Texas A&M University- San Antonio Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes October 3, 2014, 11:30-1:00 p.m. BCB 162

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

In attendance: Emily Bliss-Zaks, Katherine Gillen, Melissa Jozwiak, Robin Kapavik, Bryant Moore, Rahman Sajjadur, Joseph Simpson, Robert Vinaja, Lorrie Webb, Ed Westermann, Allison Garcia (SGA), Andres Holliday (SGA).

Approval of Faculty Senate meeting Minutes from September 5, 2014:

Motion: J. Simpson motions to accept the minutes from the 9/5/2014 meeting as written. $2^{nd}\,$

Motion Passes: 10 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Executive Committee Update:

University Space Committee Representative: E. Westermann reported that there was an oversight in electing a member to serve on the University Space Committee. Asks for nominations.

Motion: J. Simpson nominates J Simpson to the Space Committee. 2nd. Motion Passes: 10 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Presidents Search Committee: E. Westermann shared that concern has been raised regarding the importance of the committee including representation from various groups. In looking at the composition of the search committee there was some questions as to how that was formed. An e-mail containing reference to system policy was, initially, provided by V. Elias and sent to Dr. Snow by E. Westermann. Dr. Snow referred the concern to Dr. Hallmark. The Executive Committee will meet with Dr. Hallmark at 10:30 on 10/10/14 (with an open session at 11:30 for any other faculty who wish to attend). E. Westermann commented that he is uncertain the composition of the committee will be changed so it is important in the meeting to ensure that we determine how faculty will be represented. Andres asked for clarification on if there were two faculty appointed to the committee. E. Westermann confirmed. J. Simpson inquired if there is student representation. Andres shared that there is, currently, no students on the committee. E. Westermann, emphasized we want to be sure that faculty input is incorporated into the search. E. Westermann had the opportunity last week met with Dr. Hallmark to discuss this. J. Simpson asked if the answer to our request was no. E. Westermann said that there will need for more conversation to broaden the committee.

- Note: M. Jozwiak will reserve a room at Main campus: Madla building for the 11:30 Faculty Meeting.
- Co-Signing Bank Accounts: E Westermann updated Senators on the issues related to Cosigning student bank accounts. Student Engagement and Academic Success is

creating new accounts internally. It is no longer necessary to go external. J Simpson: advised that there may still be some residual issues such as deactivating accounts and eliminating EIN numbers. E. Westermann acknowledged and reaffirmed that faculty will be the chief member responsible for overseeing/approval of allocation of the funds. Ms. Cheryl LeGras has assured us that faculty would have to co-sign on each withdraw. E. Westermann expressed hat he feels that funds are the area that could have the largest legal implications for students who may be unaware of restrictions on how funds can be issued. Faculty may be able to help prevent that from happening so this is seen as a positive change.

Parliamentary Procedures: J. Simpson reported that copies of Parliamentary Procedures were distributed. Because we do not have enough copies for everyone, Senators are being asked to pass copies between members. He noted that Robert's Rules of Order may provide some an advantage in meetings. A quick summary printed with flow charts for motions are included. The Democratic Rules are straight forward, for example, you automatically get a second and discussion is included. All amendments are treated as friendly amendments and then it goes to a vote if someone disagrees. If there is a major contention, then it goes to a vote and discussion is ended. It provides collegiality and gives you flexibility. In Robert's Rues, you don't make amendment s to amendments, you must vote on each individual amendment before a second one is offered. You can revoke motions. Democratic Rules also give more leeway with e-mail and voting.

Old Business

- Dean's List Report: The Dean's List committee has not met, yet. R. Pittman reports having had a difficult time getting the email addresses for two members. She received an email Monday from one of the members that she hadn't been able to reach. She will send a group email to determine the best time to meet next week.
- Faculty Recognition Report: M. Jozwiak reported that the committee had met and assigned individuals to review what peer institutions do to recognize excellence in teaching, research and scholarship. The committee would review that information and make preliminary recommendations then report back to colleges for faculty feedback. The committee is aware that there is concern among faculty that the process of applying for and being awarded recognition must be based on valid and reliable measures of excellence (i.e. SRI scores are problematic as a criteria). Further, the goal of the committee is to develop a fair and equitable process for all eligible faculty to be recognized.

Faculty Development:

Motion: J. Simpson requests to amend the agenda to include faculty development report. $2^{nd}\,$

Motion Passes: 10 yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions.

Discussion: K. Gillen share that the committee would like clarification for faculty development leave and put a process in place. Establishing a means by which faculty could have a research based faculty workload reassignment. It would be

modeled on President's Circle process. The committee will float a draft of their proposal.

Handbook:

Office Hours on p. 15:

- E. Westermann reminds senators that the Provost said he was open to reconsider the current policy.
- Motion: J. Simpson motions to change number from 10 to 6. 2nd
- Discussion: M. Jozwiak asks about the importance of including a justification. It is noted that justification has been provided, previously. L. Webb inquires if we would want to base office hours on course load assignments. For example, she currently holds ten hours of office hours for one 3 cr class because her other assignments include supervising student teachers and being a program coordinator.
- Amendment: Changing the required office hours to two hours of office hours per three credit hours of course load with a maximum of 10 hours.

