

UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

December 3, 2013

Minutes

Present: T. Hale (President), R. Beebe (President Elect), G. Preuss (Past President), S. Henney (Secretary), M. Duncan, R. Johnson, J. Johnson, F. Khoja, J. Davis, K. Hagen, A. Lopez Pedrana, J. Quander, R. Sadana, P. Simeonov, S. Koshkin, C. Stewart, J. Herrera, G. Lund, S. Zhou, C. Rubinson, HM. Wang, P. Mandell, T. Chiaviello, S. Penkar, P. Deo,

Absent: U. Bose, A. Lopez Pedrana, M. Portillo, J. Tito-Izquierdo,

Minutes

Minutes of 11-19-13 approved unanimously.

Announcements

There will be presentations on the UHD Library, the General Council, the Ombuds, and from Pat Williams in the spring.

The meeting between the consultants and FSEC regarding the faculty salary study has yet to be rescheduled.

FAC Update: Drs. Allen and Blackburn

Dr. Blackburn reviewed FAC's reduced charge, which consists of only determining the scale to be used for the evaluation. The committee was not charged with revising the policy language, nor with revising the formula. The committee sent out an "unfinished policy" last week. One key addition to the scale was a "zero" option for "dereliction of duty".

Question: What was the thinking behind keeping 4-6 as one category?

Blackburn: Committee "comfortable" with a seven-point scale because it is the "appropriate range." It is difficult for FAC to say what a 4, 5, or 6 would be for any discipline. It is also difficult to define "exceeding expectations" with any precision. On this scale, three is the baseline, and the expectation is that most people would be higher than that. It is assumed that the expectations from each department would be that faculty would do more than "just doing your job."

Question: Is the forced average still being discussed on the scale? If we desired to have a 10 or a high number on the scale "mean something," then we should have a forced average.

Blackburn: FAC discussed it, but could not come to a conclusion on it. FAC may take it up in the spring, depending on their charge.

Question: Why not devise a 4-point scale like we give to students? Below average, average, good, excellent, for example.

Fields: 4-point scales do exist. However, faculty is a high-achieving group on the whole. On a 4-point scale, if everyone is excellent, then there is no way to distinguish between faculty members' performance; most everyone would end up with a 3 or 4, thus repeating the restricted range we have now. Provides more room for judgment between "excellent" faculty.

Question: Why even have an "area of excellence" on the side? Links in to R & T policy, so runs the danger of increasing grievances.

Blackburn: Within the area of excellence, there is a "big difference" between a three and a seven. It depends on the definitions in the departmental policy.

A faculty senator disagrees and states that excellence is in the university policy. This has direct implications for grievances, as if a faculty member has all threes and does not get tenure because the level of "excellence" was insufficient, then the faculty member just has to point to this policy to show that threes are "excellent."

Fulton: Just because you get all threes on your evaluation doesn't mean that you shouldn't be eligible for tenure. Expectations are high, and therefore doing your job is excellent. We want to move away from the idea that you have to have a "10 or a 9" to be eligible for tenure.

Senator asks why not just state in the language of the policy that faculty members with a three or above are eligible to be considered for tenure? This removes the difficulty with the "area of excellence."

Question: Linking the policies through the word "excellent" expands the potential for grievances. Why not have departments define what the area of excellence is?

(No response)

Question: The purpose of the policy is primarily to determine who receives merit, not who is eligible for tenure. By keeping the wording in, we have made the annual evaluation policy more tied to R & T than it needs to be. If you remove the excellence wording, you remove the grievability question.

A senator points out that, with this "area of excellence" description, some departments that already use well-developed rubrics will be forced to lower their standards for tenure.

Another senator states that the standard is there, whether the word is there or not. It's unfair to junior faculty to have different standards for annual evaluation and R & T.

Response: Both policies need to be aligned; the unfairness happens because of discrepancies between the R & T and Annual Evaluation policy.

