

Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
April 3, 2015 from 11:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.
Brooks City Base Room 162

Call to Order 11:30 E. Westermann

Approval of Minutes from 3/6/2015: J. Simpson motions to approve minutes. E. Westermann asks that we change the minutes to read that the interviews were by phone- not on campus. J. Simpson withdraws his motion and enters a new motion to approve the minutes as amended. R. Vinaja seconds.

Vote: 9 Yes; 0 No; 0 Abstain.

Executive Committee Update:

Dr. Matson shared an update on the legislative agenda on the \$11 Million in line item funding for downward expansion. Those funds are in the Senate bill with \$5.5 Million in article 9 and the remaining \$5.5 Million in article 11. In the House the full \$11 Million is in article 11. She explains Article 11 is a wish list; however, this wish list allows us to go to conference and determine the number not argue whether we should be in or not. Where we really need to be is in article 3. On the capitol (sometimes called TRB) build we are in on both Senate and Finance sides: one side at \$52.5M and the other at \$ 63M. Our request was for \$70M. This process will be wrapping up in May.

Downward expansion: Dr. Matson noted that she saw many faculty at the first forum in the Student Success Series (available on Adobe Connect if you weren't able to attend). This is a launching point for what downward expansion is here at TAMU-SA. We have also been accepted at AACU to send a team to study high impact practices to enhance student success. This will help inform conversations as we move forward. Dr. Matson opens the floor to questions.

E. Westermann, asks if we receive less funds than requested (i.e. receive 55M), what is Dr. Matson's intent with regards to building (i.e. seek additional funds or build at the lower amount)? Dr. Matson expresses that it will depend on the sequence of events, expressing that she is not entirely convinced of what the program plan is. Therefore, this is something she would like the URC to look at (as space is in their charge). Dr. Matson wants to collaborate to look at what should be in that facility. From there we can determine if we need to engage in fundraising, leasing, building smaller building, or other options available. She is confident we can do something fabulous at \$50 M. J. Simpson asks if renovation or re-purposing is an option. Dr. Matson expresses she and the Provost are open to any discussion on what options would have the most benefit to faculty and programs and our student's success. She expresses all of our programs coming together is a priority so we will look collaboratively on how to use space for classrooms, faculty offices, etc.

Executive Committee Update

University Resources Committee- E. Westermann shared that Faculty Senate has representations on that committee. Per the Constitution Faculty Senate has representation on the CAPB . The CAPB is defunct and has been replaced with the URC. By acclamation, to reflect changes in organizational names, M. Jozwiak we will pull the old constitution and update. Further, the name of the College of Education and Human Development will be updated. By acclamation these changes will be updated in the document.

Room Rental- Dr. Rodriguez has been charged with setting up a room rental working group. L. Webb is on that group but they are meeting at a time when she is teaching. As such, Dr. Rodriguez has provided a "Status Update on Room Rental." E. Westermann directs everyone's attention to items F, G & H. These items talk about the way History day, Science Olympiad, and other events that are not related to our academic mission will be implemented. The university will begin to charge for events to cover employee and other related costs. We need clarification on if this is statutory policy, policy from system or best practices. If it is a requirement, budgeting for the event needs to take place. Faculty will need to work with their departments, Provost or President's office to budget for this in advance. Dr. Matson clarified that it is a policy issues that, as a public university, we are recovering our costs. There are real costs associated with having events on campus. The attempt is to find the right approach and be up front about the costs to host and create a tier of events wish to sponsor and host (we are responsible for all the events- i.e. trash, injury, etc.). There are real costs because of third party services, increased staffing by police. Dr. Matson is asking for established criteria for events that we really want to host (i.e. because they build enrollment), that we only recover costs for those events, and that everyone knows what those costs are. She estimates that we are talking about hundreds of dollars in event costs (not thousands). She receives multiple calls a week from organizations asking if we can host their events. She desires a policy that points to a clear yes or no on if we can host an event. It is her perspective that there is no place in San Antonio where can have a fabulous conference room, no trouble parking, and internet, etc. for free. The goal is not to burden faculty but to keep costs low and recover them. E. Westermann asks if this will be a task for the deans to submit events at a certain time with estimated budget. Dr. Matson shares that we haven't gotten that far but that is similar to what she imagines. It will be deans making these fiscal choices but that she wants faculty to know that when they invite a group, there is real cost associated with it. Dr. Matson wants faculty to be aware of the issues and have input into the process. She affirms we absolutely want to have these events on campus but, also, be aware of what it costs. J. Simpson affirms that knowing the cost structure is good, but adds that there are additional items such as timeline, equipment, etc. Knowing what services are available; perhaps a handbook could be really helpful to make events manageable for staff and faculty.

