

Texas A&M- San Antonio  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
October 2, 2015 from 11:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.  
Central Academic Building 219

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

**In Attendance:**

K. Barton, E. Bliss-Zaks, C. Cox, K. Gillen, D. Glaser, T. Hinojosa, R. Kapavik, B. Moore, S. Rahman, C. Ross, J. Simpson, L. Webb, Dr. Teniente-Matson (President) B. Rushing , K. Bridgman, and M. Wise

**Approval of Faculty Senate meeting Minutes from September 4, 2015**

Amendments: Change experimental to experiential on page two of the minutes.

Motion: K. Barton motions to approve the minutes as amended, 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Cox

Vote Passes: 12 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

**Executive Committee Update**

J. Simpson brought up a concern of Faculty Senate involvement on committees. J. Simpson suggested that faculty members outside the senate might need to volunteer on university committees as opposed to mostly senators due to the size of the Faculty Senate. J. Simpson added that we should identify which committees need senators and which could just be filled by faculty. L. Webb agrees with J. Simpson and will talk to Dr. Matson to clarify whom she wants those email requests be sent out to.

**Old Business**

**SRI:** J. Simpson will be presenting the SRI draft at the Student Government Association meeting next Friday to get student feedback. J. Simpson is also scheduling a meeting with the Provost, Jane Mims (University Research) and Sherita Love (Academic Technology) to discuss implementation of SRIs this semester.

Discussion: K. Barton asked if there is a target response rate for the SRIs. J. Simpson stated that anything above a 50% is generally seen as good, but it's feasible to get around a 70% response rate or higher depending on how the SRIs are structured. K. Barton stated his response rate has been around 60-70% each semester because he has offered points for taking them. J. Simpson stated there has been some concern with the faculty over whether or not it is their responsibility to incentivize students to fill out the SRIs and the same practices need to be used across the campus. S. Rahman added that SGA was strongly opposed to making SRIs mandatory for students in the past. J. Simpson stated he would make sure all the implantation options would be

explained in his presentation as well. J. Simpson will work on having a plan in place by November.

**Scheduling Committee:** J. Simpson clarified that this committee would not be addressing the issue of office space since that is a separate issue. J. Simpson added the Provost suggested the members of this committee could consist of one representative from each college as well as appropriate staff members such as a registrar. L. Webb suggested it could be more than one representative from each college because this is an important issue and she agrees it would be better for the group to have an odd number of members. L. Webb suggested this committee could consist of two faculty representatives from each college and one administrator and from the registrar office. Dr. Matson added this could be a role for a former chair that has administrative as well as academic experience. J. Simpson stressed we need to start forming this committee and that it consist of an odd number of members for voting purposes. L. Webb added it doesn't need to consist of all senators. Dr. Matson stressed this is important and timely topic and mentioned this group will be working with the administrative committee that will be working parallel to this committee that is dealing with space utilization. J. Simpson volunteered to be a committee member. A call for members will be sent out to all faculty members.

Motion: J. Simpson motions to make R. Kapavik the chair this committee. 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Ross  
Vote Passes: 12 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

Discussion:

J. Simpson suggested the following issues should be addressed in this committee:

1. Designate a block of time in the schedule where nothing is offered to allow time for meetings and committee work for example to occur.
2. Responsibilities for offering flexible schedule types for students. For example, will the university have options for in person, hybrid, as well as all online degrees or all night degrees?
3. How classes are scheduled. The committee might want to look into the space between classes, the length of classes, should there be set times for classes across the university or should it be up to the college?

K. Gillen suggested the committee should also look into or work with the Space Committee to determine if certain classrooms need to be reserved for certain courses. For example, should the computer labs be reserved for particular courses that need computers? J. Simpson stated he had to revise his curriculum for one of his statistics courses one semester since a computer lab was not available when his class was scheduled and agreed with K. Gillen that this could be apart of the committee's agenda. C. Ross stated we might want to include someone who is already on the calendar committee since that committee is dealing with different aspects that effect scheduling. L. Webb stated if faculty have suggestions for what this committee should discuss, please reach out to R. Kapavik.

