Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

March 8, 2006

Attendance:
Ken Price, Management
Xueming Luo, Marketing
Ernest Crosby, Civil Engineering
John Priest, Ind. Engineering
Selichi Nomura, Mech. Engineering
Leighton McWilliams, Art/Art History
O. Elmer Polk, Criminology & CJ
Johanna Smith, English
Joyce Goldberg, History
Dennis Reinhartz, History
Mark Ouellette, Linguistics
Toni Sol, Modern Languages
Graham Hunt, Music
Raymond Eve, Sociology
Joe Kongewick, Theatre
Dan Formanowicz, Biology
John Bacon, Biology
Merlynd Nestell, Earth & Environment
Christopher Kribs-Zaleta, Mathematics
Michaela Vancliff, Mathematics
Suresh Sharma, Physics
Dan Levine, Psychology
Becky Boles, Architecture
Mary Lynn Crow, Curriculum & Instr.
David Stader, Ed. Ldrship/Pol. Stu.
Jennifer Blevins, Kinesiology
Lorrie Hegstad, Nursing
Mary Weber, Nursing
Sharon Judkins, Nursing
Norman Cobb, Social Work
Gerald Savon, ex officio
Josh Sawter, Student Congress President

Call to Order:  The meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m. by Senate Chair Dan Formanowicz.

Approval of Previous Minutes: Motion and second to approve minutes from the February 15, 2006, meeting. Approval vote was unanimous.

Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty Senate: President Spaniolo isn’t with us today. Provost Dunn is here. I have a few remarks. Most of them came the Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) that John, Dennis, and I had last week. It was a very busy meeting. We had a visit from the new Student Regent and the newest of the other regents as well as a visit from the legislator on the Committee on Higher Education. We had some interesting dialogue with those folks. In addition to that, at the back of the room, there is a document that we copied for everybody. The first page is UT Systems Planning Charge and Framework. This is something that was handed out at the meeting last week. There are some very interesting things on here having to do with strategic planning and the work schedule, etc. Some of the most interesting aspects of this are to be found on pages 4, 5, and 6 regarding interesting trends in education. In addition to that, the faculty about a year ago, made a presentation to the Board of Regents about the idea of setting up a faculty research database. The Board of Regents liked it and directed the system to do it. Basically, it is a data base for each of us to go in and enter our information and find other faculty members in the UT system that are working on similar research projects. It is designed to increase collaboration between the various UT system institutions. It is kind of up and running. It was up and running when it was showed to us last week, but I haven’t been able to get into it this week. When it is up and running, it is ready for input. We will send a memo out alerting
everyone. I would encourage everyone to get online and input their information. In addition to this one, there is also a graduate student registry that has been put into the system. I think is ready to go. It has a couple of different functions. It allows potential graduate students to register into the system. We will have search capabilities to be able to find potential students in the system and the students will be able to talk to each other as well.

Past Chair Reinhartz: We are also going to propose, I think in the fall regent’s meeting, that this be accessible eventually to employers so that businesses looking for talented young people in specific fields can dial into this to find our graduate students that they might be wanting to use either as interns or, ultimately, to hire. That proposal will be made to the regents who will be meeting here on this campus in August.

Senator: Will it be categorized in disciplines?

Senate Chair Formanowicz: Absolutely.

Past Chair Reinhartz: As will the individual professors who put theirs on there. There are a number of ways that they will be able to extract these things.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: It’s a fully searchable database.

Past Chair Reinhartz: I would recommend even my colleagues in Liberal Arts that we go on because it’s just a way to announce what you’re doing. You may actually get some input into what you’re doing. It’s also a way of advertising for the University and that is the diversity of research that goes on here.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: It all goes under the general theme that the Faculty Advisory Council felt like there wasn’t enough interaction and this is one way to respond to each other. I think it’s going to be a very valuable tool for us down the line.

As I mentioned, we had dialogue with Regent Colleen McHugh. It focused, primarily, on the Board of Regents graduation rate resolution. We’ve talked a great deal about the various factors having to do with that. It was, actually, a very nice conversation and I think she took a lot away from our point of view. We tried to set the context of how much variation is in the UT system schools was very much something needing to be considered.

The legislative representative, Rep. Patrick Rose, focused primarily on K-12 funding problem. We talked a little bit about when a special session is going to be called. He seems to think it will be shortly after the primaries. We also talked about whether or not there is going to be a special session called to deal with tuition revenue bonds. He was not as optimistic about that in terms of when, etc. He did think it would happen, he just wasn’t sure when.