Motion Passes: 9 Yes, 0 No, 1 abstention.

Syllabus:

Discussion: R. Vinaja expresses a concern about link changes being required. Noting that changes to system will require the links to be updated.

Point of clarification: consultation does not mean approval.

Academic Integrity and Misconduct p. 17:

Discussion: J Simpson notes past issues coordinating with the office of student integrity, dept. heads, etc. Questions if this section should be updated to reflect recent changes. K. Gillen expresses that there are differences between colleges in responding. K. Gillen suggests perhaps we change to "however faculty are encouraged to discuss with their department head and take matters to address the situation with the student." It was shared that the previous process included completing the documentation and then checking for prior evidence of misconduct. If no evidence was found, the document was filed. If there was prior evidence, the concern went to the board. Ongoing discussion by various faculty expresses the perspective that what is currently missing in the process is that reporting is discretionary and that with JagCare faculty are unsure if reports are being enforced. If you don't a report there isn't visibility so reporting is important. It was also expressed that without the documentation there is a disconnect. J. Simpson expresses a concern about not reporting and that it could lead to a larger disconnect in the system. A. Holliday expresses that reporting is very important if student is caught cheating or plagiarizing. He emphasized there must be accountability at this level. D. Frantzen: raised concern over the small things and grey areas that warrant discretion. L. Webb shared an example. R. Vinaja affirms that we need some discretion. E. Westermann asks if the instructor institutes academic sanctions, would it change the necessity of reporting. J. Simpson states that if faculty doesn't file a report when instituting academic sanctions, it might violate the student's rights to recourse and may also have implications forfaculty.

Motion: J. Simpson motions to add "If the incident involves an academic sanction by the instructor, the faculty member is strongly advised to report the incident to the ______ (insert appropriate office/ Assistant Vice President for Student Engagement & ______ Success)____

Motion Passes: 9 Yes, 1 No, 0 abstentions.

- Motion: K. Gillen motions to update the sections in the faculty handbook about Library Services, Disability Support Services, and Tutoring Services to reflect their new locations as well as any new information about the services they offer. 2nd
- Discussion: R. Vinaja reiterates concern that it will constantly change and questions if we should include it. J. Simpson reminds that this document will be updated annually and would be helpful with one-stop shopping for faculty. R. Vinaja asks who will update. E Westermann suggests we may need an ad hoc committee to review and update. L. Webb reminds everyone that last week we discussed this document would need to be fluid and is not set in stone.
- Motion Passes: 10 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention
- Ethics policy: Faculty senate asks for confirmation that system policy is source of information here.

Conflicts of interest p. 19:

J. Simpson motions: change impartial to biased (4th line). 2nd Motion Passes: 10 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Office of Academic Affairs: Professional Development and Training/Professional Leave, Discussion: K. Gillen notes that when you go to link it mentions a line about approval being contingent on if the department can spare you and perform normal functioning. It is questioned if applying for this leave is a right or contingent right. E. Westermann suggests that Faculty Senate has to be the oversight if people are turned down/ when there is denial of requests.

Motion: M. Jozwiak motions to add "if faculty member are told they are unable to apply there is written justification given to the individual faculty member detailing as to why they can't apply"

Motion Passes: 10 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

K. Gillen restates that we need overall clarification on this process. D. Frantzen the link gives scoring and vetting process that happens for proposals to be ranked.

Institutional Effectiveness:

- Discussion: J. Simpson shares a concern about being told to go to ITS vs. Jane Mims to get that information. Andres shares that Dr. Cooper gives that information to students. D. Frantzen took the information from the website and created summary. Jane was listed as go-to-person because she has historically served in that role.
- Point of Action: verify who is the office point of contact?

Grievances:

- Discussion: D. Frantzen, this section came from our existing handbook. E. Westermann notes that he doesn't' see faculty grievance committee listed here and offers possible language stating that if "can't resolve... at the faculty senate level or provost level, they can ask for a hearing with the compliance committee."
- Motion: K. Gillen motions to insert "Faculty Senate Compliance and Grievance committee. ... Provost"

Motion Passes: 10 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Faculty Research: Next meeting we will circulate a motion to add a paragraph/proposal for faculty course reassignment for research purposes. K. Gillen will provide the paragraph.

Library Services:

Motion by B. Moore to address typographical errors: 2nd: 1st paragraph: Update location-Should say "…located in the Central Academic Building on the Main Campus, Room 202…" Remove (Digsby) after online chat service.
Motion Passes: 10 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

UPD:

Motion: J. Simpson motions to insert a statement on payment of fines and appeals process. Motion Passes: 10 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstention

Study Abroad: Note: Address the typo

New Business: No new business

Adjourned by E. Westermann at 12:46.