Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

November 2, 2005

Attendance:
Amster, Harriett; Ho, Li-Chin; Rasheed, Abdul; Spindler, Max; Priest, John; Nomura, Seiichi; Polk, Elmer; Ingram, Tom; Porter, Laurie; Smith, Johanna; Palmer, Stanley; Sol, Toni; Savage, Sam; Hunt, Graham; Nussbaum, Charles; Young, Robert; Kongevick, Joe; Saxon, Gerald; Bacon, John; Dias, Rasika; Cordero-Epperson, Minerva; Kribs-Zaleta, Christopher, Brandt, Andrew; Crow, Mary Lynn; Stader, David; Ricard, Mark; Gintole, George; Boles, Becky; Weber, Mary; Hegstad, Lorrie; Judkins, Sharon; Cobb, Norman; Urban, James

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m. by Senate Chair Reinhartz.

Remarks by the Chair:
Senate Chair Reinhartz:
I encourage you to participate in the Faculty Development Leave program and take it seriously because there is a good deal of money involved and secondly realize that on both campuses the projects will go through the regular faculty review process for research. The same committee we use here for faculty development leave will be the committee judging the validity of those research projects and making recommendations to the Vice President for Research. That’s going to happen on both campuses. Faculty will be a determining factor in who gets what for projects. Most important is we don’t want this to fall apart because prior to this, all we had was the Chancellor offering $500 for every joint project. We told the Chancellor that $500 is basically 2-3 trips back and forth between UTD and us and the money is spent. Those of you with ideas should pursue those ideas. The deadline is January 17 for submission.

Senator Formanowicz:
Dennis and I are going Friday for the FAC Executive Committee meeting and then we have the full meeting of that committee the first and second of December. We will continue to talk about things such as teaching evaluations, faculty retention, etc.

Senate Chair Reinhartz:
We will update you on the FAC meeting at the first meeting of next year. According to the agenda, next are elections. John will make report on the nomination process, but Dan will run the elections.
Senator Priest:
We had a Nominations Committee and asked for nominations. We received one nomination for each office. I was nominated for secretary and Toni Sol for parliamentarian. As everyone knows, we would like more nominations at this time.

Senator Formanowicz:
We’ll start with the parliamentarian position and we are opening the floor for additional nominations.

Senator Amster:
I would like to nominate myself.

Senator Formanowicz:
Are there any other nominations? Can I get a motion to close the nominations?

_A motion was called and seconded._

Senator Formanowicz:
The only people who are allowed to vote are senators, not officers. There are non-voting members on this body such as student representatives and the Dean of Libraries who are not allowed to vote. They are only allowed to speak and exercise influence.

With regard to elections, Mike Moore has assured me that he will contact all units and tell them whether or not they have to have a new senator on board for next spring. All election results will be reported eventually to him and through him to us. If you’re unsure whether you’re up for re-election or not, Mike is supposed to contact all the units whose senator’s terms are up.

In some units where the deans seemed to have been confused and they’ve already done the elections, that’s fine. We just need to make sure that Mike gets the new names for next year when he asks for them.

Senator Formanowicz:
While we’re tallying the votes for parliamentarian, we’ll open the floor for additional nominations for Faculty Senate Secretary. John is the nominee we have on the ballot right now. Are there any additional nominations for secretary?

_A motion was called to accept John as the secretary by acclamation. All senators were in favor and none opposed._

Senator Formanowicz:
Toni Sol is the Parliamentarian.
Senate Chair Reinhartz:
The next item on the agenda is a report from our representatives to the Texas Council of Faculty Senates, a body that’s made up of representatives of every faculty governance body in the state for four-year schools. Tom Ingram will make the report.

Senator Ingram:
On October 21 and 22, Senator Sol and I attended the meeting in Austin where presentations were made by three groups of speakers. The first was the Chair of the University Of Texas Law School, secondly, State Representative Fred Brown chair of the Budget Oversight for Higher Education Committee in the Texas House, and representatives from the THECB.

I’ll summarize Fred Brown’s discussion by reminding you that he is from College Station and is a BMW salesman. That pretty well depicted his song and dance.

