# Minutes of Faculty Senate
## 7 November 2014

**Present:** Ambrose, Branson, Browning, Commissiong, Crandall, De'Armond, DeOtte, Dursun-Kilic, Fiaud, Hartin, Hindman, Klaehn, Lee, Osei-Hwere, Ottoson, Pendleton, Shao, Stuntz, and Takacs

**Absent:** Atchison, Blanton, and Diego-Medrano

**Guests:** Betty Conway (substituting for Diego-Medrano) and James Webb

**Call to Order:** President Ambrose called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m. in Room 14 (Eternal Flame) of the Jack B. Kelley Student Center.

**Approval of Minutes:** Stuntz made a motion seconded by Takacs to approve as amended by Dursun-Kilic the minutes of the 24 October 2014 meeting of Faculty Senate. The motion passed unanimously by the Senators present.

James Webb provided a handout. He said WT is upgrading wireless internet capacity across campus. The WT wireless has three levels of access: guests on campus, students, and faculty/staff. Faculty and staff can connect to all WT resources that need to be secure, but students and guests cannot.

Webb said 17 faculty and more than 700 students are currently learning Blackboard. A second pilot group will be trained in spring 2015. Instructional technology sent an e-mail seeking more faculty to participate. In the summer, faculty can put classes onto Blackboard. Everyone can use Blackboard starting in fall 2015. Links might not work when content is moved to the new system.

Webb said hybrid learning is taking off and WT now has 40 classrooms with lecture-capture capability. WT will outfit 20 more rooms for lecture capture. Faculty are asked to volunteer rooms. Cisco Webex is the video platform and web based. Shao wants a link to be able to download and edit by herself. Webb said faculty might be allowed to edit in the future. Shao said it is more desirable to provide pieces of lecture, not the entire 75 minutes of class.

Webb said The Texas A&M University System contracted with EMC Syncplicity for Drop Box and Cloud storage. The WT price will be $1.99 per year per person. WT plans to add a new e-mail system for alumni. Shao asked if the $1.99 per year is for personal or just professional use. Webb said the $1.99 can be used for incidental personal use and to share content with external colleagues. Webb said through the mybuff portal, WT students, faculty, and staff can purchase for $10 per year a version of Office or Windows for home use. The $10 pays Texas A&M University for processing and overhead.

Stuntz asked if Cloud will be linked to Blackboard. Webb said it will not be linked, but a file sharing tool will allow linking. Stuntz said student files are now too large to access. Webb said Blackboard said they are done with Angel, so no more research and development are occurring.

Shao said it is difficult for faculty to get onto the wireless and she asked about upgrading the wireless. Webb said faculty can use the guest wireless network but the faculty/staff network is not broadcast so as to minimize who can see this secure network. Shao said the guest network is slower than the faculty network. Webb said WT has a 650-megabit bandwidth allocated to various networks such as WT Cloud. WT must balance and provide parts of the bandwidth to support off campus, on-campus resident students, faculty/staff, and guest wireless. He said use has exploded during the past three years, and demand tripled during the last two years. WT can burst to 1000 megabits but it costs. WT is trying to budget needs and costs. The Texas A&M University System is the WT internet provider. WT pays TTVN $175,000 per year. WT is adding a separate system at the Amarillo Center.

Dursun-Kilic asked about the reduction in training programs for faculty during the past few years. Webb said IT sent a survey to gauge needs for training on campus. He said 75-125 training sessions are offered each year, but only one or two people attend the training, so he is putting more on video-on-demand. IT partnered with the Teaching Excellence Center to provide more training. Faculty should e-mail Amy Andersen or Lora Haasl with ideas for training. Students may sign up for training at the Hastings Electronic Learning Center. Dursun-Kilic said she would like SPSS and Qualtrics training for students. She tries to teach the subjects during class but does not have enough time. De'Armond said this might be more a curriculum than IT problem. Stuntz said some departments teach a class in SPSS. Webb said IT can do specific, custom training, if faculty want.

Fiaud asked if there will be intensive faculty training for Blackboard in spring 2015 because not all faculty are at WT during the summer. Webb said training is going on now and will continue in spring and summer. He said training can be put onto video-on-demand so faculty can watch online.

Crandall asked if access to courses for fall 2015 will be available earlier than mid-semester. Webb said classes can be accessed at the same timeframe as now. He said the only issue is content not being migrated over correctly to the new Blackboard system. He said IT can help faculty. Webb said to send him e-mail if anyone has other questions.

Ambrose said he convinced Pam Lockwood to reapply this year for the Minnie Piper Professor award. Stuntz made a motion seconded by Fiaud to accept Pam Lockwood as the Faculty Senate nominee for the award. The motion passed by unanimous vote of all Senators present.

Ambrose said Roy Issa spoke with him about Faculty Development Leave.  Ambrose said applications must be submitted by 1 December.  Faculty Senate at the 23 January meeting will vote to rank the application(s).  An interested faculty member should contact his Faculty Senate representative or send Ambrose an e-mail.

Ambrose said Shaffer wants Faculty Senate to be aware that the voting members of the committee that deals with academic suspension are being changed.  The committee chair is one of the five associate deans and the committee involves the Registrar and Director of Advising Services.  De'Armond said the student's advisor is very involved and does much work for the student.

