Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Minutes of October 18, 2002


Absent: Friday, Melrose

Guests: Manuel Lujan and Bob Wiedermann

The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m.

I. Minutes
A motion was made to approve the Minutes of the September 20, 2002 meeting. Zebda asked that a statement which had been included in the Minutes distributed to the Executive Committee members be put back in the official Minutes. The statement in III.C.3. reads, “The Provost stated that the University hopes to achieve salary parity with aspired universities by 2009.” Middleton made a friendly amendment to include an additional clarification statement to the above. The change was approved unanimously. The Minutes were approved as amended.

II. Guest Speakers
Mr. Manuel Lujan, Jr., Dean of Enrollment Management and Dr. Bob Wiedermann, Director of SIS Tech Support & Academic Testing.

Topic: Academic Advising

A. Lujan talked about the $20 fee that went into effect this semester to help sustain the retention-based advising program. Academic advisors are being hired. The program is:

- Organized around professional academic advisors
- With faculty as academic mentors
- Formula funded to keep up with growth
- Coordinated by the Director of Academic Advising
- Assists in communication with prospective students, as well as current students
- Has advisors work during Orientations and other special program times
- Advocates for student needs
- Tracks student progress
- Works with Admissions & Records
- Contacts students who need to apply for graduation
An automated degree plan system will be coming up soon. SMARTT software, a student tracking system, will soon be available. Advisor training was also discussed. The pieces of the puzzle are:

- Advisors
- Mentors
- Centers
- Support Services

B. Dr. Bob Wiedermann demonstrated the SMARTT software. He did indicate that there was no client for Macs, however. Bala expressed concern that this automatically left a segment of the university community out of the loop. He also stated that Web protocols could be used which would make the system available to Mac as well as to PC users.

III. Standing Committees

A. Academic Affairs – Bala

Because of comments received concerning the Proposed University Rule on Co-curricular Services to Minors and the Proposed University Procedure for Co-curricular Services, the Academic Affairs Committee needs to further study these documents before they become action items for the Senate, which had been the original intention for today’s meeting. One comment from the Psychology Department was that a University faculty supervisor may not necessarily be present at all times co-curricular services to minors are conducted. However, the practicum supervisor would be present, if the University faculty member were not. This comment was in reference to section 2.5 of the Proposed Rule 11.99.99.C5.

B. Awards/Bylaws/Election Committee - Kownslar

Monday, October 21 is the deadline for getting nominations in for the First-Year Student Advocate Award. The name of the nominee will be sent on to the Provost by October 28.

C. Budget Analysis – Zebda

1. Zebda has just received the University Budget and the committee will be analyzing it.
2. The CUPA Faculty Salary Comparison Report has also been received. Senate members also received a copy of this report.

D. Committee on Committees – Brendel

This committee has received a request from the Academic Committee to help it in some of its research efforts.
E. Faculty Affairs Committee – Ivy

   The Faculty Affairs Committee has major concerns about the proposed University Statement. For one, the policy needs to be a Chairs Policy, with a separate document for Assistant Deans and other mid-administrators. The committee requested input from Faculty Senators to help guide it in its revisions of the statement. Comments were:

   a. Lewin reiterated that annual reviews of chairs by faculty are a must.
   b. Middleton asked for clarification on what the stipend for the chair is—$1800/academic year.
   c. Crowley expressed concern over the wording of section 2.1 which says that chairs “serve at the pleasure of the dean.” While this is true, a number of faculty are concerned that not enough emphasis is placed on evaluation input from faculty within the department.
   d. Questions were raised about the wording of the first sentence of section 2.2. The committee had already begun discussing possible rewording of this statement.
   e. Crowley questioned the practice of continuing to pay an individual who has served three years in a mid-administrative position one half of the annual stipend in his or her 9-month base pay. Crowley said he had never been at an institution that continued that pay after the person had completed the administrative role.
   f. Ricard asked “Who is eligible to be Chair”? Should non-tenured individuals serve as Chairs? This situation can create some conflict of interest scenarios.
   g. Moore stated that we don’t want ossification in these positions.
   h. Meyer asked if only Professors should be Chairs. The Provost indicated that we would need to have tenured Associate as well as Full Professors in the running in order to have a sufficient pool from which to draw.
   i. Crowley stated the need for a mechanism for faculty to be able to remove a Chair in whom there was no confidence. He also said he understood that the Assistant Dean should serve “at the pleasure of the Dean.”
   j. Zebra reiterated that faculty don’t want Chairs “forced” on them.
   k. Lewin stated, once again, that faculty input in this process should be a major variable.