Blackburn states that FAC will discuss at their meeting on Friday, and then will be making a presentation to AAC the next Thursday.

Intellectual Property Task Force: Dr. Cindy Stewart

Point of information: Steve London is our representative to the System Intellectual Property Task Force.

A large number of people volunteered to serve. Eight people will serve, and they will meet this week for the first time.

Please see addendum for handout with committee membership and deliverables that was passed out at Senate.

Question: Are all colleges represented?

Answer: Yes, including Senators.

Dr. Flores points out that we have already instituted an intellectual property policy with staff.

Question: Are issues related to Blackboard (including faculty ownership of our class materials on Blackboard) going to be included?

Answer: Will review current policies, case law, and any other pertinent information in creating the policy.

CSET/MS Impact: Dr. Koshkin

The charge of this task force was to examine the impact of the departmental realignment. The task force looked at shared governance, other policies, senate constitution, and other committee information on the UHD website.

The task force identified only change that “must” happen: in the next election cycle, we must elect two senators for MS and one senator for CSET.

Also recommends that

- webpages should be updated annually
- Specify procedures for creating, reviewing, or discontinuing special standing and advisory committees
- Create a single document with charges, composition rules, and terms of service stated in uniform language
- Have a specific person responsible for posting and updating annually

*Please see the attached PowerPoint presentation for the full content of the presentation by this task force.

Old Business

Summer Salary Study Task Force: Still working on examining the policy at all universities.

Senate Constitution

1. Language for change to faculty senate with the purpose of including full-time lecturers in the faculty assembly and on faculty senate is proposed as follows:

Article 1, *Section Two—Faculty Assembly*

All university employees holding rank as full-time faculty [lecturers, tenured/tenure-track], excluding those on leave and those with administrative duties above the level of department chair, shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, and shall constitute the Faculty Assembly.

Section Three—Department Representation

To be eligible for election to a Senator position, nominees must have been members of the Faculty Assembly for at least two long semesters prior to the time of the election.

Each academic department of each degree granting college shall elect at least one representative from among the tenured/tenure-track faculty to the Senate. Departments with more than 10 tenured/tenure-track faculty members eligible to serve in the Senate shall elect one additional representative for every additional 10 tenured/tenure-track faculty members, or major fraction thereof, in the department at the time of the election. If a department is allotted more than one Senator, at least one of those Senators must be a tenured faculty member.

Each college may elect one Lecturer to serve as a representative for their college. There is no previous appointment requirement for a college's Lecturer nominee.

Question: Will lecturers serve? Do they have a motivation to serve?

Answer: New lecturer appointment letters have a service requirement included.

Question: Language having to do with “major fraction thereof” is confusing. Can we just simply state how many Senators per certain number of faculty (i.e., 1-10 faculty = 1 senator; 11-xx = 2 senators, etc.)?

Dr. Koshkin will send revised language to FSEC on this sentence: *Departments with more than 10 tenured/tenure-track faculty members eligible to serve in the Senate shall elect one additional representative for every additional 10 tenured/tenure-track faculty members, or major fraction thereof, in the department at the time of the election.*

2. Language to combine CEC/COC is proposed as follows. The language will replace the current two sections of the Constitution with this one combined section. New committee will be called the Committee on Credentials and Elections or “CCE.”

Section Three – Committee on Credentials and Elections

The Committee on Credentials and Elections shall consist of the Senate President-elect, who shall serve as chair, and one member from each department. Members shall serve for two-year terms, overlapping as needed to retain continuity, with half of the members serving a one-year term during the first year of implementation.

