

**2021-2022 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, May 10, 2022, 3pm – 5pm CST Via Zoom**

**Community Agreement**

*The UTRGV Faculty Senate is brought together in the spirit of shared governance to move forward in a positive open manner for input that allows all stakeholders to speak regarding policy and process formation. To create a safe environment where everyone's opinions are valued and considered, let us observe the following:*

- 1. Try to be on time to the meeting and actively participate*
- 2. Review the pre-reading materials to be discussed, and if you plan to comment have your thoughts organized in advance*
- 3. Assume positive intent, seek to understand, be inclusive, bring productive energy to discussions*
- 4. Only one person speaks at a time (use raise hand feature to be recognized)-chat is not part of the official record (will not be included in the minutes).*
- 5. Respect and acknowledge everyone's opinions, even if they differ from yours*
- 6. Confidentiality: some things shouldn't be repeated outside the meeting*

**Minutes Prepared by Cynthia Cripps**

**Senators Present:** Khalid Aada, Jair J. Aguilar, Tony Aguirre, Stephanie Alvarez, Andrew Anabila, Grant Benham, Sarah Blangero, Ben Brown, Jameela Banu, Lucia Carreon, Dumitru Caruntu, Joel H. Chirinos, Mircea Chipara, Cynthia Cripps, Amy Cummins, George Diaz, Louis Falk, A Fuat Firat, Christine Gerin, Rene Gonzalez, Sergey Grigorian, Fred Guerra Jr, Jonathan Guist, Tekla Hawkins, Marcela Hebbard, Sharon Helsley-Mcginley, Kip Austin Hinton, Michiyo Hirai, Ulku Karabulut, Hale Kaynak, Sanjeev Kumar, Dean Kyne, Karin Lewis, Qinyu Liao, Yu Liu, John Luna, Michael Machiorlatti, Salma Mahmood, Rachel Mann, Arnulfo Mar, Theresa Mata-Pistokache, Randall Monty, Nancy Nadeau, Cynthia Paccacerqua, Emma Perez, Volker Quetschke, Padmanabhan Rengasamy, Manuel Saldivar, Owen Temby, Paul Valadez, Jorge Vidal, Vejoya Viren, Aaron Wilson

**Administrator: Vanessa Ceballos**

**Senators Absent:** Sonja Arredondo, Narayan Bhat, Rob Gilkerson, Jimmy Gonzales, Kye-Hwan Lee, Hansheng (Jet) Lei, Mike Magee, Nilanjana Paul, Diana Paz, Riccardo Pizzinato, Abdullah Rahman, Henry Reinhart, Miguel Salazar, Sam Sale, Clarissa Salinas, Dana Shackelford, Andrea Schwarzbach (excuse sent), Yingchen Yang, William Yaworsky, Soojin Yoo, Aziza Zemrani

**New Senators:** George Atisa, Roseann Bache – Garza, Linda Belau, Salvador Contreras, Pauline Jojo, Megan Keniry, Jack Ruelas, Eloise Tamez, Ahmed Touhami, Christian Zuniga

**Guests:** Michael Abebe, Janna Arney, Marzieh Ayati, Bruno Arthur, Jorge Canchola, Alyssa Cavazos, Rebecca Coberly, Laura De Leon Escobedo, James Espinoza, Lucas Espinoza, John Ferris, , Irma Hermida, Rebecca Hernandez, Daniel Hunter-Holly, Rommel Johnson, Brendan Kinsella, Joseph Kochurani, Christopher Ledingham, Michael Mahaney, Joe Mendoza, Dania Ochoa, Sudershan Pasupuleti, Monika Rabarison, Melinda Rodriguez, Margaret Rubi, Shawn Saladin, Aaron Salinas, Luz Maria Silva, Susheelabai Srinivasa, Alex Stehn, Thuy Vu, Qing Zeng

Brownsville, Edinburg, Harlingen

**Meeting convened at 3:00 pm**

**I. Welcome by Faculty Senate President Karin Lewis:**

1. Please mute microphones and rename zoom tile to include: “\*Guest [name]...” or “[name]: (FSEC), title, college/department”
2. Volker Quetschke (Parliamentarian) will monitor the discussion
3. Cynthia Cripps (Secretary) will monitor the chat. If you have questions you would like to have read aloud on the floor, please send direct message those to her in the chat.
4. The chat is not part of the official record.
5. Amid the troubling time in our world, thank you for attending today. Thank you for the work you do and your contribution to our university, community, and beyond.
6. Please make your remarks respectful, succinct, and focused on the topic on the floor.

