

UHD FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 4, 2007

CALLED TO ORDER: The third meeting for the 2007-2008 academic year of the UHD Faculty Senate was held in A-300, One Main Street, Houston, Texas on September 4, 2007. The meeting convened at 2:30 pm. President Anjoo Sikka presiding, with Vice-President Michelle Moosally, and Secretary-Treasurer Gene Preuss.

Present: Anjoo Sikka (President), Michelle Moosally (Vice President), Gene Preuss (Secretary/Treasurer), Austin Allen (SOS), David Branham (SOS), Tony Chiaviello (ENG), Raquel Chiquillo (A&H), Merrilee Cunningham (ENG), Ermelinda DeLaViña (CMS), Joyce Dutcher (UE), Anne Kane (SOS), Steve Maranville (MMBA), Kathleen McLellan (ENG), Rich McMahon (FACIS), Pat Mosier (A&H), Angela Pedrana (UE), Sam Penkar (FACIS), Lucille Pointer (MMBA), Nick Rangel (A&H), Ruth Robbins (FACIS), Aimee Roundtree (ENG), Cindy Stewart (SOS), Jorge Tito-Izquierdo (ET), Jeong-Mi Yoon (CMS), Shengli Yuan (CMS), Zehai Zhou (FACIS)

Absent: Jeffrey Adams (MMBA), Youn-Sha Chan (CMS), Byron Christmas (NS)

Guests: Forrest Aven and William Gilbert

President Sikka declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The Senate voted to ratify minutes from the April 17, 2007, meeting, and approved the minutes from the May 1, 2007 meeting. The Senate voted to delay approval of minutes from the August 21, 2007, meeting.

REPORT FROM SENATE OFFICERS:

Sikka announced that elections are being held for five vacancies on the Faculty Senate, and for the Grievance Committee.

Thursday will be the kickoff for the Strategic Planning Workshop. There are about forty members. We will report to the Senate on the progress of the strategic planning process.

Senator Robbins asked if the consultants were the same ones that guided the College of Business's strategic planning. Sikka confirmed that they were.

The Faculty Affairs Committee continued to meet to finish revisions to the Grievance Policy. It now needs to be proofread.

Moosally stated that the Faculty Development Leave Committee and the Faculty Awards Committee are appointed by the Senate. We are still seeking reps for these committees from FACIS, ET, and CJ. Please contact her by tomorrow. She noted that the President's Office needs to send out appointments. An Updated list of Senate and Major University Committees is on the Senate Website.

Preuss reported on the progress of the Achieving the Dream Grant, which President Castillo called attention to at the President's Convocation.

OLD BUSINESS:

Faculty Senate Resolution on Program Deletion

Sikka distributed copies of a response from President Castillo. The response seemed to be referring to the second resolution that was specific to the mMba.

She called attention to a draft policy written by a subgroup of the Curriculum Committee, comprised of Adolfo Santos, chair of Social Sciences; Forrest Aven, chair of MMBA; William Gilbert, and chair of English. The draft policy addresses the deletion of a program when faculty is not affected. She emphasized that the policy is not an officially recommended policy by the Curriculum Committee, and the subgroup asks for input from the Senate.

Robbins suggested the chair of the department Rank and Tenure committee and representative from the discipline, or discipline coordinator, should be on the signature page.

Senator Cunningham suggested that the approval for deletion should be reviewed by the department's curriculum committee.

Senator Yaun asked for clarification on sections 4.2 and 4.3 as it seemed unclear if the "department faculty" indicated faculty from the discipline or program affected. Sikka agreed that the term was unclear. Yaun continued that section 4.3 outlined two possible scenarios, but suggested that this was insufficient as more scenarios could occur, and would like to see more possibilities covered.

Moosally observed that section 4.5 seems contradictory with section 4.3 when it discusses the dean's approval. Is the dean's approval in consultation or agreement with the chair?

Cunningham said she would like to see the department's curriculum committee included in sections 4.2 and 4.3.

Senator Mosier stated that section 4.2 states that the results of the department are presented to the dean, but it should state, "with appropriate signatures."

Robbins commented that without a process timeline, a policy could be deleted over a summer.

Pointer stated that it would have to go before the Curriculum Committee.

Robbins said that there should be an opportunity to make changes in a program before it is deleted. There is nothing that allows us to restructure a program.

Preuss stated that section 4.2 addresses some sort of needs assessment before the program or degree is eliminated. Perhaps that assessment should also consider ways of changing the program.

Robbins suggested that if there is to be a process it should be clearer.

Moosally suggested that it could be stated that the process has to be initiated in a long semester. It's also unclear who would perform the needs assessment or the appropriate time frame. These are areas that need clarification.

Sikka stated that the American Association of University Professors makes it clear that faculty should be the primary voice in program design and curriculum since faculty deliver curriculum and keep up with the programming. Faculty leads the discussion, instead of consultants or outsiders.

Yaun said section 4.1 is unclear as to who had the authority to make proposals.

Moosally said section 4.1 allows for "reasonable opportunity" but that concept is unclear". There should be more about who is involved in the discussion. She also noted that there is nothing about notifying the students. Students should not be left out of the discussion.

Robbins agreed that should be some opportunity for students' comments, perhaps an open forum.

Senator Dutcher noted that sometimes changes occur because society changes, what types of degrees or certifications are needed. There should be some sort of information session for students so they can make more informed decisions when they declare majors.

