

Faculty Senate Minutes

3 May 2023

Trinity Hall 104

Senate Leadership in Attendance

Jackie Fay, Chair

Andy Milson, Chair Elect

Venkat Devarajan, Parliamentarian

Kathryn Warren, Secretary

Senators in Attendance, followed by the unit they represent

(Department for TT, College or School for NTT)

Jonathan Asadi	Physics
Amy Austin	College of Liberal Arts
Karabi Bezboruah	Public Affairs
Alan Bowling	Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Lauren Brewer	College of Business
Jivas Chakravarthy	Accounting
Wei Chen	Physics
Imre Demhardt	History
Sarah El Sayed	Criminology and Criminal Justice
Julienne Greer	Theatre Arts and Dance
Doug Grisaffe	Marketing
Andy Hansz	Finance and Real Estate
Michael Holmes	Nursing
Darlene Hunter	School of Social Work
Aimée Israel-Pelletier	Modern Languages
Song Jiang	Computer Science
Theresa Jorgensen	Math
Un-Jung Kim	Earth and Environmental Sciences
Douglas Klahr	Architecture
Andrzej Korzeniowski	Math
David Levine	College of Engineering
Qing Lin	Psychology
Fred MacDonnell	Chemistry/Biochemistry
Steve Mattingly	Civil Engineering
Jeff McGee	Management
Joyce Myers	College of Education
Anne Nordberg	Social Work
Taner Ozdil	Landscape Architecture
Mark Pellegrino	Biology
Nicholas Pollock	College of Science
Stefan Romanoschi	Civil Engineering
Cristina Salinas	History

Brent Sasley	Political Science
Amy Speier	Sociology and Anthropology
Christy Spivey	College of Business
Chunke Su	Communication
Amy Tigner	English
Nilakshi Veerabathina	College of Science
Shouyi Wang	Industrial, Manufacturing, and Systems Engineering
Jeffrey Witzel	Linguistics
Ling Xu	Social Work
Yi Leaf Zhang	Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Ex officio Members in Attendance

Tamara Brown, UTA Provost

Minerva Cordero, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Guests

Chris Templeton, incoming Staff Advisory Council (SAC) Chair

**

Remarks from Provost Tamara Brown

- Congratulates Senate on 50-year anniversary
- Legislative update
 - President Cowley is in Austin meeting with legislators
 - Because legislative deadlines are coming up, we should expect a flurry of activity
 - Higher education bills get heard in the next week or two; bills have been passed out of Senate and have moved to the House.
 - Tenure bill
 - Senate passed the “get rid of tenure” bill; the House has made clear they’re going to revise that. They’re working on a substitute bill. What is expected is a codification of what’s already standard practice for UTA: rigorous tenure and post-tenure review process will become state statute.
 - Critical race theory bill
 - With the House. Unclear whether it will move forward.
 - We are advocating that the House remove the amendments that the Senate added on the way to the House so that the original language is restored: language saying that we cannot indoctrinate students with the view that any race, ethnicity, or gender is “superior” to any other.
 - DEI bill
 - Question mark what modifications the House will make to that one.
 - We’re letting the government relations team, who are advocating for us, do their work and not reacting to the various, changing forms of the bills that are getting attention in the news.

Senator: With the CRT bill, you mentioned that you’re advocating for removal of amendments; what amendments were made?

Provost: It was about reporting: the Senate added that anyone, anywhere who thinks something CRT-related happened could report on the faculty member. But given the confusion about what CRT is, it's questionable that people would be accurately reporting. There's also the question about what's actionable: what would be done with the information? It's very murky, but there would be an onslaught of reports. It's unwieldy.