**II. Report of FS Parliamentarian- Volker Quetschke**

1. Roberts rules & Zoom guidelines reminder:
  - A. Each senator is limited to (2) 90 second question/comment(s) per topic
  - B. Please write and send all motions, resolutions etc. via email or the chat so it can be copied and pasted succinctly and be placed on the zoom screen to avoid confusion during the discussion and voting process.

**III. Report of the FS Secretary-Cindy Cripps**

1. April 2022 Minutes (pre-reading handout 2.)

Motion to approve made by Micky Dumitru Caruntu, seconded by Louis Falk

Approve: 39/46	85%
Decline: 0/46	0%
Abstain: 7/46	15%

Motion carries with 85%

**IV. Report – President-Elect Kip Hinton**

1. Proclamation by the UTRGV Senate supporting The American Nurses Association and declaring May as Nurse’s Month. “You Make a Difference”

Motion to approve made by Louis Falk, seconded by Sharon Helsley-Mcginley

No one opposed, the motion carries by acclamation.

**V. Report - President Karin Lewis**

- a. FAC statement (handout 3.) The statement that was unanimously approved at the recent FAC meeting and sent to UT System leadership.
- b. FAC Executive session with Vice Chancellor Dr. Archie Holmes-FAC went into executive session for a candid discussion with Dr. Holmes about our collective concerns about the TX Senate Interim Charges. The UT System, the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor and all UT System university presidents share our concerns and are working on our behalf.
- c. FAC Academic Affairs working document – COVID Legacy (handout 4.)
- d. FAC work on Graduate Assistant healthcare coverage- It is a long-term project across institutions. It will take concerted effort, over time.
- e. UTRGV Faculty survey- A survey was sent out to all UTRGV faculty to gather feedback on our endeavors as Faculty Senate to improve our functioning and strengthen our role in shared governance. Results will

Brownsville, Edinburg, Harlingen

be shared once we have them. The survey is anonymous, however, any respondent wishing to follow up may voluntarily include their email. The feedback from the survey will inform the work of the incoming FSEC and FS in the coming year.

## VI. Guest Presentations

### 1. IT “Web-based technology” classrooms

- A. Joe Mendoza (IT Director for Academic Support Services): IT – Zoom rooms and Zoom room training for hybrid instruction – project for adding technology to 167 normal classrooms to make them Zoom capable: to the existing webcams, we added ceiling microphones, speaker system, rear classroom camera, monitor in the back (completed 80: December -March 2022)
  - The equipment will allow instructors to be mobile in the classroom.
  - Upgraded projectors, projector screens, computers
  - A company will start May 30 upgrading equipment in the remaining 77 classrooms, with the projected completion date of August 12.
- B. James Espinoza – organizer of web-based technology trainings
  - Training schedule
    - Trainings will be scheduled for every Friday: May 13, 20, 27, June 3 etc., check the schedule to register for a training.
    - 1. [Utrgv.edu/training](http://utrgv.edu/training)
    - 2. <https://webapps.utrgv.edu/it/training/index.cfm?event=training.viewUpcomingCourses>
  - Zoom classrooms are different than ITV Classrooms
    - i. How many IT classrooms, currently? Edinburg – 49 zoom (“web-based technology”) upgraded classrooms, Brownsville – 40 web-based technology classrooms: Rio Grande City – 2 classrooms for upgrades, Weslaco is also on the list for upgrades. There are plans to upgrade a few rooms on every campus.
    - ii. <https://www.utrgv.edu/it/resources/faculty/classroom-equipment-inventory/index.htm>
    - iii. **Ad Astra** has information labeling Zoom classrooms “\*room number\*- zoom in the listing”
    - iv. **Ad Astra**: ITV will be switched to zoom classrooms
    - v. Computer labs are on the list for upgrades
    - vi. Edinburg Summer projects - to upgrade other classrooms. (As many as 20 more classrooms)
    - vii. Eventually there should be a total about 164 classrooms upgraded to “web-based technology” classrooms.
  - Question: Mac vs PC? IT will investigate and see if this classroom-equipment-inventory list can indicate which classrooms have MAC and which have PC.
- C. Irma Hermida – Communication Manager
  - Use messenger to communicate
  - Software and renewals: cloud-based software must be certified by the state. Start the renewal process early before the subscription expires.
- B. Faculty concerns: Is there an immediate way to contact the experts if something is not working with the classroom equipment? Response: HELP button was removed, but may be added back onto the touch panel.

