

ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 12th, 2007

I. Roll Call

A. Members Present: Jamal Husein, Michael Buck, Dan Khanna, David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), Mary Sanders, Steven Snowden, Robert Prestiano, John Nicholson, Chris Ellery, Jack Barbour, Guoquiang Zheng, David O'Dell, William Fuller, Brian May, Michael Dixon, Nick Flynn, James Jones, David Huckaby, Trish Hutchinson (Faculty Senate Vice President), Ron Bybee, Toni Sauncy

B. Others Present: Richard Beck (Academic and Student Affairs Associate Vice President), Carol Diminnie (Dean of Graduate School/Director of Research), Jeane Irby (Information Technology Technical Services Manager and Secretary/Treasurer of the Staff Senate), Ryan Mason (Student Senate President)

II. Opening Remarks: President *Tarver* welcomed everyone to the session. He explained that ASU President Rallo wishes to be present at the first regular senate meeting of each semester. *Tarver* added that there may be, at some point, a called special session with President Rallo. *Tarver* continued by reiterating that the Faculty Senate's invited guests are invited to every meeting, and he expressed his hope that they can either attend each session or send substitutes in their places. He emphasized the fact that there are issues of concern to all three senates, and he also stressed the importance of dialogue among these three bodies. He reminded everyone present that guests have a non-voting status, but he assured all the guests present that the meeting was still open to them and that they were welcome to stay after making their comments.

III. Remarks from Guests

A. Jeane Irby (Secretary/Treasurer of the Staff Senate): Ms. Irby explained that the Staff Senate has not held elections yet during this academic year, but that it would hold them at its September 17th meeting. She reported that there will soon be a new chair and a new secretary/treasurer. She also mentioned that the Staff Senate would have a retreat and an orientation session. She stated that last year the Staff Senate had as one of its chief initiatives the Education Assistance Program, which provides for some reimbursement for certain fees for staff members taking certain job-related classes. She reported that President Rallo has asked the Staff Senate to reevaluate the Staff Excellence Awards.

B. Ryan Mason (Student Senate President): Mr. Mason reported that there is a full Student Senate for the first semester in quite some time. He mentioned that the Student Senate is working on some bills to take to the Faculty Senate; one of them, for instance, involves the remodeling of certain classrooms.

C. Carol Diminnie (Dean of the School of Graduate Studies/Director of Research): Dean Diminnie distributed a handout entitled "Guidelines for Funding Faculty Research, Development, Innovations in Teaching, and

Enrichment". She mentioned that President Rallo spoke with her regarding the external grant process. She reported that the president desires a discontinuation of the trend whereby 90% of the research budget is allocated for the funding of summer salaries for faculty. Dean Diminnie met with the deans in order to brainstorm as to alternative funding procedures. The provisions of the handout distributed by Dean Diminnie have been approved, she reported, by the Administration. She mentioned that the new plan calls for a "pot" of \$265,000; and she indicated that \$65,000 is to be for "research and development that must be closely tracked". She added that anyone can contend for the rest of the funds. She apprised the senators of the fact that, according to the new proposal, no summer salaries will be funded within her budget under normal conditions (she stated that there would need to be "an excellent rationale" for them to be funded). She reminded the senators that the groundwork for such a proposal was laid at the convocation (in August). She observed that with the upcoming salary equity review, faculty members will not need to depend on summer teaching to support their families. She predicted that next year the budgetary picture within her division will be clearer due to the fact that there will be vision and mission statements in place by then. Dean Diminnie described the future direction of her division's operations by saying that items that will be funded will be those in accordance with those statements. These items will have to do with the funding of day-to-day faculty development and faculty research. In light of all this, Dean Diminnie wants state funds to be switched to designated funds (and wants there to be no travel funding restrictions). She later addressed (briefly) the provision in the new (above-mentioned) document (handout) that deals with part-time faculty members being hired to cover the classes of faculty members receiving release time for research endeavors. Dean Diminnie stated that when members of the ASU faculty were hired, they were hired to teach; however, she added that all faculty members are also expected to engage in research and in course development (she added that this is mentioned in faculty members' nine-month contracts). She also stated that anyone who runs a program and needs to be present on a daily basis to do so should get paid for it; therefore, some supplement moneys will be available for such compensation. She mentioned that she wanted to get the aforementioned handout out by Friday, September 14th, and to the oversight committee by September 30th, so that awards may be granted. Dean Diminnie then directed the senators' attention to a section of the aforementioned handout, one in which there is a question regarding whether (besides the deans and the Faculty Senate president) the Faculty Senate would be recommending one, or two, faculty members from each of the four undergraduate colleges to serve on the University Internal Grant Committee. A question was posed to Dean Diminnie regarding whether teaching overloads, teaching graduate classes, or being head of a program of studies would be funded by internal grants; the answer was that they would not be (and that the overload situation is "up for grabs", but is being studied by the Presidential Salary Schedule Task Force). Dean Diminnie assured the senators that there will be a Center for Innovation, Teaching, and Research (and that although the proposed "Faculty Development Center" was cut from the budget at the state level, President Rallo says he will fund a "Center for Innovation, Teaching, and Research"). Dean Diminnie mentioned that with the establishment of the new Center for Innovation, Teaching, and Research two positions will need to be filled (both grant writer and center director positions). She added that the person who runs the center will

receive a half-time course release. Returning to the topic of the University Internal Grant Committee, she stated that it will have been formed by the end of October. She asked the senators once more whether they would favor the Faculty Senate recommending one committee member or two (per college). *Bybee* moved that the senate recommend two. *Sauncy* seconded the motion. Two senators abstained from the vote, while the other nineteen voted to support the motion. The next question to be dealt with concerned how to nominate these committee members. *Sauncy* suggested that the Committee on Committees be involved in this process. *Nicholson* made a motion that the Committee on Committees present recommendations to the Faculty Senate at the October 10th Faculty Senate meeting; these recommendations (for Research Development Committee membership) would be subject to Faculty Senate approval. *May* seconded the motion. The measure was approved by a 21 to 0 vote.

IV. Review of May 7th, 2007 Minutes: *Ellery* moved the approval of the minutes; *Huckaby* seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by a 21-0 vote.

V. Faculty Senate Budget: *Tarver* made mention of the exact balances of both the state and local Faculty Senate budgets. He mentioned that some money had been spent on holding the new Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty Orientation luncheon and on the cost of membership in the state Faculty Senate organization. He remarked that some of last year's budget went unused, and he reminded the other senators that it is not possible for the Faculty Senate to ask for its funds to roll over into the next fiscal year. Therefore, he said, unused funds are absorbed into the university budget. *Barbour* proposed, on the basis of the amount of funds on hand, that a representative of the External Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate join the Chamber of Commerce in order to give ASU faculty "a voice downtown". *Sauncy* agreed, as a representative of the committee, to investigate the cost of such representation.

VI. Old Business

A. Faculty Workload Report: Associate Vice President Beck reported that the Faculty Senate's report (prepared by Past Faculty Senate President Bonnie Amos, former Faculty Senator Susan Keith, and others) will be among the items considered in the equity studies, across institutions, that will be undertaken by the Administration. *Tarver* added that the salaries of those faculty members and staff members will be compared to those of peer institutions, with a view to enhancing nine-month salaries (so that summer school will not be that much of an issue salary-wise). He added that it may take two to three years of funding to achieve equity, and that base salaries would be looked at seriously.

B. Faculty Handbook (Online): *Snowden* and *Hutchinson* said that the relevant portions that have been worked on with a view to posting them on the internet are not yet online. *Tarver* reminded the other senators to refresh the cache of their web browsers when looking for potentially updatable sites such as this one. He added that he would look into the status of this particular site. Beck then mentioned that the *Faculty-Staff Handbook* would undergo changes to make it like that of Texas Tech University (TTU). He described the project as unfinished, and he mentioned that Finance and Administration Vice President Sharon Meyer is ASU's *liaison* with TTU for this effort.

C. Bookstore: *Sauncy*, who chairs the External Affairs Committee, reported that some students have been overcharged at the bookstore. She and Ryan Mason have agreed to look into this matter. *Sauncy* has been authorized to report on her findings at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

D. University Calendar: *Tarver* described next year's calendar as "still somewhat amendable". Beck noted that the university has had to modify its summer schedule. *Nicholson* remarked that the three senates (Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Senate) had been hoping to be able to help formulate the university calendar. He stressed the need for interested parties to be involved in its development. He also noted that comparisons with calendars of other schools had been made and that coordination of ASU's calendar with that of the San Angelo Independent School District was difficult because the finalization of the school district's calendar was "last-minute". He then asked Associate Vice President Beck if there could be a Calendar Development Team, involving all interested parties, one in which they could become involved, earlier than is possible at present, in the formulation process. *Khanna* mentioned that he has not been able to find the academic calendar on the ASU website. Beck replied that he has sent the Information Technology division a draft for a new website that will have it.

VII. New Business

A. Faculty Senate President Tarver's Meetings with University President Rallo: *Tarver* reported that he has had monthly meetings with Dr. Rallo (on Faculty Senate issues) and that he would continue to have them throughout the academic year. He spoke of Dr. Rallo's desire to tell him what his plans and wishes are with respect to these issues.

B. Old Rumors on Campus: *Tarver* mentioned that one of these is that summer school wages will be, like at TTU, "just adjunct pay". (He added that Dr. Rallo had sent some clarifying information regarding this to News and Publications Director Preston Lewis for posting on the worldwide web.) *Tarver* clarified another rumor by saying that some "open" time on Dr. Rallo's schedule is not actually "open door" time; rather, it is "open appointment" time. *Tarver* then dealt with another rumor by confirming that the ceremony portion of August commencement has now been discontinued (and that degrees earned in August of a given year will be conferred the semester after Summer Session II). It was also mentioned that degrees will no longer be given after graduates leave the stage. *Ellery* asked Beck whether or not students who have not quite fulfilled all graduation requirements would be permitted to walk across the stage; Beck replied that there have been exceptional circumstances (allowed by the provost). *Ellery* also asked whether or not such students' names would be marked by an asterisk. The next rumor addressed concerned the possibility of a faculty dress code. *Tarver* stated that there are no plans for such a code, but that "rules of decency and moral character" regarding faculty dress would be expected to be followed. The following rumor was that administrators received raises. It was clarified that the budget does not list such raises, except for specific cases of modest adjustments because of job realignments entailing modified expectations of employees. The final rumor addressed had to do with scholarly activity expectations (of

faculty). *Tarver* mentioned that it is true that President Rallo wants ASU to become "better at research". He (*Tarver*) added that the merit pay-type system which may be forthcoming could reward scholarship and research, and he mentioned that this system (if it is implemented) would allow faculty to choose whether or not to participate in the research that would be thus rewarded (that is, under such a monetary arrangement). *Tarver* concluded the "old rumors" portion of the meeting by telling the other senators that they could forward him any rumors they hear. He said that his next meeting with Dr. Rallo would be on the 9th of October (but that if he needs to meet sooner than that with the university president regarding a rumor of significant proportions, he can do so).

