Meeting was called to order by Dr. Suman Challa, Chair – Faculty Senate

- Dr. Challa briefly discussed the process for each committee chair for presenting their assignments. Senate members would have an open group discussion; present resolutions to act upon or not with a vote at the end of the session.

Academic Affairs Committee – Presented by Dr. Anand Prasad

- Test taking facility - all schools are impacted by not having an appropriate facility for test taking or a location that would accommodate testing.
  - Senator member discussions included: What are schools currently doing? Current accommodations for exams/testing take place in the library cubicles. Typical institutions have places for testing, the Health Science Center does not. As enrollment increases, more and more students are needing accommodations. Institutions should have a standard area where tests can be administered. The computer labs that did exist within the institution have been slowly eliminated. Now is a good time to explore what other institutions are doing. What costs are involved and who pays for the testing center – perhaps the institution? Are student fees a possibility? In some cases, testing is becoming a burden as proctors are needed to oversee testing; in some cases, must coordinate among faculty to proctor in addition to teaching responsibilities.
  - Senators are in agreement that the lack of an official testing center is an issue to be addressed for all schools. The testing area/facility should be one that does not require proctoring by a faculty member and one that would accommodate ADA students as well. The Senate should inquire about UTSA’s testing center and what other institutions may have.
  - Resolution – The Senate resolved to request that the Administration investigate the potential for having a centralized testing center for the University that would also meet ADA and learning disability requirements.

- Upward Evaluation Review of Academic Administrators
  - Currently faculty/teaching staff are evaluated by residents and students. There is no true faculty input on how division chiefs and department chairs are performing. Could survey instruments be developed to evaluate academic administrators on a regularly scheduled basis, which could help inform the President and the Deans during the performance evaluation process?
  - Senators asked for clarification about the current evaluative process and whether school leaders are following the HOP processes.
  - Senators encouraged the Officers to bring this topic to their meeting with the President.
  - Resolution – The Senate resolves to research how other universities manage the evaluation process. The Academic Affairs Committee will take the lead on reviewing practices at other institutions, and the Chair of the Senate will solicit input from the UT System Faculty Advisory Council. In moving forward, two framing questions are: Will the evaluation process move us forward and make our institution better? The process of evaluation should be one to make us a better institution and help academic administrators become better leaders.
- Non-Compete Provisions
  - Non-compete provisions are recent phenomena, and they are viewed as differentially impacting younger faculty, inhibiting their ability to move. There are also inconsistent parameters for non-compete clauses: some may limit practice to a 5-mile radius of the UT practice site and others to a 75-mile radius geographic area. Senators noted there were also different formulas for buy-outs.
  - Resolution – The Senate resolves to propose that non-competes be more uniform and equal. Or remove all together. It is about faculty well-being. Will it make the institution better? Will it hurt the institution or make it lose leverage? What is the official policy? This item tabled until there is more time for review.

Faculty Status Welfare Committee – Presented by Dr. Ricky Joseph
- Discussion centered on the recently conducted AAMC Faculty survey and accessing the survey results. Should Faculty Senate see the results or should it be the responsibility of only Administration. Senators agreed that the survey results should be seen by Faculty Senate at the same time as the Administration since the survey can provide information on how faculty are doing and how they can be empowered.
- Developing a Faculty Senate faculty recognition plan by the Faculty Senate.
  - This can be recognition of faculty at a web site or at a Faculty Senate meeting. At present, there is one faculty award for the University. Suggestions were made to have two Faculty Senate awards for each school, or potentially, because the School of Medicine is larger, 4 awards for the School of Medicine. It is recognized that Administration plays an important role and are partners and empower the faculty. It is recommended that the Administration award be granted at the institutional level.

Committee on Committees (CoC) – Presented by Dr. Norma Partida
- Merger of CoC with Faculty Senate
  - The CoC is a university committee and referenced in the HOP. Faculty and staff are identified to fill positions in standing committees. An issue to address is about merging CoC unto the Faculty Senate because many universities operate in this way. It was agreed to merge the CoC with the Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate bylaw changes will need to be approved by the Senate and the institution; HOP changes will also be required.
  - Resolution – The Senate will seek a merger of the University’s Committee on Committees as a component of the work of the Faculty Senate.
- Faculty Compensation Discussion
  - The Faculty Senate discussed the membership of the Faculty Compensation and Advisory Committee and may consider recommending changes to the President and Chief Operating Officer.
- Faculty Mentoring
  - Dr. Partida suggested the possibility of creating a standing committee for faculty mentoring. Senators agreed that this would be valuable, with each school having mentors for new faculty to offer guidance, mentor on items such as the PTAC process and teaching. Senators agreed to devote more time at the next meeting on this topic.
Faculty Governance Committee – Presented by Dr. Danet Lapiz-Bluhm

- The Senate members were provided with information as mandated by the UT System and identified responsibilities that the Faculty Senate could undertake.
  - Define UT Health Science Center’s shared governance as mandated by UT System.
  - Recommend establishment of a faculty retention program. A faculty retention committee should be formed to explore ways to improve retention & increase faculty vitality.
  - Define and implement a faculty grievance process
  - The Senate agreed to devote more time to discuss these issues at the next meeting.

At the end of the meeting, Dr. Challa honored Dr. Pounds with a gift for her contribution to the Faculty Senate and for being instrumental in bringing the group together.