- We are advocating for funding at legislature
 - Those issues won't be taken up until the other higher education bills work their way through.
 - Anticipating that we'll see an increase in our research funding, so there will be some restructuring in light of that increased research support. But it's still very preliminary.
- UTA Budget
 - Budget hearings have concluded.
 - Moving to create a draft of the budget that can be shared soon.
 - The magnitude of the asks exceeds the amount of money that is available, which means tough choices will be made. The choices will be made in alignment with the strategic themes: the closer the alignment, the higher the prioritization.
 - The Faculty Senate put forward two priorities—graduate student support and faculty salaries—and those will be factored in.
 - Some of the lines will be estimated lines because we still need to receive the budget from the state.
- Hiring updates
 - Enrollment Management
 - An Interim VP named Ray Brown began serving about a week ago. He's been a VP for Enrollment Management for other universities; he stopped doing that to retire; he then returned to work in an interim capacity. He's been doing "interim service" for several years at other universities (serving in the gap), to lead in ways that set the next permanent leader up for success. He has hit the ground running.
 - VP for Student Affairs
 - An announcement will be coming out in the morning.
 - Chief of Staff
 - Interviews concluded last Friday. Over 70 applications.
 - Negotiations underway; the position will be filled in the coming days.
 - CAPP Dean search
 - Interviews underway.
 - Dean of the Libraries
 - Finalists will come to campus week of July 10
 - Hope is to have someone in place in the start of fall.
 - College of Education, Social Work Dean searches underway; interviews will happen in the fall.
 - Lots of interest in all these positions.
- Classroom technology
 - Team charged with making sure that all centrally-scheduled classrooms meet some basic standard for technology and that it's consistent across campus. Faculty should

be able to come into a classroom and know what the setup is, and the support should be centralized with OIT so that the rooms stay up to date and when there are problems, they get addressed. Should happen for the fall.

- First phase was for centrally-scheduled classrooms; next phase begins this month, once the semester's over, for commonly used meeting spaces; last phase is June.
- There should be a culture of keeping things up to date.

Senator: What are the minimum technology standards? Or where are improvements most needed?

Provost: That simple question is hard to answer. In the past, we had different owners of different rooms and different owners of different pieces of technology in the room. Probably the greatest margin of improvement is those classrooms where there was no technology at all. The basic minimum is a computer, a screen, and a projector with cords for plugging in laptops.

- In early June, Amber Smallwood, Pranesh Aswath, and Rebecca Lewis are going to do a workshop for submitting new program proposals. It will be recorded and repeated.
 - Lots of interest in new programs but frustration with the process.
 - That's what the workshop is meant to address: helping people to know the steps (internally and externally) and the process.
 - Part of the frustration with how long it takes is not UTA; it's external regulatory bodies that add to the time downstream (US Department of Education, SACS [Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 4-6 months for approval], THECB [Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board]). Some of those bodies only hear proposals on certain dates.
 - We are attempting to frontload as much as possible.

Senator: There's this distance/remote learning thing we're trying to do in my department, and to do it well, there needs to be a tracking system that a lot of schools have . . .

Provost: You mean technology to allow for people to be present in a classroom and for someone from a distant location to also be virtually present in a classroom? We've talked about creating some of those high technology classrooms. They're on the list to get to. That was priority #1 when I came, to create those, but looking at the overall classroom technology situation, I decided we needed to start with the basics and then add the innovation. So that's what we've been focused on—getting all of our classrooms to that standard. But once we do that, the next step will be creating some of them to operate in that way. We want to be able to take advantage of developments in technology; it will help with the flipped classroom.

Senator: Question about tuition. Applicants who choose to go elsewhere are saying UTA tuition is too high, which is why they choose to attend elsewhere.

Provost: Our tuition is not the highest, but it's on the higher end. We have to think carefully about raising tuition. There are some universities that keep their published tuition low because they charge a lot of fees, so it looks like it's cheaper, but it's not. We've been reducing the number of fees for clarity about the cost of education. The less complexity there, the better. So it

does look like we charge higher tuition, but I'm not sure we actually are. We've been looking at fees and how we can be creative in that regard.

Senator: This comes from some other colleagues. They're looking for a room equipped with computers where they can send 100-200 students to take a proctored exam. I know that the library has a few computers, but not a place that's big enough. Where else can they do it? Is there any such place in consideration on campus?

Provost: I'd have to look into that for a large computer-based room.