We then talked to the Student Regent, Brian Hailey, who is a very impressive individual. He is a law student down at Austin. I think one of the interesting things going on is that the student regents from all of the systems in Texas have been meeting with each other and talking to each other. I think the largest handicap the student regent has in the way it has been set up is the
student regent is only in place for one year. I thought he was a very impressive individual and he
seemed to know a lot about what was going on. He indicated that he has had no problems fitting
in with the Board of Regents

Past Chair Reinhardt: The way the law is written, next year's regent will not be from UT Austin.
No component can repeat with a student regent. It opens up again next year to students
anywhere across the system except Austin.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: The competition will begin again in September.

That is all I have for now. I've got some things under new business that I want to talk about, but
that's all I have for now.

Senator Priest: We do have an attendance list, so be sure you check it. If you do not have a
name tag or the wrong person is listed, please update it and please leave it at the end of the
meeting.

**Remarks by the President:** President Spaniolo was not present at the meeting.

**Remarks by the Provost:**

As Dan indicated, Jim is not here today. He is in Washington D.C. and has been there all week.
He is visiting with heads of various agencies and sharing information about UTA. Yesterday, he
called in and reported the visits were going very well. If he is successful, we should see
significantly more earmarked funding for the University.

I was asked by the Senate Executive Committee meeting with the President to provide a brief
report to you on the status of the Faculty Mentoring Program. I have some information to share
with you. If you recall, this program was piloted for the first time last year, so we are in the
second year. This year we have 40 junior faculty who are serving as mentees of 39 senior
faculty. Those members compare to 34 junior faculty last year and 33 senior faculty mentors.
Last year, towards the end of the year, two group sessions were held for the participants of the
program to determine their thoughts about how the program had gone and what they might like
to see in the future. The primary feedback is they would like to see a more structured program.
We did, indeed, put in place more programming this year. We have seven events that are
scheduled throughout the year and they are open, not just to participants of the program, but
others as well. The first was early in the fall semester. It was a session on higher education. I
presented information there on state system and local organization government of higher
education. A second session was held in November by the Office of Research on Research
Funding and Grant Development. Reports from attendees of this session said it was a very
valuable one and they would like to see more programs in the future on this topic. In November,
we had a holiday social for the mentors and the mentees. I think it was quite a success. I’ve
been told it was very loud in the room and everyone was engaged in lively discussion. So, at the
very least, I know the program was successful in getting junior faculty acquainted with senior
faculty. Spring has three additional events. The Academy of Distinguished Scholars had an
event in February on strategies for developing scholarships. There will be an event coming this
Wednesday on the tenure and promotion process. Then there will be a luncheon for program participants in April. In addition to these events, the participants indicated they were interested in support for teaching development. One of your Senate members generously volunteered to structure seven instructional seminars for participants in the program. Those are underway. While attendance in these is not what we might have ideally hoped, we averaged eight participants per session. I can tell you that those who attend had strong praise and said it was exactly what they needed to further develop their teaching. From all indicators, at least all that I am able to pull together, the program is a success and will be continued. We will, again, seek feedback and seek to implement any changes that are recommended. I’ll say, finally, that Linda Wilson, who coordinates the program out of the Office of the Provost, does an outstanding job.

If you have questions or suggestions for future programs, please feel free to contact her. The only other thing I’d like to report is a status update on tuition setting. A reminder to you that there is a special meeting of the regents March 28th and that is where tuition should be established by regents. We are still in discussion about our tuition structure, so I don’t have anything complete to report at this time. We will not be in a position to establish a faculty and staff merit raise pool until after that meeting. If you have been wondering why there is no news yet, don’t despair, we are very hopeful that we will have an announcement shortly on the heels of this meeting in early April about a pool and a process for reviewing and evaluating faculty and staff. That’s all I have and I’m open to any questions.

Questions for the President and Provost:

Senator: What is the tenure earning faculty mentor program – what is the feedback so far? I know a little bit about our people in my department. What about university-wide feedback? Is there any feedback about how this program is being used?

