

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes by Dennis Elam

Sept 28, 2011 / 8:00 AM CST / Room 304 Main Campus

Present

Richard Green, Pat Holmes, Durant Frantzen, Dennis Elam, Stefanie Wittenbach, Kevin Kendricks, Megan de Valdez, Provost Brent Snow arrived 8:23 AM

Durant distributed a copy of Roberts Rules of Orders for the Group.

Richard brought the meeting to order.

Pat motioned for approval of the minutes from 9/14/11. Motion to approve passed with Stefanie seconding.

Richard explained that an Executive Meeting meant the members of the Senate and the Provost. Pat suggested a modification of the term Executive Meeting. As the group grows, Executive suggests only the Officers of the Senate would be the Executive Group.

Officers, Senators, Faculty as Stefanie explained, exist in three layers. Durant wondered what information would be sent to Officers and not to the Senate as a whole.

Megan suggested that Executive Meeting would happen before the Senate meeting. Megan did not see a need for an Executive Meeting. Meetings would be open to Faculty. Pat noted one had to be on the Agenda to speak at a meeting.

There was discussion about the level of meetings, calling special meetings, and who would be at what meetings.

Richard will take the responsibility to write the Amendment for specific language for Full Board to meet in a closed session. Durant motioned and it passed.

Megan asked if we will have two standing meetings a month. Stefanie wondered if one would be Exec and the other a regular meeting. Richard noted it was easy to have a conference call with our telephone system. Pat asked if there was a provision for conference calls in the Constitution. Durant suggested that be specified in the Constitution.

There was more conversation about remote meetings. Richard noted we may have television meetings.

The next issue Richard raised was frequency and time of meetings. There are seven Senators this year; six will be added next year.

Megan suggested that the schedule of the seven senators come first in priority of when the meeting is scheduled.

Richard mentioned a dead time for administrative meetings, Kevin noted the same thing. By dead time, some schools do not schedule classes from say 11:30 to 1:00 PM so there is time for all to attend meetings. Dennis motioned and Pat seconded for Wednesday morning at 8:00 AM for the Senate meeting time. Megan suggested first or last Wednesday, motion amended to first Wednesday at 8:00 AM. Megan seconded the amended motion. It passed by acclamation.

Provost Brent Snow

He noted there was a Faculty Handbook via Kingsville. Kingsville has just re-done its Faculty Handbook. His thinking is that this would be a good thing for the Senate to take on. He suggested a sub-committee to work on this.

His second comment regarded the Tenure and Promotion document. That document is at the Board of Regents. Another requirement is a post tenure review process. The Board has inquired as to the post tenure review process. That document needs to be developed and be approved this spring. Dennis inquired as to the length of the review process. Brent replied that a five year period would be typical of tenure review.

Megan asked the purpose of the review. Brent noted that often faculty would get tenure and then ‘fall off’ the process. And so a lot of Boards mandated a post tenure review. Tenured faculty should continue to work hard. What if the faculty member is not effective in class, service, scholarship, then what happens?

Richard noted that in the airline industry, training needed to be required. There should be an evaluation. Brent noted this is called a Professional Development Plan. The Department Chair would develop a plan to work with the faculty member found lacking. What happens if the person on the Development Plan does not perform? Brent noted he was not aware of someone who had failed the process. Brent thought the real point was to

show what faculty really do. The Board asked how many people went through post tenure review, how many passed or failed?

Full professor requires ten years of service before one can become a full professor.

Dennis asked if the sub committee would be primarily tenured faculty. Brent replied that this would be the case at most universities that had a lot of tenured faculty. Pat expressed a concern that tenured faculty be involved. Kevin wondered if tenured faculty should be given that charge.

Motion was made by Richard to create a sub-committee to create a faculty handbook.

Brent noted that the Board has rules and procedures that have a set outline for rules and procedures. Brent indicated we would get the Kingsville documents. He suggested we use an A & M system School. Motion made by Richard and passed by all that we will create two committees. One will be for the Handbook and the other Tenure Review. A Senator would be on each one and Provost would be an ad hoc member of each committee. Three people will sit on each committee.

Richard has worked on the handbook. He will Chair the Handbook committee. He will pick two other members.

Durant suggested that Pat was our only tenured faculty member and appropriate for the Tenure Review Committee. Stefanie noted the entire faculty would have to vote on this anyway. Richard suggested Pat pick two people to work with her.

Richard indicated we have a secure site to exchange information. Dennis was not able to log in to the network with this Apple laptop.

Stefanie suggested that the minutes be posted to the public site.

Dennis asked if the Faculty Senate was subject to the Texas Open Meeting Law. Durant thought that was the case. Pat noted the Constitution did not specify a last date to post items to the agenda.

There was discussion about the first meeting next Wednesday. Stefanie noted we should follow process for the first meeting. Discussion indicated that the first meeting for November would be appropriate. Stefanie noted we would have more to report by November. Richard suggested we have the

last Wednesday but then the 15th would be a better deadline for the agenda the next month.

So Faculty Senate will meet the first Wed of November. There was discussion on the proper channel for submitting an agenda item.

Megan thought faculty should be able to access their Senators. Richard thought Faculty should submit whatever they are concerned about. The Senate could request more information about an agenda item. Durant indicated he would investigate whether the Faculty Senate is subject to the Texas Open Meeting Law.

Stefanie noted we need deadlines for two sub committees to be formed. Richard suggested the 15th of October to create the committees.

Megan noted the committees need to be created before first Wed of November. Stefanie suggested Nov 1 be the date for the first draft of results.

Pat agreed to the two-week time line from Oct 15 to Nov 1 for a first draft.

Dennis moved, Durant seconded, that the committees be formed by Oct 7, and first drafts written by Nov 1. Motion to adjourn seconded and passed.