Senator: Some faculty members in Mathematics have approached me, wondering whether it will ever happen that the schedule for graduation rotates. For instance, the College of Science commencement is always on a Friday night . . . If you're in that college, you can't do anything else on that Friday night. Anyway, we were wondering about morning commencements.

Provost: I am sensitive to that. Let me look into it. The team that does this schedules on the basis of numbers, but I don't know that they pay attention to those kinds of things. Thanks for mentioning that. That's a reasonable question.

Senator: Same concern for CAPPAs as well.

Senator: My faculty members are feeling inquisitive, so I have a few questions. The first relates to ChatGPT and plagiarism. My colleagues ask, "What should a faculty member do if they suspect an essay or work product was written with AI or ChatGPT; specifically, what processes are there to avoid false accusations of plagiarism and to safeguard student privacy and rights? Is there specific guidance that protects faculty?" They're concerned with making accusations they can't substantiate.

Provost: I've been talking to the Council of Deans about that. The nature of our conversation has been in the opposite direction: how can we embrace this technology to prepare our students for the world they will enter, where this technology will be commonly used. ChatGPT is not going away, so how do we educate our students for that world, that will be filled with AI, to use it responsibly and be critical thinkers about it. That's the direction we've been going in.

To your point about academic dishonesty: it's not dishonesty if you haven't said that students can't do it. It's creativity, a creative way to accomplish a classroom task. I think a part of it is, how are we clear about the expectations of a course. I find this in other instances, cases we might call academic dishonesty come down to lack of instruction on our part. For example, students who come from cultures where you work together on things, and they bring that here, and suddenly it's a failing, but they were never told that's not the way assignments should be done in a particular class. Instructors need to set expectations and be clear about what is and isn't in bounds. That would be a starting point—and then explaining the "why." This generation wants to understand why. What is the learning enhancement you're trying to accomplish by prohibiting certain resources?

Senator: I don't have a question; I have a comment. I'd like to say thank you. I represent NTT faculty in COLA. A month ago, salary adjustment letters went out, and my department, English, had many people who were affected: quite a number got raises of about 23% as a result of that adjustment. So, it's a huge deal, it's a huge ethical statement by the administration supporting our most hardworking and underpaid faculty, and we're really grateful.

Provost: You're welcome. [Clapping] I appreciate you saying that. We all wish—and I am at the head of the wish line—that it could be more. There's explicit acknowledgment that we are not yet where we need to be, but we are on the path, and being on the path matters for people in significant ways, so I appreciate that. Thank you.

Faculty Senate minutes from the March 29, 2023, meeting approved by acclamation.

Updates from Minerva Cordero, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

- Tenure and promotion from the last cycle: all but five promotions to full were granted, and all promotions to associate professor were recommended to the Board of Regents.
- 50 cases are expected next year, with 34 applying for tenure (from 23 departments) and 16 applying for full (from 12 departments).
- The Division of Faculty Affairs (DFA) held a workshop for candidates going up for tenure with good attendance (46 or 47, so almost everyone).
- DFA has started offering office hours every other week (Minerva Cordero and Samantha Baker Moore, Digital Measures expert) for faculty going up; in August, they will be offered weekly. The schedule is posted on the Teams channel created for faculty going up next academic year. Anyone can reach out with questions about dossiers.
- Dossiers due September 1.
- T and P timeline has been revised and is on the website, with some changes: the timeframe for department Chairs and departmental Committees is shorter than in the past, which is necessary to accommodate reporting to UT System, and also because the UCTP (University Committee for Tenure and Promotion) is going to have 50 dossiers to review, so that's why. Check in with your Chairs and T and P committees to make sure they're aware of the changed timeline.

Senator: Is it only earlier, or is it shorter? How short is the timeline for departmental committees? It used to be one month.

Minerva: It might be a month. I think it starts September 1 and October 10 is when it needs to move to the Deans' level, but I don't have the dates memorized. I looked at the candidates and the departments they're from. Most departments have only one person going up (two have 4 and 5). The Colleges have more, and then it comes to UCTP. The UCTP committee spends a tremendous amount of time on each file; they're not just rubber stamping, and they need the time, as do the Provost and President. The time allowed for departments is still sufficient.

