



**2018-2019 Faculty Senate Meeting V**  
**Harlingen Clinical Education Building Auditorium 1.100**  
**Friday, December 7, 2018**  
**2:00pm – 4:30pm**  
**Minutes**

Minutes prepared by Ernesto Ramírez, UTRGV Faculty Senate, Secretary

**Senators Present:** Punit Ahluwalia, Andrew Anabila, George Amorim, Andrew Anabila, Elvia Ardalani, Bruno Arthur, Sandra Atkins, Stephanie Atkins Sharpe, Jameela Banu, Karl Berg, Dumitru Caruntu, Chinwendu Chineke, Mircea Chipara, Mark Dantzker, Arden Dingle, Miryam Espinosa-Dulanto, Raquel Estrada, Louis Falk, Teresa Feria Arroyo, Firat Fuat, Eleftherios Gkioulekas, Jonathan Guist, Hale Kaynak, Dongchul Kim, Richard Longoria, Donald Jerry Lyles, Jung-il Oh, Cynthia Paccacerqua, Volker Quetschke, Ernesto Ramírez, Candace Robledo, Maria Romero-Ramirez, Sam Sale, Andrea Schwarzbach, Laura Seligman, Hilda Silva, William Sokoloff, Annelyn Torres-Reveron, Michael Weaver, Aziza Zemrani

**Senators Absent:** Steve Chamberlain, Frederick Darsow, Abdoulaye Diallo, William Donner, Elizabeth Deven-Hernandez, Marcus Farris, Laura Gephart, Maria Miriam Herrera, Kip Austin Hinton, Elamin Ibrahim, Wendy Innis, Sunand Kallumadanda, Irving Levinson, Karin Lewis, Junfei Li, Theresa Mata-Pistokache, John Newman, Gary Schneider, Denise Silcox, Samuel Snyder, Garry Souffrant, Owen Temby, James Whittenberg, Yingchen Yang, Michelle Zeager

**Senators Absent (Excused):** Sonja Arredondo, Richard Edmonson, Ibrahim Farooqi, Lilia A. Fuentes, Anahit Galstyan, Margaret Graham, Murat Karabulut, Dae Kim, Kye-Hwan Lee, John Luna, Marci McMahon, John VandeBerg, Jorge Vidal, Jasang Yoon

**Visitor(s):** Patricia McHatton, Marie Mora, Ala Qubbaj, Sylvia Robles, Paul Sharpe

**Office Assistant III:** Vanessa Ceballos

**I. Convene Meeting and Welcome Senators and Guests**

- a. Convene: 2:09 PM
- b. Thanks to all for coming to meetings and making your voices heard.

**II. Report from VP Dr. McHatton w/ Q&A (25 mins)**

Workload policy – A draft put forth by the committee; there was representation

from the FS there. She is positive and optimistic about the final product brought out of committee. With this new workload there will likely be a necessity for a review of T&P documents to align and differentiate workloads in departments. There should have been a dialogue from the members (of the committee) with the FS and with colleges regarding this work. The policy is an overarching institutional policy giving guidance. First issue is student success; we must meet the needs of students – class sizes, courses, caps – by making sound pedagogical decisions. After a question was raised about faculty being assigned to either campus, EVP stated that information is written in our signed acceptance letters. College/departments will need to develop their own workload policies by next fall. All disciplines are different; therefore, no one policy is complete and adequate enough on its own. Academic Affairs may develop a rubric to provide guidance on these local (department and college) policies by which these will be evaluated. The review of these guidelines will be done by a committee. When asked about which committee will do this, the EVP responded that the current committee that created the policy is doing the work right now for creating a document to guide chairs as they work with faculty to create this new departmental policy. There is no determination yet about the review committee. This is a fast timeline; this work needs to be done by March/April. There was discussion about, but not a rule (developed), on how each department will be able to make adaptations. The workload will be determined at the lower levels based upon a historical account of work already in place.

The Climate Survey committee will meet with college leadership to provide a means by which to move forward and begin improving (the climate).

MOA – the memorandum of appointment will be separate from workload assignment. These are two different issues. One comes from Academic Affairs and one comes from the department. The workload is determined by the chair in consultation with the respective faculty.

Q. What are the weights now with formula funding?

A. The weights have changed; they were compressed. This is a legislative issue.

Q. Is there a default policy on workload that will be applied if a department does not develop its own?

A. There should be a college policy developed in collaboration with faculty, should a department not have its own workload policy developed

Q. We do have things that are unique to departments, but we should have a general concept, for things such as what exceeds or meets expectations. These terms should be defined for the whole university. What do these terms mean for all of us?

