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**Thursday, January 22 – ASH 208**

**10:00 – 11:00 am        Introductions and Review of November BOR Meeting**

**Approval of minutes of meeting of September 2014**

The approval of the 9.25.14 minutes was tabled.

Dr. Elizabeth Heise, FAC Chair, opened the meeting and welcomed FAC representatives. She encouraged good questions and comments for Regent Hicks. The new Chancellor sent his regrets as he was scheduled out of town.

Ray Greenberg will be 2nd visit, EVC for Health Affairs. Want to impress him with the value of the FAC for Health Sciences. He has been somewhat difficult to schedule since he took over. He has been dealing with lots of crisis, but many are common to all institutions. It was suggested that the FAC should strive to build a relationship with Dr. Greenberg so as to enhance his perception of the FAC as a partner.

Discussion also occurred concerning the model policy for the evaluation of academic administrators. It was noted that it had not been accomplished everywhere and especially on the health science side. Other discussion pertained to UT Austin and UTRGV and the new medical schools, especially pertaining to new administrators and role/structure of faculty governance. The continuing issues of data encryption, especially at the health science campuses were discussed.

Dr. Heise reminded the FAC of the redefined role of the THECB from the last legislature. The THECB now seems to want to quantify the service contribution of faculty.

The FAC then had a discussion of general topics to be covered at this meeting. It was suggested that some unintended consequences of the "Unbiased admission standards" might adversely impact the recruitment of athletes and other students. It was suggested that Academic Affairs take this issue.

A question was raised concerning "best practices" for faculty representative bodies on the various campuses. It was discussed that perhaps FAC should look at a model policy, as it often seems to carry UTS type weight.

Dr. Catsam commented on the unbiased admissions policy – from Regent Hall. (Austin Law school fallout.) The issue was referred to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Dr. Cheng asked if best practices for FAC on campuses had ever been addressed. Dr. Molony suggested that maybe a model policy be considered, often carries weight of UTS. Dr. Saavedra suggested it should be viewed from the issue was referred to Governance Committee.

A report from MD Anderson stated that the Faculty Senate was excluded from executive committee, back on, now just informational. UTSW and UT Houston seem to have more academic similar campus roles. Dr. Murray suggested a reminder that “faculty” means governance body.

Dr. Heise suggested a modification of Regent Rules might include the chairs of the FAC, EAC, and SAC, get agenda in advance, then contact Regents to be added to agenda, as appropriate. It was noted this was far from what we sought with adding to committees, may want to continue to suggest to Regent Hicks. It was suggested that the value of FAC SAC & EAC, is critical to the long-term mission of UTS.

**11:00 – 11:30 pm        Dr. Ray Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs**

Dr. Greenberg made a few opening observations. He stated that 5 months after being hired, Chancellor announces he is leaving, the process of selecting new chancellor, very tightly held process.

He try’s to see big picture and big things. Looking for input from advisory groups. He is interested in underserved populations for medical treatment. Another major issue deals with the number of military in state. Additionally, he is focused on how to elevate Dell Medical in Austin as top 1-5 Public Medical research facilities as well as making the new UTRGV medical as Texas as Gateway to Americas.

Relative to the Health Affairs side of the house: Both new medical schools moving forward with leadership hired and now beginning the process of seeking accreditation. He sees special opportunities to work academic and medical campuses together.

He reported that he has also recruited David Lacky – as split appointment with Greenberg and work UT Tyler Health Sciences. Will work with both Health and Academic and underserved populations issues – more than medical solutions but also sociological.

Continuing to work with each Health campus and their individual market place issues and competitive issues.

He then welcomed questions from the FAC. A UT Austin question was asked on integration of academic and health campuses given the increased focus on two new medical schools and health care. He responded that while focusing on East Texas and South Texas public healthcare, integration and research would not be overlooked. Dr. Murray commented on the opportunity for collaborations given the link between environmental and healthcare concerns.

Another issue of incentives for certain types of medicine was raised by the FAC. The FAC expressed concerns that the newer model tended toward pay for results, not for activity, especially for public health. He responded that he expects both private and public health polices to evolve to deal with these issues.

Dr. Hernandez commented about MD Anderson doing a model, scope of mission different, not for really Public Health – rather fixed price for specific group. Another issue was raised on how the UT System get all together to educate next generation of leaders to new model. Problems with current “system” are not enough shared experiences. Dr. Greenberg suggested a new model with broader training, especially with inter-professional training was needed.

