

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

February 23, 2012
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
LSC 304

Members Present: Len Breen (COE), Donald Bumpass (COBA), Erin Cassidy (NGL), Kevin Clifton (CFAMC), Jeff Crane (CHSS), Donna Desforges (CHSS), Diane Dowdey (CHSS), Mark Frank (COBA), Randall Garner (CJ), Debbi Hatton (CHSS), Renee James (COS), William Jasper (COS), Gerald Kohers (COBA), Lawrence Kohn (COE), Paul Loeffler (COS), Joyce McCauley (COE), Sheryl Murphy-Manley (CFAMC), Dwayne Pavelock (COS), Javier Pinell (CFAMC), Debbie Price (COE), Ling Ren (CJ), Dough Ullrich (COS), Ricky White (COS), Pamela Zelbst (COBA)

Members Not Present: Tracy Bilsing (CHSS), Tracy Steele (CHSS), Donna Desforge (CHSS), Chad Hargrave

Visitors: None

Called to order at 3:30 by Debbi Hatton

Senator change: Drew Lopenzina (Eng) has resigned from Senate; Diane Dowdey (Eng) is replacing him.

Approval of Minutes of January 26, 2011 meeting with minor corrections

Approval of Minutes of February 9, 2011 meeting with minor corrections

Committee on Committees Report (Gerald Kohers)

Update on Committee Handbook: Decision to eliminate committees is not all up to the Senate. Gerald spoke to Kandi Tayebi who is now in charge of the committee book. They are looking at which committees lack guidance. There is some problem of “committee creep”: they are trying to cut down the number of committees, but instead it goes up or stays the same. It’s a bureaucratic process. They have eliminated a few, left most, but remaining committees will be given more goal and direction. Many of the suggestions for eliminating committees have just been lost or rejected. The Faculty Excellence in Service award and Faculty Excellence in Research award are now managed by two separate committees (split the previous single committee).

A senator asked exactly what “getting rid of” a committee means. Gerald says the approach was first for Senate to stop appointing members, but the committees are still in the book. Many of them had more of a purpose at time of creation but less so now: for example, the Ring Committee has mostly a planning function now, and doesn’t necessarily require faculty involvement. The Library Committee as it is presently operated is used as a mechanism for sharing news about the library, but this function is also now served by the library newsletter, so the committee does not seem needed, though it could maybe still be useful if given a new direction.

Senate should now be ready to do the Committee Preference form; it ought to come out next week. In the future we will take a more active role in committee formation, rewriting policies, assuring that committees maintain continuity from year to year by reappointment of experienced members, and so forth.

Recruitment and Retention Committee (part of the Strategic Enrollment Management initiative): This committee now has a sub-committee on committees; they will be looking at any university committees which relate to recruitment and retention. Gerald is the chair; it ties together everything he is doing with the Senate’s Committee on Committees and the updates to the committee book.

A senator asked how a committee actually becomes a committee. It was speculated that there is probably a protocol to become one but maybe not a protocol to abolish one.

There was some discussion regarding the Tenure Hearing Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee; they are separate but the Grievance Committee seems to have taken over the role of the Tenure Hearing Committee. It was asked whether the Tenure Hearing Committee had ever overturned a tenure decision. It was noted that, under the former Provost, the Tenure Hearing Committee had no role in the process. The process should go from DPTAC -> Dean -> Jerry Dowling and the Provost -> committee; it should be the Tenure Hearing Committee, but the Grievance seems to have taken over at this step. However, Grievance Committee must show a violation of the faculty member’s civil rights.

It was agreed that the overlap between these committees should be examined to determine what ought to be done. Additional comments were made regarding the fact that Grievance Committee members have lifetime appointments, and that the grievance policy has been rewritten so that the mis-implementation of policy is all that can be grieved; the faculty member has no grounds unless procedure was violated. The grievance process is now just a necessary step before suing the university. It was noted that we can ask Provost Hebert some of these questions when he visits Senate at an upcoming meeting.

It was noted that Provost Payne's statement on promotion and tenure is still posted on the Senate website; this should be updated to reflect Provost Hebert's policy or perspective on promotion and tenure.

There was a brief discussion of the Handbook Committee: the faculty handbook used to get everything added, but Associate Provost Eglsaer thinks it should be more strategic, so there is a new vision for the handbook, and the committee is looking at the table of contents to see what can be eliminated.

Faculty Affairs Report (Paul Loeffler)

The committee has been communicating with Angrove and working toward the selection of a learning management system (LMS). They have invited a group of 10-12 "heavy" LMS users from across campus to test-drive the 3 systems under consideration (Canvas, Blackboard 9, and Desire2Learn; they have also asked that no additional options be added to this list). They had to acquire accounts for all these users and get everything set up, which has required communication and time. These users will try out all the features they use heavily and report back to the Faculty Affairs committee.