A. Meets and exceeds expectations should be defined in your own (departmental/unit) T&P policies.

Q. Follow up: But not meeting expectations what does that mean?

A. There is language for this that will be sent to the Faculty Senate.

Q. T&P, Promotion, and post –tenure review: how will this work at each level?

A. The documents should provide guidelines for this based upon teaching versus research tracks. Assistant professors should not be on teaching workload. You should be evaluated well based upon which track you are on and the guidelines should be clearly attached to that.

Q. There is a lot of confusion about merit, can you clarify?

A. There is a 2% pool of money for merit. The current merit distributions could range from 0% to 4% per person. Everyone who is eligible for merit will receive \$1000, once that is distributed. The remaining sum which remained was distributed based upon meets or exceeds expectations. The suggestions were provided to colleges. A letter will go out to everyone.

Q. Can a teaching track faculty member get to full professor?

A. Absolutely, yes, based upon the quality (of contributions).

### III. Remarks from Paul Sharpe - Librarian (5 min)

For the last three years there has been no library committee. We need this committee serve in an advisory capacity. We also need the committee to help us know what is going on and what needs to be done from their perspective. This is important to move forward. For example, the hiring of the last librarian was approved because of the position's relation to UTRGV aspiring to be a research institution. Please solicit volunteers from faculty so that we can convene this committee in January.

Q. Is this different from a library liaison?

A. It is. A liaison is a contact person for every department; however, the Library Committee is a concerted effort to get faculty involvement.

Q. The detailed budget is not in the library as it should be. It came out in December, but that was not the budget that showed.

A. It is not that the Library develops the budget; but the Library holdings contain the budget that the administration provides us.

Q. Can the ILL be put on my.utrgv.edu rather than having to access it from the library site?

A. Yes. This can be done.

Comment: I have to renew books, but there is a browser problem, so I had to do it by phone. Second, we do need to become a great university for research. We need to be informed of research; we are thin on research publications.

A. There is a strategic plan for the library that is available online, please look it over.

IV. Action Item: Approval of Minutes

Motion Senator Dantzker; Second by Senator Lyle

In favor: unanimous

Opposed: none

Abstentions: none

a. Friday, May 4, 2018

b. Friday, October 19, 2018

c. Friday, November 16, 2018

V. Report from the Faculty Senate President

We are not having enough participation at FS; we need more senators to be regularly in attendance.

We met last Friday as FSEC and worked on our agenda, confirming with departments about vacant seats. We need to have full membership in the senate.

VI. Announcements - none

VII. Business

- a. One-year (versus one semester) appointments. Report about problems in the colleges/departments.

Senator Quetschke: The lecturer lines that were available were limited. OYAs were planned on an “as needed basis.” We had 10-12 OYA in physics regularly, until this year. These were then converted to one-semester appointments; this is a way for the university to cut funds and limit the number of required people. There is a push for new adjunct instructors instead. In physics, this was not successful. Engineering is having the same issue as are many science areas. There are issues dealing with filling these positions. Philosophy has the same problem, so they are hiring STC faculty to supplement. A third of the courses are taught with one-year positions. How do we meet student needs and have the individual workload agreements in place? The university needs to invest in more full-time lecturers and TT/T faculty.

There was a discussion about requesting a response from the administration regarding the limiting of OYAs. Our rationale against OYAs is that this is student success issue, it takes time to learn how to teach and work with our students. Another issue is that if these positions are cut, the work must still be done. The (administrative) response, to

make this work, is to increase class sizes. It is about accommodating more students with the current resources available. This could have implications for retention and quality of instruction.

b. Discussion on the ITV and split conference rooms for FS meetings situation

A robust email discussion began after the November meeting about how to handle FS meetings. The quality of the technology was an issue raised. Over time, we have used technology and have had split meetings. Someone from IT needs to be in each room.

Comments from senators:

Last time we had issues because of a lack of the technology for open room use. We needed a microphone to be handed to speakers and a facilitator to make this happen.

The IT staff member was there at the start. There has been a feedback issue that makes us turn down the volume. There are so many people. This is not an IT issue. We need to be having face to face meetings. This is not about a perfect technology. We need to be realistic and have these meetings in one location. It was commented that the importance of our work requires face to face interaction. Elected members of the Faculty Senate should know that face to face interaction is needed.

At issue is that some prefer face to face; some would allow ITV. A third solution is a rotation. We can go to one campus with transportation, but the cost of the bus is beyond our FS budget.

This is something that every committee is facing at UTRGV. The graduate council has its meetings in Edinburg, with some video conferencing in Brownsville. It was commented that we should be face to face, but the reality is people don't attend.

