



Faculty Senate Minutes

15 April 2015

Senate Leadership in Attendance

Toni Sol, Chair

Dan Cavanagh, Chair-Elect

Douglas Klahr, Secretary

Reni Courtney, Parliamentarian

Senators and Student Representatives in Attendance

John Adams	Business	Seokjin Jeong	Liberal Arts
Amanda Alexander	Liberal Arts	Theresa Jorgensen	Science
Siamak Ardekani	Engineering	Susanna Khavul	Business
Donelle Barnes	Nursing	Joseph Kongevick	Liberal Arts
Miriam Byrd	Liberal Arts	Peter Lehmann	Social Work
Norman Cobb	Social Work	Don Liles	Engineering
Stephanie Cole	Liberal Arts	Kytai Nguyen	Engineering
Bill Crowder	Business	Yuan Peng	Science
D. Stefan Dancila	Engineering	Barbara Raudonis	Nursing
Ray Elliott	Liberal Arts	James Richards	SOA
Amir Farbin	Science	Peggy Semingson	Education + HP
Louanne Frank	Liberal Arts	Jason Shelton	Liberal Arts
Tom Hall	Business	Albert Tong	Engineering
James Hardy	Education	Matthew Wright	Engineering
Loan Ho	Student Congress President	Michael Young	Nursing
Andrew Hunt	Science		

Guests

Vistap Karbhari, President

Ron Elsenbaumer, Provost

Jean Hood, Vice-President, Human Resources

Maria Martinez-Cosio, Office of the Provost

Nakia Pope, Director, Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence

Call to Order: Toni Sol

2:34 PM

Remarks from President Karbhari

▪ Texas Legislature Session

- Lots of different bills for things that affect us are still being debated. There is a reasonable chance that our funding will at least hold steady and have a possible small gain. Outcomes-based funding has come up again, but it is not clear in which format it will come forward.
- The funding bill with the most traction is tied to tuition rates, which will be allowed to rise by a cost of living index. If we want to increase tuition more than that, we will have to meet a majority of nine criteria, of which 4- and 6-year graduation rates are two. There are also criteria for 4- and 6-year on-time graduation rates for transfer students, with on-time meaning 120 credit hours.
- A campus [gun] carry bill is still on the books and being discussed.
- A single TRB bill is moving forward that has set funds for three tiers of universities:
 - A+M and UT Austin are each guaranteed \$80 million
 - Emerging institutions such as UT Arlington are guaranteed \$70 million
 - Remaining institutions are pegged at \$60 million
 - These set amounts will be given to institutions even if they don't use them, and then if not used, are supposed to be returned to be reallocated.
 - We asked for 300 million, and we are trying to get special riders for use based on the space deficit we have on campus. We asked for \$300 million, so if we get the \$70 million, we hope that UT System will kick in \$300 million

▪ **Stepping down of Pedro Reyes, Executive Vice-Chancellor for UT System:** No direct impact upon UT Arlington is expected.

▪ **Merit Pool:** There will be a merit pool once again for faculty members, and letters to the deans went out on Monday. The process is in place.

Remarks from Provost Elsenbaumer

▪ Tenure and Promotion

- A total of 36 tenure and promotion cases were reviewed. 25 were approved and 11 were denied; an overall denial rate of 30%.
 - For promotion from assistant to associate professor: 24 cases reviewed, 16 approved and 8 denied.
 - For promotion from associate to full professor: 11 cases reviewed, 8 approved and 3 denied.
- No numbers regarding third-year reviews are available yet.
- Discussion regarding tenure and promotion:
 - **Ardekani:** what were the denial rates in the past two years? **Provost:** in 2014 it was 17-20% and in 2013 it was 5-7%.
 - **Farbin:** are there figures regarding at what level cases were denied? **Provost:** I don't have the figures, but remember that every level is merely a recommendation to the President.
 - **Courtney:** There is an upward trend in terms of denial over the past few years, going from 17-20 percent to now 30 percent. The reasons for this? **Provost:** One area that will be helpful is that third, fourth and fifth-year reviews are not as rigorous as they should be. There are two things to pay attention to:
 - Guidelines are often too loose and unclear at the departmental/unit level, so they need to be made clearer to people.
 - It has to be recognized that faculty have to perform across all the categories: teaching, service, research and mentorship.