2. Special Committee Policy Revisions Annual Review (Tenured/Tenure Track part-vote) (pre-reading handouts 5, 5a)
  - A. Rebecca Coberly: *Best Practices Document*
    - This is a working document.
    - The purpose of this document is to provide recommendations and examples for the content and implementation of the department evaluation guidelines.
    - Created to specifically address concerns identified in the faculty survey and in other pertinent discussions.
      - i. Need to streamline the process
      - ii. Need to maintain the integrity of the process
      - iii. Need for clarity of standards and expectation.
    - SECTIONS (see pre-reading handout):
      - i. General Recommendations and Requirements for Department/School Evaluation Guidelines
      - ii. Recommendation by Rank
      - iii. Process and Implementation
      - iv. Examples and Templates
    - To provide feedback or concerns, contact Dr. Rebecca Coberly:  
[rebecca.coberly@utrgv.edu](mailto:rebecca.coberly@utrgv.edu)
  - B. Faculty questions:
    - How does workload factor into this? Response: This would be determine based on how the department/unit describes it in their guidelines for evaluation.
    - Department/unit could determine how frequently the guidelines are reviewed and updated. Response: The recommendation is every 6 years but could be sooner depending on how the policy review period is defined in the department guidelines.
    - Are some policies becoming guidelines? Response: There is some intentional redundancy for reinforcement, but not specifically.
  - C. Daniel Hunter-Holly – *Special Committee Policy Revisions: Faculty Evaluation Policies*
    - Concerns and revision update since presentation on April 12. This includes feedback from the FS, Dean's Council, and other committees.
      - i. Should "Program" be included in the definition of "Department?" – It will be left as-is in the draft. "Center" was also removed from the description.
      - ii. Evaluation of Professional Ethics – was removed from the evaluation category and placed in a new section at the beginning of the document.
      - iii. Uneven time period for merit review – left as-is. Merit guidelines are determined at department and college level.
      - iv. Approval of department guidelines, does it also need a vote? – This has been revised and will be voted on by the voting faculty, which should be identified in the college/department level evaluation document.
      - v. Vanity presses/publications requiring payment – This will be left up to the specific disciplines to set up the guidelines for evaluation.

