

Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday, April 21, 2017
127 Administration Bldg.

Call to order: 2:01 p.m.

Adjourned: 3:56 p.m.

Members Present: L. Williams, M. Gangone, H. Hawley, K. Mokhtari, C. Ross, J. Lamb, G. Gordon, R. Stevens, G. Duke (Zoom), L. Rath (Zoom), K. Nimon, B. Hart, J. Shawn Jones, C. Snider, J. Klein, C. Rose, M. Fischer (Zoom)

Guests: K. Camp, L. Allen, R. Sherman, C. Swain, C. Zuazu, H. Patterson, A. Mirmiran, M. McGinnis, K. Krenk (Patriot Talon)

Zoom Meeting Participants: V. Joyner, K. Adams-Wiggins, K. Caruso, J. Chilton, K. Clark, K. Archer, G. Brandenburg, E. McMinn,

Invited Speakers: President Tidwell, Provost Mirmiran, D. Wood, J. Hannigan, Dr. H. Patterson

2:01 – Welcome & Minutes approval – L. Williams

The plan is to move the location of future senate meetings from Admin 127 to a smaller, more personal setting. Would like to move the meeting to a different time and day of the week. The meeting will remain the third week of the month, but will be during lunch on Wednesday, 12-noon. Food will be provided.

Dr. Kouider Mokhtari made a motion to approve the February and March meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Dr. Robert Stevens and approved unanimously.

2:05 – President’s update – M. Tidwell

1. He is trying to make the Tenure & Promotion (T&P) process a bit more user friendly, so expect some changes. More details will be provided at a later date.
2. Working with the registrar’s office, and office of scheduling to come up with a block of time on campus that has the least number of courses/labs offered during that time. The goal is to be able to use this time to hold meetings so that all, or most, faculty and staff can attend and increase shared governance.
3. Strategic planning is going well. Currently, we are in the fourth phase of the process, which is the second set of town hall discussions. If you have any suggestions or comments email Jennifer Hannigan. Expect in the new plan a discussion on going paperless. Attendance and participation has increased from the first set of town halls.
4. UT Tyler needs to have some presence in every county in East Texas. We need to find a way to do this. One possible way is to partner with UT Health Northeast to provide “pop-up” health clinics.

2:25 – Provost Update – A. Mirmiran

1. He has been looking into a common meeting time since last semester and he brought it up to the Chair's council. Registrar has found three times that have the least impact on classes from this semester (Spring 2017). The goal is not to schedule classes at those times. The least used times are:
 - Thursday 12 to 1 about 130 sessions of courses in progress during this time
 - Thursday 3 to 5 about 68 sessions of classes in progress during this time
 - Friday 3:30 to 5 only about 24 sessions in progress during this time
2. Based on discussions with the Chair's council, he is looking at instructional support fees. There is currently one fee instead of course-specific fees. Lab intensive courses may need more money; science and engineering have been impacted the most. He will put together a task force that will look into this. The task force will comprise of 2 chairs, 2 faculty, 2 students, and 2 administrators.
3. UT System has put together a faculty task force on workload. There is a set of recommendations that would permit campuses and academic departments to determine workload a workload model. Provosts from UT Tyler (comprehensive university), UT Dallas (emerging research university) and UT Austin (established strong research university) are working to draft a model that would work well for their respective campus. UT Tyler has a 6 person task force working on a template. This would need approval from UT System before implementation.
4. There have been Tenure and Promotion discussions and recommendations. One recommendation is to go digital instead of submitting a hard copy. The second is that guidelines for all departments/colleges be posted on a common website. There is also a recommendation to allow the candidate to provide a response after each stage of review. Once a draft is ready, it will be brought to the Faculty Senate.
5. Next Friday (4/28) at 11:30 am in Admin 301, there is an open forum for Faculty Senate and the Provost. Food will be provided.

