

Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes

February 7, 2020

1:00pm–2:30pm

Attendees: Dr. David Yells, Dr. Drew Morton, Dr. Jan Murdock, Dr. Craig Nakashian, Dr. Ben Neuman, Dr. Abbie Strunc (remote), Dr. Wai Yuen Chan, Dr. Joan Brumm, Dr. Angie Sikorski, Dr. Brian Matthews, Dr. Doug Julien, Dr. Mohamed Morsy

I. Call to order

II. VPAA Report..... Dr. David Yells

1. Coordinating Board approved Mechanical engineering program, waiting to hear from SACCS but excited to talk about it officially as an approved degree for Fall 2020.
2. Board of Regents approved the Master of Social Work program; moving on to THECB for review.
3. Presentation from the system giving a glimpse into what may happen at the legislature next year. They are looking into a new source of funding for schools like us, the regional or smaller ones. A specific pot of money earmarked for schools like us. The system just hired a new investment group to manage the funds and they are doing a good job with it.
4. Admission standards Committee – Dr. Nyguyen is doing a new analysis of our standards on our student population for what the best predictor of student success is to see if we want to make any changes to admission standards.
5. Dr. Neuman asked about which engineering program will be at Rellis. Electrical Engineering in Rellis in Fall 2020, but not mechanical. Rellis is up 68 students from fall to spring. Up to 17 students for Biology there.

III. Approval of Minutes (December, 2019) Dr. Craig Nakashian

Approved with unanimous vote.

IIII. President of Faculty Senate Report Dr. Craig Nakashian

1. First meeting with President and VPAA will be in March. Anything you want them to bring up specifically, let them know.
 - a. Concerns over budget. Dr. Brumm – Downward expansion is being used to fund a lot of areas. Technology fees are used to fund Julia Allen and Linda Scott, half of their salaries are funded in Distance Ed.
 - b. Admissions Tuition fees – Resident (Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, LA, AR), Border State (means every other state in the union), Non-resident (international). Dr. Brumm gave it to Dr. Yells because it is very confusing and it needs to be rewritten. The concern is that out of

state potential students do not understand the tuition rates. Dr. Brumm proposes we should label it out of state, not border state.

- c. Dr. Murdock – expresses concern over finances. She teaches IQ assessment, she asked for money for protocols and Dr. Doughty offered to give her \$100, when one package costs \$125 and that's only for one test area (e.g. Preschool – Elementary). We need more money.
- d. Dr. Nakashian – college chair meeting yesterday, discussed concern that academics is required to take a cut back but not others areas. They will take this to the President and Provost. He asks for examples of where faculty have been told no.

III. Consent Agenda Items

1. Education Technology funding request – Kelly Coke (see attachment) – Dr. Brumm questions how this is an Ed Tech funding request, because it's distance Ed. Dr. Chan asked where the conference is at? Las Vegas.
Motion to accept – approval Dr. Sikorski, For – 3; Against – 4; Abstain – 3. Request does not move forward.
 - Dr. Strunc asked for clarification. Kelly Coke is a faculty member and teaches online programs, why are you abstaining or not supporting her request? Dr. Brumm says it's not Ed tech, it is research, that it should be a FRED funding request. Dr. Morton states the funding requirements, it has to add value to the school as a whole. the student body and facilitate online education for them. Dr. Neuman said he abstains because he does not feel the funds are ever used for what they were intended to be used for. Dr. Brumm feels the same as Dr. Neuman.
2. Education Technology funding request – Linda Scott, approved.
3. Academic Rules and Procedures: Academic Freedom Procedures – moved things around but no content change. We moved sections from the Academic Freedom document to the Workload document. Approved.
4. Academic Rules and Procedures: We are updating our Tenure & Promotion document from a procedure to a rule (as per System policy). Approved.
5. Academic Rules and Procedures: We made a series of changes to the Workload document; e.g. faculty will be paid for each independent study they do. Approved.

IV. Committee Reports and Business Items

a) Curriculum Committee

No meeting yet. Provost, Dr. Yells, has asked them to look at assessment practices and faculty evaluations, he is asking the Senate what they would like to do. Dr. Julien suggests creating a new committee because he did not ask the curriculum committee to serve in that way. Dr. Julien will sit on the chair of an assessment committee. Dr. Nakashian suggests a core curriculum committee instead. Dr. Morsy proposes doing two committees. Dr. Sikorski asks, what are we going to actually do with assessment if we bring it back? Dr. Julien says we can do it in a way that we can use it and help the programs. It was determined a new committee called Core Curriculum

Assessment Committee will be created and chaired by Dr. Julien; Dr. Julien will write what the charge will be and propose it at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

b) Education Technology – no report.

c) Academic Standards

Dr. Morton: Dr. Joe Burzynski met with the Provost. Still having the same conversation as back in Fall of 2018. Wanting to lower the standards but not lowering them. No sense of a decision to be made. Nothing from the actual committee.

d) Academic Rules and Procedures

- Jill Whittington is looking up the legal requirements for post-tenure review and annual evaluations. Dr. Nakashian asked the Senate, Do you like being annually evaluated or do you think there should be a better system? Dr. Brumm – finds it helpful to submit a review once a year. Dr. Morton said he doesn't mind it either because the file is already written. Dr. Nakashian said they are trying to discover what the options are based on the actual requirements.
- Dr. Julien would love to see an academic rule that job postings need to be posted by a certain time. Dr. Brumm said they lost a candidate because of it not being posted at the right time.

e) FRED

4 under consideration. 2 considered last term. 1 is time sensitive. Dr. Neuman will send them out electronically.

f) Faculty Status – no report.

g) Budget Committee

- Dr. Brumm will send out the preliminary fund findings from her budget assessment. A whole lot of people are being paid with downward expansion that used to be on the regular payroll, this is alarming. Half of the salaries in IT are funded by downward expansion as well. Dr. Brumm is concerned about what happens if we do not make the levels required by downward expansion.
- Dr. Nakashian – it would be useful to know expenses on big ticket items, e.g. enrollment. Where did the money come from?
- Dr. Sikorski – what do we have in reserves today, 2.6 months – about \$10.3 million left is the best guess. Are we going to continue to deplete the reserves?
- Dr. Brumm said we are looking at the budget, not the spending. Dr. Nakashian suggests bringing in the CFO to discuss more.

- Dr. Matthews asks about the Strategic Planning committee if it should be aware of this because currently it is not discussed. Dr. Nakashian said bringing it to that committee is fine but it probably would not be addressed.

Meeting adjured 2:22 pm.

Next Meeting: March 6, 2020