There are many times when a member is not on track in the third year, yet everyone is in favor of continuation. We need to be honest and supportive, and seize mentoring opportunities for faculty.

- **Cole:** Are these denial rates even across the schools? Some feel that COLA has been harder hit. Moving forward, as we use these faculty lines, if faculty members are denied, the lines are not up for renewal. New line requests have to fit with the strategic plan, but is there any understanding regarding student needs, e.g., losing one person who has many students? **Provost:** in 3-5 year reviews, the outcomes are about the same across units. If we look at this year, COLA did the best in terms of promotions regarding percentages. Regarding faculty lines, every line is reevaluated regarding the strategic plan and unit's plan regarding how hires will fit and advance the university. Concerning student needs: we do not ignore these. I cannot think of one case when we were asked to provide someone for a new section regarding teaching needs where it was not provided.
- **Cole:** We need someone not to teach just 275 prelaw students, for instance, but also someone who can mentor them. It therefore needs to be somebody who is tenure-track who will be here over the long run, who will be able to write recommendations. Adjuncts therefore don't serve students. **Provost:** It is the responsibility of the unit to state and justify this need, and to find a way that teaching that subject will fit into the plan. **President:** the strategic plan is broad enough to find a role for every department in it. It will take some stretching at times to find commonalities.
- Regarding 3, 4 and 5-year reviews:
 - **Barnes:** It's not just the third-year review, but also what's happening in years four and five.
 - **Provost:** the "renew with reservations" box should be used when there are issues.
 - **Klahr:** Are you saying that even though the form restricts use of "renew with reservations" to third-year reviews, we can use it in years four and five? If so, then the form needs to be changed to state this, for it would be very helpful to have this option in years four and five. **Provost:** Yes, we encourage you to use "renew with reservations" in years four and five, and the form will be changed.
 - **Cole:** "Renew with reservations" means a tough review – the faculty member has to have a new packet in six months. **Provost:** Yes, but we also look at what the person has upcoming in the pipeline regarding publications. The pipeline is important, for it tells us where the person is headed, and that is why it is taken into consideration.

Remarks from Jean Hood

- **Pooled Sick Leave Policy:** I will send the complete policy to Toni who can then forward it all of you. Here is an overview of the policy. It was created by the Texas Education Code to provide a pool of sick leave hours – not dollars – that any of us can donate to in order to provide salary continuations to colleagues. A colleague needs to have exhausted all sick leave before applying for the pool, and two major criteria must be met: that the condition is a catastrophic – not chronic – illness and it is life-threatening. There is an application process that requires documentation by a physician regarding these two criteria. Therefore in cases that don't meet another criterion – a hospital stay exceeding 72 hours – the colleague may still apply if a physician can document that the illness was catastrophic and life-threatening, and cases will be reviewed on an individual basis. Cases are reviewed in the HR department by three people, and funding

for the pool comes from all departments. All unused sick leave hours automatically go into the pool when a colleague retires.

Remarks from Maria Cosio-Martinez

- **Departmental Chairs:** We are working with chair to provide professional development and improving communication regarding policies. We will be looking at third year reviews and the tenure process with chairs shortly. The number one takeaway from a February training cycle was mentoring junior faculty, and we therefore offer services to junior faculty, with an emphasis upon writing and publication.
- **Open Chat with the Provost:** Invitations are being sent for this event, which will be on May 4. It is for all faculty members.
- **Faculty Awards Ceremony:** This will be on May 5. 24 Faculty Development Leaves were reviewed and 10 were awarded. No figures are yet available regarding the Research Enhancement Program.
- **Student Feedback Surveys:** These are coming out soon, and the deadline for students to submit them online is April 22. Faculty members with the highest percentage of returns provide class time for this.
 - **Semington:** How can this factor be addressed in online courses? Could you provide us with some tips to give online students, and some suggested language that we can put in an email to students? **Cosio-Martinez:** We certainly can do that.