Dr. Molony commented on the notion of transparency and evaluation of academic and health affairs administrators? Dr. Greenberg commented that the new Chancellor will be visiting all the campuses and that the issue should be rasied. He also commented that he was concerned with the timing of periodic reviews. The issue of faculty surveys was also discussed. The FAC asked if it would be helpful for FAC to further comment on the frequency of the reviews? Dr. Greenberg agreed it would.

Dr. Killary addressed the issue of research for UTS health institutions and how to make use of Big Science. Dr. Greenberg agreed that UTS needed to be more competitive. He suggested the need for more commercialization in technology and informational systems… for health care. He asked why not rival Boston or Silicon Valley. Utilizes heavy concentration of knowledge in UTS. Some discussion of how IP issues tend to favor industry but not necessarily for faculty.

**11:30 – 12:30 pm        Kimberly Coleman – Chair of UTS Employee Advisory Council**

Ms. Coleman was invited to speak to FAC and to bring forward issues that are important to them.  She reported that they solicit concerns from individual campuses. Then usually about 3 or 4 individual items are brought forward. She presented some discussion of their process. She stated she wants to provide FAC minutes to their members.  She also want to develop and emphasize best practices for EAC. She suggested the need to uncover what data UTS does not provide but you would expect.

Dr. Heise suggested the need for more communication among FAC, EAC, and local senates and staff/employees groups. She suggested that is can be collaborative even with different missions. Sustainability, security, parking, professionalism were given as examples. Suggestion were for more communication with Presidents and EVC’s rather than the Board of Regents. The question was asked what FAC might be able to do to help the EAC be more effective. Some discussion of the role that the FAC governance committee might contribute was presented. Other discussion of pay scale for staff and how insecurity tends to breed silence was offered. Another issue was the possible consolidation of titles, reduce discrepancies in pay, and transferability in UTS were discussed. Further discussion suggested that these issues may also be relevant to individual colleges at institutions. The issue of campus child care was also raised as a common issue.

12:30 – 1:00 pm          Dan Sharphorn - Vice Chancellor and General Counsel

Sharphorn offered some general comments. He stated that he thought the FAC would like working with the new Chancellor. He felt he was a supporter of tenure. He did not have much new information on IP. He commented on the unbiased admission’s policy and that they were working on the possible issues relative to recruiting athletes and graduate students, as examples.

The FAC discussion with Sharphorn followed. A question of pay reduction was raised. The comment was that this does not follow “due process” and therefore problematic. The issues of bullying, professionalism and collegiality were discussed relative to faculty. The comment was that “legal definitons” were an especially difficult issue. Another issue of the “tenure clock” extension was raised, especially as it relative to grants and promotion. It was suggested that such appeals have both strengths and weaknesses.

.

**1:00 – 2:00 pm  Stephanie Huie, Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives - SeekUT**

(Please note: SeekUT handouts were provided to FAC representatives.)

A general discussion of the SeekUT program status and usefulness was presented. It was noted that the data currently goes back to 2002.

The report currently uses Texas data but expected to use National Student Tracker in the future. The data is an excellent recruiting and counseling tool.

Dr. Huie expected to be invited back for April FAC meeting.

2:00 – 3:00 pm            Barry McBee, Vice Chancellor & Chief Governmental Relations Officer

A presentation of current and expected activities of the Legislature concerning higher education and UTS was presented.

(Please note: McBee’s PPT was provided to FAC representatives.)

Comments were made on expected state budget. Major budgetary demands from health, public schools, border security, state retirement system, and water conservation, tax relief and transportation are expected. Tax relief may be major competition for higher education funding. He expects one fund for UT Austin and Texas A&M and one for emerging research institutions. He projects positive outcome on TRB’s of some sort. Chancellor recognizes the impact of the Hazlewood Act on UTS and may propose some relief. Regulation or re-regulation of higher education tuition seems to be in play. The Chancellor is on the record against both regulation of tuition and guns on campus.

Additional higher education issues for state include in-state tuition for undocumented students, the awarding of limited baccalaureate degrees by community colleges, and student success and completion rates. Additionally he expects the extension of domestic partner benefits to be decided by courts.