**Office Space:** J. Simpson expressed the need to create a Faculty Senate committee to examine office space. As additional faculty are hired as we downward expand, some faculty members will be expected to share an office while others will not. J. Simpson added the offices in the Central Academic Building were designed for two faculty members, whereas the offices in Madla building and Brooks campus were designed for one person. Whether one has to share an

office shouldn't be determined based on the building or department you reside in or when you were hired. J. Simpson feels this is an equity issue. Even though we have space limitations, we don't want faculty members of one college to feel secondary or in a different position to those in other colleges or programs. The committee needs to determine a process to resolve this issue. For example, how do we make it fair, how we decide who shares first, who shares with who, can we repurpose space for additional offices, or can we acquire portable spaces for faculty members? Is it even achievable to find 20 additional office spaces for the additional faculty members? L. Webb stated we have a space committee and as well as the space utilization committee that is looking into issues related to this. Dr. Matson agreed this is an issue that needs to be addressed. Dr. Matson suggested that the senate should come up with standards for office spaces and then the administration would come up with a plan on how to implement those standards. L. Webb added the committee should re-examine how office space is being used currently. For example, some lecturers have an office in Madla whereas some tenured faculty in CAB may have to share an office. Dr. Matson suggested the committee could determine what criteria is appropriate for a faculty member to have his or her own office and then let the administration handle it from there. J. Simpson stated there are plenty of models we can draw from to assist with this process. K. Gillen also would like the committee to think about adjunct space as well whether it's a collective space or individual space. D. Glaser suggested this committee could also look into creating a succession plan on who gets what office since all office space is not equal.

Motion: J. Simpson motions to form a committee to address faculty office space use for the campus. K. Barton 2nd the motion.

Vote Passes: 12 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

Discussion: K. Gillen suggested that the committee could be smaller than the scheduling committee. L. Webb and J. Simpson suggested the committee consist of one faculty member from each college, one librarian as well as Mr. Morrison and the committee doesn't need consist of only senators.

Motion: R. Kapavik motions to make J. Simpson chair of this committee. 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Cox.

Vote Passes: 12 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

### **New Business**

**Creation of By-Laws for College Committees:** D. Glaser proposed that by-laws be developed for committees for all three colleges. D. Glaser provided a handout that contained the following to the senate.

“In our recent rapid growth, the three colleges at TAMUSA have not developed standardized and formalized By-Laws of Organization. The By-Laws would govern activities such as the name, purpose and type of committees, numbers or faculty members, duration of service, mode of selection (elected or appointed), types of members (voting, not voting, ex officio), and other elements. College By-Laws for committee organizations are an important part of faculty governance. The college Committee Bylaws should contain a statement on faculty governance. Creating there By-Laws from the Faculty Senate allows a standard definition or a standard template in cooperation with

the Office of Vice President of Academic Affairs that can be delivered to each College for adaptation and modification by faculty vote in each of these colleges.”

Motion: D. Glaser motions to create an ad-hoc committee to develop faculty governance By-Laws for the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Education and Business. 2<sup>nd</sup> K. Gillen

Vote Passes: 12 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

Discussion: L. Webb clarified that the Provost has recently defined shared governance and this definition will be distributed to the faculty. R. Kapavik asked if these by-laws would apply to the college level committees as well? D. Glaser clarified the committee would standardize by-laws for standing as well as ad hoc committees for all committees on campus. The by-laws could also standardize how committee members are chosen, how long they serve, as well as hold committee members accountable for their committee work. D. Glaser also suggested the university should have a webpage where committees could post their minutes so everything in one location. L. Webb suggested that a master list of committees should be posted so everyone knows who is on what committee and what committees exist. R. Kapavik stated this would help with the issue of transparency. J. Simpson suggested having a committee and sub-committee structure. The committee could consist of several faculty representatives and then have a sub committee with representatives from each college that would be responsible for creating by-laws for their college. Dr. Matson urged the faculty to not lose the ability to be nimble and agile when creating the by-laws for committees.

