

Faculty Senate Meeting-Official Minutes
September 19, 2014, 2:00 PM
OCNR 363

Senators Present: Anderson, Araiza, Bowden, Brown, Cammarata, Crane, Dolan, Flournoy, Giraldo, Griffith, Kar, Larkin, Miller, Mollick, Moreno, Ozymy, Spaniol, Spencer, Thompson, Zeidan

Senators Absent: Changchit, Tejeda-Delgado

1. Meeting called to order at 2:01 PM
2. Approval of the Agenda:
 - a. Motion to approve by Spencer, seconded by Crane.
 - b. Agenda was unanimously approved.
3. Introduction of Ex Officio members Dr. Markwood, Lionel Cassin, Meredith Copeland, Ryan Beard, and welcome of new senators, Rabih Zeidan (COB) and Dee Dolan (CONHS)
4. Approval of minutes
 - a. May 2 Faculty Senate meeting
 - i. Motion to approve by Griffith, seconded by Miller
 - ii. Minutes passed unanimously
 - b. August 21 Faculty Senate Retreat
 - i. Motion to approve by Spencer, seconded by Bowden
 - ii. Minutes passed unanimously
5. New Business
 - a. Guest Speakers:
 - i. Ms. Ana Billeaux, Director of Office of International Education
 - 1) Please see Faculty Senate website for Ms. Billeaux's presentation.
 - 2) Questions from Senators:
 - a) A senator asked about the agent program. Ms. Billeaux explained that for the past 3 years or so the University has been working with international recruiting agents. These agents are met and screened at conferences. They recruit students and make sure they meet admission requirements. They receive a commission for each student they recruit who successfully enrolls.
 - i. Dr. Markwood added a clarification: We've been targeting students who do not meet ESLI. We don't pay a commission on ESLI. Commission is \$2000 divided into 2 payments.
 - b) A senator asked: Are International students paying out-of-state tuition? Dr. Markwood stated yes, plus an international student fee.
 - c) A senator asked: Can students apply for a waiver for in-state tuition? Ms. Billeaux replied that if they get an assistantship, they get a waiver. There is an international scholarship for those who have studied English in the US. What percentage has the waiver? No more than 5%. Does that help attract students? Yes.
 - d) Ms. Billeaux continued: At the undergraduate level, ESLI students have overall better grades at completion than direct recruits or domestic international students. Graduate students do not have as big a difference.

- e) We have recruitment agreements with 46 different agents. Fall 2014 we received 35 students through agent agreements. Most productive agents are from India, most are MS Computer Science students (about 30 students).
 - f) English Proficiency: Direct entry students must provide a TOEFL score of 79 ibt. Minimum IELTS of 6.5. ESLI students are exempt from IELTS/TOEFL
 - g) Dr. Meyer clarified: For the self-identified students on permanent citizenship, there is no English proficiency requirement for the undergraduate program. However, for graduate studies, if they don't have a way to show their English proficiency (i.e. degree from English speaking school), they need a TOEFL/IELTS score.
 - h) A senator asked about the tracking of students, and requested to see tracking of students who stay one semester, two semesters, etc., not just data on those who graduate.
 - i) A senator asked about the list of countries that are exempt from the IELTS and TOEFL? Did we develop this list ourselves? Ms. Billeaux: Yes, we do look at other universities to help develop it. It is a pretty common list.
 - j) A senator asked: What does it mean if countries are subject to review? Answer: The committee can review if the student's English is not well demonstrated.
 - k) A senator requested to see a correlation between the scores on the IELTS/TOEFL and their persistence to graduation.
 - l) A senator asked if a ratio of admittance to how many graduate has been calculated? The Provost clarified that it should be not just admitted, but how many enrolled. Faculty Senate should make a request for information to Provost.
 - m) The Senate thanked Ms. Billeaux for the presentation.
- ii. Ms. Margaret Dechant, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
- 1) Please see Faculty Senate website for Ms. Dechant's presentation.
 - 2) Questions from Senators:
 - a) A senator asked: what was the increase from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013? Around 3% increase (10508 Fall 2012; 10951 Fall 2013) Focus is to increase high achieving enrollment. 462 High Achieving students, up 13.7% from last year. 50% FTIC enrollment were automatic admits (met all admission requirements). Denied 1205 FTIC applicants
 - b) A senator noted that the student tours do a nice job. Dechant responded that this year is the first year we've been able to pay our orientation leaders, and that has helped increase the quality.
 - c) A senator noted a decline in Senior enrollment. Has this happened in the past? If the drop is 20%, it seems it would affect graduation by 7-8%. Dechant- I don't have those numbers. That is a retention question (Gerry Moreno)
 - d) A Senator pointed out there could be fewer students that started in previous years, so maybe not a retention question. He wondered if we could find out if it's just fewer students who started.