C. New Rumors: *Barbour* mentioned having heard a report from College of Liberal and Fine Arts Dean Kevin Lambert that no low-enrollment summer classes would be allowed (and that only classes needed for general education requirements seemed likely to have enough students for summer classes to "make", given the anticipated rise in minimum number of required students for summer courses). *Barbour* expressed concern about what he called the "enormous ramifications" of these changes. Some of those ramifications, which he and other senators identified, would be uncertainty about when students in certain graduate programs would be expected to complete them, courses possibly being dropped from the catalog because of the inability to offer them often enough, a diminished number of potential SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration) advisers, the possibility that deans may not realize that some upper-level classes in some disciplines could actually meet the minimum number of required students, and ROTC students not being able to "commission on time" (phrase used by *Buck*). It was also mentioned that for at least one graduate program, certain classes are only offered during the summer. *Tarver* explained that one of Dr. Rallo's goals is to make summer school "as fiscally responsible as possible" (*Tarver's* words). One senator remarked that "some issues already seem decided". *Beck*, incidentally, mentioned that President Rallo has been meeting with a small committee regarding the status of non-tenured/non-tenure track faculty (and that he had asked the Deans' Council for its input on the same issue). *Beck* continued by reporting that he and *Amos* had spoken with President Rallo on salary schedule issues, and that Dr. Rallo had told them that if new faculty hiring were to be for tenure track positions he hoped to use 75% of available funds for hiring tenure track personnel (and the other 25% for providing sabbaticals). He (*Beck*) further explained Dr. Rallo's rationale that since summer school is not self-supporting, it "drains us of money" (*Beck's* words) that could be used for tenure track faculty salaries. *Beck* also mentioned that what the president has in mind is a financial "readjustment to a cost-based model"; he added that the deans' recommendations have not yet been assessed as to cost. One senator expressed concern about whether these plans are already decided-on measures (for all practical purposes) or not (and asked if a Faculty Senate committee can look into the issue). Another senator expressed anger that this is being "presented as a done deal" (and opined that deans have been deciding issues on a yearly basis without telling faculty that these issues are being dealt with, thereby "running roughshod over the faculty"). Another senator lamented that the income potential for summer teaching was once considered "gold" (and now would not be). That senator was answered by a colleague who mentioned that salary adjustments would be helpful in light of this altered summer

income potential that is forecast. *Tarver* acknowledged that much of this is "unanswered" as of now, but noted that the anxiety level regarding these issues is high. *Ellery* suggested that the senators take these concerns to the deans and department heads "at the first opportunity". *Beck* noted that the summer schedule is dealt with in late January and early February. *Sauncy* identified the summer course offerings issue as a "huge" one for students and as one that the Student Senate needs to address.

D. Faculty Senate Website: *Hutchinson* volunteered to update this website. She mentioned having read the rules and requirements that pertain to it. She reported that the preferred font for the site cost over \$300. She mentioned that there are some problems with the site, but that users of the site must clear the cache of their web browsers. "For the most part, it's working" was the way she summarized the current state of the site. However, she mentioned some elements she had included on the site that were rejected (without her being notified regarding such a decision) by the Office of News and Publications. She expressed concern that "people's work is being changed" without communication regarding said changes taking place. *Tarver* expressed his hope for even more improvements to the website, and he commented that it is "already a very good match with" Texas Tech's and is "serviceable". *Khanna* asked whether or not the Information Technology (IT) division would be willing to offer faculty some training on website administration. *Irby* replied that courses for website administrators would be available at the end of September. She added that if any website administrator runs into problems with his/her site, he/she should e-mail <webtransition@angelo.edu>.

E. Honorary Doctorates: *Tarver* mentioned that President Rallo wants some honorary doctorates to be awarded during May and December commencement ceremonies. He added that Dr. Rallo asked him to collect the names of three senior faculty members, to be nominated by the Faculty Senate, who would be willing to serve on a committee formed for the purpose of helping to identify potential recipients of such degrees. The timeline for the work to be done by the committee is October 15th; and the three individuals who volunteered to serve are *May*, *Barbour*, and *Flynn*.

F. Vision 2012 - Strategic Planning: *Tarver* briefly alluded to this information item. He referred to Vision 2012 information already on the university website, and he alluded to the fact that he is the co-chair of the effort (and that the effort is being at least partially guided by a consultant). He mentioned that "benchmark measures" are being proposed.

G. Professional Pathways: This was another information item mentioned by *Tarver*. He explained that this program has to do with providing for seamless segues degree-wise between ASU and TTU. It was also mentioned that, given meeting the SAT/ACT, GPA and degree requirements, members of ASU's Honors Program would be automatically accepted into certain TTU professional programs. In response to a question from *Fuller*, he commented that the program is still "in development".

H. New Intervening Issue (Parking Policies): A senator referred to a controversial parking situation involving a departmental colleague.

The case was put forward that Campus Police policies were enforced quite strictly without policies (including what constitutes parking fraud) being articulated in a sufficiently prominent or detailed manner. (Another complaint about enforcement of parking policies was shared by another senator.) The matter was assigned to the University Affairs Committee. *Flynn* reported that this committee, which currently has no chair, will soon meet and elect one. It was also noted that one of the recent administrative changes on campus will result in the Campus Police being responsible to Finance and Administration. Finally, *Ellery* briefly mentioned the need for an appeals process with respect to parking issues.

I. Faculty Senate Member to Work with Dr. Sarah Logan on SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) Accreditation Visit Preparation:

This would involve, among other tasks, an assessment conference at Texas A & M University and a SACS meeting in December (and other preparatory meetings). *Tarver* stated that he would "look at whom to contact" (from among the senate membership) about this.

J. Senate Bill 1231 (Six-Course Drop Limit): It was explained that this new measure was designed to prevent course-hopping and professor-shopping on the part of students, and to encourage students to complete degree programs in a timelier manner. *Flynn* referred to a helpful e-mail on this topic that was recently sent campus-wide by Registrar Angela Balch. Beck observed that there are exceptions provided for by the bill, as well as an appeals process. He added that "the specifics of the issue are still being debated", and that the measure "may be repealed in the next legislative session".

K. Student Travel Requiring Faculty/Staff Accompaniment: *Nicholson* spoke briefly to this issue, noting that ASU only pays for student travel if a staff or faculty member accompanies the students. It was also mentioned that if two or more faculty or staff members go on such a trip, only one of them receives travel funds in advance.

L. Degree Plans of Only 120 Hours: The State, *Tarver* said, is going to be strict in its enforcement of this new numerical standard.

M. First-Year Experience Initiative: Plans for ASU personnel to take a fact-finding trip to Sam Houston State University (SHSU), where there is such a program in place (and where learning communities are part of it) were discussed. This is because Dr. Rallo, who is informing ASU personnel of the particulars of the first-year program he gained experience with at Western Illinois University, wishes to see six-year graduation rates and full-time student retention rates at ASU rise and feels that a first-year experience initiative would be a needed step toward improvement here also. *Huckaby, Sauncy, Tarver, and Dixon* engaged in discussion and inquiries regarding what type of involvement there would be on the part of a Faculty Senate member (since one was requested for the trip) and which committee(s) would be best-suited to deal with the matter. It was noted, eventually, that *Flynn* would be taking the SHSU trip, anyway; and he stated that he would be happy to report back to the senate on his findings. Beck, incidentally, in answer to a question, noted that involvement beyond the SHSU trip would be expected of the Faculty Senate member going to Huntsville (or, at least, that further involvement would be preferred). It is not clear,

as of the date of this meeting, whether another Faculty Senate person will be selected or not.

N. TTU System Board Visit (September 27th-28th): *Tarver* mentioned that he may need to answer questions from board members on this occasion. He mentioned that these important visitors will be attempting to become better acquainted with ASU.

O. Institutional Brand/Faculty Signature: *Tarver* mentioned that Dr. Rallo is "very interested in this". It would be a core of twelve credit hours of classes that would give a uniquely ASU flavor to the curriculum and that would provide our students with a common educational experience. Incidentally, Biology Department Head Dr. Kelly McCoy is interested in a West Texas-flavored institutional brand and has stated that a specific Biology course that would fit in with such a brand is already in existence. The institutional brand concept is said to be common at other universities.

P. Mentoring for New Tenure Track Faculty: *Tarver* mentioned that Dr. Rallo wants the Faculty Senate to suggest the assigning of mentors extra-departmentally (in addition to doing it intra-departmentally). Extra-departmental mentoring provides a department with someone who could help a faculty member without being involved in voting on that person's tenure issues and the like. *Sauncy* suggested that this be an initiative that could be handled within the proposed Center for Innovation, Research, and Teaching.

Q. Update on Tenure and Promotion Guidelines: *Ellery* mentioned a limbo-like situation with regard to these guidelines in that no actions have been taken since the Select Faculty Committee (SFC) (on Tenure and Promotion) submitted its recommendations to the provost in May. He mentioned that the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (UCTP) has to meet this month and establish its procedures. SFC Chair Dr. Mary Ellen Hartje has stated that she wants revised guidelines to be in place by late October or by (at the latest) November. A question was raised concerning the process for adopting guidelines. Beck, who explained the situation regarding the disappearance and recoverability of the SFC document, stated that he had not yet asked Provost Don Coers about that process. One senator also mentioned that the Faculty Senate has not seen the document with the proposed guidelines (although another senator stated that the Faculty Senate's input has already been relayed to the SFC). It was also reiterated that all parties involved have to review the document before it can be agreed upon. *Ellery* suggested that *Tarver* e-mail UCTP Chair Dr. James Forbes to urge him to make sure that guidelines are in place "on time" for this academic year. Another senator objected to the idea of rushing such important changes. Beck affirmed that structural changes to the tenure and promotion guidelines constitute the primary consideration, and he assured the senators that the deans know that they may have to act quickly (before passing the document on to President Rallo).

VIII. Standing Committee Reports:

A. By-Laws and Standing Rules: *Ellery* reported that there are some proposals for by-laws changes that are pending, but that none of them is an urgent issue (with so many matters on the table currently).

B. University Affairs: It was again noted that this committee needs to elect a chairperson.

IX. Roundtable Issues

A. Student Senate Roundtable: It was announced that this event would take place at the Lake House on September 19th (and that administrators and faculty would be welcome to this afternoon session).

B. Timing of Finals: *May* mentioned that (some) other universities begin finals on Thursday of Dead Week and finish by Wednesday of finals week. Therefore, he said, they are able to finish semesters earlier in the same number of days as ASU. He stated his desire to look into that possibility for our campus. *Tarver* commented that the idea is interesting, but reminded him that such a change would affect the university calendar.

C. Tenure and Promotion Issues: *Ellery*, chair of the 2006-2007 UCTP, mentioned that only one change in portfolio content has been proposed, that is, documentation prepared by department heads on candidates' teaching effectiveness. He added that portfolios of ineligible persons are received every year. It was also stated that the position of the Faculty Senate is that of urging the UCTP to work with Provost Coers to assure proper and timely handling of the latest guidelines.

X. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell
Secretary, Faculty Senate

ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

October 10th, 2007

I. Roll Call

A. Members Present: Jamal Husein, Michael Buck, Dan Khanna, David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), Mary Sanders, Steven Snowden, Robert Prestiano, John Nicholson, Chris Ellery, Jack Barbour, Guoquiang Zheng, David O'Dell, William Fuller, Brian May, Michael Dixon, David Huckaby, Trish Hutchinson (Faculty Senate Vice President), Ron Bybee, Bonnie Amos (Past Faculty Senate President), Charles Allen (for Toni Sauncy)

B. Others Present: Lynsey Flage (Chair-Elect of Staff Senate), James Adams (ASU Police Chief)

II. Opening Remarks and Reports from/Interaction with Guests: President Tarver opened the meeting with a word of congratulations to Senator Toni Sauncy, who was recently named the 2007 Society of Physics Students (SPS) Outstanding Chapter Advisor (at the SPS National Council meeting). He then conveyed the regrets expressed by Provost Don Coers, who was unable to attend the Faculty Senate meeting (because of being at Texas Tech with Richard Beck, Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs). Flage was introduced, but she mentioned that she had no issues to bring to the floor; she added that the Staff Senate will have its first meeting next week. Chief Adams was then introduced. He addressed what he termed "an inaccurate rumor" regarding a case of what the Campus Police have considered fraudulent use of a faculty parking permit. He described the case in detail, and he defended the way in which the case was handled. Chief Adams also stated that the levying of fines was not excessive, considering the number of violations committed by the permit holder in question; and he maintained that his dismissal of one of the violations constituted a good faith effort to work with, and be reasonable with, this individual. Adams also fielded questions regarding (among other issues) fine amounts, parking appeals processes, and the difference between how the Campus Police view first-time parking violations and repeated violations. He noted that there will be a parking assessment this academic year (done by an external professional reviewer). Tarver then commended Adams for the way in which he openly shared information and perspectives on these issues. Following this, Tarver brought up the matter of campus safety, expressing the hope that soon there may be a campus-wide session on campus safety issues. Adams described how law enforcement entities nationwide have changed their thinking, incorporated active shooter training, and employed a more confrontational strategy regarding active shooter events (since the Columbine shootings in Colorado several years ago). He mentioned that in case of an active shooter event, the Campus Police would find itself "far better armed" than before for it. He added that they have, already in place, formalized procedures with the San Angelo Police Department for "joint action". He also mentioned that "the university is three or four months away from rolling out Connect Ed" (a customizable campus-wide emergency notification system), and he described some of its features and functions. He added that Connect Ed will be well-publicized. He then discussed various facets of the active shooter event issue, including how to notify instructors [while

they are teaching] regarding an active shooter situation and what their responsibilities would be during it, and how to equip classrooms and dormitories with emergency notification technology. *Tarver* then implored *Adams* to set up a venue or workshop on campus safety. *Adams*, in response, agreed to hold such a session and mentioned a document (one that deals with different types of events) prepared for the ASU web page; he expressed his hope that the document would be online by November 1st. He stated that when the document does appear on the website, a user of the site will be able to access it by clicking on a tab with the label "Emergency Preparedness".