- For FDLs, there were 18 applications this last round, and 12 were funded by the Provost's office. I'd like for the Provost to consider increasing that funding (and REP [Research Enhancement Program] funding as well). For UT System schools, up to 6% of faculty can be on FDLs at the same time, which is between 35 and 40, so we're way below that number;

with NRUF funds and other funds, having made Tier 1, we should be able to accommodate that. My personal recommendation is that FDLs should come with additional travel funds. We are investigating those things right now.

Stephanie Scott, Associate VP of Business Affairs

- Here to talk about the Concur Travel Project: trying to improve travel and expense processes at UTA through expanded use of a platform called Concur, which is used to do booking through CTP (Corporate Travel Planners).
 - The booking piece is a small portion of Concur; want to leverage its additional functionality.
 - Two phases: focus on travel, then on ProCard reconciliations and improving that process.
 - Doing this because the processes are outdated and highly manual and disconnected.
 - We are stripping the travel and expense processes out of UT Share because it's cumbersome.
 - Will be operating through Concur instead. Travel requests will be done in the Concur system, and it has information to populate the expense reports.
 - Travelers be able to use phone to snap a photo of their receipt, which will go into Concur, and Concur will know what trip it is (because of the date) and the type of expense it is, and it get sent to an expense report that starts populating.
 - The admin will only have to go through to make sure everything's correct.
 - Payment will be quicker.
 - A lot of improved functionality, improved visibility.
 - There's a Concur app so that all of this can be done from one's phone. And another app called TripIt that knows what trip you're on, knows what the flight is, keeps you up to date on gate changes and hotel info and rental car, and everything can be booked from the phone.
 - Second phase: ProCard reconciliation. Related in that the travel portion, if you have a travel card, it will pull those things automatically in. Can download ProCard transactions into Concur, and admins can access them throughout the month.
 - Trying to modernize, automate, and keep people connected.
 - For additional information: they've been having informational sessions. Webpage set up. Working on FAQ page.
 - Timeline: late summer to early fall for travel and expense piece and the second phase will be coming early in 2024.
 - As part of the process, there will be an outage to transition the new Concur into the current Concur. Scheduled for May 15 to begin. Will probably be May 15-22 that Concur self-service will be down (will probably be done earlier).
 - During that time faculty will need to book with CTP agent.

Senator: Will CTP continue to be partnered with UTA in the future?

Stephanie Scott: Yes, as long as our contract continues. CTP will remain our travel partner, and you'll still have access to book with an actual agent, but we encourage you to use the Concur app or desktop version to book. There's fees involved with using an actual person.

Senator: Just today I had a booking to do with CTP, and when you go on their website right now, there's no telephone number. I Googled it to find a number (800 number), and I waited for an hour when I called it. I had another number from before the pandemic, so I called it, and I got through in just two minutes. When I have a live agent, I get for UTA a better price than I do through the automated system. A live agent gets better prices. We shouldn't get rid of the live agent because the savings might add up.

Stephanie Scott: Yes, I know; they will still be available. Agents can be very helpful with complicated travel.

Senator: During your testing, did the OCR (optical character recognition; software that reads text from digital images) work okay? Because traditionally it's not very reliable.

Stephanie Scott: As far as I know, it's been working fine. It's not perfect, because it's OCR.

Committee Reports

Nila Veerabathina, NTT Faculty Concerns

- We brought a motion back in March about nomenclature for NTT faculty, and we tabled it in order to canvas faculty for their input.
- To that end, we made a survey with two questions and a space for comments and suggestions, and it was distributed to NTT faculty.
- The survey is still open, but we encouraged people to do it by the end of April. So far, 146 people have completed it.
- First question: do you want the nomenclature "NTT to be changed?" 72% said yes.
- Second question: what nomenclature would you like to see (professional track, fixed term track, teaching track, instructional track, other; asked to rank)? Teaching track, instructional track, and professional track got almost the same number of votes; fixed term track got the fewest.
- Plan to bring NTT faculty from across UTA together for an open discussion about the title next semester.
- Returning to tabled motion from March 1 meeting: "We recommend that the NTT title be changed to better reflect the activities of these faculty and current trends in higher education."
- Right now we are just voting on whether it should be changed. Next year, there will be more discussion among NTT faculty about what it should be changed to.