2:43 – President Inauguration – D. Wood & J. Hannigan

D. Wood and J. Hannigan are co-chairing the Presidential Inauguration that will be held September 12, 2017 at 2 pm. Save the Date cards were sent out to the campus a few weeks ago. The ceremony is formal and is open to faculty, staff, students and the community. During that week there will be symposiums for faculty and guests. They encourage anyone with cutting edge high tech research to showcase their work during the symposium. Looking at a full week of celebration starting September 11. Prior to installation, there will be a VIP luncheon at the Alumni House. After the ceremony on September 12 there will be a reception followed by a black tie gala (this is by invite only). Wednesday will be the ribbon cutting for the Alumni House (open to all). From 5pm-6pm on Thursday there will be an event hosted on campus by the Tyler Area Chamber of Commerce. This week is also seen as a great opportunity to discuss the draft of the UT Tyler strategic plan with members of UT System and the community.

2:51 – FAC update – C. Ross

The final FAC meeting of the year was held. Dr. Ross reported the following:

1. **Shared Governance** – The team lead by AVC Cucolo will be returning to campus in the Fall to follow up on the progress of shared governance on campus. The team will make sure that no administrators are present during sessions dedicated to just faculty and staff.
2. **Dual Credit** – A study on dual credit was commissioned and is almost complete. No official conclusions have been made at this time. Data has been collected and will be analyzed by a team of stakeholders in June with a report to follow.
3. **Faculty Physician Burnout** - UT System is holding a conference regarding faculty physician burnout. Nearly 40 percent of faculty physicians are leaving academics.
4. **Online Education** – A task force is being developed that will look into online education. The task force will have four objectives which are: (1) develop a self-study to determine the current state of online education; (2) develop a survey that evaluates the needs of online education and how things can be improved; (3) learn from self-study to identify common themes; (4) develop an advisory council that will update the Chancellor periodically on this topic. UT System is looking to have a representative from each campus on this council. Need to ensure that online courses are of high quality.

3:07 – Student Affairs update – H. Patterson

Dr. Howard Patterson gave a presentation on the status of Student Affairs and Athletics. He reported that students who are engaged on campus have higher retention, persistence and graduation rates. Career Services has job postings and career fairs each year. There are many other areas that fall under Student Affairs including, but not limited to, The University Center (UC), athletics/Greek life/student organizations, judicial affairs, veterans resource center, testing center, and student counseling services, which had about an 11% increase in appointments this year. They also have services on the distance campuses (Houston, Palestine, Longview). We currently have over 340 student athletes who maintain an average GPA of 3.0.

3:29 – Athletics Committee – M. McGinnis

Dr. Michael McGinnis is the Chair of the Athletics Committee and provided a report from the committee. Please send him an email (mmcginnis@uttyler.edu) if you want more information. Currently, the athletic department is on budget. However, it is anticipated that there will be a deficit in the coming years if things stay as they are. As a result, they will be asking for three things: (1) a \$2 increase in 2019 for athletics fee; (2) an additional \$1.20 fee increase in 2020 and (3) the ability to change the fee structure by 10 or 20% without the need for a memorandum. This fee has not been increased in around 8 years.

There is talk about becoming Division II. If so, we will need to spend 3 years with provisional status before becoming a fully accepted DII program. More money will be needed to go to DII. It is estimated that an additional \$2.5 million in the budget will be needed if we go DII, of that roughly \$2.2 million would be used for scholarships. Athletics is doing well in the conference and the division. Please be aware that when enrollment criteria change, it interferes with the athletes.

3:41 – Tenure and Promotion Task Force update – L. Williams

The faculty senate revisited the Tenure and Promotion resolution presented during the Fall semester. Some wording was changed from the previous draft. Dr. Williams read the changes that were made. The resolution is essentially asking the faculty to take part in the tenure

process by providing a policy specific for their department or college that outlines the expectations to receive tenure and/or promotion. It is recommended that the document from each department or college will have a time-stamp and will be reviewed on a set time period (for example, every 3-5 years).

Dr. John Lamb made a motion to accept the newly revised resolution with a slight change in the wording to say that the department chairs work with the faculty to develop these policies. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cameron Rose and unanimously approved. The updated and approved resolution is attached to the minutes.