- e) Dr. Markwood commended Ms. Dechant and her staff for being selective and still experiencing growth. We still grew in the right areas with the targeted students.
- f) Dr. Markwood: Another enrollment note: Program for System Admission (PSA). Partnership program with TAMU. TAMU passes on students who TAMU did not admit to sister schools. This year a little under 600. Of those, 192 enrolled here (down from 207). This is the first year we have not increased PSA students, but A&M admitted a larger than usual amount.
- g) A Senator asked: How do PSA students do? They in general do well. They stay here in general. Senators considered asking for numbers on this.
- h) The Senate thanked Ms. Dechant for the presentation.

6. Speaker's Report

- a. Welcome dinner was held for new faculty, August 22 at the Art Museum of South Texas.
 - i. Dr. Markwood: 55 or 57 of 66 new faculty attended.
- b. FYI convocation: The Speaker carried the Mace for First Year Islander convocation.
- c. Applications for faculty development leave are open (CFE). Due Friday Oct. 24.
- d. Visa issues came up at Executive meeting. Senators are to ask in their colleges to see if and what issues any faculty are having with their visa applications. We are in information gathering stage at this point, trying to find out if this is really an issue. Speaker Larkin will forward the email that Senator Spencer drafted to send to constituents.
- e. Information Tech/Distance Ed Committee CPIRA
 - i. IT: Concerns about Blackboard- they were aware.
 - ii. IT: Ability to save files on classroom computers? (options: Google Docs, dropbox)
 - iii. There is a new virtual proctoring software on campus: We have 2 ways that distance education programs are currently proctored:
 - 1) Nursing: students pay a fee and are proctored.
 - 2) Business: Examity virtual proctors, therefore program is completely online.
 - 3) Question: Is the College of Business covering the proctor fees for its students? Do students pay for proctoring on a per basis fee, or is there a flat fee that that is charged? Dr. Markwood: If we charged a "fee" it would require Board of Regents approval. If it is a resource that's required for their course (like a textbook), we can do it as long as students are notified prior to registration.
 - 4) A Senator noted that she had used testing centers last spring, and she had to sit by the phone during exams to handle the myriad problems.
 - 5) A Senator from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences noted that Nursing has used secure testing sites for 3 years. Usually problems only occur the first time, after that no problems.
 - 6) A Senator from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences: We have had good luck using secure testing centers. We screen them to find out how secure they are really going to be. The longest any test is open is 6 hours.
 - iv. CPIRA: Senator Moreno was elected vice chair, also elected to be CPIRA's ex officio member to Faculty Senate. CPIRA has made a request to the RCO to report how funds collected from investigator IDC ("indirects") accounts are being used. Have also addressed invoicing issues and prepared a set of

recommendations to enhance the efficiency of Institutional Review Board (IRB) practices.

- v. Fall faculty Forums: October 27, 28 early to late afternoon. Primary topics- workload policy, other issues as necessary
- vi. University rule review: Granting honorary degrees—senators please look at this and get final comments to Dr. Larkin by Monday.

7. Committee Reports

a. Academic Affairs

- i. Received document from grad council that lists the deadlines. One of our goals is to improve timeliness in programs reaching us. Catalog changes timeline. Dr. Beard clarified some of the deadlines. The December 15 deadline relates to VA requirements. We have to submit everything prior to that deadline, but it doesn't tie our hands. It's a draft for us to show to the VA.
- ii. Another goal was to improve the quality of writing of academic program proposals- Provost's office is working on that.
- iii. Want to review how well students are prepared for their programs- were encouraged by the presentations today.

b. Awards, Bylaws and Elections

- i. Two announcements have been sent out, 2 more will be in the next weeks. There are plans for a new award for administrator excellence. Plans to clarify in the bylaws related to eligibility to vote in Faculty Senate. May discuss possibility of increasing the number of representatives from colleges from 4 to 5. Possible electoral voting on meeting virtually for emergency situations.
- ii. Dr. Markwood requested that we move forward the call for Regents professor earlier in the semester.
- iii. Senator Moreno, as parliamentarian, noted in reviewing bylaws: There is no comment in our bylaws about the need for a quorum in taking actions and taking votes. He strongly suggests we add language in the bylaws about this.
- iv. Speaker Larkin noted: We will need to bring up bylaws changes in the October meeting. Who is eligible, language, etc. Question: Some of these things in the bylaws, new definitions of ex-officio. Constitution says you have to have a campus wide vote to change things. Does the constitution need to be changed? A Senator responded that yes we have to vote. Place in front of faculty. Maybe we can bring that up at the October meeting, Faculty Forum too.

c. Budget Analysis

- i. University's budget is ready- Josh has long meeting next week with Dr. Funk-Baxter
- ii. Side project: inquire about aspects of faculty pay not covered in merit/equity pool—what are people paid when promoted from assistant to associate and associate to full. Asking peer institutions. Also will ask about adjunct pay. Going to ask if peers have PTR processes and is there a stipend involved.

d. Committee on Committees

- i. Had one meeting. Submitted names to Dr. Shupala.
- ii. Will have another meeting to look at the survey responses from faculty about their committee interests.
- iii. Some committees need faculty senate representation; Crane will send out the list. Will ask for volunteers for those.