Motion is seconded.

Senator: Is there a title yet? Change to what?

Parliamentarian: All the motion says is that it should be changed.

Chair: That would be a future discussion, if this motion passes.

Senator: Is there any movement on the UT level from universities that haven't already changed for a universal or almost-universal title?

Chair: No. A lot of have already done this change, and they've changed it to different things. UT Austin, UTSA . . . they aren't the only two. We could bring it to FAC, but that would be unwieldy and would be a top-down sort of approach; we might never get that body to agree on one name. It would take a long time.

Senator: Is this change a decision made by the administration or by the Senate?

Chair: We're an advisory body. A motion like this would be a piece of advice to the administration, who would then have the ability to enact that change if they so wish.

Senator: I'm just trying to understand about what actions are associated with this motion. Will there be a follow-up discussion with Faculty Senate? Will there be a deadline by which it should be handled? It's a very broad kind of statement.

Chair: We pass a lot of motions, which are public statements out of the Senate. Anybody's welcome to make suggestions.

Senator: If we pass this motion, and then we get the survey results, then that's what the package we give to the Provost?

Chair: The committee could do that, but certainly the motion would be an official statement that would be part of the official record.

Vote: one against, everyone else for, no abstentions

Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee, Stefan Romanoschi

- Need to submit the names for faculty representatives for UCTP—candidates have to be full professors with tenure without full-time administrative appointments (Chair or above).
- Need to submit names for five colleges: CAPP, COBA, COEd, COLA, COS (no names for COS yet)
- A message was sent to faculty, but there was some confusion about where nominations should be sent. Nominations should go to Stefan directly.
- Nominations still being accepted. Next step: to make sure nominees eligible.
- The elections will be conducted at the College level.
- College of Science needs to send nominations; they've sent no nominations at all.
- It's a great experience (Jackie says)—a lot of work, but really meaningful and interesting.
- It's a two-year term, and faculty can't serve more than three terms.

Douglas Klahr, Operating Procedures

- No report; thanks Senate for passing the bylaws at the last meeting.

Brent Sasley, Academic and Student Liaison Committee

- No report

Dave Levine, Information Technology and Information Security Committee

- No report

Imre Demhardt, Budget Liaison Committee

- There was a meeting scheduled for Monday with the CFO, but it was pushed back to an online meeting on May 15; so Senators on the BLC should join the meeting (10am)

Chair: We concluded the Budget Shared Governance Oversight process on Monday; all nine steps were finished. We came up with a plan for revising the process to make it less cumbersome.

Taner Ozdil, Special Projects Committee

- 12 submissions for Emeritus, all approved and passed on to the next level.
- 5 COLA, 2 COB, 1 COE, 1 COEd, 1 CONHI, 1 COS, 1 SSW

Chair recognizes Taner Ozdil for 6 years of Senate service, especially for his work on the Emeritus process.

New Business

- Revision of Emeritus policy to incorporate the policy change the Senate approved a year ago: to open the Emeritus status up to NTT faculty
 - A committee was constituted to review the policy (Minerva Cordero, from DFA; Taner Ozdil, who has chaired the committee tasked with handling Emeritus nominations; Kathryn Warren, as an NTT faculty member; Paul Paulus, a former Senator who holds Emeritus status now; and Jackie Fay)
 - First step: Shelby Boseman helped to review the existing HOP Emeritus policy and draw up a revision draft; the committee took it from there.
 - Main changes
 - The process remains the same, but it's opened up to NTT faculty in addition to tenured faculty
 - The committee stipulated the length of service necessary to earn Emeritus status, which was previously not in the policy (10 years).
 - Specifications about who can nominate and who can write letter.
 - New section at end about Emeritus administrative titles (administrators can only apply if you have a full-time faculty appointment)
 - We should forward this policy to the HOP committee to review (Senate can't change the HOP; we can only make recommendations).