The committee is taking a three-part approach: collecting Senate input; getting input from the "heavy users" test group; and inviting people who attended the Canvas training to meet with the committee and share inputs. They are also thinking of developing a survey for faculty about key LMS features and their opinions. They plan to issue a report on their findings and a recommendation at the March 23 Senate meeting.

Chair's Report

Westar: The system is almost ready; this is the system that we voted to buy during Fall 2011, which will allow faculty to uplink to media outlets for live broadcasts. It will be tested Friday afternoon and then it will be free to use, probably by 3pm Friday (Feb 24). The original \$50,000 price tag went down to only about \$10,000 because the university already owned many of the needed components, which was not realized in advance. The system can handle international communications as well, so faculty can now provide live expert interviews and so forth for both U.S. and international media.

Curriculum Committee Review: Kandi Tayebi needs a second volunteer. This review will look at the curriculum committees, how they function, how information should flow; they will determine how the *college* curriculum committee fits with the *university* curriculum committee. Certificate programs are also hung up in this because some

certificate programs have been approved but the classes that ought to make up those programs have not been approved. Len Breen volunteered.

President/Provost Evaluation: The chair met with the System office to discuss the reviews of the President and Provost; this went very smooth. They met as a group: SHSU, TSU, Lamar, Sul Ross, and Vice-Chancellors Perry Moore and Sean Cunningham. The vice-chancellors apologized; they didn't mean to scare anyone. Moore says he is not "out to get anyone." He says he won't tell a campus *how* to evaluate their administration, but the evaluation *will* happen, it will be *voluntary* for faculty, it will be *systematic*, and the results will be *reported* to their office.

The Chair had assigned this to a Senate committee; that assignment has been withdrawn. The President has already decided to go beyond the necessary faculty review and is implementing a 360 Review (this company has an existing instrument, so we don't need to duplicate work by creating or selecting an instrument). The President indicated that it "will need some work to convince some administrators that this is a good thing."

There was discussion regarding 360 Review: what is it? 360 Review incorporates many review components, including reviews from alumni, community, industry (what do they think of our graduates?), faculty, etc. This is a common tool in business. It has great breadth, uses very general questions.

Concern was expressed by senators: Should the person being reviewed get to choose the review method? We should see the administration ranked as we are ranked (for instance, the IDEA form for administrators). A senator pointed out that alumni reviews were sure to be biased toward the positive, versus review by all the students, including those who are failing. It was concluded that we should become too stressed about something that hasn't gone that far yet; Human Resources is busy handling several lawsuits right first before they can address the planning and implementation of something like 360 Review, and the President is still getting administrative buy-in.

A question was raised as to who counts as "administrative"? The bylaws say all faculty must get post-tenure review; many administrators have not been getting reviews because they do not fit the definition of "faculty." What about associate deans (and others?) who are filling an administrative role but also occupying a tenure seat? Why should they get it both ways, to keep their faculty/tenure rank and maintain a tenure position that can't be filled by someone else, yet not be reviewed?

Budget Cuts: It's not good. They don't expect a special session. They are viewing higher education as "discretionary" and so not adding funds to it.

The 2013 military dependent is expected to cause problems for schools. There is an unfunded mandate (from the TX legislature) to provide free higher education to military dependents. This applies to the dependents of not just active military personnel, but retirees as well. The dependents must still meet admission requirements. No plan yet for how SHSU will handle this; they are looking into it.

The \$10,000 degree is coming. Legislature proposed a cheaper degree instead of a \$10k degree, but it didn't pass as a blanket policy, so they are back to looking at \$10k. Sul Ross will be the test case for the Texas State University System; they already had lower tuition and therefore a better starting point. The price is intended to include tuition, fees, and textbooks for four years. The system's office thinks a combination of dual-credit classes, online classes (community college), and two years at a university may be doable.

Low-Producing Programs (LPP): Round 1 is over. Round 2 has already begun (2010-2014); it is retroactive. The process was drawn out for 2 years by grievances at the end of Round 1, but it was determined that it would still start in 2010. The expected numbers of graduates for Round 2 (total over the five-year period) would be AA/BA: 40 students; Master: 25 students; and Doctoral: 15 students. Round 3 will be 2015-2019. The expected numbers of graduates for Round 3 (total over the five-year period) would be AA/BA: 55-60 students; Master: 35-40 students (still nailing down those two numbers); and Doctoral: 15 students.

Most schools have not been adding new programs as SHSU have; they are focused on identifying "at-risk" programs (programs they do not think will be able to meet the minimum graduate requirements) and pushing people to get through those programs. Most schools are deciding to either shut down at-risk programs now or throw a lot more money into them.

