

Faculty Senate 2018-02-02 Draft Minutes

Call to order

Craig/Ambrose reminded senate of need to amend December minutes to properly list T&P committees chosen then, King moved to amend them, Meredith seconded, motion passed.

Corrections were noted to Jan 19 minutes on system policy announcements and the Communication Disorders announcement, Babb moved to accept the minutes with those revision, Davis seconded, motion approved.

Welcomed our new senator, Lisa Rollin.

Announcements from agenda handout (See also Ambrose remarks below).

Provost Shaffer's remarks and discussion:

The THECB is looking at emphasis on competency-based education with performance-based funding. Metric proposed: graduation bonus, \$500/\$1000 per at-risk student. Brought in people from around country on this. Not sure it will pass legislature, but sentiment is out there. 9% of CC funding is performance based.

Pressed on funding in next legislative session: sales tax up, oil prices up, but last session kicked a lot of stuff down road to this one. Potential for increased funding is not great. We are still about a year before next session. A big item of focus will be special-item funding. There are people (Seliger) that want to eliminate special-item funding. Getting ready to appoint committee of state senators on special-item funding. For us: Ag, Engineering, Museum, etc. would be among biggest impacts, about 50-60 salaries on campus.

Babb: What are threats or risks from performance-based funding from your perspective?

Shaffer: Risk that it will be set up for larger institutions, may be better from the at-risk student issue. Right now coordinating board is looking at putting this on top of other funding, but we don't think it will happen. No appetite in the legislature.

Ingrassia: with performance-based funding, will instructor be pressured to pass students (as has been done in TN)?

Shaffer: This is a serious issue

Ingrassia: In TN there was worry about losing job if D-F-W rate was too high.

Shaffer: This has gone nationally from an access issue to a completion incentive; this is a serious concern.

Babb: worried that this is afoot at AC.

Hindman: Is there any additional information on core curriculum, moving this to WT 125 theme groups for example?

Shaffer: At the state level there are two things being explored that I support: to include foreign languages in core curriculum, and to either do away with core 90 and go to 36 hours, or take all restrictions off of core 90. This would resolve issues with 4-hr classes, etc.

On our campus, Wendler has had informal conversations on merit of core having fewer options, so that it is a genuine core. I think his concern is that

the core is too bound to discipline, with duplication of content areas needed. He has an emphasis on core transfers, requirements of particular core areas. It is a difficult issue. Many restrictions have been placed on us, the more flexible we can be the better. This has all been informal, Wendler has not charged anyone with making changes

Meredith: current freshman/sophomore enrollment is down 8%, any recruiting being done?

Shaffer: We are concerned about this. Data you see is our internal classification, we lead with dual credit enrollment, so many in spring semester are not recorded as freshmen. So what is actual size of entering freshman class from academic perspective? Looking at FTIC (first time in college) and track those. Jr and Sr numbers are up. Number of students with associate degree started climbing 2013/14, same time as freshmen/sophomores started to drop. Admissions is down 4 of 5 positions, having trouble hiring (worsened with Workday problems). Found out some fundamental recruiting for freshmen has not been done. H. S. students hearing from other schools much more than WT. There will be changes in freshman recruiting, trying to pin down Wendler on what he means by keeping freshman class 'the same size'. Are actual numbers down 8%? More? Less?

Davis: are those numbers defined institutionally or by THECB?

Shaffer: We define institutionally as freshmen as those with less than 30 hours, etc. THECB has tighter definitions, e.g. FTIC definition is more rigorous from the state. Would you say freshman status by 1st year in college or by credit?

Babb: those with dual credit are still freshmen.

Shaffer: Notion that dual-credit is a problem is a 3rd rail in TX, despite low graduation rates/long times.

Babb: If you get to know students, will get corroboration that it's not the same.

Shaffer: Students tend to be difficult to classify, are human beings. Students are coming in as dual credit/transfer, data has to lead us. Have to communicate if credit is effective or not (to Wendler etc.) Data should be what is driving us.

Seward: After last meeting we took notes about instructor promotion proposal and haven't heard back?

Shaffer: Received resolution, but not counter-proposal?

Ingrassia: Proposal last year was rejected and we watered down.

Shaffer: It was read to Deans but didn't see it as action-item.

Seward: So what does this mean?

Shaffer: Discussed again in Dean's council, discussed pros and cons. Some of concerns are same as before. I haven't done good job of explaining impetus behind this, whether not there is a level field for instructors, etc. We see disparity across campus between colleges and departments.

Seward: Part of it is the consistency issue.

