

Faculty Senate Meeting—November 3, 2015

Senators Present: Eliezer Louzada, Bart Ballard, April Conkey, Kathleen Rees, Armando Ibanez, Christine Fiestas, Barbara Cooke, Pamela Wright, Ryan Paul, Elizabeth Janzen, Joachim Reinhuber, Richard Miller, Stan Hodges, Ruth Chatelain-Jardon, Don Jones, Daniel Burt, Melody Knight, Monica Wong Ratcliff, Chongwei Xiao, Joseph Sai, Rajab Chaloo, David Ramirez, Bruce Marsh, Amit Verma, Ryan Rhoades, Polly Allred, Jody Briones, Valerie Bartelt, Patricia Huskin, Nestor Sherman, Lifford McLauchlan, Hong Zhou, Alberto Rodriguez

Senators Absent: Manuel Flores (1), Xiaoliu Chi (3), Kendra Huff (3), Nuri Yilmazer (2), Maria de Jesus Ayala-Schueneman (2)

Attending: Dr. Heidi Anderson, Dr. Mohamed Abdelrahman, Randy Hughes, Abigail De La Mora,

❖ **Quorum Call 3:30:**

- *Dr. Verma asked parliamentarian, Dr. Nestor Sherman, if there were enough members for a quorum. Dr. Sherman replied in the affirmative.*

❖ **Approval of Minutes from October 6, 2015 Senate Meeting:**

- *Dr. Verma asked for review and approval of the previous meeting's minutes, which had been emailed out to the senators.*

- A motion to approve the minutes was made by Dr. Richard Miller. The motion was seconded, and then passed unanimously.

➤ **Presentation from Provost:**

- *Dr. Heidi Anderson gave an informal and brief presentation to the Faculty Senate*

- She has been conducting meet and greets with the various departments and colleges. Dr. Anderson said the feedback has been very valuable for her to learn about each unit.
- The big item currently is the **search for the College of Arts and Sciences Dean**. Dr. Anderson passed out a draft schedule for the search process.
 - A survey was sent to faculty and staff within the College of Arts and Sciences asking if they thought an external or internal search for a permanent dean was appropriate. Respondents were asked to give written justification for this choice as well as their rank (faculty, staff, etc.) and years of service.
 - Dr. Anderson stated that she learned a lot about the college, and only she knows the results of the survey.
 - There will be an external search for the A&S dean, welcoming internal applicants. This has been announce to the college, and will now be announced to the university and community.
 - Dr. Anderson will publish (to the college first) the draft of the search timeline and its phases.

Faculty Senate Meeting—November 3, 2015

- Mr. Bob Lawless of AGB Search Firm will head the search up. Mr. Lawless has worked previously with the university to bring in the President as well as two Provosts.
- The search committee will be composed of a faculty representative from each of 10 departments, two department chairs, two deans, and representatives from Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and Student Government Association (SGA) respectively.
 - Dr. Anderson stated this is a large committee due to the large size of the college itself.
 - Next Monday, Dr. Anderson will receive names of the individuals to serve on the committee. Those names will be presented to the President on the following Tuesday.
 - A website will be developed regarding the search.
- Dr. Anderson stated that the timeline is drafted to be conducted quickly. There are two reasons for this.
 - One reason is bringing stability to the college as soon as possible.
 - The second is since we will be posting on the Chronicle for January 8th; there is a deadline for that submission.

➤ **Questions and Comments:**

- *Dr. Verma asked about the state of iTech. During the year, iTech, which was originally under the Provost's Office, was moved to Dr. Terisa Riley's division. Faculty members feel they do not have a direct link to iTech as they previously had regarding classroom technology.*
- Dr. Anderson stated that she would need to get more information on the issue. She requested more data and details so that she can pull that information together and pass it on. She suggested meeting with the person responsible to discuss the issues.
- With no more questions, Dr. Verma thanked Dr. Anderson for her presentation.

❖ **Report from Dr. Mohamed Abdelrahman:**

- *Dr. Abdelrahman gave an update on the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.*
- Dr. Abdelrahman stated that although he is the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, he would like to take the time to discuss the other side of his title, which is research.
- There have been 21 new faculty members hired both last year and this year. The New Faculty Investment Program has now includes a research track and training in 'grantsmanship' for new faculty. The focus is more on the second year of the New Faculty Investment Program.
- A new program titled iCare will help with the focuses on undergraduate research and academic engagement through grant modules. Faculty would develop these modules in core classes in their respective disciplines.
- There has been an increase in the TCUR budget to help engage undergraduate research.