Sikka thanked the members of the Curriculum Committee subgroup for coming to the Senate to listen to the comments and suggestions.

Faculty Climate Survey

Sikka informed the Senate that the Faculty Climate Survey is done biennially, and was administered in May 2007. She stated that the Survey does have some impact, and the Senate should consider how the results should influence the Senate's actions. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee would look at the preliminary analysis, but the Senate as a whole owns the survey, and it is one way of knowing what our constituents believe about the issues. She asked Senators what they believed the next step should be.

Robbins said that Question 6 should be considered in light of the previous discussion. Sikka said that Question 5 related to shared governance. Robbins said we should make sure faculty has a voice.

Senator Rangel asked if the results for Question 4 could be broken down between Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty. Sikka said that could be a question for further analysis. Rangel asked if Question 2 could also be disaggregated. Sikka asked about Question 3, and Rangel agreed. Senator McMahon said it could be done on all questions. Rangel said the response on Question 7 seemed so high that there might not be a difference.

Another Senator pointed out that the data for Question 2 and 3 are identical. Sikka stated that it was an error that she would correct.

Robbins asked if a breakdown could be done by rank if not by Tenure or Tenure-Track. Sikka stated that since UHD doesn't normally give promotion without rank, assistant professors are not considered tenured, while associate and full-professors are. Herbert Rebhun said that there are some associate professors hired without tenure. Mosier suggested that we ask on the next survey.

Rebhun asked what the Sente will do with the data. Sikka replied that the next step could be:

- Conduct an additional survey on specific problem areas.
- Analyze the current data.
- Identify a problem and have a committee address it.
- Ask administration to respond to the issues.

Pointer asked about the difference in responses to Questions 5 and 6 between the present survey and the last survey. Sikka stated that the old results were available, so an analysis can be done.

Pointer also suggested that a "3" value might be considered neutral, and that future surveys might want more responses. Senator Chiaviello asked who decided the range of the Likert scale. Sikka said it was based on the previous survey, the Senate, and the FSEC. Chiaviello asked if it was outsourced. Sikka said it was not. Chiaviello stated that the scale seemed standard.

Moosally stated that former president Nell Sullivan oversaw the first survey brought in consultants, but then did the survey in-house. Chiaviello said that he didn't see a design problem. He felt the results depend upon legitimate wording, and the questions in the survey seemed straightforward.

Senator Roundtree observed that many of the issues are perennial issues discussed by the Senate. She suggested that the Senate redress or provide more updates on and awareness about repeated topics. Sikka stated that the compensation issue is one such issue. Will faculty ever feel adequately compensated? The issue, she explained, is complex because it's intertwined with the workload issue, so there are two aspects to the question.

As an example of one issue that the Senate addressed that administration responded to, Sikka stated that compensation and compression was an issue last year. David Fairbanks proposed a faculty salary adjustment model based on a \$4,000 adjustment from assistant to associate, and an \$8,000 increase from associate to full-professor. Sikka is analyzing the resultant salary adjustments to see if they addresses the issue of compression. Pointer asked if the proposal for increasing promotion pay was accepted. Sikka responded that it was. VPAA Woods stated that the Planning Council make the proposal. Sikka noted that the resolution to the Planning Council came from the Senate. Pointer said that this should point out that the Faculty Senate is doing something.

Sikka asked if there were additional comments. Chiaviello said that there are some responses that are not recorded. He said that fields without responses should still be included, otherwise the results might be muddled. Sikka said that the problem with Likert scales is that they leave much to individual responder's interpretation. Senator DeLaViña noted that the instructions

stated that people could leave the response blank. Sikka said this is an area of concern, and perhaps we should be more familiar with the standard we hold our students to across the university.

Roundtree stated that Question 13 might be analyzed by department, by what kind of tasks and responsibilities account for time reported as “teaching”—grading written assignments, office hours, time in class. She noted that writing intensive courses often require spending more time grading than other courses.

Senator Kane stated that disaggregating by colleges would be helpful regarding to the question about compensation, as those results might differ. Sikka said she would break down the analysis by rank, number of years, and colleges. Preuss reminded the Senate that previously concerns were raised that such a breakdown could result in identifying individual responders. Sikka said that if the results were less than five respondents, it could be collapsed with another category to keep identities private.

NEW BUSINESS:

Suggestions for Topics/Issues

During discussion, Senators suggested the following topics:

- Online Course Evaluations
- Consistency Of Evaluations Across Colleges
- Assessment
- The Condition Of The Boat Dock
- International Programs
- Parking
- Safety (Especially In The New Building)
- Disability Access And Procedures For Evacuation
- The Time It Takes To Commute Between Buildings
- Adjunct Faculty Voice
- Signage
- Task Force On Research Support/Faculty Recruitment And Retention
- Shared Governance
- Rank And Tenure Procedures
- Increased ORC Funding And Faculty Development Award Funding
- Infrastructure/ Staff Support/ Equipment Related To A Geographically Disperse Campus

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Sikka announced that after the Faculty Senate Task Force on Research Support, and Faculty Recruitment and Retention’s presentation last year, it was charged with investigating different courses of action and suggestions to reduce course load. When the taskforce reconvenes it will take up these issues.

ADJOURNMENT: The Senate adjourned at 4:03 pm.

Date of Approval

**Secretary/Treasurer
UHD Faculty Senate**