3:51 – University Committees – L. Williams & K. Mokhtari

A committee consisting of Drs. Mirmiran, Geiger, Fischer, Mokhtari, and Williams proposed changes to the committees on campus. The proposal suggests that there be 10 established committee as these 10 are required per HOP guidelines. A list of advisory committees are also provided. These are not standing committees and will be formed only when there is a need. All committees will report to the senate.

This proposal was sent out by email to the Faculty. Please read through the proposal (attached to the minutes). This will next go to the Chairs for discussion. Bring any comments to the May Faculty Senate meeting as this will be the primary agenda item.

3:56 – Adjourn

FACULTY SENATE TASK FORCE ON TENURE & PROMOTION TASK FORCE RESOLUTION

Background and History Leading to Resolution:

It is assumed that all faculty hired at UT Tyler will be given the opportunity to develop their professional skills as teachers and researchers, and that they will join in collegial service to the institution. At appropriate times, these faculty should be fairly and objectively evaluated for the purposes of tenure and promotion. In the past decade UT Tyler has doubled in size and has also experienced quite a lot of change in the Office of the Provost. With this growth, and with each new Provost, have come differing ideas about faculty recruitment, retention, and—more specifically—about tenure and promotion standards. The Senate began to receive reports from faculty of the lack of objective, measurable criteria for annual performance evaluations, tenure, and promotion decision-making in some departments.

In an effort to facilitate greater clarity about these issues for the faculty, the UT Tyler Faculty Senate convened a Tenure and Promotion Task Force in Spring 2016 to:

- examine departmental tenure and promotion policies
- evaluate these policies for objectivity, equality and fairness, and,
- more specifically, to clarify departmental guidelines for co-authorship on scholarly/creative endeavors.

The Task Force included a number of assistant and associate professors and was chaired by a full professor. This group determined that annual performance evaluations at UT Tyler are heavily linked to decisions regarding tenure and promotion, but there seemed to be a significant “disconnect” between these two processes. For example, some annual evaluations do not differentiate between what “exceeds expectations” vs “meets expectations vs “does not meet expectations.”

In addition, some annual evaluations do not reflect the HOP criteria for tenure and promotion, so tenure-track faculty are not aware of specific tenure and promotion requirements or the status of their work toward successful achievement of tenure and promotion. Some tenure track faculty do not receive any type of written evaluation that reflects their progress toward a successful tenure and promotion process.

The task force consulted the policy documents of the American Association of University Professors with regard to tenure and promotion. Here is what the AAUP has to say about these matters:

- decisions regarding faculty performance are primarily a faculty responsibility because it is scholars in each field that have the “...chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues...” (p. 121).
- decisions regarding tenure should be made by an appropriate faculty group using procedures approved by the faculty (p. 95, 97)
- a wide “latitude of academic freedom...and standards of fairness” should be observed when an institution is making decisions regarding tenure. (p. 95)
- deliberation on faculty tenure and promotion must avoid judgments based on “arbitrary or...inadequate consideration” (p. 94).
- “Good practice requires that the institution (department, college or university) define its criteria for reappointment and tenure and its procedures for reaching decisions on those matters” (p. 94).

- probationary faculty members (faculty in the first 7 years of employment) should be informed early in their employment of standards affecting renewal of appointments (p. 95)
- senior faculty members should regularly review, advise and assist junior non-tenured faculty members regarding status toward meeting standards for tenure (p. 95)
- it is important to inform faculty members of “shortcomings” that could affect a negative decision regarding tenure so that they have the opportunity to correct such deficiencies (p.95) and;
- Finally, that following the guidelines discussed above “contributes to the achievement of harmonious faculty relationships and the development of well-qualified faculties” (p. 98).