- vi. Requirements of Dossier being too cumbersome - Summary statement of professional goals, or development plan will be used for evaluations striving toward a promotion. This will be optional for faculty in a terminal rank.
- vii. Automatically uploaded or faculty will need to “run” the reports for: Course Evaluation, Department level evaluation, Workload and they should upload to FPT without involving extra steps or the Dean’s office.
- viii. Current draft:
  - 1. Expectations for early promotion: “A tenured associate professor seeking promotion to the rank of professor may apply early if the faculty member believes their performance record **substantially exceeds** the department’s evaluation guidelines for promotion to professor.”
  - 2. Process for early promotion: “To be considered for an early promotion review the faculty member must, 1. **Consult** with the department chair and college dean prior to submitting an application: the consultation will serve as a notification of the faculty member’s intent and allow the department chair and college dean to provide perspective on the expectations for early promotion. (Added this sentence-) The consultation is not an approval or denial of the early promotion process and cannot prevent a faculty member from submitting an application for early promotion.”
    - Faculty concern: Why have this step? If the faculty feels qualified, why does that person need to consult? There could be biases or discouragement that could come from the chair or dean. Response: It is the current language, so the committee kept it for consistency.
    - Dr. Arney comment: There is a need for early notification because of the need to include the selection and contact of external reviewers as part of the process. We are open to comments and feedback to change this.
  - 3. Annual Review Appeal: “If in the dean’s review the overall rating is changed to unsatisfactory or does not meet expectations, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost/EVP who will review the information and provide a final decision.”
- (NEW) Department evaluation guidelines approval process: “If either the chair or dean do not recommend approval, they must provide their reasons for withholding approval to the voting faculty. The department evaluation development committee will reconvene. The chair or dean should meet with this committee to attempt to resolve the issue with the proposed evaluation guidelines. Any new proposed evaluation guidelines will be submitted to the voting faculty for review and approval. If the differences are not resolved within 60 days from the dean’s initial response to the department, the dean will make a recommendation to the provost/EVP regarding the adoption of the department evaluation guidelines.”
- (NEW) Scope of documents for promotion: The Dossier must include the faculty member’s applicable work, documents, and information for at least the review periods listed below, and as described in the department’s guidelines:

Brownsville, Edinburg, Harlingen

- i. If tenured: review period for promotion to full professor is since the submission of the dossier for tenure
  - ii. If tenure-track: review period for tenure and promotion to associate professor is the full probationary period
  - iii. If non-tenure track: review period for promotion is since the submission of the dossier for the previous promotion or if it is the first promotion since hire.
- Review Committees – guiding principles
  - i. Annual review:
    - 1. Committee must include 3 or more full-time faculty members;
    - 2. Committee should include faculty of the titles being reviewed and tenured faculty, as applicable;
    - 3. Reviews must be done by committee members at an equivalent or higher rank than the faculty being reviewed, within their faculty title as well as tenured faculty;
    - 4. Tenured faculty are eligible to review faculty of all titles.
  - ii. Action Reviews (3<sup>rd</sup> year, Tenure, Promotion, Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation)
    - 1. Committee must include 3 or more full-time faculty members;
    - 2. Committee should include faculty of the titles being reviewed and tenured faculty, as applicable;
    - 3. Reviews must be done by committee members at a higher rank than the faculty being reviewed, within their faculty title as well as tenured faculty;
    - 4. Tenured faculty are eligible to review faculty of all titles
- Department Committee formation
  - i. Review committees are elected by the department faculty by the date listed in the pathways.
  - ii. All ranks being reviewed are eligible to vote on committee membership.
  - iii. Committee members do not need to be eligible to review all department faculty; all reviews must still include three or more faculty reviewers.
- Notable changes to the TT-Policy from HOP ADM 06-505 Faculty Tenure & Promotion
  - i. Leaves of Absence: The new draft elaborates on and distinguishes between Faculty Development Leave and FMLA leave.
    - 1. Faculty development leave: will be counted toward maximum probationary period and faculty member will undergo a performance evaluation that year.
    - 2. For other types of authorized leave, expectations for annual performance will be negotiated between the faculty member and chair. The written expectations must be approved by the dean and EVP/provost and in compliance with the HOP policies and Regents Rules and state and federal laws. (HOP ADM4-600 Series of Leave Policies)
    - 3. A faculty member who has missed time due to FMLA leave shall be reviewed only on the basis of actual time worked, without penalty for time on FMLA leave (HOP ADM4-608, Family Medical Leave Act)

Brownsville, Edinburg, Harlingen

- Current policy 4<sup>th</sup> year review (HOP ADM 6-505) will be changed to a 3<sup>rd</sup> year review

Faculty comments/concerns: The process still seems cumbersome and takes time away from teaching and scholarship. Consulting with chair and dean may also put them in an awkward position if the faculty member was encouraged at those levels yet was declined early tenure/promotion. We need a HOP Policy to make department/college documents/policy and bi-laws legitimate. Department/unit should have a vote if they agree to use the college policy rather than creating one at the department level. Why is there no process to appeal to the provost other than at “does not meet” or “unsatisfactory” decisions? How to document health issues that did not require time off from work (due to covid)?

