



2018-2019 Faculty Senate Meeting II
TSTC University Center
2424 Boxwood St. Harlingen, TX 78550
Friday, September 21, 2018 2:00pm - 4:30pm

Minutes prepared by Ernesto Ramírez, UTRGV Faculty Senate, Secretary

Senators Present: Punit Ahluwalia, Elvia Ardalani, Sonja Arredondo, Bruno Arthur, Sandra Atkins, Stephanie Atkins Sharpe, Karl Berg, Dumitru Caruntu, Chinwendu Chineke, Mircea Chipara, Mark Dantzker, Elizabeth Deven-Hernandez, Abdoulaye Diallo, William Donner, Richard Edmonson, Miryam Espinosa-Dulanto, Raquel Estrada, Louis Falk, Marcus Farris, Laura Gephart, Eleftherios Gkioulekas, Margaret Graham, Jonathan Guist, Kip Austin Hinton, Wendy Innis, Murat Karabulut, Hale Kaynak, Karin Lewis, Junfei Li, Richard Longoria, John Luna, Donald Jerry Lyles, Theresa Mata-Pistokachke, Jung-il Oh, Cynthia Paccacerqua, Volker Questchke, Ernesto Ramírez, Maria Romero-Ramirez, Sam Sale, Andrea Schwarzbach, Laura Seligman, Annelyn Torres-Reveron, John VandeBerg, Jorge Vidal

Senators Absent: George Amorim, Andrew Anabila, Steve Chamberlain, Frederick Darsow, Ibrahim Farooqi, Teresa Feria Arroyo, Anahit Galstyan, Maria Miriam Herrera, Elamin Ibrahim, Sunand Kallumadanda, Irving Levinson, John Newman, Mahmoud Quweider, Candace Robledo, Gary Schneider, Denise Silcox, Hilda Silva, Samuel Snyder, Garry Souffrant, Michael Weaver, Yingchen Yang, Michelle Zeager, Yasar Tasnif, Aziza Zemrani

Senators Absent (Excused): Jameela Banu, Arden Dingle, Lilia A. Fuentes, Marci McMahon, William Sokoloff, James Whittenberg, Jasang Yoon

Faculty Senate Office Assistant III: Vanessa Ceballos

Visitor(s): N/A

I. Convene Meeting and Welcome Senators and Guests

- Meeting was convened at 2:13 pm when a quorum was obtained.
- New Senators were invited to stand and be recognized.
- President Quetschke announced the resignation of President-elect Timmer from both FSEC and the FS as he has accepted a position as an administrator.
- This was followed by an introduction to the need for an exemption of constitutional rules to be in place for service to FSEC, until the Constitution Committee can address the issue of requirements for service in FSEC and bring that to the FS.

II. State of the Union and Shared Governance

- Past President Saavedra thanked the Senate for allowing her service to this body. Thanks were extended to Dr. Quabaj, Ms. Ceballos, for travel costs and making meetings happen.
- The FS has established policy, and a whitepaper (7/2016) the result being that the interim Provost invited FS to serve on committees.
- Still in place, the need to address issues of transparency and equity.
- Distribution of the evaluation survey was the significant event of the year. Senators have the results in Blackboard and will be reposted to this year's Blackboard for new senators.
- Challenges ahead:
 - Forge partnerships with Staff Senate, Student Government Association, and the Women's Faculty Network.
 - Bring Truth to power
 - Do what is right
 - Practice shared governance – service to all
- Motion: President Quetschke made a motion to Thank Dr. Saavedra for her service to the FS.
 - 2nd by Bruno Arthur
 - Motion carried unanimously
- Past President Saavedra proceeded with a presentation on Shared Governance, this PowerPoint was first delivered to the FS on 10/23/2015, the 1st meeting of the UTRGV FS.
 - A general commitment by all built on trust
 - Goal: make decisions with collective intelligence
 - We need to develop the structure and practice for shared governance
 - To explain difference between academic freedom and shared governance.
- President Quetschke explained that the UT System is supportive of Shared Governance, so we need to recognize that as we move forward.

