Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
May 1, 2015 from 11:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.
Central Academic Building 334

Call to Order

In Attendance:
E.Bliss-Zaks, R.Kapavik, B.Moore, R. Sajjadur, J. Simpson, K. Voges, R.Vinaja, L. Webb, E. Westermann, B. Snow (Provost), Dr. Teniente-Matson(President), C. LeGras & M. Mahan (Student Affaris) C. Cox, M. Mayorga, M. Peterson, C. Ross

Approval of the Minutes from April 3, 2015

K. Gillen motions to accept the Minutes from the 4/3/2015 meeting as amended. J. Simpson seconds.

Motion Passes: 13 Yes; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstain

Executive Committee Update

Election Committee- J. Simpson shared that nominations for Senators went out at the beginning of April. There were several nominees in each college. One week after nominations, elections were held. New Senators introduced: Arts and Sciences: Cody Cox and Corinna Ross; Education and Human Development: Mary Mayorga and Maria Peterson; Business: Kevin Barton and Kathleen Voges; Library: Bryant Moore

2015-2016 Senate Office Elections- A brief description of each office was shared. J. Simpson raised concern that, based on the constitution, he was unsure if the office of Vice President should be limited to first year Senators. E. Westermann shared that the spirit/intent behind the role was that it would be held by a first year Senator who could then serve as President the second year of their term. J. Simpson expresses concern about the room for interpretation in the constitution. K. Gillen suggests that the Senate may want to pursue amending the constitution to reflect the intent. J. Simpson agrees that this needs to be addressed formally in the following year.

Parliamentarian: Nominations: Joe Simpson, by acclimation

Vote Passes: 13 Yes; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstain

Secretary: Nominations: Mary Mayorga, by acclimation

Vote: 13 Yes; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstain

VP/President Elect: Nominated: Corinna Ross; Kathleen Voges (declined); by acclimation Corinna Ross

Vote: 13 Yes; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstain

Old Business

Faculty Recognition Committee-M. Jozwiak shared the most up to date drafts for the committee; three individual sheets (one for each award). These items are ready to go out to faculty for feedback. Please provide feedback to College representative: K. Kamblach, P. Calfatore; S. Peters or M. Jozwiak. There is an alternative rubric attached. The rubric was the most challenging element and the aspect where the committee was unable to fulfill faculty preference for a detailed and specific rubric. She shared as a committee we failed to be able to do that because the differences between colleges and expectations for T&P made it impossible to be so specific. The committee felt the best solution was to keep the rubrics open and trust the elected committee to make the best choice and select the best individual. K. Voges asked for clarification on if the committee had made a final decision about the rubric that should be used. M. Jozwiak said final decision between the two presented in the draft packet would be made following faculty feedback. Faculty feedback is preferred by May 15th so that final copies can be submitted to the Provost by the end of June and implemented in the fall of 2015.

Scheduling- J. Simpson offered a brief update sharing that the feedback he was given was that all of the information for scheduling was being entered by hand and this was why there were so many errors. Scheduling software exists but perhaps there needs to be some direction to ensuring the software begins being used. E. Westermann asked if it was a training issue? J. Simpson offered he believed a lack of training was part of the issue, as was familiarity with entering the information manually. J. Simpson asked for specific issues/concerns to be forwarded to him so he can work on them over the summer. B. Snow asked for clarification on what the primary concern was. J. Simpson said the major concern he was aware of was related to errors. Faculty would submit changes and when drafts were returned they did not represent the requested changes. Major errors (i.e. double booking faculty to teach two different classes at the same time) existed. Following these errors being made, faculty were asked to submit a formal schedule change to correct the mistakes that were not a result of faculty error but entry error. Asking faculty to do this extra work seemed inappropriate.

SRI Committee Update- J. Simpson shared the printed information in the minutes reflects what will be included in the report. Additionally, pricing has been investigated. For example, Scantron was contacted and is very expensive versus what we are currently spending. Current costs are estimated at $5,000. Scantron (paper electronic and application on phone) would cost closer to $30,000. We are currently using blackboard service and Jaguar-connect. He will be meeting with Sherita to mobilize technology to find better ways, more technical ways (i.e. pop-up in Blackboard) to encourage responses. He believes we will continue to need some form of electronic due to online classes. J. Simpson further shared that based on the research that was done on SRI data; a list of questions is being developed. A draft copy of the question is included in the minutes. R. Vinaja shared that Texas State experienced an increased response rate when required to

complete SRI before entry into blackboard. C. Nolasco shared that some A&S faculty offer extra credit to encourage students to complete the SRI's. E. Westermann shared that as of today, the current response rate is 19%. S. Rahman suggests asking SGA for feedback on that process. J. Simpson clarified that based on his conversations with H. Verhasselt we pay for the service but we can make the questions. J. Simpson reiterated he believe it is an issue with compliance that surveys are not being completed in summer sessions. Dr. Matson, shared that one thing shared in the student success series was the idea that sometimes we need to get in the way of students to help them be successful. If getting this feedback is helpful in improving their success, then, to the degree we can overcome these hurdles, it is a good practice and she is supportive of making this mandatory. R. Kapavik – wanted clarification on if Senate should distribute to faculty or if J. Simpson will do so. J. Simpson clarified at this point he is just seeking feedback from Senate. C. Ross suggested that if SRI's are attached to courses that we find a way to stagger sending them out. She also, raised questions about how the simplified questions will be used in annual evaluations. K. Gillen, expresses support for mandatory submission and shared the actual questions look good but that may want to ask questions about assignments, faculty feedback and grading. E. Westermann closes discussion and asks Senators to please e-mail J. Simpson.

