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Meeting Minutes

**Thursday, September 3- ASH 208**

Dr. Ann Killary, Chair called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00am.

The following members were in attendance:

Alton, Suzanne Brown, Jubilee Burns, Cheryl Cavanagh, Dan Cheng, Jonathan Cordell, David Cox, Marc Dass, Karen Deschenes, Beth Eldridge, James Gore, Andrea Griffith, David Heise, Elizabeth Hernandez, Jill Ingram, Tom Izquierdo, Elena Izzo, Julie Jensen, Jody Killary, Ann Koukl, Jim Kovalik, Gae Leaf, Murray Marshak, David Molony, Don Morgan, Bobbette Pounds, Lori Ross, Catherine Saavedra, Dora Sereno, Anne Sol, Antoinette Walker, David

**Introductions and Review of August BOR Meeting**

Update from the last spring FAC Meeting. Chair Ann Killary informed the representatives that this year she decided to provide a written report to the BOR as well as the oral presentation at the August BOR meeting. She also invited the co-chairs of the standing committees of the FAC to sit at the BOR table and participate in the FAC report. The FAC group reporting to the Board of Regents included the chairs of Health Affairs, Governance and Academic Affairs in addition the chair, past chair and past-past chair.

FAC reported on what we accomplished during the past academic year and added our main focus and priorities for the 2015-2016 academic year. Our priorities for the upcoming year are:

* Shared Governance-We will identify the various forms and mechanisms of governance on each campus, then we will identify best practices. Our goal is to enhance and support shared governance on all of our campuses;
* Research Success -We will look at current support for faculty research and examine new grant opportunities to support faculty in the System in both academic and health institutions. We need to integrate and support our new units;
* Core Curriculum-there has been an increase in dual credits that students bring with them when they enter UT. Some issues have arisen from this increase. We need to identify where students are earning their core credentials, whether dual credit programs are helping or hindering student progress, and identify successes and difficulties. This study should aid us in our mission to prepare students with a broad base of knowledge and skills to continue on with their studies. We will work with David Troutman from Strategic Initiatives on this study.

Regents 90101- IP issues were discussed. Chair Killary explained that we were not included on the task force looking at revising the regents’ rule for whatever reason. The lack of faculty participation is of great concern. The FAC executive committee contacted Chancellor McRaven with our concerns about our exclusion and potential unintended consequences. We are now scheduled to participate in the implementation and writing of the System model policy. A new industry friendly preamble and student intellectual property rights were added as a section at the end that allowed UTS institutions to hold equity interest in companies. There is still work to be done on the role of the creator, authorship, timeline, and implementation.

[POSTPONED: Approval of minutes of meeting of April 2015 and Strategic Planning ]

**Presentation: Dr. David Troutman, Director for Strategic Initiatives** **(and Jessica Shedd).**

Dr. Troutman gave an overview of his office, the types of data they capture and their mission to transform meaningful data into information to support the System’s mission. The presentation was distributed to the FAC representatives. One of the areas that Dr. Troutman and his team are studying is the impact of different pathways to student success (part time students, working students and what adjustments are needed to accommodate a student body with significantly different profile from traditional student bodies. They are looking to develop a way to account for different student pipelines. His office is working with a technical group from each campus to develop metrics. They are looking at predictive vs. actual graduation rates, controlling for a number of factors. A discussion was held on the importance of various factors such as socio-economic level.

Q. Can we look at economic data post graduation to figure success based on their working status?

Dr. Troutman stated that working on campus has a positive effect on graduation rates. However we don’t know how many hours students work and we don’t know the threshold where positive becomes a negative. We are missing some info. We don’t have the occupation but we know the industry and earnings from the CB. That info is not available. We have quarterly earnings and industry. Those are the two pieces of info that we do have.

Representatives had questions regarding unpaid internships and transfer students (they do not ever register as having graduated-students who start in a community college are not tracked). Dr. Troutman explained that they were trying to figure out how to deal with that information. He explained that one way of looking at this factor is to look at Semester Credit Hour (SCH) consumption compared to how long it takes to graduate. He suggested that a student taking eight years to degree at 120 hours and a student earning a degree in four years at 120 hours should be counted as student success. One student is not consuming university resources more than the other. We need to develop the transfer area. The transfer student rate varies enormously campus to campus. Up to 60% of students are transfers. We are figuring out a way to account for this.