Provost Dunn: Yes, the participants were surveyed last year and we will do so again this year. The general feedback was very positive. I did bring along some quotes from the surveys that I will share. They are somewhat representative of the kind of things we hear. Recently, Linda received an email from a participant who said, “The program helps her feel more like she knows what she is doing and that she feels much more effective working toward tenure rather than just being out there on her own, hit or miss.” Someone else wrote recently saying, “Thanks for organizing the discussion with the Academy of Distinguished Scholars. It was extremely helpful and informative. The lectures brought out the best of both speakers and participants and provided insights that have not been offered elsewhere.” Generally, we are hearing positive things, but we’re always open to constructive criticism. If you hear anything, positive or negative, please feel free to share. We are happy to tailor the program to many more, hopefully large, generations of faculty.

Senator: How is the faculty club coming?

Provost Dunn: Well, it’s coming, quite certainly. I’m just two floors over the construction and I often feel like I’m in a dentist’s office. If you see me walking around like this, it’s because the sound factor is very much like the drill in the dentist’s office and it is fairly frequent. You probably know the initial goal was to have it open in March. I don’t think we will make the end of March. I do believe we will be able to have it open before the end of the semester. In all
likelihood, sometime in April. I would guess late April. Probably the interior room will be largely complete. Some of the artwork will not be completely installed, but the lounge should be very functional. The outer court may not be completed at that time, but will be finished over the course of the summer. John Hall will be constituting another advisory group, and he may have already contacted the senate, about representation to help him review menus and hours of programming. It will be somewhat of an experiment initially, in that we will be open the hours that faculty and staff indicated in an earlier survey. If the demand is there, then we will review those hours and maybe expand them. If things aren’t perfect at the outset, I guess I would say two things – share your feedback and your presence because our ability to expand programming services, food offerings, and the like will depend, in large part, on utilization. I’m very excited about the facility. I had an opportunity to look at the design drawings. It’s going to be the most special place on campus with the possible exception of the new planetarium.

Pam Haws – Compliance and SACS:

Senate Chair Formanowicz: I asked Pam Haws to come and talk to us a little more about the SACS process and the reaffirmation process. One of the reasons I asked her is that we have heard a lot of the QEP side of things and I thought it would be a good idea if everybody had a fuller picture of what was actually going on in terms of reaffirmation. So, I have asked Pam to come and talk to us a little bit about timeline process.