Motion: J. Simpson nominated D. Glaser to be the chair of this committee. 2<sup>nd</sup>

Motion passes 12 yes; 0 no; 0 abstentions

Discussion: J. Simpson suggested all three deans should be involved on these discussions as well as representatives from each college. L. Webb suggested reaching out to the colleges for representatives.

**Writing Across the Curriculum:** Dr. Gillen and Dr. Bridgman proposed that a Writing Across the Curriculum Committee standing committee of the Faculty Senate. K. Gillen and K. Bridgman provided a handout to the senate that contained the following statement.

“ We propose the creation of a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Committee as a Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate. The President has designated Writing Intensive (WI) courses as a high impact practice that will be implemented across the University. Because Texas A&M University – San Antonio places primary responsibility for the content, quality and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty, faculty should lead this process. To that end, the WAC Committee will be tasked with implementing WI practices throughout the University. The WAC committee’s duties will include defining criteria for WI courses, interpreting best practices for our institutional context, and

determining a process for designing, assessing, and supporting WI courses. The WAC Committee will make recommendations to the Provost and the President. As a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, the WAC Committee would consist of three representatives (one from the Arts and Sciences, Education & Human Development, and Business) elected by their respected Academic Units, two representatives of the Faculty Senate elected by the Faculty Senate, and the WAC Director. The committee would be chaired by a Faculty Senator.”

L. Webb clarified this committee would be addressing the curriculum piece of WAC as opposed to other details that other committees on campus are addressing and in order to make this a standing committee, we will need to amend the constitution. J. Simpson read the amendment procedures to the senate. C. Ross suggested if we are going to amend the constitution we need to make the other amendments that have been mentioned in the past due to the amount of work.

K. Gillen motions to amend the constitution to create a WAC standing committee of the faculty senate. 2<sup>nd</sup> by J. Simpson

Motion passes 12 yes (out of 12); 0 no; 0 abstentions

Discussion: J. Simpson asked if the committee could help faculty determine if certain courses should be labeled as writing intense courses. K. Gillen feels these are issues that the committee could address. For example, what constitutes a WAC, what should the size of the class be for WIC, etc. K. Barton asked if there would be enough recurring work for it to be a standing committee. K. Gillen stated amendments would need to occur as we grow and curriculum changes. The committee could also promote writing at the university, provide input on the writing workshops on campus as well as provide guidance on what courses are designated as WAC courses. Dr. Matson sees the need to have a committee that addresses the writing skills of our students. K. Gillen also stressed a lot of faculty coming in my not have experience implementing writing in their classes or dealing with the writing level the students are coming in with and the committee could help with this.

Motion: J. Simpson makes the motion make corrections and amendments to three components of the constitution. 2<sup>nd</sup> by C. Cox

- Change the name of the Council on Assessment Planning and Budgeting standing committee to University Resources Commission.
- Eligibility to serve as Vice Faculty Senate President and Faculty Senate President should be clarified in the verbiage of the Faculty Senate Constitution
- Remove the wording from the Faculty Senate Constitution that states the Roberts Rules of order is the parliamentary procedure the senate will follow to allow the senate to choose the parliamentary procedure they prefer to use each term

Motion passes: 12 (out of 12) vote yes

**Faculty Annual Evaluation:** L. Webb stated the senate has been charged by the Provost to create a committee to examine the faculty annual evaluation as well the forms used in each of the colleges that go with that. L. Webb added that the committee would consist of one department chair, one dean and one senator from each college. L. Webb asked if anyone would like to volunteer to be on this committee. C. Cox volunteered to serve on this committee for the College of Arts and Sciences, R. Kapavik volunteered for the College of Education and Human Development and S. Rahman volunteered for the College of Business. L. Webb informed the senate that the Provost would like this completed by December 1<sup>st</sup> so the Faculty Senate can review the changes and provide input at the December meeting.

### **Administrative Update**

Dr. Matson encouraged faculty members and senators to attend the inauguration events next week as well as attend Dr. Alma Clayton-Pedersen's presentation on Diversity next Friday.

Motion: Motions to adjourn.

**L Webb adjourns the meeting at 12:59p.m.**

Approved on 11/6/2015