Senator: My greatest concern is of the benefits of being an Emeritus is #4 under "Privileges": "entitlement to full freedom in research and publication." Is an Emeritus document necessary to guarantee this? The University can't take this away from me. My opinion is that it doesn't belong in this document, because it opens the door to there being some limitations.

Senator: I'd argue to the contrary. There's a change when it comes to being Emeritus because you're now fully retired from the University, whereas previously you were a member of the University, and therefore if we didn't have that, someone might ask if that changed. I think it's perfectly fine to keep it in here because it precludes someone asking that question, and I wouldn't view it as a threat.

Senator: I'd also add that when you publish as Emeritus you'd be using the UTA as your affiliation, and without that, you're not allowed to, because you're not formally affiliated with the University anymore. You can write a paper under your own name.

Senator: This leads in to the second problem. Emeritus status is an acknowledgement of good service to the institution, however, the process is a lot of work, and in the end, what do you get? A university space, possibly, attendance at department meetings, access to university resources and facilities, entitlement to full academic freedom (which no university can take away from me), and eligibility to serve the university. What I really get is not really worth it. I'm concerned about having a right I already have granted only after an approval process. But I can research and publish anywhere, so this is basically nothing.

Senator: If it's basically nothing, then what's the real objection to keeping it in there? You're arguing from your personal perspective, and unless a lot of people agree with you, I would argue the phrase should remain in there because when you are Emeritus, it is different from you leaving the university and retiring and being an independent scholar. This is different, and I think it's fine for this document to spell these things out. I don't think there's any slippery slope.

Senator: From my understanding, the biggest benefit of this kind of language is your access to the libraries. If you lose the benefit, it's really expensive to replace it.

Chair Elect: Does this language that I highlighted help? (On screen, highlights text from section G, on Privileges: "Emeritus faculty are accorded privileges intended to encourage and facilitate their continued participation in the academic community without compromising the professional authority or responsibility necessarily delegated to faculty and staff with active [non-honorary] appointments.") It says up front, we're not saying that faculty don't have these things; we're saying that these things continue if you have Emeritus status.

Senator: One more thing we should probably discuss is that whether we want Emeritus faculty to be involved in faculty searches, Chair searches, Dean searches, I think we need to spell it out clearly. In my experience I've seen Emeritus professors getting involved with and changing the outcome of such searches.

Chair: You're not protected by tenure after you retire; if this phrasing isn't in there, and UTA doesn't like what you're doing, it could tell you to stop doing it.

Senator: It could also remove your ability to receive funding from research if there's a project they didn't like.

Chair: Yes, I see a lot of potential negative outcomes if that part isn't there.

Senator: We need changes in the “Limitations” section. In our department we have someone who’s been Emeritus for 15 years and still gets very involved in departmental administrative decisions and faculty hires. He’s been catered to by our former Chair. We’d like to see something that doesn’t have them heavily involved in choosing faculty appointments. I would worry about other Chairs behaving that way.

Senator: I think the language should remain as it is because the unit needs to have the freedom to come up with its own policy. If the unit feels strongly, they should come up with their own policy.

Motion: I move that we approve to send this policy as written to the HOP committee.

Motion is seconded.

Senator: I hear the Emeritus has endless benefits.

Senator: May I propose a small amendment to satisfy our colleague? Can we change the bullet point to “continued entitlement”?

Senator: I appreciate that you try to accommodate my concern, but my concern is a more principled one.

Senator: I appreciate that I’m in a minority.

Senator: Is Emeritus status a lifetime status?

Chair: Yes.

Senator: We should recognize former senator Ramez Elmasri, who was involved in bringing this policy change forward. He is no longer with us, but it’s important to recognize him.

