

DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR 2015-2016

Following are the minutes of the General Faculty meeting of Monday, January 25, 2016.



Hillary Hart, Secretary
General Faculty

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR 2015-2016

The regular meeting of the General Faculty for the academic year 2015-16 was held on Monday, January 26, 2015, at 2:15 p.m. in the Main Building, Room 212. President Gregory L. Fenves presided over the meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Secretary Hillary Hart (distinguished senior lecturer, civil, architectural, and environmental engineering) asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. Since there were none, she called for a vote to approve the minutes as posted. The minutes of the 2014-15 regular meeting of the General Faculty, which was held on January 26, 2015 ([D 12993-12999](#)), were unanimously approved by voice vote.

II. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL, 2014-2015.

President Fenves said the annual report could be found in the documents of the General Faculty pages 13084-13115. He asked Secretary Hart to present the report and lead the discussion. The secretary gave a quick summary of the 2014-15 academic year and actions of the Faculty Council, which included the completion of twenty-three memorial resolutions, and twenty-seven pieces of general legislation were considered by the Faculty Council and received final approval from UT System or the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. In 2014-15, a special meeting of the General Faculty was called to consider the proposed Thanksgiving Break, which was among three items classified as major legislation that received final approval from UT System. Concluding her report, the secretary noted that five Standing Committees of the General Faculty had presented reports to the Faculty Council in the past academic year. There was no discussion.

III. COMMENTS BY AND QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

President Fenves announced that three questions had been received from faculty in advance of the meeting, all related to Campus Carry. He said that he would defer those questions to the Faculty Council meeting, which would meet immediately following the General Faculty meeting. He then welcomed any non-Campus Carry questions. Hearing none, President Fenves said General Faculty members were welcome to stay for the Faculty Council meeting and make comments or ask questions at that time.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS—None.**V. REPORTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY, COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS, AND COMMITTEES.****A. Committee to Nominate a Candidate for Secretary of the General Faculty.**

Faculty Council Chair Andrea C. Gore (professor, pharmacy and committee chair) reported that the committee recommended Secretary Hart as the sole nominee for secretary “based on her extraordinary performance and all the work she has already been doing as the secretary of the General Faculty. Hillary Hart rose to the top.”

Also serving on the nomination committee were Drs. William Beckner (2014-15 chair, mathematics), Jody L. Jensen (2015-16 chair elect, kinesiology and health education), Coleman

Hutchison (English), Maria G. Juenger (civil, architectural, and environmental engineering), Kerry A. Kinney (civil, architectural, and environmental engineering), and Lauren A. Meyers (integrative biology).

VI. NEW BUSINESS.

A. Election of the Secretary of the General Faculty.

President Fenves asked if there were any nominations for secretary from the floor. Since there were no other nominations, he called for the vote. Dr. Hart was unanimously elected to serve through August 31, 2017. President Fenves thanked her for her dedicated service saying, “It has been a pleasure to work with you, especially over the past couple of years.”

B. Discussion on Changing the Criteria Used to Determine the Voting Members of the General Faculty in the *Handbook of Operating Procedures* 2-1010 and 2-1020.

Opening her remarks about proposed changes to the criteria used to determine voting members of the General Faculty, Dr. Hart said that changes to the voting rights of faculty members had been on and off the table many times over the past few years. She explained that the Faculty Rules and Governance Committee wanted the criteria to be more inclusive of non-tenure track faculty members whose primary professional home is UT Austin and who teach at least 50% of the time. Dr. Hart said, “It seems to me that non-tenured track faculty who contributes significantly and over time to the teaching mission of The University of Texas at Austin should have equal voting rights, at least on academic polices and welfare regardless of title.” She pointed out one of the issues the committee had run up against was that titles are not used uniformly across campus, one example being clinical faculty. In the College of Pharmacy alone, there were eighty clinical assistant professors, sixteen clinical associate professors, and six clinical professors, none of whom were currently eligible to vote. See [Appendix A](#), slide 4 for additional data on the number of clinical faculty by college.

Professor Gore commented on the positive impact the proposed changes would have in the College of Pharmacy. She said that she had solicited feedback from colleagues in her college and asked those present to indulge her while she read some of the statements she had received.

Dr. Bryson M. Duhon (clinical assistant professor) wrote:

As a clinical faculty member, I participate in the education of our students all across our curriculum. I currently teach more than thirty hours of didactic lectures in six different required and elective courses, in addition to presenting twelve students on an adult medicine rotation during their 4th year. I am also actively involved in research, currently involved in many service positions; they are vital to the health of the college as a whole. I believe that not giving faculty, like myself, who are 100% paid by the University voting rights sends the wrong message in regards to our importance.

Professor Gore quoted another colleague who she said had won many, many teaching awards in the College of Pharmacy.

Dr. Laurajo Ryan (clinical associate professor):

We teach the bulk of the clinical curriculum in the College of Pharmacy, both in didactic and experiential areas. Last year alone, I had thirty-eight TLU’s. As a clinical faculty member in this COP, College of Pharmacy, I am 100% committed to the University and as such should have full voting rights.”