It was noted that a graduate program generally needs to enroll about double the number of students it expects to graduate. Many programs would need funding for more TA positions to achieve that.

It was clarified that, if a LPP is shut down, you can still offer the courses, just not the degree. The Senate questioned what students would take those courses then.

A request was made to define what is meant by "program": does that mean you can't major in bassoon, or you can't major in music? It was clarified that "program" refers to "degree program," so it is based on the degree title, for example, the Master of Music.

Core: This is still in work; the coordinating board is still making tweaks.

Communication 6hrs

Math 3hrs

Life/Physical Science 6hrs *

Language, Phil, Culture 3 hrs

Creative Arts 3hr (not production but appreciation)

American History 6hrs (does include Texas)

Political Science 6 hrs (does include Texas)

Social Behavioral Science 3 hrs

Institutional Designation 6hrs (split 3/3)

There is a lot of concern about the science block because it is limited to six hours but most introductory science courses are four hours (class + lab). Many of the larger community colleges are going to a class + lab 3hr combo. This is helping them with the lack of space for labs. Existing space is being converted to nursing program labs or certificate programs. Another option is requiring that lab work be done on-line within the 3 hour course. (Provost Hebert dislikes the idea of online labs.) A final option is using hours from the Institutional Designation block for the labs. This is a decision that each campus will need to make individually.

It was also noted that students could take classes at the community colleges and take the labs after transferring to a 4-year institution; unclear how such transfer would work.

Two concessions that the THCB made:

1) community colleges will have a TX Gov't. & Federal Gov't. breakdown in History and Political Science blocks, while Universities can combine the classes. The 4-year campuses must publicize how they will accept the community college Gov't. transfers;

2) while the THCB prefers that the Institutional Designation block include interdisciplinary capstone courses that assess all six outcomes (i.e., as UT & AM will do), each campus will be allowed to control 3 hours with no questions asked while the second 3hrs will need be required to contain ALL SIX learning outcomes. (The first 3 hours can be anything the school chooses; for example, at TWU, all students are required to take a women's studies course.)

Shared Governance: Shared Governance means seeking the wisdom of the faculty. There are some items that faculty should take the lead on while others are the responsibilities of the administration or the Board.

Items such as curriculum development, faculty handbook, recruitment and retention of faculty as well as students should be under direction of the faculty. (Many schools are currently doing Strategic Enrollment Management activities, but these are coming from the faculty rather than marketing, unlike at SHSU.)

Structural and budgetary items (buildings, roads, campus master plans, strategic plans and budget distribution) all require contractual agreements and must come from the administration. The board, under advice of the President, has final word on any contractual decision.

The systems office is very curious to know how shared governance is being carried out on campuses. They are especially interested in who is responsible for updating faculty handbooks. All schools in our system are working on updates (ours was last updated in 2009). Right now they are assessing what should actually be in our book; next year they will look at the actual policies.

A question was raised about where recruitment would fit in the FES. Vice-Chancellor Moore sees that the 10% of the 90/10 funding should come from retention, which he sees as a direct outcome of service: faculty should be generating money either through research grants or through serving the university by helping student retention.

Texas Council of Faculty Senates (TCFS): Core curriculum revisions were discussed. Sam's committee on core has not been established. Names sent forth: Doug Ulrich, Debbie Price, Renee James, Sheryl Murphy-Manley, and Debbi Hatton. There are STILL changes being made to core. The latest was made last Thursday and establishes that Critical Thinking and Communication (written, spoken and visual; they dropped listening) MUST be assessed in every core course (in other words, they must be tied to learning outcomes and an assignment). They have one more tweak they are working on which will be voted on March 4th. This is huge across the state!

LEAP programs: this is what the core is being based on. Their opinion is that core classes should:

- 1) Consist of High Impact Practice Courses that include applied learning
- 2) Must have courses that are innovative
- 3) Must engage big picture thinking
- 4) Must be small in enrollment
- 5) Must provide students a common intellectual experience

All of this sounds a lot like the ACE designation for SHSU courses.

A senator noted that this approach sounds good for small liberal arts colleges, but what about ~200-seat, 50-minute lecture courses? The integration and assessment of these things does not scale well to larger institutions.

Senate Bill 26 (passed by TX Senate) requires assessment of academic advisement on all campuses. This involves student evaluation of quality and outcomes; it is departmentally based. SHSU's Bill Fleming is on the State's committee to review and assist universities with this process. There is no definite office to receive the results but there is a mandate to have the assessment in place.

It was noted that, currently, not all departments are represented by the SAM Center, in fact not all departments allow their students to be advised there. The SAM Center was originally conceived for general-education students, to help them find their way to a major, but now many departments just transfer their advising responsibility to the SAM Center.