- Some schools/colleges single level with nuances at department level. Department/college was intended to be “or” not “and” – particularly in Liberal Arts.  
Each department should confirm/affirm the college policy.

Where is it written who selects the committee to review the dossiers? HOP doesn't specify who votes. Lecturers?

- Draft states that all ranks being reviewed are eligible to vote for committee members.
- Voting membership is not defined in the document draft because there are different types of committees. This definition needs to be specified in the department or college guidelines.

Faculty concerns: If a tenured faculty member has received meets/exceeds expectations for 6 review periods, is a post tenure review necessary? Response: Regents Rules requires some form of review every year.

Faculty comment for clarification: Post tenure review should only include the current year, if in the previous 5 reviews the faculty member has met or exceeded expectations.....?

Sometimes a faculty member is not in complete control over what appears in the computer generated FPT CV. Can something that someone else input (and have left the university) be changed?

- Email: [FPT@utrgv.edu](mailto:FPT@utrgv.edu) to make corrections or updates.

Comments from President Karin Lewis: This is a working document. We should consider voting to move the Tenure and TT documents forward in the process, with the understanding that we will continue to refine and improve them. They will continue to be vetted and may come back to the FS for more discussion and feedback. Faculty development leave and non-tenure track documents are not ready to move forward. They need further discussion and revisions.

*Move forward* defined as: if FS approves today it will go to the Provost's Council (has FS representation) for vetting. If there are any substantive changes, it would come back to the FS for refinement. If it is endorsed by the Provost's Council, it would move on to the HOP policy committee (also having FS representation) to be vetted. If there are any substantive changes, it would come back to the FS for refinement.



Brownsville, Edinburg, Harlingen

Louis Falk moves to vote move the tenured and tenure-track document forward in the process, Volker seconds the motion. Louis Falk accepts Cynthia Paccacerqua's friendly amendment with absolute certainty that it comes back to the FS for review between each step (after the provost's Council review, and after the HOP policy review.)

Approve: 28/44 64% +2

Decline: 9/44 20% + 1

Abstain: 7/44 16%

The motion carries with 64% approval.

**VII. Committee reports – please refer to shared folder**

**VIII. Old Business**

1. Results of the Chair's Evaluation are in and are being formatted and prepared for distribution by the SAAR office
2. Campus Life – Motion regarding pools on campus.
  - A. Faculty comments: REC and HPE "promised" to reopen exercise facilities (racquetball courts, pool, etc.) to students, faculty, and staff this semester and it hasn't completely happened. No hours are posted, no attendance is taken, it seems that the pool is being set up for failure because not many people know it has reopened. Pre-pandemic, the pool schedule would be based on the swim classes, and it would have two and sometimes three people in each lane or waiting for an open lane. The pool should be maintained and potentially expanded upon by adding a facility on Brownsville campus and with the potential of eventually putting a lap pool near the REC in Edinburg. We realize it would take some time to maintain and update the existing indoor pool on Edinburg campus, but we are asking to KEEP the pool and not to repurpose the space.

Presented by Micky Caruntu: Background: The existing Indoor Lap Pool HPE1 in Edinburg Campus is needed for offering swimming and scuba diving classes (by Health and Human Performance Department), the wellness of Students, Faculty and Staff, and also to attract new Students and new Faculty and Staff to Edinburg Campus.

