

Faculty Senate Minutes
March 1, 2019
11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Room: CAB 402.1

In Attendance: Claire Nolasco, Joseph Simpson, Mike O'Brien, Matthew Mangum, Marina Narvaez, Alan Daniel, Robert Vinaja, Andrew Sanders, Gilbert Barrera, Sajadur Rahman, Scott Peters, Kevin Barton, Jimena Guerra, Young Rae Kim

Guests in Attendance: Megan Wise de Valdez, Smriti Bhatt, Katherine Guillen, Lorrie Webb

Meeting called to order: 11:30 a.m.

Approval of Minutes.

Dr. Peters motioned to approve the minutes.

Dr. Simpson seconds.

Minutes were approved.

Administrative Updates:

The Provost provided an update on the search committee for vice Provost for Research. There was a great pool of candidates, two candidates were interviewed two, and even tried to hire both. Because of several issues no candidate was hired. The search will continue.

New business

Elections for Committee Members of Distinguished Faculty Awards Committee

Dr. Nolasco said the senate needs to elect committee members for awards committee. Dr. Piper expressed interest to chair committee, asked for volunteers. This committee judges applications, members could be elected from faculty senate or could be elected in the colleges or appointed by the deans.

Announcement about Jaguar Tracks by Dr. Webb.

- There are changes to the Jaguar Tracks courses. The decision was made based on feedback from the Provost, instructors, and students from the last two years. Also gathered feedback from faculty regarding the success of these four courses, and discovered they are not fulfilling its intent, and good intentions did not come true.
- Jaguar Tracks 1, 2, and three will become one 3-hour course; it would be a first-year experience course, similar to what other universities have. Students would be able to substitute if they have taken a similar course at another university. If students would not have to take the course if they have a specific number of hours. Non-traditional students with life experience may not need this course. Jaguar Tracks four would remain a 1-hour course. There is no need to change the number of hours for the programs; it will stay at 120 hours.
- Departments will retain the Jaguar Tracks 4 courses and will be able to modify it, change the course description, rename it, make it a 1-hour capstone course or even combine it with a 3-

hour course to convert it into a 4-hour course. Any changes would need to go thru the curriculum proposal process for fall 2019. Changes would take place in fall 2020. Otherwise, the Jaguar Tracks 4 course can stay in a degree program as is. If a department wants to implement changes for fall 2020, the proposal must be submitted this fall (2019). This is also when the proposal to create the 3-hour first-year experience course will go thru.

- After considering some alternatives, the Jaguar Tracks committee emphatically indicated that freshman students still need 3 hours of content related to time management, attendance, etc., so they are prepared for upper-level classes.
- After spring break, in April there will be open faculty forums to allow faculty members to ask questions. If faculty were to express major concerns, the committee will rethink this plan, and go back to the alternative proposal of a 1-hour course and give the other 3 hours to the departments. The committee will gather input after the forum will have a syllabus outline for the first year's experience course. No name for the course has been determined, but the name would not be Jaguar Tracks.
- Dr. Megan Valdez inquired about the possibility of just eliminating the course. Dr. Webb said that is a valid option. Ms. Narvaez inquired how is determined if a student needs the course or not. Dr. Webb said that had not been determined yet, but they will research what other universities are doing and what has successful at other universities. Simpson asked about an existing strategy to make the multiple catalog changes since most programs will need to submit a catalog change. Dr. Webb said they are trying to figure out a process to make changes to all degrees without the need to submit hundreds of degree change forms.

Old business

Core Curriculum Committee Proposal

- Dr. Guillen explained the proposal. Major change based on feedback is the composition of the committee, which now is larger, now it would include representatives from history, communication, philosophy, and from new departments. Details are provided in the proposal. Alan Daniel asked for clarification since the constitution already has a curriculum committee, he inquired if we are proposing to switch to a separate committee. Dr. Nolasco indicated that creating this separate committee would require a change to the constitution. Dr. Alan Daniel believes the curriculum committee is too small, not large enough to create a subcommittee from it, in addition the committee already has too much work. Dr. Daniel suggested having a separate committee. Dr. Simpson indicated that we need to draft some language to be amended in the constitution; some specific lines need to be changed.
- Dr. Daniel said that section 9.0 Committees in the constitution refers to other jobs that no longer exist. Dr. Nolasco indicated that section 9.2.1 would be revised and delete all references to the core curriculum. A constitution change requires two successful votes; in that case, we may need to vote today.
- Dr. Mangum made a motion to vote. Dr. Peters seconded. Vote: 14 votes in favor. 0 Passed. The Senate will vote again in the next session.

Spouse Hire Policy

- Dr. Sanders recommended several revisions including removing reference to mental capacity. There is no imposition on the department to hire the spouse; in fact, a provision was added

about demonstrating a hiring need in the department that would hire the spouse and the need for a majority vote. Dr. Simpson inquired about guidelines for an implementation timeline. The process would be done in a timely manner; the timeline is specified in section 5.5.