Everything that we’re hearing from SACS, QEP, Unit Effectiveness, etc. is the tip of the iceberg. The key word is accountability. At one point, Mr. Brown made a point that the legislature felt like it made a major tradeoff in tuition deregulation and needed higher education to be much more accountable back to Austin and the legislature. All those reports that we’re all filling out, you can expect to see more and more of them.

The next group was from the Coordinating Board: Susan Brown, Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Planning and Accountability; Cynthia Ferrell, Program Director for Participation and Success, and Program Director for Academic Excellence and Research. They were pretty candid about the impact of the new state laws. I’ll summarize: watch out who you vote for and send to Austin because they have a lot of impact on our daily lives in higher education.

There was a real buzz at the council meeting that had to do with TAMU-Kingsville. Previously, the president has suspended the faculty senate and said it needed to be reorganized. It was interesting because the keynote speaking in the evening was Bob McTeer, Chancellor of Texas A&M System. He was there to tell the other side. We did hear from the released president of the faculty senate from Kingsville to present their side. Dr. McTeer also brought along one of the members of the committee that was appointed to study the issue, Dr. Bob Strasser. He was the former president of their faculty senate several times over. He tended to side very strongly with the chancellor. The bottom line, in my opinion, is it was a breakdown in communication over a long period of time. The president of the university said he felt they were trying to veto the actions of the administration and didn’t accept that they were advisory as part of faculty governance. A&M System concurred. One of the major issues was that at least over half of the faculty senators were elected at large. Because of some of their bylaws, once you got in an “at large” situation you were pretty powerful and stayed in office as long as you wanted (almost). The committees sought equal representation which essentially what we have here. Dr. McTeer cited his position to “follow the money.” He wanted to know who benefits from the way the votes are cast and he had a strong stance against some of the faculty associations. He felt that they did not benefit anyone. That discussion went
on for about 2-1/2 hours. There was a general open discussion after the presentation which I thought was very good.

We also went over enrollment. Overall, it appears that with internet classes a lot of universities said that it was very difficult to gain information because they were not separating the classes in the computer system. Also, there were classes using various internet components (e.g. WebCT and Blackboard) which were not reflected in the numbers at all. That varies tremendously across the state. We also went into faculty being compensated who hold the rights to those courses.

The issue of salaries was also brought up. We reported that our faculty senate salary survey was still in the process. It is difficult to get things resolved.

Also, there was a discussion about faculty growth versus student growth. Most of the places have the same issues that we have and being asked to have more students and fewer tenured faculty.

There was further discussion about the Kingsville issue. A motion was made for the faculty senate that had been disbanded and those people were being disallowed to participate in a reconstitution. That was not supported and we did not feel that was good information on both sides. The resolution that did pass re-affirmed our position in the faculty senate that shared governance and that the faculty senate should be advisory. We copied that resolution.

Senate Chair Reinhartz:
This is something on the FAC that we haven’t taken up because we deal with System. That is, we keep our purvey within the UT System even though we’re watching what’s going on in Kingsville. On this body, they can actually deal with it and talk about it. It’s good to have the information. From what we picked up, it’s a real mess. Some of you remember when we had a similar situation. To the credit of all involved, it was a fairly reasonable process so it didn’t get out of hand. In fact, the senate played a major role in a change of leadership. Down there, they called for a vote of “No Confidence” on their president and failed by one vote. Somehow, I think they’re taking that as a sign of victory of the administrative side.

Senator Young:
Do you have any sense of what this “iceberg” looks like that you spoke about? We’ve been hearing about it for over a decade now. I haven’t heard anything new.

Senator Ingram:
One of the bigger things that gives me pause is the fact that the Coordinating Board has been completely re-organized, in part, around the accountability issue and how they’re required to report to the state legislature. They need a couple of years for it to trickle down.
Part of the discussion also was the multiple layers that seem to exist in reporting. It’s not just a UT System thing. People feel like they’re filling out the same reports over and over. How about deciding what you want and doing it once and be done with it.