Ambrose discussed the proposed post-tenure review policy.  He said he incorporated what was previously suggested by Faculty Senate, and discussed everything with Shaffer.  Ambrose clarified the two-tier policy, one by review by randomly selected peer evaluation committee and the other as now done by the direct supervisor.  A peer evaluation committee can decide on development for a tenured faculty member reviewed, but the dean, provost, and president will eventually be involved.  Ambrose said the reason for the first paragraph is to describe the purpose for post-tenure review to make an outside person aware of why review is done.  The WT mission statement was put in place of the next paragraph.  DeOtte suggested removing the mission statement because it is redundant and already in the Faculty Handbook.  The term "minimal standards" was changed to "required standards" because faculty are not trying to do the minimal amount possible.

Ambrose said Shaffer said post-tenure review would not start until March 2016.  DeOtte said a mechanism for transition is needed for newly tenured versus long-time tenured faculty to be reviewed.  Stuntz said the committee discussed having everyone tenured 10 years or more be reviewed first, but a phase-in is needed.  Browning agreed that review should be counted since the last promotion.  The proposed post-tenure review policy will be rewritten "The faculty member will undergo a CPE during the spring semester following each six-year anniversary from the most recent of the dates on which the faculty member was granted tenure or promoted."  All Senators agreed.

Ambrose said a peer evaluation committee would have three members from the college, if possible, and two from outside the college of the faculty member being reviewed.  Ambrose said Shaffer thought direct supervisors who already handle the other track for faculty development should be excluded from doing post-tenure review.  Stuntz said she is okay with direct supervisors being excluded.  DeOtte said the Faculty Handbook allows direct supervisors to be on promotion and tenure committees except in their own departments.  Pendleton said direct supervisors are not peers.  DeOtte said deans are administrators but lower ranks are considered faculty.  Stuntz said because peer review would be by a college committee, the associate dean is considered a direct supervisor of faculty in the college.  In the College of Business, direct supervisors are associate deans and cannot be on the college promotion and tenure committee, but are not direct supervisors in other colleges.  Ambrose said there are enough tenured faculty members at WT and it is simplest to exclude direct supervisors as well as other administrators

from peer evaluation committees.  The majority of the Faculty Senators voted against including direct supervisors and other administrators on peer evaluation committees.

DeOtte objected to a lottery to draw names of tenured faculty to serve on peer evaluation committees.  He said someone who is an associate professor for 14 years and who has not applied for promotion to professor should not pass judgment on faculty who progressed.  He asked what happens if a person selected for the committee is opposed to judging peers.  He asked if a faculty member tenured long ago who has an axe to grind is wanted on the committee.  DeOtte said the committee members should be elected, not randomly chosen by drawing.  He suggested using the promotion and tenure committee.  Stuntz asked DeOtte to explain why he wants to use the promotion and tenure committee.  DeOtte said promotion and tenure is a peer process, then direct supervisors evaluate, then peers in the college, the dean, the university promotion and tenure committee (of combined administrators and faculty), provost, president, and Board of Regents.  Stuntz said in her department, the promotion and tenure committee already reviews dozens of folders.  Stuntz asked what to do if anyone refuses to serve on the peer evaluation committee.  DeOtte said he knows people who refuse.  Ambrose said if someone does not want to serve, he probably would be more likely to pass the person being reviewed because it would be easier to do.  Stuntz said she likes randomness and said promotion and tenure committees already are overworked.  Ambrose said random selection looks good to someone from outside.  Crandall asked if the committee at WT researched post-tenure at other institutions, and Ambrose said Gary Byrd reviewed policies and procedures at other institutions.  DeOtte moved to reject the concept of a random lottery.  No one seconded DeOtte's motion, so the motion died for lack of a second.

Dursun-Kilic asked if a faculty member being reviewed will know who is on the peer evaluation committee.  Fiaud suggested that if a faculty member has a problem with serving on a peer evaluation committee, he could go to the provost and explain.  Lee said it is similar to jury duty when a percon can go to the judge and another person might be selected from the pool.  Faculty Senate will select 25 committee members, but a faculty member might appeal.  Stuntz suggested randomly drawing 25 names plus five alternates.  Dursun-Kilic said the five alternates should be from the five different colleges.

The date for submission of the folder will be changed from 15 March to the last Friday before spring break.  It was discussed that if a faculty member to be reviewed does not submit a folder, nothing can be evaluated, and the faculty member would not pass that year.  If there are dire circumstances, being late would be allowed.  Faculty who are going to be reviewed in the spring should be notified by the Provost's Office in October.

DeOtte said mechanics are missing.  Dursun-Kilic suggested committee members should not know if tenured faculty need to apply a second year because of not passing the first year.  The Senators changed the proposed policy that the provost, not peer evaluation committee chair or members, will know if the tenured faculty member being reviewed receives a second "no" vote and thus needs development.  The provost will

send a "yes" letter to the dean that a faculty member met required standards.  DeOtte asked if the System legal had reviewed the procedure yet.

Stuntz moved to accept the post-tenure review policy with the additions that were discussed during the current meeting of Faculty Senate.  Lee seconded the motion.  Fourteen Senators voted in favor, four abstained, and none were opposed to accepting the post-tenure review policy.

Ambrose said one faculty member from each college is needed to serve on a standing university student academic integrity committee.  The Associate Provost is Chair with five faculty and five students on the committee.  Fiaud asked the role of the committee.  Ambrose said if a student is accused of academic dishonesty, but thinks he is not guilty, he can appeal.  Stuntz asked how the committee differs from the Student Grievance Committee.  Faculty Senators from each college need to get together to select someone to serve on the new standing committee.  Ambrose, De'Armond, Fiaud, Hindman, and Stuntz volunteered to coordinate selecting a faculty representative from each of their colleges.

The meeting of Faculty Senate was adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Bonnie B Pendleton*

Bonnie B. Pendleton, Secretary

*These minutes as written were approved at the 21 November 2014 meeting of Faculty Senate.*