

2021-2022 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 18, 2022, 3 pm – 5 pm 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, Grant Benham, Ben Brown, Lucia Carreon, Dumitru Caruntu, Joel H. Chirinos, Mircea Chipara, Cynthia Cripps, Amy Cummins, George Diaz, Louis Falk, A Fuat Firat, Christine Gerin, Rob Gilkerson, Jimmy Gonzales, Rene Gonzalez, Sergey Grigorian, Fred Guerra, Jonathan Guist, Tekla Hawkins, Marcela Hebbard, Sharon Helsley-Mcginley, Kip Austin Hinton, Michiyo Hirai, Ulku Karabulut, Hale Kaynak, Sanjeev Kumar, Dean Kyne, Kye-Hwan Lee, Hansheng (Jet) Lei, Karin Lewis, Yu Liu, John Luna, Michael Machiorlatti, Mike Magee, Salma Mahmood, Rachel Mann, Arnulfo Mar, Theresa Mata-Pistokache, Randall Monty, Nancy Nadeau, Cynthia Paccacerqua, Nilanjana Paul, Emily Perez, Volker Quetschke, Padmanabhan Rengasamy, Sam Sale, Clarissa Salinas, Andrea Schwarzbach, Dana Shackelford, Owen Temby, Paul Valadez, Jorge Vidal, Vejoya Viren, Aaron Wilson, Yingchen Yang, William Yaworsky, Soojin Yoo, Aziza Zembrani

Administrator: Vanessa Ceballos

Senators Absent: Stephanie Alvarez, Andrew Anabila, Sonja Arredondo (email excused), Jameela Banu (email excuse), Narayan Bhat, Sarah Blangero, Diana Paz, Riccardo Pizzinato, Abdullah Rahman, Henry Reinhart, Miguel Salazar, Manuel Saldivar

Guests: Michael Abebe, Janna Arney, Guy Bailey, Beatriz Bautista, Jonikka Charlton, Rebecca Coberly, Miryam Espinosa, Lilia Fuentes, Nikkie Hodgson, Daniel Hunter-Holly, Carolina Huerta, Mary Jane Lewitt, Qinyu Liao, Liji Mathew, Jacob McDonie, Fidencio Mercado, Cecilia Montiel-Nava, Sandra Musanti, Ney Alliey Rodriguez, Eloise Tamez, Viviana Trevino, Justin White

- I. **Meeting Convened at 3:00 pm** – Faculty Senate President Karin Lewis: Welcomed everyone back to spring semester 2022 and continues to recognize concerns and impact of the ongoing pandemic on UTRGV faculty and the community at large. She encouraged everyone to use the resources available to keep ourselves and everyone healthy. She encouraged everyone to watch UTRGV President Bailey's "Welcome Back" video. Dr. Lewis thanks everyone for their attendance and reminds us to:
 - a. adhere to the community agreement (listed above)

- b. follow Robert's Rules
- c. guests to add “*guest” to their name and senators to add your college or title to your name
- d. Parliamentarian, Volker Quetschke, will be monitoring the meeting and secretary, Cynthia Cripps, will monitor the chat, in case guests or senators wish their comments or questions be read aloud on the floor
- e. the chat is an informal space and will not be included in the minutes

II. Report of FS Parliamentarian- Volker Quetschke

- a. Roberts rules & Zoom guidelines reminder:
 - i. raise your hand and speak when you are recognized
 - ii. you may speak twice (90 seconds each) on a topic
 - iii. to make a motion, please submit a written statement in a direct message or an email to Volker Quetschke or Cynthia Cripps. It will then be displayed on the screen (floor) and discussed or moved upon as directed

III. Report of the FS Secretary - Cindy Cripps

- a. Motion to approve the minutes from November 6, 2020 (vote: zoom poll) made by Micky Caruntu, second by Hale Kaynak
 - Approve: 44/49 90% +2
 - Abstain: 5/49 10%The motion to approve the minutes carries with 90% approval.

- a. Motion to approve December 2, 2021 Minutes (vote: zoom poll) made by Micky Caruntu, second by Sharon Mcginley
 - Approve: 44/49 90% +2
 - Abstain: 5/49 10%The motion to approve the minutes carries with 90% approval.

IV. Report – President-Elect Kip Hinton – He will present a report from the Education Policy Committee later in the meeting.