New Business

Student Organizations- Dr. Mahan & Cheryl Le Gras provided a formal response to the concerns raised by faculty. This is included in the minutes. M. Mahan, thanks the Senate for the invitation to share this information and the new process that have been put in place. Also, for being advisors to our students. She shared that she knows there are still improvements that need to be made and that they are on board, want faculty feedback, so they can see what can be implemented. C. Le Gras began addressing the list.

1.) Make it easier to publicize events - Any response must be in compliance with A&M, state and federal rules and policies. Most of the areas have been identified as a concern including some institutional polices. For example, the no chalk on campus policy was considered by the Executive team. The Executive Team has allowed for that new practice on campus. C. Le Gras continued, the other items have to do with postings. We also had dialogue about this and made some changes for paper copies vs. digital. They agreed that if you are doing paper copies it is your club's responsibility to proof-edit. Our office is only making sure your event is scheduled and that you are not doing anything that is considered inappropriate. Above that, we don't do editing, or checking spelling like we used to. Digital is different as it is under the Office of Communications. We need you to send that to us electronically and we review it and send it up to the Office of Communications to review and approve before being posted on electronically. Dr. Matson asks a clarifying question regarding the process for electronic board- received by C. LeGras, sent up to communications and then returned to C. LeGras. C. LeGras clarified that it only comes back to her if there is an error. K. Gillen shared that student are communicating that is too difficult to get things on the board and feel the process is too cumbersome. Dr. Matson recognized that there are a lot of touch-points and recommends they may need to review and streamline the process. J. Simpsons, shares

that having something that outlines the process- a one sheet guide would be helpful. Some is hidden and perception is it is difficult to do. E. Westermann added that in the past, depending on if you were faculty, staff or student, there were three different conduits that you used making it inefficient and frustrating. He further discussed that at other universities you can provide the necessary information and have it posted. Here, that work has been transferred to the faculty. Dr. Matson assures faculty that they will address this issue. V. Elias expressed two concerns. One, when we attempt to ask students to complete these tasks for their organization they are often sent in circles trying to find the correct person to help them. Two, when they leave things in the office they seem to fall into a black hole. She expressed understanding of the short-staffed situation in the office and that it is not a reflection on C. LeGras. M. Mahan shared that a new person has been hired for new student orientation and student clubs. This will help alleviate some of these issues as it is no longer a student in these roles.

2.) Holding a meeting- C. LeGras shared that is institutional policy not to schedule academic rooms until after census date. However, if you pick a non-academic room you can schedule before census date. If the event is for more than any conference room can hold it is placed in the hopper until after census date. J. Simpson asks about the metrics on dropped classes, moving classes. M. Mahan clarifies if what he is asking is 'do we need to reevaluate that census date policy?' J. Simpson confirms. M. Mahan says we have been moving classes a lot; it has been a struggle in the past. But because we are moving from a spreadsheet model to an automated model, when it is up and fully functional we can revisit policy. K. Gillen shared a concern that it is her understanding that groups can't organize until they are a formal organization and that this makes it difficult to form a group. C. LeGras, clarified that is not correct and that as long as she has been here that has not been the policy. K. Gillen and J. Simpson both express that then there must be some miscommunication about that. C. LeGras shared that when she arrived she developed an "Intent to Organize" sheet that addresses this issue. V. Elias asked to have Club Rush moved back until after rooms can be scheduled. C. LeGras shared that they are gathering student names for organizations and that there is an online version. J. Simpson shared that mobilization is his primary interest. He has a long list of students but getting mobilized is the challenge.

3.) Advisors have more control- M. Mahan & C. LeGras asked for clarification on what was the primary concern regarding this. J. Simpson shared that before, when trying to organize a group it was a host of no's. Every endeavor was received by a no answer and it was unclear where that answer came from- some no's were coming from students, staff, some from a black hole. Part of the concern on this item is that as advisors, we don't want to be told "no" we want to be told "this is how we can make this happen." As an advisor, he understands that we need to meet federal and state laws but students don't have those concerns. M. Mahan shares that she feels that we now have staff in place that can help with those things. Further, she has only been here for two years, C. LeGras 1 ½ years. We are working on processes and trying to make this happen. She realizes, yes, faculty were hearing "no" all the time but they are working to change this. The have also been working to reduce the paperwork and process for new vs. renewing organizations. L. Webb asked for where those documents can be found. C. LeGras shared that they can

be found on Community, the student portal. L. Webb shared that when she was approached to be an advisor for an organization, they tried to find the documents, including calling the office, and were told that all the documents were being revised. They finally gave up and told the students to find another advisor. C. LeGras shared that when she came on board; they inherited software that was not robust. They are now moving to a more robust system that includes access to web pages, etc. that imports every faculty member and student. One challenge was that they didn't have good software. V. Elias voiced the need to provide better links to find those items.

