10/17/2014
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Meeting Called to order – 10:00 AM-12:00PM.

Participants: Dr. Peter Racheotes, Dr. Massimiliano Laddomada, Dr. Terry Bechtel, Dr. Teri Sartor, Dr. Godpower Okereke, Dr. Joan Brumm, Dr. Igor Aizenberg, and Dr. Elaine Beason.

Guest: Dr. Emily Cutrer, Dr. Rosanne Stripling, Dr. Craig Nakashian

• I. Call to Order: Presented by Dr. Peter Racheotes

• II. Provost Report: Presented by Dr. Rosanne Stripling

Dr. Rosanne Stripling gave a brief report about FY15 Budget issues, Revisions to UP 12.01 Academic Program, Academic Vision and Master Plan for Fall 2014, and Low Producing Program Report as follows;

1. FY15 Budget Issues
   The faculty salaries and salary adjustments letters were discussed in the meeting. Salary adjustments are currently in progress. The staff will have two different letters from HR department named “CUPA” and “MERIT” letters. This will be effected by Nov. 1st, 2014.

2. Revisions to UP 12.01 Academic Program
   Revised UP 12.01 academic program is ready to be implemented.

3. Academic Vision and Master Plan for Fall 2014
   Dr. Rosanne Stripling gave a brief report on the Academic Vision and Master Plan for Fall 2014 Program as follows:

   a. Identifying High Impact Practices (HIPS) options for incorporating elements of the Academic Vision and Core Values into all courses.
   b. Creating a faculty incentive program to promote “course redesign” for implementation of HIPS:
      Each professor is going to teach one course at least. In 2015-2016 Academic Year:
      $50000 Technology related projects are put aside
      $50000 Non technology related projects are put aside
      $100000 for 20

   c. Determining whether or not the Academic Vision and Core Values merit consideration for adding a seventh university-wide learning outcome (beyond the six TAMUS common outcomes) for graduates of all degree programs:
      This academic vision impacts on any course for our undergraduate and graduate programs. We are looking at the Academic Vision and Core values. There are 6 common outcomes in all A&M graduates. We are in the process of evaluating 3 of
each. Dr. Stripling pointed out that student engaged activity should take place not only in the community but also abroad.

d. Guiding the selection and prioritization of new degrees for the next seven years:
Dr. Stripling discussed the possibility of adding programs to the core curriculum and suggested that we add “Civic Engagement.” She believes that adding “Civic Engagement” into our programs is very crucial for our University in terms of becoming a civic engaged University in the next 7 years (2014-2021), and being recognized as a Carnegie Community.

e. Guiding the selection of a topic for the university’s reaffirmation Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that complements the Academic Vision and core values.
Dr. Stripling addressed the importance of the institutions developing QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) and gave a brief report about the prerequisites for QEP Plan.
Discussion about the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), the necessity of assessment. There are 4 documents will be rolling out. Each of the colleges will have 6 weeks from Oct. 15th through Dec. 1st to collaborate and discuss about certification and concentrations to be sent to the Provost Office for an approval.
Each will be asked to think about vital programs, new degrees and concentrations for the next 7 years. Each of the programs proposed in each college will be prioritized and submitted by Dec. 1st 2014 by Deans or President.

4. Low Producing Program Report
Dr. Stripling gave a brief report about the number of Annual Graduates for Undergraduate & Graduate Programs at Texas A&M University – Texarkana. According to the low producing program report based on THECB Standards for Evaluation, 5-Year Average for each Undergraduate program must yield 5 graduates per year (25) and 5-Year Average for each Graduate program must yield 3 graduates per year (15)

Standards apply to new degrees beginning in the sixth year of implementation.

• III. Commencement Speaker: Presented by Dr. Peter Racheotes
Dr. Racheotes requested nominees to be sent to him ASAP.

• IV. Faculty Senate Constitution: Presented by Dr. Teri Sartor
Discussion on the faculty senate constitution ensued. A committee was appointed. Dr. Sartor was appointed chair.

• V. Call Non-returning Students: Presented by Dr. Godpower Okereke
We discussed the necessity of gathering a data for the students whom have been terminated from the university. This is very embarrassing from students’ perspective and students may feel more comfortable to discuss this issue with someone from their own department in order to return to school.

• VI. Fred Update: Presented by Dr. Joan Brumm
Dr. Brumm gave a brief report about the budget and the research for Fred. She pointed out that we are ready to begin the applications. This is an enormous budget and we do not have to spend money. We have a year to extend the funds.

We are working on getting a student worker and Dr. McHenry is going to simplify it.

**VII. New Initiative Requirement about Monthly Teaching Evaluation:** Presented by Igor Aizenberg

Dr. Aizenberg discussed the problems with the Dean of STEM creating evaluation twice a semester. Dr. Donald Peterson sent an e-mail to all faculty members to organize and conduct mid-term teaching evaluation report in the middle of the semester. Dr. Igor Aizenberg pointed out that there are two important issues to be addressed as follows:

1. Whether this is acceptable to conduct in the middle of semester.
2. There are great concerns about confidentiality and how this is going to be organized.

Dr. Igor Aizenberg addressed that Dr. Donald Peterson created an online access and there is no confidentiality on it. Anybody can create this form and manipulate the online evaluation. We have students complaining about teaching issues and the accents of the professors who are not Native American citizens. He pointed out that he has never had issues before students complaining about the accents of the professors and he feels offended and frustrated about the situation.

Dr. Joan Brumm addressed that no one is against the evaluation. However, the most important question to be addressed here is that “Is it possible to change the rules all of a sudden in the middle of the semester?”

In conclusion, the majority of the faculty did not agree on this evaluation process and discussed possible solutions. Dr. Craig Nakashian suggested to get faculty approval and asked for a peer evaluation.

**VIII. Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Deans:** Presented by Dr. Peter Racheotes

Provost had no problem on this issue whatsoever. She agreed on the document. This unveils a greater problem. Dr. Joan Brumm pointed out that there have been several members (3 members of the committee) who called her about faculty participation. There was only 3 faculty in the past. We had another 10 year from our college. Broadly, there is much more participation of the faculty. We make recommendations about how search committee is stricked.

**IX. Texas Council of Faculty Senate:** Presented by Dr. Peter Racheotes

Dr. Peter Racheotes informed everyone that he is going to have a meeting in Austin for the Faculty Senate meeting next Thursday on October 30th, 2014.

**X. Old Business**
No Old Business discussed.

• **XI. New Business**

  Dr. Racheotes gave a brief report about the chancellor being on campus December 5\(^{th}\) 2014. He has asked to meet with Dr. Racheotes and 4 Faculty for one hour.

• **Next Meeting on Friday, November 21\(^{st}\), 2014 at 10:00am.**