



2018-2019 Faculty Senate Meeting VII
Brownsville: BSTUN 2.24/Edinburg: EACSB 1.104
Friday, February 22, 2019
2:00pm – 4:30pm
Minutes

Minutes prepared by Ernesto Ramírez, UTRGV Faculty Senate, Secretary

Senators Present: Punit Ahluwalia, Andrew Anabila, Elvia Ardalani, Sonja Arredondo, Bruno Arthur, Sandra Atkins, Stephanie Atkins Sharpe, Jameela Banu, Karl Berg, Steve Chamberlain, Chinwendu Chineke, Frederick Darsow, Elizabeth Deven-Hernandez, Abdoulaye Diallo, William Donner, Richard Edmonson, Miryam Espinosa-Dulanto, Raquel Estrada, Louis Falk, Ibrahim Farooqi, Marcus Farris, Teresa Feria Arroyo, Lilia A. Fuentes, Laura Gephart, Eleftherios Gkioulekas, Margaret Graham, Kip Austin Hinton, Maria Miriam Herrera, Elamin Ibrahim, Wendy Innis, Hale Kaynak, Dae Kim Dongchul Kim, Irving Levinson, Karin Lewis, Junfei Li, Richard Longoria, John Luna, Donald Jerry Lyles, Theresa Mata-Pistokache, Jung-Il Oh, Cynthia Paccacerqua, Volker Quetschke, Ernesto Ramirez, Maria Romero-Ramirez, Clarissa Salinas, Gary Schneider, Andrea Schwarzbach, Denise Silcox, Hilda Silva, William Sokoloff, Owen Temby, John VandeBerg, Jorge Vidal, Michael Weaver, Jasang Yoon, Michelle Zeager, Aziza Zemrani

Senators Absent: George Amorim, Mark Dantzker, Jonathan Guist, Sunand Kallumadanda, Murat Karabulut, Kye-Hwan Lee, Marci McMahon, John Newman, Candace Robledo, Sam Sale, Samuel Snyder, Garry Souffrant, Yingchen Yang

Senators Absent (Excused): Dumitru Caruntu, Mircea Chipara, Arden Dingle, Firat Fuat, Anahit Galstyan, Laura Seligman, Annelyn Torres-Reveron

Visitors(s): N/A

Office Assistant III: Vanessa Ceballos

- I. Convene Meeting and Welcome Senators and Guests
 - a. Convened: 2:05 PM
 - b. 41 Senators were present; quorum was met
 - c. President Quetschke mentioned that we didn't have any specific guests brought to the FS today.
- II. Action Item: Approval of Minutes – January 25, 2019; tabled to next meeting
- III. Report from the Faculty Senate President

Dr. Quetschke reported about the Faculty Advisory Council meeting in Austin on Jan. 31- Feb. 1, 2019. The Chancellor wants the council to work on a free speech policy, one that follows the Chicago Declaration closely. FAC created a document last year for this, but it is not yet ready to be rolled out. The UT system appears to be in complete support of free speech as the Chancellor is championing this issue before the legislature. President Quetschke is now the co-chair of the Academic Affairs subcommittee of this body.

IV. Announcements

a. Dora Saavedra – TCFS report

The Texas Council of Faculty Senate meeting in conjunction with the AAUP meeting in Austin. The main item on the first day was the downgrading of the professional librarian status at several Texas institutions. Many institutions represented at TCFS have library professional staff as members of Faculty Senate. Dr. Bowen Lofton, former UHD FS Chair and former President/Chancellor at University of Missouri, had suggestions for shared governance. There will be a report forthcoming from Dora Saavedra. UT Austin voted a resolution against the FPT stating that it does not adequately represent what they have been accomplishing. We may want to consider an endorsement of their work. At the meeting there were also discussions on Field Of Study from Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. This is an issue as Community Colleges want more courses lowered from upper division to lower division so that the CC can offer these as well. Dr. Paredes (THECB Commissioner) has recently and unexpectedly announced an intent to retire as head of THECB; the THECB has recently received a letter from SACSCOC about the FOS issue and its lack of respect for the Faculty shared governance expectations. AAUP is also interested in making sure that shared governance is secured and implemented at UTRGV.

b. Volker Quetschke – Ombudsperson

The search is continuing with Dora Saavedra and Volker Quetschke serving as the co-chairs of the search committee. The salary in the position description is closer to the minimum rather than the standard. There is an expectation that the person would have faculty experience and an advanced degree. There was concern about the rapidity of the announcement. The process was accomplished without Faculty Senate input, although not intentional.