Faculty Senate Meeting—November 3, 2015

- Dr. Abdelrahman is working on increasing research centers such as biotechnology and biomedical areas. He hopes to exceed \$21 million in research expenditures and feel this can be done with undergraduate and graduate research.
- Dr. Abdelrahman also mentioned the Title V grant and the push for STEM research ideas and requested that if any individuals have any research ideas to pass them along.

➤ **Questions and Comments:**

- *Dr. Verma stated that there have been comments across campus that there is money but no strategic vision.*
 - Dr. Abdelrahman stated that with RDF money about \$1 million is put back in the college. Currently, 19 million is brought in with specific goals, which seem to have natural resources as their areas of focus.
 - Dr. Abdelrahman wants to broaden the umbrella of research. He used the College of Arts and Sciences as an example of a college not big on grants.
 - Dr. Abdelrahman mentioned that there are five NIH funded grants that gives leverage to engage undergraduate research.
- *Dr. Rajab Chaloo asked how this money is going to be used for university growth and when will we see it.*
 - Dr. Abdelrahman stated that particular question is for the President as research funding works under specific goals related to the proposal.
 - Dr. Anderson stated that the question would need to be answered at another time by the Provost or President.
- With no more questions, Dr. Verma thanked Dr. Abdelrahman for his presentation.

❖ **Report from Committees and Officers:**

- *Various committees and officers gave updates to the Faculty Senate.*

▪ **Faculty Senate President Update - Dr. Verma, Faculty Senate President:**

- *Dr. Verma recently attended the Texas Council of Faculty Senates and met with Vice Chancellor Hallmark as well as other Faculty Senate Presidents. There were discussions on various items.*
- *Dr. Verma handed out information on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) 60X30 Strategic Plan (previously emailed out to senators).*
- *Dr. Verma opened the floor for questions and discussion regarding the issue.*
 - Dr. Briones asked about the **changes in Wisconsin** and why we as Texans should care?
 - Dr. Verma replied that it does not really affect us, because they are changing their tenure system to align with the national trend similar to what Texas already follows.
 - Dr. Verma explained that the **60X30TX plan** will affect us, so individuals should please review it, so we can determine our stance and communicate it to the president, so he can voice it to the forum.
 - Some individuals have read the report and reviewed the goals.
 - 60% of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate or degree.

Faculty Senate Meeting—November 3, 2015

- There was also discussion on completion rates as well as Goal #3, which states that all graduates from Texas public institutions of higher education will have completed programs with identified marketable skills.
- The final goal discussed is the loan debt. The goal stated that undergraduate student loan debt will not exceed 60 percent of first-year wages for graduates of Texas public institutions.
- A concern was stated that this plan was developed without formal faculty representation.
- Dr. Verma stated that he abstained from the vote, as he had not read the complete report prior to the vote, but that the motion passed opposing this plan.
- Dr. Richard Miller stated that this issue is not going away and stated that they need to come back and ask faculty to participate in the discussion. Clarification needs to be made to define marketable.
- Dr. Verma stated that he met with Dr. Tallant and discussed the issue and informed him that at TCFS meeting it was stated that university presidents in Texas oppose the plan. Dr. Tallant stated he did not know.
- Dr. Verma has read the entire report and didn't find anything specific that stands out; rather the whole report was a concern.
- Dr. Christian Fiestas asked who is in charge of this report. It was stated that the report has a list of individuals.
- Dr. Kathleen Rees asked if there was a Lumina connection, as this sounds similar. No one was aware of that connection.
- Dr. Verma stated that the way the graduation rates are calculated it is unfair to TAMU-K because of the type of community we serve. We have students enter at different points versus other universities that receive students from freshman to senior year.
- Dr. Patricia Huskin stated that this also affects Del Mar College as well as they cannot count some of their students. Dr. Kathleen Rees stated that transfer student don't get credit
- Dr. Polly Allred stated that faculty needs to be involved in the definition of marketable skills. It can be quite burdensome to redefine, re-document, and designate who does this and when.
- Dr. Daniel Burt stated that reading the objectives gives ideas as to what they will do.
- Dr. Verma stated that reading the executive summary will give you one idea and the full report another. -He asked Senators to read the full report and share it with others.
- Dr. Monica Ratcliff stated that her department has an articulation agreement where the students get their associates first and then come here to finish their four years.
- Dr. Verma stated that the requirement to justify marketability affects all departments regardless of discipline, even if they think they are exempt (automatically marketable).