Shaffer: one of the Deans' concerns is long fixed-term is it doesn't afford flexibility that may need with budget changes, etc. In general I don't think Deans will say absolutely not. Terry has chosen different way with clinical faculty, but also added many more tenure-track as well. But instructors can be removed if growth falls

off. Idea on percentages, etc.

Seward: We did have ideas on percentages of faculty to qualify etc.

Shaffer: Would have to be things about outstanding ratings, etc.

Seward/Ingrassia: We had all sorts of carefully constructed levels in proposal, but it was rejected.

Shaffer: would need to know how would happen, would they benominated? Automatic after a time? Are we comfortable with 13 instructors waiting for a few to get status? I think we can work out, but can't move all instructors. Need something similar

to fixed term, whose description must be changed. Current fixed term system is for exceptional or unusual ability, background experience, etc. When there are many competitors for a position can we call them specially qualified? Fixed term was for specific faculty with unusual qualifications. Know of one department head who was unable to move faculty because they didn't fit that definition. Can make percentage in each dept, so percentages vs. numbers may be problems.

Seward: 20% of faculty or instructors?

Shaffer: Can we see proposal again?

Seward: We sent, deans said they would prefer something along lines of fixed term, so we went back to resolution.

Meredith: It's now a different budget situation, but that is always true.

Shaffer: Issue is always what happens when we have to eliminate faculty, etc.

Meredith: We had wittled it down to 1-time promotion, requiring excellent rating, etc.

Seward: Deans said it should be more like fixed term.

Ingrasia: Now we are being told to go back to the old way.

Babb: Why not sent old proposal back?

Shaffer: I can bring proposal from deans to you. If you're uncomfortable I will try to keep navigating it back & forth. Need to know what is ultimate motivation behind this? Equity? Status? etc. Communications has 4 fixed term who promoted and received merit.

Meredith: for me it was for recognition of exceptional achievement. Want to recognize quality, new title, 1-time pay bump.

Nam: Sent email to my faculty. But no instructor contacted me about any issues, no response. Have other faculty approached and gotten feedback

Meredith: I have?

Babb: Was there no comprehensive survey or outreach in prev. proposal?

Meredith: Was outreach but not systematic.

Nam: We have a lot of exceptions in music.

Meredith: Let's talk about this after Shaffer has left.

Meredith: What was the concern about language on academic X-drop issue?

Shaffer: Halperin's (lawyer) language was: Without prior approval no course is to be dropped when academic integrity is pending or when has been found.

Pinkham: It is the issue of students dropping immediately, pending means coming in and starting paperwork.

Shaffer: Issue is we cannot drop or prevent drop of students. Is going to be a manual process with the registrar.

Pinkham: Idea was that X could be changed afterward to reflect academic misconduct.

Shaffer: I thought changing afterward would be best but Halperin articulated a concern that I can't recall. Need to revisit with him.

Pinkham: If we can file it without student having to sign, then this will resolve a lot of issues.

Shaffer: Are you comfortable with doing this manually with registrar? (General notes that it is ok from others.)

Babb: There is a consequence, will be a boom to fall.

Meljac: This will make boom fall, but different boom. It is worth calling registrar, is a serious issue. Might be lesser penalty down the line. It's worth making effects felt immediately. Not a burden I would avoid.

Ingrassia: At my prior institution, student didn't have to sign. Current system is to entice student to come in and have to sign.

Shaffer: It doesn't have to be signed. You can process these without signature. If there is a sense that it's only valid with signature, that is not true. If everyone did as Meljac, it would be better, should be escalation on punishment in campus. Need to find serial cheaters. Need to make documentation move up.

Pinkham: Problem is the notion of student needing to sign it.

Shaffer: Please send it up regardless of signature.

Meredith: How to proceed?

Shaffer: I can check on changing grades, can start procedure with email to registrar to block grades, etc.

Meljac: What was outcome of the academic integrity committee?

Shaffer: New form was from them, it is a complex process, moving slowly.

Craig: There was an honor code at my private alma mater: students are harsh on other students.

Shaffer: Similar experience at Oklahoma, looking at early restorative penalties. Would like to look at students serving on that:

Ambrose: I have asked Dr. Shaffer to come back in two weeks if possible.

Ambrose remarks:

Set up next meeting w/ President for March 23. He asked Ambrose to be on committee to hire replacement separated V. P. for Institutional Advancement. Could appoint someone else if Ambrose cannot make due to conflicts.

Meeting with Rikel on parking (see handout):

- Final campus master plan will also weigh in, see handout. Seems will be final iteration.