Election Committee- J. Simpson shared that the Elections Committee is in the process of drafting an e-mail to go out to all faculty. He is looking for a list of all eligible faculty to vote. He will send out call for nominations and has the list of outgoing Senators. L. Webb suggests it will be helpful to know which Senators have served two consecutive terms and can't be re-elected. E. Westermann confirms that we do not have anyone who is completing their second term this year. As such, all outgoing Senators are eligible for a second term and J. Simpson will note that on the e-mail to prevent confusion regarding second terms. J. Simpson further discussed that the committee unanimously preferred paper ballots. They have discussed different ways to do that (i.e. put a ballot box in each college office and list of eligible faculty that can be checked off). E. Westermann, asks if there is a reason we don't want to continue to use survey monkey? J. Simpson asked what the response rate was last year. M. Jozwiak shared that COE used a survey program (not Survey Monkey) c/o V. Elias and had a response rate of less than 50%. R. Vinaja, asked for clarification on if adjunct can vote? E. Westermann clarified that adjuncts do not vote, only full-time faculty (tenure, lecturer, etc.). J. Simpson shares that based on the university having approximately 100 voting faculty it was a manageable endeavor with regards to response rate, time, etc. E. Westermann asks for an informal survey of Faculty Senate on preferred delivery method. Response supports electronic voting. R. Sajjadur reminds us that last year College of Business completed their paper ballots in a faculty meeting. Nominations available Monday to Monday. Then ballots will go out for one week and close so newly elected Senators will be able to attend the joint meeting. M. Jozwiak recommends letting the nominees know that if they are elected that there will be a meeting May 1, 2015 that they are invited to attend.

Texas Council Faculty Senate- L. Webb shared that the entire focus was on legislation. 1st day was with Dr. Hallmark and he highlighted several items that are pertinent to us. There are two items- a bill and an act. Both have to do with guns on campus. The Bill to carry guns on campus (open carry) is written with local control where we could say "not here." The other is item is the Campus Protection Act which allows anyone with a Concealed to Carry License to carry a gun on a higher education campus without local control. The Dream Act provides in-state tuition for undocumented residents. Legislature is trying to overturn this. Chancellor Sharp supports this act but the legislature is trying to overturn it. Automatic transfer of courses- as of February the bill had not been filed but the system anticipates that it will be filed. Automatic transfer of courses would make the numbering system state-wide. There would be some mandated areas- we already have education, criminology and engineering available but not mandated. Included in this would be guaranteed admissions with the use of these transfers. Because the bill has not been written she is unsure how that would actually transpire. The bill to support community colleges in conferring 4 year degrees has been filed in nursing and applied sciences but

other areas could add on to that. Not many community colleges will be able to do this but, locally, Alamo could. Later that day there was a panel on collegiality, bullying and academia. It is an issue that seems to be wide spread. UTSA, Trinity and UT Austin had representatives on the panel and it boiled down to 'nobody knows what to do.' Round-up Reports had common positives between the majority of them: 1.) Many new presidents and new administration. This was viewed as positive change. 2.) Most are writing By-laws, Constitutions, etc. which is positive because it is being faculty driven (rather than from administration). Common Big challenges: Promotion & Tenure, post tenure, workload and salary issues. Common minor issues: hiring research faculty and student evaluations (and how used by faculty). The issues we are facing were reflective of what others were reporting. Travis Clardy, District 11 Representative, spoke during a very heated discussion on the legislative session. He conveyed similar messages on the bills that were going up. He supports open carry with local control. He also discussed Hazelwood (free tuition to Veterans plus all descendants under 25 years). The importance of Veterans receiving free tuition was agreed upon but putting full financial responsibility for all dependents on the university is challenging. Initially it was proposed as a negligible amount but now is an exorbitant amount to provide this education and there are no state plans to assist with the costs of these. E. Westermann added that when Dr. Matson met with the finance committee she did say that was an issue they needed to look at it, but that it was his understanding that it was only for 150 hours of coursework per Veteran. During the business meeting Mary Mayorga was re-elected to represent the region on this council. As a proactive measure, the body sent out the attached resolution to Gregg Abbott. L. Webb is tracking the bills as they change but that concludes her updates. E. Westermann shared that TCFS offers faculty a voice but that it also raises the issue of the AAUP which has presented there and seeks membership there. In the future, Faculty Senate will need to address if want an AAUP chapter here.

