

## Faculty Senate Minutes

Texas A & M University – San Antonio

April 5, 2012

Senators Present - Stefanie Wittenbach, Durant Frantzen, Dennis Elam, Richard Green, Megan Valdez, Kevin Kendricks,

Brent Snow, Ed Westermann. Alan Preston, Enrique Ramirez

1. Minutes from past meetings Dennis received some corrections to the January minutes and this will be done. Durant motioned and Megan seconded approval of the minutes.
2. Election Procedures to be used for new Senate members

Richard exhibited the proposed ballot for the Senate Election. He proposed using an adobe acrobat form. Stefannie suggested using Survey Monkey. Dennis suggested that the e mail list the existing Faculty Senate members. Richard responded that he would add explanatory material about the Faculty Senate and its members.

Stefanie offered to set it up in Survey Monkey; Richard responded that he would handle it. Megan inquired as to the time line. Richard wanted it out ASAP. It will be open until noon Friday April 13, 2012. Richard suggested a meeting to count the ballots. Then the candidates willing to serve would be presented to the Schools. By Friday April 20. Then the same process will be used to give all a week to vote. May meeting will be the first meeting for new Senators.

Stefanie noted that Survey Monkey could accumulate the names. A committee meeting would still be required to certify the names.

Durant motioned approval and it was passed.

3. Review of Graduation Policies Theresa Torres form Academic Advising

Durant suggested delaying this until Teresa arrives.

4. Travel Reimbursement must be received within 15 days. Richard felt the policy was flawed. He noted that expenses had to move physically from for example the School of Business to the Main campus to back here to Gillette. The deadline should be when it needs to be in the hands of the administrative assistant, not make the faculty responsible for the entire process.

Provost Snow noted there were two parts to this. For local travel it needs to be In by the 21<sup>st</sup> of the following month. The other part is that you have 15 business days to have it in to finance administration. The steps have been

reduced. After leaving the School Head it goes directly to Finance. The other thing is that the procedure as passed will stand. If late the person will still get reimbursed. He noted we need to do a better job at the faculty level of properly completing the forms.

There was more discussion about forms laying around and not getting sent on .

Dennis noted that the DSS Office refused to accept by inter campus mail although Durant noted they send the forms back that way.

Stefanie was curious why the 15 day limit was adopted. Ed noted that people complained the process took too long. So to speed the process Ken Mitts suggested that the submission process be accelerated.

Brent Snow noted that there were many requests right at the end of the fiscal year. Part of the idea was to avoid that last minute rush.

Richard noted that eliminating two of the steps and sending this on to finance seemed to eliminate the need to act.

Durant motioned to let the issue rest. Richard suggested that we consider this resolved. That motion passed.

5. Rules – Richard demonstrated that the Rules are on the website. Richard noted that this site is here and faculty should be encouraged to study the rules. Richard noted we need a policy on establishing policy. Brent noted that Rules and Procedures needed to be developed. Richard noted that many details of policies are not contained.

Richard noted that the compliance officer had written many of the rules. He noted this was a violation of internal control. Durant thought it was just a matter of our being more familiar with the policies. This is an information item not an action item. Brent noted that rules are not passed with out the Executive Cabinet approving them.

6. 1. Grading system, no change can be made while we are using the Kingsville Banner System. Ed Westermann reported results of the survey. A copy is included with these minutes.

- 6.2. Post Tenure Review Policy –

Annual Report – Richard noted that there had been numerous complaints about the form and content of the annual report. For example, if the information on courses taught is already on Banner, why does it have to be listed on the annual report.

Student evaluations already exist as well as summary statistics. Why is this being required again?

When you get the student evaluation you are supposed to report the results, but that is also in the system.

Durant suggested that each school develop a sub committee of faculty to review models at other A & M Schools. Megan liked the idea. Stefanie wondered why there would be a different approach in the different schools.

Derrick had no objection to the way it is done. Durant made the point that the computation component, if it is coming from the database, it is more reliable and not depending on the faculty member computation.

Richard thought the committee should be broader ust faculty. It and the Provost should be involved. Megan thought IT should be brought in later. Richard replied that if the elements are not involved form the get go they would be negative on getting it done. Richard suggested that there be deadlines for the committees to report on suggestions to the report. Durant agreed with Megan. Let the faculty work on models, then bring in Ravi. Richard asked for a motion that Senators for each School would collect information, then bring it to the Senate. Motion was made by Durant and seconded. The motion was that we would decide. Megan thinks the motion is too abstract. Megan suggested that at the first meeting in the fall Senators come with concrete proposals.

The motion was made that at the first Faculty Senate meeting in the Fall, each School would have a recommendation from the faculty senator from each school that would reflect suggestions form the department meetings. Richard noted that there would be two more senators. Motion carried 5 to 1.

Dennis noted that there seems to be little evidence the faculty reports are actually read. Durant noted that this was an additional dimension to the process. Durant repeated the idea that other models should be examined. Derrick asked how is the information gathered . Derrick noted that this began with questions about what he faculty was required to report. Durant thought looking at the whole process was part of the investigation.

Physical make up, content, and value of the questions were the three areas that Richard had been asked.

Richard remarked that the form was the problem. His second point was that the existing report brought in content that already exists. The third was the value of what we are doing. The first motion was rescinded. A new motion was presented that Senators get ideas from their faculty about changing the Faculty Evaluation Report. Senators

were also asked to canvas other schools about their reports. The motion passed 4 voting aye and 2 abstentions.

6.2, 3,4 were mentioned. Senate was out of time, but right to enter a faculty office, use of electronic devices, These items will be held over until the next meeting. It is routine for janitors to enter the office every evening. Richard thought we needed a written policy about entering offices.

Alan Preston noted that when IT confiscated his wireless router his equipment had disappeared. He did not get any information about the confiscation. He is not an enemy. He wondered why IT did not just call rather than raid his office. He felt that was an extraordinary action. He felt it was a personal offense. If they had called we might have worked out a solution. He noted he was a faculty member not an enemy. Alan found it unbelievable that this would be confiscated without notice.

IT seems to be dictating what we need. Richard expressed the same feeling. Richard noted that this had been a problem for a long time.

Richard asked that the concerns be written and brought to the Senator for the School.