Pam Haws: There is a one-page front and back handout at the rear table. The first thing I wanted to refresh you on is just the general timelines. We really started this process last summer when we went with Orientation for the Leadership Team in Atlanta and it correlates with our on sight review in the spring of 2007. We hope to have our reaffirmation announcement after that. This is a new process for SACS. It shares many qualities with the former process, but is different in some ways. This plan has been in place since 2001 and they are calling this one reaffirmation instead of re-accreditation. The subtlety there is that being credited is an ongoing process and so we are not being reaccredited, SACS is just reaffirming accreditation. We are busily trying to make sure we get all terminology for reaffirmation. I think the important difference between the two processes is that, in the past if you were here ten years ago or at another SACS institution, you may remember the “must” statements. There were 462 of these things and they were quite specific in terms of all the things we teach. There are 462 of these things and they were quite specific in terms of all the things we teach. They have cut down the number of those items. If you look under “New Process, Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement,” there are 12 Core Requirements which are the most basic change, 53 Comprehensive Standards, and 8 Federal Mandates, which if I have added correctly, adds up to 73. They pared it down from 462 to 73. I have a note on the handout that these statements are less specific than the “must” statements. That is an understatement. You can imagine in going from 462 to 73 that there is much less specificity in the new statements. The problem with that is that we are all engaged in time to learn what it is that those statements mean and what the expectations of the SACS reviewers will be with regard to each of those 73 statements. So, we go to conferences, we talk to our SACS liaison person in Atlanta, we talk to other institutions with a grievance recently, and we talk to SACS consultants, etc. So, believe me, as the accreditation liaison on this campus, I’m engaged in that, others in the Provost Office are engaged in that, Dan is engaged in that, and many of you are also engaged in that in regard to talking with colleagues, etc., about what exactly these things mean. There is a lot of room for
interpretation in some of these, but we are trying to come to a more clear understanding of what these things mean. As some people have remarked, when we hear what the expectations are, we seem to be learning more about what is not acceptable. That is understandable. It’s easier to say what is not acceptable, than to provide a full and complete model of what is acceptable. If you ask me a question and I can’t get you an answer or I can’t give you a hard and fast answer, or show you where it is in black and white print this is the way we must do it, it is because we are dealing with expectations that are communicated through emails, presentations, and other kinds of things that aren’t as official as this little book that has the 73 principles in it. Also, I’d like to call your attention to the new process that they do emphasize the two foundational facets of this process are integrity and quality enhancement. Quality enhancement is a broader term than just related to the Quality Enhancement Plan. So, when you hear about the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, that’s talking about the whole reaffirmation process, not just the Quality Enhancement Plan that Victoria has come and talked to you about. I understand there is lots of room for confusion there because the terms are kind of thrown about in different ways. The primary purpose of this reaffirmation process is to verify that institutions are engaged in self-monitoring and is using the results of that self-monitoring to enhance quality programs and services to the students. It is probably, the number one thing that is emphasized to us over and over. You all know about all the calls for accountability from all the other external agencies from the federal government to the state government to the coordinating board to the UT system. So, there are many calls for accountability and this is one of them. Everyone agrees that we would rather be involved in monitoring ourselves and showing that we do that and we use that information for enhancement and improvement, than to have a totally external governmental agency come in and institute some sort of test. One thing I also want to say is that we always talk about SACS as they. Why do they do this to us – why do they do that to us? It is a quasi agency because it does hire staff, etc. The thing to keep in mind is that the reviewers who come to our campus and who also do the off-site reviews are faculty and administrators from other institutions. So, as our presenter, Joseph Hoy who is here from Georgia Tech said, “Remember, they are us.” That is another place where we can get involved is to become evaluators or reviewers themselves in some way. This new process requires the preparation of two documents. The Certification of Compliance which I am overseeing. That is more similar to the old self-study that you may remember from the prior process and the Quality Enhancement Plan which Victoria has talked with you about a couple of times. I have included some things about the Quality Enhancement Plan, but I know you all remember that, so I’m not going to spend time on that. If you have question on that, we can go back to that later. The Certification of Compliance is a document that we are in the process of preparing. It documents the institutions judgment of the extent of our compliance with these 73 requirements that are stated. We have three choices to mark. We have compliance, partial compliance, and non-compliance. We present a short text about each one and links to a lot of documentation that will provide the evidence to show that we are in compliance in most cases. This will be submitted on-line by September. The document will be evaluated by Off-Site Review Committee that meets in Atlanta the first week in November. They will respond to us later in November and tell us what concerns they have. We have another two weeks to address those and send them another document called the Focused Report. That has to be received six weeks before our on-site visit. The On-Site Committee will visit us in late February to early March 2007. The way that it has been explained to me, the purpose of the On-Site Committee is to provide input on the QEP. However, to the extent that there were questions raised during the compliance certification
portion, things that we haven’t yet been able to explain or show that we are in compliance or that we have a plan for becoming compliant, they will address that when they come on campus as well. I wanted to mention that it seems to me that two of the major areas of emphasis in the compliance certification are, first of all, institutional effectiveness. That just means are we doing what we say is our mission to do. Do we have a clear mission? Do we know where we are going? How well are we doing in getting there? To demonstrate institutional effectiveness, they really expect us to show at every level that everyone has that same outlook. In a course you know where you are going, you see how well you got there, and you use that information to enhance that experience for students in the future. You have to set program-level outcomes and assess students to see how well they are meeting those outcomes. The core will be assessed. Administrative and support programs have outcomes and are being assessed. The idea of institutional effectiveness is not a new idea for SACS. It has been in place almost 20 years. It continues to move and now is kind of their central idea in institutional settings which is why you are hearing so much about what we are asking faculty and programs to do in terms of setting outcomes and looking to see how those are being achieved. Another big area of emphasis is on faculty qualifications. SACS has very specific requirements for degree level, degree area, etc. in the teaching field. Those requirements have not changed. They have been the same for a long time. How strictly they are adhering to them and how much justification they make us give for someone who doesn’t have exactly what it says on paper that one should have is the part that has changed. In the past, we may have had an original official transcript on file. Now, we know that you are being justified by means of some of the other educational credentials. We are supposed to have documentation of that. If we say you have certification as a Microsoft engineer, we have to have copies of that. If we say you are a CPA, we have to have a copy of that license. Whatever your chair says are your qualifications to teach that course, we have to have documentation. Sometimes the profiles of the faculty can be an inch thick that are put together to justify that someone is teaching outside the area in which they received their degree or is teaching with a different level of educational preparation. That is another area that has gotten more emphasis and more complex. We are busy polishing and shining up all of these things and that is why you are hearing so much emphasis on this. We are trying to get everything in order and everything ready so that when we send in this Certification of Compliance in September of 2006 and SACS looks on our website, they will find the kinds of things they need to show that we are in compliance.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: Any questions?

