when system told us that the public health service was redoing their guidelines and we should wait until they were done. About a year after that we got the email that said it doesn't look like PHS is actually going to do that so we are going to go ahead with this. They sent out essentially the document that you have seen which is altered from the original that we had but not to the extent that the task force members wanted it altered. They invited comments several of us sent comments and again in about two weeks later they sent us a thank you very much for serving on the task force and here's a copy that we are sending to the campuses is what you saw. In December when our campus received it I got a call from the Office of Research because unfortunately my name is on this thing as a member of the task force asking me what I knew. I met with the folks at the Office of Research, VP of Research, Jeremy Foresberg and some other folks to talk about it. This particular policy puts everyone under the same constraints as the medical campuses as if you were dealing with PHS, the Public Health Service of the NIH. Our office of research feels like, and I do too, that it is overly burdensome and that it goes way too far with folks that don't have to deal with those particular constraints and those particular regulations. Federal regulations are much tougher than most of us have to deal with; in fact, Jeremy said he feels like 95 percent of the faculties don't need to be under these guidelines. Jeremy has been talking to his opposite number at UT Dallas and UT San Antonio; I've been talking to faculty senates at UT Dallas and UT San Antonio in what relates to trying to organize a push-back on this. This is similar to what happened with criminal background check policy a couple years ago. The policy came out of system without any vetting ahead of time and campuses and presidents and senates threw up their hands and said we can't do this. Then we backed down and put something together reasonable. I hope you have read it because it is for most of us an unreasonable policy. It places an unreasonable burden on any one who has any sort of research funds. What they basically did was take a policy that's being used in the medical campuses and tried to apply it to us. I have talked to our folks in the research office and they are very concerned for a number of different reasons: a) they don't have the staff to be able to pull this off they couldn't possibly with their current staff and their current budget follow this policy. That is one of their major concerns of course. b) Their concern is that because it is so restrictive it applies to people it doesn't have to apply to that what people are going to do is stop reporting and somewhere down the line someone is going to get caught and be in big trouble. This policy encourages people to not report quite frankly the way it is put together. Basically what we are trying to do is touch base with all the tier one aspirants to get a response from each of those campuses within the system. Basically what Jeremy asked is that we bring this policy to the senate and I ask the senate for an up or down vote approval or non-approval of the policy as it is. Then once, whatever happens today, with that I will take it and go back to Jeremy and go down to system with your response. Questions?

Q: I only opened this up yesterday I feel uncomfortable voting on it.

A: Formanowicz—I understand that. The reason that there is a push on it is because for whatever reason system has put a deadline on compliance of April 1. Even though the federal deadline for us meeting federal guidelines is either August 1 or August 31. I don't want to suggest that they are trying to do is shove this down your throat but that's what I suggest.

Q: Chrzanowski – BIOLOGY: Since you have worked on this so long and I took one look and said I am not sitting here reading through all the gibberish advise me to your opinion should we vote up or down?

A: Formanowicz: If we want any chance of it going away we have to vote it down. The idea here is to try and organize the research administration on the tier one aspirant campuses and the senates on the tier one aspirant campuses to pull together on this. So my advice put it to vote.

Q: Raudonis – NURSING: I think also it stands we summarize the thinking of our research office and these are the people that are really going to be hit with implementing it and I know we know what a small budget those are the people that have to safeguard it that gives me comfort in voting it down at this point they have had you talk with them and they do not see this as the best interest of our faculty members.

A: Formanowicz—we had a very long meeting with Carolyn Cason as well it was mostly Jeremy telling us how this just wasn't going to be logistically possible for us to do this given their budget and given their staff and Dallas is saying the same thing, and San Antonio. That was a lot of our meeting concern, that and the fact that we're just afraid people are going to stop reporting and at some point they will get into a lot of trouble when they get caught.

A motion that we reject this proposal as it has been submitted and seconded – motion passed - unanimously.

Formanowicz: I want to follow up on something Dr. Elsenbaumer said the coordinating board has a meeting on Friday in which they are going to be discussing university accessibility. It is apparently in response to HB736 which is as much as I paid attention to what went on last time, is entitled Internet access to faculty information. But it also has to do with this whole thing with graduation rates, low performing programs, and all that. It is not quite clear what this meeting was about, it will be webcast and if I have time I am going to have it on in the background so I can listen. House bill 736 has to do with reporting all sorts of information on the Internet, it is a little outdated given all that has happened regarding our regents and such. But if you get a chance you might want to look at it. It is important to note that the whole graduation rates thing is not really coming from our regents at this point it comes from the governor, it comes from the legislature and it comes from our coordinating board, our regents at this point are just following suit. About a year and a half ago the former executive vice chancellor David Pryor gave a presentation to the regents in which he presentenced a whole series of alternative ways to looking at graduation success. The regents really bought into it fairly well the problem is the legislature and coordinating board has not and that's a problem. The interesting thing about the low performing program argument is that if you look at the last list that came out, and it came out about two years ago, with all the low performing programs according to the coordinating board. There were about 800 programs on that list. The institution with the greatest number not the greatest proportion or programs on that list was UT Austin. Austin has more programs on that low performing program list than anybody which makes it quite curious for going after all these programs. That is a priority of the coordinating board; there are two things that are priorities: graduation rates, low performing programs and the coordinating board believes that there are way too graduate programs in this state. All three of those things sums up our high priority of this particular board.

