

Texas A&M- San Antonio  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
February 5, 2016, from 11:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.  
Central Academic Building 219

**Call to Order** at 11:30 a.m. by L. Webb

**In Attendance:**

K. Barton, E. Bliss-Zaks, C. Cox, K. Gillen (via Adobe Connect), D. Glaser, R. Kapavik, B. Moore, M. Peterson, S. Rahman, C. Ross, J. Simpson, K. Voges, L. Webb, Dr. Snow (Provost), Dr. Teniente-Matson (President) (via Adobe Connect), E. Westermann, K. Bridgman

**Approval of Faculty Senate meeting Minutes from December 4, 2015**

Motion: M. Peterson motions to approve the minutes, 2<sup>nd</sup> by J. Simpson

Vote Passes: 11 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

**Executive Committee Updates:** J. Simpson and E. Bliss-Zaks updated the constitution with the amendments approved during the December meeting. A document to keep track of all the changes made to the constitution has also been created. E. Bliss-Zaks has uploaded both of these documents to the Faculty Senate website and to Faculty Town Square in Blackboard.

J. Simpson reminded everyone elections for senators will take place this spring. J. Simpson encouraged senators to talk to their colleagues about volunteering to serve on the senate. Due to the amendment in the constitution, L. Webb reminded everyone there will be an additional senator from the College of Arts and Sciences since C. Ross will be serving as the Faculty Senate President next year. J. Simpson also proposed the senate should formally keep track of bills proposed in meetings. J. Simpson will bring more information and an example of this to the next meeting.

C. Ross shared updates on the Academic Learning Communities Committee with the senate. An email was sent out in January in regards to volunteers for committee members. The committee should be finalized by mid-February. L. Webb felt the initial list of volunteers for the committee wasn't a good representation of the university and should probably include more members from the core curriculum committee since the pilot will most likely fall under that committee. C. Ross informed the senate the volunteers mostly came from the College of Arts and Sciences with a couple from College of Education. C. Ross also stated block scheduling is no longer being considered, but the committee will be developing pilots for Academic Learning Communities for the fall and the deadline to complete these is before invitations for new student orientation are sent out.

### **Administrative Update**

Dr. Snow asked the senate for feedback on whether or not we should extend the application deadline for the scholarship, teaching and service faculty awards. The deadline was January 30<sup>th</sup>. In total seven people have applied for distinguished scholarship, four for distinguished service, and four for distinguished teaching.

Discussion: R. Kapavik stated the deadline should not be extended to be fair to those that applied before the deadline. J. Simpson would be in favor of extending the deadline since the committee wasn't established until December and thus the committee didn't have a lot of time to advertise. E. Westermann asked Dr. Snow if others have asked about the deadline or about applying. If no one has asked or made comments, then the deadline shouldn't be extended. Dr. Snow said he only had one person ask him about the deadline. J. Simpson said he had several emails asking more about the process before the deadline but he wasn't sure if those individuals ended up applying. K. Voges asked how aware the faculty were about the awards. J. Simpson stated two emails were sent out, one in October and another one in November. J. Simpson also sent a follow up email to the College of Arts and Sciences in December. L. Webb mentioned it at convocation, uploaded the documents to Faculty Town Square with an announcement and passed out the packet at the faculty breakfast. Both R. Kapavik and J. Simpson were surprised by the low turnout due to the fact many faculty members didn't want to serve on the committee because they were planning on applying for one of the awards. Dr. Snow felt the number of applicants was good for the first run as well as because of all the other things going on around campus. K. Gillen asked if the application form for course reassignment has been created. Dr. Snow stated his office has not finished creating the form but he will work on this. K. Gillen offered to draft the application form.

Dr. Snow provided an update on the Alamo University Center. As of this semester, 367 students are enrolled in 18 courses at the center. This is a record high for us in terms of number of students enrolled in courses at this campus. Dr. Snow reminded faculty to think about this space when scheduling courses in the future.

Discussion: J. Simpson asked how many classrooms are available to use at the center. Dr. Snow was unsure of the exact number but if we need additional classrooms, then the center will most likely give us space. K. Barton and S. Rahman stated there were plenty of classrooms available this semester as well as in the past, though the technology in the classrooms needs to be updated. K. Barton added they are trying to meet our needs because they did update one of the computer labs for his class this semester. E. Westermann asked if a cost analysis has been done on the building and what is our vision for that building. Dr. Snow said a cost analysis was done on the building about two years ago and we were turning a profit at that time. Dr. Snow added we should also examine whether or not students are enrolling in a course there because it's a convenient location or is it because the class they need is only being offered there. K. Barton stated the students he has talked to took classes at both locations and in a lot of cases the students took a class there because that was the only spot left for a particular class. J. Simpson asked about how academic support services fit into this campus. Dr. Snow stated academic support services would be something to consider having there in the future but we will need to complete another cost analysis report to see how the hidden costs, such as student support services at the campus, will affect our bottom line.

