Preliminary Minutes of Faculty Senate
February 5, 2016

Present: Stuntz, Branson, Fiaud, Ambrose, Alex, Baker, Blodgett, Combs, Commissiong, Craig, Crandall, DeButte, DeOtte, Dursun-Kilic, Hartin, Hindman, King, Klaehn, Lee, Lust, Nam, Osei-Hwere, Ottoson Shao.

Absent: Craig, Meredith, Wilson.

Guest: Dr. Wade Shaffer (Provost), Dr. Drumheller, Angela Allen, Blanton (substituting for Wilson)

Meeting called to order at 12:15pm in Room 14 (Eternal Flame) of the Jack B. Kelley Student Center.

1. Minutes from November 6 meeting
   a. Approved unanimously

2. Q&A with the Provost
   a. Next week finalize SACS-COC report. Deficiencies that were identified to be addressed are being worked on. Onsite committee will be here at the end of March. QEP hopefully should be the focus of discussion when the committee will be on campus. Prior to the visit, there will be several means of communication (posters, emails, etc...) displayed on campus to ensure that the campus community is aware of the QEP.
   b. Budget hearings are open to everyone. Academic affairs will be first to go. Confident that “lots of faculty positions will be open this year”. Possibly 6 positions. If questions regarding the budget, contact the department heads or deans.
   c. Next week, Dr. Schaffer will attend the quarterly board of regents meeting. Jim Rogers will be recognized as Regent Professor and will receive an award.
   d. Proposal of concealed campus carry plan approved by Dr. O’Brien. OGC will review it this month and, after approval, the proposal will move on to the Board of Regents in April. If approved there, WTAMU will start an information campaign on campus, along with town hall meetings primarily for students. Flexibility to have temporary exclusion of concealed campus carry law for special event for specific areas. Concealed campus carry does not start until August 1st 2016. The law is for students, staff, and faculty. Lockers will be provided in residence halls. If faculty refuses to abide by the law, consequences will be applied, possibly ending into termination. Additional venues could be added at a later time if need is identified.
      i. If approved, guidelines will be distributed throughout campus through various means: NSO, student Handbook,...
      ii. Law stipulates: “concealed carry should be allowed on public university campuses”.
      iii. What are some of the consequences if there are some places that have alcohol? Are we selling alcohol? Do we derive profit from it? Probably not an issue for on campus at this time.
      iv. 2 weeks from now, Austin conference: “60 by 30” theme. How to create pathway for students to go to college for a smaller amount of money. Affordable Baccalaureate plan. Most likely for people who have developed
skills and want to get a degree (military, skilled workers, ...). Increased focus on increasing the number of people in TX having a degree.

e. Post tenure review: faculty handbook updated in August. In effect since September 2015. Every 6 years, the tenured faculty will go through a review process. Need to figure out who is in the first cohort and when it starts. Year that faculty received their last promotion (6 years or multiple of 6) will be the 1st cohort.

f. Course evaluation questions:
   i. Student that dropped allowed to complete the survey.
      1. Value in any student being in the class for a significant amount of time to complete the survey.
      2. Student will not be allowed to complete the evaluation if dropped prior to the drop date.
      3. In old CIEQ, the total number of student listed were the number of students on the roster at the very beginning. It affected the percentages.
      4. Feedback on why students drop the class early can be obtained through other means.
   ii. More freedom from faculty to determine the timeline on when to give the survey.
      1. Payment for release date therefore difficult to change that.
      2. Recommendation from Dr. Schaffer: Solution maybe to communicate with the student to express when the faculty wants the student to take the surveys.
      3. The survey will not be released until last drop date.
      4. Continue to work on the evaluation process; because truly anonymous, the student have a tendency to be more negative.
      5. Newer faculty worried that the new system is different. Drumheller: “not a significant difference observed but the data set is limited”. More positive trends observed. No survey fatigue. No reverse coding present in the survey. Questions were validated.
      6. Change in emphasis a few years ago where the CIEQs were deemphasized somewhat. Other ways to evaluate were added.
   iii. What about order bias of questions?
      1. Don’t know if the company has that capacity.

