

Texas A&M University- San Antonio
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
November 7, 2014. MC01- 353

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

In Attendance: : E. Bliss-Zaks, K. Gillen, M. Jozwiak, B. Moore, C. Nolasco, R. Pittman, J. Simpson, K. Voges, R. Vinaja, L. Webb B. Snow, R. Sajjadur , R. Kapavik, A. Holiday (SGA)

Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes from October 3, 2014

Motion: J. Simpson motions to approve the agenda and minutes from the 10-3-14 meeting. 2nd.

Vote Passes: 11 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

Executive Report

President's Search Committee: L. Webb reports Dr. Westermann was selected to be on the search committee for the incoming President and will provide additional faculty representation. As they are meeting today, he is not in attendance and she will be overseeing the meeting.

Texas Council of Faculty Senate meeting, October 2014. One meeting was spent with Dr. Hallmark, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Community colleges in Texas are really pushing to offer 4 year degrees. Four-year institutions are fighting back but the Texas Higher Education Coordinating board is seriously looking into it. The fields of nursing and applied sciences are areas being looked at most frequently. There is broad concern regarding SRIs. There was consensus that they want to return to the old system of scantrons. Dr. Hallmark views deans differently and prefers they teach one class per year. He also remarked that A&M- College Station limit Deans to two three year terms. Post tenure review was heavily discussed with much conversation focusing in on a measurement system to help enhance consistency. TAMU - Commerce raised questions about faculty workload with regards to size of courses, online courses, and research. Dr. Westermann specifically spoke about how some faculty are supervising 30-plus research projects without compensation beyond service credit. Dr. Hallmark will provide information related to faculty pay equity issues within system schools. TAMU-Corpus Christi asked for information on pay equity between system schools as faculty move between ranks. Intellectual property panel affirmed this is a hot topic across state and nation. A&M is heavily protecting of faculty so we felt good in comparison to other institutions. Lastly, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is heavily scrutinizing new graduate programs. This will be especially relevant to our institution coming out of SACS. Data to support the need for the program is important. J. Simpson shared how difficulty the paperwork is to complete for degree programs (i.e. sociology). Suggesting it would take a full year to complete. L. Webb closed the report sharing key faculty issues from round up which included: shared governance, P&T policies including post tenure review and collegiality as criteria for promotion and tenure, evaluation of online degree programs and faculty workloads. No decisions were made just consensus regarding what is happening.

Old Business

Dean's List: R. Pittman provided a table showing data from system schools on the issue. She shared that the committee divided up schools to research and compiled their findings in the handout.

Somehow, our requirements fall .10 or .20 below what others are using. The committee also included how other institutions are labeling their recognition. The inconsistency in labels gives us flexibility in selecting titles. With the data gathered the committee is waiting for provost to give future guidance. Dr. Snow thanked the committee for checking with other schools, commenting that this issue has been highlighted at various graduation ceremonies during the reading off of names with honors. Quite a few have commented on how bright our students are or that we are recognizing so much that it is losing importance. That is what he was hoping to look at and the committee's follow up has helped. He asked for input, thinking, on this issue. R Kapavik questioned how we became the lowest rather than be similar to Central? Provost Snow suggested it was flow over from Kingsville. Ramona looked at Kingsville data (this data was accidentally omitted from the handout) and shared that they use the same requirements as TAMU-SA. J. Simpson comments that with the consistency shown at all other institutions, it is difficult to justify the difference. R. Vinaja asks about the percentages of students receiving the honors. J. Simpson offers GPA + top 10% could be used as criteria rather than a hard GPA cut off. R. Vinaja suggests using top % of students. R. Kapavik expresses concern about using percentages due to the timing of award confirmation. She could imagine a situation where someone was not recognized for an honor at the ceremony, but when final grades are posted (after graduation) receiving an award that didn't get announced. She suggests Dr. Vinaja's inquiry into percentages is important but we want that to be an internal source of data analysis and consideration. There was general agreement from all faculty senators on this point. M. Jozwiak asks about the process need for making this change. Dr. Snow said that it will be implemented through his office. J. Simpson affirms that we do not currently have a dean's list. R. Pittman asks for clarification on next steps. Dr. Snow will meet with the committee at the next meeting to make recommendations on Dean's list. L. Webb asks about timeline for implementation on Dean's List. Dr. Snow affirms that a decision target will be December meeting. The issues will be revisited in December with a vote expected. Discussion on implementation timeline is raised. Dr. Snow shared that because it is an Honor, it may not maintain the same requirements of notice and a Dec 2015 graduation target is expected

Faculty Recognition: M. Jozwiak shared that the committee has developed a survey to solicit faculty feedback on what is important to them in a faculty recognition award. It is anticipated that this survey be distributed to all faculty (tenure, non-tenure and adjunct) in the next few days. The committee will be meeting again once that data is compiled so they can begin to form recommendations. Fall 2015 is the target for the first cycle of awards.