Tom also circulated the post tenure review role that the regents passed in January if you have questions about that I can answer them. As you look at it I want each of us in our units are going to have to help

develop local policies to fit into that. We will have to develop a local policy in HOP as well. I'm working with UT Dallas and we're building a model policy that we are going to circulate and that should be done pretty soon. We will have to build a HOP policy and each individual unit will have to build policies within. There has been a tremendous amount of press relative to this post tenure review change the reality of it is in terms of how we dealt with it on our campus changes aren't that different from what we have been doing all along. It formalizes some of the things that were in the old that we do the biggest change has to do with post-tenure review.

Chair Ingram: Next item is a proposal on the change on the nomination process for professor emeritus. Just to give you a little background, the current policy is that those applications come to a senate committee, then a recommendation that goes to the president. What the executive committee has been informed of is a couple of situations where this process probably didn't serve the best interest of the institution, and a look at the process is appropriate. The draft was charged to Dr. David Silva who put together the draft that was sent to you. First it starts at the ACTP level, goes to the chair, then to college level to the dean, then to the senate, and then the recommendation for the president. It will be dealt with as any other academic promotion a very formalized process. We kicked several things around: they would prefer that we tend to look like the other UT systems as far as our policy. That is to us fairly reasonable on the executive committee with a couple exceptions: Nobody should have veto power over it to keep the application from going up, so if there is a political agenda of some type no one could block it. Our recommendation of the senate is to recommend that chairs and deans or equivalent, depending on your school, be invited to copy but not be in a direct line, which would tend to not evade somebody. We discussed this last week at the president's advisory committee with the provost and president Spaniolo. I did not get the feeling that the president wanted this to be treated exactly like an academic promotion. A little more rigorous process but it should still carry essentially honorary component and not undergo the same scrutiny as the process of somebody going up for professor or something like that. The policy needs to clarify what the rights and privileges are and basically, you get the title.

Q: Young – SOCI/ANTH: Is it not written in such a way now that essentially a chair or a dean has veto power?

A: Chair: No. The applications come to the senate committee for reviews and make their recommendation to the president.

Q: Young – SOCI/ANTH: It comes from the department?

A: Chair: From the nominator. So if you retire we get two people to say you are a really good guy, and you're nominated. The administration is concerned that is possibly not rigorous enough for this type of honor.

Q: Chrzanowski – BIOLOGY: I have a concern that if we invite the recommendation that our deans and chairs will indeed make a recommendation that will be heavily weighted as it moves up the line. I think commentary on a candidate is quite a bit different than a recommendation.

A: Young – SOCI/ANTH: That is essentially what I am saying. The term invite put in something basically that will allow input.

Q: Chrzanowski—BIOLOGY: Then I misunderstood. That input should be short of a recommendation or a condemnation. It should be just commentary on this individual. Their contributions, what they did what they didn't do without "I recommend this person/I do not recommend this person." I think that would carry undue weight. This body is supposed to make that recommendation.

A: Formanowicz: That was the intent. Anyone that is not aware of the fact that deans are not happy for some significant period of time but the fact that they don't have veto power over this. This is the second time that I know of that we've been through this. The difference now is really in line with

whether our institution is in the system. When I was chair I had at least two, let's call them, interesting phone calls from deans about folks who were up for emeritus that they didn't necessarily approve of.

Q: Raudonis – NURSING: If it had the dean's name on it and there is ways of saying more of a recommendation without saying "I do recommend" I am kind of concerned they want to recommend it they want to say something negative even if it is a commentary they would be able to do it and I think the dean versus the associate professor could be read more heavily. So I guess we are playing symantics with words and how they could be interpreted than what is the best way to give them the best process and to be true to the spirit of what we feel.

A: Formanowicz: Deans and chairs have always had the ability to comment, so if the dean or chair does want to comment it forces them to put it in writing. Deans and chairs have always had the ability to weigh in on this, or anything else, and some of them do on occasion. I think this does two things—gives them a little bit of what they want but it also makes them put it in writing—it they are going to do it. Cavanagh – MUSIC: What is important to me that this does that the faculty senate is the recommender. When there's a dean's name on something you could read through the lines there too. The way that this is written seems to be consistent with the idea that faculty recommend bestowing this honor. We could solicit comments to help inform the decision but I think it is important that the faculty senate is at the top of the chain not somewhere in the middle.

Q: Young – SOCI/ANTH: What does the term complete retirement actually mean? Does that preclude a person teaching as an adjunct part time for example?

A: Ingram: I've got a call in to Dr. Silva and I want to get clarification on that to go on the record that is the intent. We are just negotiating right now; no motion is needed.

Ingram: Old business

Equity Committee Report: Cichock – POLS: We are under staff and need senators to fill the openings from ARCH, BUSS, ENG, SUPA.

Chair Ingram: We also have a shortage from the Tenure and Academic Freedom committee in EDUC & HP, SW, SUPA.

Chair Elect - Sol: Need to vote to support, reject or amend Faculty Authored Textbook amendment.

Ingram: This would be non-binding just how we see it at this point.

The motion would be to accept in principle the new textbook policy with possible amendments for clarification etc. The prevailing thought at this point seems to be to accept the committee's report to accept in principle the new policy with potential amendments that will be reported the HOP committee. Motion passed.

Any other old business: None

Meeting adjourned 4:05 p.m.