Senator Banu & Senator Dingle report for Health Affairs & SOM

- Both Senators are out at conference, thus their report to the FS is postponed to next meeting

III. Action Item: Waiver/Motion to accommodate restrictive eligibility requirements for FSEC members.

- The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) was asked to introduce themselves for the Senate. Present to do so were President Quetschke, Parliamentarian Estrada, Secretary Ramírez, Sandra Atkins, and Past President Saavedra. Other members of the FSEC were also announced, Andrew Anabila

(COBE), Jameela Banu (COHP), Arden Dingle (SOM), Jerry Lyles (CFA), Doug Timmer (CECS and President Elect – now vacant), and James Whittenberg (CEP)

- Motion: Senator Bruno - That the Faculty Senate Executive Committee members shall be electable from all currently serving senators.
- Second: Senator Gkioulekas
- Discussion about the rule that currently exists ensued. A concern was that we should fill all vacancies on the senate before we then elect to fill open FSEC slots, also that people elected to this position have the full right of voting on FSEC matters. Both concerns were addressed in discussion, by virtue of election to FSEC the right of vote exists and that not all senate seats will be filled as people withdraw from service at various times for reasons outside of senate activities. If postponing FSEC elections occurred waiting for FS to be filled the FSEC could not operate. Currently Senator Whittenberg is in need of this exemption because he has not yet accrued three years of senate service, but he was duly elected by the CEP caucus to represent them on FSEC.
- Vote: Yay – unanimous; motion carried.
- The introduction of a second concern in the faculty senate constitution, there is a three-year rotation of first term senators that was created by lot for the first seating of the UTRGV faculty senate. Some of these senators then did not serve a full term, but nonetheless served. Therefore, they are not eligible for another term because of the term limits. There is a suggestion that these be treated as special elections similar to one held for an unfilled position, thereby allowing the senator to serve an additional full term that would place them in excess of the current six-year limit.
- Motion: Senator Caruntu - That the faculty Senate elections for less than 3-year term limits be treated as special elections for the purpose of identifying the term limit of Senators.
- Second: Senator Falk
- Floor opened for discussion, no senator engaged in a discussed on this motion
- Vote: motion carried, majority in favor; 1 abstention.

IV. Action Item: Approval of Minutes – May 4, 2018

- Item Tabled.

V. Business

- a. Memorandum of Appointment (MOA)
 - i. Tenure/Tenure-Track report & discussion

- ii. Lecturers report & discussion [items discussion held together]
- Issue raised - Who defines the percentages, what are the percentages of and what does that mean?
 - Some senators have experience with these percentages, but that they have no documents explicitly defining these percentages. The College of Science does have a document for percentages, resulting in MOAs in which the language is considered harsh. The EVP has stated that this is standard legalistic language that is approved for this document. She further explained that this is no measure to demean faculty. A PPT was shared with one department in the CLA by Dean Diaz, it originated with the Workload Committee.
 - Discussion continued on the possible need for different college or tracks, those doing research and those teaching.
 - There are no explicit answers on why this is in place now. However, some senators understood that this was to create a baseline for comparison later, an opportunity to create a measure against which the new policy could be designed.
 - Concerns: there should be an appeals process for this, a chair makes a decision, but there is no appeal process in place if a dispute arise; Is the purpose of the percentages to be used for evaluation.
 - NTT, lecturers, faculty don't even have a MOA for the year, only their initial letter of appointment. The EVP though has stated that lecturers will also have MOAs in the future.
 - Clinical faculty have similar issues in regard to service, research, teaching, and clinical work.
 - Senator Hinton indicated that the MOA is supposed to be transitional, to understand work now for the areas of clinical, service, research, and teaching. Then the university administration can have an idea of what to expect in the future.
 - The problem with this situation is that there is no transparency, later review committees will have to figure this all out as they evaluate based upon these percentages listed in MOAs. In addition, we all have the percentages change as the semester follows, but that is not reflected in the documents (e.g. new committee memberships increases service which is not reflected in MOA).
 - In SOM, the language is not harsh, it is aggressive. The MOA can be modified by administration without faculty input. NTT can be released without prior notice, this is the vast majority of the faculty

of the SOM.

- Even though the percentages may be useful and provide some flexibility, there is need to clarify everything.
- Motion made by Senator Gkioulekas to create a subcommittee tasked with
- drafting a Senate Resolution concerning the MOA
- Second by Senator Bruno
- Discussion – We are reminded that the workload policy will be presented November 1, this is closely tied to the MOA. Most others don't have MOAs in the UT System. Health clinicians have stated that it is familiar to their division. The MOA used here is almost a template document; it is standard practice at health systems within the UT System. Senator Seligman stated that a previous institution in which she was employed that the MOA was beneficial, it needs consistency in the process and requires consistent negotiation to make this work. The concern again raised is what power exists in the chair to decide the MOA.
- Senator Gkioulekas is invited to chair this subcommittee on MOA, Senator Lyles will join him.