Questions and discussion from the FAC raised some issues. The composition of the Board of Regents should see Hicks reappointed with Stillwell and Powell rotating off the board. Higher education committee chairs yet to be determined but expect Seleger to return. He did not expect major changes with THECB.

**3:00 – 5:00 pm            Committee Meetings, ASH 202, 208, and 210**

**Academic Affairs and Faculty Quality (ASH 208)**

**Health Affairs (ASH 202)**

**Governance (ASH 210)**

**Friday, January 23 – ASH 208**

**8:30 – 9:00 am            Working Breakfast with Committee Meetings**

**9:00 – 10:00 am          Committee Meetings ASH 202, 208, and 210**

**Academic Affairs and Faculty Quality (ASH 208)**

**Health Affairs (ASH 202)**

**Governance (ASH 210)**

**10:00 – 11:00 am        Commissioner Raymund Parades**

Dr. Parades made general opening remarks concerning the legislative session and future of THECB. He commented that he did not get enough faculty input and so he valued visiting with the FAC. He commented on various possible funding projections for higher education. Generally expects to be about the same. He saw the possibility of regulation of tuition as real possibility. He hoped that the Texas Grants Program would be better funded and “Be on Time” graduation funding to get support.

He felt the Rand Corporation study supported the offering of a limited number of undergraduate degrees at Community Colleges held possibilities. He suggested it would be done in consultation with “neighboring” universities. Dr. Molony suggested that there could be issues with such students advancing into medicine and graduate work. He further commented on the Strategic Plan for Higher Education and believed most of the goals would be achieved. He recognized community college enrollment had been dropping but degree completions were on target. A question was asked if a financial impact study had been done. He responded that going to college in Texas was still a good deal and below the national average. However, he suggested that what higher education is doing in Texas is wildly inefficient and has to change. He cited the steady decline in teaching loads and the attempt to have more research universities as one cause. Discussion mentioned the current long work hours of faculty and the state’s push for more research institutions. Additional comments were offered concerning the seeming administrative bloat. He suggested these are just the usual arguments that simply do not resonate with the legislature. He further suggested universities consider more outsourcing such as Texas A&M has utilized to reduce administrative costs. He also suggested that too many courses are being offered and tend to be what faculty wants to teach instead of what student’s need. He suggested that faculties should be much more involved with advising.

 The issue of the quality of instruction was raised by the FAC. He responded that maybe about 60 standardized course should be developed and push students out the door with quality. This was countered with the need for advance preparation in anticipation of graduate and professional education. The issue of transfers from community colleges was addressed by FAC. He responded that the total number of hours was not that much different. Dr. Molony suggested advanced course supported better critical thinking skills and that they were linked to research institutions.

He also addressed the push for more research institutions in the state. His opinion was there simply was not enough resources to support 8 more research institutions and would result in a failure of all. The FAC also expressed concerns that faculty were improperly accused of light workloads. He contended that he defends faculty workloads and the need to make public aware of the value of higher education. However, he sees the need for higher education to change because society has changed. The FAC also challenged the number of courses that community colleges transfers brought that were not applicable to the completion of degrees. It was also suggested by FAC that the problem was not with current delivery system but with administrative issues, paternalism, and student expectations. Again, he responded that higher education in Texas must change.

**11:00 – 12:00 pm        Committee Reports**

**1. Recommendation on Inclusion of Contingent Faculty**

From: Governance Committee

Resolution to: EVC Reyes and EVC Greenberg

Outcome: Passed Unanimous

To: UT System Campus Presidents, Provosts, and Chairs of faculty governance organizations

Through: Pedro Reyes, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs

The University of Texas’s Regents’ Rule 40101, “Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formation,” states that “the faculties of the institutions regularly offering instruction shall have a major role in the governance of their respective institutions in the following areas:

General academic policies and welfare.

Student life and activities.

Requirements of admission and graduation.

Honors and scholastic performance.

Approval of candidates for degrees.

Faculty rules of procedure.”

The UT System Faculty Advisory Council recommends that each UT System campus establish guidelines and policies that clearly define the categories of non-tenure-track faculty who have instructional responsibilities comparable to those of tenure-track faculty and provide for including them in the faculty governance system, providing the ability to vote, serve on representative bodies, and be appointed to appropriate committees. Policies should be adopted to ensure fair representation to maintain the integrity of the academic community.