Q. Is this position an advocate for the faculty member?

A. It is an informal stage of inquiry and to find avenues for complaints or other resolutions to do mediation.

Q. Is the grievance policy approved, the one we worked on at the start of the FS years ago?

A. Yes, that is the policy that is at the level of legal review.

Q. If the policy has not yet been approved, do we still have a right to exercise the provisions that are there?

A. This is up to the Dean at this point; the Dean may elect to use the policy that is publicly published as approved (on the university website) rather than the one that was approved by the Blue Ribbon Committee and FS. There are a number of these policies that are stuck at some point in the approval process.

- c. Justin White – Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) – Senator Raquel mention that on Feb 20th a link was sent for a webinar. That is useful for our attendance.

V. Workload / MOA / T&P guidelines

- a. UTRGV Guidelines from last workload committee meeting were distributed to the Senators.

Faculty members and department chair should work together, although some chairs still seem to be unclear what that means. CLA had a town hall meeting. The request to change the policy came down from system and needs to be realized by UTRGV. The first (used this year) MOA has had horrible language that was disrespectful to faculty members. The committee has been working on this. Walter Diaz indicated an openness to this discussion. The University Workload Committee work is ongoing. The departmental committee can use the equivalencies already laid out in the previous HOP policy documents. The March 1st deadline is for this year and we can revisit this policy from year to year to improve the policy – like any other HOP policy. Service loads should also be considered in the workload policy – we need to enumerate what that looks like at the departmental level. As senators, we need to inform the departments and help with the policy development on the departmental level.

Q. Should the MOA be speculative since much can change between March 1st and September 1st?

A. It is a promise to get certain work done, but it must also be flexible based upon conditions. The language of the policy needs to reflect that.

Q. Why a fixed percentage, why not a range of expectations for this promise?

A. It can be suggested, but the expected response is that percentages add up to 100% while ranges do not.

- VI. Change of Schedule – impact on faculty family responsibilities. Discuss possible resolution and/or survey
Alex Stehn reports: The committee that made these changes about schedule was not identified. The proposed (or newly adopted policy) is not family friendly for faculty with children. It used to be common for the newly

proposed activity period to be used as the time to pick up children from school. This time slot has been very friendly to parents.

A member of this committee reported to us that this committee was a “provost/AA” taskforce. The committee met several times with faculty on the committee. Several suggestions were made by many faculty members, but the final decision appears to have been made by those who were not faculty. The committee appeared to be run in a fashion that was not considering the needs of the teaching, but rather of the businesses involved with the university such as food services (Sodexo). Most of the committee business was done by email. The conclusions of the committee work were then just given at the end **without faculty support**.

When Dr. Stehn attempted to gather data to support or refute the new schedule, the university did not have the data available which should have been used for the decisions that were made. When we are responsible for doing this work of the university we should not also be told when we are told to do the work if we also have other responsibilities.

The Dean of CLA reportedly used family friendliness as a recruitment tool, but this new policy will have an impact on his work in recruiting high quality faculty.

- This policy also impacts night time ending times. This is a hardship as the new times are later (10:15 p.m.)
- Students will lose their activity period. Comment: There may be an easy departmental fix if we just don’t schedule a class during that time. Response: That is not a good enough solution if we consider that this solution may only work for one department not for all, as some units will do this (scheduling) and some will not.
- EVP states that the decisions were made by the committee with input from SGA and enrollment.
- Recommendations have been made for years about time, being adopted in a piecemeal fashion. Yes, time between classes is important for travel time between classes and yes time for starts is unusual. However, the activity period is still an issue.
- Seems that this is a push for some of the changes that were mentioned before about schedules such as the MWF courses.

Q. Are we doing this because we are attempting to be useful to our students and faculty or because we are maximizing class times?

A. survey was conducted among the Senators and it is the sense of the Senate that the Senate should push back and derive a better plan for scheduling that includes a number of real inputs and values that are reflective of student and faculty/staff needs and family friendliness, rather than business.

There is an urgency to this issue as schedules are set to soon go out. Admins have already entered the upcoming schedules.