Old Business

Club Advising Issues- E. Westermann provided a handout and discussed the history on this issue. Following our Faculty Senate meeting, Dr. Matson sent a request to club advisors for feedback. K. Gillen has been working on this issue and E. Westermann currently describes this as a work-in-progress. It raises workload issues (i.e. for the latest issue on the Holocaust presentation it required three iterations to get through). University Communications is working with faculty but what are the limits if we provide time, date, etc. Why do we then have to re-format everything? Where is the correct line in some of these issues? Dr. Matson did take a copy of this document. Dr. Snow has a copy. This will be a continuing dialogue. Dr. Snow asks for clarification on what is the central issue: how compulsive do we get and when do we back off? He shared that Dr. Matson asked if this issue should go on the agenda for the Executive Team for Monday and will add it to agenda. E. Westermann asks for an update on May 1st. J. Simpson share that it goes beyond the above issue and includes a lack of communication and constant roadblocks. The overall climate and attitude is damaging to our organizations. J. Simpson shared examples of constantly being told no and explains his membership is

dwindling. They have become an organization with money with no membership. In the last two semesters membership has dwindled from 20 to 3 members. L. Webb identifies a huge issue with inquiries regarding policies. Faculty are told they are online but they are not online. Then, they send you old one but it is being revised. We have an organization in CoEHD that has been without sponsors since December. They are having meetings, spending money, and it is still happening despite no faculty advisor. That office is aware of this and it is still being permitted to happen. R. Kapavik stated that she called the office and asked for the policies. She was told they were revising the documents and there is no longer a student organization handbook. When she asked for the old policy, the student couldn't find it. E. Westermann then emphasized an issue, frequently cited by faculty, that a student worker makes a decisions with/without consult with Cheryl LeGras. Faculty have cited student workers chastising them in front of students and receiving unsigned e-mails (from Student Affairs). Overall, it seems to faculty, that the Office of Student Affairs has empowered student workers to a point that is disproportionate with their role. Dr. Snow shared that the previous Student Handbook should be in effect until revised. J. Simpson asserts that any changes should be in consultation with student government and Faculty Senate. Faculty are asked to send concerns to E. Westermann or Dr. Snow.

Faculty Recognition Committee- M. Jozwiak met with Dr. Snow and reviewed drafts of the framework. The framework is aligned, as much as possible, with the Mission and Promotion & Tenure Policies. The rubric will be aligned with the mission and have a consistent format across awards but the criteria will be unique to each award. The document contents were discussed briefly clarifying that the attachment of a cash award to this recognition is not finalized but was included in the document as a placeholder should it be available. D. Glaser asked how annual evaluations will be used in relationship to the award. M. Jozwiak explained that the award has been streamlined with Promotion & Tenure. The application does not require a copy of your annual evaluation; however, the criteria will be similar to that which is required for Annual Evaluations. The deadlines were set to match, as closely as possible, the deadlines for Annual Evaluations. D. Glaser asks for clarification on when Annual Evaluations must be shared with faculty. E. Westermann proposes that it should be by the end of the academic year. J. Simpson asks for clarification on the timeline. M. Jozwiak shares: apply by April, notified in May and recognized in August at Convocation. It is recommended that the award be for calendar year, not academic year making the first cycle of awards the 2015. J. Simpson asks if the information is limited to one year. M. Jozwiak confirms that it is a historical view (even beyond their tenure at TAMU-SA). R. Sajjadur inquires if there is one award for each college or if they are competitive between colleges. M. Jozwiak clarifies that they are competitive. The selection committee will include 2 faculty from each college and one from the library. M. Jozwiak discusses eligibility as all faculty at the university for at least two years. This process will be a confidential process and faculty would not receive scoring rubrics utilized in the process. D. Glaser shares that it is important to him that faculty get their annual evaluations during the academic year. R. Kapavik emphasized that the timeliness of this information is essential for T&P growth. Dr. Snow will follow up on this. R. Vinaja asks if there are limitations on how often individuals can apply. E. Westermann offers that there could be a moratorium on applications (i.e. 3 years after winning an award).

Scheduling- J. Simpson needs feedback from registrar on how the scheduling process occurs.

