

## UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

September 18, 2012

### Minutes

**Present:** G. Preuss (President), T. Hale (President Elect), S. Henney (Secretary), A. Allen (Past President), J. Ahmad, C. Bachman, M. Benavides, C. Burnett, P. Deo, M. Duncan, S. Farris, J. Herrera, V. Hrynkiv, J. Johnson, R. Johnson, F. Khoja, S. Koshkin, P. Li, W. Nowak, J. Schmertz, K. Switzer, J. Tito-Izquierdo, I. Wang, S. Penkar, C. Rubinson

**Absent:** P. Mandell, C. Nguyen

September 4 minutes approved by unanimous vote.

#### **Guest Speaker: Doug TeDuits**

He needs 6-8 names of faculty members interested in serving on the Title IX and Sexual Harassment Boards. These are grievance and hearing committees. Preuss will obtain recommendations.

#### **Guest Speaker: Dr. Flores**

Dr. Flores welcomed us to a new Senate year. The highlights of his report include:

- We have the highest headcount ever, with 13,750 students (+100 from last year).
- Dr. Flores wants to visit each college or department and discuss plans for the future.
- Administration is working on our appropriations request, which will be presented this Friday.
  - The two big requests include: a revenue bond for a Science and Technology Building and \$5 million for a Student Success Initiative.
  - The money for student success will help support students who come in under the new admissions standards. This includes money for “Accuplacer Diagnostics,” advising, and mentoring. Dr. Flores insists that there will be no reductions in standards, but rather increasing support for students.
- Work on the Facilities Master Plan will begin in January, 2013. This plan will include more parking and academic space (after Science and Technology).

Preuss asked about charge from the System to “move the needles on our performance dashboard.” Flores replied that UHD hasn’t moved much on statistical items, particularly 6-year graduation rates. However, UHD is at the bottom of all public universities in appropriations, and we have the lowest tuition.

Schmertz asked how has the “move the needle” message been communicated and was there a threat behind it. Flores replied no, no threat. We are in the process of educating the legislature about who we are and the unique challenges we face. We produce more students at a lower cost than most other universities.

J. Johnson comments that the admissions standards committee had suggested that supports be in place for the contingent admissions students. Flores stated that there is a task force working on this. A “Summer Bridge” program, possibly with developmental courses, is being developed.

Li asked why our numbers are going up? Is it the poor economy? Flores replied that we are more focused on recruitment. We also have a new marketing campaign and are building a reputation.

**Guest Speaker: Ron Beebe**

There is a new AAUP chapter at UHD, which will be holding an information and membership meeting on October 11. A UH System representative will talk about intellectual property.

**Faculty Senate President's Report: G. Preuss**

1. We need a new representative for the System Intellectual Property Committee. Steve London was the secondary representative, and he will move up to primary. Byron Christmas has been mentioned as a possible secondary rep.
2. Michael Duncan is the new Senate webmaster. Thank you!
3. Senate, CEC, and COC nominations are underway. FSEC will narrow down to three choices in each race, if necessary.
4. Faculty Grievance Committee will be totally reelected (due to the fact that they were held over). Two people will be elected from each department, with one having a one-year term.
5. ORSP will hold a responsible research meeting this Thursday.
6. Preuss and Hale will be attending monthly Executive Council meetings and will distribute written highlights of the meetings
7. Preuss will distribute 12<sup>th</sup> day fact sheet to Senators.

**Guest Speaker: J. Schmertz**

Distributed and provided an overview of a document summarizing PS 01.A.03, the Academic Shared Governance Policy. This document was approved by the Shared Governance Committee for informational and implementation purposes. The document is included as Attachment A. She requested that the document also be sent to the chairs of the shared governance bodies: Academic Affairs Council (AAC), Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), Academic Policies Committee (APC) and University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

**New Business:**

Preuss reported that FSEC will complete the review of the Faculty Ombuds.

Preuss indicated that there have been concerns about the learning outcomes (LOs) that recently came out in the form of worksheets. Henney stated that the issue is that some of the LOs are different than those that were put forward to the Oversight Committee by the faculty-led Component Area Committees. In other words, the Oversight Committee, the Provost, or both changed some of the LOs. Concerns raised by Senators about this development included:

1. If curriculum is a primary responsibility of the faculty, how were faculty members included in the revision process (if at all)?
2. Do the people who revised the LOs have the necessary discipline-based knowledge to write LOs? How can we be sure the revised LOs are as strong as those coming out of the committees?