Possible Research Collaboration: In an effort to ensure student success, we need to identify and assess the methods by which the student receives the Core and its correlation with graduation rates. We focus on three areas: writing, reading and mathematical skills. We need to look at course sequencing—how successful are students negotiating the series of courses. We have found that students taking course sequence on campus do better than those coming in with the core from outside.

Discussion on areas to be studied, the unequal level and quality of dual credit courses, course rotation, classification (a freshman can enter as a junior, for example), college readiness, risk factors for students coming in with dual credit, and the identification of pathways to failure as well as the pathways to success.

**Dr. Steve Leslie, Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs and Dr. Kevin Lemoine, Associate Vice Chancellor**

Introduction: He considers himself a member of the faculty (on extended leave to administration). His goal is to support faculty. He pointed out that there is not a university without faculty and that faculty nurture and change students’ lives. Our nation is what it is now is due to the high quality of education across the nation. He stressed the importance of technology but only in partnership with faculty and from a foundational standpoint, faculty is at the center of the educative enterprise. He is a neuroscientist- institutional aspect is neuroscience (history of neuroscience). In his experience those programs that brought faculty and students together and recognized the importance of the student-teacher relationship were the most successful. As provost from 2007-2013, he found that the way to support and advance institutions was to support faculty. Dr. Leslie commented on the strong staff at system who are committed to educational mission and the institutions.

He commented on the recent good legislative session and that he was working with the regents on the elaboration of a plan (white paper) for tuition increases. All the units of UT are lagging behind peer institutions in faculty support. The presidents were asked to generate campus level needs.

Dr. Leslie introducedAssociate Vice ChancellorKevin Lemoine, who is working on challenges and solutions to annual faculty reviews and post-tenure or comprehensive review. The report is due to the Board of Regents in May. A group met to discuss issues and write recommendations. There are four recommendations:

1. Add model policy categories into Regents rules- Add definitions into the rules.
2. Add statement about comprehensive review combined with peer review.
3. Add annual reviews to comprehensive reviews in the report for the Board of regents.
4. Show the extent that the annual review lines up with the comprehensive review.

**Discussion**:

Q- Some units have definitions for categories already. Would these replace campus definitions?

A. Yes, if Regents’ rules define the categories then they would replace existing campus policies.

Q. The model policy is more flexible and adaptable to each campus. What is the problem, what is broken and that needs to get fixed? We already follow the policy…

A. There wasn’t one motive.

Q. Who was on the workgroup?

A. Provosts and Deans from various campuses.

Q. the comprehensive review is independent of the annual reviews on some campuses. What is the impact that this will have on grievance procedures?

A. Really? Is this true? Any apparent discrepancy triggers an explanation. This is already in the rules right now. Single score doesn’t provide enough nuance.

Q. Who is reading this?

A. Academic Affairs Committee of Board of Regents will hear the recommendations.

FAC needs to provide input on these new changes to regents rule. Work on this issue is scheduled for the November meeting.

Discussion on dual credit and proposed study of Core Curriculum:

Dr. Lemoine informed FAC that there were other groups working on this as well such as Brent Iverson at UT Austin and schools that participate in LEAP initiative-coming out of American Association of Schools. He emphasized that this is of core importance and that we need to understand how we should proceed and do the right thing for students and families and maximize student success. He pointed to the student side of the question that drives large numbers and maximizes access and completion and our responsibility to Texas and the nation to stand firm to deliver an acceptable outcome. Early college high schools–interaction with community college–is beneficial as long as we maintain quality and standards.

**Dr. Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor Health Affairs (via VC)**

The transition with Dr. Leslie creates an opportunity to bridge the sort of firewall between the science and academic campuses. This is critical for two new medical schools. First time both units are united in Texas and there are advantages and disadvantages. Dr. Leslie and Dr. Greenberg (former president and former provost) bring a complementary perspective on emerging issues.

Dr. Greenberg spoke about the chancellor’s strategic planning process that he plans to roll it out in November. We will soon hear Chancellor’s agenda and the five areas of importance. One issue is leadership (he wants system to be leaders in leadership). How do we develop a leadership skill set among faculty to be effective? For those who move into administrative positions, how do we prepare them to be effective leaders? Another issue is diversity (a number of units are leaders in some areas but there are areas in which we could improve). A third is area is student success (undergraduate education particularly). On the health side- how do we manage large and somewhat independent institutions to make a collective impact on health in Texas? How do we work collectively? UT System recruited Dr. Lakey in H. A. office to advance this on mental health. We are already planning interdisciplinary group meetings (psychiatry chairs met for the first time as a group for example) to move forward.