4.) Financial Records- C. LeGras shared that when she came on board there was some concern about creating EIN #'s to secure a bank account. That has somewhat been resolved: they have created on-campus bank accounts and are working with staff to finalize. Faculty now have those two options available. On campus isn't a bank account but a business office so it limits how some things are done. M. Mahan, when your account is on campus you don't have to worry about signature cards, etc. there will be a process for requesting a check. J. Simpson shared his experience of opening an account and asking for a report with balance. The Business Office shared that they weren't able to do that. The associate hand counted the money and wrote a hand receipt but expressed that they can't track the money. Some training at the Business Office may be necessary. He recognized that the current way of coordinating funds through Student Services is not sustainable and C. LeGras agreed. M. Mahan, shared that this is a normal process for campuses and that we should be able to get the Business office up to speed on this. E. Westermann shared that this new process is helpful and he expressed his appreciation for the changes. He further asked about vendors and if clubs can purchase form any vendor or only certain vendors. M. Mahan said there shouldn't be any restrictions. C. LeGras clarified that it depends. If C. LeGras uses the P-card to help with the purchase, she must purchase under the guidelines. If reimbursed you can go anywhere. M. Mahan is open to looking more closely at if faculty can be issued P-Cards for clubs.

5.) Training- currently have a once-a-year 1.5 hours basic training. Other trainings are optional. C. Nolasco asked if they have considered putting trainings online. C. LeGras said they are working with Adobe but also offer on-demand. J. Simpson asked for clarification on the Organization Forum. C. LeGras shared that it still occurs but is not required. J. Simpson suggests that they may want to coordinate with Student Government.

6.) Communication and respect for advisors- M. Mahan shared that having Gretchen, will help. E. Westermann reiterated the need for signed e-mails. C. LeGras shared that that issue is resolved. She has 10 student worker accounts so each has own account that is up and running. E. Westermann thanked C. LeGras and M. Mahan for their assistance.

Salary Savings from External Funding- C. Nolasco presented a draft proposal. This proposal provided a list of how other universities manage savings. Next year Senate should consider drafting a policy on this. E. Westermann shared that that was something addressed in the PLC. Concern about policy lag and being sure we get ahead of that by developing a policy. J. Simpson. Affirms this and recommends discussing grant process

as a whole (support services, budgets, information, identify, how coordinated, payments, institutional costs, etc.). He recommends looking at this issue as a comprehensive issue. E. Westermann offers perhaps an Ad. Hoc committee is required. Dr. Matson shared that there were 2 or 3 faculty members on the URC who will be looking at the issue of salary savings. She recommends coordinating with those individuals and that the senate work runs through them. E. Westermann shares that L. Webb is the Senate URC representative. C. Nolasco urges that there be a summer salary policy. Dr. Snow shared that many of the issues we are raising are due in part to our not having a grants office. We need more resources to go into that area.

Motion to extend the meeting 15 min. by M. Jozwiak
Vote Passes: 13 Yes; 0 No; 0 Abstain

Administrative Updates

Dr. Matson wanted to address the article in last Sunday's paper about ECAC. As she shared at the Budget Forum, she believes the article was factually accurate, but she would have preferred not to be front page story. When we entered into the lease agreement in 2012, we signed that city would stop funding in 2015. She arrives at the university and receives news that we need to contribute more money. We currently contribute $200,000 the city pays $300,000 + $150,000 HOT funds. City would like to stop and we would pick up expenses. She has asked the city to continue to support their part of the funding. Also, she wants to be transparent with faculty that we do have the right to exit out of the agreement. She is not sure this is a good decision for the university or the city so they are in negotiations and will share with the chair what we are doing. She shared that there are important strategic initiatives and we can focus on, some without being distracted from downward expansion. J. Simpson asked if there was a charge for the center. Dr. Matson shared that it is free but that we are looking at fee structure for exhibits and looking at revenue generation. All other museums charge a fee. Dr. Matson also wanted to address the Price Waterhouse Cooper report. The URC has put together a sub- committee on PWC report. The report addresses how we are spending our resources. The data suggests that we are behind our peers in instructional supports and ahead in administrative costs. She will be working with subcommittee that will be addressing that issue. Third, the President's Inauguration is set for Oct. 10, 2015. She is appointing an inauguration committee to look at something much bigger and look at whole university to celebrate faculty, scholarship, students. A few events already scheduled include the Dream-makers awards (Oct 7). SA Water Forum has agreed to host their regional event here and highlight our water efforts. These are examples of the type of broadening events that brings attention to the university and that the committee will be looking at.