**2. Resolution on Shared Governance**

From: Governance Committee

Resolution to: EVC Reyes and EVC Greenberg

Outcome: Passed Unanimous

To: UT System Campus Presidents, Provosts, and Chairs of campus governance organizations

Through: Pedro Reyes, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Raymond Greenberg, Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs

UT System campus governance organizations should be aware of their powers and responsibilities as assigned by tradition and recognized in accrediting standards and UT system rules. The provisions are as follow:

First, the traditional and necessary authority of the faculty is recognized in The University of Texas’s Regents’ Rule 40101, “Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formation.” This states that “the faculties of the institutions regularly offering instruction shall have a major role in the governance of their respective institutions in the following areas:

General academic policies and welfare.

Student life and activities.

Requirements of admission and graduation.

Honors and scholastic performance.

Approval of candidates for degrees.

Faculty rules of procedure.”

Second, the Rules recognize that “the faculty” is represented by the elected bodies of the faculty governance organization. Institutional policies should be in the institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures. It follows that the faculty governance organization should have a major role in designing all policies in the Handbook of Operating Procedures under the headings of Regents Rule 40101. In Regents’ Rule 20201, responsibility to assure that such policies are reviewed by the governance body are assigned to the President of the university. As follows:

The University of Texas’s Regents’ Rule 20201, Section 4.9:

“(a) Input from the faculty, staff, and student governance bodies for the institution will be sought for all significant changes to an institution’s Handbook of Operating Procedures. The institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures will include a policy for obtaining this input that is in accordance with a model policy developed by the Office of General Counsel.

(b) Sections of the Handbook of Operating Procedures that pertain to the areas of faculty responsibility as defined in Regents’ Rules and Regulations, Rule 40101 titled Faculty Role in Educational Policy Formulation will be explicitly designated in the Handbook of Operating Procedures. The president, with the faculty governance body of the campus, shall develop procedures to assure formal review by the faculty governance body before such sections are submitted for approval. The formal review should be done within a reasonable timeframe (60 days or less).”

In addition, the accreditation standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and schools and Liaison Committee on Medical Education place great emphasis on the importance of faculty governance involvement in establishing academic policies. For UT campuses, this necessarily would mean involvement of the faculty governance organization:

2. SACS/COC standards related to faculty governance:

“3.2.6 There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy. (Board/administration distinction)

3.2.7 The institution has a clearly defined and published organizational structure that delineates responsibility for the administration of policies. (Organizational structure)”

“3.4.1 The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. (Academic program approval)”

“3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty. (Responsibility for curriculum)”

3. LCME standards related to faculty governance:

“1.3 Mechanisms for Faculty Participation

A medical school ensures that there are effective mechanisms in place for direct faculty participation in decision-making related to the medical education program, including opportunities for faculty participation in discussions about, and the establishment of, policies and procedures for the program, as appropriate.”

“2.6 Functional Integration of the Faculty

At a medical school with one or more geographically distributed campuses, the faculty at the departmental and medical school levels at each campus are functionally integrated by appropriate administrative mechanisms (e.g., regular meetings and/or communication, periodic visits, participation in shared governance, and data sharing).”

“4.6 Faculty/Dean Responsibility for Educational Program Policies

At a medical school, the dean and a committee of the faculty determine programmatic policies.”

“Standard 6: Competencies, Curricular Objectives, and Curricular Design

The faculty of a medical school define the competencies to be achieved by its medical students through medical education program objectives and is responsible for the detailed design and implementation of the components of a medical curriculum that enables its medical students to achieve those competencies and objectives. The medical education program objectives are statements of the knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes that medical students are expected to exhibit as evidence of their achievement by completion of the program.

6.1 Format/Dissemination of Medical Education Program Objectives and Learning Objectives

The faculty of a medical school define its medical education program objectives in outcome-based terms that allow the assessment of medical students’ progress in developing the competencies that the profession and the public expect of a physician. The medical school makes these medical education program objectives known to all medical students, faculty, residents, and others with responsibility for medical student education and assessment. In addition, the medical school ensures that the learning objectives for each required learning experience (e.g., course, clerkship) are made known to all medical students and those faculty, residents, and others with teaching and assessment responsibilities in those required experiences.

6.2 Required Clinical Experiences

The faculty of a medical school define the types of patients and clinical conditions that medical students are required to encounter, the skills to be performed by medical students, the appropriate clinical settings for these experiences, and the expected levels of medical student responsibility.