Besides cost of travel, time is an issue. If someone is teaching what do they do? One suggestion was a resignation from the Senate, students come first. There is a policy about assigning classes to senators, Senators should not be assigned classes during meeting times.

There seems to be budget money for administrative costs. We need to get the details about this to make money available for us to do this work. We have no say about how money is distributed, yet there are millions reallocated every year.

The FS needs to see where the money is going.

- c. Constitution Committee Status Report – chair Dora Saavedra – Deadline March 15. The Qualtrics survey on the Constitution will be put up for comments from senators on Qualtrics
- d. Chair Survey committee Status Report – chair Aziza Zemrani. – We had a productive meeting to improve the survey; we are still looking for members. Currently, there is no diversity since the committee is comprised of all women.
- e. White Paper Report Card Committee – Will investigate the overlap with the ModernThink survey and the Administrator evaluation – chair Michael Weaver – no report
- f. Shared Governance award – status. No report
- g. Shared Governance Resolution – 1st reading.

Presentation of resolution by Dora Saavedra and Marie Mora.

Discussion: Please consider this resolution. We welcome input for improvement, especially, to include feedback from SOM and Division of Health Affairs.

Shared governance would be clearer if divided in two as academic affairs and administration issues.

Vanessa will distribute the document. Take the next week to send suggestions to Mora and Saavedra. A final version will be sent and an electronic vote will be conducted at the end of the year.

Senator Lyles moved, Senator Sokoloff seconded the motion to endorse the resolution work.

There was discussion about how (the process) of collecting electronic feedback on the resolution. The discussion was not about passing the resolution.

Vote: aye - unanimous; no and abstentions – none.

#### VIII. Caucus discussions

- a. Split in tenure / tenure track and NTT caucus and work on identifying the most pressing problems. (15min)
- b. Split in college caucuses and work on identifying the most pressing problems. (15min)

c. Report results from caucus discussions 1 NNT, 4 T/TT reports, see flipcharts below.

- 1) NT positions NOT well defined
- 2) Difference in appointments:  
 1-year → Need notices  
 3-year → Timing of Notices  
 NEED TO FEEL VALUED
- 3) Least represented in F.S. and  
 We are the faculty that
  - have less (or none) job security
  - teaching load
  - # of students in classroom
  - Some - expectations @ 3 areas (T, R, S)
- 4) NO TRANSPARENCY!  
 What are the 'minimum' level salaries for lecturers?

- The University of Texas  
 Rio Grande Valley  
 Tenure/Tenure Track
- X. Adjournment  
 XI. Next meeting  
 Faculty Senate Meeting VI: January 25, 2018  
 Location: TBD
- Problems
- post-tenure review (what's the VP?)  
 - criteria for 6 years
  - 1 year lectures (teaching load P)
  - Research emerging institution → how? Teaching research
  - offer letter for the faculty
  - rooms for lose classes
  - class sizes → research fac. upper level classes  
 big sizes → teaching fac. for lower level
  - Ph.D programs ✓
  - Release or stipend for UG, or GR program directors (no more course release)
  - Faculty retention

- T-TT  
 Observations:
- ① Dept. Chairs and Deans (Assistant or Assoc.)  
 CHA SOM without proper announcement/procedures.
  - ② Faculty not being consulted in the process of appointing Deans/chairs.  
 CHA SOM
  - ③ Bureaucratic Bureaucratic interference in research funds.  
 CHA SOM
  - ④ Lack of transparency in how \$ is being used. As of Dec. 7 some dept. do not have a budget even  
 CHA SOM
  - ⑤ Shortcomings in teaching that result in lower competencies attainment of students.
  - ⑥ Too much reliance on student's evaluations.

- Concerns:
- #1 Annual Review Committee's
    - Apoint/ Selection of members
    - Process - Clarification.
    - No garate of Faculty Oversight.
  - #2 "Emerging Research Institution"
    - Goals stated not Consistent with policy initiatives
    - OYA → No official Explanation of WHY
    - One year Appoints
    - Need more Tenure/TT Appoints. and/or 3YA.
    - How To Maintain Enrollment With Fewer Faculty

Inst. missions of student  
success + ERI status  
undermined by  
admin practices & pertaining  
to merit, + + P. 644  
annual review, ~~of~~ hiring  
practices.

Punative Institutional  
Culture

- Exmp: Faculty held Acct.  
for Negative TA student Eval.

IX. AOB

X. Adjournment 4:29 PM moved by Senator Sokoloff, second Senator Falk, motion carries.

XI. Next meeting Faculty Senate Meeting VI: January 25, 2018 Location: TBD