During the course of the task force’s efforts they discovered that the Provost had requested the Graduate School Dean, Dr. Geiger, to collect and analyze departmental tenure and promotion policies from around the campus. Realizing that this work was in progress and that the Task Force itself has little or no authority over colleges and departments regarding structure and processes for tenure and promotion, annual evaluations and guidelines for co-authorship of scholarly works, it was decided that the Task Force would write a resolution to share with the full Senate. It follows:

Whereas retention of productive and scholarly faculty is tantamount to promoting excellence in teaching and effective learning

Whereas The University of Texas at Tyler (UT Tyler) recognizes the importance of facilitating a culture of productivity through significant contributions to scientific knowledge, public policy, economic opportunity, and artistic expression

And Whereas the faculty expect the university to adhere to AAUP best practices with regard to faculty retention, tenure and promotion, be it

Resolved, that the UT Tyler Faculty Senate requests that the department chairs within individual departments work with faculty to develop written procedures and implement processes across colleges and departments to:

1. ensure all departments have annual evaluations for tenure track and promotion-eligible faculty that reflect HOP criteria of scholarship, teaching, service and collegiality;
2. ensure criteria for annual evaluations reflect criteria for tenure and promotion for relevant faculty;
3. ensure criteria for performance evaluation, 3rd year review for tenure track faculty, and tenure and promotion are specific, measurable, objective and fair given resources available for faculty;
4. ensure faculty are aware of evaluation and T&P criteria early in their appointment;
5. ensure a workable plan is in place for mentoring of new and junior faculty;
6. make available to the greatest extent possible resources for faculty to achieve T&P goals;
7. adopt and enforce standards and for determining co-authorship on scholarly works (publications, creative art productions, presentations); and
8. ensure periodic evaluation of T&P procedures, mentoring processes and implementation of standards for co-authorship of scholarly works.

University Committees – Proposed changes

A committee consisting of Drs. Mirmiran, Geiger, Fischer, Mokhtari, and Williams met on April 17 to discuss potential changes to the University Committee structure. Existing committees were subsequently broken into 3 groups. The first group represents those committees that are mandated by the HOP. The HOP is fairly specific about how those committees are formed and the membership. The Committee on Committees of the Senate fills the membership with guidance from the Provost.

The second group (a single committee) is not mandated by the HOP, but this group recommended it remains a University Committee.

The third group is what we are calling Advisory Committees. The HOP does not mandate these committees. We recommend this third group no longer be part of the University Committee structure. This third group would fall under the auspices of the Administrator that the committee serves. We recommend that if those committees were kept, the Administrator in charge would form and convene the committee and ask for committee members from the campus community (presumably they would elect a chair). We further recommend that a minimum of two faculty members be appointed to the advisory committees, and those faculty members should seek approval of their Chair and Dean. The Advisory Committees would not report to the Senate, unless they make policy recommendations that would fall under the purview of a Senate Committee (e.g., affect graduate curriculum so they would need approval from the Graduate Council).

University Committees (Section of the HOP referenced)

Admissions/Recruitment/Retention Committee (1.4.3)
Arts and Performing Complex Advisory Committee (1.4.3)
Faculty Emeritus Committee (3.1.12) – This one is a purely Senate Committee
Graduate Council (1.4.2)
HOP Committee (1.1.1)
Undergraduate Council (1.4.2)
Student Financial Appeals Committee (1.4.3)
Student Affairs Advisory Committee (1.4.3)
Research Council (1.4.2)

Committee Retained as a University Committee (not in HOP)

Facilities and Space Allocation Committee

Advisory Committees (potential Chair)

Internal Audit Committee (Viergever)
Information Technology Committee (Whatley)
Distance Education Advisory Committee (Collier)
Honors Program Advisory Committee (Streufert)
International Oversight Committee (Kennedy)
International Studies and Intercultural Affairs Committee (Kennedy)
Institutional Effectiveness Committee (Berman)
Institutional Executive Compliance Committee (O'Donnell)
Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (Patterson)

Recommended for Elimination or Modification

Faculty Affairs Committee

Graduate Fellowship Committee (subcommittee of Graduate Council)

Undergraduate Scholarship Committee (subcommittee of Undergraduate Council)

Intellectual Property Committee (combined with Research Council)

DRAFT