Pinkham: Issue of looking at parking App while driving around?

DeButte: cars in museum area are on faculty-only spots.

Old Business:

IT committee: No report. Asking for input.

Deans proposing changes to T&P: Ambrose will meet with Mallard to discuss this after this meeting

Email election for ANS at-large: No quorum on e-mail vote from college. Shaffer suggested to reopen voting until quorum, this was discuss with Almas.

Discussion on Merit Committee (Pinkham chair):

Handout of Questions for Allocation of merit.

(I requested electronic copies to ease incorporation in minutes)

Nam: could question 4 be correlated with APS scores? Pinkham: this is in question 7.

Craig moves to accept questions. Meljac second. Approved to send to Blake Deckard.

Elect replacement for ESS rep on student endowment:

Hindman received Malvika Vehl & Mark Riney

Ambrose: any other nominations? None.

Vehl elected. (show of hands)

New business:

Ambrose: Annual Professional Summary issues: is it possible to choose percentages at end of year, rather than at beginning.

Davis: I agree, a grant received will change time allocation, and that is appropriate.

Hindman: Have never known how to choose percentages.

Meredith: Unless we are doing something special, all in our college are given same weights

Pinkham/DeButte: Often changed to our advantage in discussion with chair.

Craig: Is there a rationale for choosing at beginning?

Ambrose: Will take up with Shaffer? history of setting weights, etc.

Pinkham: Approached by faculty about identification of sponsor for tabling at JBK, but there is no requirement for identification at the table itself. Concerned about "free-listening" person. Can we make a requirement that tables display their affiliation? Faculty talked to director of JBK who said this is what we do.

Meredith/Craig: Who supervises/changes that?

Meredith is it the JBK committee? Pinkham: is JBK committee. Senators generally conceded that this is a good idea to go to JBK committee rather than Senate.

DeButte: Issue of faculty teaching problems courses not being paid.

Craig: Serious college and curriculum issue, needs to be part of load.

Ingrassia: Workday issues: faculty not being paid, retirement re-allocations not being made. Other faculty agreed with similar issues, people not being paid on time for winter intersession, etc.

Respectfully submitted,
-David Craig, Secretary

Questions for Blake Decker of institutional research follow in an appendix as communicated by Dr. Pinkham. These were formulated by the senate and the merit committee of the Senate:

Questions Regarding the Allocation of Merit Increases

Faculty Merit Increases

1. What percentage of the overall merit pool was received by each college in 2017?
 - To what extent has that changed/remained constant over the past five years (i.e., 2012 to 2017)?
 - What is the correlation between the percentage of the overall merit pool received by each college and the average APS scores of faculty in each college?
2. What percentage of the overall merit pool was received by each department in 2017?
 - To what extent has that changed/remained constant over the past five years (i.e., 2012 to 2017)?
 - What is the correlation between the overall merit pool received by each department and the average APS scores of faculty in each department?
3. Within the merit pool allocated to each college, what percentage was received by each department in 2017?
 - To what extent has that changed/remained constant over the past five years (i.e., 2012 to 2017)?
 - What is the correlation between the percentage of merit received by each department and the average APS scores of faculty in each department?
4. What percentage of faculty received merit increases for 2017?
 - Overall
 - By college
 - By rank
 - To what extent has the percentage of faculty receiving merit increases changed/remained constant over the past five years (i.e., 2012 to 2017)?
5. Of those faculty receiving merit increases, what is the average merit increase (as percentage of annual salary) for 2017?
 - Overall
 - By college
 - By rank
 - To what extent has the average merit increase (as percentage of annual salary) for faculty changed/remained constant over the past five years (i.e., 2012 to 2017)?
6. What is the average APS score received by faculty for 2016?
 - Overall
 - By college
 - By rank
7. What is the correlation between APS scores for 2016 and merit increases for 2017?

- Overall
- By college
- By rank
- To what extent has the correlation between APS scores and merit increases changed/remained constant over the past five years (i.e., 2012 to 2017)?
[please provide scatterplot as well as relevant statistics]

Administrator Merit Increases

8. What percentage of administrators received merit increases for 2017?
 - Overall
 - By rank
 - To what extent has the percentage of administrators receiving merit increases changed/remained constant over the past five years (i.e., 2012 to 2017)?
9. Of those administrators receiving merit increases, what is the average merit increase (as percentage of annual salary) for 2017?
 - Overall
 - By rank
 - To what extent has the average merit increase (as percentage of annual salary) for administrators changed/remained constant over the past five years (i.e., 2012 to 2017)?