

UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

April 1, 2014

Minutes

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

Absent: U. Bose, R. Johnson, M. Portillo, C. Stewart, F. Vela, J. Davis,

Announcements

- UH – Victoria's President has resigned, and an upper administration reorganization has occurred
- UFEC Meeting (UHD, UH, UHCL, & UHV Faculty Senate) April 18 at UH – Clear Lake
- Full professor meeting occurred on March 28.

Minutes:

March 18 minutes passed with one opposed (21 in favor).

New Business:

Hale presents the following resolution for consideration.

UHD Faculty Senate Resolution concerning Summer Salary at UHD / Spring 2014 / 1st-2nd Read

**2013-2014 UH System Summer Salary Study Ad-Hoc Faculty Senate Committee
Phil Lyons (Chair), Aimee Roundtree, Beverly Rowe, Stephen Wernet**

Whereas the summer salary for full time faculty at the University of Houston - Downtown is 1/12th of 9 month salary per 3 credit hour summer course,

Whereas the current policy for summer salary for full time faculty at the University of Houston - Clear Lake is 1/9th of 9 month salary per 3 credit hour summer course,

Whereas the current practice for summer salary for full time faculty at the University of Houston - Clear Lake is 1/11th of 9 month salary per 3 credit hour summer course,

Whereas the summer salary for full time faculty at the University of Houston - Victoria is 1/12th of 9 month salary per 3 credit hour summer course,

Whereas the summer salary for full time faculty at the University of Houston varies between 1/9th and 1/12th of 9 month salary per 3 credit hour summer course,

Be it resolved that the 14-15 UHD Planning and Budget Development Committee at the University of Houston - Downtown consider increasing the current summer salary stipend to 1/11th of 9 month salary per 3 credit hour summer course.

Q: Would this impact our ability to teach two courses at the faculty rate? Could they just say this implies one course instead of two?

A: The only change being requested is the change in stipend.

Q: How do we go forward on this?

A: Present this to the administration.

Q: Why does UH-Clear Lake not abide by their 1/9th policy?

A: They have one number in policy and one number in practice.

Comment: This should be a dialogue. We should approach this as a suggestion to administration for a direction to take rather than trying to box in administration.

A: This is not boxing in. This is requesting an improvement.

Amendment from the floor:

Be it resolved that the 14-15 UHD Planning and Budget Development Committee at the University of Houston - Downtown consider increasing the current summer salary stipend to 1/11th of 9 month salary per 3 credit hour summer course for up to two courses.

13 in favor, 4 opposed

Amendment carries.

Q: Concern that this request is without context. We should have a policy that deals with summer salary. We should address our salary problems in a larger way, including regular salary.

A: We just had two salary adjustments.

Comment: Mr. Hugetz is aware of the summer salary differences. We should have this discussion in the budget and planning committee process. However, we have had declining summer enrollment, and we are offering fewer summer courses. Faculty are not incentivized to teach in summer.

Guest, Elaine Pearson, Provost's Office

Pearson brought documentation of the impact of a move to a 1/9 summer salary.

Urban Ed is in the black by close to \$3,000, and would be in the red by over \$32,000 if we went to a 1/9 summer stipend.

English is in the black by almost \$47,000, and would be in the red by over \$32,000 if we went to 1/9 summer stipend.

Comment: We are asking for 1/11 at this time. This is also meant to initiate discussion.

Motion to approve resolution as amended is approved (17 in favor, 4 abstentions).

Guest, Michelle Moosally, Chair of the General Education Committee

This is an update on the effort to revive and reinvigorate the Gen Ed curriculum and the assessment of such. Please see attached handout for an overview. Key points:

- The previous Gen Ed Objectives needed to be reworked to be more assessable and to reflect current goals.
- The new core gives us an opportunity to revise Gen Ed and decide what we think is important to include.
- The core is part of Gen Ed, but Gen Ed also has elements outside of the core. The 42 hour core forms the “centerpiece” of Gen Ed, but we can add elements to this.
- Gen Ed proposals will be going out to the faculty, and faculty needs to weigh in on the process we want to follow for Gen Ed.

Q: Extending the core into the upper levels should be considered. For example, scientific ethics is an extension of the basic ethics; this provides better grounding in the discipline. Also allows longitudinal assessment of these objectives over a degree program.

Q: Shouldn't this be part of degree plan assessment rather than university assessment?

A: There is no reason why we cannot have University-level longitudinal objectives for Gen Ed that extend a competency from college entry to graduation. This is best practice.

The committee will be proposing a new set of Gen Ed objectives. The current ones will go away, and will be replaced by the core objectives.

The new Gen Ed proposal will be finalized this week to be dispersed to faculty for feedback. The most likely items to be added to Gen Ed include an upper-division writing course, an ethics component, and a technology component.

Q: Can these requirements be counted as part of the core, so they can fit within the 120 hours? This as a new pressure on a degree plan; how are we going to fit all of this within 120 hours?

A: These are requirements outside of the core, but they can be satisfied with a range of options. It can be a specific course, embedding into any existing class, or something else.

Q: Somewhere there is a statement that “UHD graduates will be able to.” So we are assessing the core at the core level as if this is all we expect graduates to do?

A: The core is not being assessed at graduation. The core is being assessed as the core. There is no specific external mandate that we assess the core at graduation, but this is something we should thoughtfully consider. Should it be up to the degree programs or a university-wide effort?

Q: If you are assessing outcomes at freshman and sophomore level, but we don't continue to assess, then what are we really proving or assessing?

A: There has been some discussion about what we want our graduates to know, but there is no official statement.

Updates from Standing Committees

APC: Presentation made to AAC on Thursday. The APC will discuss the language having to do with dissuading faculty from incentivizing students to complete the student opinion survey.

FAC: Have been working on the Emeritus Policy, which is now complete.

UCC: No report

Updates from Departments on progress developing yearly evaluation rubrics.

NS: Finished with their teaching rubric. Subcommittees working on scholarship and service.

UE: Has all three components finished, and will be distributed soon to faculty.

COB: Three sub-committees working on each area.

CJ: Three subcommittees have completed job and is under department review

Math/Stats: Have completed three parts, distributed to whole department for review. No lecturers involved, only T/TT faculty.

AH: Two marathon meetings on these. Will have more meetings to finish the rubrics before the deadline..

ENG: Three sub-committees. Upcoming meetings with whole faculty.

SOS: Meetings keep happening, with substantial revisions. All three areas are being addressed.

ET: Are working as a whole faculty to develop rubrics.

Q: Who decides on final rubric?

A: Whole department should have a voice. Departments should follow the current policy (10.A.05).

Hugetz: There must be a rubric for the lecturers, but it can focus on teaching and service. They do get evaluated, so they should be involved.

Comment: In English, lecturers are involved on the teaching and service sub-committees.

Q to Mr. Hugetz: What happens after these come to your office on April 16.

Hugetz: Must do an analysis of what we have from several points of view. Will work with FAC on this issue. Need to give feedback back to the departments and give departments a chance to respond.

Q to Mr. Hugetz: What will you be looking for in assessing the rubrics?

Hugetz: Are we really differentiating between the levels in a measureable way? Doesn't have to be perfect, just has to be a starting place. We can continue the dialogue.

Adjourn: 3:44 pm