III. Review of September Minutes: *Dixon* corrected one of the sentences within the minutes that had been sent to the senators. *Bybee* moved that the minutes be approved as changed. *Hutchinson* seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

IV. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs Committee: *Huckaby* presented a proposal from the committee, one in which an increase in cash amounts for Teaching Excellence Award (TEA) winners and runners-up would be sought. Eighteen senators voted for this measure, while two senators abstained. He also presented a second proposal, one which (as amended by *Bybee*) would reduce from three to two the number of years a faculty member must have been on campus to be "eligible for nomination for the TEA". There appeared to be widespread support for this idea. Nevertheless, *Tarver* suggested that the committee revisit both of these TEA-related issues; *Huckaby* agreed to take these matters back to the committee for further deliberation and investigation. *Nicholson* then spoke concerning a proposal he had formulated (regarding a change in office hours policy); he asked that no action be taken on it until the November meeting (after senators have had time to ponder the contents of the proposal and the rationale behind it). He moved that the committee revisit all of the above-mentioned committee issues (delaying any action on any of them). *Tarver* seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved.

B. By-Laws and Standing Rules Committee: *Ellery*, as did *Huckaby* before him, circulated a brief committee report. One issue discussed in a committee meeting was also discussed in this full senate session: in this discussion and in the committee report, *Ellery* confirmed the fact that the Faculty Senate president may appoint non-senate members to serve on special committees formed by the senate. In light of this fact, senators expressed a decided preference for leaving the Committee on Committees as it is (rather than making it a standing Faculty Senate committee, which would require most senators to serve on it, and which would also require an amendment to the senate by-laws). A final brief moment of discussion ensued, during which *Ellery* mentioned that the senate could (if it desired) begin to establish standing rules (though there is no record of any, as yet).

C. University Affairs: *Husein* reported that the committee would meet within two weeks.

D. Student Affairs: *Nicholson* stated that there were no current committee issues that he knew of.

E. External Affairs: Allen read a report prepared by Sauncy. The two main requests conveyed therein regarding the San Angelo Chamber of Commerce are (1) that the senate not "pursue any formal (Chamber) membership beyond that already established by the university as a whole" and (2) that *Tarver* meet with ASU President Joseph Rallo (who "officially represents Angelo State in Chamber Activities") "about the possibility of having a faculty member be a part of Chamber activities". It was confirmed that *Tarver* will meet with President Rallo. *Barbour* promoted the idea of having a Faculty Senate member being an official part of the ASU delegation at the Chamber, and he opined that such representation could counter the perception that the university is insufficiently concerned about the community. *May*, who for many years had chaired the Legislative Affairs Committee of the Chamber, agreed with *Barbour* on the perception issue; however, he expressed uncertainty regarding how greatly the senate would benefit by direct Chamber representation. (Incidentally, *Flage* expressed her desire that ASU be a Gold Member of the Chamber and add a contact person to its membership profile.) *Barbour* asked if the issue could be tabled until determinations could be made as to needed depth of financial and time commitments and as to the possibility of a Faculty Senate representative being named as an ASU contact person at the Chamber; *Tarver* agreed to this. *Dixon* suggested that the chairperson of the External Affairs Committee would be "the logical person" to look into these matters. Also mentioned in Sauncy's report was the request that the issue of "looking into" the ASU Bookstore's procedures for establishing textbook and laboratory manual prices be tabled. This request was made due to the fact that the committee has "been unable to get a meeting time for all committee members with the bookstore manager"; their aim has been to "procure a copy of the bookstore contract" "in the hope that the bookstore manager can provide" them "with the details of the contract".

V. Unfinished Business

A. Salary Equity Review: *Amos* reported that this committee has not met.

B. Revised Faculty Evaluation: Referring to the Presidential Salary Schedule Task Force, *Amos* reported that the group requested and received (from President Rallo) permission to continue the work it had begun in 2006 (after being appointed by then-President Hindman). The task force has been working to improve the university's annual evaluation procedure in ways that not only permit review of faculty performance but also enhanced faculty development. Part of what the task force seeks to do, she reported, is "work with departments" and also, especially, with the proposed Center for Innovation, Teaching, and Research, for improvement of faculty development opportunities. She mentioned that the task force desires to replace ASU's step promotion system with a performance achievement award framework; the award would be administered according to "a point-based system" and would be "for salary enhancement" (and tenure and tenure-track faculty would be eligible for it). She added that the task force's final proposal is due in early November; and she referred to the fact that the issues it has studied are among those that will be addressed by Dr. Rallo at the November Faculty Senate meeting. *Amos* explained that the original achievement award framework was also envisioned for non-tenure track faculty, but that now the case of faculty members in that category is being considered by a separate committee (and similar

opportunities for them are being looked into). *Prestiano* asked about the situations of faculty members who now find themselves "between steps". *Amos* replied that faculty members who are now eligible for a step promotion should "apply this year". *Huckaby* asked whether or not changes in salary brought on by the proposed new framework would "be retroactive to the last step" attained by a faculty member; *Amos* replied that the task force has not talked about that issue.

C. Honorary Doctorates: The committee, on which *May*, *Barbour*, and *Nick Flynn* will serve, will have a meeting in the near future.

D. Faculty Members to Assist Dr. Sarah Logan on SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools)-Related Initiatives: *Tarver* explained that the deans have already appointed certain individuals to work on these (therefore, the Faculty Senate will forego making its own appointments for this purpose).

E. Commencement/Graduation Policy: *Tarver* stated that "there must be formal guidelines if students are allowed to participate early". He mentioned that the deans are working on these and that *CASA* (the Council for Academic and Student Affairs) would have an opportunity to contribute its input as well.

F. Student Travel Requiring Faculty/Staff Accompaniment: Part of this issue is the fact that if two or more members of the faculty or staff participate in such travel, only one is compensated for expenses in advance. The other(s) would need to carry his/her/their own expenses at first and be compensated afterwards. *Nicholson* observed that the Faculty Senate will need to ask *Dr. Beck* whether *ASU's* policy is state policy or is a local regulation. *Dixon* asked the other senators whether or not a faculty member must accompany students on trips, and he asked whether or not all faculty members going on such trips can receive advances. (*Tarver* will investigate these matters.)

G. Texas Tech System Board Visit, September 27th-28th: *Tarver* mentioned that he reported to members of this board on nine Faculty Senate initiatives. He noted that all conversations with *Tech* persons have been "very positive". He also mentioned the importance of the role *Angelo State* plays not only in its "marriage" with *Tech*, but also in others' perception of how university realignment transitions can occur. He added that other, similar realignments are being investigated (and may occur in 2009). (Note: after this issue was addressed, the senate agreed to begin holding future meetings at a starting time of 3:15 p.m.)

H. Institutional Brand/Faculty Signature: *Tarver* reported that this issue is now "on the back burner".

I. Nine-/Twelve-Month Pay: *Tarver* reminded the senators that he had e-mailed them the latest update on this matter (and that the issue does not affect *ASU* employees until the 2008-2009 academic year).

J. Vision 2012 - Strategic Planning: *Tarver* mentioned that *President Rallo* has not yet called a meeting for this committee. The external consultant needed for the process has not yet been identified, *Tarver* reported.

K. April 2nd, 2008 Public Presentations: *Tarver* explained to the other senators that this will be a time in which "ASU showcases itself to the community". Information will be given regarding the institution's mission and vision, the initiatives already achieved by that time, and initiatives still in the planning stage by that time.

VI. New Business: It was mentioned that *Nicholson's* office hours policy proposal is one item of new business. Another such item is the fact that the 2003 Tenure and Promotion Guidelines have been posted to the Faculty Senate website (for consultation purposes, to help those involved in this year's processes). Yet another item of new business is the Centennial Village Time Capsule Committee: *Tarver* reiterated the fact that the senate is able to appoint non-senators to this committee, and he mentioned that one committee meeting has been held (and that the burial of the capsule would take place in about a year) (and that more information on the work of this committee would be disseminated later).

VII. Roundtable Issues: *May* encouraged the establishment of departmental links, contacts, and networking with Texas Tech counterparts. He emphasized that, with "entrenched lobbying", these efforts could maximize possibilities for receiving federal funding for projects. He advised that senators following his suggestion keep Carol Diminnie, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, and Rhonda McClung, Director of Development, "in the loop" regarding funding initiatives. He mentioned that some ASU departments have already met with their Tech counterparts, and he added that Tech units have been encouraged to "visit us, too" (for the sharing of "ideas, if nothing else"). *Allen* added that there are matriculation agreements (for some programs) between the two universities as well.

VIII. Budget: *Tarver* reported that in account number 0100-61025, the Faculty Senate has \$1,800.00 (and that in account number 0700-62235, the Faculty Senate has \$1,065.96).

IX. Adjournment and Information Regarding Next Full Senate Meeting: *Tarver* notified the other senators that in order to accommodate Dr. *Rallo's* schedule, the November 13th meeting will be at 2 p.m. *Hutchinson* made a motion for adjournment; the motion was seconded by *Nicholson*. The motion passed by a 20-0 vote. Adjournment was at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell,
Secretary, Faculty Senate

ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

November 13th, 2007

I. Roll Call

A. Members Present: Jamal Husein, Michael Buck, Dan Khanna, David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), James Jones, Mary Sanders, Steven Snowden, Robert Prestiano, John Nicholson, Chris Ellery, John Glassford (for Jack Barbour), Guoqiang Zheng, David O'Dell, Michael Dixon, David Huckaby, Trish Hutchinson (Faculty Senate Vice President), Nick Flynn, Ron Bybee, Bonnie Amos (Past Faculty Senate President), Toni Sauncy

B. Others Present: Don Coers (Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Yzelda Sam Hinojosa (Administrative Assistant, Office of Academic and Student Affairs and also Staff Senate member), Susan Keith (from the Presidential Salary Schedule Task Force), Jesse Gómez (Director of Human Resources)

II. Issues Addressed by Invited Guests

A. Jesse Gómez: Mr. Gómez referred to an initiative presented by the Staff Senate, namely, the service awards program (for employees completing ten, fifteen, twenty [and beyond] years of continuous full-time service at ASU). With their initiative, the members of the Staff Senate seek to recognize "breaks in service" and part-time service (dependent on percentage of time worked, e.g. twenty years of half-time service would equal ten years of service that can be rewarded). Gómez stated that he was present at the Faculty Senate meeting to solicit input on this measure, and he mentioned that he would provide the specific wording of it to *Tarver*. Gómez added that if the measure passes, it would still be difficult to implement the changes it entails by the time of next year's awards program (due to the amount of time it would take to deal with the administrative details, such as tracking service hour totals of various employees). *Nicholson* then asked Gómez if there is a financial award given for years of service; the reply was that after ten years a certificate is awarded (and then, for service totals of five-year increments following the ten-year benchmark, the awards given are in the form of merchandise from the bookstore catalogue, such as desk accessories, pens, and lamps [as well as the cost of the dinner provided at the awards ceremony]). Gómez also mentioned that Texas Tech University (TTU) (in its employee service awards program) rewards part-time service and time spent in student service. He added that this issue was also being discussed before the Texas Tech-ASU merger took place, and he stated that he would find out just how the Texas Tech employee service awards program works (in more detail). He also mentioned that he would send forward the Staff Senate's endorsement of the measure, along with a list of pros and cons. *Tarver* then asked Gómez about the status of Section 409 (A) of the Internal Revenue Service Code (which, according to Gómez, may end up affecting deferred compensation options for ASU employees, beginning next September); the reply was that Texas Tech has contacted its attorneys, who will find out whether or not institutions of higher education are to be affected by this regulation.

