The meeting began at 2:00 pm.

**Meeting Focus:** Social Science Departments and Centers  
**Chairs/Directors Present:** Alared, Boehmer, Campbell, Castandeda, Heyman, Sowards,  
**Chairs/Directors Invited but not Present:** none  
**Dean’s Office Staff Present:** Loya & Zarate

1. **UTEP Core Metrics**  
Crites briefly discussed the core metrics that are shared across UT System institutions (specifically: enrollment, semester credit hours, degrees awarded, research expenditures, and publications) and showed a website that shows these metrics to college deans. There was a brief discussion about the limitations of Academic Analytics because it does not track all publications (e.g., often does not capture book chapters).

2. **Having search committee members from outside departments**  
Crites asked chairs for input on the idea of including a non-departmental faculty on faculty search committee (e.g., a linguistics faculty on a psychology faculty search committee). One chair indicated that has outside members have served on departmental search committees and reported that input from outside faculty was useful (outside faculty are not permitted to vote). There was concern that this might not work well in other instances because outside member might not have expertise in search area and department faculty may not welcome input from outside individual.

3. **The following issues emerged during a general discussion regarding problems and goals of social & behavioral sciences within the College.**  

   - **Shifting funding from non-tenure-track lines to tenure-track lines.** There seemed to be a consensus that this would be advantageous because tenure-track faculty drive most of the creative activities/research and service. But, doing this will be difficult because non-tenure-track faculty provide a significant amount of essential instruction.

   - **Providing incentives to faculty to maintain engagement with research following tenure.** This was mentioned, but there was not much discussion about it. If THECB allows universities to adjust teaching-load credit rules, this might be an issue that can be addressed.

   - **Providing incentives to faculty to submit grant proposals given the low rate odds of obtaining funding.**
      - A couple departments have general expectations for “grant seeking behavior” that is expected for tenure and yearly evaluations. Other departments advise
non-tenured faculty to focus on publications and not grant proposals because
publications are important to external reviewers (relative to non-funded
proposals). A consensus did not emerge as to whether departments and/or the
College should provide more weight to grant seeking activity during
evaluations.

◦ In the last few years, the College has supported initiatives to promote research
and creative activities, and these had an explicit requirement to seek funding.
Given ongoing funding changes, it is not clear whether the College will be
able to continue these initiatives. The Dean and Associate Deans will meet
soon to discuss whether and how we can continue these initiatives.

• Problems with post-grant support. There was a lengthy discussion about these
issues. Crites updated chairs on movement to create business centers in all of the
colleges. There was general support for this idea, but the recognition that there
would be “growing pains” as we adopt to this model, especially with the units in
the College widely dispersed across campus. Chairs provide some feedback to
help the Dean and CAO with implementing this idea.

4. Increasing number of PhD graduates and Social Science faculty who advise PhD
students

• There was a short discussion about past problems with adding PhD degrees in the
College. Some of these included: the considerable amount of work that it takes to
prepare these, lack of investment that will be needed to support them (e.g.,
funding PhD students), lack of support within departments for interdisciplinary
proposals, low number of critical faculty with departments, and incorrect
assumptions that there are few jobs for PhD graduates in social sciences.

• Another option that was briefly mentioned was for non-PhD programs to partner
with existing PhD programs to develop new cooperative programs.

5. College support to help implement and track UTEP Edge initiatives. The College
will likely have to help departments and units with the logistics of implementing and
tracking activities associated with the UTEP Edge.