Faculty Senate Minutes
6 February 2014

Senate Leadership in Attendance

Toni Sol, Senate Chair

Tom Ingram, Past Chair

Mark Cichock, Chair Elect

Douglas Klahr, Secretary

Reni Courtney, Parliamentarian

Senators and Student Representative in Attendance

John Adams	Business	Cynthia Kilpatrick	Liberal Arts
Amanda Alexander	Liberal Arts	Joseph Kongevick	Liberal Arts
Mindi Anderson	Nursing	Ali Koymen	Science
Ivonne Audirac	SUPA	Don Liles*	Engineering
Randy Basham	Social Work	Carl Lovely	Science
Rebecca Bichel	Library	Varun Mallipaddi	Student Congress
Robert Bing	Liberal Arts	Kytai Nguyen	Engineering
Miriam Byrd	Liberal Arts	Yuan Peng	Science
Dan Cavanagh	Liberal Arts	M. K. Raja	Business
Thomas Chrzanowski	Science	Barbara Raudonis	Nursing
Norman Cobb	Social Work	Jim Richards	Architecture
Stephanie Cole	Liberal Arts	Jennifer Ronyak	Liberal Arts
D. Stefan Dancila	Engineering	Stefan Romanoschi	Engineering
Ray Elliott	Liberal Arts	Peggy Semingson	Education + HP
Kevin Gustafson	Liberal Arts	Mike Ward	Business
David Hullender	Engineering	Lewis Wasserman	Education + HP
Theresa Jorgensen	Science	Matthew Wright	Engineering

*Standing in for Brian Huff

Guests

Ron Elsenbaumer, Provost

David Silva, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Jim Bradley, Chief Information Officer

Maria Martinez-Cosio, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Development

Call to Order: Toni Sol
2:32 PM

Provost Elsenbaumer
- **President Karbhari** is not able to attend, for he is at a Board of Regents meeting.
- **Student enrollment** is listed at 33,400 but it truly is close to 38,000 when all students are taken into account. About 5,000 of those are online students. The administration realizes that this fast pace of enrollment increases puts strain not only on faculty, but also on non-academic personnel, e.g., advisers and coaches. He requested patience on everyone's part and stressed that the administration would be putting more resources into areas stressed by enrollment increases.

- **New administrator searches:** The dean of nursing search is far along. Three candidates have visited the campus and a fourth is due on Friday (February 7). The search for a dean for the new SOA/SUPA unit will get underway. The integration of Kinesiology/Nursing and SOA/SUPA means that they are looking for deans who have broad perspectives and foci.
- **Faculty senate visits:** When the president and provost come to the senate, it is important that David Silva comes along as well, given that his focus is faculty affairs.

Discussion about student enrollment and programs
- Lovely: Is there any intention to cap enrollment?
- Elsenbaumer: No. Our intentions are to grow. There is a strategic plan across the system, for instance, for engineering programs to double in size in 10 years. Therefore we are looking for growth over time. The administration is trying to find ways to minimize the impact of increased enrollment on faculty
    - Looking at Blackboard to provide more solutions regarding progress reporting requirements and even perhaps class attendance, since some evidence of attendance is required to be presented by faculty members when giving a student a grade of F in a course
    - Blackboard is not mandatory at this point, but the more we can use it for data mining, the easier things become.
- David Silva: We are about to be designated as an Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), which means that we will have access to 100,000s of dollars of grant money from an entire range of federal funding agencies for programs that support all our students, not just Hispanic ones. This means that we also we see increases in enrollment from our local demographic.
- Cole: Do minimal thresholds for PhD program degree production apply to UT Arlington?
- Wasserman: How do Tier 1 and UT systems regarding degree production thresholds interface? What about the relation of increased enrollment to admissions criteria and quality control of students admitted?
- Elsenbaumer:
    - Minimal degree production figures for all programs are now the responsibilities of the system to manage, not the Coordinating Board due to legislation passed in the last session limiting the board's purview. If a program should fall below a threshold, UT system will be alerted and then help the unit manage the program. There is more time and opportunity to work with problem programs than before.
    - Regarding minimal thresholds of degree production, some of the fuzziness is due to the history of the institution. We are now looking at some key metrics in strategic planning and looking at how we would be able to provide that information. We have to do a better job of providing information.
    - Quality control of students is important, and our 18% first-time freshmen graduation rate is an example of improvement that is needed. Quality control resides with the faculty: that's why we have program reviews to ensure that we have quality programs.
- Semington: What about expanding programs online and internationally?
- Elsenbaumer: Growth in higher ed outside US is growing exponentially. We already have a strong brand in China, and nursing is an example where visitors from China come to see the program. There also is interest in India. We need to have suitable management and resources for that growth, and the president's talk about strategic vision always includes global.

