Faculty Senate Minutes
April 27, 2016

Senate Leadership in Attendance
Dan Cavanagh, Chair
Theresa Jorgensen, Secretary
Ray Elliot, Parliamentarian
Toni Sol, Past Chair
Tom Ingram, UT System FAC

Senators and Student Representatives in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>Finance/Real Estate</td>
<td>Kathy Daniel</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Alexander</td>
<td>Art/Art History</td>
<td>Amir Farbin</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siamak Ardekani</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>James Hardy</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivonne Audrac</td>
<td>Planning and Landscaping</td>
<td>Desiree Henderson</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Butler</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Seokjin Jeong</td>
<td>Criminology/Crim Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Byrd</td>
<td>Phil/Huma</td>
<td>Susanna Khavul</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Chapa</td>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>Don Liles</td>
<td>Ind, Manufact, &amp; Syst Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay-Yut Chen</td>
<td>INSY/OPMA</td>
<td>Chris Morris</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Chave</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Kytai Nguyen</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Chrzanowski</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Mohan Pant</td>
<td>Curriculum + Inst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Cobb</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Jacqueline Fay</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Coursey</td>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>Martha Walvoord</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reni Courtney</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Naoko Witzel</td>
<td>Linguistics/TESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Stefan Dancila</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guest in attendance:
Vistasp Karbhari
Maria Cosio-Martinez
Michael Holguin – Interim Parking Director
Anthony Musselman – Shorthorn reporter
Two students in attendance for student project

1. Call to Order: Dan Cavanagh
2:32 PM

2. Welcome from the Chair

3. Remarks from President Karhari
   - First time after a long time that I am here. My thanks to you, you got me out of some meetings with the Chancellor. The time used to clash with this. Thank you all as semester comes to close. Haven’t heard
many complaints from students. There is a great job being done on academic side. Look forward to seeing you all at commencement. Had ring ceremony last night. Students got to rub head, take part in tradition.

- Question asked at earlier meeting. Parking. Parking rate will now be capped for the day in the parking garage.
- This is the time period when we submit initial budget to system. We had a preliminary phone call last week. They look at our ratios. As in previous years, we have put enough money for merit raise for faculty and staff – contingent on staying the course in tuition increase and that we have growth in numbers. It does look like that should be in place. Memo should go out soon to start process. Same amounts available (3.5%)
- T&P 35 up for promotion. 21 promotion and tenure – 18 are recommended to be promoted to UT regents. 13 up for promotion from associate to full – 12 were sent forward to the regents. One associate went up for tenure at current rank – that was approved. 88.58% approval rate (recommended to the board)
- Visit from academic affairs of the system. They met with some of you and left with understanding of some of our challenges in terms of People Soft and UT Share. Heard it from faculty.

Questions to the President
- Chair: Follow up on questions from previous. Can I send the list to you? We have already discussed them in public forum. Karbhari: Yes.
- Senator: Parking cap? How much is it? Karbhari: $10 per day.

Motion for Closed Session made by Coursey, seconded by Dancila. Motion passed unanimously.

Entered closed session at 2:40pm.

Returned to open session at 3:00pm.

President departed.

4. Call for a quorum. A quorum is present.
5. Tenure and Promotion Discussion – University Committee

Walvoord, chair of the committee that was tasked with proposing changes to promotion and tenure process in the HOP (Policy 6-300) with regard to the make-up of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, shared the committee’s proposal. Change is in section 6-305 F.1. University P/T Committee Composition. Proposed language is:

F. University P/T Committee Review
1. Committee Composition
The University P/T Committee shall consist of one tenured, full professor from each academic College or School in the university. The Faculty Senate Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom and Responsibilities shall serve as the nominating committee for membership. Upon nomination of a slate of candidates, tenure-track and tenured faculty in their respective college or school will vote for membership for their respective representative. A plurality is required for a nominee to be elected.

In addition, the University P/T Committee shall include one member from the Academy of Distinguished Scholars and one member from the Academy of Distinguished Teachers. Each Academy shall elect a member from its ranks who fulfills the eligibility requirements.
The term of service shall be two years. One-half of the committee’s membership will be elected each year. Committee members shall serve no more than three consecutive two-year terms.

Eligibility: Committee candidates shall meet the following requirements for service: 1) Full Professor with Tenure, 2) A highly respected and recognized leader at the University as well as in his/her respective disciplines, and be able to fulfill the responsibilities of evaluating candidates with an eye toward the overarching principals and purposes that guide the faculty body and the University as a whole; and 3) no full-time administrative appointment (defined as chair and above)

2. Committee Duties
The University P/T Committee shall review the previous recommendations and all information contained in the faculty member’s dossier. The committee shall recommend whether to tenure and/or promote the faculty member. A vote shall be conducted and the documented result, along with a written recommendation, shall be presented to the provost.

G. Upon receipt of the candidate’s full dossier and recommendation from the University P/T Committee, the Provost shall review the dossier, with advisory input from the Vice President for Research. The Provost will provide a written recommendation to the President.

Upon receipt of the candidate’s full dossier and recommendation from the Provost, the President shall render one of the following decisions: ...

Discussion was held about the intent of the second eligibility criteria. Some senators worried that the statement was not enforceable. Walvoord noted that the intent of the statement was to reflect the import and the work of the committee members.