B. Provost Coers: The provost first spoke of Texas Tech-Angelo State collaborations and the travel involved in establishing them. He announced that tomorrow he will address the Texas Tech system regents (in a meeting he described as a preliminary session to the upcoming board meeting). He mentioned more of his November meetings, including one with Dean Kevin Lambert (College of Liberal and Fine Arts), Communication/Drama/Journalism Department Head June Smith, and Pat Turner (Instructor in Communication/Radio/TV) concerning a possible format change and a facilities modification coming to National Public Radio outlet KUTX (i.e. a format change to classical music and the creation of three digital substations) once TTU assumes control of the station. Dr. Coers also mentioned having met with his TTU counterpart and also (with ASU Dean of the College of Sciences Grady Price Blount) with Dr. Pamela Eiback, Dean of TTU's College of Engineering (about articulation agreements). Other topics of meetings with TTU representatives have been the first-year experience concept and enrollment management. Provost Coers also alluded to an upcoming meeting (at the end of November in Austin) (with Associate Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer Doug Fox) regarding contracts with Unisystems, DIR (the Department of Information Resources), and IBM. He also reported having met last week with two IBM representatives, and he described the possibility of an arrangement with that company as a "public-private partnership" that may allow for the possibility of internships for ASU students. He also alluded to a program called Honors Advantage. The provost then spoke to the elimination, on campus, of phone trees; however, he mentioned the Administration's awareness of the fact that a "one size fits all"-type policy is not workable in an absolute sense. He mentioned that the Academic and Student Affairs unit met regarding this matter. He spoke to the possibility, in some cases, of having a second ("separate, unpublished", "for internal use only") phone line in order to allow for faster direct communication with a specific person. He reported that a two-page memo on recent phone policy developments (ones that are now in effect, he stated) and proposals had been sent to the deans and department heads, to the secretaries, and to ASU President Rallo. Dr. Coers explained that the document has been sent "out for commentary and feedback" to him, and he added that feedback can either be given to him directly or to one's department head. Then the provost announced that given the reorganization that is taking place in Academic and Student Affairs, there will be some job description changes. He specifically stated that a degree audit position and a budget position will be added. He explained that with these changes, Hinojosa will be "freed up to morph into her new position". He also announced the addition of two more positions designed to enable the university to achieve HSI (Hispanic-Serving Institution) status; he mentioned having taken this matter to the Deans' Council to solicit their input on the ways to most efficiently use the money set aside for these HSI-related personnel moves. Dr. Coers then named more to-be-created positions within his unit. One will be a first-year experience coordinator post. Another will be for a "web magician" (a person well-versed in information technology whose job will be designed to ease technological burdens of faculty, department heads, and deans). Another opportunity will be at least a half-position in the area of imaging. Also, the provost reported that university commencements will henceforth be directed by the Registrar's Office (where the position of the person dealing with them will be enhanced). After his reports, Dr. Coers was thanked by Tarver for his help in enabling him (Tarver) to access and utilize

Banner to study budget issues. Then a senator asked Dr. Coers why the formerly-online *Faculty-Staff Handbook* has been removed from the internet location where it had been (since the policies therein are still in place). Dr. Coers replied that policy regarding the handbook is still changing. He reminded the senate that the division with oversight of the handbook is the president's office. He mentioned the most recent Select Faculty Committee (SFC) (on Tenure and Promotion) changes (and the need to keep them current), and he noted that his office has sent reminders so that faculty will consult the latest version of the handbook (since "significant changes" occurred in 2002, 2003, and other years). Dr. Coers expressed his wish that the latest version could be online perpetually. Then *Amos* reported that she had related to ASU President Joseph Rallo how Dr. Jeffrey Schonberg and some of his students had worked on an online version of some chapters of the handbook. She also relayed the news that there has been some difficulty in getting the ASU handbook's "verbiage to agree with Texas Tech's" because TTU's "is clearer". She added that there are legal aspects of the handbook's contents that need to be checked out and okayed. She then mentioned that President Rallo also asked for an additional portion of the handbook to be created and approved, that is, a portion relating to non-tenure track faculty. It was also mentioned that not all of ASU's and TTU's policies are concomitant, and that ASU (though not in a substantial way) changed certain ones to make them more concordant. The changes have been sent to the Texas Tech regents, who will act on them next week at their meeting. Dr. Coers pointed out that there had been support for the idea of separating the faculty and staff portions of the handbook, and he stated that because of this "we can take more time" to iron out handbook-related issues (although he also acknowledged that he knows that the status of the handbook has been "a source of frustration"). He invited anyone eyeing a step promotion this year to call his office to be sure about being updated with regard to the latest SFC changes and to be sure about the tenure and promotion guidelines from the 2003 version of the *Faculty-Staff Handbook*. *Tarver* pointed out that those 2003 guidelines are available on the Faculty Senate web page, and he announced that this afternoon the Tenure and Promotion Committee is to meet at 3:30 p.m. and discuss portfolio contents. *Tarver* also reminded the senators that President Rallo has decided that current tenure and promotion policies (pending any changes made at the 3:30 meeting) will be adhered to this year.

III. Review of October Minutes: *Hutchinson* moved the approval of the minutes as submitted. *Bybee* seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

IV. Address to the Faculty Senate by University President Rallo: The president first thanked the senate for the opportunity to speak, and he mentioned that he looks forward to a shared governance experience at ASU. He then mentioned that he would move, in his talk, from broad issues (he has been working on) to specifics. The first broad issue he mentioned was strategic planning (including the drafting of values and vision statements, the creation and functioning of planning pods, and transparent public presentations of university-level plans). The second broad area that has been addressed by the new president is student retention. Regarding this, Dr. Rallo reminded the senators of the record size of this year's freshman class, and he mentioned measures employed (and to be employed) to help retain these students (including University Center food and hours of operation, residence

hall issues, a first-year experience, flexible hours for classes, and on-campus activities). The third broad area is that of physical facilities and infrastructure projects (examples: Centennial Village, food service opening in August, the "one-stop shopping" area in the "shoe box of the Hardeman Building" [with access to Financial Aid included], the planned Center for International/Multicultural Studies, the movement of the police station to the corner of Avenue N and Jackson Street, infrastructure changes that may result from the passing [by the students] of a recreation center fee, and the proposed closing of Johnson Street [with safety issues in mind]). The first of the specific issues he mentioned is faculty recruitment and retention (he is looking at the possibility of faculty time off for research and the possibility of augmenting nine-month salaries). The second is overload compensation. The third is the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research. After mentioning these areas, Dr. Rallo cited the efforts of Drs. *Amos*, Beck (Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), and *Tarver* to help to get ASU "pay schedules...lined up with the normal template for peer institutions". He also referred to one of the facets of the work of the Presidential Salary Schedule Task Force headed up by *Amos*, namely the proposed evaluation system in which productivity expectations for faculty would be generated at the departmental level and, subsequently, supervised for the sake of equity of standards on a university-wide level. He also assured the senators that the university-wide planning process would be aligned with the institution's growth and vision statements. The president then mentioned that there are eighteen vacant tenure-track positions on campus, and added that there is also a need for new positions. He reported that the university now spends almost two million dollars per year on adjunct faculty. He then explained that there will be a plan whereby, on a department-by-department basis, the need for adjuncts will be assessed and provided for (according to the institution's vision and needs). He said of his tenure in office, "It's been a great five months"; and he opened up the floor for questions. Nicholson asked President Rallo for his characterization of "adjuncts"; the answer he received was that they are looked at as full-time employees and that Dr. Rallo expects the deans and department heads to study the status of this segment of the faculty (in terms of the question of which is "the best way to use faculty resources" in the light of what "expectations in the classroom" should be). Another senator asked the president about how to balance the drive to increase enrollment (which will, inevitably, lead to a greater number of weak students) with realistic retention expectations. The president replied that his idea is to take the current pool of students and expand it, especially so as to reach underrepresented groups. He added that he also believes in ASU recruiting to its strengths, such as the sciences, and, perhaps, even creating new colleges. He then mentioned another idea, that of creating new programs, such as the International Studies program that the Department of Modern Languages has undertaken to develop. He also mentioned the potential of new programs to attract more students. Then he added that it is also possible to grow programs that are attractive and that have the capacity to become more attractive, such as Chemistry with Forensic Chemistry offered as well. He characterized ideas such as these as allowing the university to "grow by getting better". *Tarver* quickly referred to a graduate-level School Counseling program that already fits this mold. President Rallo named three areas in which ASU has control of its growth and retention capabilities; one is the pool of students who are already here. Another is the potential

for crafting new programs. The third is the spillover effect of students being admitted to Texas Tech and there being no room for them there. He affirmed that he wants the university to "search for very good students". *Nicholson* asked the president how retention rates are reliably calculated since for many students, staying at ASU is not what they have in mind anyhow when they first enroll. The president replied that many people are unaware of the resources that exist here, such as the great faculty and impressive rate of graduate school acceptance of our graduates. He noted that ASU is the only public institution that has not grown lately. *Hutchinson* then asked the president about what can be done to address weaknesses in advising on campus. Dr. Rallo, in his reply, mentioned his goal of having advising be improved technologically and a "six-semester view" implemented. He also mentioned that he would like to see an optimum balance between professional advisers and faculty advisers. *Bybee* asked the president whether he would have the Faculty Senate to be composed only of tenure track faculty members. Possible alignment with Texas Tech, in that regard, was mentioned; however, Dr. Rallo stated that he does not set rules for the Faculty Senate. Another senator espoused the view that it is problematic for department heads to remain in their positions indefinitely. The president stated that expectations for deans and department heads will be studied. *Tarver* then asked a question about what is happening, in big-picture terms, with the university budget. President Rallo, in his answer, mentioned several budget realities--the recent tuition increase of 15%, fee structure adjustment, and the setting aside (on the part of then-ASU President James Hindman) of one million salary dollars. He added that there has been a reallocation of funds for a Vice President of Strategic Planning position, and he also reminded the senators that the number of positions in the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has dropped from two to one. He mentioned that the State has provided two million dollars for new positions. He also noted that the university has been conservative with its fund balances; therefore, a good amount of money is available. Finally, with regard to this topic, he stated that if the Nursing Department is doubled, money needs to be allocated toward that. In response to a question by *Huckaby* regarding the Carr scholarship program, the president mentioned that three and one-half million dollars per year is the sum spent on those scholarships. He stated that roughly one out of every six ASU students receives a Carr scholarship. He mentioned that the scholarship distribution process is being re-evaluated. There is now a collection process, investment of Carr funds, and an allocation process that will change dramatically, most notably in the direction of additional programs "that we want to grow". He also stated that Carr assets will be moved to a Texas Tech fund, where the rate of return will be about 18% (which is more than three times higher than the current rate of return). He observed that this type of reallocation, based on "programmatic and growth desires", involves no loss of control of the program. *Khanna* then asked a question about faculty being able to take classes. Dr. Rallo replied that faculty credits are not allowed in the state of Texas, but that for persons over a certain age earned course credit may be awarded for free. *Nicholson* asked Dr. Rallo about the energy- and cost-saving potential of the new buildings going up across campus. The president replied that one of them is a lead-certified silver building. He also expressed optimism regarding future developments in the area of wind energy technology. *Amos* then brought up the matter of availability of ASU T-shirts at places other than the ASU Bookstore. The president

replied that he wishes to have an off-campus agreement with a vendor such as Wal-Mart. He added a note about the need for a new merchandise provider for the ASU Bookstore. He also mentioned that he likes an idea brought forward by *Amos*, namely, that of a random lottery award in which the winning student receives an ASU T-shirt. The president mentioned that he wants to pass on this idea to Ryan Mason. *Snowden* chimed in with an additional idea he has seen put in practice at other campuses, that of a T-shirt of some other university worn by a student being swapped for a T-shirt of (as applied here) Angelo State. The next question came from *Hutchinson* (regarding the status of distance learning on campus). The president made it clear that this delivery method is not the expectation for all ASU students, and he also observed that some classes will be of a "blended" delivery style. It was noted there are some departments in which there is more interest in distance learning (than in others), and *Hutchinson* added the observation that there are international students who are interested in distance learning also. President Rallo then mentioned some line-item funding from Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison's office that will be very helpful to ASU: it will consist of two million dollars for the addition to the Hardeman Building;; two million dollars for ASU, Texas Tech, and Goodfellow Air Force Base instructors to take advantage of special seminars from Air University; and two million dollars for more technological improvements on campus, such as the construction of interactive walls that will enable real-time interaction. The president also mentioned, in closing, that he wants more international students on campus. *Tarver* thanked Dr. Rallo for addressing the senate. The president expressed his thanks as well, and he added that the senators will be pleased with some announcements that will be made soon.

V. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs Committee: *Huckaby* reported that the committee he chairs is getting ready to begin the yearly Teaching Excellence Award (TEA) process. He added that *Nicholson* had been endeavoring to look at the award amounts given at other institutions but had recommended that we keep the amounts the same this year (and perhaps look to increase them next year). *Huckaby* added that reducing the time requirement for the TEA from three to two years would not affect CASE or Piper Award nomination criteria.

VI. Unfinished Business

A. Student Travel Requiring Faculty/Staff Accompaniment: *Tarver* mentioned that he had visited briefly with President Rallo regarding this matter, but that he (*Tarver*) needed to understand it more completely.

B. University Calendar Committee: *Hutchinson* reported that she is on this committee for the 2008-2009 academic year and that there will be a meeting of the committee next week. She added that she wants to pursue the Wednesday-before-Thanksgiving holiday issue that the Faculty Senate dealt with last year. But she stated that she is in need of a proposal to bring forward.

C. Honorary Doctorate Committee: *Flynn*, who serves on this committee, reported that the persons receiving an honorary doctorate at December commencements would do so for community service and that those receiving an honorary doctorate at May commencements would do so for being significant donors or potential donors to the university. He added that interested nominators may forward him names and the reasons for their submission (and he will then forward them to the committee at large). On a final note, he mentioned that the first conferment will take place this coming May.

VII. New Business

A. Office Hours Policy: It was stated that *Nicholson's* office hour policy change proposal had been tabled so that what is done elsewhere regarding office hours could be studied. It was decided that the Academic Affairs Committee would study the issue and (perhaps also) conduct a faculty survey on it.

B. Student Advising: *Buck* raised some advising-related issues where problems have arisen. For instance, some students, due to bad advising, have ended up taking courses they do not need (and, therefore, graduating later than they had planned). Another problem that was described related to the ability of some secretaries on campus to clear advising holds. *Buck* and *Nicholson* called for standards to be implemented for student advising. *Sauncy* pointed out, as well, that there needs to be adviser training for the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research (ITR). *Tarver* declared that at the upcoming CASA (Council of Academic and Student Affairs) and Deans and Department Heads meetings, he will bring up the issue of advising frustrations. *Nicholson* opined that the use of spreadsheets on Rampart "can be part of the solution". *Flynn* added that such a setup could include a record of recommended classes to help at advising time. *Sauncy* also called for "a uniform (advising) format" to be instituted via the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research. *Buck* asked what is done regarding these issues at Texas Tech (TTU), and *Tarver* mentioned that he would soon meet face-to-face with his TTU counterparts and be able to ask them specific questions regarding advising. *Nicholson* emphasized the potential consequences for retention that quality of advising carries. Another senator mentioned that in his five years at ASU, he has not received any training regarding how he is expected to advise students. *Nicholson* advocated the idea of a one-hour-per-month faculty forum, wherein issues dealt with could be taken up with Dr. Rallo at some point. *Bybee* and *Tarver* reminded the other senators that we do represent our faculty and should do a good job of reporting back to them the news that arises at Faculty Senate meetings. *Tarver* then underscored that point for the benefit of all present (implored his fellow senators to not only report "as well as possible", but also to "gather issues" that need to be addressed in the senate).

C. Student Health Issues: A discussion ensued regarding the need to have a plan of action ready to be implemented when a student is mismedicated by the University Clinic or shows signs of a mental health disorder (especially signs that threaten faculty and other students). Concern was expressed that current policy does not enable faculty to be proactive in any meaningful sense in such situations. One senator espoused the idea of a planning pod to work on such issues. It was emphasized that the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research

would be the entity which, when it is up and running, would be the appropriate one to conduct the oversight of these matters.

D. Radio Station Format: *Dixon* expressed the desire for something to be done to preserve National Public Radio programming on KUTX here locally. *Nicholson* mentioned that Pat Turner (Communication, Drama, and Journalism Department Instructor) would be the person to contact regarding that.

E. Strategic Planning Committee: *Tarver* mentioned that this committee will meet for the first time on November 28th and that it will meet every two weeks thereafter through March 2008. He reported that metrics of success will be established.

VIII. Faculty Senate Budget Balances: *Tarver* reported that they remain unchanged from October.

IX. Adjournment: *Tarver* mentioned when the next meeting would be (December 12th at 3:15 p.m.). Then, at 4:10 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell,
Secretary, Faculty Senate

ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

December 12, 2007

I. Roll Call

A. Members Present: David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), Chris Ellery, Jamal Husein, Jack Barbour, Mike Buck, Guoquiang Zheng, Steven Snowden, Ron Bybee, David O'Dell, Mary Sanders, Nick Flynn, Toni Sauncy, James Jones, Bonnie Amos (Past Faculty Senate President), John Nicholson, Brian May, Mike Dixon, David Huckaby

B. Others Present: Don Coers (Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Richard Beck (Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Lynsey Flage (Chair-Elect of the Staff Senate)

II. Comments from Guests

A. Provost Coers: The provost reported that he had returned from a SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools)-related meeting, and that he is going to go tomorrow to a Texas Tech University (TTU) System Board of Regents meeting. He stated that there has been much interest in the progress that has been made regarding the goal of ASU's achieving HSI (Hispanic Serving Institution) status, for which the requisite Hispanic enrollment percentages are set federally. He also mentioned that TTU's percentage is 12-12.5% (and that a consultant was needed on that campus in order for it to increase its percentage), and that ASU's was around twice that of TTU. Dr. Coers also reported that discussions have continued regarding the arrangement of IBM/Unisystems internships for TTU and ASU students. He added that the TTU System regents are interested in this arrangement as well. Turning to an on-campus issue, Provost Coers announced that he had taken to University President Joseph Rallo a plan to use Academic and Student Affairs division funds for the hiring of a Technical Services Specialist, someone who could offer assistance with Blackboard, distance education, and other such matters. He (the provost) also spoke of his desire for there to be a Process Integration Analyst for all divisions of the university, one who would use Banner to accomplish needed tasks. He added that the deans and department heads had been offering their input regarding this potential position. Then Dr. Coers mentioned the committee that has been looking into room utilization issues (and the progress it has been making). He mentioned that the committee's effort consists of "finding ways to spare as many classrooms as possible", and he added that a subcommittee dealing with this initiative will hold a meeting before Christmas. After reporting this, the provost mentioned that there has been continued improvement on SACS-related initiatives (dealing with self-study and institutional effectiveness issues), especially through the identification of challenges and implementation of changes; he reminded the senators that ASU needs to go through three more self-study cycles before the 2013 accreditation visit takes place. Following this report, Dr. Coers mentioned a quality enhancement document (dealing with online marketing and the monitoring thereof). He stated, "We've had great success with that with ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) implementation, so we plan to use it again." He then mentioned, in passing, a plan for a cap on resources to be administered by deans and department heads. Returning to the issue of the TTU Board of Regents meeting, he then announced that it will take place tomorrow through Friday. Then a question came from *Ellery* regarding how it will be determined "who loses" classroom space when the relevant committee brings forward its recommendations. The provost replied that it is not yet known what will be done about that issue, but that the committee is attempting to achieve "the look and feel of a residential campus". He added that the creation of lounge areas is one of the proposals that have been advanced.

III. Review of November Minutes: *Bybee* moved the adoption of the November 13th minutes. *May* seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. Standing Committee Reports:

A. Academic Affairs: Committee chair *Huckaby* reported that the Teaching Excellence Award (TEA)

announcement has been sent out. He added that the deadline will be around February 13th and that there be a few more days in which it may be possible, if need be, to extend it.

(No other committee gave a report at this meeting.)

V. New Business

A. Presentation from Bonnie Amos and Richard Beck (concerning the proposed Professional Achievement Award procedure): It was noted that the Presidential Salary Task Force, originally named by former ASU President James Hindman, had been constituted in May of 2006 (and that it would continue through January of 2008). ASU's salary schedule, *Amos* explained, was unique and had not been studied for a long time. The task force (whose members were mentioned by name by *Amos*) studied it and the possibility of merit-type alternatives. Two subcommittees of the task force were formed, one to study financial issues and one to analyze evaluation procedures. The task force, as a whole, was described by *Amos* as "a review board" for the subcommittees' findings and recommendations.

The initial change took place when the task force, as a whole, voted to work to replace the current step promotion framework (especially since many faculty members had reached a point of being unable to advance further via step promotions). In addition, the group felt that a salient disadvantage of the faculty schedule is that it is so difficult for almost everyone to use it to accurately calculate faculty salaries. The task force, in its first year of deliberations, worked toward the development of strategy and policy recommendations to forward to then-President Hindman. This was accomplished at the end of the Spring 2007 semester, and those recommendations included simplifying the schedule, replacing the steps with a merit system, establishing uniform guidelines and procedures for the achievement of merit increases, and improving the annual faculty evaluation guidelines and procedures. The group's proposals originally included non tenure-track faculty, but since coming to ASU President Rallo has asked that faculty be removed from the proposed new framework (their situation is currently being addressed by a separate committee chaired by *Tarver*, who stated that they will have some type of framework that will enable them to pursue a certain degree of advancement in salary and in title).

Amos presented (via PowerPoint and a set of handouts) (and with clarifications and further explanations by Beck) the new evaluation and PAA system; the information she imparted will be placed on the R: drive and may be sent to any interested individual via e-mail by *Amos*. She announced that Dr. Nancy Allen (English Department) is working on a narrative (explaining the new system) that may be available as early as next week. Beck stated, "We're drafting a narrative in order to continue with the process" (referring to the proposed new system). *Amos* added that some *Faculty-Staff Handbook* changes will need to be made in light of the implementation of the system.

Buck made an observation in which he expressed concern about how delayed the giving of feedback to a faculty member will be under the new system. His comment was praised by *Amos* as well-founded and worthy of further thought.

Amos described departmentally-defined criteria as "the heart of the PAA". She mentioned that these criteria are to be defined and approved prior to each annual evaluation cycle. She added that during the Spring 2008 semester Departmental Criteria (DC) are to be established, and that the first PAA system documents could be submitted during the Fall 2008 semester. *Nicholson* stated that the DC documents should be posted electronically for all to see, even as they are being worked on (to allow across-the-campus comparisons of point assignments for various activities).