6.3 Self-Directed and Life-Long Learning

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes self-directed learning experiences and time for independent study to allow medical students to develop the skills of lifelong learning. Self-directed learning involves medical students’ self-assessment of learning needs; independent identification, analysis, and synthesis of relevant information; and appraisal of the credibility of information sources.

6.4 Inpatient/Outpatient Experiences

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes clinical experiences in both outpatient and inpatient settings.

6.5 Elective Opportunities

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes elective opportunities that supplement required learning experiences and that permit medical students to gain exposure to and deepen their understanding of medical specialties reflecting their career interests and to pursue their individual academic interests.

6.6 Service-Learning

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical education program provides sufficient opportunities for, encourages, and supports medical student participation in service-learning and community service activities.

6.7 Academic Environments

The faculty of a medical school ensure that medical students have opportunities to learn in academic environments that permit interaction with students enrolled in other health professions, graduate, and professional degree programs and in clinical environments that provide opportunities for interaction with physicians in graduate medical education programs and in continuing medical education programs.

6.8 Education Program Duration

A medical education program includes at least 130 weeks of instruction.

Standard 7: Curricular Content

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum provides content of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare medical students for entry into any residency program and for the subsequent contemporary practice of medicine.

7.1 Biomedical, Behavioral, Social Sciences

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes content from the biomedical, behavioral, and socioeconomic sciences to support medical students' mastery of contemporary scientific knowledge and concepts and the methods fundamental to applying them to the health of individuals and populations.

7.2 Organ Systems/Life Cycle/Primary Care/Prevention/Wellness/Symptoms/ Signs/ Differential Diagnosis, Treatment Planning, Impact of Behavioral/Social Factors

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes content and clinical experiences related to each organ system; each phase of the human life cycle; continuity of care; and preventive, acute, chronic, rehabilitative, end-of-life, and primary care in order to prepare students to:

Recognize wellness, determinants of health, and opportunities for health promotion and disease prevention.

Recognize and interpret symptoms and signs of disease.

Develop differential diagnoses and treatment plans.

Recognize the potential health-related impact on patients of behavioral and socioeconomic factors.

Assist patients in addressing health-related issues involving all organ systems.

7.3 Scientific Method/Clinical/Translational Research

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes instruction in the scientific method (including hands-on or simulated exercises in which medical students collect or use data to test and/or verify hypotheses or address questions about biomedical phenomena) and in the basic scientific and ethical principles of clinical and translational research (including the ways in which such research is conducted, evaluated, explained to patients, and applied to patient care).

7.4 Critical Judgment/Problem-Solving Skills

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum incorporates the fundamental principles of medicine, provides opportunities for medical students to acquire skills of critical judgment based on evidence and experience, and develops medical students' ability to use those principles and skills effectively in solving problems of health and disease.

7.5 Societal Problems

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes instruction in the diagnosis, prevention, appropriate reporting, and treatment of the medical consequences of common societal problems.

7.6 Cultural Competence/Health Care Disparities/Personal Bias

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum provides opportunities for medical students to learn to recognize and appropriately address gender and cultural biases in themselves, in others, and in the health care delivery process. The medical curriculum includes instruction regarding:

The manner in which people of diverse cultures and belief systems perceive health and illness and respond to various symptoms, diseases, and treatments.

The basic principles of culturally competent health care.

The recognition and development of solutions for health care disparities.

The importance of meeting the health care needs of medically underserved populations.

The development of core professional attributes (e.g., altruism, accountability) needed to provide effective care in a multidimensionally diverse society.

7.7 Medical Ethics

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes instruction for medical students in medical ethics and human values both prior to and during their participation in patient care activities and requires its medical students to behave ethically in caring for patients and in relating to patients' families and others involved in patient care.

7.8 Communication Skills

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the medical curriculum includes specific instruction in communication skills as they relate to communication with patients and their families, colleagues, and other health professionals.

7.9 Interprofessional Collaborative Skills

The faculty of a medical school ensure that the core curriculum of the medical education program prepares medical students to function collaboratively on health care teams that include health professionals from other disciplines as they provide coordinated services to patients. These curricular experiences include practitioners and/or students from the other health professions.”

