

## UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

October 2, 2012

### Minutes

**Present:** G. Preuss (President), T. Hale (President Elect), S. Henney (Secretary), A. Allen (Past President), C. Bachman, M. Benavides, C. Burnett, P. Deo, M. Duncan, S. Farris, J. Herrera, V. Hrynkiw, J. Johnson, R. Johnson, C. Rubinson, S. Koshkin, P. Li, W. Nowak, J. Schmertz, K. Switzer, J. Tito-Izquierdo, I. Wang, P. Mandell, C. Nguyen, R. Davidson, R. Beebe, D. Epstein, S. Yuan

**Absent:** J. Ahmad, F. Khoja, S. Penkar

September 18 minutes approved as corrected with one abstention.

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

1. Preuss extended a heartfelt thank you to Drs. Chiquillo, Deo, and Simeonov for their dedication and work in conducting all of the beginning of the year elections.
2. One more election needs to be run for a Grievance Committee seat from Urban Education.
3. Distributed three handouts, including the "UHD Progress Card," a request from a SFA graduate student to interview Senators for his dissertation, and the results of the Grievance Committee elections.
4. FSEC will conduct the Ombuds review next week.
5. Obtaining nominees for the Intellectual Property Committee and the Title IX and Sexual Harassment Boards is ongoing.
6. At times both non-tenured and tenured faculty feel reluctant to speak up on important issues affecting the University. Dr. Preuss reads the following into the minutes: "In the interest of protecting all faculty from any form of retaliation, the Faculty Senate minutes will no longer record individual faculty statements. We strongly urge other committees to follow a similar procedure. The intent is to record the argument, not the author."

A Senator objects and moves that we retain the "traditional method of minute taking that we've gone by all these years." The Senator stated that faculty need to know how they are being represented, and this decision should not be made by FSEC alone. Preuss stated motion would be taken up later.

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

Dr. Flores reported the following:

- The six year graduation rate of our peer institutions is 29%. Ours has dropped from 15.4% to 11.8%.
- A task force is working on how we can "move the needle" on our six-year graduation rate this year. A list of 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> year FTIC's has been generated. The numbers are so small that if we even graduate 20 to 30 more FTIC's, it will make a marked difference in our rates. Dr. Flores is asking the faculty to do everything they can to help students—especially FTIC students—move through their degree plans.

- We have an historic increase in students. What is important is that although there are more students overall, fewer of them need developmental coursework. This trend is expected to increase as we adopt admissions standards.

A Senator asked why we do not intervene earlier than the last 30 hours? Flores replied that we want to make a difference where we can, and interventions will occur at every level once we identify the target FTICs.

### **Election for the CEC and the COC: T. Hale**

Ballots were distributed, returned and counted by Hale and Allen. The results were:

CEC winners: Hewitt (CPS) and Crone (CHSS)

COC winners: Hashemi (COB) and Bachman (CHSS)

### **Guest Speaker: Dr. Chapman on Charges to the Standing Committees**

Preuss reviewed the memos that had been distributed from Dr. Flores (via an email from Preuss) and Dr. Chapman (via an email from FAC Chair Ahmad).

Dr. Chapman stated that three years ago Dr. Flores had received a charge from the Chancellor instructing him to update UHD's out-of-date policies. Chapman stated that 75% of UHD policies are five years old or older, with 54% being 15 years or older and 27% dating back to the 1980's. He further stated that only three policies were revised all of last year, and we are "way behind" in our revision of policy.

This summer Dr. Chapman decided to present revised policies to policy committees with a deadline in order to facilitate timely rewriting of policy. Thus, three policies were forwarded to FAC along with deadlines. The Academic Appointment Policy was rewritten by the Provost's office and contains "insignificant changes." It has a deadline of November 1, 2012. The two policies requiring more significant changes, Annual Review of Faculty Performance and Rank and Tenure, were given deadlines of February 1, 2013 and March 1, 2013 respectively.

Dr. Chapman stated that these deadlines are in place to give committees a timeline by which they must make "significant progress" on the policies. He further stated that the "caveat" to his memo and Dr. Flores' memo is that the deadlines can be "negotiated" if the policies are not quite ready. Dr. Chapman reports that the whole of UHD's policies are under the President's authority, and he is using this authority to make these deadlines. When explaining the need for deadlines and expedited work on policies, Dr. Chapman used the example of the Academic Appointment Policy, which has needed revision for quite some time due to the fact that it does not contain some of the academic positions, such as the new endowed chair position, that we hire for at UHD.