Discussion about the strategic plan and reorganization of programs/units

- Raudonis: When the strategic plan will be rolled out?
- Elsenbaumer: The president wants to complete the strategic plan before the end of the semester. He had a meeting last week with deans from all the units to share strategic plans, and things look good.
- Audirac: Ten questions about the SOA/SUPA merger, of which four were asked and the list given subsequently to the Provost. Will a draft ad for the dean's search for this new unit be ready by mid-February, and will it be shared with the faculties? If not and the search takes longer than expected, are there contingency plans for an interim dean? When would this be announced? Any prospect for opening the process for other programs/units to join this merger?
- Elsenbaumer:
    - o Our intent is not to get to the interim dean point. The process we will implement will be the same for every other search: a search committee will be formed of all stakeholders so that we will have a balanced committee. Everyone in the committee, and the consultants as well, will have a full understanding of the intended outcome, and the ad will be crafted with everyone's input, with committee members bringing the ad draft back to the departments for feedback.
    - o The president wants to look ten years out regarding strategic programs coming together. Therefore four have been identified [Nursing/Kinesiology and SOA/SUPA]. The administration has a lot on its plate at the moment and is not overly excited about engaging in more activity at this point. If there are other ideas, faculty should explore them [with other faculty] if the faculty feel that it is appropriate to the growth of that unit over time.
- Klahr: Will the administration will be issuing a short memorandum directed to students in SOA and SUPA, who also are stakeholders and are operating in environment full of rumor?
- Elsenbaumer:
    - o Sometimes written communications don't reach the intended audiences, whereas meetings allow concerns to come up that may not be addressed in a memo. Either he or the president would welcome coming over to address a student forum or meeting, as well as periodic update meetings with faculty members.

David Silva: Four items to discuss

1. **Congratulations regarding an overall 25 % increase in Student Feedback Survey (SFS) response rates:** the institutional average is up to 40% now. This increase is due greater awareness of faculty members regarding SFS and their role in its progress. Also the SFS was shortened so that it became easier: we have implemented the 5 questions mandated by UT system but have not removed the prose questions. Congratulations to the dean of business for the biggest increase. Question: We wait until after Jan. 1 to send the reports to faculty, but the soonest would be after grades officially are posted. Would faculty members like to receive their SFS reports before or after winter break? We can the question take back to units and ask for faculty members' preference. This only regarding fall semester.
    - o Cichock: Earlier receipt of SFS reports in May would also benefit faculty who teach during the summer.
    - o Silva: Acknowledges that point and will look into it as well.
2. **National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD)**: we are now a member, and all faculty should be receiving the Monday Motivator. We will have CEO coming on Feb. 19th to talk to faculty leadership. Go to facultydiversity.org and check out the website and look at array of materials available. Faculty will receive official notice Feb. 6 in the Faculty Affairs newsletter. Then on the weekend faculty will receive directly from HQ instructions on how to create an individual account to access materials. This is intended to support our revamped mentoring program but does not replace individual mentoring. The resources are also available to contingent faculty and GTAs.
    - o Lovely: Why are RAs also are not included?

- o Silva: Will look into this.
- o Klahr: Why is setting up an individual account is necessary if the institution already is a member of NCFDD?
- o Silva: An individual account provides full access to all the website materials.
3. **Peer review of teaching:** We have begun crafting policies from UT System and FAC (Faculty Advisory Council), and there is about 80% overlap between the two, and the senate committee {Academic Freedom Committee] will be continuing work on this.
    - o Chrzanowski: Does this mean that people going up for tenure in fall must have peer review done by then?
    - o Silva: Ideally yes, but it is not required. Therefore the complete policy will be in place by fall 2015, not 2014, and in Fall 2015 we will expect to see at least one peer review of teaching in a dossier for faculty members coming up for promotion.
    - o Wasserman: Who does it: the chair or assistant chair? Has the system worked out who will be considered a peer? Will it be a departmental or college decision?
    - o Silva: It must be another tenured or tenure-track faculty member of equal or higher academic rank. Whether a chair or assistant chair should do this is a debatable point that will be addressed in committee and then brought to the senate until a broad consensus is met in the final policy. How we define academic units can be discussed and hammered out.
    - o Ingram: the FAC model was to leave peer review of teaching at the departmental level.
4. **Promotion/tenure and post-tenure review guidelines:** He want to post on the Faculty Affairs website every department's guidelines so that we can get a broad overview and see how things are handled throughout the university. Please have senators or department chair send him Word documents of PDFs by the end of business on the 12th [subsequently moved to the 17th].
    - o Chrzanowski: Doesn't the current tenure dossier require these as part of the submission>
    - o Silva: Yes, but we receive a variety.
    - o Cavanagh: Is there a directive at some level about having fleshed-out guidelines in every department?
    - o Silva: There is no definition of "fleshed-out" to date. Gathering these will reveal these differences.
    - o Romanoschi: Would annual review guidelines be useful as well?
    - o Silva: Yes – send him everything. [Toni Sol will repeat the request for guidelines via an e-mail to all senators]

Jim Bradley, CIO
- Has been in the position for 10 months.
- **Three big goals of Information Technology:**
    1. Align IT to the university's goals.
    2. Align IT to serve student success.
    3. IT wants to be the best organization there is.
- **Ten Objectives:**
    1. Say "yes" we are here to help you.
    2. Strengthen infrastructure.
    3. Leverage the cloud and sourcing heavily, making strategic choices between insourcing and outsourcing.
    4. We already are doing a significant amount of staff augmentation. This will increase capacity although might not save a lot of money.
    5. We want to build strong academic partnerships and have started working with some deans.
    6. We must have better systems.
    7. We have to have governance: we currently have a highly under-utilized governance structure on the web.
    8. We must strengthen the core skills of the IT team: skill gaps are being identified.
    9. We have to create differentiated processes: one size does not fit all. The business of the university is about admin efficiencies, but faculty work is different and highly differentiated.

