

UHD Faculty Senate

Minutes recorded by: Michael Cavanaugh
January 21, 2020 2:31 - 3:51 pm
UHD A-300

Senate: Michael Duncan, Ronald Beebe, Hsiao-Ming Wang, Michael Cavanaugh, Franklin Allaire, Maria Benavides, Alexander Bielakowski, Dexter Cahoy, Kristen Capuzzo, Prakash Deo, Isaac Elking, Krista Gehring, Angela Goins, Felicia Harris, Susan Henney, Tahereh Jafari, Cynthia Lloyd, Steve London, Jeffery Martz, Mitsue Nakamura, Nathan Neale, Andrew Pavelich, Joseph Sample, Johanna Schmertz, Julie Wilson, Ting Zhang.

Absent: Stephanie Coleman, Pamela Hurley, Timothy Klein, Laura Mitchell, Jace Valcore, Pat Williams.

Guests: Jerry Johnson, AVP Faculty, Research, and Sponsored Programs; Michelle Moosally, AVP Programming and Curriculum; Jimmy Jung, VP Enrollment Management, Pat Ensor, Library Director; Sandra Dahlberg, Faculty Ombuds; Darlene Hodge, FS Admin; Kevin Buckler, Professor; Alan Modrow, SGA Chief of Staff; Shenaedra Tatum; SGA President.

Call to order: The Senate was called to order at 2:31 pm by Senate President Michael Duncan.

Dr. Duncan wanted to address two things quickly prior to getting into the items listed on the agenda. He explained that the previous meeting had two guests engaged in a spirited disagreement toward the end of the meeting. Dr. Duncan apologized to the Senate for not intervening more quickly. He vows to do so in similar situations in the future. He also reminded senators and guests of senate decorum and procedures during Faculty Senate meetings. The meetings are collegial in spirit, civil words should be exchanged and when discussing the issues, senators are to be recognized first, followed by guests from the audience.

The second thing that Dr. Duncan wanted to do prior to the official agenda was to recognize the service of Ms. Darlene Hodge. Ms. Hodge has been the Senate's administrative assistant since the office was opened and she has been a rock for the Presidents who have worked with her (Drs. Ashe, Hale, Wang, and Duncan). Much of the Senate's work could not have been done without her help and she deserves to be recognized for her hard work. Dr. Duncan presented Ms. Hodge with an award recognizing her service to the UHD Faculty Senate.

Minutes

Minutes of the November 19th, 2019 meeting were approved unanimously.

Reports

Dr. Michelle Moosally was introduced in her new position as Associate Vice President of Programming and Curriculum. Dr. Moosally thanked Senate for the time and just wanted to explain what she saw as her new role. Primarily, this new position is to serve the faculty. As a new role, we have the opportunity to frame the role as it is fairly loosely defined. There are a couple of things that she must

do in the new role, such attend University Curriculum Committee meetings (only as a resource) and serve on the Academic Policy Committee as an administrative representative. However, Dr. Moosally sees this role as a major resource for faculty when they have programming or curricular questions/concerns. She said that she would like to meet with all of the department curriculum chairs and help familiarize faculty with curriculum. She also stated that if faculty are thinking about developing programs and/or certificates to please talk with her about the procedures involved as she can help guide that person through the process. Dr. Moosally said that she would be working on Open Educational Resources (OER) and Distance Education too. She wants to hear from the faculty and will have an open door policy in her office in the Provost's suite.

Mr. Jimmy Jung gave a presentation on the spring 2020 enrollment for UHD. He explained that the outlook is trending up.

Q - Is the SCH increase attributable to the increase in the number of students?

A - Mr. Jung said partly. The increase in the number of students helped increase the SCH numbers, but students are also taking more courses on average. This has been a focus from the university and an example can be seen from University College and Dean Marzilli's push for student success and getting students to graduate sooner.

Initiatives

Dr. Kevin Buckler came to Senate to speak on some Faculty Affairs Committee concerns. Mainly, FAC is working on the Senior Lecturer policy and they would like to invite the lecturers from Senate for input on the policy.

Q - Are you writing a new policy or working within the existing policy and actually applying it?

A - Dr. Jerry Johnson answered the question. He said that the committee has not gotten to that point yet. The committee is looking at a true promotional ladder for lecturers rather than just the single senior lecturer promotion. However, it is in the early stages.

As a suggestion, you may want to talk to lecturers outside the senate. Not all lecturers are like the Senate lecturers. Not all do service to that degree.

Dr. Johnson indicated that was planned, but this was the first chance to get some feedback on potential options.

Ms. Shenaedra Tatum, SGA President, came to Senate to discuss a few concerns.