Senator Priest: Our visitor from Georgia Tech had a presentation that had a lot of focus on course outcomes, student learning outcomes, actual assessing to a much greater level than I think we are doing. Are we going to try to get to that level that he was talking about or stay like we are now?

Pam Haws: It is my understanding that we need to be moving in that direction. We have program level outcomes stated for every degreed program on this campus. The level of assessment and use of those results for improvement varies from unit to unit. Some units are very engaged in that process, some units are less engaged perhaps because of circumstances – have more trouble following through. Everybody is pretty good at saying what they are going to do, but actually getting the assessments done with everything else we have to do is the hard part.
The unit effectiveness process is in place and has been since 1997. It has evolved over the past 8 or 10 years. We continue to try to improve that and help unit administrators and faculty members who are involved at the unit level to work on that. The new part is the memo that you are referring to from the Provost Office about putting student learning outcomes and faculty expectations from individual course into the web based syllabus. This is an expectation that over the last six months to a year, we have learned more and more that expectations are moving in that direction. It think it is a part of that institutional effectiveness idea that everyone should have a clear idea of the outcomes they are trying to achieve in the assessing and to what extent those are achieved and feeding that information back in for enhancement and improvement. It is my understanding that what you have been asked to do by the fall is put student learning outcomes on the syllabus and be thinking about how you will assess those. I know that Dr. Hoy had a question directed to him about what SACS will do with that information about individual faculty member’s assessment of student learning outcomes in their course. They can come in and say that you said students would get this and then you are saying they didn’t get it so you’re in trouble. That is not my understanding at all. I think if they were to ask an individual faculty member a question it would be a question of what are the students learning for your class. What assessments do you do, what information have you found, how well do you feel students achieving these, and what have you done with that information. It would be more of a process question of how you assess and how you use that information to improve your course. Not so much, “Why did you say 80% would do this and you only found that 70% did?” I realize it is an evolutionary process. It is not going to happen overnight. We might only get learning outcomes on a syllabus by September, but the level of those and the level of assessments is going to take some time to get all that going just the same as it took a while to get it going at the program level.

Senator: How can we as faculty make this thing work for us not just as teachers, but as departments in our programs to maintain the quality?

Pam Haws: I don’t have an answer to that question. We are going to be meeting with program chairs this spring. The new instructions for the Unit Effectiveness Plans will be coming out hopefully this week. Over the next couple of months, we will be meeting with program chairs and other people in the units who are involved in doing those plans at the program level. One of the things we hope to talk to each of those groups about is what kind of external accreditations do they do, what kinds of other assessments, what are their needs in terms of data, how might they use this data or other data for their own purposes. Is there a way to make the things you need for program review, the things you need for other kinds of accountability or assessment processes, is there a way get a close tie between some of those different processes. I don’t think there is one overall answer. It’s going to be different in nursing than it is in engineering – than it is in some other area. I would love for there to be a way for the information that we have to demonstrate to SACS that we are doing this to be useful to the units as well. It needs not to be a meaningless burden to people.

Past Chair Reinhartz: Can you flunk this?

Pam Haws: No, I don’t think so.
Past Chair Reinhartz: So what happens if we don’t do what they expect us to do? Is there any penalty?

Pam Haws: Yes. First, they would give us recommendations and ask us to do follow-up reports. We would have a certain period of time. It is very cumbersome, because you have to provide more evidence and they are really watching very closely. I don’t know if you heard Dr. Hoy from Georgia Tech, but when he went to Georgia Tech, they were on probation from SACS for institutional effectiveness. Specifically, assessing graduate programs. Had they not hired an assessment crew and gone to work on it, they could have lost their accreditation from SACS. At that point the Department of Education has invested the regional accrediting agencies with the power to strip us of accreditation and we can’t get federal funding for students. It has not happened to a large school that I am aware of that they actually stripped them of their accreditation. They have put lots of people on public warning and public probation.