Senate Chair Reinhartz:
Realize that the legislature is still wrestling with the school funding issues. Once they are done with that all, other things open up again. This is one of the issues that has been pushed aside. It will open up again. Accountability is what the legislature is into. Kent Grusendorf uses that term in every other sentence he speaks. In other words, this isn’t something that is going away. Another issue to revisit is post-tenure review. That too has been waiting. They’re beginning to figure out that it’s not doing what they intended it to do. When you realize that the Coordinating Board was a whisker away from being eliminated, they are coming back with a vengeance trying to establish that they are necessary. I have been at UTA 33 years and the first nastiness I heard when I got here was the Coordinating Board. They were almost eliminated, but now they’re back.

Next, our Dean of Libraries has requested time to talk about print quotas for students beginning in spring, 2006.

Gerald Saxon:
I wanted to give the faculty and faculty senate a heads up on some changes that will take place in the spring semester regarding print quotas for students. Some of you may know that currently there is no limitation on the number of print jobs on library and OIT lab printers. The fact that there are no quotas had lead to some abuse that we would like to curb if we can.

There are a few reasons why we want to place quotas on printing. Basically, unlimited printing has become very wasteful. Last year, 185,000,000 prints were done in the library and on OIT machines alone. I know that some colleges and departments have their own printing labs as well. These numbers don’t account for what’s going on in those labs. OIT and the Library are spending close to $300,000 per year supporting free and unlimited printing. That doesn’t account for the cost of the machine’s upkeep – that’s paper only. There have been a few discussions in terms of what is being printed and a lot of what is being printed is not related to academic pursuits. OIT got a print job about 3 weeks ago for about 75,000 pages. A lot of website are being printed as well as flyers, etc. There are a lot of things being printed that we feel the library and OIT probably shouldn’t have to support. We’ve also received complaints from students who feel that their fellow students have been abusing the printing. They can’t get their print jobs if huge print jobs are running at the same time. What we would like to do is preserve free printing, but place limits on it. We would like to begin this in the spring semester. Basically, what we’re proposing is a quota that every student would have beginning in the fall semester. Let me review this, then discuss.

Essentially, every student enrolled in fall semester will get a $100 print quota for that academic year: fall, spring, and summer. Anything that’s not used in fall will roll to
spring and then to summer. Essentially, what a $100 print quota will give a student is 1,000 pages of black and white printing on one side of the page or 1,332 pages of black and white printing on 2 sides of the same sheet of paper. That’s by far the most generous print allotment in the Dallas-Fort Worth area or perhaps in the state of Texas.

The quota would be prorated for those students who are new in the spring semester with a $70 print quota. For those students new in the summer semester, they will receive a $30 print quota. What we’re proposing for this spring semester is a $70 print quota. There are details on how that will work on the proposal. Basically, what I want to do is give a heads up because we hear that a lot of faculty are requiring students to do intensive printing. A lot of faculty put notes, power points, readings, and all sorts of assignments on the web. I want you to be aware that coming in the spring semester students aren’t going to have unlimited printing. That means that you’re requiring them to print 1,000 pages in your class alone. Anything above that is going to be 10 cents a page.

Senator Sol:
I was completely flabbergasted when I found out that UTA didn’t charge. Does this also count for microfiche printing?

Gerald Saxon:
This is only printing through electronic resources. We’re unusual in that we haven’t charged. Some universities charge from print one.

Senator Young:
Once they go beyond 1000 pages, can they pay for it?

Gerald Saxon:
Yes. It’s either 10 cents a page for one-sided printing or less than 10 cents if they use double-sided printing. What they can do at that point is add money to their Mav Money account because this is all going to be regulated through their Mav Cards. In order to print, students are going to have to send the print command and in order to release it they will have to swipe their card. It will deduct it from their quota. If they reach the 1,000 page/1,332 page limit, it will deduct the money from their Mav account.

Senator Young:
Will they know how many they’ve used as they go along?

Gerald Saxon:
Each print job will tell them how many pages they have remaining.

Senator Savage:
How much is this allotment saving of the $300,000 spent?

Gerald Saxon:
We frankly don’t know how it’s going to save to be honest. It’s difficult to know where the problems are located. It’s not just a library thing, it’s also OIT. The Mav Express
Office has been talking about this for several months. Suzanne Montague and I have talked to Student Congress, the deans, and university library committees about this. Generally, there has been support on the part of the students. I think they realize there have been abuses of the system. I think if there’s a criticism, it’s where the quota has been set. We feel that we’re more than generous. Some students, particularly in the sciences, feel that there is a lot of printing required in the sciences.

