

UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

December 4, 2012

Minutes

Present: G. Preuss (President), S. Henney (Secretary), A. Allen (Past President), C. Bachman, C. Burnett, S. Farris, V. Hrynkiv, R. Johnson, J. Schmertz, P. Mandell, C. Nguyen, R. Davidson, R. Beebe, C. Rubinson, J. Ahmad, P. Deo, M. Benavides, M. Duncan, J. Johnson, C. Nguyen, D. Epstein, J. Herrera, S. Koshkin, S. Penkar, I. Wang

Absent: T. Hale (President Elect), F. Khoja, S. Yuan, J. Tito-Izquierdo, P. Li, W. Nowak

Guest Speaker: Diane Summers, Executive Director of University Relations

Presentation on “Major Opportunity” marketing campaign. These are some key features of the campaign:

- 1) Metro
 - a. Original plan was to “wrap” metro rail cars, but is cost prohibitive (200k for 6 months)
 - b. Therefore, produced multiple posters at rail stops; this is free!
- 2) Digital
 - a. Reviewed results for Pandora, Facebook, Google, & AdNetwork.
 - b. Can “slice” the results in different ways to determine who is clicking and who is coming back.
 - c. Good response to most of the digital efforts.
- 3) Discovery Green
 - a. UHD was the main sponsor for spring concerts. We had an admission booth there.
- 4) Building banners & shuttle wraps

Projected cost: \$336, 756. Actual cost: \$319,250. Total marketing budget: \$628,688 (other universities with 10k plus students spend upwards of one million dollars on marketing).

What’s next? Mainly refine and repeat. Need 10 new “major opportunity” students, and faculty should recommend their “rock star” students for this.

Minutes

November 20 minutes approved unanimously.

Faculty Senate President’s Report: G. Preuss

There was a bomb threat at a System campus this week. We need to move forward with emergency planning/response system. UHD is considering a hire in this area.

There is a system-wide capital campaign underway.

UH System website will direct students to campuses offering specific degrees, including online degrees.

Tuition increases appear to be “on the table” for next year.

The chair of the Senate Higher Education Committee supports an initiative that at least 25% of incentive funding will be based on outcomes. UHD's problem areas are FTIC retention and graduation rates.

VP Montalbano and FSEC met regarding an RFP for a faculty and staff salary study. Faculty are and will continue to be involved. Dr. Flores commented that we first want to see where the biggest discrepancies are and target these first for both faculty and staff. Salary adjustments, if indicated, may be over a two to three-year period.

Motion: "To suspend the agenda so we may address new business related to policy." Passed with one opposed.

New Business

Academic Appointment Policy

Latest policy revision sent out 11/20. Has received some feedback and made some changes.

Major issues addressed:

- 1) Instructors: May not have a terminal degree
- 2) Assistant/Associate/Full: Changed some language
- 3) New positions added include: Endowed Chair, Clinical Professor, Visiting Faculty, Research Faculty, Graduate Assistants, Teaching Assistants, etc.
- 4) Policy statement (introduction) has been revised.
- 5) Repetitive language has been removed.
- 6) Number of hours adjunct faculty can teach has been specified.

Audience member points out that workload is expressed for lecturers as FTE (not number of classes) within this policy.

Academic Evaluation Policy

The purpose of the discussion was to get the Senate's overall sense of the problem areas with this policy. FAC sent out six areas of concern originally. It was also pointed out that one of the issues is how this policy relates to Rank and Tenure.

Preuss discussed his overall understanding of why this policy is coming up for review now.

- 1) It is out of date and badly in need of being brought into line with what faculty actually do. Faculty work isn't always recognized and needs to be reflected specifically in policy.
- 2) Dr. Chapman expects changes. Sees the draft he sent as a starting point. The basis of the draft is from another university.

Senators raised the following issues and concerns about the draft policy:

- 1) Activity Insight:
 - a. Why is a specific software program specified in a policy? Software changes more quickly than policy. How is this digital information going to be used? Could it be used

to “witch hunt” faculty members? This type of digital information should be for internal use only (but this cannot be guaranteed with freedom of information).

- b. This type of information can be obtained by “fringe groups,” which can be a safety issue.
 - c. Is this just a “bad shopping” issue? Are we just using Activity Insight because we bought it?
- 2) Inclusion of “collegiality” as an evaluation criterion:
- a. AAUP has a statement against including collegiality as a separate standard. It is not a measureable criterion.
 - b. There is a risk that “heated discourse” could be misinterpreted as lack of collegiality.
 - c. Collegiality rating can be positive if done correctly.
 - d. No weight or rubric assigned to it, just an up or down.
 - e. Can be used to play favorites (“I like you”=collegial; “I don’t like you”=not collegial).
 - f. As written, everything is in the hands of the chair; where are the “colleagues” in collegiality?
 - g. The definition seems more appropriate to service than to its own category.
 - h. Can threaten academic freedom.

Motion: “Senate votes to recommend that collegiality be taken out of this policy.” Passes with one abstention.

- 3) The number scale for evaluation:
- a. It is too complicated. Sometimes simplicity is better.
 - b. The evaluation scale on this policy is fundamentally flawed. It does not reflect what we do. “Satisfactory” doesn’t get you a raise! Is this the policy basis that we want to start with? There must be something better out there.

Discussion:

- c. Deadline is approaching. FAC can ask for more time.
- d. Consensus from SOS is that other policies need to be looked at, as this policy is fundamentally flawed.
- e. Why not revise old policy?
- f. The criteria throughout favors certain types of activities and certain types of accomplishments.
- g. We need to develop a set of shared goals for this policy prior to revising. What is the purpose of the change?

The question is called. Motion passes.

- 4) Merit pay:
- a. Limits of how and whether faculty can qualify for merit and which categories.
 - b. There is a 20-60-20 split on who qualifies for merit.
 - c. Still unclear what is “meritorious.” Problematic that there are those who cannot get merit raises.
 - d. This is like using a bell curve for grades. Even if everyone is actually doing well, some will still fail.
 - e. This type of evaluation has been unpopular in business.

- f. Departments are asked to be more stringent in ratings, but this is not being implemented across the board. Faculty in more stringently rated departments are at a severe disadvantage for raises.
 - g. A very small difference (between a 2.4 and 2.5) could have a huge impact on your life, professional and financial. That means a small misstep could have disproportionate consequences.
- 5) Research/Creative Activity Cycle:
- a. Policy should reflect the academic flow. Should take into account that the publication process is not a yearly activity. Our evaluation instruments fail uniformly to address this fact.
 - b. This also applies to creative activity.
 - c. Length of publication process is not always in our hands.

Motion: “Senate recommends that FAC consider incorporating language that applies to evaluation of various aspects of the research process and creative activities in a way that takes into account the differences between the disciplines.” Motion passes with two abstentions.

FAC requests continuing feedback from Senate and faculty colleagues.

Adjourn: 4:05 pm