Functions of the committee are to:

1. Nominate to the Senate for a vote, faculty members for all standing Senate Committees;
2. Nominate and conduct the election of Faculty Senate officers according to the guidelines in Article 2, Section 2;
3. Nominate to the Senate [or to the Senate Executive Committee] for a vote, faculty members to serve as faculty representatives on the committees or task forces of the university or system including the Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Policy Committee, and University Curriculum Committee;
4. Solicit committee nominations from the faculty;
5. Conduct other elections ordered by the Senate by secure and anonymous balloting processes;
6. Inform the Senate President, by February 1 of each year, of the number of representatives that each department is entitled to elect to the upcoming session of the Senate;
7. Investigate and report to the Senate all questions pertaining to elections. Final decisions on such questions shall be made by the Senate Executive committee;
8. Decide questions concerning an individual’s eligibility for membership in the Faculty Senate and inform the Senate President of the decision;
9. Establish guidelines for the election of departmental representative to the Senate.

The Committee on Credentials and Elections will ensure that no more than three nominees for any one position are presented to the Senate for a vote, applying such criteria as the committee deems necessary.

The Committee on Credentials and Elections is responsible for handling elections for the positions below, in addition to any other assigned by policy, the constitution, or the Senate:

1. Senator positions
2. Senate officer positions
3. Grievance Committee (according to PS 10.A.02)
4. Academic Affairs Council
5. General Education Committee
6. University Planning Council

[Delete Section Four]

Question: Why no more than three nominees per office?

Answer: To avoid perpetual run-offs.

Question: Is it a problem to have the same committee create the ballot and run the election?

Answer: Something to think about, even if it's just a perceived problem.

Question: Can we run the elections online? Isn't there concern about the anonymity and/or confidentiality of online elections?

Answer: We have been running some elections online through a "more secure" online program.

Hale will send out a version of the proposed revisions side-by-side with the original policy.

Disability Services "Straw Poll"

Hale asks, "Have you been significantly impacted by the change in the rules?"

Response from Senators: The changes are too new...hasn't begun to be an issue yet.

The genus of the concern is that "parenting" is now a disability. How do you account for something that impacts so many people over so many academic areas (i.e., group projects)?

Faculty members need direction on how to proceed with this. Possibility of FSEC sitting down with the relevant parties to clarify what the boundaries of these accommodations are.

New Business

Problems with work load equity for classes with different credit values (2-3-4-5 credit classes). There has been banking of credits, but the practice pertaining to these classes varies widely across departments.

Adjourn: 3:55 pm

Addendum 1

UHD Intellectual Property Faculty Senate Task Force

Membership	The Intellectual Property consists of eight members, three of whom serve on Faculty Senate. Current Faculty Senate representatives include: Cindy Stewart, Ron Beebe, and Sergiy Koshkin. College representatives include: Gail Evans, Penny Smith, Mian Jiang, Byron Christmas, Hong Lin.	
Terms of Membership	One academic year appointment	
Chair	Committee Chair is appointed by Faculty Senate, and serves for one academic year. Current Chair, Cindy Stewart, Associate Professor of Psychology, Department of Social Sciences	
Charge	<p>Literature Review of Case Law on Intellectual Property</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define intellectual property rights of faculty 2. Define faculty rights to research products 3. Define faculty rights to online instructional materials <p>Review UH System Policies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review UH Intellectual Property policy statement 2. Review UH sister institution Intellectual Property policy statements <p>Review Intellectual Property Policies Outside the UH System</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review state institutional policies 2. Review select national university policies <p>Draft an Intellectual Property Policy for Faculty Senate Review</p>	
Time Table for Deliverables	Chair appointed	11/13/2013
	Committee charge received	11/21/2013
	Committee membership determined	11/22/2013
	Literature Review summary completed	1/28/2014
	Summary of Intellectual Property policies completed	1/28/2014
	Draft of UHD Intellectual Property Policy Definition/Glossary	2/11/2014
	Draft of UHD Intellectual Property Policy Guidelines/Principles	2/18/2014
	Draft of UHD Intellectual Property Policy Procedures	2/25/2014
	Presentation of Summary and Policy to Faculty Senate	3/4/2014
Recorder	To be appointed	
Quorum	Five faculty members shall constitute quorum.	