The remaining overarching points concerning the proposed PAA and new evaluation framework (that may not be fully covered by the aforementioned PowerPoint presentation) are as follows: (1) as was stressed by *Amos*, the PAA is "a criteria-based, non-competitive award". (2) She also emphasized that President Rallo has guaranteed that the resources to fund the PAA will be made available. (3) The PAA is also an amount added to the base

salary of the recipient. (4) Points toward a PAA may be carried over from one year to the next. (5) A limit of five bonus points toward a PAA is permitted annually. (6) Dr. Amos added that a person may apply for a PAA and a rank promotion at the same time. (7) According to Dr. Rallo, clinical (but not non-clinical) professional specialists will be PAA-eligible. (8) Lastly, with regard to the yearly evaluation process for faculty, a rating criterion (between "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory") has been added--"satisfactory, improvement needed".

B. Presentation from Skip Bolding, Director of Environmental Health, Safety, and Risk Management:

Faculty Senate President *Tarver*, at this point of the meeting, mentioned that Mr. Bolding was to address the senate next, but that he had to take care of a minor emergency; therefore, he was unable to be present.

VI. Miscellaneous Updates

A. Additional Information on Salary Equity Review: It was reported that the Salary Equity Review Committee is composed of Dr. Beck, Dr. *Amos*, Dr. Susan Keith (Kinesiology), and Ms. Yzelda Sam Hinojosa (Administrative Assistant of Academic and Student Affairs). *May* asked Beck when results of the committee's deliberations would be known. Dr. Beck's reply was that since the budget needs to be in by February 1st, recommendations to the committee need to be made by late January or early February. It was also mentioned that the Staff Senate is dealing with salary equity issues for staff; Human Resources Director Jesse Gómez is in charge of a group working on that issue (and Flage reported that this group does not yet have a timeline for its tasks). *Tarver* emphasized that the achievement of faculty salary equity can provide a measure of "attractiveness for assistant (professor) positions", lead to better faculty retention rates, and offset anticipated cutbacks in summer salaries.

B. Faculty Senate Sunset Review: *Tarver* reported that a letter dated December 1st makes official the Faculty Senate's status as a re-appointed, re-approved working body.

C. Faculty-Staff Handbook Update: *Snowden*, who (on a departmental level) is working on re-accreditation issues, asked "Where are we...?" with regard to the updating of this document. Beck explained that TTU asked ASU to analyze its policies and compare them to TTU's and to those of the TTU Board of Regents. He stated that this was done and that as many of them as possible were converted to TTU's format. He also said that further work on the project is being done in the office of Vice President for Finance and Administration Sharon Meyer, and he added that it is anticipated that Board of Regents approval of the converted document will take place in February. Beck stated that after that, it will be possible to "extract policies back out" for the re-molding of the handbook. He noted that Chapter 4 required "a substantive rewrite" (since many changes were needed). Beck described the overall process by saying that the handbook is being "diced up and plugged into the new format", but that it is "still in effect".

VII. Faculty Senate Budget: Balances remain the same as for November.

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell,
Secretary, Faculty Senate

ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 13, 2008

I. Roll Call

A. Members Present: David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), Mike Buck, William Fuller, Chris Ellery, Jamal Husein, Jack Barbour, Guoquiang Zheng, Steven Snowden, Ron Bybee, David O'Dell, Mary Sanders, Toni Sauncy, James Jones, John Nicholson, Brian May, David Huckaby, Martha Sleutel, Michael Dixon

B. Others Present: Lynsey Flage (Chair-Elect of the Staff Senate), Don Coers (Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Trish Hutchinson (Director of the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research [CITR])

II. Comments from Guests

A. Lynsey Flage: Flage mentioned the names of the winners of the Staff Excellence Awards, and she added that there had been 25 nominees. She expressed her gratitude for the record number of nominations this year. Flage added that although the Student Senate is still pursuing a proposal to have the day before Thanksgiving as a student holiday, the Staff Senate chose not to do the same. She stated, however, that this potential holiday has been added to the proposed academic calendar (pending Deans' Council approval). *Nicholson* affirmed that the Faculty Senate will revisit that issue "at a later time". (During this part of the meeting, *Huckaby* reported that the Student Senate had unanimously voted against the XF proposal that Liberal and Fine Arts Dean Kevin Lambert had presented to the Faculty Senate during its January meeting. *Huckaby* added that he needed to "catch up with" Dean Lambert and ask him about the current status of the proposal.)

B. Provost Coers: The provost announced that there will be a search (and a search committee formed) soon for the position of Dean of the College of Graduate Studies. He stated that many people have already sent in applications for the position. He then mentioned that the individuals charged with direct oversight of the change in bookstore vendor (Follett is now, again, the company with the contract) are University President Joseph Rallo, Sharon Meyer (Vice President of Finance and Administration), Arlene Freatman (Finance and Administration Administrative Assistant), and Greg Pecina (Special Events Facilities / Services Director). He mentioned the potential effect of House Bill 188 on textbooks (beginning at the kindergarten level and extending through higher education levels); he added that institutions are being encouraged to arrange for "the best possible deals" (to hold down textbook costs). He observed that "other states are concerned" about textbook costs as well. Dr. Coers mentioned having lunch (and a discussion of this issue) with the assistant to the provost at a university in Missouri during a conference of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; the administrator from Missouri told Dr. Coers that at his institution (Northwest Missouri State University) there is a program in which primary textbooks are leased to students at a rate of \$5 per semester credit hour. Dr. Coers made it clear that if ASU had a comparable policy, there would be a need for a mechanism for the stipulation of "intelligent exceptions" (which are warranted, for instance, as he explained, in cases such as significant scientific advancements). He commented that lease arrangements are easier to legislatively prescribe than to concretely bring about. He reported that he had talked to Greg Pecina, who has put in an RFP (Request for Proposals) for a lease arrangement (something that Follett has said it will consider, but only if use of a text for a minimum of three years is guaranteed). Provost Coers urged the Faculty Senate to consider that (and he will urge the Deans' Council and others to do the same); he stated that he needs to prepare a recommendation that President Rallo can take to the Texas Tech System Chancellor (and he added that the Texas Tech Board of Regents is also concerned about textbook costs). He reported that he will amass feedback on the textbook leasing issue and relay it to the Deans' Council. (*Dixon* commented that ASU needs credit when it offers books via online purchasing options.) Turning then to other issues, Dr. Coers reported that the director of the Honors Program at Texas Tech (TTU) is here today for a meeting about a medical school arrangement and a law school arrangement with ASU. The reciprocal agreement would involve admissions in those TTU schools for ASU

students in exchange for TTU's receiving permission to use ASU's data center (the Texas State Data Center). He added that TTU Provost Bill Marcy will undertake the follow-up negotiations regarding this potential agreement. Dr. Coers also mentioned the agreement ASU and TTU now have with IBM for two students from each university to assume internships; he said that ASU faculty will oversee the ASU students' participation and that ASU course credit would be granted for successful completion of the internship. Also, the provost mentioned having attended (over the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday) a meeting of the Hill Country Advisory Committee. He stated that "one of the greatest advantages of the merger" (with TTU) has been the opportunity to "grow both the undergraduate and (especially) graduate programs" through ASU's link to the TTU campuses in the Hill Country (Fredericksburg, Junction, and Marble Falls). He observed that *Tarver* had voluntarily taken the lead in this initiative. He also mentioned the existence of an advisory committee, which deals with this MITC (multi-institution teaching center) initiative, within the (ASU) School of Education.

C. CITR Director Hutchinson (see "New Business" below)

III. Review of January Minutes: *Ellery* moved the adoption of the January minutes. The motion was seconded, and the minutes were approved by a vote of 16-0 (two senators were not yet present).

IV. Standing Committee Reports:

A. Academic Affairs: Committee chair *Huckaby* reported that five nominations for the Teaching Excellence Award (TEA) have been received and that the deadline will be February 19th.

V. Unfinished Business

A. ASU Foundation Board (note corrected name: in previous minutes, it was referred to as Texas Tech System Development Board): *Tarver* informed the other senators that University President Rallo wants ASU faculty representation through one board membership slot. He (*Tarver*) added that TTU will develop a foundation board of its own, and that the ASU Foundation Board will report to TTU's Foundation Board. He added that President Rallo likes the Faculty Senate's choice of the Faculty Senate vice president (whoever s/he may be at any given time) to be the ASU Foundation Board's faculty representative.

B. Faculty Senate Website: *Tarver* reminded the other senators that *Husein* has volunteered to make sure that the site is kept accurate and up-to-date. He added that Doug Fox (Associate Vice President for Information Technology [IT] and Chief Information Officer) has assigned Carey Taylor of IT to work with *Husein* on this.

C. ASU Core Curriculum Committee: *Tarver* related to the other senators the fact that President Rallo wants the Faculty Senate to have major responsibility for, and major input into, the oversight of this committee. *Tarver* added, "Our current structure is the best way", especially (among other reasons) given our impending visit from SACS (the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities) and core curriculum assessments we will have to undergo. Referring to the current status of the Core Curriculum Committee, *Tarver* mentioned that through the Committee on Committees, the Core Curriculum Committee has been reinstated (and *Nicholson* added that it is an advisory committee [with a slightly modified charge from before] that works in conjunction with Dr. Sarah Logan [Institutional Research and Assessment Director], who is in charge of the budgetary assets and processes for core curriculum assessment).

VI. New Business

A. CITR Director Hutchinson: Dr. Hutchinson reported to the senators that her office is already set up, but that she does not have any help yet. She did state, however, that perhaps there will be a student helper for her. She said that work so far has centered on issues such as needs assessment, formulation of vision and mission statements, and coming to an agreement with the Administration regarding the role of the center. She added that an advisory board for the CITR is being formed (and that a Faculty Senate representative for the board is being sought). Dr. Hutchinson mentioned the vacancy left by the departure of Dr. Carol Diminnie (who was Dean of the

College of Graduate Studies and Director of Research and Faculty Innovation [and whose position is being advertised on ASU's website and in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*]). *Tarver* encouraged his fellow senators to tell anyone who may be interested about this job opening, and he added that March 14th is the deadline for applications (which can be submitted by individuals who hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor). *Dr. Hutchinson* continued her report, mentioning that other issues that have been dealt with at the CTR include budget review (especially given the vacancy left by *Dr. Diminnie*), realignment according to a new reporting structure, the development of marketing materials, and the assumption of responsibility for the New Faculty Orientation (formerly a Faculty Senate undertaking). She also noted that a crucial part of the needs assessment she has been involved with has been an effort to avoid the duplication of services provided on campus. She asked the senators for help and information regarding initiatives that "can be centralized through the CTR". In response to a question from *Sauncy*, she clarified the fact that an e-mail regarding the CTR's needs assessment will be sent to the entire faculty (and that the e-mail can be printed and sent back, or replied to directly). Finally, she reported that analysis of the database generated by responses to the e-mail will take place between March 15th and March 30th.

B. New Senator for Art & Music—Dr. Jeff Womack: *Tarver* announced that *Dr. Womack* will be the new senator from Art & Music and that his name (and that of *Sleutel*) had been added to the membership list. He added that a new roster will soon be sent to *Husein* and *Taylor* for website updating.

C. Election of Faculty Senate Vice President: Nominations from the floor were solicited. *Zheng* (with a second from *Buck*) nominated *Barbour*. *Sleutel* (with a second from *Sauncy*) nominated *May*. *Bybee* then moved that nominations cease; *Snowden* seconded the motion, which then passed unanimously. *Nicholson* urged the two nominees to speak to the senate body (and they did address the other senators). *Tarver* spoke briefly about the course reduction and about the time commitment that being (eventually) Faculty Senate president bring. Then, once the written ballots called for by the Faculty Senate constitution were cast, he stepped outside with *O'Dell* to count them. (The ballots were destroyed by the same pair after the meeting was adjourned.) *May* emerged as the winner. Both nominees were commended by *Ellery* and others. *May*, regarding his election, thanked the other senators and added, "I'll do my best".