g. Card swiping:
   i. Before fall semester, RFID technology use at entrance of classroom. Dr. O’Brien wants to continue to record attendance for identifying student in needs of additional support. System will be phased in over several semesters.
   ii. Request for an early alert specialist position funding.

h. Practical online exams proctoring:
   i. Contract for pilot with Examity. Pilot to have a remote proctoring site for online scheduled later this spring. Very expensive process. Other companies are available too for similar price.
   ii. Most students who cheat do so in multiple classes. Ensure that faculty is aware of the process to report and keeps records on file.

i. Annual review of faculty performance process.
Interview with department head or associate deans. Looks like it is not a standardized process in all colleges? No evaluation report in advance but rather provided while in the meeting. Some faculty members find this process intimidating. Would it be possible to have the evaluation in advance to possibly comments on the wording? Don’t have to sign immediately. Dr. Schaffer: “it may be a good idea to send the evaluation prior to the meeting.” Drumheller: willing to take it to the Academic Leadership Council to discuss. Dr. Schaffer’s recommendation: Maybe it should be codified in the faculty handbook (48 hours of notification?).

Summer Budget
i. Identical for 5 years.
ii. For this year, creating a separate account for department head 1.5 months guarantied pay.
iii. $1.4 million pool created but no longer adequate.
iv. Working on it. Hoping to increase it by 2-3 percent per year.

3. Old business
a. Update and proposed wording for changes to by-laws from Constitutional Committee
   i. Summary of recommendations:
      i. Vote on “Faculty Senate shall have tenure”
      1. For 15, against 4, abstain 1 – Passed
      ii. Constitutional convention meeting: should have 2 meetings during the week.
   ii. Question about possibility of reducing the size of the senate.

b. Report on Committees not meeting
   i. Large majority of committees active.
   ii. Further discussion during next faculty senate meeting.

c. Student Fee Advisory Committee
   i. Mark Bartley still a member of this committee until he finishes his term.

d. Report from Wellness Committee
   i. Various initiatives were discussed to highlight services already in place to support faculty and staff.
   ii. Creation of marketing plan.
   III. Health Fair in the spring.
   IV. Discussion regarding faculty/staff access to the VHAC, in particular to the walking track.
   V. Discussion about mapping the campus with signage for walking path, including distances.

e. Report on Street safety
   i. Acknowledgment that streets around campus are dangerous but Canyon has nothing to do with it. Willingness to meet with TXDot and discuss

f. Other? None
4. New Business
   a. Angela Allen, Diversity and Inclusion & Dr. Drumheller, Buff Allies.
      a. Donning of the stoles ceremonies. Most universities have some forms of ceremony and it is based on cultural diversity. This past December, over 100 students, family, and friends attended the ceremonies to acknowledge the achievement of those students. Some stoles are family owned and passed along to the next generation.
      b. Rainbow stole. Represent the support they have received on campus sometimes not getting any in other places. Finding a community that has supported them and their achievements.
   b. Proposal about academic regalia
      a. Is there any process as to what is allowed at graduation?
         i. The Kente stole, the Sarape stole, and the Rainbow stole were presented in front of the faculty senate and were approved for graduation. Approval was also sought through Dr. O’Brien’s office.
         ii. Other paraphernalia mentioned in the proposal were not presented for approval to the faculty senate.
         iii. TAMU has a policy which allows exception if granted approval.
         iv. President O’Brien just approved a Veteran’s cord.
      b. Freedom of speech issue?
         i. What is defined as “academic related”?
      c. Who would be policing it and what would be the consequences?
         i. Some faculty would not feel comfortable telling a student to remove things.
      d. Further discussion during next faculty senate meeting.
   c. Administrator evaluations
      a. Will be implemented this spring.

The meeting of Faculty Senate was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vanessa A. Fiaud, Secretary