K. Gillen, asked for a comment on significance of the Board of Regents approving the Core General Education Requirements. Dr. Matson shared that Dr. Snow was going to share that but the significance is tremendous. We are now in line for downward expansion- A huge milestone.

Dr. Snow shared we now have a Core Curriculum but no students. This ties into downward expansion. We submitted the Core that many of you were involved in, especially from

Arts & Sciences. You did a large amount of hard work in short time. The proposal was submitted to the board and approved. Now it allows us to go to coordinating board and get feedback from the Coordinating Board about what they don't like. He expressed thanks faculty for all our work on undergraduate and graduate research, regarding the Student Research Symposium. Really outstanding event with 150+ students involved. We continue to get feedback from students on symposium's impact and faculty support. We held this event because we had been attending the Pathways to Doctorate Symposium held by system. Not held this year so we decide to host our own and it was very successful. Dr. Matson shared that it was very moving to see how proud families were of their students. We received Board approval of 9 faculty for Tenure and/or Promotion. Dr. Matson shared how she had discussed with Dr. Snow how impressed she was by Bio's for our faculty. It was a very impressive presentation.

Certificates of appreciation were distributed to outgoing Faculty Senators.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:04.

TO: Faculty Senate
FM: Dr. Melissa Mahan, Vice President for Student Affairs
        Ms. Cheryl LeGras, Director of Student Activities
RE: Faculty Concerns about Advising Student Organizations

RESPONSE

Overall, the Office of Student Activities has made leaps and bounds in being proactive and setting and being consistent with guidelines. With the limitations of the office having one professional staff member until March 2015, it is understandable and expected that improvements continue to be made and will be an evolving process as we continue to grow and expand our reach and services. Student Activates has tried to address concerns by both faculty and students as they arise. Most of the current guidelines stem from suggestions made by many across campus. However, we agree that more improvements need to be made but some are beyond the reach of the Student Activities office. Student Activities is responsible for enforcing guidelines set by many different departments and not a sole reflection of not displaying mistrust in the judgment of the faculty who advise these organizations.

1. **Make it easier to publicize clubs and events.**
    - Part of the responsibility of SA is to make sure student groups adhere to University, System, State and Federal policies. The current guidelines are a reflection of the current University Communications department and the premise that all university publications are consistent and a reflection of an institution of higher education.
    - Up until now, chalking was not permissible by the previous administration and was thus responsibility of SA to enforce that policy with student organizations. Since March 2015, a new policy has been adopted by the current administration addressing the chalking concern. Chalking is permissible with guidelines. Please refer to chalking guidelines.
    - Digital boards falls under the purview of the Communications department. In fall of 2014 a change to the posting board policy was made. Student Activities only reviews for explicit language. The SA office does not review for punctuation etc. SA only verifies that the group has submitted an event request.

2. **Make it easier for me to hold a meeting:**
    - SA is required to enforce the university policy that prohibited the scheduling of rooms until after census date to ensure all classes had priority. The policy was made due to the limited space that was available. A Room Rental/Facility Usage Fee group has been created to look at the broader scope of our non-classroom space and how these spaces will be reserved in the future for all stakeholders including student organizations.
    - The process for on and off-campus events is the same if the group is within the 25 mile radius as outlined in the Texas Education Code-Tex. Educ. Code § 51.950
      http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.51.htm#51.950
    - Student Activities tracks all student organization activity through Symplicity which is our student organization portal system. We review the events to make sure that University, System, State and Federal rules and regulations have been adhered observed. Advisors are provided some of this training at our Jaguar Student Organization Training Session and additional training on Symplicity is available. Currently Symplicity training is offered and scheduled by the request of the student group and/or advisor.

3. **Give advisors more control over what activities are appropriate:**
   - Unsure of the question being asked in this section.

4. **Make it easier for new organizations to form.**
   - As of Fall 2014 as a result of feedback we changed the process to include two new forms and the establish of a new classification for student organizations. Interest groups were instituted and we developed a one page request to organize form (see attached).

5. **Limit paperwork**
   - Unsure of the question being asked in this section.

6. **Make our financial records available, transparent, and predictable**
   - Progress has been made with regards to student accounts on campus, but those accounts are not bank accounts and based on System and Finance policies there is no foreseeable way to make these account operate like a bank account.
   - Advisors can have access to the information if they are interested in learning about the university software which is Cascade software. The advisor names are listed on the account we can asked financial services to provide training for those who are interested in access their account balance. As a result of feedback we received from advisors in late Fall 2014 we moved accounts on campus we are working through all of the logistics in Spring 2015. Groups still have the option to maintain off campus accounts because there is no University policy requiring accounts on campus.
   - One of the features of the new student organization software that we will be transiting too this spring is the finance module which will allow student organization accounts to be maintained in the portal system. This is some that we cannot get with our current vendor which is one of the many reasons for making the switch to a new vendor.

