**The University of Texas System Faculty Advisory Council**

**210 West 7th Street, UTS 2.206.1**

**Austin, TX**

**October 5-6, 2017**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday, October 5th**

Dr. Jonathan Cheng, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Council called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

The following FAC members were in attendance on October 5th, 2017:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Jonathan Cheng | Volker Questschke |
| Daniel Cavanagh | Michael Riben |
| Tom Ingram | Ann Killary |
| Steven Hoelscher | Lynne Hughes |
| Charlotte Canning | George Carayannopoulos |
| Murray Leaf | James Eldridge |
| David Cordell | Jessica Garrett |
| Elena Izquierdo | Emily Bonner |
| Sandor Dorgo | Joshua Thurow |
| Gurur Biliciler-Denktas | Jeff Van Dermark |
| Ryan Quock | Julie DeVahl |
| Ramon Cestero | John Lamb |
| Suman Challa | Kouider Mokhtari |
| Leo Holm | Catherine Ross |
| Vijay Ra | Dora Saavedra |
| David Coursey |  |

**Introductions**

**10:00-10:30** Chair Cheng gave an overview of the agenda and members introduced themselves.

**10:30 – 11:30** Dr. Cheng reported that Regent Tucker was elected Chairman of the Board of Regents. Dr. Cheng gave an overview of initiatives that FAC has been working on for the past few years, and presented information about the role of FAC and members’ roles as members of FAC. He discussed the structure of FAC, governance initiatives and principles, and accomplishments over the past year. See attached Powerpoint for more details.

Several campus reports were presented orally

**ACTION ITEMS**:

1. Murray Leaf moved to approve and Charlotte Canning seconded a revision to the FAC guidelines to require 2/3 majority vote for all items.
2. Dora Saavedra moved to approve and Suman Challa seconded the following changes to the FAC guidelines:
	1. Verbiage defining “quorum” as 50% of the voting members of the FAC and
	2. Defining membership eligibility for FAC to indicate that if a member is ineligible to serve on their campus Faculty Senate, they are ineligible to serve on FAC

**12:00-3:00** **Continuing Business**

FAC members voted to approve the minutes from the previous meeting

Several more campus reports were given

Shared governance visits are continuing despite several scheduling complications. Contact Dan Cavanagh or Cathy Ross with questions/concerns as you are planning your visit.

There are issues on campuses related to recruiting female faculty on to particular committees where diversity is preferred. FAC discussed that this is a symptom of a larger issues around women in the academic pipeline, and representation at higher levels in institutions. FAC discussed taking up the issue of maternity leave, which ties into the Chancellor’s Quantum Leap on gender diversity.

There are several issues for the Governance Committee to consider. RR 31006 on workload has been created and socialized among the Regents. FAC considered generating a model HOP policy based on the RR revision, but because of the diversity of campuses this was a difficult task. Dr. Leslie asked one of each of the three campus types to pilot HOP policies. Instead, best practices and essential elements that should be included in a new HOP will be developed by the Governance Committee and circulated, focusing on things that are possible that were not possible before (i.e. more autonomy in departments, importance of shared governance/stakeholder feedback). Dr. Leslie will present criteria against which their HOP will be judged, and the creation of these policies will be an iterative process.

Academic Affairs is working on a set of recommendations related to NTT faculty. This aspirational document/white paper could be followed by something that is issued by the Chancellor supporting this statement. The other academic affairs issue is UTS 182. This is a rule on whether department chairs have to have tenure, and we need a recommendation from the AA committee.

The Health Affairs Committee has made great progress in the study of physician burnout. A summit on the topic was held and well attended with the purpose of developing possible solutions. Health wellness focus groups have been initiated to gather qualitative data on this topic [see PPT for more details].

**3:00 – 5:00 Committee Meetings**

**Friday, October 6th**

Jonathan Cheng, Chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

The following FAC members were in attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Jonathan Cheng | Michael Riben |
| Daniel Cavanagh | Ann Killary |
| Tom Ingram | Lynne Hughes |
| Jody Jenson | George Carayannopoulos |
| Charlotte Canning | James Eldridge |
| Murray Leaf | Jessica Garrett |
| David Cordell | Emily Bonner |
| Elena Izquierdo | Joshua Thurow |
| Sandor Dorgo | Jeff Van Dermark |
| Gurur Biliciler-Denktas | Julie DeVahl |
| Ryan Quock | John Lamb |
| Ramon Cestero | Kouider Mokhtari |
| Suman Challa | Catherine Ross |
| Leo Holm | Dora Saavedra |
| Vijay Roa | Volker Questschke |
| David Coursey |  |

**8:00-8:30 Committee Reports**

**Health Affairs:** Suman Challa reported that the Health Affairs committee is working on a white paper related to physician burnout with specific suggestions for administration and best practice. The committee has a deadline of December 1st, with conference calls every two weeks led by various members of the group.