- iv. Larkin: How is the committee coming that has been tasked with hearing faculty grievances, one that will have 15 members recommended by the senate? Crane: We need a list of people who are tenured for those. Deans need to make their selections first to account for small number of eligible faculty from units such as CONHS. Faculty Senate will then make their recommendations.
 - v. Markwood: The Deans need to go first, then senate.
 - vi. Crane: We really do need that list of all tenured faculty. Dr. Shupala and her office have been very helpful.
 - e. Faculty Affairs:
 - i. 2 files for emeritus status came forward for review
 - ii. Concern for faculty forums. There has been huge concern about faculty workload. Encourage everyone to go back to our colleges and have people attend these forums.
 - iii. Larkin: What about the workload rule is under revision? Bowden: We need to coordinate that with the dates and make sure everyone gets that.
8. Provost's presentation
- a. Academic Affairs agenda:
 - i. Enrollment: In light of the new strategic plan, Vision 2020, the first priority is enrollment of high achieving students and retention. President Killebrew has established a goal to have 15,000 students by 2020.
 - ii. Dual enrollment agreement with Del Mar: A working group is developing a program whereby students would attend 1-2 years at both institutions. 75/25% Delmar/TAMUCC. This is designed for students who want a degree but can't afford it. However, Community College uses an outcomes based funding model using momentum points, and students in dual enrollment would not count for momentum points.
 - iii. Targeted new academic programs: Primarily at graduate level. Where is the next PhD program coming from? Currently working on obtaining THECB approval for Geospatial and Computing Sciences PhD and Doctorate in Nursing Practice (DNP).
 - b. Emerging Research institution: the goal by 2020 is to have made progress towards this. Each department will be asked to develop an emerging research plan. There will be a focus on creating a culture of inquiry—A campus wide research and creative activity symposium may be starting this spring. All departments will need to focus on looking at research and creative activity from their faculty. What changes need to happen in order for faculty to have time for this? Do we have sufficient infrastructure support? If not, how can it be provided?
 - c. Will look strategically at targeted faculty hires, “cluster” hires around certain research areas and topics. Sustainability (in its broader form, not just environmental), working group- what kind of research and programming agenda can we launch around that? Same as informatics (BIG DATA), what can we do better together than we could do separately?
 - d. Emerging research- facilities
 - e. 5 year SACS COC. Draft to be done by January 2016. Readiness audit launched by Shupala. A Senator asked: Is there a QEP? Dr. Markwood: Yes there is the same QEP, we will be reporting on what we have learned.
 - f. One area that Dr. Beard is focusing on is getting our assessment house in order. Do not consider WEAVE to be our assessment tool. Weave is a repository. It's clunky.

- g. Continuing rules and procedures. Dr. Beard has a stack of 75 to be reviewed, about 20-30 which pertain to Faculty Senate, in various stages of process. A senator requested that Dr. Beard send a list of all 75 to Faculty Senate so we can see what is under review and which of those we will be asked to assess.
 - h. Student Engagement and Success: This is a major focus for campus. We are moving forward with High Impact Practices initiative. The goal is 4 high impact educational practices for each student. Students in first year program already experience 2.
 - i. We need to make sure we have every national/discipline honor society we are eligible to have. The Provost has startup funds for student organizations to get these started. A Senator asked: What about professional societies? Dr. Markwood answered that is fine.
 - j. We are taking a defensive posture for the TAMUS' campus administrative cost study. Results should be coming forward in the next month or so. Preliminary feedback- "Span of Control" Positions that have 1 or 0 subordinates were flagged.
 - k. Questions:
 - i. At the end of the spring semester, you were sharing with us some things to anticipate from Board of Regents and the outcome based focus. How much of our focus on High Achieving students is based on that? Markwood: I can't deny that there is probably some, but at the same time, we have been moving on retention much longer than the Regents have been focused on this. We can also report that the Board of Regents wanted to create this outcomes based funding model, but they don't have the money to do it. As it was approaching 4 p.m., motion was made by Spencer to extend meeting to 4:30 pm. Dulal seconded. Motion passed.
 - ii. Are there developments that are making it more difficult to get new programs through? Dr. Markwood: It's a lengthy process. On campus there are processes in the department, then college, dean, then University wide approval process (undergraduate or graduate council). There is a change this year: Once a college has approved a new program, it goes straight to Academic Affairs (AA) and they send it to the appropriate multiple offices and review committees (after review). This will take off several months of the process. After a program is approved by the university, it goes to System- and at least 3 months pass before it goes to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)- THECB has a year for review. For a new program to go through the process you need to think 3 years.
9. For the good of the order:
- a. This room is not available after this month. We're looking for a new room for Faculty Senate meetings.
 - b. Dr. Markwood: President Killebrew has sent out a campus announcement regarding enrollment and the increase wasn't enough to be able to fund a merit pool. However, he is going to authorize one time merit payment this year.
10. Bowden move to adjourn. Meeting was adjourned at 4:09 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah Engledow Brown, Secretary