Ms. Tatum indicated that one of the major concerns that SGA had is faculty diversity. SGA would like to see a faculty that looks more like the student body. While difficult to accomplish, student input for the hiring process may be one way to accomplish this. She indicated there were a couple of options that she saw as being possible: 1) candidate lectures with students; and 2) students serving on search committees.

Questions and discussion ensued

Q - So the two possibilities are 1) Search committees and 2) Watch and give feedback on presentations?

A - Ms. Tatum answered in the affirmative. Students would be involved in the process. SGA could pick students to serve on the committees.

Q - If we went with the committee idea, wouldn't we want students from that specific discipline participating and not simply SGA members?

A - Ms. Tatum said that SGA has two senators from each college.

If we were to have students on search committees, we would have to change the policy to allow for this.

Ms. Tatum indicated that she understood this would not happen quickly. However, having the discussion is a positive step.

One of the issues that we have is persons of color are underrepresented when looking at who is awarded PhDs. Only about 9% of PhDs are persons of color. Many universities around the country are trying to increase their faculty diversity too and this drives up the costs of hiring these individuals. In my former administrative life, I tried to hire a great faculty candidate (who was also a person of color) and he asked for \$6,000 more than we could offer. The university would not increase the offer and we lost him because we could not meet the financial demands of the market.

Dr. Johnson said that there have been discussions with Ms. Ivonne Montalbano about the financial issue. Currently, the university is looking for ways to fix the problem.

Dr. Duncan asked senators for their views on the proposals.

I am on board for more involvement in the hiring process (i.e., feedback from lectures). However, I do not support students sitting on search committees. The committees need to be small and the bigger they get, the more likely it is for delays.

Mr. Alan Modrow, the SGA Chief of Staff, spoke briefly about student involvement on search committees. He indicated that he had been on search committees for administrative positions in the past and it turned out well for him as the student representative. He was able to interact with high-ranking university officials, some of whom he was able to readily identify with. He ended up corresponding with one of the candidates, who was not selected for the position, and that person has turned out to be quite the mentor for him. The student will be the one most affected by the selection of the faculty member and their perspective is important. Gaining student input on a search committee is a good thing.

If the students want the voice on the committee, they should have it. Search committee representation is hard. I have been on small committees that have been delayed for lack of participation or bogged down because of a couple of malcontents and been on rather large search committees that have run very smoothly.

Ms. Tatum also wanted to talk about the topic of changing textbooks from semester to semester. She was hoping that Senate would help SGA to figure out a way to keep the same book for a few semesters or have free textbooks. Some textbooks are close to \$300.

Discussion about textbooks occurred.

Usually what drives my decision on textbooks is feedback from the students.

The Social Work program books are free. The courses are either completely open access or the students "rent" the textbook from the program (for free) at the beginning of the semester and return the book back at the end. Some of these open access textbooks are great, some are not. A lot of work goes into creating an open access course. There are also books/courses that are not entirely free but are significantly less cost than other books.

Ms. Tatum said that the biggest hurdle is for SGA to figure out a way for the books not to change every semester. Another issue is that many programs do not offer supplemental instruction for online classes. For programs that are completely online (i.e., Masters in Non-Profit Management), there is no option for this. The more difficult classes could use supplemental instruction.

Dr. Duncan indicated that the online classes and supplemental instruction might be addressed by the Online Quality & Programming Taskforce. The other two issues could be addressed by resolutions or other measures from the Senate.

Q - What about the use of e-books?

A - Ms. Tatum indicated SGA would be amenable if the books were available and if the costs were not too high (i.e., \$300).

There will be wide variation between departments when it comes to the prices of books and that may just be the norm of the discipline. One class in business may require a \$300 book and be perfectly normal, while three books, at \$20 apiece, in philosophy may be normal. I cannot see a mandate from the Senate on this, more likely just guidance.

Updates and Old Business

Dr. Duncan gave a brief update on the Senate Constitution Revision. There is not much to report on since the last update, but with the upcoming elections, a temporary fix may be in order. There were a few minor clarifications being made to the constitution that would be useful in the spring elections. For example, we were going to clarify that only T/TT faculty could be elected to serve on the Shared Governance Committees in the faculty roles (AAC, APC, FAC, PBDC, and UCC). Clarifications like this would help the CEC when running the elections. Dr. Duncan mentioned a couple of other clarifications like CEC does not solicit nominations and PBDC is not actually elected.

Dr. Sandra Dahlberg explained that PBDC is not elected because the committee name was changed under Provost Chapman and he moved to appointments. This was done without faculty input. The question is do we want the elections back?

Dr. Duncan said that this should really be brought up with the Provost and suggested that FSEC could do this.

Discussion on PBDC occurred.