7. **Limit required training to one event each year and make it worth our time:**
   - The main focus of our training sessions has been on student development. We have one required/mandatory training session for all student organization and we offer a host of other training which are directed at both students and faculty/staff. (see attached schedule)

8. **Make communications shorter, clearer, and give a clear contact person:**
   - It is challenge to appoint one contact person due to the constraints of the staffing in the office. The SA office personnel included one full-time staff member and 10 student workers. The one full-time staff person is responsible for a number of activities and events to include New Student Orientation, Campus Programming, Jaguar Ambassador, Student Leadership and Student Organizations. Student staff are utilized to help address routine issues addressed by student organizations and the campus community.

9. **Show respect for faculty advisors**
   - It is unacceptable for any staff member to be disrespectful to anyone. Customer service training is provided to staff and will continue to be provided to all staff members. Should you experience a problem please contact the director of Student Activities immediately.

Draft SRI Questions

Informational Statements
(answered on a scale of 5 = Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neutral; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree):

The instructor clearly defined and explained the course objectives and expectations.

The instructor communicated information effectively.

The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter of the course.

The instructor was prepared to teach for each instructional period.

The instructor encouraged me to take an active role in my own learning.

The instructor taught is a way that stimulated my critical thinking.

The instructor was available outside of class either electronically or in person.

I perceive that my knowledge/skills in this content field have improved as a result of this course.

Essential Statements
(answered on a scale of 5 = Excellent; 4 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor):

What is your overall rating of this course?

What is your overall rating of the teaching of this course?

Student Feedback

What suggestions do you have to improve the course?

Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the instruction of the course?

Do you have any additional comments?

PROPOSAL ON DISTRIBUTION OF SALARY SAVINGS FROM EXTERNALLY FUNDED FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS

Although Texas A&M-San Antonio has only recently been accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) separately from Texas A&M-Kingsville, more faculty are applying for external research grants. There is a need for university policies that create incentives for faculty who are successful in obtaining funds for their academic salary from external sources. Certain external grants allow as part of the grant budget, specific portions of the faculty member's academic salary from external sources. When these funds are allocated in the grant budget, the successful faculty member charges his/her salary to the award account and salary savings for the university is generated. Salary savings are generated when a faculty member draws a portion of his/her budgeted academic year or fiscal year salary from the budget allowed by the external funding agency.

The actual salary savings resulting from the external funding has historically been used by research universities and other recipient institutions to support replacement instruction, mandatory salary supplements for university fellowships & research assistantships and other instruction and research needs. Other universities allow faculty and departments to share in the distribution of the salary savings generated when their salaries were charged to externally sponsored research accounts. Texas A&M-San Antonio should similarly implement policies that encourage faculty to apply for competitive grants that bring recognition and prestige for the university.

Listed below are some policies on distribution of salary savings from other universities.

UC DAVIS	TEXAS A&M (EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT)	PURDUE UNIVERSITY (COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS)	TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY	SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY	TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
The general fund salary savings gained by moving a portion of a faculty member's salary to extramural grants will be distributed as follows: • **75% to the principal investigator;** • **15% to the PI's department;**	Any salary savings generated by external funding returned to the College will be distributed using these guidelines: • **Dean's Office will retain 20%; the remaining 80% will be sent to the PI's department;** • if any expenditure by the department is	**One third (1/3) of the salary savings from external research grants is retained by the college and two thirds (2/3) is transferred to the department or school,** where, after calculating official university salary increases and for the salary buyout	1. The amount of the incentive compensation to the Principal Investigator will be equal to **35% of the salary savings.** 2. The academic base salary (without any incentive compensation) is the salary to be used for calculating official university salary increases and for the salary buyout	1. This policy establishes procedures for incentive compensation for faculty, including qualified Chairs/Directors and Deans who buy out from 25 to 100 percent of their base salary with externally funded sponsored program funds.	The incentive will be determined by calculating an amount equal to **30% of the "recovered" or "bought out salary" and fringe benefits.** The investigator will be paid a salary supplement equivalent to **30%**

- **10% to the dean's office.**

required to hire adjunct faculty for course PI is buying out is incurred, this amount will be subtracted from the 80% of salary savings left after the Dean's Office share;

- from the funds remaining after the Dean's 20% and any course replacement costs are subtracted, **33% will be awarded to the PI and 67% to the PI's department.**

have been subtracted, the **remainder is shared equally between the department/school and the Principal Investigator.**

to be budgeted in grant and contract proposals.

2. The incentive compensation is to be paid to the faculty member at the end of **of the actual recovered salary earned during the previous calendar year on any or all external funds.** The department may factor teaching workload buy out costs in incentive pay calculations. The incentive must be recommended by the Department Chair and approved by the Dean of the SOAHS.