Senator Ouellett: I just wanted to comment the question that was raised. I think it is an essential question for faculty members concerning restrictions on how we teach. My background is in Linguistics, but it is also in Education. I feel that learning outcomes are important to effective teaching at all levels of education. Particularly, not only in benefiting the students, but in benefiting the faculty members themselves. Specifically, in helping professors and teachers understand their own teachings and better plan their lectures and lessons based on the needs of the individual students. More practically, even when students have complaints about their grades, you have a very set standard where you can show them explicitly what they have met and what they haven’t. So, in this way, I see it as sort of two different dimensions of benefits. One, more abstract, that helps us round our teaching. It gives us sort of a defense management to deal with student complaints.

Pam Haws: Our UTA SACS website is up. There is not a lot of content on there now, but there will be more content as time goes on there is a link to the Principles of Accreditation if you want to look at those. We also taped Dr. Hoy’s sessions and those tapes will be available for check-out in our office once we get all the permissions in place.

Senate Chair Romanowicz: Along those same lines, I do want to report that the QEP proposal deadline was last Friday at 5:00 p.m. We had, by my count, 38. He had 41. There were a large number of proposals submitted. We got proposals from every academic, unit except one and that one is graduate education. We have a large number of proposals that the committee is going to be sifting through over the next week.

Committee Reports: We really don’t have any reports. Senator Nestell asked me to remind everyone that if you have individuals to nominate for emeritus status, you should get that information to him as soon as possible.

I do have some things I want to say. After our last meeting, there were several committees that were left completely empty. Part of that was because we didn’t have a full group here. People weren’t able to sign up. I sent around a committee list. If you are not getting my emails, let me know. Basically, what I did was fill the committees out with folks who had not signed up for anything. On that list, I have indicated in bold the individuals who have already agreed to be
chairs or the person responsible for calling the first meeting. When you meet and get a chair, you need to report that back to me.

We do have other things going on other than SACS. Certainly, those are the things that are going to be dominating the landscape over the next year. I do have some charges that I am going to make today.

At this Freedom and Tenure, we have been asked by the Provost Office to look at the promotion and tenure policies. Specifically, with regard to the required timing of reporting the voting results to candidates, as it is written right now, it is five working days after each vote is taken, the candidates are supposed to receive notification in writing as to what vote was at each level. There have been some questions about that being a little fast and about some problems that have come up. Particularly, in some large departments that have lots of decisions to make. I will be asking Academic Freedom and Tenure to take a look at that to see how the policy reads. I’ve got some more information that I will be giving you about that.

We have a continuing chair in Academic Liaison, Chris Kribs-Zaleta. I do want to continue talking about retention and the issues around retention. Particularly, the administrations recent focus on retention of minority faculty members. The other thing I want to put on the plate of Academic Liaison, including the Student Liaison as well, it is probably time that we take a look at student evaluations of our teaching that we are currently using. Those have been in place for ten years. We didn’t like then ten years ago and we don’t like them now. I think it is time, probably, to take a look at those and decide if they are, in fact, doing us any good at all or if they are just providing numbers to administrators to use in certain contexts. I think my bias is coming through, but that’s o.k. I think it is time we evaluate alternative instruments for doing this. There are alternatives out there. There are some commercial products. The University of Washington has one that we have heard a lot of good things about. I would like both Academic Liaison and Student Liaison to work on that.

Past Chair Reinhartz: Also, had not our Vice Chancellor Terri Sullivan taken a job up in Michigan as Provost, she would be on it by now. She was most appalled fact that our general opinion, in fact, was that the least of these things do is help us become better teachers. They do a lot of other things, but they do not tell us an awful lot about our teaching.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: We have had extended discussion, in fact, about how useless these things really are at this point.

Past Chair Reinhartz: We are assuming that when the new Vice Chancellor is in place, we will hear from System on it.

Senator: Did the Washington procedure that you mentioned take into account or did that (incomplete).

Senate Chair Formanowicz: I haven’t actually looked at it. We have heard about it in a couple of different reports. I think it is something we need to look at. There are a couple of System schools who are using it, right?
Past Chair Reinhartz: Right, and also Mary Lynn will remember our old idea survey. Some of you have been around long enough to remember the idea survey we used to use. San Antonio is just abandoning it, finally. They have the same problems we had 20 years ago with it. They have finally had enough of it. There are a lot of schools, particularly the academic components, who are beginning to shift on this stuff. It’s not only us.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: As with anything else, if we can find some way to make this more useful to us, that is what we ought to be moving towards. Operating Procedures, I’ve already talked about the idea of streamlining senate committees. John is chairing that committee and I’m going to ask that committee to look at that. The other thing I’m going to ask the committee to do - about a year ago, we passed a resolution on inclusion of faculty on search committees for administrators. That resolution went forward to the Chancellor. The Chancellor’s response was that he agreed with it and that it was a good idea, but that is should be handled on individual campuses. Our original idea was to get some thing in Regent’s Rules on it. The Chancellor has endorsed the idea. We don’t have any such policy in our handbook right now. UT Dallas has one that is pretty good that we can use as a model.

