

1 Faculty Senate Meeting, WTAMU, 2017 September 29

2 The minutes from the last meeting were approved.

3 President Ambrose made some announcements:

- 4 - The ombuds officer application is out, there has been one applicant.
- 5 - There have been no recent messages on system policies from Dr. Spaulding.
- 6 - Do we want an acknowledgement or an apology from President Wendler on the  
7 change in the merit pay issue?  
8 Ingrassia moved that we ask for an acknowledgement and an explanation of  
9 the reasons for the policy change. Motion approved
- 10 - Reminder that handbook changes need to be made quickly. (There was a handout  
11 sheet distributed on this.)
- 12 - Provost Shaffer has asked for summer school working group due to increases  
13 in summer school enrollment, etc. Eric Meljac agreed to work on this.
- 14 - For the Foster Care Advisory Board: the first volunteer (B. Garcia from  
15 Education) was selected because that university committee position needed  
16 to be filled quickly.

17 Old Business:

- 18 - Tenure & Promotion committee- have passed around draft, will meet some this  
19 afternoon.
- 20 - IT committee and dual factor authentication:  
21 Meljac: my department was not happy with it. Dual shackles to desk. Those  
22 who find it burdensome may begin using offline providers -- FERPA issues,  
23 etc. Especially problem for part-time instructor, not smart phone user,  
24 etc.  
25 (There was a discussion of Duo usage)  
26 Anand: this is a system policy (TAMUS)  
27 Craig discussed the timecodes made by Duo don't need internet connection,  
28 also noted that there are inexpensive USB dongles made to work with Duo as  
29 alternative to smartphones.
- 30 - Promotion for instructors: committee is having discussions but no new  
31 proposal.
- 32 - Ambrose: reminder for Piper award (primarily for teaching)  
33 Ingrassia: is there of who has been chosen? (will look for, not found on  
34 quick web search).
- 35 - Alumni evaluations: Shaffer says they are more important for promotion to  
36 professor than for associate level. Deans are not in favor of eliminating  
37 them.  
38 Meredith: Response rate is low, but they do make a difference. No  
39 reason to axe them.  
40 Lust: This initiative is from Jarvis, what is the actual burden of  
41 work? Not clear as to motivation for elimination.  
42 Ambrose: Jarvis felt they were not worth money, but deans do not favor  
43 eliminating them.  
44 Tao: A student after 3 years working understands better what you're  
45 doing in teaching than one just at the end of the class. Ingrassia:  
46 agree this is also true for history, humanities.  
47 Comissiong: could we make it optional?  
48 Frisch: It's important to have a diversity of evaluations, don't think

49 we need to make it easier to evaluate us negatively.  
50 Pinkham: need actual time/dollars used to discuss this.  
51 King: Isn't this outside of our scope?  
52 Babb: some accreditations (ABET) include a requirement to look at  
53 students later.  
54 - Motion (by Meredith): We oppose eliminating alumni evaluations.  
55 Seconded by king. Motion passed with no opposition.  
56 - XF cheating matter: a committee was appointed to examine this: F. Davis  
57 (chair), Pinkham.  
58 - Merit raise committee: will await discussion with President Wendler.

59 New Business:

60 - Meredith: Appeal Process for Annual Evaluations (handout distributed)  
61 We are the only system institution that allows appeal all the way to the  
62 university president on annual evaluations. There is a low cost on a  
63 faculty member to abuse the process.  
64 Has suggestions for requiring more effort on faculty member's part,  
65 requiring more information to provided during appeal process. There have  
66 been those who have won appeal at provost level. Don't think it needs to  
67 go all the way to the president.  
68 Ma: what additional info? Meredith: why they disagree with previous  
69 decision, etc. Hindman: basically requiring rebuttal of decision at each  
70 level.  
71 Tao: what about the issue of providing information after the evaluation  
72 date?  
73 Commissiong: you could add language that it must adress issues in original  
74 evaluation.  
75 Babb: in defense of involving the president, his input is part of decision  
76 apparatus. Meredith: grievance procedure still exists for involving  
77 president. This is just intended for the evaluation process.  
78 Lust: complainant may still go to President anyway. Ambrose: grievance  
79 process is what you have to do.  
80 Craig: we could put language in to require using grievance process as  
81 highest level of appeal.  
82 Lust: you're only requiring just one more page? Meredith: must provide  
83 more information in that at this stage.  
84 Lust: how common is abuse of appeal process?  
85 Meredith: this may deter it, but that is a fair question. The idea is to  
86 prevent frivolous appeals.  
87 Babb: you are saying for every level of appeal there must be more  
88 substantion  
89 Motion (by Meljac): Produce a new revision by committee, incorporating  
90 suggestions.  
91 King seconded. Passed with one opposing.

92 Meeting was adjourned.