Dr. Gore noted that many of the non-tenure track faculty members in her college who had originally been categorized as lecturers lost their voting rights when they were reclassified as clinical professors because “it seemed more appropriate to the clinical profession.”

Dr. Hart clarified that most clinical faculty working in the Dell Medical School would be Seton employees and consequently would have zero-time appointments with the University and would not fit the criteria. Having talked with Dr. Susan Cox (executive vice dean for academics, Dell Medical School), Dr. Hart said that over the next couple of years, the medical school would likely

hire some clinical faculty in their departments, but it was projected that only 20% of those would meet the proposed criteria. She further explained that the Faculty Rules and Governance Committee would have a review process to address any non-tenure track faculty member—clinical or lecturer—who felt they ought to have been included as a voting member of the General Faculty but were excluded.

Dean M. Lynn Crismon (pharmacy) spoke in favor of the proposed criteria saying, “Quite frankly we couldn’t function without clinical faculty.” He said that for eighteen years, the college had been working to create a career track for clinical faculty and had developed promotion criteria as well as appointment criteria at each one of the ranks. He clarified that these faculty members’ primary contribution had to be UT Austin and be at least halftime and tied to an instructional budget. He explained that under the college’s criteria, clinical faculty must have excellence in teaching, and be evaluated as “excellent and innovative” in one of the other two areas, either scholarship or service. He noted that the college had been successful in getting non-tenure track faculty to submit for promotion. Consequently, it now has three clinical professors where as a few years ago there were none. He remarked:

They vote on all college matters according to our faculty by-laws. They serve on committees; they chair committees; they bring in research grants; they write papers; they write books. In every sense that you can think of, they are faculty of our College of Pharmacy. And for them to not have full voting rights at the University really treats them like second-class citizens and that shouldn’t be the message that we try to send to people who contribute to the instructional, the scholarship, and the service to this University.

Professor Larry Abraham (kinesiology and health education and School of Undergraduate Studies) echoed Dean Crismon’s remarks. He said that ten years ago when he chaired the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, in an effort to recognize contributions of non-tenure track faculty members whose assignments were to work with future teachers, it was decided that it would be more appropriate to call them clinical assistant, clinical associate, or clinical professor with the rank representing their term of service and levels of service both in teaching and for many, in scholarship. He stated that by reclassifying them, the faculty members were stripped of their voting rights, which was an unforeseen and unfortunate consequence.

Professor Abraham pointed out that early on, the term clinical was used more in the health profession, but now, there is a move across the country where many schools of education recognize people whose primary teaching expertise is in preparing new teachers as clinical faculty. He added that he understood the problem with the blanket use of the clinical title, but “the additional criteria that defined the nature of their work and extent of their work being the qualifier makes a lot of sense to me. So I am strongly supportive of this.”

Professor Gayle Acton (nursing) also concurred with Dean Crismon saying that “the rigor and the teaching and the scholarship and the research that our clinical faculty in the School of Nursing do” supports his words. She then noted a correction in the numbers on slide four saying that she knew of one associate clinical professor who was also a senior provost teaching fellow and received a disposition to be the school’s graduate advisor. Professor Acton said, “I just want to echo my support for this and say, we in nursing, we could not get along without our clinical professors. They are vital to our teaching mission. So I highly support this recommendation.” Dr. Hart commented that she had been surprised that there was only one clinical faculty member in nursing. Professor Acton responded that there are at least ten if not a few more.

Because the changes in the criteria were brought forward for discussion and not as formal legislation, Dr. Hart explained that the General Faculty members could only vote on the concept. Chair Gore expressed concern that proposed changes to the criteria had been “rolling around” for many years and that she would like the body to vote on a statement endorsing the proposed changes. Professor Beckner suggested that there be a motion of general support for the outline criteria for voting rights for instructional faculty at the University. After some discussion of what the exact statement should be, Professor Martha F. Hilley (music) made the following motion,

“Those in attendance at the General Faculty meeting in January of 2016 wish to support the principle and criteria as presented.” The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

VII. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT—None.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:43 PM.

[Appendix A](#)

Text from PowerPoint Presentation

Slide 1

Recommendation on Faculty Voting Rights from Faculty Rules and Governance

Principle: Non-tenure-track faculty who contribute significantly and over time to the teaching mission of the University of Texas at Austin should have equal voting rights, at least on academic policies and welfare, regardless of title.

Slide 2

Only Lecturers can vote at University level.

Some faculty with Clinical titles are making significant teaching contributions across the University but NO faculty member with a Clinical title has any guaranteed voting rights at any level.

Slide 3

Suggested criteria for voting rights:

- Those faculty who contribute significantly to the University’s teaching mission and who have a sustained record of spending at least 50% of their professional time making that contribution
- Those faculty whose primary academic home is the University and who teach organized courses as the instructor of record.

Slide 4

How many clinical faculty?

School	Clinical Professor	Clinical Associate Professor	Clinical Assistant Professor
Business		2	1
Communications	3		3
Education	4	2	29
Engineering	1		
Fine Arts			2
Law	20		
Liberal Arts	2	5	20
Natural Sciences	2	1	6
Nursing			1
Pharmacy	6	16	80
Public Affairs	4	1	
Social Work	5	3	5
Total by ranks	47	30	147