Discussion- FAC’s priorities dovetail with those of the Chancellor. Each of the campuses is taking care of underserved populations. We need a unified access to UT institution (medical) and a unified record system. This was proposed this a few years ago.

A- We only scratched the surface of what we should and can do in collaboration.

Q. The separation that the academic and Health campuses should not be. We should address student issues together.

A- It is fostered by our institutional structure. The arrival of Dr. Leslie will remedy this somewhat. Bureaucratic structure should not impede collaboration and we have the momentum now and should build on it.

Dr. Greenberg stated that Tony Cucolo was essentially brought here to address leadership and that he has extensive experience in this. He has been side tracked to some extent by the strategic plan. But he has plans for a broad-based program to reach those who want to move into leadership roles or simply learn the skills.

Some collaborations exist between the academic and health sides of UT but not extensive enough and with unequal success.

In response to a question about research grants, Dr. Greenberg said that UT will work with FAC on specific suggestions and suggested that we contact Dr. Hurn to find out where they are on the same topic. UT will develop a proposal to bring to the legislators along the idea that all institutions will put their weight behind a broad based extensive initiative.

Discussion on Intellectual Property and problems inherent in the system:

Discussion on the Texas increasing investment in national recruitment from national academies: There is also a need to invest in faculty already here as well as in new junior faculty.

Discussion on faculty governance initiative: The recent growth and maturation of the Faculty Senate at UT MD Anderson is encouraging. There is work to be done as faculty governance is highly variable and idiosyncratic across institutions–one size does not fit all. It would be helpful to have baseline information of how it is working now. What is the structure, where is it shared, or not shared, for example? We need to create organizational structures that ensure elected faculty membership or inclusion.

Dr. Greenberg said that we need to make sure that the leadership on campuses values faculty input. The faculty recommendations need to be timely. Quick expedited thinking is crucial in a business environment and this has to bubble up from below. There are confidentiality issues as well.

**Edward P. Mattison, Chief Information Security Officer**

Edward Mattison, who recently retired as a Colonel after 24 years as an Army information systems officer, was appointed as the Chief Information Security Officer of The University of Texas System in August 2015. He served two assignments as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at the United States Military Academy at West Point cyber security research. His publications center around how to use tech for engineering education. Faculty have to have the knowledge to enable and protect business, and to promote good information security positively. Usually data leakage or breaches are most often not malice but user error. For example the recent incident at MD Anderson was not malicious, but unknowing error instead. He will visit all campuses within the next six weeks. The first thing that will come down as an area of concern: mobile device management. These are for the most part privately owned devices with 100% connection with no protection. We have to find a way to protect data and offer the faculty a way to keep info protected.

**Campus Reports- (posted on FAC website)**

**Committee Meetings, ASH 202, 208, and 210**

CHARGES:

* Academic Affairs and Faculty Quality (ASH 208)
	+ Core Curriculum
* Health Affairs (ASH 202)-
	+ Research Grants
	+ IP Issue (Make a list of suggestions for Patricia Hearn)
	+ Salary Equity of Women
	+ Post tenure review
* Governance (ASH 210)
	+ IP Issue RR
	+ UTS 124
	+ Shared Governance

**Friday, September 4 – ASH 208**

Dr. Ann Killary, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 8:30am.

The following members were in attendance:

Alton, Suzanne Brown, Jubilee Burns, Cheryl Cavanagh, Dan Cheng, Jonathan Cordell, David Cox, Marc Dass, Karen Deschenes, Beth Eldridge, James Gore, Andrea Griffith, David Heise, Elizabeth Hernandez, Jill Ingram, Tom Izquierdo, Elena Izzo, Julie Jensen, Jody Killary, Ann Koukl, Jim Kovalik, Gae Leaf, Murray Marshak, David Molony, Don Morgan, Bobbette Pounds, Lori Ross, Catherine Saavedra, Dora Sereno, Anne Sol, Antoinette Walker, David

*Campus Reports, cont*.