### **Old Business**

Academic Plan: R. Kapavik held an Academic Plan meeting last Friday to get feedback from the Faculty. The plan has been posted on Faculty Town Square and the Provost Office has shared it via email. During the month of February, R. Kapavik will be meeting with the colleges to get additional feedback, collect questions, etc. to help drive what will be in the Academic Plan. R. Kapavik reminded the senate that the Academic Plan will inform the Strategic Plan which will then inform the budget. The committee has received several comments from multiple departments such as from the University Library, College of Arts and Sciences and College of Business. R. Kapavik reminded faculty to send feedback to her via email or to post it on the discussion board in Faculty Town Square. Every Friday R. Kapavik will send out via email the current Academic Plan with the edits, suggestions, and questions side by side until the end of February. The committee will then meet at the end of the month to incorporate feedback that was given as well as possible remove content. The committee will hopefully present a new draft at the next Faculty Senate meeting in March.

Discussion: E. Westermann inquired if any analysis has been provided to her to justify needing the specific programs that were mentioned in the plan. R. Kapavik said the committee would only include programs in the plan that had some sort of data to back it up. J. Simpson mentioned the data on program demands from local SAT exams that the Provost Office sent out recently should be examined to help decide what programs could be listed. E. Westermann added a market analysis should also be done to determine what new programs will be sustainable in the current market as opposed to just looking at the program demand data from test scores. K. Voges asked if faculty should be including a cost estimate parameter in program proposals. R. Kapavik said including costs for programs would be helpful so we can figure out whether a program is doable based on costs. R. Kapavik reminded everyone to contact Jane Mims or Holly Verhasselt if you need data for program proposals. Dr. Matson stated the university does have external data on market demands and needs for the area. For example, Alamo Workforce just completed a market study on our region. Dr. Matson added she wants to drive the strategic planning process with thoughtful external and internal data so the Academic Plan will make sense within that context. L. Webb reminded the senate that there is an Academic Plan discussion board on Faculty Town Square faculty if faculty would like to continue the conversation.

### **Faculty Annual Evaluation Review Committee:**

C. Cox informed the senate the committee has met several times and has been examining other faculty evaluations forms from the other A&M campuses. From those comparisons, a draft evaluation form was created (see attachment). The form would allow faculty to work with their Dean/Chair to select the appropriate weight of each category, allows an option for a bonus/merit pay and could allow each program/college to develop their own criteria within their program/college. C. Cox would like senators to examine the form and provide suggestions.

Once those suggestions have been compiled and edits have been made, C. Cox will send the draft evaluation form to faculty. C. Cox stated the next steps would be to rewrite the evaluation packet as well. E. Westermann suggested aligning the deadlines for the annual evaluation, the Tenure and Promotion packet and the award application. L. Webb added all of these documents would contribute to the Merit Pay process as well. Suggestions can be sent to C. Cox via email or faculty can also hand in the print form with comments.

**Bylaws Committee:** D. Glaser informed the Senate that the committee consists of two faculty members from each college and one admin from each college. D. Glaser stated the committee would have a draft proposal for the April meeting to get feedback and then have the final version done by the May meeting.

**Office Space Committee:** J. Simpson stated the committee will meet this month to work on a draft document that will include known office space issues and present temporary as well as permanent solutions to these issues. J. Simpson hopes to present to draft to the senate at the March meeting. Most likely the document will also include some standards for assigning office space such as rank. J. Simpson wanted to point out the Office Space Committee is only setting standards for offices for faculty and not staff. J. Simpson noted the committee still needs a representative from the College of Business.

Discussion: D. Glaser asked if office succession policies would be included in this document. J. Simpson stated that could be included in the document though the committee needs to set standards in terms of quality and size for spaces moving forward to ensure all offices as much as possible are equal as opposed to creating offices that are nicer than others.

**Merit Pay Committee:** L. Webb announced we need two senators to volunteer to serve on the Merit Pay Committee. The committee will also consist of one to two faculty members from each college as well as someone from the URC committee. This committee will only be examining faculty merit pay. There will be a separate Merit pay Committee for staff. Dr. Snow stated a timeline has not been set but the committee will to meet in the near future. M. Peterson and C. Cox volunteered to serve on this committee.