**3. FAC Responses to Proposed Admissions Policy**

From: Academic Affairs Committee

Resolution to: EVC Reyes and AVC Wanda Mercer

Outcome: Passed Unanimous

Note: This responds to the draft policy sent in fall 2014 to the campus administrators who oversee admissions. It does not, therefore, take into account any changes that may have taken place in the intervening months.

The Faculty Advisory Council embraces the principle of prohibiting outside and improper influence in admissions. In order to ensure integrity in admissions policy the FAC would like to make the following observations:

We advocate a considerable expansion of the faculty capacity to act to advocate for or otherwise have a voice in admissions. Because of the role of faculty in every element of student education, from drafting admissions standards to approving candidates for graduation and all of the instruction that goes on in between, faculty can never be considered an “improper third party.” The faculty represents the most interested party in the System outside of the students themselves.

Faculty members are especially central in the process of the recruitment and application prospects of graduate students. Even given official graduate and professional school admissions policies, applicants often need faculty support for both program admission and funding. The policy as written could, if read narrowly, be construed as limiting the faculty’s rightful role in graduate education, which includes recruitment, admissions, and funding.

Additionally the drafted policy does not into account the realities of student recruitment for athletics and activities such as art, music, drama, debate, and others.

Athletics coaches are in regular contact with admissions officials regarding their recruits. Readings of some aspects of this document would indicate coaches’ contact with admissions to be inappropriate behavior. We believe this to be an inappropriate hindering of coaches’ ability to recruit student-athletes.

As read the current policy clearly prohibits contact between outside third parties and admissions officers. But the clear intent of the policy is to prohibit improper external pressure being applied to anyone on campus who might then try to influence admissions policy. It would clearly violate the spirit, and possibly the letter, of the proposed policy for a legislator or other powerful person to try to influence a faculty member or member of staff (whether in admissions or not) to advocate for or against an applicant. Yet the lifeblood or athletic recruiting is contact with high school coaches.

Music or theater instructors (who may but may not also teach one of their high school musicians) may play a similar role for talented music students. There are other examples, but these represent two of the most visible ones. This creates a potential conflict. Without these contacts athletic recruiting would be nearly impossible. Yet carving out an exception for coaches and yet denying similar rights for other citizens to act to advocate for students who are not athletes would be equally problematic.

One possible solution is that anyone can provide support for an applicant but that support must be clearly documented.

Two sections of the proposed policy seem to be in conflict with one another: II.B (With regard to graduate school and program admissions, third-party communications are also prohibited; however, third parties may participate by composing formal letters of recommendation, if such letters are permitted or required, and if the third party is an expert in a relevant academic or professional field and has personal knowledge of particular candidates) III.B.2 (Any graduate school or professional program may engage in customary solicited or unsolicited conversations with experts in the relevant academic or professional field and with personal knowledge of particular candidates to that graduate or professional school to determine the likelihood of success of those candidates to a particular course of study).

**4. Health Affairs Request for information on faculty time reporting**

From: Health Affairs Committee

Send to: Health Affairs FAC Representatives

Professional responsibilities dictate that Faculty typically work more than 40 hours a week. The systems being used to account for faculty time are not uniform throughout the UT institutions. In the interest of fairness faculty members should receive appropriate compensatory time for work conducted outside normal hours, including on­call responsibilities.

The faculty governance organizations on each campus should describe the faculty timekeeping procedures at their institutions and make a brief report to the FAC at the next meeting. The topic will be discussed with the goal of identifying the fairest and best practices and, possibly, recommending them for the entire System.

**12:00 – 1:00 pm   Pedro Reyes, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs & Dan Sharphorn, Vice Chancellor and General Counsel – UTS 175**

Dr. Reyes made general opening remarks before responding to FAC questions and discussions. He reported on the UT Austin Presidential search. He commented on how the UT Austin faculty had really spoken up. He reported that the committee was close to bringing candidate to campus. He also commented on the process and the need for confidentiality to obtain outstanding candidates.

He briefly commented on the appointment of new Regents and reappointment of Regent Hicks. He also noted Hicks support of FAC represenatives on the Board of Regents Academic and Health Affairs committees in an appropriate role. He further commented on his belief that the new Chancellor was a strong supporter of tenure and faculty governance.

He commented on higher education issues in the Legislature and impact on UTS. He commented on the competency based education trends in some areas. He expected movement in areas with high employer and student demand but would be determined in conjunction with relevant faculty. He expects up to 8 areas. Dr. Heise commented on problems with returning to traditional course work after achieving competency-based credit. Dr. Molony commented that competency based was increasingly the norm in some areas of medical training. Another issue of counts on campus figures and graduation rates would need adjustments.