This committee takes a while to figure out what is going on. It would be nice to have more faculty on it.

Dr. Dahlberg said that under the old scheme (Pre-2012) faculty members served two-year terms.

Dr. Johnson explained that he chaired the committee for two years when he was faculty. In its current iteration, it does not work that well for faculty. It may not meet the true spirit of shared governance. More faculty representatives are needed and more transparency is needed.

I looked at a draft of the constitution and there should have been an election for PBDC, but we were not having a current election. I think the old language was "Budget Committee".

Dr. Schmertz moves that we reinstate the election language back into the constitution and that the voting faculty representatives on the PBDC are the Senate President and President Elect (ex-officio) and one member from each college (elected).

I would like to point out that we are trying to add more service again, as we are trying to get rid of it with the other committee.

Right now, we still have a voice, but how we choose it (appointment v. election) is important.

I am not informed enough. I would much rather have a backroom negotiator than a bunch of representatives in the front room who are ignored.

Currently we have one member from each college and the Senate President and President-elect on PBDC. There is no increase in presence. Really all we are debating is whether we want to change appointment to election.

Dr. Johnson said that when he was chair of PBDC, the committee instituted a town hall afterwards, but shortly thereafter, the practice ended. Transparency is the key. Senate voices for transparency is needed as well as having faculty input in the process.

Dr. Dahlberg suggested that the chair of the PBDC (always a faculty member) should be a part of the final discussion along with other members of the cabinet.

Dr. Schmertz amended her motion to move that the Committee on Credentials and Elections conduct elections for the Planning and Budget Development Committee, one member from each college, and forward those names to the Provost.

How urgent is this decision?

Dr. Beebe, as chair of CCE, said this is not an immediate concern. We may need to have a decision by next Senate meeting. There are special elections currently being run but the new elections will start up soon enough.

If we change the process, what happens?

Nothing is binding. Provost Link can follow along with the motion/elections or he can talk with us if he does not like it.

Right now, there is no current policy, just current practice.
What should we do? What is deliverable?

We need to talk to the provost about this rather than just send him a list of names.

We can start with a motion and if that does not work, we can revisit a resolution. Provost Link is reasonable.

This is just a recommendation.

Dr. Schmertz amended her motion to request that FSEC approach Provost Link with all due speed to announce the Senate's desire to have PBDC's faculty representatives from each college elected rather than appointed. The motion passes with 21 votes in favor and 1 against.

Dr. Beebe wanted to give a brief update on the Bridge plan. The work groups started in October and most of the work has occurred in the workgroups. You will soon get a survey that addresses some part of the strategic plan. Please participate in the survey and focus groups (if invited) as the plan will need your feedback. The real work will happen this semester.

Dr. Bielakowski made a motion to un-table to Core Assessment Resolution. Ms. Nakamura seconded the motion (see attached).

Dr. Pavelich explained the motion and some changes that were made.

Q - Isn't Gen-Ed in charge of Assessment?

A - Dr. Pavelich said that he was of the understanding that Gen-Ed implemented Assessment/Core issues, but that ultimately University Curriculum Committee (UCC) is in charge of the Core

UCC probably needs to instruct Gen-Ed to do this, if we were to pass it. Gen-Ed falls under UCC.

Dr. Pavelich further explains that while we have been told that we need to assess the core with signature assignments, in specific classes, with specific populations for accreditation, this may not be accurate. Other accredited universities do things very differently. Sam Houston State University is just one example. They are SACSCOC accredited too.

Language modification in the motion were proposed and accepted.

There was a vote on the resolution and it passed unanimously with one abstention (to be placed on Senate website).

Dr. Duncan asked senators to send him items if they wanted them to be added to the agenda for the future.

Dr. Benavides made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Dr. Bielakowski seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 3:51 pm.

Core Assessment Resolution (version 3)

Whereas

While the core itself is largely dictated by the state of Texas, how we evaluate the core is entirely up to the faculty of UHD;

Whereas

Our current method of assessing the core relies on every core class generating Signature Assignments, while only a fraction of a percent of total artifacts generated will actually get used for assessment purposes, making the process inefficient, and the results possibly not representative;

Whereas

Evaluating the competencies of students who are taking classes in the core at the time of evaluation (as is currently done) necessarily does not evaluate the success of the core as a whole;

Whereas

Since every school under the purview of the THECB and SACS had to implement a new core and a new core assessment program six years ago, there are many different approaches that have been taken throughout the state for us to examine;

Be it resolved:

The Faculty Senate asks the University Curriculum Committee to investigate other possible models of core assessment and present the results to the UHD faculty for consideration. Further, we ask that the upon review of these alternatives, the UHD faculty be allowed to decide whether to adopt a new core assessment method, or retain our current one.