Faculty Senate Meeting—November 3, 2015

- Dr. Verma stated that at the council meeting the top agenda item was **SB 11** (gun law).

❖ **SB 11 Response Committee – Dr. Bart Ballard & Mr. Randy Hughes:**

- *Dr. Ballard and Mr. Hughes reported regarding the Campus Plan regarding SB 11.*
 - Dr. Ballard stated that the system has allowed university to establish their rules to cover areas that are not excluded by the law.
 - The committee, who was chaired by Mr. Hughes, was composed from individuals from Compliance, University Police Department, Recreation and Housing.
 - The committee solicited requests for additional exclusions and received decent feedback. The committee discussed those exclusions with system lawyers to ensure compliance with the law.
 - Forums are being setup to share information. Final recommendations will be sent to the President for approval (with or without modifications) and once approved to the Board of Regents (with or without modifications) then finally to the legislature.
 - A Concealed Handgun License (CHL) holder must be a Texas resident over the age of 21 and must complete a background check and pass a 9 criteria test.
 - System lawyers looked into the statistics of citizens.
 - 2.7% of all eligible Texans are CHL holders.
 - 1.4% of our student population on campus is between the ages of 21-30. Based on this statistics, in the dorms, there would be 4 or 5 students with CHL. International students were not considered, so this number is likely smaller.
 - The committee talked to Wisconsin who has passed a similar law this year. They also spoke with Utah (specifically University of Utah), the state with this type of law the longest (5 years). They stated that during the time they have had zero violations of state law or university policy.
 - Those areas that are excluded would have an approved sign posted.
- **Questions and Comments:**
 - *It was asked how often was the child literacy laboratory had participants.*
 - It was stated that children were there fairly regularly. The concern was mentioned that the child literacy clinic is just one room but what would happen to the building Manning Hall that houses it and the CSDO clinic.
 - It was stated that the system lawyers said it would have transfer zones set up. Anyone that is carrying a concealed handgun would need to store the handgun in his or her vehicle or at UPD prior to entering.
 - Signs will be placed outside locations but admittedly it will not be convenient.
 - *It was asked if faculty were to monitor for handguns to ensure they are not entering excluded places with handguns in hand.*
 - It was stated that you cannot ask the individual to self-identify. The use of the honor system will be used in the instance.
 - *It was asked what if the student were to somehow show the gun (example was used of a jacket swinging open to reveal a shoulder holster).*
 - This is identified as flashing and it is not against the law.
 - *Dr. Burt asked about instances of temporary events where kids K-12 attend.*

Faculty Senate Meeting—November 3, 2015

- It was stated that our campus does hold these types of camps and we can temporary a no carry zone. Again, we can post but you cannot check and see if they are carrying.
 - It was stated that the Stadium is a no carry zone either way for UIL competitions.
 - 0.3% of CHL holders have been convicted of violations but none major crimes, rather domestic.
 - It was emphasize that these individuals are law abiding and will follow notices.
 - It was stated that labs with organic solvent will be excluded. The committee met with Shane Creel since the law is broad.
 - *Dr. Monica Ratcliff asked about what happens when students come on campus for tours as well as those students who attend for dual enrollment.*
 - Mr. Hughes stated that when dual enrolled students attend our classes, they become our students.
 - Academy High School will be talking to the parents. Mr. Hughes was not sure what do in those type of situations as of yet.
 - It was reminded that we are not allowed to ask the student to self-identify. If you have concerns, contact UPD who will be the ones to regulate issues.
 - The university cannot act in any way that goes against the law. The committee has received a lot of input and is still requesting input currently.
 - *Dr. Verma asked if there would be an increase in budget for mental health. There was not a response to that question.*
- With no further questions, Dr. Verma thanked Dr. Ballard, Dr. Jones, and Mr. Hughes for their work on this committee and the presentation.

❖ SRI Committee – Dr. Elizabeth Janzen:

- *Dr. Janzen gave a report on the SRI Committee.*
- Dr. Janzen handed out the latest revision to the proposed SRI.
 - It was stated that the term “timely” and “frequent” was initially removed but have been replaced. The committee was informed that that current model has statistical merit. Questions 7 & 8 have been added. Questions are kept broad to encompass multiple areas. The committee was forwarded (and incorporated) the concerns of Kinesiology.
 - Dr. Janzen requested that this version be submitted as a final draft up for voting.
 - Dr. Monica Ratcliff asked to define Question 8, as the concern is that it isn’t clear when the faculty member answered questions such as in class or after class or during office hours.
 - Dr. Bart Ballard suggested adding an example
 - Dr. Verma stated that the Senate does not have a formal motion on the floor. Before we go into discussion we have to have a motion made.
 - Dr. Janzen **moved to vote on the current draft**, to which, Dr. Richard Miller seconded.
 - There was discussion on whether or not the committee has moved into new business or old business.