Vote: two against, everyone else for, no abstentions—motion carries

Theresa Jorgensen, Equity and Ethics Committee

- Process created for giving an award for Outstanding Service to the UTA Faculty Senate (document outlining process appended below); executive committee members not eligible

Motion: That the Senate adopt this procedure for establishing a yearly award for Outstanding Service, Seconded.

Discussion:

Senator: Maybe the phrasing regarding eligibility the committee should be changed—there’s no more executive committee. (Should be “officers,” not “executive committee.”)

Senator: So the nomination would be made by . . .

Theresa Jorgensen: Self-nominations are allowed, and any faculty member can nominate.

Senator: What's the timeline? Fall, spring?

Theresa Jorgensen: Our thinking was that it would be awarded at the last Senate meeting of the year. Based on our guidelines for awards, which we'll present in a minute, a call for nominations should be sent a month ahead of time in the Faculty Affairs newsletter (so maybe late February, before spring break).

Vote: motion carries unanimously

Theresa Jorgensen: Next step: job of developing a rubric will get passed to a committee.

Chair: Equity and Ethics committee did a fantastic job outlining a fair and thoughtful process.

Theresa Jorgensen:

- Shares document the committee drafted outlining how competitive faculty development opportunities should be handled at UTA (teaching awards, REP grants, FDLs). (Appended below.)
- Process
 - The Equity and Ethics committee discussed of frustration points in the processes and examples of what doesn't work well when it comes to applying for awards and the selection process.
 - Received examples from different departments about how they manage these procedures.
 - Basis for resulting document comes from Mathematical Association of America; it's trying to pay attention to fairness and equity.
- Results
 - The document outlines a set of principles to be adhered to.
 - A lot of room for growth at UTA in cultivating the nomination process and following best practices for how to do that.
 - Includes some guidelines to follow in the selection process as well.
 - Considering asking for a mechanism for feedback: if someone submits for an award or grant and is not selected, currently, they don't know why. Not every unit is open to providing that feedback, but there are units that do. Thinking about how feedback can be productively given while also protecting anonymity.

Motion: That FacSen adopt these guidelines for competitive faculty development awards/grants/fellowships at UTA at all levels.

Seconded

Senator: I have a friendly amendment. Point 3d says, "Do not let any committee member remain silent." Maybe something like, "encourage every committee member to contribute" instead?

Theresa: I would like it to be a strong statement; I accept the amendment.

Call the question, vote: motion passes unanimously

Jackie Fay, Chairs' Report

- Thanks the executive committee, PAC, committee chairs, and all the members of FacSen—we got a lot of stuff done in 2022-23 and should be proud of that.
- Thanks President and Provost, citing the compensation review, improvements in grad student funding, and the Senate Summit. It's been a great year for collaboration.
- Thanks NaKasha Brown (in DFA) for her hard work on behalf of Senate.
- Recognition of Mike Nelson, who is stepping down as TCOFS rep and of two senators finishing up their terms, Taner Ozdil and Keith Burgess-Jackson.
- Accomplishments this year include passing the reapportionment policy and the revised bylaws
- Representative Chris Turner filed a resolution in honor of UTA's Faculty Senate on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary that will go up before the committee for a vote and adoption on Saturday; two more representatives signed on (Salman Bhojani, David Cook); History MA student Jennifer Jenkins did the research to contribute to the timeline of accomplishments listed in the resolution.

Chair Elect Andy Milson

- Distributes Faculty Senate interest survey to help him make committee assignments in the fall.
- Announcement: the FAC (Senate for Senates for UT System) elected a new FAC chair for 2024-25. That person goes to Board of Regents meetings, interacts with the chancellor, and runs the FAC meetings. Jackie Fay was elected in a contested election.

Chair: It will be great to have Andy as the next Senate chair.

Christopher Templeton, incoming SAC (Staff Advisory Council) Chair: (Alicia Gill is stepping down because she's leaving the university.) He wants to work more closely with Faculty Senate than SAC has in the past, working in partnership with faculty to the end that all employees can have meaning in their job.