Motion: FSEC should contact administration to request that the University honor the old schedule until a new decision can be made (Motion by: Senator Eleftherios Gkioulekas and it was seconded: Senator Bruno)

The motion passed with 1 abstention.

VII. Online Teaching Guidelines Handout

Guidelines were sent to FS by Nina Young. The Senators were asked to look at the documents and provide feedback to the FS. This is not an approved document. Questions about this policy, who is responsible for this policy? What is the policy? More needs to be brought forth about this, and it must be revisited. Feedback will be provided later, and a meeting is suggested with EVPAA for clarification. Contact also Francisco Garcia at COLTT for inclusion in the discussion.

VIII. Bullying on Campus

Do we want to plan action for this on the future? Between which parties (faculty-faculty, student-student, faculty-student, etc.). What policies are at other institutions and what needs to be done? Legislation has yet to catch up with bullying so it may be a policy decision for us until then.

IX. Business

a. Open university committee seats.

If you know of anyone or wish to volunteer, please let the FSEC know of this to obtain a pool for future openings. When we make recommendations, we need to make sure that the person is updated so that we know what is happening with the nomination.

Senator Paccacerqua – sent an email earlier to learn about this process of committees. It is about not just having administration accountability but clarity and accountability of faculty as well.

AA should update their list of committees and taskforces so that there is clarity about the processes involved.

b. Constitution Committee Status Report – chair Dora Saavedra – Deadline March 15th.

Remember that the deadline is rapidly approaching. Get feedback from your constituency to place your suggestions in the Qualtrics survey.

c. Chair Survey Committee Status Report – chair Aziza Zemrani.

President Quetschke reports that a meeting with EVPAA resulted in a desire to do a chair survey along with the FS. 20 questions have been formulated. These were discussed and clarified in the dialogue which may result in another meeting. This is a survey, not an evaluation. This is a tool to bring issues up to the attention of decision makers so that further inquiry can be made – it is not an evaluation tool.

- d. Whitepaper Report Card Committee -chair: Michael Weaver– charge: to investigate the overlap of results between the ModernThink survey and Administrator evaluation –The committee will also discuss possible action(s). A final report will likely be available at the next FS meeting. The White Paper has five general areas that matched with the survey and the administrator evaluations. There is a strong correlation between the White Paper findings and the survey. It appears also that these findings also are similar to what was found with the administrator evaluations. The result of the question about “Do you have confidence in administrator xx?” from the administrators’ evaluations has not been addressed. Each senator should share with their constituency that there was only 33% support for President Dr. Bailey. President Bailey believes that the publication of these results can be construed as defamatory and damaging to future employment.

The Senate was forced to remove the evaluations from our website, but they are on the Black Board site available to every Senator.

- Q. The senate passed a motion that the administrators with low scores be placed on a growth plan, what became of that? Second, there is a lack of response from upper administration about these concerns for the last two years, **should we be appealing higher and who is that?**
- A. EVPAA was informed of the motion; she has not responded. During the last meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee at UTS, there was discussion of the resolution. The discussion was not just about individuals at UTRGV, but the University’s alleged inappropriate actions in regard to faculty and shared governance in a general fashion. Associate Vice Chancellor, Tony Cuculo is aware of this at system.
- Q. There was a question. Is Bailey’s contract up this summer? In light of non-responses from Administration, could we as faculty ask for a full search of a President that would include giving Dr. Bailey the opportunity to apply for the position?

X. AOB

ModernThink came to the university. We met with the representative and asked about access to raw data. The materials are being presented in a number of meetings and presentations, but the data itself have not yet been made available. Who needs to be contacted to get that to happen? That will be addressed in the chair survey committee as this will be essential for the context of that work. Although the numerical data will be likely shared, the qualitative data will not.

Shared the response from Dr. Bailey last time, but it was not made available electronically. Dr. Bailey denied permission for that document to be shared. The new modified version which he is allowing us to share we believe still has some inaccuracies. The FSEC, for example, was not “consulted,” about the 3 Senior Executive Vice President positions. Instead, we were notified immediately prior to the announcement going out on campus.

- XI. Adjournment 4:04pm
- XII. Next meeting: Harlingen Clinical Education Building: HCEBL 1.100
(Auditorium) 2:00PM- 4:30PM.