

Texas A&M University- San Antonio
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
September 5, 2014. MC01- 353

Call to Order at 11:30 a.m. by E. Westermann

In Attendance: E. Bliss- Zaks, K. Gillen, D. Glasser, M. Jozwiak, B. Moore, C. Nolasco, R. Pittman, J. Simpson, R. Vinaja, K. Voges, L. Webb, E. Westerman, B. Snow, B. Rowe, C. Suthammanont, E. Rodingram (Mesquite)

Introduction of new Senators representing the Library (Bryant Moore [evening librarian] & Emily Bliss-Zaks)

Approval of Faculty Senate Minutes from May 2, 2014: Due to extenuating circumstances, V. Elias was unable to provide the minutes at this time.

Motion: L. Webb motions to table the discussion of minutes.
2nd.

Discussion: J. Simpson suggests we could do that via e-mail. E. Westermann confirms Senate will distribute the minutes through e-mail and will accept feedback.

Motion Passes: 11Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Executive Committee Update provided by E. Westermann

Constitution Vote: The final vote was 20 in favor and 3 opposed. The approved Constitution will be posted on the Faculty Senate Website.

Committee Assignments: There was an attempt to create equity across colleges; therefore, you may not have received assignment on the committee you requested. For the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, there will be additional members assigned by the Deans. Members of the Faculty Recognition and Dean's List were appointed last year and are already in existence. The Dean's List committee includes two Senators, one of whom was appointment by the Dean. The proposed chairs for those committees were assigned as per the new Constitution which states '[...] that these committees should be chaired by a member of the Faculty Senate.' An exception to this is the Director of Graduate Studies who serves as non-voting chair of the Graduate Committee. R. Pittman asks for clarification on if the individuals listed on the committee are already aware they are on those committees. Dr. Snow clarified that Deans may not have informed people who are on list of their participation on the Dean's list committee, but that he will ask the Deans to do so at this time. Dean's List and Faculty Recognition committees are expected to report at the next meeting.

Motion: J Simpson motions to accept the committee assignment as shown.
2nd

Motion Passes: 11 yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions

Old Business

Dean's List: R. Pittman will have a report at next meeting

Faculty Handbook

Discussion: E. Westermann reminds faculty there was an opportunity to review the handbook last year and that it was redistributed this semester. The author, D. Frantzen, is present at the meeting today to answer questions. Dr. Snow recommends the document should be updated and

reviewed annually. J Simpson affirms timeliness of information as needing annual review. **Note:** All system policies and procedures supersede any policies and procedures in the handbook but that this handbook can make recommendations for university-level policies or guidelines.

Table of Contents:

Discussion: Request to add page numbers. K. Gillen notes that Tutoring Services and Disability Services are identified in two different places. She questions if they should be reorganized. After some consideration, makes final recommendation to keep the Table of Contents as is, as long as, within the content, resources for students are listed under syllabus requirements and faculty resources are listed elsewhere.

History, Page 3:

Motion: L. Webb motions to distinguish which department from COEHD is located at each campus.
2nd

Motion Passes: 10, Yes, 1 Opposed. 0 Abstentions

Format Change/Clarification: When identifying the university, Texas A&M University- San Antonio will be used initially. Thereafter, it will be referred to at A&M San Antonio.

Motion: D. Glaser motions for author to insert language to clarifying the population stated is referring to the population of San Antonio and the surrounding area.

2nd

Discussion: R. Vinaja offers clarification that these statements are referring to a specific point in time when San Antonio only had a population of two million people and only one major university. He asks should the population statistic be clarified to indicate that it was referring to that specific time. J. Simpson states that in the year 2000 the population of San Antonio was not that large. Discussion continues to offer differing possibilities.

Amendment: to insert "Currently" & "San Antonio and the surrounding cities"

No 2nd

Original motion Passes: 9 Yes, 0 No, 2 Abstentions

Pg. 4

Motion: C. Nolasco motions that a discussion of the concept of shared governance be included under a subheading of 'Shared Governance' and that the language of that section be patterned after the Task Force on Shared Governance, dated July 2010.

2nd.

Discussion: J. Simpson affirmed his support of this inclusion

Motion Passes: 11 yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Faculty Senate:

Motion: K Voges motions the wording from the new Constitution, for eligibility requirements, replace the language in the current document.

