

Faculty Senate Meeting
November 15, 2013
OCNR 222

Present: Senators Anderson, Araiza, Brown, Chambers, Concannon, Crane, Engelhardt, Giraldo, Griffith, Kar, Klaus, Larkin, Miller, Moreno, Tejada-Delgado, Wines, Zimmer

Present: Ex Officio: Billeaux, Cassin, Markwood, Meyer

Present: Guests: Hearne, Wetz (Michael), Canales (JoAnn) Absent: Senators Baldwin, Bowden, Friday, Keys, Spencer

1. Meeting called to order by Larkin at 2:01p.m.
2. Approval of agenda: Motion to approve by David Miller seconded by Crane. Motion passed.
3. Introductions of ex officio members and guests
 - a. Dr. Cassin - Qualtrics survey software has been purchased by the university and will be available on 11/18 and free for all X2692.
 - b. Dr. Michael Wetz, Program Coordinator for Marine Biology Ph.D. program
 - c. Tiffany Hearne, Provost's Office
 - d. Dr. Chris Markwood, Provost
 - e. Dr. Joann Canales, Dean of College of Graduate Studies
4. Approval of October 18, 2013 FS minutes: Motion to approve by Griffith and seconded by Zimmer. Motion passed.
5. Old business
 - a. Patrick Larkin: Post tenure review (item for forum)
 - i. Comparison chart of Current PTR policies at TAMU College Station and TAMU-CC with proposed new TAMU-CC policy.
 - ii. Larkin reviewed both system policy and TAMU-College Station policy.
 - iii. TAMU-CC appears to be in compliance with TAMUS policy as it is currently written.
 - iv. Recommendation by Larkin: Revise TAMU-CC policy to align more closely to TAMU College Station, specifically the area in which the TAMU policy indicated an annual review rather than a 5 year or more cumulative evaluation.
 - v. Discussion:
 - a) Chambers: Liked less paperwork/fewer dossiers; peer reviewed of the packet could pose a problem. She suggested to "tweak" our policy to align more with TAMU, but with some changes. Dossier could still be an option. An appeal committee when there is disagreement between the faculty and the evaluator. Asked if today's purpose was for information purposes only. Larkin responded with a yes. Chambers asked why Regents are so concerned with this issue.
 - b) Markwood stated that College Station (TAMU) does have a six year review. The system policy and the TAMU policy are different when it comes to post tenure review. We do need to correct the lack of our policy having a "peer review" component as it is a legal requirement and we are currently out of compliance. Provost suggested the faculty could simply compile their three areas via DM which would be submitted annually and then ultimately at the end of the six years with an attached e-portfolio (of their choice). He reminded senate that the Peer Review component is state law and is non-negotiable.
 - c) Araiza expressed she is concerned with the amount of time that a post tenure six year review will take from the already busy faculty and time it takes away from teaching and the students. She also inquired about an evaluation plan in place for administrators and when that would be available to faculty. The provost indicated that a 360 review is in place for administrators at the provost's office and the office of

academics. Larkin asked how the faculty is able to provide input to the 360 evaluation. Provost indicated that he is open for suggestions and maybe expand the 360 review. The provost verified that there is no section, currently, in the 360 review that asks for faculty input. Rather, it only asks for those in close working relations with the administrator being evaluated. Araiza asked when this post tenure review would be due. Provost indicated in May.

- d) Griffin expressed that the faculty forums should not be where we “fix” the post tenure issue, but rather a starting point for discussion about its revisions.
- e) Larkin suggested that bringing in some of the Regents in to meet faculty might be a good opportunity to help them get to know our faculty on a more personal and professional level. A round table format was suggested. He also asked the Provost to provide him with the information he has regarding system policy with regards to Post Tenure Review and how it differs from TAMU-College Station.

b. Bryant Griffith: Minimesters (item for forum)

- i. Reminded the faculty about the Faculty Forums and to encourage faculty to attend.
- ii. Tejada-Delgado suggested that these dates be sent out to faculty as soon as possible (today) in order that they are able to plan and calendar accordingly. Suggested that the next set of forum dates go out to faculty well in advance.

c. Sara Baldwin: faculty awards: definitions and proposed bylaws changes

- i. Engelhardt and Tejada-Delgado presented on ABE.
- ii. Two friendly amendments were made to change a few word choices.
- iii. Kar suggested that we clarify what we mean by “five years tenure track with the university” requirement.
- iv. Vote to approve: unanimously approved.
- v. Proposed changes to bylaws, allowing organizations and individuals outside of ABE to help collect and organize (but not judge) award applications was reviewed. Vote to approve changes was unanimous.