The group also discussed how they could support the “Stop the Bleed” campaign, leveraging UTS resources to support this work.

**Academic Affairs:** The Academic Affairs committee reviewed the most recent document from the AAUP and the SACS information and various articles/data about contingent faculty. Cathy Ross reported that new data show that 3 out of 4 new hires are NTT, and students who engage with NTTs at a 2-year college are less likely to go on to a 4-year program. The group is trying to connect these findings to student success, in particular the pillar of belonging. The committee also discussed the need to define some of the terminology (adjunct, contingent, etc.) and titles. The committee is interested in framing a white paper around student success, focusing on whether students are more successful when they interact with particular types of faculty, and the ways in which quality of instruction plays a role. The goal of the white paper, which is likely to be out in the next few months, will be to have some best practices in hiring and use of part time and full time contingent faculty. It will be a set of guidelines that is broad enough to be relevant to all academic, and potentially health, campuses. In the meantime they need to find out what all schools are doing in this regard at this time with titles and practice (i.e. Professors of Practice, etc.). The larger group discussed that this work may have larger implications for clinicians and health campuses, and this is a possible area for exploration.

**9:30-10:30 Tony Cucolo, Associate Vice Chancellor for Leadership and Veterans Affairs**

Tony Cucolo discussed how FAC has had a “series of wins” with the BOR and administration recently. The work that the FAC is doing has an impact on how Faculty Senates are perceived at campuses. He presented an overview of leadership and discussed a “toolkit” for leading peers. He discussed the need for leadership training at all levels, and the plan for leadership at four levels (American Leadership Program). He highlighted ideas about servant leadership for the good of the organization, how to identify and work towards desired outcomes, and “leader language” tips. He also discussed characteristics of the best leaders he has seen.

**10:00-11:00** **Dr. Rebecca Karoff, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**

Dr. Karoff gave an overview of the Texas Prospect Initiative and specifically the dual credit taskforce that has been formed. There are a number of other projects within this Initiative including the P16 summit that focuses on building relationships with community partners. The initiative is also interested in getting faculty and teachers at all levels talking to each other about how they deliver curriculum and outcomes. She said that the Chancellor is very focused on improving retention and graduation rates across the UTS. The work has been structured around 3 pillars (affinity groups have been formed for each and will deliver reports in December): belonging, finances, and advising. She discussed the Student Success Summit that was held in Dallas in September. The major takeaways from the campuses emphasized the role of faculty in student success. The BOR gave the Initiative $10 million to support this work, which (through a competitive process) was awarded to 6 applicants across 5 institutions. These campuses have very clear goals and assessment plans. System will measure success of the funded projects against the goals that were stated in the proposal. Dr. Karoff mentioned that we need new metrics for assessing these goals, and asked for suggestions as to how we might engage faculty in student success. The following suggestions were made:

* Faculty involvement in high schools and communities and faculty involvement in advising
* Faculty role in evaluating data
* Concerns with 75% of core classes being taught by contingent faculty
* Catch students who have financial difficulties before they leave, and utilize emergency grants/loans in these situations
* Encourage paradigm shifts among faculty towards student support
* Leverage information about HIPS
* Incorporate financial literacy into student coursework (banks have funding to provide these programs)
* Reward faculty for student success
* Culture at universities militates against achieving some of these goals – shift needs to come from leadership at UTS level
* Ensure that we are attending to NTT faculty and TT faculty and emphasis on excellence. Currently, this is defined as a focus on research, there should be an acknowledgement that effort should be put toward that
* Communications plan around the emergency funding – how can we ensure that faculty now about these things so that they can convey them to students?
	+ Communication is an essential element of shared governance, so it should be emphasized that this is important to the Chancellor and system
	+ Confrontational leadership can also help with this – raise the issue
* Follow through is also an issue
* Professional development for teaching is another way to improve belonging
* Utilize faculty who specialize in curriculum and pedagogy to lead these efforts

Dr. Karoff would like suggestions from FAC about how to design the 3rd Student Success Summit (topics, keynotes, etc.).

**11:00-12:00 David Troutman, Associate Vice Chancellor, Institutional Research & Decision Support**

Dr. Troutman presented findings from a dual credit study. He is seeking FAC’s perspective to include in the final report. Recently dual credit has increased 650%, including AP and IB. 91% of students at UT Austin come in with some credit. Dr. Troutman’s team did a mixed methods study to investigate dual credit. Over 500,000 courses have been transferred in from 132,000 students (ranging from 3-92 credits each). Some key findings and recommendations are:

* DC students are more likely to be retained and graduate (model gets stronger over years)
* Hours they bring in is not significantly correlated with retention, but it is correlated with 4 and 6 year graduation
* Qualitative data from students showed that students talked about soft skills (how to read a syllabus, expectations, time management, etc.) rather than content
* Though saving money was the second most reported reason for students to pursue dual credit, data show that bringing in credits does not translate to significant reductions in debt
* Students who accrued credit through both DC and IB/AP were more likely to succeed
* Faculty are concerned about quality and rigor, and the financial implications for the school
* In 80% of the courses offered students are making an A or B (grade inflation?)
* Faculty are rewarded for passing students through

There were many questions from the FAC, some of which centered on the causal claims made in the presentation. Dr. Troutman’s report will be sent to members of FAC for review and input. FAC members emphasized that it is important to get this information out to faculty as soon as possible.