Senator Bacon:
Is there a fee for registration of the library fee? Do you recall how much it is?

Gerald Saxon:
Yes. It’s $15 per credit hour for the library. It’s higher than that for OIT. It actually covers 70% of the library, 30% comes from the state. In fact, the state part doesn’t pay for our staff. I guess my point about these fees is that every dollar we spend to support abusive printing, is a dollar we don’t have to spend to support the core mission of the library which is to acquire information and make it available, to researchers, faculty and students. I understand your point that there is a library fee, but it funds only 70%.

Senator Boles:
A lot of our work in Architecture is printed on 24x36 sheets or 35x48. Is there a discussion on how those 8-1/2 x 11 pages translate to a larger format.

Gerald Saxon:
Architecture has a plotter fee that is charged to students. The machines I’m talking about don’t accommodate that kind of paper. The policies in place for Architecture would not change.

Senator Amster:
At 10 cents a page, how did you arrive at that amount?

Gerald Saxon:
Actually it’s less than 10 cents a page if you print on both sides and copying is 10 cents a page. We’ve never underwritten photocopying for students. We’re trying to get students to self-edit what they’re printing so that it’s related to school or if not, they realize that somewhere down the road if they print more than 1,332 pages, they’re going to have to pay for it.

Senator Spindler:
Is there anyway students could download a file so they wouldn’t have to print?

Gerald Saxon:
Yes. Every machine in the library and in OIT labs has USB ports and CDRW drives.

Nursing Senator:
We had a similar problem in the School of Nursing. What we instituted is for faculty to convert all files to .pdf files or something else in black and white so that we save money.
Gerald Saxon:
It could impact other printing and computer labs on campus once we start instituting the quota because others may not have the quota. Suzanne and I will send the message to all faculty letting them know that they may want to consider a course packet as opposed to putting things on-line that require printing. Please be aware that beginning this spring, it’s not unlimited and be aware of what the students may be going through.

Senator Judkins:
How will you let the students know?

Gerald Saxon:
We’ve met with the Student Congress and The Shorthorn has had a story that actually came out in support of this policy. We’re going to soon be placing it on the Library’s home page. We’re trying to get the word out.

Senator Spindler:
Will the library and OIT be reimbursed for this excess printing?

Gerald Saxon:
If we get any money, we’re going to use it to cover the print management software which had to be in place in order to make the system operate. It cost $40,000 to create the print management system and $11,000-$12,000 per year for licensing.

Unknown:
What if a person prints a job and then changes their mind?

Gerald Saxon:
It is only when the print job is released that they will be charged. They have to approve it twice. They have to submit the job. Then the software will inform the student how much the print job will cost. Once they release the print job, they have to approve it again.

Remarks by the President:
Not Present.

Remarks by the Provost:
Not Present.
Committee Reports

Academic Liaison: (Kribs-Zaleta)
The committee’s charge is to extend the faculty turnover survey to investigate what sort of breakdown we have in terms of faculty resignations. I have requested from the Provost Office updated data comparable to that what was given to the committee for last year’s turnover survey. The data should be returned very shortly.

Budget Liaison: (Rasheed)
No Report.

Special Projects: (Nestell)
Please turn in your nominations for Professor Emeritus to this committee. The nominations aren’t due until March, but the process is long. Please do it as soon as possible. Please contact Professor Nestell for more information

Student Liaison: (Priest)
No Report.

New Business
None.

Old Business

Senate Chair Reinhartz:
This is my last meeting as Faculty Senate Chair given our by-laws. I now move over after the first of the year to a past-chair role which is to primarily to support the new chair, Dan Formanowicz, who will take over as of January 1. We will then have completed the transition to the calendar year. I have enjoyed my prolonged time as faculty chair. I appreciate all the help I’ve received from everyone in here and those who are no longer a senator but who were of great help.

I will then be devoted to helping Dan, but also at System to working with FAC. This year I’m learning how to become chair of FAC and next year I will be chair of FAC. The year after that I will move into the past-chair role there. That will take us to June, 2008.

Announcements:

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.