The Indoor Lap Pool HPE1 served and serves as the on-campus Natatorium in the Edinburg Campus. During the years, the Natatorium was very well attended and well utilized by all Students, Faculty and Staff, for teaching and recreational purposes. The advantages of the Indoor Lap Pool HPE1 are: a) UTRGV owns it (it is not shared with anyone else); b) the length of the pool is 25 yards which is standard for lap swimming; c) it can be open all year around; d) it is within 5 min walking distance on campus (its location on campus saves a significant amount of time for students and faculty).

**MOTION:**

The UTRGV Administration, with respect to the Edinburg Campus Natatorium (Indoor Lap Pool HPE1) is recommended to:

- 1) Maintain the Indoor Lap Pool HPE1 as the Natatorium of Edinburg Campus



Brownsville, Edinburg, Harlingen

- 2) Remodel the Indoor Lap Pool HPE1 up to the standards of a modern Natatorium
- 3) Make the Indoor pool available for swimming and scuba diving classes,
- 4) Make the Indoor Lap Pool HPE1 available to Students, Faculty and Staff for at least 5 hours a day during the week, and up to 4 hours during the weekend.
- 5) Maintain the Indoor Lap Pool HPE1 as the Natatorium of Edinburg Campus until a future Indoor Lap Pool is built at the UTRGV Recreation Center in Edinburg Campus.

Motion by Micky Dumitru Caruntu, seconded by Nancy Nadeau + friendly amendment made by Ulku Karabulut to include the importance of the indoor HPE pool for swimming classes/educational purposes.

Approve: 29/37 +2 78%

Decline: 2/37 5%

Abstain: 6/37 16%

Motion carries with 78% approval

3. Revised Draft Resolution (pre-reading handout 6 *forthcoming*, discussion)
  - A. Comments by President Karin Lewis: There are two different drafts of revised resolutions. It is too important of an issue to make a hasty decision. It would be important to combine the two drafts and she suggests that this be the first order of business to work in the summer.
    - Louis Falk and Cynthia Paccacerqua initiate a discussion regarding calling an executive session.
      - Need for a discussion regarding political updates on the topic of academic freedom
      - Need to pull together the two resolution drafts
      - New senators have not been confirmed yet, and they should be in the discussion and drafting of the resolution.
    - Louis withdraws motion.

**IX. New Business**

- President Karin Lewis confirms and welcomes newly elected senators.

**X. 2022-2023 FSEC and FS Meeting calendar (handout 7.)**

- Please add these dates to your calendars

**XI. President Bailey's Cabinet Meeting Executive Summary (handout 8.)**

- Please read this summary.

**XII. Election of FS Officers**

- A. Voting for new officers will take place electronically, check your email for a link.
- B. Voting will take place consecutively
  - A. President elect (0 nominations)
  - B. Secretary (2 nominations)
  - C. Parliamentarian (2 nominations)

Brownsville, Edinburg, Harlingen

- Currently there are no nominations for president elect. We will take nominations from the floor or in the self-nomination form.
- When we have a nomination for President elect, a link will be sent to current senators for a vote.

- XIII. 2021-2022 President, Karin Lewis – final remarks:** “Colleagues, it has been an honor to serve as your Faculty Senate President this year. I have learned so much, and I deeply appreciate your trust and support throughout this challenging year. We have been through a lot together. We have accomplished so much, and we will continue to work collectively to improve and advance the strengthening of shared governance even more. I believe that cultivating relationships is paramount to accomplishing anything. I sincerely hope that during my term our relationships have strengthened based on mutual respect, collaboration, and collegiality, sharing of ideas and expertise, and working together for the common good. I am profoundly grateful for each of you and your active and sustained engagement in advancing our collective role in shared governance. UTRGV is better for it. It is now my pleasure to recognize our new FS president, Kip Austin Hinton.
- XIV. 2022-2023 President, Kip Austin Hinton –** Silently (in the chat) acknowledged his new leadership position as Faculty Senate President, but he was not able to address the senate because he was administering a final exam.
- XV. Motion to adjourn made by Louis Falk, seconded by Fuat Firat - Meeting adjourned (5:34 pm):**