

Texas A&M University – San Antonio
Faculty Senate Agenda
Meeting of Friday, October 7, 2016
CEAC - Room 337
11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Call to Order – Senate President Cory Ross – 11:32 a.m.

Recognition of Guests:

President Matson	Lorrie Webb
Provost O'Brien	Megan Wise
Justin Smith	Katie Bridgman

Senators in attendance:

Corinna Ross	Dan Glaser	Deirdre McDonald
Amy Porter	Kathleen Voges	Caroline Knight
Robin Kapavik	Theresa Dorel	K.C. Kalmbach
Bob Shelton	Jennifer Wilson	
Jack Ayers	Bryant Moore	

Attendance by Adobe Connect:

Wu, Rowe, Simpson, and Calafiorie

Approval of agenda

Approval of minutes for meeting September 2, 2016

Faculty Handbook will be chaired by C. Ross, T.Dorel will assist.

R. Kapavik asked for a grammar change within the section on Faculty Evaluations & Merit

Vote to approve of minutes with the above changes was unanimous

Remarks

1. Senate President – Dr. Cory Ross
Thanked everyone for their hard work and quick turnaround during this busy time of the year.
2. University Provost – Dr. Michael J. O'Brien
Based on surveys from the start of the semester meetings two priorities have emerged. Number 1, faculty work load. The Provost reiterated his seriousness about a fall '17 policy for a 4:3 work load. Then in the future a 3:3. Number 2, The Office of Sponsored Programs. The hope as of right now is to hire said person in early winter. The President and Provost still have to go over budgets which they are doing right now.

3. University President – Dr. Cynthia Teniente-Matson

Reiterated the results and importance of the surveys from the start of the semester. A new Chief Business Officer, Dr. Briggs-Spencer will be starting at the end of the month. Dr. Spindle is working with the Provost and President to ensure that budgets are in order. The modular facilities are coming online soon. New signage is being installed today. The housing project will soon be fully enclosed. Implementation of the strategic plan, the rotation plan and strategic plan should be ready in early November its expect to be finally completed and able to share it around January's Convocation. The Master Plan and design for the new STEM facility are nearing completion.

4. Center for Teaching and Learning – Justin Smith (out of order during the meeting)

The offerings through CTL were based on faculty feedback from surveys done during the 6-week and 2-week training done over the summer. Examples are Dr. Jack Ayres was on campus and hosted a faculty round table and midterm feedback that was well represented across the colleges. Today's Faculty Fridays feature Dr. Holly Verhasselt (Vice President of Academic Affairs) will be talking about "mindset" in a roundtable format. Dr. John Smith on October 14th will be presenting about one of our high impact practices. Then Dr. Jim Jurica will be presenting on "video reflection teaching". After that Dr. Kalmbach will share her expertise and offering another engaging military students round-table. Then Durant Frantzen from Criminal Justice is going to have a panel discussion on teaching stats. We have partnered with the Center of Immigration of Research to stream "Teaching and Learning" through a national symposium series. A new Journal Club will be meeting once a month starting next Monday.

5. Reports from Faculty Senate Representatives

- Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) – Amy Porter

A. Porter recently attended a retreat and learn the tremendous amount of work done by WAC committee. They are nearing the completion of a draft and planning a town hall for the end of the month (October 25th). The WAC in the meantime is asking for Faculty Senate support for the following; to cap up to 3 course sections, ideally one from each college at 20 students for the spring 2017 semester for pilot studies. On October 25th WAC will share more details of the afore mentioned policy.

L. Webb Question: How are the sections that were chosen for this semester's pilots chosen?

K. Bridgman: Originally it was from discussions with WAC committee members and the committee members suggested courses from their

colleges. I then met with those faculty members. The reason we ended up only being able to pilot the chemistry labs was because the course we were looking to pilot in business, weren't able due to size. The cap on those courses were raised because of the fluctuations and the increase in enrollment. The other course from the College of Education was transitioned from a face to face to a hybrid course so we weren't going to pilot it after that.

L. Webb Question: Are they going to be chosen the same way in the future?

K. Bridgman: No, we will be reaching out for different courses. What I do is based on the suggestions from the committee members from that college, they make the suggestions and then I just talk to faculty and see if they're willing to participate in the pilot. Just because one course is in the pilot doesn't mean that other courses can't be in the future.