An audience member asked Dr. Chapman to provide an update on the policies that are outstanding in the AAC. He responded that he is making some changes to the "format" and that the policies will move forward after these changes are made. The audience member used the example of the ORCA policy to state that changes are being made to policies outside of the policy process—primarily at the Provost level. The audience member asked what the purpose of faculty involvement is if the policy will be changed later without explanation at the Provost level? Dr. Chapman responded that the changes that had been

approved by the Chair of FAC. This was disputed by the audience member. Another issue raised was what the process will be if the committee recommends large changes to the rewritten policy? Dr. Chapman replied that all of the policies will be vetted by the General Counsel's Office, and that we are "stuck with" whatever policy changes or additions are necessary to meet the legal and budgetary requirements.

A FSEC member asked about the consequences outlined in the memo of administration taking over writing of the policies and the role of the Dean's Council. The consequences are seen by faculty as a threat. Dr. Chapman reiterated that the intent is to negotiate the deadlines if necessary.

Another FSEC member was concerned about the mixed messages being conveyed and about failure to communicate from administration to faculty. A Senator urged the administration to follow the existing Shared Governance Policy. AAC should be used to develop deadlines collaboratively with faculty.

A FSEC member asks Dr. Flores about the role of Dean's Council suggested in his memo. Dr. Flores stated that the Dean's Council's role will be to "give advice" on policy, not to approve.

A FSEC member pointed out that faculty members are working in good faith on these committees. Faculty is not trying to disrupt the policy revision process, and we should try to get to the point where threatening memos are not required in order for administration and faculty to sit down and discuss these issues. An audience member comments that it is not only faculty that doesn't meet policy deadlines. Everyone is busy. There are large time gaps from administration and from the outside; delays are not only on the committees' part. Dr. Chapman committed to attending any committee meetings where he is needed to provide input and also to make the UHD attorney available for these meetings if needed.

A Senator asked for an explanation about the "emergency" policies written over the summer and how policies are targeted or prioritized for revision. The Senator expressed concern that policies "written from scratch" will come into conflict with other existing policies and noted that it makes the most sense to begin with the existing policy language, identify the flaws, and see what needs to be changed in and around it. Dr. Chapman stated that that is exactly what had been done this summer. For example, four small policies were combined into a larger policy and definitions were standardized across several policies. The intent is to make the policies fit what we are actually doing. The Senator stated that the "Faculty Evaluation Policy" was "completely incompatible" with the current policy. Dr. Chapman stated that it was not incompatible, but that there are substantial changes, and that the committee has time to look at the policy thoroughly. Dr. Chapman stated that there is a benefit to the committees receiving policies fully revised; it was his contention that this will make the committees' job easier since they don't have to "start from scratch."

### **Old Business: Core Changes**

The original LOs submitted from the Component Area Committees (CAC) and the revised LOs distributed from the Oversight Committee (OC) have been collected and disseminated.

A FSEC member asked why LOs were revised without being communicated back to the committee in the first place. Dr. Chapman explained that the process was that the OC received LOs from the CACs. One committee sent forward 42 outcomes, most of which were "assignment outcomes," not LOs. LOs are more general—what is the "residue" that the student retains after completing a four-year degree. The OC

is currently asking each CAC to tweak their LOs and send them back to the OC; this process is ongoing. Even after the “tweaking” by the CACs, “assignment outcomes” will still not be allowed. A FSEC member asked about LOs like “note taking,” and Dr. Chapman explained that this is a good example of an “assignment outcome” and not a LO. A Senator reminded all that time is of the essence, as we have deadlines ahead.

A Senator stated that it is very important that we are “playing the same game” that every other university in the state is playing. CACs should be checking with peer and feeder institutions to see if we are doing the same things other institutions are doing in each category. Dr. Chapman responded that there is a lot of innovation across the state; some universities don’t have English courses any more. They have communications courses, which can be taught by any faculty. The Core Components must be there in every case.

A FSEC member commented that there is still evidence for lack of communication in the process. There still has been no rationale communicated to faculty as to why changes were made.

Dr. Chapman stated that the next steps are that CACs must build rubrics and faculty must build courses. Dr. Chapman further stated that SACS “doesn’t care about specific learning outcomes.” He stated that SACS is most concerned with “closing the loop” or demonstration of the changes implemented as a result of the assessment.

A FSEC member noted that one of the factors that faculty have been “up in arms” about is the loss of three hours of writing from the core; what faculty hear back is “this is the final decision and we are not going to discuss this issue.” Dr. Chapman said there are two statewide problems. First, students don’t improve in writing by graduation, and second, the high fail rate in science classes. Both of these should be addressed in the core.

Preuss revisited the motion previously proposed regarding minutes. Specifically, the Senator proposed, “The Senate will continue the process of attaching names to statements in the minutes.” A motion to table was proposed, seconded, and passed unanimously.

Adjourn: 4:02 pm