SRI Committee Update- J. Simpson shares policy issues: 1.) SRI's for summer are necessary and we may be out of compliance by not doing them. 2.) There are classes that are exempt (i.e. Thesis classes or Independent Study or small classes <6). J. Simpson reported: Jane provided me with data for the 2014 Spring and Fall semesters which was about 8,000 cases or about 25% of the total possible responses for that time period.

1. I conducted a Cronbach's Alpha based on the response items used by the annual evaluation. All of the categories were "good" (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.84$) scales and all of the items used in the evaluation were "very good" strong internal consistency with each other (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.97$). Including all of the items provides an identical result (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.97$). Using the items that correlate the least ($r=0.55$) to construct scales still produced "good" scales (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.72$). Interpretation: any combination of items will produce a useable scale. The ones selected are slightly better than chance but any other combinations would work just as well or better.
2. I also conducted a factor analysis of the items. In simple terms, there is only one underlying factor. All of the items are components of one underlying factor. Best case is "student perceptions of teaching effectiveness." Worst case is severe response set bias. There is zero evidence that these items should be broken in to separate scales.
3. Response rate. Basically, 90% of all the students that took the SRIs thought they were going to earn an "A" or "B", 7% thought they were going to earn a "C", and less than 2% thought they would earn a "D" or "F". If you think you are failing the class you are not filling out the survey. This is a non-question.
4. 87% of respondents were taking the class for their major, 6% because it sounded interesting, 4% because I like the professor, 3% because of the time of day, 0.2% because of location, and 2% other. This is also non-question and does not provide any useful information
5. The grand mean (the mean of the mean of each item) is 4.45 out of 5. That's pretty high. All of the items have a mean in between 4.24 (item 16) on the low end and 4.64 (item 3) on the high end.
6. For fun I also looked at the difference between those expecting "A" vs "B" "A" vs "C" and "A" vs "D and F" and all had significant differences with "A" having the higher evaluation over the other categories (not surprising given the sample size of 8,000). The effect size tells more of a story. "A" vs "B" had a small difference (Cohens's $d=0.29$), "A" vs "C" had a large difference (Cohens's $d=0.86$), "A" vs "D and F" had the largest difference (Cohens's $d=1.51$).
7. All of these results point to some possible underlying problems with the SRIs (response set bias, sampling problems etc.) However, I think this evidence supports developing a smaller more targeted survey.

D. Glaser asked if SRI's are a good indicator of teaching. J. Simpson shared that he measured reliability not validity. One finding he had was that the committee almost universally agreed that we needed a shorter evaluation. There is no reason to have so many questions. R. Vinaja shared that the SRI document used to be longer. E. Westermann asks for a conclusions and recommendations paper for future discussion.

New Business:

Administrative Update:

Dr. Snow would like to discuss shared governance at an upcoming meeting.

Announcements:

Technology Update: C. Rangel shared that in faculty online training and boot camp 130+ faculty were trained. For spring we have 10-12 still enrolled. Offering their third Lunch & Learn session. Innovation center CAB 231 is open with 24 -7 access for faculty who use ID to access (small video studio with green screen, etc.). They are also planning an equipment loan program with document cameras, clickers, camcorders, etc. They are starting to plan for fall Lunch & Learns. E. Westermann asked about documents for the migration of Blackboard. These are still need from Sherita.

Student Government Update- A. Holiday shared semester events: 1.) Forum on Conceal Carry- it went well with much support from the students. There is currently a poll open until Wednesday, then, Student Gov. will write a resolution. 2.) Mayoral forum 250+ people attended. He highlighted that we were the only university to host 10/14 candidates (more than big 4 candidates). 3.) There is an upcoming Education forum on the educational departments, testing, EPCC, grade inflation threat. Also, elections are about to be held. Recently there was a concern regarding the focus of the Patriots Casa. A Military resolution was developed requesting the focus of Patriots Casa always be focused on Military Students. He has not approved or denied this resolution. E. Westermann and Faculty Senate thank A. Holiday for his service to the students and university.

Meeting adjourned at 12:57

Whereas Greg Abbott has already provided a vision of higher education initiatives and

Whereas future prosperity of the state of Texas is dependent on the education of 21st century educated citizen and

Whereas Texans deserve the best educational system in this nation, be it resolved that TCFS welcomes and supports the governor's vision and mission for higher education.

The TCFS wholeheartedly supports the efforts of Governor Abbott and the Legislature to provide the resources and support to elevate the national research standing of our universities, educate new generations of Texans, and make college more affordable.

Approved 5/11/13

Approved 5/1/15