Faculty Senate Meeting—November 3, 2015

- Dr. Janzen clarified her earlier statement regarding the use of the word “timely”. She clarified stating she removed the word “frequently” and added in “timely”.
- **Discussion of the SRI draft.**
 - Dr. Kathleen Rees asked if the Senate was voting the draft in its entirety.
 - Dr. Janzen stated in the affirmative that it would be for the entire draft.
 - Discussion occurred regarding what was voted on previously and what needs to be voted on now.
 - It was decided that the previous vote was not valid due to procedural issues.
 - Discussion also occurred regarding assessment and implementation of the instrument.
 - There was voiced concern over the implementation to which most stated that implementation is the next step in the process.
 - Dr. Verma also reemphasized that this is a multistep process with a possible long phasing period.
 - It was stated that faculty hasn’t approved this draft. Discussion occurred regarding whether or not it should be taken back to the faculty for review. Many felt it was a never-ending process going that route and others felt that the Faculty Senate can act on behalf of the faculty.
 - Dr. Polly Allred gave appreciation to the committee on their hard work, both the previous committee and current. She reminded senators that faculty has voiced their concerns previously and the committee has addressed those issues.
 - Dr. Nestor Sherman voiced his decision of being against the item. He stated that senators are voting on the potential for it to work. There is a current instrument in place with an assessment we are familiar with. It was suggested to reverse the items currently on the assessment and stick with what we are currently using.
 - Dr. Richard Miller stated that we can use both items and run the current instrument that is approved to test.
 - Dr. Valerie Bartlett stated that surveys have a lot of dimensions to measure and test with a lot of questions. She stated with the current model we have only 4 useable questions, which is not enough.
 - Dr. Janzen stated that the original request was to shorten the survey and was the charge of the committee to do. The committee did the task as requested.
 - Dr. Miller, who was on the previous SRI committee, stated that the committee used literature to back up the questions. They were also charged to streamline the survey.
 - Dr. Janzen stated that she conducted research among colleagues and universities using 10 questions with comments.
 - Dr. Rees stated that last spring; there was a survey that was approved by the Council of Chairs. She wanted to know where that version is.
 - Dr. Verma stated he was unaware of this version.
 - Dr. Ballard stated that the previous committee worked on that version and this is it.
 - Dr. Stan Hodges suggested that the survey goes out to the faculty one more time.

Faculty Senate Meeting—November 3, 2015

- Dr. Allred asked if it would be for asking for input, revision, or get a feeling from the faculty on this version.
 - Dr. Hodges stated it would be both and this would be the last time.
- Dr. Verma stated that he would honor the request of the committee and disband it. There would be no other committee to address revisions. He felt that this would not be fair to involve another committee in an endless task.
- Dr. Verma requested senators to take the survey back to their area for advice on how to vote.
 - Dr. Armando Ibanez stated that as senators, we are elected to represent the faculty and have a responsibility to vote, which is on the line.
- Dr. Verma asked if there was a **motion to table this vote** until next meeting to allow senators to get feedback on how to vote.
 - Dr. Hodges moved to table the SRI vote. Dr. Barbara Cooke seconded the motion
 - The motion carried with 17 in favor and 10 opposed.
 - Dr. Rees questioned whether the previous vote in favor of section 4 is now invalid.
 - It was stated that this was correct.
 - It was asked if this would go back to the committee if the revision was not approved.
 - It was stated it would not go back to the committee.

❖ **Announcements:**

- *Dr. Verma opened the floor for various committees to make announcements.*
 - **Election Committee**—Dr. Lifford McLauchlan (Chair) reporting:
 - The committee conducted two elections. Newly elected senators are: Dr. Manual Flores (Department of Art, Communication and Theatre) and Dr. Alberto Rodriguez (Department of History, Political Science and Philosophy).
 - **Piper Award Committee**—Dr. Hong Zhou (Chair) reporting:
 - It was reported that the committee has submitted their candidate recommendation.
 - Announcements from the floor:
 - Dr. Huskin (**Title IX Working Group** Faculty Senate representative) stated that Jerry Trew has accepted the Title IX Coordinator position.

❖ **Adjournment:**

- *Dr. Verma stated that the next meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 1, 2015.*
 - With no further items, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.