

Faculty Senate Meeting
October 18, 2013
OCNR 213

Present: Senators Anderson, Araiza, Baldwin, Bowden, Brown, Chambers, Crane, Engelhardt, Friday, Giraldo, Griffith, Kar, Keys, Klaus, Larkin, Miller, Moreno, Spencer, Tejada-Delgado, Zimmer

Present: Ex Officio: Markwood, Meyer
Guests: Cassin, Funk-Baxter, Hearne, Morgan

Absent: Concannon, Wines, Lopez

- 1) Spencer Call to order – 2:00.
- 2) Approval of Agenda- Griffith requested that we not approve the agenda as written, that we consider the doctorate in nursing practice under new business
 - i) Keys moved and Griffith second - unanimous
- 3) Introduce Ex-Officio members and guests: Lionel Cassin, Tiffany Hearne, Paul Meyer, Kathy Funk-Baxter, Provost Markwood, Kem Morgan.
- 4) Minutes of Sept. 20th minutes – David Miller moved and Bowden seconded approval as distributed. All but one senator voted to approve; Giraldo abstained.
- 5) Old Business:
 - a) Griffith suggested we form Ad Hoc committee for two issues (mini-mester and office hours) and each committee, each college and the library would be represented. Araiza agreed to be the point of contact person for nominees.
 - i) Spencer recommended that each committee chair recommend at least one person.
 - ii) Dates for Faculty Forums on these two issues were not decided.
 - b) Faculty Awards (Baldwin)
 - i) Committee has met twice and has written proposed definitions for each of the two proposed new awards, Teaching Innovation and Creative Research, Research.
 - ii) Larkin moved that the proposal go back to committee.
 - iii) Motion seconded by Friday.
 - iv) Committee will move ahead with the 4 existing awards.
 - v) Committee will bring a proposal on how long a faculty member must have worked here in order to be eligible for the Teaching Innovation award (For example, only 2 years, while the others stay at 5 years; the shortened time period for teaching innovation may encourage more

applicants. Committee will also bring back to Senate a list of the criteria for each of the six awards.

- vi) Senate might still have time to institute new awards this year if the Committee makes its report in the November 15 meeting, with the December 16 award submission timeline.
 - vii) The Committee will also need to bring to Senate for Review the necessary changes in the By-laws to allow the Center for Faculty Excellence to participate in the gathering of award nominations.
- 6) New Business
- a) Formula Funding
 - i) Funk-Baxter and Provost reported
 - (1) Funding formula presented by Funk-Baxter and Morgan (see power point and 2 handouts – Cost Study Matrix & Comparison of Weighted SCH's & Formula Funds Generated by course)
 - (a) State funding
 - (i) 2 formulas – Instruction/Operations & Infrastructure
 - (ii) 2 Supplements - Teaching Experience and Review
 - (b) Base Period
 - (c) Each SCH is weighted by level and program area
 - (d) Weights are determined by a **cost study**
 - (e) Discussion over lower division courses and their impact on the weighting system (Friday)
 - (f) Lower & upper division SCH taught by tenure/tenure track faculty are given an additional 10 percent weight
 - (g) Meyer reported that they are reviewing how courses are coded, and consistency will be key
 - (h) Infrastructure formulas – 3 components (Operations/Maintenance (O/M); Utilities & Small School Supplement
 - (i) Designated Tuition – Counts as monies we actually got from the student. It is NOT included as part of the method of finance of appropriations.
 - (j) Statutory Tuition – cannot go above \$50 a credit hour
 - (k) Araiza asked about fees for distance ed and “blended” courses. There is NO FEE assessed for minor use of Bb in a course in which students meet in the traditional way in a classroom.
 - (l) Timeline for Biennium Jan 2014-Jan 2015 (see PowerPoint)

(m) Chambers asked whether senior level students could take graduate courses and be counted as a graduate course weight? Provost said Yes.

(n) Chambers asked if new blocks and times had come out of calendar committee. Provost said No.

b) Doctorate in Nursing Practice

i) Proposal has been underway in CONHS for over a year and was held up at the THECB.

ii) Legislature has now provided a window to move this forward.

iii) Grad Council agreed unanimously and this proposal is supported by CONHS faculty and students, the community and the nursing profession.

iv) Griffith moved to open this as a discussion item; Larkin seconded.

v) Chambers asked if increased funding exists; Griffith responded Yes.

vi) Zimmer asked about the specificity of Doctorate – This would be a Practice Doctorate, which would not be same as a Ph.D., as it would focus on measuring quality patient care.

vii) Bowden asked if there are any regional issues of accreditation which would exclude us from beginning. No.

viii) Program would be 100% online

ix) This will be the ONLY program of this nature in South Texas and the only one 100% online.

x) High demand exists for this program.

xi) Griffith made a motion to make this an action item; Crane seconded.

xii) All but one senator voted in favor; Zimmer abstained.

xiii) Motion to approve

(1) Miller moved to approve the Doctorate of Nursing Practice; and Bowden seconded.