Budget Liaison – There was some discussion in Executive Committee last week with the Provost about the guidelines for the REP and the FDL in the Research Enhancement Program grants. There are some mumblings and murmurs about problems with the way that process has been going. I would like Budget Liaison to take a look at those guidelines. It is probably a good idea to do it anyway. It has been a while since we have looked at them. There seems to be some complaints about what is going on process wise with the FDL proposals and the REP proposals.

Special Projects committee we have already talked about. Equity Committee doesn’t have anything on their plate at this time, but is one of those committees we need in place whether we need it or not. It is a place where non-tenured promotion grievances go. There is some indication that Equity may have some things to do this semester.

That is what I have on committees. Do I have any questions about the committees? I will get in touch with everybody who I have indicated either as chair or to call the first meeting to be more specific. There is a lot going on in this campus right now. We have been hearing a lot about QEP and SACS, but there are a lot of other things going on as well that we need to be paying attention to.

Senator: I’m new here so I don’t know all the details. There are discussions in my department about the issue of the faculty salary and especially compression. How or when was that done?

Past Chair Reinhartz: It has been at least three years.

Senator: Is that available.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: I think it is and it is something that we talked about more last year. I’ve had several issues come to be via email relative to salary and salary compression relative to the idea that we are hiring folks at higher rates than some of our folks are making right now.
There are a lot of issues here. Some of them have to do with equity, adjustments, and things of that nature. What I would do is take this up with the Executive Committee and revisit that.

Past Chair Reinhartz: If you look at Michael Moore’s survey, it’s dated. It’s instructive to look at it, but it’s already dated because of the issue of what we are paying incoming people in certain area’s starting level salaries. That has already gotten out of hand in comparison to what it was three, four, or five years ago.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: Let me mention that there are some holes in terms of representation on some of the committees. It is possible to serve on more than one. So, if I have volunteers to fill some of those holes, let me know. I realize that, in some of the units, you have limited numbers of representatives for 11 committees.

**New Business:**

Senate Chair Formanowicz: I have a couple of items. One of them is related to what Pam was talking about and two a couple of the questions or comments that were made. We talked in Executive Committee last week about the memo that came out from the Provost Office relative to student learning outcomes. I have received a fair amount of feedback from folks asking me what is a student learning outcome and how do we do the assessments, etc. I’ve talked with the Executive Committee, I’ve talked a little bit with the QEP Steering Committee, and I’ve talked with the Provost about it. What I would propose is that we put together a faculty workshop or two. We would invite other faculty members on this campus who know what these things are to come in and teach the rest of us about it. I think that is the most straight-forward way to do it. There are ways that you can take the goals and objectives that are already on our syllabi and transform those into certain student learning outcomes without too much effort. I would like to do this through the Senate. I mentioned this to Dana and Jim. We talked about the Executive Committee and I think it would be a good idea. I’ve talked random faculty members across campus and everybody seems to have a pretty positive outlook. I think the idea is to take the bull by the horns and figure out what we have to do. At this point, I’m thinking about putting together a workshop for student learning outcomes and in the fall, put together another one to look at assessments. My idea is to get as much information out about what we need to be doing as we can. Again, it is an opportunity to help what we are doing with our students and to increase what we know about our students. It presents an opportunity as well as something we have to do. The more we know about it, the more efficient we will be. I’m throwing this out as a proposal. If the Senate agrees it is a good idea, I will follow up and we will begin to get something set up. It will probably be April before we will be able to get the first of these done and then get the other in the fall. With no comments or questions, Senate Chair Formanowicz stated he would move forward with the plans.

Senator: One thing you might think about is that different disciplines do things differently. It might be good to workshop those to that particular discipline so that whoever works with them can look at how they propose things. If you have two different disciplines in a room, it is very hard get enough information to go forward because they couldn’t see their own discipline.
Senate Chair Formanowicz: I think that is a very good idea and I will take that into account as we put things together. What we may end up doing is putting together one for each college or school.