3. To qualify for incentive compensation, the faculty member must buy out using externally sponsored programs funds, at least 25% of his/her base salary during the Fall and/or Spring semester.

4. The incentive compensation is to be paid to the faculty member at the end of the semester in which a portion (at least 25%) of the base salary is bought out.

5. For example, a faculty member's base salary is $60,000 for his/her nine (9) month contract. (A base rate of $6,666.67 per month). The faculty member buys out 25% of their salary for the Fall semester.

6. The incentive compensation would be calculated as follows:
- Amount of salary bought out is 25% of $6,666.67 X 4.5 months = $7,500. Amount of salary bought out is $7,500.
- The amount of incentive compensation is 35% of $7,500= $2,625.

Award for Distinguished Scholarly, Research or Artistic Achievement

Purpose of the Award:

The **Award for Distinguished Scholarly, Research or Artistic Achievement** is intended to recognize outstanding work by faculty. Specifically, it recognizes outstanding performance consistent with the mission of the university. Scholarship, research and artistic endeavors can take many forms and should be evaluated in the context of discipline specific norms. In many disciplines, peer reviewed, knowledge-generating publications represent the standard by which scholarship is judged. In other disciplines, the production of artistic works or performances are the standard. For the purposes of this award, grant writing and related activity shall be considered evidence of scholarly productivity, as will participation in professional activities and production of materials furthering the mission and reputation of the University.

Nature of the Award:

Recipients of the **Award for Distinguished Scholarly, Research or Artistic Achievement** receive a cash award from the campus and recognition by the Provost. Recipients are honored during fall Convocation and their accomplishments are permanently documented by the university.

Eligibility:

All members of the Texas A&M University- San Antonio faculty are eligible to apply for this award provided they meet the following criteria:

a) Currently employed by Texas A&M- San Antonio as a Tenure or Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Lecturer, Visiting Faculty or Professional/Clinical Faculty.
b) Have been in current or similar position with the university for at least two years.

Selection Criteria:

The following criteria are intended to encompass various aspects of teaching and teaching-related activities at the undergraduate and graduate levels across the University. Applicants may submit documentation that supports their efforts in the areas identified below. Applicants are welcome to include additional documentation so long as it specifically addresses the applicant's qualification for this award. An explanation of relevance is encouraged. This awards process is designed to align with faculty self-evaluation criteria and reporting procedures in an attempt to streamline workload and enhance efficiency, thus encouraging applicants to consider applying for the award after reviewing/compiling accomplishments from the previous year.

A. Peer reviewed scholarly articles
B. Book chapters
C. Editor of texts
D. Books published by academic press
E. Invited or juried oral research presentations
F. Grants proposals authored (with Agency feedback summary preferred)
G. Grants funded and implemented
H. Professional materials developed (for Government Agencies/Organizations, etc.)
I. Commercial products developed/patented/produced

J. Original creative writing (e.g., theatrical play, musical piece)
K. Public performance of an art form
L. Public display of a visual art form in a juried setting
M. Commercial products developed/patented/produced

Application Process:

1.) Complete and submit the Award Application and all supporting documentation (see Selection Criteria for guidance on required documentation) to the Office of the Provost by February 15th of each academic year.

2.) A committee with two representatives from each college and one library representative will be elected by the faculty to serve as the evaluation committee. Faculty Senate will oversee the election of committee members. The elections will be held in December and the committee will convene following the January _____ submission of applications. Any individual applying for an award is not eligible to serve as a reviewer on the award committee.

3.) Each committee member will review and score each application independently. Distinguished performance is considered to be a score of 2 or greater in the awards category applied for. In the event no applications meet the scoring criteria, no award will be given in that academic year. In the event more than one application is eligible, the award will be given to the eligible application with the highest overall score. When the highest scoring applicants have tied scores, the committee will determine the award recipient by consensus.

4.) The application and selection process is a confidential process. The Provost's Office will maintain all relevant documentation related to the application and award process.

5.) An applicant may withdraw his/her application at any time during the review process by submitting a written request to the Provost.

6.) Faculty will be notified regarding the outcome of the application by May 30th. Award recipients will be formally recognized the following semester at Convocation. Monetary awards will be presented at that time.

Scoring:

Domain	Distinguished Scholarly, Research or Artistic Achievement - Scoring Rubric 3 = Evidence of outstanding activity/performance (as indicated by reach, rating, or citation) 2 = Evidence of strong activity/performance 1 = Evidence of activity/performance 0 = No evidence/not applicable			
	3	**2**	**1**	**0**
Scholarly/Research				
Peer reviewed scholarly articles				
Book chapters				
Editor of texts				
Books published by academic press				
Invited or juried oral research presentations				

Grants proposals authored (with Agency feedback summary preferred)				
Grants funded and implemented				
Professional materials developed (for Government Agencies/Organizations, etc.)				
Commercial products developed/patented/produced				
Other:				

Comments:

Artistic/Performance				
Original creative writing (e.g., theatrical play, musical piece)				
Public performance of an art form				
Public display of a visual art form in a juried setting				
Commercial products developed/patented/produced				
Other:				

Comments:

TOTAL Score:				

Award for Distinguished Service

Purpose of the Award:

The *Award for Distinguished Service* is intended to recognize outstanding work by faculty. Specifically, it recognizes service consistent with the mission of the university. Service as it impacts student empowerment, the creation of innovative and challenging academic context and co-curricular programs that contribute to and enrich the economic and social development of the community and region; and, service that inspires graduates to be lifelong learners and responsible global citizens.