- Dr. Barton made a motion to approve the policy. Dr. Peters seconded the motion. Vote: 14 votes in favor, one opposed, one abstain. Policy is approved.

Workload policy

- Dr. Nolasco explained the revision to the policy. Revision are based on received feedback. Added provisions to section 1.3 based on feedback from Dr. Coulton about wording. For section 1.5, Dr. Barrera inquired whether the workload assignment was for academic years or semester, academic years are easier to determine than by semester. Additional items were added to section 2.1, including teaching activities, like directed research. In addition, a description was added to section 4.1. Dr. Barton inquired about the definition of 'directed research'. Dr. Nolasco clarified the meaning of directed research.
- Dr. Wise de Valdez asked about section 4.1 and why banked credit is approved by Provost and not by the dean or chair, he thinks the chair could approve it. Dr. Nolasco explained that currently there is no banking system in place. Dr. Daniel said we could define a system to award credit based on the number of courses instead of number of students and define guidelines on how to incorporate variable credit.
- Dr. Wise de Valdez proposed that any directed research course with 10 students should count. Dr. Daniel explains the current approach is based on the number of hours devoted per week. Based on the number of hours per week we award one hour or three hours. Courses that are zero credit would not be considered. Dr. Simpson indicated that sometimes we teach classes that would not make, and that a 1-hour class is not necessarily less work than a 3-hour class. Dr. Wise de Valdez thinks the department chair would have a good pulse to decide because there are differences among disciplines.
- Dr. Simpson described the possibility of negotiation to get a course release for work done in the previous years. Dr. Daniel inquired about the logic behind 'within three years.' Dr. Simpson indicated that it is difficult to get credit the next immediate year, so it is better over a period of time. Dr. Simpson, Dr. Daniel, and Dr. Wise de Valdez discussed several negotiation options. Dr. Nolasco proposed revising section 4.1 to indicate the option to negotiate credit with department chairs. Dr. Daniel explained some issues related to scheduling of 3 hours, 4-hour courses and variable workload in the spring and fall semesters. Dr. Wise de Valdez proposed the specification of 6 semester credit hours per academic year or equivalent.
- Dr. Barrera inquired about the meaning of 'consultation' in section 1.5. Does consultation means that the chair can approve regardless of the dean's position. Dr. Nolasco explained consultation means informing the chair, to obtain implicit consent. Dr. Sanders explained that there would be a discussion between the chair and the dean. Dr. Wise de Valdez pointed out that some faculty members have no research expectations and some have no service expectations and inquired about the standard for non-tenure track faculty with no service expectations.
- Simpson asked about a case where a faculty member is hired under a different arrangement. Dr. Wise de Valdez suggested that can be negotiated and can be adjusted. Dr. Nolasco said that case is explained in section 4.5.1. Dr. Nolasco referred to section 4.5 and said she received comments about the addition of examples of extraordinary service. Dr. Wise de Valdez suggested adding program coordinator to the list. Dr. Simpson suggested adding faculty senate president to the

list of examples. Dr. Nolasco said the policy would be revised and considered in the next meeting.

Post-tenure Review Policy

- Faculty expressed concern that is not complaint win the AAUP provisions. Post-tenure should not be used as a tool for dismissal. Dr. Nolasco discussed the revisions. Dr. Simpson indicated that this policy cannot be an alternative to a dismissal process. Dr. Barton indicated that the wording of the policy would allow for bad performance in two areas without a trigger. Dr. Nolasco stated that there is a dismissal policy that is separate from the post-tenure process. In the revised policy, the process is triggered by unsatisfactory performance in all three areas, not just one area.
- Dr. Simpson thinks that in a dismissal process should show that the faculty member has violated some trust. Dr. Barton expressed concern that this would set up a standard that does not trigger faculty development. Dr. Nolasco asked the Senate whether that should be included in the annual evaluation. Dr. Barton said we should not wait until three years of poor performance to implement mandatory PDP. Dr. Simpson said we should develop a mechanism for PDP in other areas like mentorship.
- Dr. Guerra expressed concerns about different treatment and workloads for tenure-track professors, associate professors, and full professors. She feels tenure-track faculty are doing most of the work. Dr. Nolasco believes that tenured faculty usually are assigned more service. A faculty member could have a change in distribution, and have more teaching responsibilities than research responsibilities. Dr. Guillen said the chair could reassign weights in the annual evaluation. Dr. Wise de Valdez pointed out that based on the policy if you are only teaching; you would never be unsatisfactory in all areas. Dr. Nolasco said that if you were not satisfactory in any one area, you would do a PDP.
- Dr. Simpson indicated this would be a general policy and would be amended in the future. Dr. Rahman described the current policy in the College of Business. A faculty member can decide the weights When the committee calculates a score they use weights

Meeting Adjourned at 1:00 pm.