A motion from A. Porter for Faculty Senate to support a cap of three sections at 20 students.

-Seconded

Suggestion: A statement to the Deans and Provost that as we are building these classes and the Faculty Senate supports the capping of a certain number of sections.

Suggestion: Go through academic affairs. A statement as simple as an email addressed to the Provost requesting that since we are in the curriculum review process and not completed yet that the writing center's requesting a hold on 3 classes capped at 20. Then the Provost can act on that with the Deans to ensure that actually happens.

Vote: With the language provided by A. Porter an email addressed to the Provost requesting a hold on 3 classes capped at 20 on behalf of WAC.

All in favor: 12 votes.

Opposed: 0 votes

Abstentions: none

- Updates on OSRP – Dr. Cory Ross
No further updates from what Dr. O'Brien mentioned. C. Ross has asked everyone for suggestions for faculty that have been involved with external grants. From which she has created a short list that was shared with Dr. O'Brien's office to put together a group of people so we know what expertise we have and where the problems lay.

- Executive Committee Updates
No other updates

- Evaluation and Merit Committee Updates – Dr. Theresa Dorel

The committee has met twice. During both meetings there was a lot of discussion about continuity and equity across colleges. From these discussions one really overarching recommendation: Give this back to the colleges so each college can go ahead and establish their own guidelines for evaluation and merit because each college has different needs that need to be documented for the process.

Other recommendations that come forward underneath that umbrella. We are suggesting that the policies that are drafted be highly reflective of the tenure and promotion policies that are set in place for each college. If there are no tenure and promotion policies that are directed towards that college that those also be visited simultaneously so as not to double up the work or having to go back and change things. We need to look at possibly making merit something that you visit maybe every 3 years, taking average of multiple years worth of evaluations. Making sure there's no violations with college policies, university policies, or system policies. It is still a lofty goal of January 2017 which means colleges would have to immediately commence their own committees to establish evaluation and merit guidelines.

The merit will be decided at the Dean and Chair level. Of course the Provost and the President would make those final decisions based on the Dean's and Chairs recommendation. We're looking at possibly getting these recommendations back from the colleges to have them approved by Faculty Senate and then also the Provost office before implementation. We do have a lofty goal of January 2017, we may not make that. Reality is that may not happen.

A. Porter: We need to map out some of these specific recommendations so when sent back to the colleges they can follow these guidelines. We had several people who wanted to make sure that the process aligns very closely with the T&P process. We are talking specifically about the binder and whatever each college creates for evaluation process that it's brief. That it doesn't become something unwieldy. People should be able to handle this in a concise manner. Also one of the concerns and why we are talking about why there are somewhat different expectations within the colleges is because the colleges at some point were to clarify T&P policies.

I know in Arts and Sciences there was talked about a draft policy but the College of Education has one up online and I'm not sure about business. There are differences in those policies. Some of the concerns that the annual evaluations give a lot of credit for working on projects but not

necessarily completing them so we had some guidelines making sure there are specific goals set or timelines for a project so that these things would be completed at some point so you don't have somebody going through and getting positive annual evaluations the whole time but then it becomes a problem at the time of tenure promotion.

One other thing that was possibly a recommendation I know for the merit committee, we talked about having the same instrument, so in evaluations tied to merit that there could be a committee if a college preferred to go with a committee of peers to look at merit rather than a chair.

Dr. O'Brien: A point of clarification, my understanding of the last processes if you scored at X on your overall rating and you were above that rating that qualified you for a merit increase. It wasn't if you were above that rating the chair or the dean would recommend you. I think that becomes problematic if we're using the term Dean and Chair recommendations versus a standard. If you are above that standard you qualify for merit. I think you start open up questions of equity and a potential grievance issue so I don't think it can be allowed to stand as the way it was portrayed. Maybe that's not what you meant but the way it's portrayed here it can't be a pick and choice otherwise I think you're going to have some real issues with equity and potentially grievance.

Intense discussion continues. See transcript for more information.