Committee Meetings **ASH 202, 208, and 210**

**Academic Affairs and Faculty Quality (ASH 208)-** Met with Dr. David Troutman, Director for Strategic Initiatives and our goal is to run data analysis at system level. We will focus on “quick wins".

* Dual credit students vs. native 1st time students
* GPAs at years 1, 2 and 3
* Credit hours consumption
* How many times change major

This is a multiple year project. We plan to take into account selection bias- socioeconomic factors need to be taken into account in addition to dual credit and majors and use Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) info.

If anyone has a research question that has not been mentioned, please send to David Cordell or Jill Hernandez.

**Resolution: The UT System Faculty Advisory Council supports the Chancellor¹s efforts to develop a multidimensional success metric beyond the 4-6 year graduation rate for campuses.**

* Motion of committee
* Date: 9/4/15
* From: Academic Affairs
* Outcome: Unanimously in favor
* Send to: Drs. Leslie, Greeburg , cc. Chancellor McRaven

**Health Affairs (ASH 202)**

Problems IP:

* Inadequate resources to file patents
* Procedural barriers- time to approval/decision
* Insufficient incentives to inventor
* Introduce timeline
* Identify additional resources needed to process IP in timely manner or return to creator
* Clarification on works of authorship.
* Identify Categories that might be exempt

Problem in inequities of salaries between institutions- three institutions are currently looking at the issue: UT Houston, UTMB and MD Anderson. In Houston, there are equal numbers of men and women on the faculty, but at the assistant and associate levels women make 30% less, on average. Women are not well represented at the professor level and they make relatively less. Things are better at UTMB and MDACC, however. We learned about experts there who have begun to address the disparities, and we will consult with them on their findings. We will request data on UT institutions system-wide and report back next time.

**Grants**-

The committee revised plans for small grants from UT System to faculty from both academic and health campuses. The grants will support research on any topic, like the ARP grants from the THECB in years past. Funding will be based on the merit of the proposal, but extra consideration will be given to applications: 1) from junior faculty, 2) collaborations between UT institutions, 3) proposing interdisciplinary research, and 3) involving students in research. The committee proposes to name these "Career Development Awards" Criteria

* Proposal merit,
* Collaboration,
* Interdisciplinary,
* Student participation,
* Junior faculty

**RESOLUTION: The UTSFAC supports fully the efforts of the Chancellor and Governor Abbott to increase the number of National Academy members and Nobel laureates in UTS. In addition to these outstanding recruits, UTSFAC would like to investigate additional mechanisms to support our existing faculty. Nationally, we are experiencing perhaps the most difficult of times for research funding. Our faculty, who have made our institutions great, no longer have adequate mechanisms to support their research. Along with declining research support is a concomitant decline in indirect costs to the university and in some cases, a decrease in expenditures on research administrative support, as well as infrastructure and IT support. We would also like to work closely with UTS to identify ways to improve and better integrate research, infrastructure and IT throughout UTS.**

* Motion of committee
* Date: 9/4/15
* From: Health Affairs
* Outcome: Unanimously in favor
* Send to: Drs. Leslie, Greenberg , cc. Chancellor McRaven
* Governance (ASH 210)
* Nothing to act upon. The committee is in the planning and gathering information stages on charges. The goal is to have something concrete to act upon by the end of the year. We request information from each campus. Inquire from each senate chair provide a synopsis of what is working well and not so well in each campus. Send in response by the end of November or beginning of December.

Discussion on UTS 124 with regard to background check: Feedback request on UTS 124 from Dan Sharphorn. How does the policy work on all the campuses? He needs it by end of semester.

**Mr. Tony Cucolo, Associate Vice Chancellor for Leadership Dev. & Veterans Affairs -Strategic Assessment**

Presentation and introduction **(Presentation was shared with FAC)**

Mr. Cucolo spoke about Chancellor McRaven’s Leadership initiative and his view that positive effective leaders can affect society. The encouragement of the desire to serve, the acquisition of leadership skills and leadership development are integral to this initiative. Mr. Cucolo will be visiting all the campuses to consult faculty. He wants to know the situation with respect to leadership and leadership development for faculty and students on each campus, asses what is going on, on campuses already and identify existing leadership courses or see if existing courses be adapted. The chancellor plans to establish a leadership institute-brick and mortar institute and center for leadership excellence.

