

Faculty Senate Minutes

16 April 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

Amanda Alexander	Liberal Arts	Joseph Kongevick	Liberal Arts
Mindi Anderson	Nursing	Ali Koymen	Science
Ivonne Audirac	SUPA	Judy LeFlore	Nursing
Randy Basham	Social Work	Jon Leffingwell*	Education
Miriam Byrd	Liberal Arts	Carl Lovely	Science
Dan Cavanagh	Liberal Arts	Varun Mallipaddi	Student Congress
Thomas Chrzanowski	Science	Kytai Nguyen	Engineering
Norman Cobb	Social Work	Yuan Peng	Science
Stephanie Cole	Liberal Arts	JimC Quick**	
D. Stefan Dancila	Engineering	Barbara Raudonis	Nursing
Ray Elliott	Liberal Arts	Stefan Romanoschi	Engineering
Kevin Gustafson	Liberal Arts	Jennifer Ronyak	Liberal Arts
David Hullender	Engineering	Jason Skelton***	Liberal Arts
Andrew Hunt	Science	Mike Ward	Business
Theresa Jorgensen	Science	Zhiyong Yang	Business
Cynthia Kilpatrick	Liberal Arts		

*Standing in for Peggy Semingson

**Standing in for Susanna Kavhul

***Standing in for Robert Young

Guests

Vistap Karbhari, President

David Silva, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Call to Order and Welcome: Toni Sol

2:35 PM

President Karbhari

- Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI):** We have received notification from the US Department of Education that we are approved as an HSI. This does not mean that we get funds automatically: rather faculty should start looking for HSI grants through individual and group proposals. HSI designation is a big value to all our faculty, for most of the grants are aimed at a general population. I thank Dale Wasson for pulling together all the data to make this designation possible, as well as the group of faculty that was led by David Silva.

- **Dean of Nursing:** We have appointed a new Dean of Nursing, Anne Bavier, former Dean of the School of Nursing at the University of Connecticut. She brings lots of experience to the job.
- **VP of Student Affairs:** A search committee to find a new VP of Student Affairs has been created and will be chaired by John Hall. The search will run through June and July, bringing candidates on campus. A major change is that the VP will report to the President and not the VP of Academic Affairs. This highlights our emphasis upon student affairs as a university. I encourage faculty to submit information about outstanding candidates, and remember that one can be surprised by an individual who at first might seem very settled in a current job but who might want to relocate.
- **Tuition Proposal:** A tuition proposal was submitted to UT System in November and returned in January with changes, cautioning us to keep a tuition increase proposal under 3%. We therefore submitted one with a 2.9% tuition increase proposal, and we will see how this goes. There is a new subcommittee within the Board of Regents to which university presidents will make 10-minute tuition proposals next week. Several years ago, UT Arlington bundled tuition and fees together, making it impossible for us to raise some fees while keeping tuition constant. We are attempting to un-bundle the fees from tuition, but this requires a one-year process.
 - Question re 2.9% (Cichock): Does the 2.9% proposal include fees? VK: Yes – and there have been no increases in fees in three years.
- **Total University Budget:** The summary of the total university budget is due in early May, and there is a line in there for merit increases, although they depend upon enrollment figures and tuition increases.
 - Question re merit increases (Cavanagh): Will merit raise start in September or January? VK: no agreement from UT System yet on this, but we will hear more in May about this.
- **Question re rumor about COLA and COS merging (Sol).** VK: No truth to the rumor; he had not even thought of such a merger.

David Silva

- **Shimadzu Corporation:** The Provost is in Japan with the VP of Research visiting the Shimadzu Corporation.
- **University Attorney:** We now have a university attorney.
- **Promotion and Tenure:** Deliberations are almost at an end, with a record 54 cases to review. We are in the final appeal stage now. Promotion and tenure guidelines will be post on the Faculty Affairs website in early summer
- **Student Feedback Survey (SFS):** Invitations were sent to students today, and SFS close at 11 PM on May 2. Be proactive with students, talk it up in class, and set aside time in class for them to complete the surveys. There are three types of students regarding SFS: those who don't complete any, those who complete all of them, and those who complete a subset (usually for courses in a major). Faculty will get a reminder shortly that also tells what percentage of students have completed them midway during the SFS period. Notify him if there is a SFS for a course you are not teaching or if there is no SFA for a course you are teaching.
 - Question re SFS (Elliott): Even though the SFS is online, is it still recommended that the professor leave the room while students are completing the SFS? DS: Yes, it is still recommended.
 - Question re SFS response rates (Cichock): Do we have numbers for response rates from peer institutions? DS: The numbers usually are around 30%, and there is a rough correlation between university size and response rates in that smaller institutions tend to have slightly higher rates. Our rate has been around 32% but last fall it went up to 40%. We don't yet have figures for rates at other UT campuses for last fall.
- **Faculty Development Leaves (FDL):** Only 22 people applied, and he would love to see at least 35 apply next year. FDLs are good for faculty wanting to move from associate to full professor. This year 14 FDLs

were awarded, the highest percentage for a long time. Maria Martinez-Cosio worked with the committee and got feedback regarding strong versus weak proposals. She will be having a workshop about this in the fall. Regarding an FDL proposal: write something that can be appreciated by intelligent colleagues from a range of disciplines. All recipients will be announced at a 4 PM reception on April 29.