## **New Business** **Elections**

**Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Committee:** J. Simpson announced the WAC committee has representatives from each of the colleges, however the senate needs to elect two senators to serve on this committee.

Nominees for WAC committee: J. Simpson and K. Gillen

**Vote:** 11 yes for both nominees

J. Simpson and K. Gillen were elected to serve on this committee

Nominee for Chair: K. Gillen

**Vote:** 11 yes

K. Gillen was elected to serve as chair of this committee.

**Provost Search Committee:** J. Simpson opened the floor for nominations to serve on the permanent provost search committee. The senate needs to nominate two tenure track faculty members for this committee.

**Nominees:** G. Shelton (Arts & Sciences), E. Westermann (Arts & Sciences), K. Voges (Business), C. Green (Business), L. Webb (Education), C. Ross (Arts & Sciences), K. Gillen (Arts & Sciences).

**First Vote:** G. Shelton 0; E. Westermann 9; K. Voges 3; C. Green 0, L. Webb 1; C. Ross 0; K. Gillen 1

E. Westermann was elected to serve on the committee.

**Second Vote:** G. Shelton 0; K. Voges 2; C. Green 2, L. Webb 7; C. Ross 1; K. Gillen 0

L. Webb was also elected to serve on the committee.

L. Webb will send the names to the search committee.

**Faculty Senate involvement with Core Curriculum Committee:** J. Simpson expressed his concern with the structure of the Core Curriculum Committee. The committee was organized on an ad hoc basis for the initial core curriculum proposal and has now been reconvened to deal with additional core curriculum issues. At the moment the senate does not have any constitutional provision for a core curriculum committee. As the Constitution reads, the undergraduate curriculum committee should be overseeing this committee. J. Simpson would like input for as for what the structure of the Core Curriculum Committee should be and how it should relate to other committees. For example, should the core curriculum committee be a completely separate committee like the undergraduate and graduate committee or should this be a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee who makes the final approvals.

Discussion: E. Westermann suggested having a combined committee that looks holistically at the core curriculum and majors as opposed to having two separate committees. J. Simpson added his concerns about the committee not being faculty driven but also certain key figures are missing from the committee such as the AVP for the University College. L. Webb suggested the Core Curriculum Committee should be a subset of the undergrad curriculum and the AVP for University College could act as an ex-officio. The AVP would be a constant for the group since all other members are serving terms. K. Gillen recommended if the Core Curriculum Committee is going to be a separate committee, then it needs to have the same structure as the other Faculty Senate standing Committees. J. Simpson will draft a proposal for the structure of this committee for the March meeting.

Motion: Motions to adjourn.

**L. Webb adjourns the meeting at 1 p.m.**

**TEACHING**

**Peer Evaluation:** Receive peer evaluation and incorporated evaluation into teaching.

**Student Evaluation:** Receive student evaluation and incorporated evaluation into teaching.

**Organized Instruction:** Provided students with current syllabus including objectives, learning outcomes, grading and attendance policies.

**Responsiveness:** Provides feedback to student inquiries and on student work in a timely manner

**Achievement Outcomes:** Student learning outcomes measured and incorporated into teaching.

**Engagement:** Provides opportunities for individual and group engagement with the course material

**BONUS:**

**New Course Development**

**New Technology Incorporated**

WEIGHT \_\_\_\_\_ %

1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5


**SERVICE**

**Sustained Collegiality:** Be supportive, collegial in a manner that supports a healthful, positive work environment

**Committee Service:** Accept and serve on committees to promote student success, personnel development, accreditation and alumni relations

**Professional Service:** Service to professional or academic organizations within the faculty member's main or related disciplines

**Community Service:** Service to the public related to faculty member's area of expertise

**BONUS:**

**Promoting Student Organizations through Sponsorship**

**Development and Maintenance of Program's Website**

**Participation in Recruitment Activities**

WEIGHT \_\_\_\_\_ %

1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5


**SCHOLARSHIP**

**Seek Funding Opportunities:** Demonstrate participation in grant writing and proposal development

**Academic Presentations:** Participate in writing and presenting at conferences each year.

**Academic Publications:** Peer- reviewed publication of scholarly work.

**BONUS:**

**Article in a Top-Tier Journal (as identified by program)**

**Research Conducted with Students**

**Student Research Presented at Conference**

**Book Publication**

WEIGHT \_\_\_\_\_ %

1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5
1---2---3---4---5


Is this faculty member eligible for merit pay?

YES

NO