Suggestions from FAC:

* Add peer leadership development
* Better admin support (secretarial, tech) for faculty senates
* Importance of graduate student leadership development
* New institutions: importance to establish a culture that encourages service leadership.
* Career development oriented around Research— suggests a three area promotion system that includes service along with research and teaching.
* Include UT workforce balance in strategic plan
* Health and care of workforce

Veteran Affairs is an area of development in the chancellor’s plan. We are to set and resource appropriate levels of support for student success for those students who are veterans and address the needs of employees who are veterans. Mr. Cucolo will serve as System-level advocate for ROTC programs and liaison for Defense related initiatives.

Mr. Cucolo spoke about the dual nature of leadership in UT System. The first is strategic: lead the system to support the state of Texas and the second is stewardship of the institution. See presentation for more details.

**Dr. Patricia Hurn, Vice Chancellor, Health Affairs** –

Dr. Hurn discussed the recent vote on RR 90101 on Intellectual Property. She briefly detailed the changes coming out of the taskforce: a preamble was added with emphasis on promoting partnerships, encouraging innovation, fostering economic development and added language on community engagement. Other changes were in Sec. 11.5 on the reimbursement of licensing costs (previously 50/50) to a wider spread 30-50 (inventor)/50-70 (institution/system). This would take into consideration team inventions and accommodate multiple creators (Team Science).

The next step is to write the UTS 125 on IP and a model HOP. The stakeholders will have a role in this and write it together. Dr. Hurn requests the names of two to three FAC representatives to work on the model HOP.

Q- What about authorship?

A: RR does not deal with copyright completely. This remains to be established.

We need to study how to deal with IP and educational technologies.

Q- What are the possibilities in putting in specifics in the model HOP?

A: Yes, we can specify if X, then Y type to make sure that the various parties involved.

Q: Given the types and numbers of IP disclosures, from a practical standpoint significant resources will be needed to deal with massive IP claims.

A: Different things will be looked at and we can spell his out in the Model HOP and to whom. If you have a set of offices that are not resourced enough to serve their constituency, then we will need to know what resources are in these offices and what functions do they choose to do. What resources are needed to accomplish their mission? Faculty, students and community are stakeholders or audience.

Q- The main concern we had and cause for 11th hour appeal had to do with the IP Definition and the inclusion of “any work of authorship” being IP. This would cause a huge increase in number of cases.

A- There is a shadow system in existence in effect on campus independent of RR. All systems need flow and continuity. The Task force needs to go through each of these procedures and rationalized with RR.

Q- A suggestion is to take out work of authorship?

A: RR can be modified. Look at section on copyright. The Board of Regents does not assert ownership of copyright. Sec 7 is subject to 12 but not to section 2 (Copyright) (i.e. Sec 7 is freestanding to whatever is set out in preamble). There is a pretty large stack of policies that do not match. We have to look at this. The field or mode of authorship is changing rapidly. Shared governance should have a role in the writing the process. A member of the FAC, should be included on any future taskforce duties.

Comment: Creation and authorship are faculty duties.

Suggestion from Dr. Hurn: put together a special interest group to be involved in UTS and model HOP.

Q: The new RR addressed the output barrier: handoff between system and commercializing entity. Spontaneous generation of copyright generates input barriers. Procedural issues predate the new RR.

A: The previous regents rules were not clear, not helpful to move commercialization forward. We need to do this.

Q: What are your asks: rep on taskforce, interest group? What is the practical number that could participate in writing group crafting the UTS and HOP policy?

Dr. Hurn’s “asks"

* UTS/HOP crafting
* Reviewers and commenters on assessment of campus OTCs
* Membership on IP Task Force
* Membership on Copyright/Ed Tech assessment process and recommendations

Suggestions from FAC: Time to process is too long. We need to set some expectation of how long something takes to move through the process. A time baseline in the HOP.

A: These need to be made in form of recommendations

Q: There is a real problem with patents that sit in the office. Faculty are told that they have to be the brokers for their patents.

Chair Killary-I heard the recommendation that we try and work with Dr. Hurn. This is an ongoing process. We have been added to a list that we didn’t know existed, but we have been added and that is important to move forward. We can come back to RR if we find that our interests are not being met. The exec board will work on the membership on these committees.

Meeting Adjourned: 1:50pm