Some discussion of the transfer of IP persists with such issues as what belongs to the institution as a whole and distribution of future monies. Another issue discussed was the possible organization of a conference for student governance and what role FAC could play.

The discussion returned to IP. Dr. Heise suggested FAC send comments to Hurn, Chairs of Task Force and EVC’s. She stated that the FAC needed to have voice and possibly audience before the policy is formed and possible rewrite of Regents Rules. It is imperative that FAC have representation.

Discussion of what the FAC should discuss with Regent Hicks was undertaken. Some talking points were: FAC representation on Board of Regents committees, more research funding, community college undergraduate degrees, TRBs, faculty raises, Hazlewood, UTS 175, and generally more resources for faculty from Chancellor.

**1:00 – 2:00 pm            Vice Chairman R. Steven Hicks**

Regent Hicks mad a few opening remarks and was open for questions. A question was asked concerning how he sees the Board of Regents interacting with Faculty. He responded that he sees the role of the Board to help and assist the member institutions and their faculties. He drew the analogy of supplying the raw goods to the factory and the faculty work on the factory floor. He recognized the need for better students coming in and better faculty getting them out. Dr. Leaf suggested it was not just quality faculty, but also how they are organized and therefore faculty governance. He suggested that the Board of Regents needs to see the value of faculty governance in achieving the UTS mission.

Dr. Molony commented that faculty are all committed to the success of the core mission and that can continue with FAC presence on Board committees. Regent Hicks said he supported in principle subject to rules. However, the Board looks to EVC’s Reyes and Greenberg as the key contact points. It was suggested that the separation of administrators and faculty has caused some disillusionment among faculty. Regent Hicks acknowledged that the role of the Student Regent was valuable in bring their perspective to the Board. Some FAC discussion was held to reinforce that faculty realize higher education is changing and that faculty continue to want quality but are willing to work with change. Dr. Heise reminded Regent Hicks of the FACs willingness to participate on Task Force Committees.

 Additional discussion focused on the changing nature of medical education and research. The FAC commented that their business is knowledge and new knowledge and application. It was noted that the increasing focus on generating more revenue from clinical is taking away from research. Regent Hicks responded that loosing sight of mission is not good in the long term. Dr. Molony also pointed out that the support of tenure at MD Anderson and Health Science Tyler would contribute to reputation and recruitment. The Regent generally agreed and pointed out that he liked the post tenure review process and recognized FAC’s role in developing that process. The issue of transparency at all institutions is highly valued and should be encouraged. The Regent encouraged the FAC to have strong faculty representation and work with Presidents, if problems, go to EVC.

Regent Hicks acknowledged the Board had spent much time recently devoted to one institution and hoped they would move on to the business of the entire UTS.

The balance of directed/commercialized research v academic freedom is a continuing issue at both medical and academic campuses. Regent Hicks suggested it was much better to have that be a local campus decision, not dictated by the Board. It was discussed that one local faculty had patentable item, but was told not to pursue because the institution may want to patent. Regent Hicks stated that was not the position of the Board.

Regent Hicks also stated the need for a UTS inventory of research. The FAC discussed how this could help obtain grants across multiple fields.

The FAC thanked Regent Hicks for our opportunity to speak to the Board and asked if there was anything specific that the FAC could do for the Board. Regent Hicks responded that he felt the FAC should really have voice on committee before it goes to the Board. He liked the idea and supports as the Academic Affairs Chair.

Other discussion by the FAC revolved around some seeming micro-management from the Board by certain Regents. Regent Hicks responded that the Board should function a board with directions coming from the entire board, in his opinion. Regent Hicks also commented that he supports broad based education and that “we are not just a job training center”, rather UTS has a bigger role in society. The FAC suggested centering on limited metrics did not capture our full roles. Suggested different metrics for each campus due to their roles in educating the state.

Additional comments were made concerning the work of the FAC. Regent Hicks said he valued the FACs work and would suggest that Regents be required to visit the FAC. Additional comment on the issues of IP were offered. Dr. Reyes said he would encourage the Regents to consider FAC involvement in the IP discussion. The FAC offered that the Board should be a partner and work together.

\*\*\* end \*\*\*