Nature of the Award:

Recipients of the *Award for Distinguished Service* receive a cash award from the campus and recognition by the Provost. Recipients are honored during fall Convocation and their accomplishments are permanently documented by the university.

Eligibility:

All members of the Texas A&M University- San Antonio faculty are eligible to apply for this award provided they meet the following criteria:

a) Currently employed by Texas A&M- San Antonio as a Tenure or Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Lecturer, Visiting Faculty or Professional/Clinical Faculty.
b) Have been in current or similar position with the university for at least two years.

Selection Criteria:

The following criteria are intended to encompass various aspects of service and service-related activities at the undergraduate and graduate levels across the University. Documentation related to these activities should be included. Applicants are welcome to include additional documentation so long as it specifically addresses the applicant's qualification for this award. An explanation of relevance is encouraged. This awards process is designed to align with faculty self-evaluation criteria and reporting procedures in an attempt to streamline workload and enhance efficiency, thus encouraging applicants to consider applying for the award after reviewing/compiling accomplishments from the previous year.

A. Advising, counseling and other student activities (e.g. assisting students in your program; serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization; recruiting students to the University or to a program; placing students in graduate programs.)

B. Service to the Community involving your students (e.g. student internships in local organizations; student assistance in research projects for community / business / governmental organizations):

C. Administrative and Committee Service to the Department, School and University: explain your role and contribution for each administrative or committee assignment.

D. Honors, awards and special recognition received during reporting period (include offices held in learned societies, fellowships, and new memberships in learned societies in which elections are on elective basis: new listings in Who's Who in America or similar publications).
   a. Special Recognition and Honors:

     b. Election to Office in Scholarly or Professional Organizations:

E. Public service to the community, state, and nation:
     a. Public service to the community, state, and nation based on your professional expertise. Explain the nature and significance of each service activity:
     b. Other public service not based on your professional expertise (e.g., membership or holding office in an organization unrelated to your academic role---church boards, scouting or athletic organizations, etc.

Application Process:

1.) Complete and submit the Award Application and all supporting documentation (see Selection Criteria for guidance on required documentation) to the Office of the Provost by February 15th of each academic year.
2.) A committee with two representatives from each college and one library representative will be elected by the faculty to serve as the evaluation committee. Faculty Senate will oversee the election of committee members. The elections will be held in December and the committee will convene following the January ____ submission of applications. Any individual applying for an award is not eligible to serve as a reviewer on the award committee.
3.) Each committee member will review and score each application independently. Distinguished performance is considered to be a score of 2 or greater in the awards category applied for. In the event no applications meet the scoring criteria, no award will be given in that academic year. In the event more than one application is eligible, the award will be given to the eligible application with the highest overall score. When the highest scoring applicants have tied scores, the committee will determine the award recipient by consensus.
4.) The application and selection process is a confidential process. The Provost's Office will maintain all relevant documentation related to the application and award process.
5.) An applicant may withdraw his/her application at any time during the review process by submitting a written request to the Provost.
6.) Faculty will be notified regarding the outcome of the application by May 30th. Award recipients will be formally recognized the following semester at Convocation. Monetary awards will be presented at that time.

Scoring:

Domain	Distinguished Service Scoring Rubric 3 = Evidence of outstanding activity/performance (as indicated by impact or innovation) 2 = Evidence of strong activity/performance 1 = Evidence of activity/performance 0 = No evidence/not applicable			
	3	**2**	**1**	**0**
Service to the University				
Advising, counseling and other student activities				

Comments:				
Administrative and Committee Service to the Department, School and University				
Other:				
Comments:				
Service to the Local Community, State & Nation				
Service to the Community involving your students				
Public service to the community, state, and nation:				
Other:				
Comments:				
Service to the Profession				
Election to Office in Scholarly or Professional Organizations:				
Other:				
Comments:				
TOTAL Score:				

Award for Distinguished Teaching

Purpose of the Award:

The *Award for Distinguished Teaching* is intended to recognize outstanding work by faculty. Specifically, it recognizes teaching excellence consistent with the mission of the university. Teaching as it impacts student empowerment, the creation of innovative and challenging academic context and co-curricular programs that contribute to and enrich the economic and social development of the community and region; and, teaching that inspires graduates to be lifelong learners and responsible global citizens.