2nd

Discussion: Constitution section 3.11

Motion Passes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Academic Unit:

Typographical error noted – change to 6 units.

Motion: L. Webb motions to change Bilingual Ed /ESL. to Bilingual Ed. /ESL. Program.

2nd

Discussion: K. Gillen notes that only COEHD uses the word 'Program.'

Amended: to remove the word "Program" from all programs under COEHD.

2nd

Motion Passes: 11, Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Academic Convocation & Faculty Responsibilities:

Motion: K. Voges motions to change language from "require" to "expected" to attend Academic Convocation.

2nd

Discussion: J. Simpson asks for clarification on if there is a fall and spring Convocation or only fall. Dr. Snow confirmed that there was only one fall Convocation.

Amended: to read 'For Academic Convocation, new faculty and tenured faculty are recognized [...] All full-time faculty are expected to attend Academic Convocation.'

2nd

Discussion: B. Brantley states that there was an e-mail from the Dean stating that attendance at Academic Convocation is required. Chair asks Dr. Snow for clarification. Dr. Snow states that there is a fine line between expected and required. Faculty is, certainly, expected to be there. K Gillen expresses the belief that 'expected' communicates a professional and collegial tone. D. Glaser raises questions about acceptable exemptions.

Amended Motion Passes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Motion: J Simpson motions to add an additional paragraph after Academic Convocation for Academic Commencement with similar wording to Academic Convocation.

2nd

Discussion: L. Webb raises question on the appropriate placement asking if it belongs under Faculty Responsibilities.

Amended: include the verbiage of previous amendment (required/expected) and add, both, Academic Convocation and Academic Commencement sections under the section on faculty responsibilities.

2nd

Amended Motion Passes: 11 yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions

Annual Review:

L. Webb raises questions about the vague language "annual review will be focused on the previous academic or calendar year." The belief that different colleges may have different review timeframes was expressed by Senators.

Motion: K Voges motions to add after the word 'previous academic or calendar year,' "per Dean's discretion."

2nd

Discussion: C. Suthammanont expresses concern that such language may allow for a change in the length of the review period for a faculty member. As such, it could cause problems for tenure track faculty in effectively planning, in advance, for performance criteria (i.e. publications). J. Simpson: suggests Faculty Senate may want to take a stance on either academic calendar or yearly calendar. C. Suthammanont suggests remaining consistent for a faculty member's entire tenure.

Motion Withdrawn

Discussion: Importance of handbook alignment with Promotion & Tenure documents. Point of clarification by author: D. Frantzen clarified that he included a statement that defers to college Promotion & Tenure documents. R. Vinaja questions if faculty handbook would guide college

policy. E. Westermann confirms that the handbook would guide other policies. D. Frantzen clarifies this section is a summary of main components of Promotion & Tenure but does not include specifics of the Promotion & Tenure policy. Every college will have policy with the handbook referring to those policies. J. Simpson suggests the handbook should provide guidance and protection. B. Rowe asks, if there is a discrepancy between the handbook and any other written policy, which has precedence. E. Westermann shares that the hierarchy of policy depends on the specific policy and the source it is in conflict with. System policy supersedes university policy. Perhaps the handbook should include a statement on remediation for conflict between handbook and other university policy. L. Webb states that the handbook refers the faculty member to their own College's Tenure and Promotion policy. It provides an overview but directs new employees to the college policy. J. Simpson raises the issue that the Annual Review document is standardized but the timeline is not. E. Westermann asks if what is needed is a statement that would mandate the inclusion of all information in the event of a change in the timeframe for annual review. C. Suthammanont clarifies that the concern she is expressing is regarding the need for faculty to be able to plan a consistent production schedule to ensure a faculty member is making adequate progress in whatever time period that would be evaluated in that Annual Review Process. To get adequate feedback there can be no misunderstandings of what can be produced in that timeframe being evaluated. K. Vogues affirms it could have significant impact on numerical score for evaluation. K. Gillen reminds the Annual Review does include a statement assuring faculty be afforded the opportunity to explain circumstances such as this in their review. She also noted that this solution does not fully address the issues raised and recommends we may want to table this discussion because this seems to be a bigger issue rooted more in policy than the handbook.