D. PAA/ IDEA Form use: *Sauncy* explained that she had been approached by someone who had served on the Presidential Salary Schedule Task Force (the group that has produced the overall PAA [Professional Achievement Award] framework) regarding the idea of the Faculty Senate looking into the possibility of a policy designed to ensure "uniform administration of IDEA forms" (words of *Sauncy*) across campus. Word had spread to that task force member that some faculty members have allegedly tried to unduly influence their students to rate them favorably through various measures and appeals. (Whatever proposed policy regarding IDEA administration may come out of the Faculty Senate would, according to *Sauncy*, subsequently go to the Deans' Council.) What *Sauncy* explained that she has in mind is a policy whereby a faculty member would not have the IDEA forms in his/her possession before or after administration of the evaluations (and someone else would administer and collect the IDEA in place of the faculty member). She said she could e-mail a proposal to the other senators for their review. *Sleutel* commented on how well the online evaluation process has been working in her department for courses that are also online ("no time crunch", "good comments" written by students). *Tarver* stated that such has been the experience overall with online courses, but that *Dr. Logan* wants the process to still be face-to-face for classes that meet face-to-face. *Dixon* strongly suggested that if someone other than the instructor of a class is going to administer the IDEA to a class, it needs to either be another faculty member or a staff member. *Tarver* asked that the University Affairs Committee deal with this issue by the time of the March meeting, and he added that senators may e-mail *Husein* regarding this matter. *Nicholson*, in addition, proposed that any policy about uniform IDEA administration also address uniformly the issue of what is to be done about handwritten comments produced by students. It was then announced by *Sauncy* that some departments have already finished their drafts of their departmental criteria for the PAA and that some departments set aside earnable points for high IDEA scores (while others do not). *Sauncy* stated that IDEA scores are still tied to tenure and promotion possibilities for faculty, and she again stressed the need for IDEA administration to be uniform (because of the potential effect of scores on personnel decisions). *Ellery* replied that the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion has "no real guidelines" on how to use IDEA scores. After

some further discussion, *Tarver* reconsidered the assignment of the issue and asked the Academic Affairs Committee (rather than the University Affairs Committee) to work on it (the charge is "to review procedures for IDEA administration and collection" and to work toward the implementation of "a common format" to use [one in which, as expressed by *Husein*, the faculty member's role would be reduced]).

E. April Meeting: *Tarver* reported that President Rallo would be "happy to continue our tradition" (which consists of the ASU president calling a meeting each April to review a report prepared by the president of the Faculty Senate [on the Senate's activities during the academic year that is coming to a close]). *Tarver* then urged the other senators to "aggressively invite" their departmental colleagues to the April meeting. He added that another part of the aforementioned tradition regarding the April meeting is a question-and-answer session with the ASU president. He mentioned that he is hoping the meeting can take place at 3:15 p.m. on April 9th in Cavness 100 (but said that he needs to receive word that that place and that time have been approved). He added that officer elections need to be fit into the time period of that meeting (or perhaps could take place afterwards).

VII. Roundtable Items: One senator expressed the view that the IDEA forms should be used for the improvement of teaching (and nothing more) and expressed concern that their weight (in the PAA process) could vary from college to college to a disturbing degree. Another senator reported that IDEA results will indeed be used in his department (with one PAA point being awarded for above-average scores) because there simply is not anything better than the IDEA, as of now, in the way of a measure of teaching effectiveness. Then another senator asked why none of the recipients of the Staff Excellence Awards was from an academic department. Flage mentioned that the Staff Senate coordinated the ceremony and process for the first time this year, and she pointed out that all sectors of staff were represented (and that election by peers took place). She mentioned that it is a difficult process to manage and that there will always be points that can be criticized, but she affirmed that in the election process "a lot of it comes down to discussion" of the nominees and their merits. She added that the Staff Senate welcomes feedback on how the process unfolds. More discussion on what might constitute fair representation of nominees by category and proper rewarding of deserving individuals followed; afterwards, Flage stated that a Staff Senate committee could discuss the process and solicit "input on how to improve the system". Then another senator expressed concern about some Carr Scholarship recipients registering for a course that they do not intend to complete (then dropping that course after the time for having to carry the number of hours required for the scholarship has passed). *Tarver* replied that the new six-drop policy is, in part, designed to discourage such a practice.

VIII. Faculty Senate Budget: Account number 0100-61025 has a balance of \$1,800.00. Account number 0700-62235 has a balance of \$1,065.96.

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell,
Secretary, Faculty Senate

ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

January 23, 2008

I. Roll Call

A. Members Present: David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), Chris Ellery, Jamal Husein, Jack Barbour, Guoqiang Zheng, Steven Snowden, Ron Bybee, David O'Dell, Mary Sanders, Nick Flynn, Charles Allen (for Toni Sauncy), James Jones, John Nicholson, Brian May, David Huckaby, Martha Sleutel (newly elected in place of Trish Hutchinson)

B. Others Present: Lynsey Flage (Chair-Elect of the Staff Senate), Marcus Kelley (Vice President of the Student Senate), Kevin Lambert (Dean of the College of Liberal and Fine Arts)

II. Comments from Guests

A. Lynsey Flage: (Note: Before recognizing Ms. Flage, *Tarver* explained to the other senators that Provost Don Coers was unable to be present because he was at a meeting of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.) Ms. Flage reported that the Staff Senate has been "looking at Fall Break" as an issue and has concluded that it wants to keep the current holiday schedule as it is. Flage also encouraged everyone at the meeting to subscribe to ASU Alert.

B. Dean Lambert (Please see "New Business".)

C. Marcus Kelley: The Student Senate Vice President asked for faculty support for a textbook rental program the Student Senate is considering (to help defray book costs in light of the fact that for so many books, new editions have been coming out after short spans of time). The program would not only provide for textbook rental, but would also constitute an attempt to persuade faculty to agree to continue to use a given edition of a given book for at least three years. (*Barbour* asked if the name of the new ASU Bookstore vendor has been released; Flage replied that it has been not [and she named the two finalists for the contract].) *Flynn* asked Kelley whether or not a survey has been conducted to ascertain whether or not students (by and large) want such a program at ASU. *Barbour* asked which books would be the relevant ones for the program; Flage stated that the program would apply to "as many as possible". *Barbour* asked Kelley who would decide (if such a program were enacted) if a faculty member would have to use the program. Kelley replied that he would have to ask Student Senate President Ryan Mason that question. (*Barbour* then commented that compulsory participation in the program, i.e. a situation in which choice of text would be dictated to a faculty member, would be an impingement on academic freedom.) *Flynn* asked what percentage of campus-wide participation would be stipulated as necessary if there were a textbook rental program. Allen mentioned a bill that had been introduced in the state legislature, namely one that would prohibit the adoption of a text with new editions being published more frequently than every three years. *May* reported that the bill Allen was referring to was tabled after many constituents had complained to their representatives concerning its provisions. *Tarver* declared that he would schedule someone to speak to the senate at the February meeting on the issue of textbook requirements. He added that Dr. Maurice Fortin, Director of the Porter Henderson Library, told him of some new federal textbook requirements (with accommodations for persons with various challenges and disabilities). *Tarver* also mentioned that he wants Fortin to speak to the senate about this issue.

III. Review of November and December Minutes: *O'Dell* commented on the nature of corrections he made to the November minutes, which had already been approved in December. *Bybee* moved the adoption of the November 13th minutes as amended by *O'Dell* after the December meeting. *Barbour* seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously. *May* then moved the adoption of the December minutes. *Bybee* seconded the motion, and the December minutes were also approved unanimously.

IV. Standing Committee Reports:

A. Academic Affairs: Committee chair *Huckaby* reported that the second Teaching Excellence Award (TEA) announcement has been sent out. He then repeated the announcement he made in December, namely that the deadline will be around February 13th and that there be a few more days in which it may be possible, if need be, to extend it. He also reported on the amount of response (to the TEA announcement) received thus far.

B. By-Laws and Standing Rules: Though there was no report from this committee specifically, *Tarver* discussed a provision of Article VI, Section 6 of the By-Laws, namely that the ASU president is the person who is to call the April Faculty Senate meeting each year. He spoke of his need to "visit with" Dr. Joseph Rallo about this (to apprise him of this provision). *Nicholson* stressed the importance of both this meeting and the more public April 2nd meeting that President Rallo has been mentioning at various venues.

V. Unfinished Business

A. Faculty Office Hour Proposal: *Nicholson* reported that deliberations on this measure within the Academic Affairs Committee are still ongoing (thus the committee is not yet ready to propose anything to the senate as a whole); he mentioned that there would need to be more single-mindedness regarding the measure among the committee members for any specific proposal to be finalized and advanced.

B. Honorary Doctorate Committee: *Flynn* reported that this committee has submitted nominations for recipients of doctorates at the spring and fall commencement ceremonies this year. He added that the committee is working on getting a medallion ordered and ready to award to doctoral degree recipients. He mentioned that no honorary doctorates were conferred in December because no member of the Texas Tech Board of Regents could be present at the ASU commencement ceremony (therefore, this spring will mark the first time any will be awarded).

VI. New Business

A. Faculty Senate Vice President: *Tarver* officially announced that Dr. Trish Hutchinson has withdrawn herself from senate membership because she has assumed an administrative post (Director of the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research). *Sanders* added some information regarding the funding for Hutchinson's new position. *Tarver*, therefore, spoke to the need for a new vice president. He added that there are two individuals already interested in this post. He reported that the Executive Committee had decided that electing someone in February would be better than holding a January election (which would be "premature"). He assured the other senators that other interested individuals would be welcome to also make known their intentions of being considered for the vice presidency. *Ellery* read, from the By-Laws, that written ballots will need to be cast when the election takes place in February.

B. Introduction of New Senator: *Tarver* officially introduced and welcomed *Sleutel* to the senate body.

C. Faculty Senate Web Page: *Tarver* asked the other senators who could take over this responsibility, which had belonged to Hutchinson. *Husein* volunteered to oversee that updates are made (by someone from the Information Technology division, as suggested by *Nicholson*).

D. XF Grade Policy Proposal: This was presented by Dean Lambert, who stressed from the outset that this policy proposal is being developed due to concerns that faculty members have expressed regarding students who have practiced academic dishonesty (especially those who have cheated somehow during the first weeks of a semester and, after having been found out, simply dropped the classes in which the cheating occurred [and have thereby eluded "accountability" for, and "repercussions" of, their actions]). The dean commented on the academic integrity process, saying that it is "discouragingly labor-intensive" and adding that it does not provide for a way to track cheating that occurs by the same student in different classes. He also stated that there is now

no way to give a failing grade that is designated as being given due to academic dishonesty. Dean Lambert pointed out that former Dean of Student Life Dr. Deborrah Hebert knew of an XF grade (F due to academic dishonesty) being given on certain other campuses, and he also cited the involvement of Registrar Angela Balch and of Financial Aid Office Director Lyn Wheeler in the formulation of his policy proposal. He summarized what an XF policy would make possible: (1) identifying an F due to an academic integrity violation, (2) creating a repository of records of such violations (in case action would need to be taken, and the knowledge of prior violations could inform any action taken against a student found guilty), and (3) following the same appeals process (after an alleged academic integrity violation) as for a grade grievance case. He also explained that the XF grade policy would require a student found guilty of cheating to stay in the class (instead of being allowed to drop). Participation in class on the part of that student would thereafter be allowed only with the faculty member's permission. XF grades could be given by a faculty member, who will have consulted with (but who will not have asked permission from) his/her department head. Dean Lambert also explained that there would be a way a student could get an XF grade (actually the X part of it) removed. (This is described in more detail, as are other facets of the proposal, in a handout that was distributed to the senators.) He mentioned that the proposal has already been approved by the Deans' Council, and that it had yet to be presented to CASA (Council on Academic and Student Affairs), the deans and department heads, the provost, or the president. He stated that he was looking for "thoughts" and "feedback" on the proposal from the senators. The questions and discussion that followed concerned areas such as turnover of faculty (and how it might affect memory of specific cases), the issue of who would have oversight of the process (Student Life or Academic Affairs), what the timing of such a proposal should be in the event that the entity with oversight of the process changes, how permanent ought (or ought not) an XF to be, what details would need to be documented for the repository of cases, how a policy might be enacted with the university being on safe legal ground, and just what a student would have to do to get an XF changed to an F. Dean Lambert agreed with the senators who expressed the view that the legal ramifications of an XF policy would need to be checked out and worked out. *Tarver* asked if each senator could respond to the proposal's content, and Lambert agreed to receive feedback on it during the next two weeks. *Tarver* also agreed to receive each senator's comments and to forward them to every other senator.