**12:00-1:00 Dr. Steven Leslie, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dr. Kevin Lemoine, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**

Dr. Leslie stated that the RR 31006 change related to workload is on the Regents’ docket for November. He said that the intent of the changes to the rule were to protect faculty time and commitment to advancing the institution. In response to the concern that the policy could be used to overload faculty, Dr. Lemoine suggested that we come up with a set of guidelines or best practices in implementation. Dr. Leslie said that we could work campus by campus on putting initiatives into the HOP. Another concern related to clarifying which campuses are affected by the rule change was raised. Dr. Leslie indicated that medical schools on academic campuses would be but that medical campuses would not. Dr. Leslie suggested that his office speak with colleagues on the health affairs side to uncover possibilities. Dr. Leslie emphasized that student success is at the forefront for UTS and his office. FAC raised the concern that student success is not valued in faculty evaluations. Dr. Leslie said that the workload policy allows for flexibility in this regard so that the strong teachers and strong researchers, while focusing on different things, collectively move the organization forward. Another concern was raised related to the perception that the perception from the state is often that faculty members do not work hard. This may contribute to a difficult sell in terms of the revised rule. Dr. Leslie indicated that data show that faculties far exceed the 18-hour minimum, and this can be used to illustrate the need for this policy. Dr. Cheng asked Dr. Leslie to speak about NTT faculty. Dr. Leslie said that he thinks that NTT faculty are essential to the mission, and some of the most effective and strategic educational leaders. He said that there should be a clear place for NTT’s institutional voice on decisions as all levels. Appropriate titles are also important to this mission. Dr. Leslie raised a question about what teaching excellence looks like, and how this might change over the course of one’s career.

**1:00 Updates on ongoing work**

Emily Bonner gave an update on the dual credit taskforce that Wanda Mercer is leading. She met with the team in September and worked with the program quality group. There are two more meetings scheduled – one in October and one in November. Dan Cavanagh will be attending the P16 summit in October. Those who went to the Student Success Summit will put together a list of recommendations from that meeting. Dr. Cheng discussed UTS 189 on institutional conflict of interest. He said that he is still not satisfied with the way the interest committees will be structures and there is no mechanism for reviewing contracts before they are executed. FAC also discussed UTS 182, which addresses academic positions and mandates that a department chair has to hold a tenured position. There is proposed language that we have been asked to review and provide input on:

*Under special circumstances, qualifications, experience, an/or other factors may warrant consideration of a non-tenured faculty member to hold the position of department chair, subject to the approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.*

Suggestions:

* Distinguish between non-tenured and NTT faculty. If a non-tenured TT faculty member serves in this position, he/she is not focused on research or other activities that will help him/her to obtain tenure. Also, they would be chair over people who will eventually be deciding their tenure case.
* This policy may conflict with tenure issues. For example, chairs write tenure letters to the dean and they have to equal or exceed the status of the person who is being reviewed.
* There are other implications for academic quality and the erosion of tenure
* This policy may affect medical campuses differently (leaders would have to be brought in from outside) though this policy only applies to academic
* NTT would make more sense, though this could create a conflict of interest since administrators are deciding on their contract renewal

Ultimately, FAC did not recommend that this change be made in relation to academic campuses. FAC did agree that this may be appropriate for medical campuses in relation to clinical faculty. The conversation was tabled.

**1:45 Governance Committee Report**

Dora Saavedra said that the governance committee worked on providing a set of guidelines for how to implement RR31006 at the campus level. Some of the highlights of this discussion:

* Change the word “maximize” to eliminate possibility of exploitation of policy
* Section 3.1 – this is where we need to talk about shared governance philosophy, define “academic workload” in the broadest sense of the word, emphasize quality instruction, maximum course load of 24 units
* Section 4.3 – supervision of doc students, practicums, etc.
* Section 4.4 – has been used to exploit lecturers with no additional compensation, needs to be discussion of professional ethics related to this, also discuss maternity issue but may need to be separate
* Section 4.5 – include faculty teaching quality or fostering faculty success in teaching
* University service definition or example so that is valued and put on the forefront of their minds, workload may fluctuate over a faculty’s career, equitable consideration of workload in consultation with faculty (not only available to select few), support faculty professional development
* Committee would look at quality of instruction

Dr. Cathy Ross and Dr. Dan Cavanagh presented an overview of initial findings from the campus shared governance visits. They gave an overview of what happened at each visit. Overall, the visits have been a good experience for the team and a report if forthcoming.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.