Faculty Development Leave. A proposal from the Faculty Research and Development Committee was prepared and distributed. This is something we will want to add to the handbook but the committee has not forwarded their recommendations to Dr. Snow. K. Gillen shared that the idea would be that there would be a competitive process where faculty could apply for research based reassignments. The committee has had some consultation with Deans and Department Chairs and they recommend that they have some voice to ensure the ability of the faculty to take a leave without significant consequence to the department. Please review the document. Opens to conversation: C. Nolasco asks, how would criteria be weighted? How often could faculty request? Should faculty reassignment be contingent on creation of a product at the end? R. Sajjadur shared this is just a framework that has been presented. K. Gillen acknowledges that there is the need to develop a rubric and work out the questions raise by C. Nolasco. R. Pittman raises concern about the overload of service impacting faculty's ability to engage in scholarship and wonders how do we balance that? K. Gillen shares that course reassignments are clear unit

of time with service being less tangible. To provide clarification on C. Nolasco's inquiry about an outcome, report, or manuscript under review- it will depend on discipline and recommendations by the committee. J. Simpson reminds that this is the intermediary between full sabbatical. K. Gillen favors outcome report with drafts of documents and includes productivity on previously reassigned courses could be part of the rubric. K. Voges asks if each college will have a designated number of slots or if it will be a fluid number with Dean's/Department Chair's recommendations making that determination. K. Gillen clarifies that a large portion of the process should be based on program need not individual's agreement with the individual applicants and his/her research agenda. R. Sajjadur questions if non-tenured faculty had greater pressure to do research and produce than faculty that are already tenured. K. Voges offers an alternative perspective suggesting the importance of research for promotion and maintenance of full professor. J. Simpson recommends that non-tenure track and adjunct faculty should not be eligible for this reassignment. K. Gillen asks how to proceed? She is looking to Dr. Snow for further guidance. Dr. Snow affirms this is not intended for non-tenure track faculty. He affirms the suggestion that past performance is important criteria, as well as that this program can't be at the expense of the needs of the dept./program- and what those needs are, is something that only the chair or dean would know. We need recommendations on how often and when. K. Gillen asks if a certain number will be designated. Dr. Snow confirms that there needs to be some limit on it because of our accreditation obligation that there be certain percentage of the program be taught by faculty. He doesn't know number but would like to be conservative to start and grow the number thereafter. His expectation is that there would be a report on what you did or manuscript generated, working paper etc. R. Kapavik suggests that if we are replacing class time with research, there needs to have something to show such as a manuscript or manuscript in process. L. Webb affirms we should make sure something can be produced. R. Kapavik shares that some may only need one semester, others two. These are some baby steps towards faculty research. K. Gillen states that the committee will revise based on feedback and bring back for Dec member meeting for a vote. The committee would appreciate any sense of a number. Dr. Snow agrees he will bounce this against deans & chairs for feedback. C. Nolasco asks if the actual number of reassignments is required or the maximum available, with the possibility that some may remain unfilled based on quality of submissions. K. Gillen affirmed the importance of maintaining the integrity of the reassignment process so some could remain unfilled if there were not enough qualified applications/candidates.

Faculty Handbook: J. Simpson reminds us that this is a living document and the research reassignment could be added in the future.

Motion: J. Simpson motions to adopt the Faculty Handbook as amended. 2nd.

Vote Passes: 12 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

New Business

SGA update: A. Holiday shares that there is a survey on food service underway with 384 completed) 24% satisfactory rate thus far. The survey is looking at quality, friendliness and price. They are finding that students are taking business elsewhere as the cost of food on campus could be \$400.00 per month for students. J. Simpson shares that Student Affairs is doing a broader survey addressing the same issues. A. Holiday clarifies that Student Affairs took questions from the Student Gov. survey but that SGA wants own the data from students and that their survey started sooner. K. Voges asks if they are differentiating Main Campus from Brooks. A. Holiday states that they can differentiate but that the Food Service Survey is for Main Campus.

However, while the focus was on main campus it is almost impossible to ignore the issues at brooks.

Administrative Updates

Equity Study: Dr. Snow reported that last year we did not have money for raises so they did an equity raise and did bump up all Assistant Professors to a salary of at least \$60,000. Administration pooled money to accomplish this. In the coming year they will try to do the same. This year will try to pool funds and bump up all Associate Professors to \$65,000.

Dr. Snow provided clarification that the hiring freeze was only at staff level not for faculty.

Dr. Snow affirmed that he will continue to provide his Faculty Matters Update on a regular basis once each semester.

K. Gillen asked for clarification on the Faculty Development Leave because faculty were under the impression that we didn't have it until they saw in the handbook that we do. She asks, can people apply? Dr. Snow affirms that yes, if you meet the requirements (i.e. have six years at university) and have approval of Department Chair and Dean you can apply. This leave is available to a maximum of one or two individuals per year IF someone meets the requirement. He cautions that the Board of Regents does not smile at these leaves and they must be approved by that board. Sabbaticals have gotten such a bad reputation so we use the language "Professional Leave." K. Gillen asks does the leave have to be for research? DR. Snow does not believe it is defined as research so he would like to see some faculty use it as teaching improvement as teaching is major theme at our university.

Announcements

J. Simpson shares that there is a faculty survey on Academic Technology underway. Also, there is a new joint effort with the methods class in sociology to join statistics and sociology to gather data and do analysis. They hope to report by Dec 5. on the findings of this study. It is open for two weeks. He will try to have data to give feedback but if he doesn't meet the December timeline he will report in January. Also there is a student survey open. Please encourage students to take survey for general campus experience.

Follow up: Add this report to December Agenda

Motion: K. Gillen motions to adjourn.

Meeting Adjourned by L Webb at 12:47 p.m.