Round-Up Reports at TCFS:

- 1) VERY few new programs. Main focus is identifying At-Risk programs and working to strengthen them.
- 2) Core revisions
- 3) Post Tenure Review
- 4) Work-load policy
- 5) On-line faculty evaluations

TCFS presentation regarding online course evaluations (summarized by Mark Frank): Majority of schools see a very low response rate, typically between 20% and 40%, and the low response rate tends to be associated with lower average ratings. Most schools are conducting online course evaluations for every course, every semester. Several ideas have been tried to increase the response rate. Entering evaluation respondents into a raffle for a prize (iPad, parking permit, etc.) has been very successful, while tactics like withholding grades has not been successful.

Chair Meetings with President and Provost: Chair presented write-up for evaluation of President and Provost; it was well-received. The President has some ideas to continue building communication with Senate and thinks the body is an excellent "sounding board."

Dean Sloan stepped down due to health concerns; Mary Robbins is now Acting Dean of CFAMC. Questions were asked concerning this choice because she is not CFAMC

faculty. Numerous senators were quick to defend her clear-headedness, unique skills, and the fact that she is not part of any of the current problems in the college.

Review of IT Policies: Requested by VP Mark Adams; assigned to University Affairs Committee. Fourteen of the 17 policies were not received until late on Tues Feb 21, so Chair chose to place this on the Senate's March 8 docket rather than Feb 23. The procedure for passing campus policies as outlined in the handbook is Senate -> CAD -> Cabinet -> Book. The IT policies which are currently under review were submitted directly to Cabinet because they were needed to comply with an audit currently being conducted on campus; they will come to us and CAD prior to being voted on by the Cabinet.

Enrollment numbers are still not "certified" so cannot yet be released; release is expected Feb 24th. The Chair has requested that Rita Caso send these numbers to Senate when they are released.

Strategic Plan: The dates were decided by the Deans and Cabinet at the joint retreat in January. Provost Hebert was under the impression that the chairs would include the faculty but it has been pointed out to him that he shouldn't assume; some chairs have asked for faculty input while others have done it without faculty. They do not want a plan revision (the plan went in the fall); what they were looking for are five initiatives (goals) from each department for next year. The plans that were sent in during the fall should be structure and now we are just going to send in how we are going to achieve those plans. The five items could include anything from FTE, capital expenditures, curriculum expansion, etc.: whatever the department felt they wanted to do next academic year. Those five items will be how the budget/FTE lines/renovations will be determined. If you were not consulted, ask your chair. It was noted that not all the deans seem to have received all the details from the retreat, especially regarding tying the goals to the budget.

Curriculum review stuff is due in March to go from the department to the college curriculum committee.

The Social Media Policy Committee has been working hard, meeting every Thursday (update from Paul Loeffler). They are crafting a letter to Gomez regarding the responsibilities and liabilities of faculty, especially with regards to monitoring communication and records retention implications. What are our responsibilities if we (class, department) use social media? What if our students post something inappropriate? What non-text-based social media (video, etc.): how do we manage that with regards to records retention?

Senate Tracking Forms: The Chair has developed a mock-up of a form to track issues we send forward. TSU and Lamar have forms attached to any piece of legislation that

comes through the Senate for review. Some items we have sent forward have ended up side-tracked; tracking will hopefully prevent recurrence of that.

A question was asked about the requirements for reporting back *down* from CAD and Cabinet to Senate regarding issues or policies that have been sent up. At the moment, these are little or none, but it is in work. It was suggested that the tracking cover sheet should perhaps come back to Senate with a status.

It was also noted that the tracking forms would be a good way to track Senate accomplishments for reporting to upper administration.

Best Places to Work Survey: Rita Caso encourages the Senate to fill out this survey when it arrives in email after Spring Break, and encourage department faculty as well.

Research survey sent by Lillian Pass recently has been reviewed and has full IRB support; there had been questions about this when it was sent out via email recently.

New Business

The Chair is looking into questions regarding the COS dean search; the cost of the recent dormitory remodeling; and the enrollment numbers.

Organization and Efficiency Task Force update (Dwayne Pavelock): They held several town halls and are still accepting online feedback until about Fri Mar 2. They welcome any suggestions for improving organization or efficiency on campus. They have already reviewed about 30 submissions to decide what to forward to Cabinet. It was noted that UNT solicited feedback on this topic by asking, "How would you make your job simpler?" to identify problems in daily work; they found \$2 million in savings.

A senator shared that the President had allegedly said she was "fairly sure" that we would have merit, and that we should have it "3 out of every 5 years." Questions were asked about what this actually means and how it would impact the quality of faculty work.

March 8 Senate meeting: VP Hooten will be visiting to discuss budgeting. Senate may ask him to come last half hour or so, so other Senate business may be completed first.

Adjournment: 5:00 PM