- V. **Report - President Karin Lewis** – (pre-reading handout 3. President's Message Spring 2022). Dr. Lewis invites Dr. Janna Arney and Dr. Guy Bailey to address the decision to start the spring 2022 semester on-line for two weeks (until January 31).
 - a. Dr. Arney: Leadership team and “front line” workers met to discuss the state and local climate (regarding Covid-19), coming out of the December break, and what would be the best course of action. In turn these thoughts were reviewed with the Academic Leadership team to discuss the pros and cons. After announcements of other universities and careful consideration (of bringing about 30,000 students, + faculty back to campus), they decided to move classes to remote learning for 2 weeks while safety (vaccines, boosters, etc.) was emphasized.
 - b. Dr. Bailey: The variant, omicron, presented lot of unknowns and we felt we needed to take a step back and organize to best address issues. Other university presidents and administration reacted in a similar manner to initiate the spring semester.
 - c. Dr. Lewis: There was concern that if we started the first week as a traditional “first week” there may be more spread of the illness in week 2 and beyond. Moving the teaching modality to “remote” for the first two weeks gave everyone opportunity to get fully vaccinated/boosted, hopefully to mitigate the spread.

VI. Guest Presentations

• Strategic Planning

- **MaryJane Lewitt:** Strategic Planning Process Update. The Strategic Planning Process website is located here: <https://www.utrgv.edu/spc/> There is a form on the site for you and your constituents to provide input.
 - Strategic planning process will seek input from faculty, staff, and students through the spring 2022 semester to create a vision for UTRGV through the next 5-10 years. Faculty Senators please use the following link to volunteer in focus groups. https://utrgv-my.sharepoint.com/:w/g/personal/maryjane_lewitt_utrgv_edu/ESpL1SOCrSxPrr-XvW_yON8Bou1pvmMInyp-JWJ6Rwf9fQ?e=TX4xME
 - Senator suggestion: Please vary the focus group times and use the “activities period” so more faculty can participate.
 - These will be one-hour zoom conversations will use structured questions to direct the discussion. The goal of these initial groups is to use the data to formulate a broad overview of topics, which will then be narrowed and grouped into more specific areas. Then the committee will reach out to find specialists in the specific areas to continue more specialized discussions. If you have additional questions, please contact: maryjane.lewitt@utrgv.edu
 - For instance: To determine the values and goals of UTRGV, and outline ways in which they can be achieved.

• Faculty Annual Review

- **Michael Abebe:** Annual Review Policy revision-update on progress of Special Committee
 - Faculty Annual Review Survey
 - 37% of faculty (mostly tenured and tenure track (TT)) responded to survey
 - 57% are “somewhat satisfied” or “not at all satisfied” with the current AR (annual review) policy
 - 57% are “somewhat satisfied” or “not at all satisfied” with the current AR (annual review) timeline/pathway
 - Most wanted to keep review in the Fall semester
 - AR Statements:
 - 91% agree AR should be based on workload
 - 90% agree AR should accommodate specific job of non-tenure track (NTT) faculty (currently there is no NTT faculty policy)
 - 92% agree AR should result in feedback
 - 34% agree/36% disagree AR is redundant for TT faculty
 - 76% agree AR process should encourage faculty to provide evidence of short-term activities in context of their long-term professional goals
 - 92% agree AR should be streamlined to avoid cumbersome steps
 - 87% would like a rank specific AR
 - 87% believe it is important to emphasize progress toward professional goals
 - 93% agree faculty AR should be based on workload expectations

- 85% agree AR policy should be revised so it provides consistent and clear feedback
- Three categories of additional comments:
 - HOP AR policy revision: AR policy redundancy, guidelines for department policy, pathways/timeline, review rating/performance standards, transparency
 - Outside policy revision (department, professionalism...): evaluation standards, subjectivity in AR process & lack of transparency, student evaluations, workload determination, FPT application issues, Lack of NTT guidelines, merit increases, training
 - Conflict with University and/or UT system policy and guidelines: AR should not be conducted by faculty peers, AR does not need to be done annually, merit pay should cover cost of living adjustment
- Committee hopes to have a draft in the near future, hoping to use the new guidelines for the next review.
- Other comments:
 - Confusion between AR and Post-Tenure Review it isn't clear if a faculty member is being evaluated for the year or for 5+ years.
 - Develop a model of pros and cons (which may be different by per college) for using certain models of AR
 - School of Nursing, School of Social Work and College of Health Professions, although they have a different AR pathways calendar are all under the same guidelines as Academic Affairs. Should this align? What are the pros and cons?
 - It is possible to make pathways calendar different for each college.
 - What would be the concepts for "streamlining"?
 - Process: two narratives? two separate feedback – one for AR and one for PTR
 - Progress toward professional goals – can feedback be tied to the professional goals
 - Do different calendars create a bottleneck when moving to the UT system? – certain years must stay on the fall review to move together through the process.

VII. **Old Business** – DORA (Declaration of Research Assessment) Resolution reaffirmation (handout 9)

<https://sfdora.org/>

- a. Motion to accept/support the DORA resolution previously passed by senate in 2019 (vote: zoom poll) made by Nancy Nadeau, second by Fuat Firat

Discussion: Justin White: Declaration put together in 2012 regarding equitable research assessment. It applies to institutions, publishers, individual researchers. There are 18 provisions divided among the stakeholders. Strives for equity in research assessment.