3. Examples were given of LOs that are not assessable. For example, the “financial literacy” LO, which Preuss noted the Provost has said is mandated by law, states, “Understand and apply the principles of financial management.” Senators stated that the word “understand” is not assessable.
4. Some of the LOs were described as inscrutable for the discipline. Who will interpret the LOs so that departments can write acceptable proposals?
5. Concerns were raised about how the LOs will be received by SACS. We do not want to revisit the SACS issues we have had in the past.

A Senator who is a senate representative on the Oversight Committee stated that many of the changes came from the Provost and involved combining LOs and changing certain language that was predicted to be unacceptable to the Coordinating Board. A Senator stated that faculty committees were in effect working in the dark if they were not privy to the information on which such predictions were based. A question was raised about Lea Campbell’s role in assuring that LOs are assessable. The Oversight Committee member indicated that Campbell is on the Committee, has visited some Component Area Committees, and has participated in writing many of the documents coming out of the Committee (including the worksheets).

It was noted by a Senator that the Oversight Committee has not distributed minutes since March. This would be a way the Oversight Committee could have transmitted the reasons for the LO changes to the Component Area Committees. An audience member indicated that it is incumbent on decision-makers to be transparent.

A discussion ensued about minority representation of specific discipline members on Component Area Committees (i.e., a minority presence of Historians on the History Component Area Committee) and that the Chairs are not discipline experts. Preuss reported that it was his understanding that the Provost’s rationale was that the core objectives were not discipline-specific. Preuss noted that the Provost put an English or Communications faculty on many committees that had the Communications Component Area as part of its core objectives.

The result of the forgoing discussion was the following:

1. Senators stated that we need to investigate and understand how the LOs were changed. The original LOs should be collected from each Component Area Committee Chair, and these should be compared to the worksheet LOs that came from the Oversight Committee.
2. The Senate requests that the Component Area Committees meet again as soon as possible to review the new LOs and that a process be specified so they can communicate their suggested revisions and changes on the new LOs to the Oversight Committee.
3. That the Component Area Committee Chairs and the Oversight Committee Chair be invited to speak to the Faculty Senate about the work of their committees and their LOs.

Adjourn: 4:02 pm

## Appendix A

### Shared Governance Committee Report

Our understanding of the ways in which academic shared governance works at UHD comes from the language of PS 01.A.03 and the subsequent enactment of that document that has been shared practice for many years. Fundamentally, we see the goal of our process to be full input and shared decisions at all levels to ensure a successful UHD experience for our students as well as faculty, staff, and administrators. The discussion that follows exempts policies passed on an emergency basis.

Policy writing and revision begins with a charge being given to one of the three policy writing committees (Academic Policy, Faculty Affairs, or University Curriculum). UHD policy is silent about who may or may not issue a charge to one of these committees. UHD practice has been that anyone may issue a charge, but most commonly charges come from the President, Provost, or Faculty Senate.

When it receives a charge, a policy writing committee begins its work, seeking input as needed from constituents, Senate, legal, special knowledge bodies, other universities and so on. Timelines for work on a particular policy vary depending on the scope of the project, and committee priorities are often determined in consultation with Provost and Senate. There are no provisions in policy that regulate the workflow in the policy writing process while it is with a policy committee. At some point, however, a policy committee will conclude that its draft is ready for consideration and send it to the Provost for distribution for the AAC. (This step should take place at least three weeks before the AAC meeting at which the policy will be discussed—because the Provost needs to provide an agenda three weeks prior to any AAC meeting.) At that point, the Senate President places the policy on the agenda for a Senate meeting. Between the distribution of the agenda and the AAC meeting, Senators and AAC members should consult their constituencies about the policy.

During the meeting, the AAC may make non-substantive changes to any policy and, following a majority vote, send it to the President for signature. If the AAC deems substantive changes to be necessary, it will send the policy back to the policy committee with specific requests or a new charge. The committee at that point has 30 days to respond before the AAC may make a final recommendation to the President.

Following AAC approval, the Provost takes the policy to the President who will review and sign the policy within 30 days. The President, however, retains the prerogative not to sign a policy presented to him. If he decides not to do so, he should inform the AAC in writing of his reasons for not following its recommendation.