Motion was made to remove statement 2) from the Eligibility requirements. Motion made by Dancila, seconded by Chen.

Motion passed.

Further discussion was held on the language regarding how nominations for members of the University P/T committee are to come from all the faculty.

Walvoord noted that the committee, at the request of the Provost and President, removed the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Provost as ex officio members of the University T/P committee. The Provost also wanted language for the provost to receive advisory input from the VP for Research and the VP for Faculty Affairs.

Much discussion followed on whether or not the Faculty Senate chair should serve as a non-voting member of the University T/P Committee.

Motion was made by Dancila to reintroduce Chair of Faculty Senate as ex officio member of University T/P committee. Seconded by Elliot.

The motion carried by a large margin.

Discussion was held about the role of the Vice Provost for Research on the committee.

Dancila made a motion to strike the VP for Research’s “advisory” role. Chrzanowski seconded.
The motion passed.

Morris moved to approve the language in the policy to move it forward. Dancila seconded.

The motion carried.

6. Approval of minutes from March 2016.
Minutes were inadvertently not distributed prior to meeting.

7. Remarks from Maria Cosio-Martinez, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Student Feedback Survey system. Old system was clunky. Info was in two different servers. Under new system (IOTA) you (faculty) will have a dashboard that will let you archive information and you can import old surveys (if your department has staff to do that.) It provides its own helpdesk. Students call me and say "I submitted this for the wrong faculty member. How can I pull it back?" We will now have a process. Do not have exams before finals week (students might be able to pull back surveys). Your picture will be in system to help students know what faculty they are filling out the survey for. We will be testing it this summer, then fully implement it in the fall.

Senator: Interface and database. How are specific student comments protected from becoming public? Have our security folks vetted it? Cosio Martinez: Department chairs and deans will be able to search the student comments (you can too). You will be able to make comments that response to student comments and your comments will stay in the record.

8. Michael Holguin, presentation on parking

Holguin delineated challenges, and new systems. New system is very robust. No more waiting in lines, can manage your own account through your computer/smart phone. Parking is ever evolving. We want your input in the process.

Chair: Departments are having difficulties getting guest permits for visitors to campus. People who fly in don’t have license until they arrive in town. We have a world famous visitor in our dept. who is visiting and was not treated nicely by parking booth. Sometimes it is last minute. We need to be able to do this. It is great for our students. Holguin: A lot of dept. heads have my personal cell phone. Last minute stuff is easy. It’s just a matter of finding out. I communicate with people at booth. We have lots of training, and work at improving customer service. I communicate with them daily from the parking office (the booth person is not a parking employee). Those last minute calls are imperative for us to make that connection. We have the ability to exempt parking for those last minute requests (e.g. senate hearings on campus)

9. Election of Chair-Elect

Ingram: The committee received two nominations for chair elect. The candidate who is elected will serve one year as chair elect. 2 years as chair. 1 year as past chair. Dancila, Coursey are the two nominations.

Motion to close nominations made by Morris, seconded by Elliot. Motion carries.

Short speeches by both candidates

10. Chair report
None for today in the interest of getting through other business.

11. **Equity and Ethics Committee report**

**Henderson:** Our committee was tasked with strengthening language of appeals of faculty members against whom a sexual misconduct case has been decided. (HOP section 5-513 F.) HOP language was a mess. We have proposed the new procedure will involve this committee in a supervisory role (to increase faculty governance). HR head Hood approved both the rewriting of the HOP policy as well as FS role in the process of the appeals. Justification for these changes:

1. The Equity and Ethics Committee agreed that the text of the HOP needed revision for clarity, as the original draft does not clearly communicate that faculty have the option to appeal such a decision.

2. Additionally, the Equity and Ethics Committee agreed that in order to guarantee faculty governance over such a significant issue within the career of a faculty member, it was ideal to include faculty peers in the process, in the form of the Equity and Ethics subcommittee. In this way, the appeal process for a sexual misconduct charge will be handled similarly to the appeal process for a denial of tenure or promotion (evaluated by the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee). The Equity and Ethics Subcommittee would be (like the Grievance Committee) held to strictest confidence in their evaluation of the sexual misconduct case. It would play a crucial supervisory role to make sure that every step of the investigation, decision, and sanction process has been handled appropriately.

Chair called vote on committee recommendation. The recommendation carried.

12. **Special Projects Committee report**

**Byrd:** Special Projects committee – how faculty member would be affected if faculty member takes FMLA before 3rd year review. There is procedure in HOP for 6th year review. Since 3rd year review has become very important, we recommend the HOP procedure in regard to 6th year review be extended to 3rd year review. Committee was not unanimous on who should make decision (Provost or Dean w/option of appeal).

Motion was made by Henderson to approve the recommendation with proposed alternative wording “The decision regarding the request shall be made by the dean upon recommendation of the department chair, within (15) working days from the date the request is made, with option to appeal to the provost.” Seconded by Chrzanowski. Motion passed.

13. **New Business**  
(moved first two topic to new business for fall meeting)

Redaction of external letters for promotion and tenure discussion. Pros and cons were explored.

14. **Chair Elect Results**

David Coursey is our Chair Elect.

15. **Adjourn 4:55**

*Submitted August 23, 2016*  
*Theresa Jorgensen, Secretary*