Senator: I think people might feel more comfortable there when they can share and understand their disciplines more.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: I think that is a good idea. That is what I would suggest and that is what we have talked about is the idea that people bring their syllabi in with them. Sit down and actually look at what you already have on there. We can transform that into student learning outcomes. The assessment issue is a little trickier and a little more complex. We can talk about that in a later workshop once we have a better idea of how we are going to assess the things in the QEP. Hearing nothing else, then I will move forward with that and I will keep the Senate apprised on what is going on in that regard.

The other thing I have under New Business is the Coordinating Board has put out a call for nominations for an Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee. The Provost was already aware of it and they have made a nomination. This is a new advisory committee. They already have a Graduate Advisory Committee and we have a representative from the faculty. The charge of this committee is to advise and assist Coordinating Board staff in 1) designing and conducting a study the current state of undergraduate education in Texas and preparing a report for the Board this year that includes recommendations for actions, and 2) making recommendations to the Commissioner for future directions, and 3) developing a process to review existing procedures. The President has made one recommendation for that. It is Victoria Meyers who is currently heading the QEP Committee. I talked with her today and in the call for nominations, they suggested you could nominate an administrator and faculty member. We can sort of cheat and put Victoria over on the administrator’s side. If anyone is interested in being involved in this, please talk to me. I want to forward a nomination to Dana relatively soon. I think it is very important that we nominate as many folks as we can when it comes to a Coordinating Board committee that we are asked about.

Past Chair Reinhartz: Those of you who have been around for a while know that there is no end to the trouble that the Coordinating Board can get into or cause us. It just goes on and on. Two years ago they were on the verge of being extinguished by the Legislature and they managed to survive. Now, they are doing it again. Every time we can have input into what they are doing and also report back on what they are doing on a timely basis, it benefits us all. This is very, very important. It is not just some committee where you will be forgotten about. The Coordinating Board is incredibly active.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: The Advisory Committee on Graduate Programs, which our Provost sits on, has been very helpful. We need to increase our involvement with those folks. Again, if you are interested, please talk to me either after the meeting or send me an email.

Senator Priest: On a side issue with the Coordinating Board, their big push is to cut down on the number of buildings being built at the University in order to lower education costs. They are recommending Saturday classes. The strangest thing is they are also recommending that every
program require some hours done using distance learning. So the idea would be you could cut down on the number of classrooms, etc.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: Despite the fact that data that are coming in is showing that DE is not doing nearly as well as everybody would like it to, the Coordinating Board thinks it is a real good idea to pursue. It is one of the reasons why we need to keep an ear and an eye on this.

Past Chair Reinhartz: They have also been working on cutting back the numbers of PhD programs in the state. Also, cutting back PhD programs developing in places, in what they consider, on the periphery – like Brownsville or UTEP, etc. and concentrating them in the elite areas like College Station and Austin.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: That is just one of the issues that we would not be aware of if hadn’t had a faculty member on that program.

Past Chair Reinhartz: That is one of the areas we have been successful in holding them off on. Particularly, pointing out to them that some of the programs they are talking about are in critical areas like nursing, education, engineering, etc., where, allegedly, we don’t have enough people in them and that they are contradicting themselves.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: Is there any other new business:

Past Chair Reinhartz: Yes. Most of you are probably aware that our colleague, Diane Patrick, won a victory yesterday for her Republican nomination in the 94\textsuperscript{th} District in the State assembly. She is a former senator from the College of Education. She is also a colleague and friend to many of us. I would just like to offer that the Senate congratulates her on her victory. I think that is the least we can do to show one of our own that we are proud of them when they do something like this.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: Was that a motion?

Past Chair Reinhartz: Yes, that’s good enough.

Senate Chair Formanowicz: Motion and second. Is there discussion? With no discussion, motion carried unanimously.

Old Business:

Senate Chair Formanowicz: I will assign that to committee as I told her I would. I just actually forgot. That reminds me because I got an email from her as well because she couldn’t come today. As many of us know, Mary Ridgeway is resigning as Director of Community Service and Learning Center. There is a search committee to find a replacement. They are looking entirely internally for this individual. Laurie said the ad would be placed on the UTA website by March 24\textsuperscript{th}. She wanted me to alert anyone who might be interested that there was going to be an internal search for that position.
Announcements: None

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45.