b. Faculty Workload Committee - report & discussion

- The UT System Faculty Advisory Council has three documents useful for this conversation, the Regents Rule on this issue, the Best Practices document, and the memo from Dr. Steven Leslie, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- There have been three meetings of the university workload policy committee already, the current pause is to obtain feedback from faculty, WSCHs is still prominent in the discussion. Although negotiation is important, the needs of the department are also of importance. There is a call for clear, fair, equitable processes to be in place. The reason we are discussing these issues is because chairs have in some cases previously acted in opposition to just practices. Questions raised about the committee, the FS nominated members, the Deans nominated members, the administration selected from nominations. The direction being taken now is that the university will have one common general policy and each department will have a unique select policy for full implementation.
- Senator Bruno spoke to the agenda items (A)(B)(C)(D) as one element representing his colleagues of the COBE: reiterated Dr. Bailey's statement of bottom up not top down management, but T&P proposal was rejected for a college proposal instead; EVP

Research, can't be one policy for items such as journal publication, different fields in his college are represented by varying numbers of publication opportunities, making it unfair for one field to be measured against another; percentages are confusing, there is no standard against which to compare – 40 hours of a work week maybe.

- It was reiterated that departmental decision making should be followed not college. In one opinion there is a standard that is already being followed and the workload definition allows for year to year changes as is seen fit by the faculty member, only serious changes in decreasing areas of the workload requires negotiation. Again, a committee is suggested to do this work.
 - Motion made by Senator Gkioulekas to create a subcommittee tasked with drafting a Senate Resolution concerning the workload policy [Amending the previous motion to include the task of this committee, one committee two charges]
 - Second by Senator Falk
 - Discussion – what do we need, what are we looking or and how do we ask for these answers. We need the information now to get to the committee for workload. It is important to get the resolution, even without enough information at this moment, so that information is forthcoming. If we are not made aware or informed of policy processes the resolution is our way of informing system that this is happening.
 - Vote; Motion carried with majority in favor and 2 nay votes.
- c. HOP for Carnegie designation - Marie Mora, Linda Matthews, & Dora Saavedra
- d. Status and revision of HOP Policies
- i. ADM 02-201 Academic Committees and Councils
 - ii. ADM 06-502 Annual Faculty Evaluations
 - iii. ADM 06-505 Faculty Tenure and Promotion
- [c. and d. were presented/discussed together]
- Faculty Senate previously passed these policies. However, for the new Carnegie designation being sought the concepts of Community Engagement must be included not just in statements, but in policy. It is therefore introduced in these policy areas with slight language changes so as to not change the policy, but to emphasize Community Engagement as what we do at UTRGV.
- e. Administrator Evaluation Report

- It was strongly suggested that the evaluation results not be disseminated by the Faculty Senate to the faculty through a mass electronic communication. Each faculty senate member has the results and may print that out to discuss with constituents.
- Respecting the administration's position, it is still quite problematic that the administration would impose a de facto gag order on the Faculty Senate, the representative body designed to provide voice for faculty. If the FS cannot communicate its work with its constituency then the administration is halting this body and its senators from doing its work. All faculty evaluations are online, and administration should lead by example.
- The suggestion for the Constitution Committee is that this should be explicitly stated as a task for the FS to conduct an evaluation and to share the results. There was a period of clarification for the new senators to understand that the survey was approved by the previous senate, implemented, and results obtained. The legacy institutions used to do the same with their respective administrations and senate bodies.
- Motion by Senator Torres that the Faculty Senate will send the evaluation of administration to the faculty [amended to: The Faculty Senate will send the evaluation of administration to the faculty and assert that it is within Faculty Senate authority to conduct evaluations of the administration and distribute the results to all UTRGV Faculty on the UTRGV senate webpage]
- Second by Senator Paccacerqua
- Discussion – Senators wished to see this report before it is sent out so as to prepare to meet with their faculty constituency.
- Vote: Motion Carried, 24 Yay; 1 Nay; 7 Abstentions

[The remaining of the agenda was tabled, lack of quorum after agenda item (e)]

- f. Mileage Reimbursement - Discussion
- g. Subcommittee on Chair evaluations
- h. Constitution Committee
- i. Subcommittee Whitepaper status
- j. AOB

VI. Next meeting

Faculty Senate Meeting: October 19, 2018
EACSB 1.106 / BBRHB 1.207 (WebEx)

VII. Adjournment

Adjourned at 4:31 pm.