Dr. O'Brien: I am speaking for me and not the President, but what I expect the President would do and it is her decision. This is what you've got for merit pay and then I work with the academic units, the Deans and the Chairs, but it's not just because somebody hits a magic bar that everybody gets X amount of money. I won't do that. I can see down the road I might give money differentially to the colleges based on the needs that have been reported back up to me. I have a more fundamental belief that people will do the right thing when they are presented with good options. That is each department should have it's own committee that is elected by the faculty. You could do it one of several ways, that are making recommendations of their peers to a department chair as opposed to a department Chair or Dean saying just send me the stuff and I'll make the decision. I won't allow that, I want departments and units to have a say in that and then it gets reported up and Deans make decisions just like Chairs do and I'll make the decision eventually. There has to be that buy-in from day one and that where those department committees are so important.

Dr. Matson: I could add to the former statement that in our emergence as a University we haven't really had a consistent practice or policy and that was part of the challenge that I was presented with almost in my first 2 days. The first meeting with all of you I was asked about merit practices

and policies and I charged back that it's not something that the President or the Provost should sit down and write, it is a Senate issue for you to develop a policy for that practice.

Intense discussion continues. See transcript for more information.

C. Ross: This was obviously a very contentious issue, we knew it would be, it continues to be, unfortunately we need to move on. Teresa and Amy do you feel you have enough that you can take it back to the committee and at least bring the issues that everyone needs ... I don't think we can make a consensus, there's no consensus at this table. I'm tasking you with taking it back and developing something that can come forward to Senate.

- Bylaws Committee Updates – Dan Glaser

A year ago this was presented to the Faculty Senate that as we've been growing we're noticing we didn't have formal procedures as to how we should organize our colleges. This was just an idea that I came up with. I presented it and what it was, was to create a task force that we would come up with bylaws for the colleges and we'd start out with one big set of bylaws that would be somewhat generic enough that Arts and Sciences could take it and adapt it as they see fit in the future. The same for Education and the College of Business and any new structure that we have coming along in the future. It's divided up to various parts.

First of all we have adoption of college bylaws. How we will do it. Faculty Senate, you guys like it, pass it, if we need to amend it, we'll amend it, if it's just really that bad we'll reject it. Hopefully it's a pass. There's a statement on shared governance and this is brought out from the faculty handbook, it's line 16 through 18, the structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved and established by joint actions of the components of the institution, faculty representative should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty and this is coming straight out of AAUP 1966 Statement of government of colleges and universities. Our committee consisted of 6 faculty members and 3 administrators. It was 2 faculty members from each of the colleges. We met about 6 times now.

On line 20 we first have the college procedure bylaws. We did not attempt to go even further into the colleges having a departmental procedure bylaws that we have in college. I believe that if you want to go deeper into that each college can develop those. On the next page we have college standing committees and we came up with three different committees, we came up with the promotion and tenure and post tenure review committee and the curriculum committee.

We had one on here that was for strategic planning but one of the things we found was college of Business has that and that's principally because of our accrediting board, the AA, CSP requires us to go in that direction. We didn't we found Education and Arts and Sciences didn't have one so we didn't expectation is as this is approved and it gets to the college then they could go ahead, the college of Business that is, they could go ahead and put in their own standing committee.

We also have a procedure for that, that's on line 112 on the third page which is for other standing committees. How they can be set up. It can either be by the Dean or faculty can also propose them and what we'd like to see is a structure and function and how people are elected and so on to these committee. On line 126 we also have adhoc committees that come up and those can be established by faculty or they can be recommended by the Dean or department Chairs. Finally 134 we have amendments to the college bylaws. Each college then if they would like to make changes to these bylaws they can go ahead and amend them and this is the procedure for doing that.

There's a lot to take in here and I don't think today we have the time to do any of it. My suggestion is if you have some ideas about this start writing them down, you can email them to me or to Cory or to the whole senate so that we can start thinking about them so rather than showing up here, starting from scratch, if you've already got an idea that you want to make a change go ahead and propose it or have it in writing or something to that effect so that were not just communicating everything verbally. It would make it easier if we had it in print. Either electronically or on paper.

Old Business

C.Ross: Library Committee chair needed: Bryant Moore nominated to chair committee.

Vote: unanimous

New Business

Chair access to Faculty Town Square

C. Ross Motion to add Chairs to TownSquare

Seconded

Discussion: Grave concern over their administrator role which may prove to be an issue. For further information see transcript.

Vote: “To allow access of Chairs to the Faculty Town Square”

For: 3

Against: 6

Abstentions: 2

Review of term limits for Senators and Executive team.

C. Ross: Redefine number of Senators and terms, increase to 3 year

Abrupt adjourn due to scheduling conflicts