- Question re FDL benefits (Cichock): How are benefits allotted for those who take a full-year FDL at 50% pay? DS: Those faculty members will receive compensation to cover the usual benefits (e.g., health insurance) for the year, but other benefits base upon percentage of pay will not be compensated.
- Question re overall FDL budget (Wright): Is the overall budget flat and therefore only enough for 14 slots? DS: It isn't flat and the total allocation is around 100K. The salaries of faculty members involved are not an issue; rather the variable is the cost of compensating academic units to replace the teaching during the FDL. The most expensive FDLs therefore come from high-cost units.
- **Peer Review:** A point of contention is what happens to the actual peer review file, which encourages the faculty member to report on the form the impact of the process. A handful of deans felt that the actual rating should be included in the faculty member's dossier, but they did not prevail. There also was a discussion about letting a faculty put the rating in her/his file if one wanted to do so, but this will not happen. Therefore the observation is a private matter between the faculty member and the observer. Only the faculty member's response goes in the file. Regarding peer review, an amendment to the policy was brought to his attention by faculty in studio/performance-oriented disciplines. The policy begins to ease into effect on 1 September 2014 and becomes mandatory on 1 September 2015.
 - Question re peer review (Cole): Will there be provisions for asynchronous online courses, and how will these courses be classified? DS: This would be classified as a lecture course, and we will have a provision to have someone come and do an assessment of such an online course. There is a difference between instructional type and delivery format, and peer review addresses delivery format.
 - Question re ratings (Elliott): What were some of the arguments in favor of including the ratings in files. Were they regarding possible punitive measures? DS: From a dean's perspective it was "How will I know if teaching is good if you won't tell me what happened?" DS countered that with the question "Isn't it more important that the person got professional feedback and can act upon it, rather than a dean knowing?"
 - Question re ratings (Cole): This history department has had peer review and included ratings in files for decades. Do these ratings now come out of the files? DS: Yes.
 - Question re observation report (Cavanagh): Is the full observation report sent to the ACPT? DS: No – only the faculty member's response is submitted.
 - Question re peer review forms (Raudonis): Will we have official forms for each unit? DS: We will be posting some university-wide templates that departments/units can adopt or adjust as long as they don't violate the spirit and letter of the policy. These will be posted on the Center for Teaching Excellence website by mid-May. I recommend that departmental policies look exactly like the university one.
 - Question re next steps (Chrzanowski). DS: The policy next goes to the HOP Committee and then hopefully will be in the HOP by early July.
 - Question re compensation (Chrzanowski). Will there be any changes to the HOP regarding compensation for people having to do these evaluations? In some departments, being an observer/evaluator can take many hours. DS: This did get raised at the end of discussions with deans who were concerned about the extra service component this represents. The Center for

Teaching Excellence will provide support to evaluators, for we know that it can be a lot of work for P+T chairs. I estimate that it takes about 4 hours of work to do an assessment.

- Sol: In the policy it is stated that observers' time should go toward the service obligation and be included in annual evaluations.

March minutes

- Sol: Request for any corrections
 - Dancila: requests correction of spelling of his last name
- Motion to approve minutes made and seconded. Minutes approved.

Peer Review Policy

- Discussion
 - Cavanagh: Some confusion regarding associate/assistant chairs and whether they are eligible to be the observer.
 - Ingram: If you are not technically compensated as an administrator, then you cannot serve as a peer review observer.
 - Lovely: Peer review for post-tenure review is not in the policy as written.
 - ~~Sol: Yes, there is a conflict between policies 170 and 180.~~ There is no language in the peer review policy that applies to peer review occurring, but lecturers would go through it every 5 years.
- Vote: motion made to close discussion and seconded. Discussion closed. Motion made to vote and seconded. The policy is approved by vote.