   October 23rd is the next meeting date of the committee. At that time, the committee will be addressed by Dr. Mary Jane Hamilton, Director of the School of Nursing, and a College of Education representative. They will give input on this subject as their two disciplines are especially impacted by this proposed rule.
3. The committee will also be tackling the workload issue once again. There is no report, as of yet.

IV. Action Items
There were no action items as the Academic Affairs Committee has to incorporate faculty feedback within Proposed University Rule, 11.99.99.C5, Co-curricular Services to Minors and Proposed University Procedure, 11.99.99.C5.01, Procedures for Co-curricular Services.

V. Provost's Report

A. There was an Administrative Retreat on the topic of Hispanic enrollment. TAMU-CC was almost flat in its growth in Hispanic students. An upcoming Campus Conversation on October 21 will also focus on this issue. The Provost encouraged faculty to attend and share their ideas. There is a Wiki Wiki Web page on the various Campus Conversations that can be accessed through the main University homepage.

B. TAMU-CC has been recognized as one of the thirteen "Institutions of Excellence in the First College Year." One hundred thirty institutions from across the nation competed for the award, and the winners were selected by a national panel of experts. Researchers affiliated with the national program will be visiting campus on October 30 and 31 to gather information about our First-Year Learning Communities Program for their forthcoming book on "Best Practices in the First Year of College." The Provost invited Senate members to attend the forum to be held on October 30 from 10:15-noon in the Lone Star Ballroom 142-A during the site visit.

C. A first draft of University Goals has been written. The draft was included in the meeting packet. These goals now need to be fleshed out.

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to extend the meeting 15 minutes.

The Provost is asking each program what dollar amounts need to be attached to program goals in order to reach these goals. By October/November, smaller units should have their goals drafted. By February 2003, goals should be fleshed out.

D. Institutional Effectiveness is undergoing restructuring. Attempts are being made to identify non-academic factors that might be impeding our effectiveness.
A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to extend the meeting another 15 minutes.

VI. Speaker’s Report/Discussion/Information Items

A. The Speaker thanked Denise Landry-Hyde for standing in at the second New Faculty Focus Session. Service will be the topic for the final session in the series which will be coming soon.

B. The Speaker suggested that senators check with the Faculty Senate Office on topics they need to research. The Senate files are very good, and there is no need to re-invent the wheel.

C. Brendel will be attending the Texas Council of Faculty Senates next week.

D. Today is Administrative Assistant Joy DuBose’s last day. She was presented with a bouquet of flowers and thanked profusely for her work on behalf of the Senate. Zebda suggested that she be given a plaque for her service.

VII. Other Business

A. The “Legislative Outlook: 78th Legislative Session” handout was discussed.

B. The “CUPA Annual Faculty Salary Comparison Report” was distributed.

C. A handout, “Information from the 9/24/02 SEBAC [System Employee Benefits Advisory Committee] Meeting” was distributed. An administrative fee of $1.75/month has been added to the health insurance premiums for all plans for FY03. The College Station Faculty Senate has passed a resolution that condemns the fee and urges its immediate rescission. The College Station Faculty Senate also requests that equivalent bodies at other TAMU System components make known their opposition to the administrative fee.

Crowley made a motion to support the Resolution on Administrative Fees. A motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to extend the meeting time an additional 15 minutes. Middleton made a motion to table discussion until the Speaker could get more background information on the issue. By a vote of 7-4, with 1 abstention, the Senate decided to table discussion until more information could be obtained. The Speaker will let the Senate know what he learns from the Texas Council of Faculty Senates meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise Landry-Hyde, Secretary