6. New business

a. Graduate Student Salaries-Dr. Wetz, guest

- i. Larkin stated that the pay for the Graduate Assistants (GAs), Research Assistants (RAs) and Teaching Assistants (TAs) has short comings as compared to other comparable institutions and we are markedly lower (Research provided by Dr. Wetz). Wetz would like to work with administration to boost these salaries. Larkin asked if this was an issue that is present in other colleges and asked for comments.
- ii. Griffith stated that his department cannot entice excellent doctoral candidates due to the low salaries they are currently able to offer GAs. Stated how important it is to pay our GAs well in order to attract the best students and move us toward an emerging research institution.
- iii. Provost indicated that they had approved a graduate assistant (GAs, RAs, TAs) raise; however, there is currently a lack of a systematic structure to target what the range would be for competitive salaries by colleges. He reported that deans are meeting this week to try to have things implemented by January, 2014 with an increase of \$250,000 available for graduate student salaries. He indicated that Funk-Baxter created a model of GAs, TAs, RAs teaching model to determine if they are “making the university money.” He indicated that the results of the study indicated that GAs, TAs, RAs teaching our courses do not make the university money, but do help us build programs across the university.
- iv. Moreno suggested that a review of all colleges on this issue be conducted in a survey form, possibly. Provost suggested he would provide us with the data he has already collected as a starting point. He will provide this information to Dr. Spencer.

- v. Chambers suggested the possibility of using tuition scholarships, or part of them, since the state does not allow us to waive tuition. She asked the Provost if someone could look into this. Paul Meyer indicated that the Division of Finance would look into this possibility.
 - vi. Isabel expressed her concern with overworked and underpaid GAs, TAs, and RAs in her college.
 - vii. Kar expressed his concern regarding international students and an I-20 form since they have to demonstrate how they will support themselves completely in order to receive a VISA. The low pay would prove to be poor evidence of international students being able to financially support themselves, therefore, resulting in possible VISA rejections.
 - viii. Klaus asked why the Hazlewood Act allows universities to waive the tuition, but not other populations.
- b. Speaker's report
- i. Draft budget for FY2014
 - a) Reviewed by Senate – Larkin asked for questions or comments.
 - 1) Catherine Bridges indicated that the Survey Monkey funds had already been reallocated.
 - b) Motion to approve: Crane motioned to approve.
 - c) Zimmer seconded the motion.
 - d) Vote to approve: Unanimous approval (17 hand count).
 - ii. Strategic Planning & Continuous Improvement Committee update
 - a) Larkin suggested that senators with questions should contact Dr. Spencer.
 - iii. Faculty Forums
 - a) Tues., Nov. 19: UC Oso Room 221, 1-3 p.m. (Minimester, Post Tenure and Office hours)
 - b) Fri., Nov. 22: CCH 118, 12:30-2:30 p.m. (Minimester, Post Tenure and Office hours)
 - iv. New Faculty Orientation: scheduled for Aug. 15, 2014
 - a) Provost indicated this date is reserved for NFO, but if we ended up with more students than anticipated, he will have to re-evaluate the venue. He did express concern as to where he would be able to move it since venues are scarce on campus.
- c. Committee reports
- i. Academic Affairs:
 - a) Griffith: Reviewed request by Dr. Thomas Naehr (graduate studies) for approval of proposed Master's of Science Degree for Coastal and Marine Systems Science (CMSS). Suggested that the proposal be reviewed and explained to AA before the committee makes any decisions. He will bring those results to the FS meeting in December.
 - b) CMSS – FS may need to have a Dec. 6th emergency meeting to meet on this. Griffith will e-mail FS more information shortly.
 - c) Undergraduate Council – Billeaux indicated they have approved the catalogue changes and proposed new program in electrical engineering.
 - d) Provost asked if the electrical engineering program would be considered in the December FS agenda? Griffith indicated that it would be a struggle due to the magnitude of the work involved to get this approved. Griffith also indicated it would be ready for the January regents meeting.
 - ii. Awards, Bylaws & Elections: No additional report other than what was already presented
 - iii. Budget Analysis (see attachment):

- a) Hazlewood Act: We would like to see some of that money reallocated and Provost indicated he will look into it.
 - b) Dependent Tuition Waiver: Survey indicated that the waiver would result in faculty to work harder and better retention of faculty and staff. This information is based on those who participated in the survey. Faculty who had children showed more genuine interest.
 - c) Pay Raise Issue: Faculty feel the last pay raise was unfair based on faculty responses. Survey revealed that 48% of respondents believed the procedure was unfair and 52% believed the adjustment was unfair (not enough monies allocated). See survey results for complete analysis.
 - d) Provost indicated the Merit pool would be 2% this year.
 - e) Provost indicated that he submitted the results of possible gender inequities last year to TAMU-CC's EEO office and its results yielded that the university was in complete compliance. The provost was asked for access to this study.
- iv. Committee on Committees: No report
 - v. Faculty Affairs:
 - a) Post Tenure Review (See above) and will be part of faculty forum for more feedback.
 - b) Revising Librarian promotion policy.
 - c) Dr. Timothy Dew was approved for Professor of Emeritus.
7. Provost's comments
- a. Isabel asked about the alternate admissions information she has requested from the provost numerous times but has not yet received. She asked why this information has not been disclosed to her even after she has asked and it is part of the open records law. The Provost indicated that he has already provided this report to Dr. Spencer. Isabel would like to see the report.
 - b. A new system for student ranking has been adopted based on the Texas Tech model.
 - c. Klaus asked about low producing programs and what criterion is used to determine which programs are considered low producing. Provost indicated it depended on the number of graduates over a five year period. A report by the president will be presented to the Board of Regents and Legislature in the next legislative meeting.
8. Other – None
9. Motion to Adjourn by Crane and seconded by Anderson
10. Adjourn at 3:59p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Carmen Tejeda-Delgado