***Motion to extend to meeting to 4:30 made by Speaker Spencer;
Friday seconded***

c) Speaker's report

i) University offices' evaluation of the Aug. 23 New Faculty orientation. They were pleased with the interactions with faculty.

ii) Interest in scheduling regular Faculty Senate Forums – (Tentatively set for this term, Tuesday, Nov. 19th & 22nd)

- iii) Survey concerning local tuition remission for dependents update (Chambers). It is sensitive to income of the respondents, in the sense that those making under \$80K would be more likely to take advantage of this benefit; those making more money will continue to send their children to other institutions. Chambers is putting together preliminary statistics and asked for feedback as to how to look at the data. Age of the respondent made a difference in how favorably this benefit was viewed, with those of the age to have children at home being more in favor. A reduction of 50% reduction of the total bill for tuition and fees created a major increase in the number of credit hours respondents indicated that their dependents would enroll for. Both a practical and a theoretical report would be applicable. Senators indicated that they would like to see the statistics on the whole data set, across various groups of respondents.
 - iv) Study of impact of last year's compensation increase model update. Numbers have not yet been crunched. 174 responded, of which 77 respondents wrote comments (60 negative, 6 positive, 11 neutral).
 - (1) Chambers suggested card sort of factor analysis
 - v) News regarding this year's compensation increases: Provost Markwood reported no new information, but Spencer is hopeful there will be some news soon. More attention to merit is expected for this year, as opposed to last year.
 - (1) Chambers asked if the "look back" period could be revised and recommended? More tied into the Post-tenure review?
- d) Committee Reports
 - i) Academic Affairs Committee (AAC). No additional report (see previous statements)
 - ii) Awards, Bylaws & Elections (ABE) Committee. No additional report (see previous statements)
 - iii) Budget Analysis Committee - Chambers
 - (1) Grounds-keeping is now performed by contractors, removing that division from the administrative budget: Recalculating, now that the amount of the budget that moved from staff/administrative to contract is that the Non-faculty salaries portion of the budget grew slightly more than the faculty salaries portion; though roughly even.
 - (a) Spencer asked where the faculty raise money is sitting? Chambers - Planned new lines.
 - (b) Chambers suggested given the delay in compensation increases for faculty that we may pose the question: What were the raises in the contracts just signed for administration?

- (i) Meyer indicated no raises have been given this year for faculty/non-faculty or administration.
 - iv) Committee on Committees (COC). Crane reported that most committee slots are filled. Still need a faculty senate representative for the University Center and Student Activities Advisory (UCSAA) Committee.
 - (1) Lisa Wines was volunteered for UCSAA Committee.
 - (2) Crane reported that website for COC is in the process of being updated, but no timeline on that process yet.
 - (3) Paul Meyer suggested any changes should be referred to university COC.
 - v) Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).
 - (1) Bowden reported that FAC is recommending Dr. Jack Cassidy for Emeritus Status.
 - (2) Meeting with provost on Monday regarding the establishment of a Librarian promotion rule.
 - (3) Larkin distributed draft policy on Post-Tenure Review (PTR) rules to Senators for review (will be discussed at next FS meeting). Senators are asked to e-mail Patrick and copy Randall with questions or suggestions concerning the document.
 - (4) Larkin reported on the last meeting of the University Calendar Committee:
 - (a) The 7-9:30 pm time frame for once-a-week classes is back on; changing to the proposed 5:30-8 pm and 8:10-10:40 time slots will be considered this year for possible adoption next fall.
 - (b) Labor Day is no longer a university holiday.
 - (c) Whether the proposed seven-week semester dates will be changed to actually be seven weeks in length is still in question.
- 7) Provost's comments
- i) LEAP Texas (AACU) – Our university has joined and is the lead institution in TX; 60 institutions have responded to our invitation to work collaboratively with TAMU-CC on the issues outlined, starting with the new core, which will start next fall.
 - ii) Textbook Adoption Process – Streamlined with Barnes & Noble to streamline the adoption of textbooks. Would like to discuss the option to automatically roll the previous adoption and to set a deadline for the previous faculty member to change, if change is needed, or do nothing if the same book is to be used following semester.
 - iii) Chambers posed 2 questions from Sept. 20, 2013

- (1) Update on raises – Provost has no update
- (2) Clarification on Jan-mester - Compensation at the adjunct rate or In-load assignment, thus reducing the next long semester’s teaching assignment. In-load assignment must be approved by the Chair, Dean, and withstand Provost’s review.
- (3) Provost would support the Dean of Business’ decision to reduce or not reduce
- iv) Larkin asked about any updates on lecture capture. Yes, the institution does rights for future use: the instructor owns the pedagogical content, but difference between institutions using lecture captured material when the subject matter has changed, for example. The university does not have the right to sell the lecture content.
 - (1) Campus procedure will be written up
 - v) Summer school issue is still being looked at by President Killebrew and the provost has no information at this point.
- 8) No other items were brought forward.
- 9) Motion to Adjourn by Miguel Moreno
- 10) Meeting was adjourned at 4:31pm

Respectfully submitted

Carmen Tejeda-Delgado (Secretary)