Motion: R. Vinaja motions to table further discussion on this section.

2nd.

Discussion: R Pittman asks what action will occur during this time period. J. Simpson suggests Faculty Senate may just want to make a motion. K Voges affirms that we should be specific and utilize something that is standardized for university wide application. As well, to discuss at the Faculty Senate level is beneficial. Dr. Snow shared that he and the Deans had previously agreed to utilize the calendar year. In this instance, he would be opposed to differing deadlines for different colleges.

Motion Fails: 0 Yes, 11 No, 0 Abstentions

Motion: K. Voges motions to change verbiage to calendar year and remove academic year.

2nd

Discussion: R. Vinaja expresses a concern for new faculty and wonders how a shorter evaluation period would impact their review. J. Simpson, B. Rowe and L. Webb shared experiences with differing timeframes for review.

Motion Passes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Post Tenure Review, Page 7

Typographical error: will change "and" to "or"

Discussion: Does promotion restart the PTR clock? K. Gillen suggests that In general we may want more information on promotion to full professor. D. Frantzen offers that the PTR document provides detailed discussion.

Motion: J. Simpson motions to change "and" to "or" in 1st sentence and clarify exactly when post tenure review happens in relation to promotion.

2nd

Discussion: Dr. Snow suggests six years after the last review or last personnel action (i.e. promotion).

Amended motion: to change the “and” “or” and add the language “or since the last personnel action” (e.g. promotion)

Amended Motion Passes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions

New faculty Information:

Faculty Staff ID/K#

Discussion: R. Pittman expresses concern about how K numbers are used so openly yet they are linked to sensitive information. Additional faculty had concerns with the multiple use of the K-Number. Issue recommended for new business.

Motion: L Webb motions to strike the UIN statement.

2nd

Motion Passes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions

New Faculty Orientation:

Motion: J. Simpson motions to amend the language to include, at a minimum, faculty are provided with tenure binder, and access to handbooks.

No second.

Point of Clarification from author: these policies were drawn, primarily, from the A&M System Handbook as these policies are system-wide. Links were taken from our website.

Correction: Human Resources is listed at being located at Gillette when actually, now, located at the Main campus. The address should be changed throughout the document.

Discussion: K. Voges asks where the resignation policy was taken from; specifically, due to the citation of an expected date regarding resignation. E. Westermann affirms that the source of the resignation policy should be clarified and asks author for that source.

Motion: K. Voges, motions to table discussion.

2nd

Discussion: D. Glaser makes the request that if we are supporting the use of a date that we are also timely in awarding contracts to allow others to be professional in their resignations.

Motion Passes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Note: Request for D. Frantzen to clarify the source of information for resignation policy due to concern with the inclusion of a calendar date.

Employee Training

Motion: L Webb motions to strike “you can think of this as a virtual classroom.... real time.”

2nd

Discussion: K. Voges asks if we are still using TTVN or other specific distance learning systems.

Amended: to strike “you can think of this as a virtual classroom.... real time.” And change language within this section to, no longer include, any specific platform. Instead, use “distance learning technologies.”

Amended Motion Passes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Holidays:

Motion: K. Gillen motions to remove the specific dates and list only the valid holiday titles.

2nd

Discussion: Need to review of the master list of holiday to be sure it includes the correct holidays.

Motion Passes: 11 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions

Vacation:

Typographical Error: choose vs. chose

Classroom & Syllabus Requirements:

Discussion: K. Vogues raises discussion on Office Hours as a policy. L. Webb asks for clarification on the previous resolution submitted by Faculty Senate. Dr. Snow clarified that it was not approved and that he was not ready to make that change. Additionally, Letters of Appointment include that requirement. E. Westermann, clarifies that to change this policy, we would need to negotiate with administration.

Chair's Prerogative to adjourn at 1:00

Note: Due to time constraints resulting from review of the Faculty Handbook, the committee was unable to attend to the agenda items listed under New Business. Those items will be moved to the 10/3/14 agenda.

Future Actions:

- Request to provide comments to D. Frantzen by submitting Motions. Motions will be sent to Melissa to collate prior to next meeting.

Approved 10/3/14