Academic Liaison Committee FDL Report

- Survey handout distributed to senators
- Byrd: The committee contacted 19 institutions regarding their FDL policies, but did not receive responses from all of them. UT Arlington's percentage of faculty awarded FDLs (2.3%) is lower than the percentages from the schools that responded.
- Discussion
 - Question (Cole): Does this include schools with regular sabbaticals? Byrd: Yes, they are in the equation. Cole: Would the better question to survey be what percentage of faculty members get FDLs over a 10-year period, because this percentage would be 100% at other schools?
 - Elliott: And FDLs are also awarded on a competitive basis, not regularly.
 - Sol: The committee was to find alternative ways to do this.
 - Question (Dancila): Was seeking funds from an endowment considered? The amount is small. Maybe we can pursue an endowment for such things; put in place a process to raise funds to establish an endowment in addition to what funds already exist.
 - Quick: Contact Professor Dov Eden at Tel Aviv University. He began sabbatical research in 2000 that we were a part of. He initially went with the assumption of a 7-year sabbatical program but learned that this was not the case worldwide and studied respites from work. His team probably has a significant database.
 - Question (Cole): What is the next stage? Does the report go to the president? Sol: it goes back to the committee for these two additions.

Senate IT/Internet Security Committee Report

- Sol: This will be a standing committee that will interface with OIT and the Office of Internet Security, advising the president which paths to follow, policy development and policy implementation. There will need to be an amendment to the senate bylaws regarding the establishment of this committee. Ingram: We can form an ad hoc committee until the bylaws are changed. Sol: There will be one member for each undergraduate college plus one each from Social Work, SOA/SUPA, and Nursing/Kinesiology, and membership is restricted to senate members, since this is a senate committee.
- Dancila: Members need to be technically savvy. There is an urgency to form the committee, for decisions will have to be made in the fall.
- Sol: motion to approve establishment of the committee, motion seconded. Vote affirmative.

Change in HOP language regarding faculty composition on ACPT committees

- Sol: The proposed language states that only tenured faculty members should be on ACPT committees in units. Motion to approve the change in language, motion seconded. Vote affirmative.

Other business

- **Commencement** (Sol): The senate statement on commencement was sent to the president that asks that a majority of faculty be required to be present as opposed to a number, clarification of consequences for non-attendance, and provisions for costs. The president responded to these issues during the PAB meeting and said that deans and not departmental/program chairs will be tasked with maintaining the lists. Money is set aside for junior faculty regarding regalia, and such faculty members should contact David Silva directly. Emphasis: this is only for truly junior faculty.
 - Brief discussion regarding the bookstore's contract with Josten's for academic regalia (Audirac, Sol). Jorgenson noted that the math chair bought gowns for everyone in the department.
 - Chrzanowski: Did the president comment about faculty members revealing personal health issues to a dean with regard to an excuse not to attend? Wouldn't this be a violation of HIPAA [Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996]? Sol: No, the president did not discuss this at the meeting of the President's Advisory Board. Cichock: A faculty member could always say to a dean that such information is privileged information under HIPAA.
- **Presidential Charges to Senate** (Sol): The first charge is to think about how we are going to deal with online courses that are taken elsewhere and for which the student wants transfer credit. The second charge is to think about how joint appointments can be made, especially between departments. The model must work, and thinking about this charge will be given to a committee in the fall.
 - Dancila: Tarrant Community College (TCC) is using Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and flipped classrooms. By us not having a way to have a mechanism for counting these courses toward credits, we allow others like TCC to monetize the MOOCs, which then are transferred and become part of a student's UTA transcript. He is a proponent of MOOCs, but there are several problems concerning how to do it in a credible manner, for open enrollment is incompatible with credit. He therefore suggests Massive Online Courses (MOCs) instead, for we could then leverage courses for a program. There are two necessary conditions: (1) Course syndication on a platform, which we can then take to other schools for them to accept for credit; (2) Course modularity: fit courses together in a sequence. We are a part of EDX and cannot be left behind, but he tried to gain access to the EDX studio and could not. There needs to be a clear, open process to make the platform available to all faculty, and we therefore need to have input on this, for there will be a big difference in 5-10 years.
 - Brief discussion re MOOCs
 - Cavanagh: We are looking for some big-level suggestions regarding policy.

- Raudonis: The president also said that we have to be prepared to accept from other schools.
- Chrzanowski: The topic is better dealt with by the undergraduate and graduate assemblies, rather than the senate, for it is a matter of transfer credit.
- **Issue of Department Chairs**
 - Chrzanowski: There is a rumor that all department chairs will be hired as heads with 12-month appointments and will be declared as administrators. This is coming from the Regents, although existing chairs would be grandfathered and still called chairs.
 - Sol: There are salary negotiations between faculty and deans regarding these positions. Within COLA, the salary is paid over 9 months and then the chair is paid for a summer class.
 - Ingram: UT Regents' Rule 182 was passed regarding this, and the general intent is that chairs would be acting implementation personnel for the deans and no longer advocates for the departments.

Sol: Meeting adjourned at 4:13.

Submitted by Douglas Klahr on 28 April 2014.