Approve: 32/45 71% +2

Reject: 3/45 7%

Abstain: 10/45 22%

The motion to reaffirm the 2019 senate's approval/support of the DORA resolution carries with 71% approval.

VIII. FS Committee reports discussion

- a. Education Policy Committee (Kip Hinton): transcript examples for indicating a student have met the UTRGV "Gender and Ethnic Studies Graduation Requirement"
 - i. Option 1: in comments are at the beginning of the transcript
 - ii. Option 2: annotated in the semester that it was met

Which college and departments are prepared within their degree plans? Could be implemented by college.

- o Could go into effect for college courses already defined with these characteristics.
- o Other colleges could begin to incorporate it or adapt the course descriptions to indicate which courses meet the requirement.
- o Need to involved departments and colleges to determine which courses meet criteria for this requirement

- Possible courses:

- ANTH 4304 Indians of North America
- ANTH 4306 Anthropology of Borders
- ANTH 4308 Conquistadors and Chiefs
- ANTH 4309 Anthropology of Sex and Gender
- ANTH 4323 Mexican American Culture
- ANTH 4350 Mexican American Folk Medicine
- ANTH 4375 Mexican American Folklore
- ARTS 3359 History of Women in Art
- ARTS/MASC 4357 Latin@ Art History
- ASLI Diversity in the Deaf Community
- ECEC 4313 Multicultural Perspectives in Early Care and Early Education
- EDFR 2301 Intercultural Context of Schooling
- ENGL/MASC 2351 Introduction to Mexican American Literature
- ENGL/MASC 2327 Mexican American History I
- ENGL/MASC 2328 Mexican American History II
- ENGL 3334 Ethnic Women Writers
- ENGL 3335 Women's Literature
- ENGL/MASC 4317 Mexican American Literature
- ENGL Topics on Border Studies
- ENGL/MASC 4370 Intro To Border Languages
- GWSP 1301 Intro to Gender, Women's, and Sexuality Studies
- HLTH/ MASC 3325 Latino Health
- HPRS 4320 Border Health Issues
- MASC 2301 Introduction to Mexican American Studies
- MASC 2303 Border Literature
- PHIL 1362 Race, Sexuality, and Class
- SPAN 2320 Latina/o Culture and Civilization in Spanish
- SPAN 2321 Spanish in the United States

- b. Technology Enhanced Oversight Committee (Randall Monty): Research IT support: Fernando Cervantes fernando.cervantes01@utrgv.edu
- c. Research Policy Committee (Sergey Grigorian):
 - University is planning to introduce an internal grant – awaiting information from Dr. Arney
 - Faculty development leave program questions – awaiting information from Dr. Arney
 - Dr. Spencer is working on organizing and mapping processes, including those of IRB reviews and Grant submissions etc. to clarify processes.
 - Research operations and HR are working on a post-Doc job title
 - IT has a liaison dedicated to research support: Hernandez Cervantes
- d. Faculty Welfare Committee - Proposal for faculty health and wellness outdoor workout space
 - i. Walking trails
 - ii. USPS mailing covid test starting Wednesday www.usps.com/covidtest

IX. New Business

- a. Owen Temby – Chair Survey? and Interim Chairs?
 - i. Karin Lewis’s response: She met with Chair of the Chair of Chairs to review FS’s feedback. They have made necessary adjustments and input has been integrated to the chair’s survey and will be covered in their next bi-weekly committee meeting. At this time they will discuss how to distribute the survey and report findings from the survey.
 - ii. Dr. Arney is aware and committed to address the problem regarding interim chairs and the need for permanent chairs. The Deans have been charged with the commitment to get permanent chairs for departments in question.
- b. Hale Kaynak – Why does HR include sick leave into total rewards?
- c. Aziza Zemrani – Can a faculty member refuse to give another faculty member their on-line course? What is the final decision on the ownership of the course? Understanding that faculty shares ownership with the university.
 - i. Randall Monty
 - 1. It’s a contract created between faculty and the university. If you are blueprinting a class or creating a video in Panopto with a UTRGV program/software, UTRGV has shared ownership of that. Legally they claim ownership of it. The underlying content (lecture notes) is the professor’s.
 - 2. Syllabus, for instance, you created, but it is a public document of the university.
- d. Mircea Chipara – if the university pays faculty to create the class, the content belongs to the university.

X. Next meeting date: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 (3-5 pm) via Zoom

XI. Motion to adjourn: Volker Quetschke Second: Louis Falk Meeting adjourned (4:47 pm)