Nature of the Award:

Recipients of the *Award for Distinguished Teaching* receive a cash award from the campus and recognition by the Provost. Recipients are honored during fall Convocation and their accomplishments are permanently documented by the university.

Eligibility:

All members of the Texas A&M University- San Antonio faculty are eligible to apply for this award provided they meet the following criteria:

a) Currently employed by Texas A&M- San Antonio as a Tenure or Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Lecturer, Visiting Faculty or Professional/Clinical Faculty.
b) The intent of the Award for Distinguished Teaching is to recognize sustained excellence in teaching, therefore, all applicants must have taught at least six regularly scheduled courses in the past two years.

Selection Criteria:

The following criteria are intended to encompass various aspects of teaching and teaching-related activities at the undergraduate and graduate levels across the University. Applicants must submit any documentation designated as required but are welcome to include additional documentation so long as it specifically addresses the applicant's qualification for this award. An explanation of relevance is encouraged. This awards process is designed to align with faculty self-evaluation criteria and reporting procedures in an attempt to streamline workload and enhance efficiency, thus encouraging applicants to consider applying for the award after reviewing/compiling accomplishments from the previous year.

Effective teaching is a minimum expectation for the granting of tenure and promotion, and no recommendation for tenure or promotion should be made when effectiveness of teaching is in doubt. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be as comprehensive as possible. The process must include information from a variety of sources including systematic assessment of student feedback and input from peers and the academic School head. Among the methods that may be used to demonstrate teaching quality are:

A. Documentation of exceptional teaching strategies, academic rigor, outstanding student work, assessment of student learning outcomes, course revision as a result of assessment
B. peer observation of classroom performance
C. receipt of an award or honor for Teaching Excellence from an internal or external agency

Application Process:

1.) Complete and submit the Award Application and all supporting documentation (see Selection Criteria for guidance on required documentation) to the Office of the Provost by February 15th of each academic year.

2.) A committee with two representatives from each college and one library representative will be elected by the faculty to serve as the evaluation committee. Faculty Senate will oversee the election of committee members. The elections will be held in December and the committee will convene following the January _____ submission of applications. Any individual applying for an award is not eligible to serve as a reviewer on the award committee.

3.) Each committee member will review and score each application independently. Distinguished performance is considered to be a score of 2 or greater in the awards category applied for. In the event no applications meet the scoring criteria, no award will be given in that academic year. In the event more than one application is eligible, the award will be given to the eligible application with the highest overall score. When the highest scoring applicants have tied scores, the committee will determine the award recipient by consensus.

4.) The application and selection process is a confidential process. The Provost's Office will maintain all relevant documentation related to the application and award process.

5.) An applicant may withdraw his/her application at any time during the review process by submitting a written request to the Provost.

6.) Faculty will be notified regarding the outcome of the application by May 30th. Award recipients will be formally recognized the following semester at Convocation. Monetary awards will be presented at that time.

Scoring:

Domain	Distinguished Teaching Scoring Rubric 3 = Evidence of outstanding activity/performance (as indicated by impact or innovation) 2 = Evidence of strong activity/performance 1 = Evidence of activity/performance 0 = No evidence/not applicable			
	3	**2**	**1**	**0**
exceptional teaching strategies,				
academic rigor				
outstanding student work				
assessment of student learning outcomes				

course revision as a result of assessment				
Comment:				
peer observation of classroom performance		-		
Comment:				
receipt of an award or honor for Teaching Excellence from an internal or external agency				
Comment:				
Other:				
Comment:				
TOTAL Score:				

Engagement: Evidence of sustained levels of commitment, involvement, or collaboration
Score:

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Impact: Evidence of an expansive impact
Score:

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Quality: Evidence of exemplar/high quality work
Score:

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Importance: Evidence that work addresses important issues
Score:

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Total Score: _____ /24

The mission at Texas A&M University- San Antonio affirms:

Texas A&M University-San Antonio faculty and staff prepare and empower students through innovative and challenging academic and co-curricular programs that contribute to and enrich the economic and social development of the community and region. A solid foundation for success is established through dynamic teaching, scholarship, research, and public service that inspire graduates to lifelong learning and responsible global citizenship.

In dynamic and diverse ways, the work of faculty at Texas A&M- San Antonio fulfills this mission. Applicants for an award for Distinguished Teaching, Scholarship or Service should demonstrate an ongoing commitment to the qualities, skills and work that supports the fulfillment of this mission. Each candidate will be rated based on the following criteria:

> Innovation
> Effectiveness
> Engagement
> Impact
> Quality
> Importance

A score of 1-4 will be assigned in each area. The elected committee will use these scores to determine a single recipient in each category. When applicants receive identical numeric scores, the committee will be responsible for determining one award recipient in each area (Teaching, Research, and Service).

Innovation: Groundbreaking views/approaches to new or existing issues
Score:

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Effectiveness: Extensive evidence of efficacy
Score:

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____