10. We need transparency.
- **Strategic alignment:** how do we align IT to the university? We have assembled teams to look at assets and benchmarking, and there are some faculty members on those teams. We surveyed more than 2K students, and surveyed deans as well, getting good feedback. We want to ask first to get feedback before implementing changes, as opposed to blowback. We acknowledge that there is no intermediate help source between the help desk and CIO.
- **Big ideas:**
  o We need a customer-facing function that is focused on needs of different constituencies, and we cannot do' do this through the help desk. The model is more like the sales and service organization of a vendor.
  o We have 25% problem: we have only invested 25% what was needed in infrastructure each year, which is a losing proposition and, not what Tier 1 does [he was formerly at Tulane]. It is always a question of balancing priorities; that said, the network must work but it has been underfunded for 10 years.
  o We must shape the IT organization in a collaborative way and build something that we all understand.
- **Current things regarding faculty support:**
  o How better to support faculty research? They are looking at data curation, infrastructure grants, etc. They are looking a possible "Research DMZ", a network for research that is separate from university web functions such as payroll. He needs to push up the band width for research, and this might be one way.
  o Mac support will be improved.
  o IT will be partnering with tech labs, e.g., working with Beth Wright on a broadcast lab for COLA, chatting with the dean of engineering regarding supporting GTAs in IT.
  o Box.com is similar to Dropbox and will eventually replace J drive. It will roll out at 20G for everyone but IT will be able to increase that for any faculty member up to eventually a terabyte. IT has also acquired Adobe Creative Cloud. We also have a license for SPSS and will be getting one for Qualtrics.
  o An encrypted tablet is possibility in the future.
  o Future visioning meetings with faculty members, as occurred last semester, are a possibility.
  o Will be addressing the number of virtual servers that we have online in order to cut down on instances where no classroom login is available.
  o His phone numbers:
  o Office: 817 272 -5602
  o Cell: 713 725 8268

Sol: asks for approval of the November minutes. Minutes approved by voice vote.

Ingram: FAC Report
- **FAC got to meet the new regent, Ernest Aliseda**, who seems to be saying the right things about the regents not micromanaging things. There was pushback last year regarding micromanagement, and hopefully the regents will be more about system policy in the future.
- **Peer evaluation:** FAC fought hard for peer observation as a tool to help each other and peer evaluation only when necessary for P+T. FAC fought for other forms of peer evaluation to be included as well, to keep it as flexible as possible and at the departmental level. There is some question whether this would be included also at post-tenure level. Brief discussion about language in eventual policies, e.g., "should include" versus "shall include".
- **Issues of encryption and what constitutes university property:** some wiggle room regarding grades, for instance, which technically are assigned by a registrar and not a faculty member (this is still a point of contention with the Office of General Counsel OGC). Issues also about reading university e-mails on non-encrypted personal devices including smart phones. Things are still being negotiated and policies being determined, so don't listen to rumors.

Senate Committee Reports:
- **Texas Council of Faculty Senates (TCoFS)**
  - Cavanagh: A member of the Coordinating Board addressed the council. The process for approving new programs has been streamlined: if a proposal is not rejected by the board within one year, approval then is automatic.
- **Senate IT Committee**
  - **Dancilia:** A committee is being formed.
- **Special Projects:**
  - Sol: David Silva will be sending out the call for nominations for Professor Emeritus.

Old Business:
- **Financial Exigency Policy**
  - Sol: All UT units have it except UT Arlington. We are using the model policy and will be submitting it to the HOP committee.
- **Peer Evaluation**
  - Sol: The model policy is in committee being reviewed. It is written in the policy that the observation report is between the observer and the faculty member/evaluator and never gets put into a file or is seen by a departmental chair. What gets put into the file is only the member's response to the report. Upper administration probably will want to gain access to these reports, so expect some pushback. It is not included in post-tenure reviews. Local policy will be finished this semester so that it can be implemented in the fall as an option [mandatory in Fall 2015].
  - Chicock: It does not apply to full professors, since they cannot go up for any further promotions.
  - Ingram: It might help combat low SFS response numbers for a faculty member.
- **Program Abandonment Policy**
  - Sol: This already is in place.
- **Committee on Work-Life Balance**
  - Cole: We have had one panel thus far and will be having another one in February. Feedback is invited regarding issues to be addressed.

Sol: Meeting adjourned at 4:30.

Submitted by Douglas Klahr on 11 February 2014.