March Minutes approved.

Other Business

- **Special Projects Committee (Hall):** Our collection of data will be complete by June 1. We will do an analysis over the summer and have a final report to the Senate in November.
- **Report from the Chair (Sol):**
 - The FAC meets tomorrow in Austin.
 - UT Share: The problems with statements of accounts was discussed with the President, and he had a video call with the Chancellor about this. New people from Huron are being brought in to see if they can figure out how to fix things, and three campus are sharing workaround methods with one another: UT Arlington, UT San Antonio, and UT El Paso.
 - President's Advisory Board Meeting of April 7: The President went over the different votes and levels of dissent regarding tenure and promotion cases. All the cases were different: there was no single area in common. Some were denied for their teaching and not for research: faculty going up for promotion at least have to make the university average regarding teaching or better, and the average is about 4.2 /5.0 points. There is no need to be stellar in teaching, but one needs to be in line with the university average. Trajectories of teaching regarding improvement over time are looked at.
 - Discussion about teaching:
 - **Sol:** Regarding online courses that often result in lower ratings, this was discussed with the President and he said that the courses need to be labeled so that it is clear in the dossier that they were online. The Special Projects Committee is looking into whether there might be special prejudices that figure into these ratings, and the Provost is interested in accounting for such factors. The committee is also looking into the validity of data when only 20% of students complete a Student Feedback Survey, and it will be making recommendations regarding this.
 - **Cavanagh:** There was not a single instance of the President being the lone dissenting voice with regard to the university tenure and promotion committee. The president votes by himself, and not at the committee meeting.
- **Closed Session**

Open Session Resumes

New Business

- **Elections (Sol):** We will hold elections at the first fall session for the positions of Secretary, Parliamentarian, and TCoFS Representative. Please send all nominations and self-nominations to Toni.
- **Operating Procedures Committee (Cavenagh):** The committee concluded its work on joint appointments with some recommendations. It met with faculty members who have joint appointments, and there is no clear policy, especially regarding the salary percentage split. Other institutions were studied, and the University of Michigan has a good policy. The President seems interested in implementing that in some way, and it may go the HOP Committee. Recommendations will be sent to everyone.
- **Professor Emeritus Nominations (Sol):** The deadline is next Friday. Joe Kongevich is the chair of the committee, which also consists of Tom Ingram and Thomas Chrzanowski.
- **The David Silva Position (Sol):** Think about having a possible Senate Resolution in the fall regarding the importance of keeping this position.
- **Departmental Chairs (Sol):** Since these are now fulltime administrative positions, we need to change the HOP regarding chairs being allowed to serve in the senate, for they no longer are faculty positions. We also need to review tenure and promotion guidelines in departments.

Meeting adjourned at 4:18

Submitted by Douglas Klahr on 20 April 2015

Addendum: The Senate requested supplementary information on tenure and tenure track decisions and the correlation with third year review. The provost provided the following figures:

TT Faculty Years 1-5

2012-13 (2013)

Renew	150
Renew with Reservations	4
Non-Renew	<u>4</u>
Total	158

2013-14 (2014)

Renew	130
Renew with Reservations	2
Non-Renew	<u>3</u>
Total	135

2014-15 (2015)

Renew	74
Renew with Reservations	23
Non-Renew	<u>6</u>
Total	103

+2 outstanding decisions = 105

3rd Year Review Decisions for the 8 denied tenure this year:
 4 Renew
 4 Renew with Reservations

2014-15	3 rd Year Renewals	18
	3 rd Year Renew with Reservations	10
	3 rd Year Non-renews	3
	4 th Year Renewals	10
	4 th Year Renew wit Reservations	5
	4 th Year Non-renews	0
	5 th Year Renewals	16
	5 th Year Renew with Reservations	6
	5 th Year Non-renews	<u>2</u>
	Total 3-5 Years	70

Minutes Approved by the Senate on September 9, 2015