Senator: Thanks Jackie and the executive committee members and asks whether it's possible to move the Senate meeting time up (earlier) by a half an hour.

Chair: We will investigate that.

Meeting Adjourned 4:45 pm

Next Meeting: September 2023

Process for Award for Outstanding Service to the UTA Faculty Senate

Why: To recognize general faculty senators who go above and beyond in their service as a senator

When: To be awarded yearly at the last senate meeting of the year.

Who: To one member of the current Faculty Senate, exclusive of the Faculty Senate Officers

How: Nominations will be solicited from the faculty in general. Senators may self-nominate. Call for nominations will be publicized during Faculty Senate meetings, and through University-wide newsletters (e.g. Faculty Affairs newsletter), at least one month prior to the nomination deadline.

Nominations will be submitted via Question Pro.

- Required: Name of senator being nominated
- Required: Email address of senator being nominated
- Required: Name of nominating faculty member
- Required: Email address of nominating faculty member
- Optional open response field: Please provide a brief statement that indicates why you think your nominee is deserving of the Award for Outstanding Service to the UTA Faculty Senate

A faculty member who has been nominated will receive an email indicating they have been nominated. In that email will be a link to a Question Pro form. Completion of that form will comprise their application packet.

- Required: Name of senator completing the application form
- Required: Email address of senator
- Required: Number of years of service in the UTA Faculty Senate (years do not need to be consecutive) (drop down menu with options: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)
- Required: Open response field: Please discuss the ways in which you serve the Faculty Senate.
- Required: Open response field: Please discuss how you engage with your department as a Faculty Senator.

Who will select winner: Faculty Senate Officers

Rubric for selection to be determined

Guidelines for competitive faculty development awards/grants/fellowships at UTA at all levels

Award winners are regarded as role models and leaders, so it is important that the award selection process recognize the achievements of a diverse group that reflects the breadth of UTA at all levels (tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, teaching faculty, clinical faculty, groups traditionally underrepresented in disciplines, etc).

1. Composing selection committees

- a. **Appoint diverse selection committees and committee chairs.** Diverse committees provide access to a wider set of networks from which to cultivate nominations. Committee members and chairs from underrepresented groups may cushion against unintentional stereotyping.

2. Cultivating nominations

- a. **Generate a large and diverse pool of nominees.** Awards are selected based on established criteria, so this step is crucial to ensuring that the pool of nominees contains as many eligible candidates as possible (especially those whose work is outstanding but less well-known). Increasing awareness of the particular award and its selection criteria among all faculty has the side benefit of increasing interest in the award and making the selection process more transparent and inclusive.
- b. **Publicize the award among underrepresented groups.**
- c. **Periodically review and discuss practices for building a pool of nominees.**
- d. **Periodically review the description and guidelines for the award.**
- e. **Periodically review the information that is truly necessary for the nomination packet.** Minimize the onerous requirements involved in submitting application materials.

3. Selecting recipients

- a. **Discuss the process and criteria that will be used to evaluate nominees before reviewing nominations.** Develop a rubric that matches published criteria for the award. Research has shown that implicit bias can enter via unintentional “criteria-shifting” after nominees are discussed. Consider how inter-rater reliability might be taken into account in the process.
- b. **Make a personal list of top nominees before hearing the recommendations of any other members.** This avoids the undue influence of one member and ensures that the list of viable nominees is as large as possible before discussion begins.
- c. **Create short lists via inclusive rather than exclusive methods.** For instance, select candidates that are outstanding, rather than finding reasons to eliminate candidates from consideration.
- d. **Ensure that every committee member’s voice is heard.** Encourage all committee members to share their rationale.
- e. **Take adequate time to make a decision.** Research has shown implicit bias is mitigated when committees have time for thoughtful reflection and discussion, instead of making snap judgments.
- f. **Consider a mechanism for providing feedback to unsuccessful applicants.**

Modified from “[Guidelines for MAA Selection Committees: Avoiding Implicit Bias](#),” 2017