E. NCAA Faculty Representative: It was mentioned that *Snowden* holds this position at ASU (as appointed thereto by the Committee on Committees). He mentioned to the other senators that there are some twenty legislative proposals that the NCAA (National Collegiate Athletic Association) is dealing with. He expressed interest in finding out which one(s) may be of interest to the Faculty Senate. Giving an example, he stated that the measures basically have to do with protecting "student-athletes as students". *Tarver* asked that a historical written record of relevant issues be disseminated. *Snowden* stated that he would be "happy to share" such information. *Tarver* then encouraged the other senators to share with *Snowden* their NCAA-related concerns.

F. Texas Tech University (TTU) System Development Board Representative: This board, *Tarver* explained, is seeking an ASU faculty representative. He added that ASU President Rallo thought of the idea of making the ASU faculty representative a position instead of a person, and he reported that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee favors the idea of having the Faculty Senate vice president be the person to serve on the board. This idea was also acclaimed by *Barbour*. *Tarver* explained that the ASU faculty representative would need to attend three meetings per year. *Snowden* moved that the Faculty Senate vice president (whoever that would happen to be at any point in time) be the ASU faculty representative on this board. *May* seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously. *Tarver* stated that he would ask Dr. Rallo about what this representative position on the TTU System Development Board would entail. *May* stated that it probably has to do with fund-raising.

VII. Roundtable Items: *Flynn* mentioned that the 2008 Science Competition hosted by ASU (for sixth- through twelfth-graders) will be held on February 26th. He invited senators wishing to set up recruiting tables for their departments (at the competition site) to contact him for more information. Also, *Flage* encouraged the senators to attend the Staff Excellence Awards ceremony (an event coordinated by the Staff Senate) on February 12th at 10:00 a.m. (in the C.J. Davidson Conference Center of the University Center).

VIII. Faculty Senate Budget: *Tarver* stated that although the senate's account balances (as they are now listed on Banner) remain the same as for December, they do not yet reflect the fact that he put in a requisition to pay

the ASU Faculty Senate's dues to the statewide faculty senate organization. He mentioned that this organization still meets every semester. He stated that he will encourage active participation in it. *Barbour*, who years ago regularly attended its meetings and who held a regional office within that organization's purview, chimed in with his view that such participation would be positive for the senate.

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell,
Secretary, Faculty Senate

ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 12, 2008

I. Roll Call

A. Members Present: David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), Michael Dixon, Jack Barbour, Jeff Womack, Martha Sleutel, Nick Flynn, Jamal Husein, Michael Buck, Steven Snowden, Chris Ellery, Ron Bybee, William Fuller, John Nicholson, James Jones, David Huckaby, David O'Dell

B. Others Present: Angela Balch (Registrar), Nolen Mears (Interim Dean of Students), Don Coers (Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Judy Stanley (present in place of Staff Senate Chair-Elect Lynsey Flage), Trish Hutchinson (Director of the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research [CITR])

II. Comments from Guests

A. Provost Coers: The Provost recalled that last year the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate recommended the Wednesday before Thanksgiving as a university holiday for students and faculty. He added that in 2000 this was also considered by the Deans' Council; he stated that not many ASU students lived far away from San Angelo then (eight years ago) but that now the situation is different. He further explained that it would not be necessary to give up Labor Day to have this holiday. He mentioned that the Deans' Council and CASA (the Council of Academic and Student Affairs) have all agreed to support this idea. He stated, however, that he is not certain as to whether or not the measure would apply to faculty if it were implemented. He added that Jesse Gómez is looking into the question of whether it would apply to faculty or not. Dr. Coers stated unequivocally, however, that at the very least the measure would apply to students. He added that the proposal would be forwarded to ASU President Joseph Rallo. After his update on this matter, the provost was asked by *Barbour* about the progress being made on two specific issues, i.e. salary equity and teaching load reductions. Dr. Coers replied that his office has been helping to provide information requested by Dr. Rallo on these matters. He also mentioned that Yzelda (Sam) Hinojosa (Academic and Student Affairs Administrative Assistant) has stated that she will be departing next January, and he mentioned that someone else has been hired in his division solely to work on budgetary matters. Dr. Coers added that work on this issue (salary equity) has "profound budgetary implications". He stated that he does not know exactly "where he (Dr. Rallo) is" in his progress on the matters asked about by *Barbour*, but he assured the senators that the president is still moving forward on them. Dr. Coers added that Dr. Rallo continues to ask for information in order to see what can be done regarding these matters. *Tarver* asked the provost if recommendations had been issued yet by the Salary Equity Committee. Dr. Coers replied that he did not know whether any had arisen or not but that he did know that the committee has still been meeting and has "met recently". He further elaborated on the committee's work by saying that it has presented several plans to him. He stated that he has asked the committee for clarifications, modifications, and adjustments. He reiterated the fact that the content of their plans has "profound cost implications". *Tarver* then asked Dr. Coers when faculty members will receive their letters of

appointment. The reply was that they would be received in late spring or early summer. The provost mentioned a caveat with regard to this; Board of Regents approval will be needed for the offers to be formally made. He mentioned also that the Board of Regents postponed its consideration of fee increases and added that the Board will meet on March 29th to deliberate on this matter; he reminded the senators that this applies to Texas Tech University (TTU) and to ASU (and he mentioned that the budgets of the two institutions will be further discussed at that meeting also). Tarver also asked for an update on the search for a Vice President of Strategy, Planning, and Policy; the provost replied that he could not yet speak to that exact status of the search, though he did say that three candidates have visited ASU. Then Dr. Coers fielded a question from Ellery regarding the bookstore changeover (of owners), saying when that the Follett company "got the bid" it included within it a "request for text rental". The provost added that when the contract was let, Greg Pecina (Special Events Facilities/Services Director) wrote into it a statement of ASU's willingness to consider that idea. He also mentioned having found out that textbook-related House Bill 188 does not, after all, apply to universities. Then Tarver mentioned that textbook requisitions for the summer are being called for, and he stated that he would forward to the other senators the memorandum dealing with that issue. After that, it was mentioned that the seven-member search committee for the position of Dean of the School of Graduate Studies has been appointed (and that it will be chaired by Dr. Brian May). Dr. Coers mentioned that most of the members of the committee will be from departments with heavy graduate enrollments, and he announced that he will soon meet with the committee and assign it its charge. He clarified that current Graduate Dean Carol Diminnie will continue in her position until late August. He added that there have been many inquiries from within the campus and from outside regarding her position; and he stated that this is a "really critical position, especially with the Hill Country expansion" in graduate course offerings. He added that because of this expansion, ASU is "poised for" significant growth in graduate enrollment (and that there are good funding implications for the support of such growth).

B. CITR Director Hutchinson: Dr. Hutchinson began her remarks by announcing that she has retained her faculty status. She expressed her desire to attend Faculty Senate meetings every month. She mentioned that she had two choices in her work at the center. She could, on one hand, either take money designated by President Rallo for faculty innovation grants and faculty development leave, rewrite proposals for the spending of that money, and present the proposals to the deans (for projects funded thereby to go into effect as of the Fall 2008 semester). On the other hand, she could send proposals to many committees and risk not seeing them passed on time for funding to go through. (She chose the former.) She stated that the center administers all the internal grants and faculty leave, although there is no new money for the latter. She distributed handout material to the senators. She stated that grant guidelines have been made more stringent but that more money has been made available to more faculty. Capped amounts of funding are made available (as opposed to the "apply for money in the pot" idea that had been in the works). A certain amount of money has been set aside for faculty development leave, she added. She mentioned that the center's proposed guidelines have been reviewed in Provost Coers' office, by the Deans' Council three times, and by others also. She mentioned that they need to "go out" in final

form by March 14th in order for the money requested to be granted by the fall. She added that if the guidelines are tabled, the money will not be available for next year. She assured the senators that all faculty development grants will be externally reviewed. Proposals are due to be turned in to the center by April 11th, and parties who will have submitted proposals will be notified regarding the status of each of their proposals by the first week of May. Dr. Hutchinson also announced that the application process has been "streamlined dramatically", but that it still needs to be approved by the provost. *Tarver* asked her if she needed amendments and suggestions from the Faculty Senate. She confirmed that she does need those, as well as applications. *Dixon* asked if grant types are competitive with each other. Dr. Hutchinson's reply was that some proposals stipulate leave, that others do not, and that some are of a combination type. She clarified that there is a certain amount of money tagged for leave and a certain amount tagged for innovation grants. She also made it clear that the dollar caps are on the innovation grants, and she added that she hopes many projects will not require leave. *Ellery* noted that the frequency of leave differs typically, and he noted that there is no definition of "meritorious academic service" (a phrase found in the handout distributed by Dr. Hutchinson). She agreed that "there needs to be" a definition of this phrase. *Nicholson* also brought up another imprecisely defined term in the handout, i.e. "satisfactory". *Tarver* explained that the choice of the words "meritorious" and "satisfactory" are linked to the new Professional Achievement Award (PAA) process. *Buck* expressed his view that the senators at least needed to vote on approval/non-approval of the guidelines. He then moved their adoption given the incorporation of Faculty Senate input within them (with the input to be given before 11:00 p.m. on March 13th). The measure passed unanimously. Following the vote, Dr. Hutchinson announced that the CITR's Advisory Board has now been formed (and that it would meet on March 27th at 4:00 p.m.). She spoke regarding the progress that has been made in determining matters of vision and direction at the center, and she mentioned having visited similar centers on other campuses (and having met with the Deans and Department Heads group and with Dr. Coers). It was then brought up that there needed to be a CITR Advisory Board volunteer from the Faculty Senate. Both *Jones* and *Dixon* volunteered; through a coin toss, it was determined that *Jones* will serve on the Board and that *Dixon* will serve as the alternate advisor. Dr. Hutchinson concluded her segment of the meeting agenda by stating that she wants the CITR to be "more visible in the coming months"; and she thanked the senators for their support of the center.

C. Registrar Balch: Ms. Balch distributed handout material, which was something she had prepared in the wake of the new legislation (TEC 51.907) that imposes a six-course drop limit on new students ("entering freshmen" and "first-time-in-college students" in the Fall 2007 semester or thereafter) (with some exceptions that are explained in the handout material). She suggested that perhaps faculty members, when asked for a drop slip by a student, should ask the student if he or she is "subject to this limitation". She mentioned that "there is some wiggle room" (given by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board [THECB]) regarding the deadline by which measures for implementing this policy at affected institutions must be "in place". She discussed the issue of "setting the counter at zero" in the case of a transfer student, and she stated that counter-setting (if inaccurate) "can be corrected". She then fielded questions from *Dixon* (regarding the

number of students at ASU who have six or more drops) and from *Husein* (regarding the choice of the number six, as opposed to other numbers that could have been arrived at). She described ASU's TEC 51.907 policy as "very good", and she added that when another registrar on the TACRAO (Texas Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) listserv asked for a policy, she (Balch) sent ours. She reported that our policy has been praised by the Associate Registrar at the University of Texas at Austin (with phrases such as "great job" and "looks good"). *Tarver* asked Balch if there has been any internal review of the policy. She responded that there indeed had been (on the part of CASA and the Deans' Council) and that TACRAO guidelines had been followed. She explained that her office had "tried to make it as clear, simple, and airtight a process as possible" (again, within the "wiggle room" permitted by the THECB). Registrar Balch then mentioned that a clause permitting some judgment calls in certain drop exemption cases (the clause specifically reads "other good cause as determined by the institution") "has already been used". She added that this was a clause she had recommended to the deans (and that the Deans' Council had approved). Regarding the aforementioned wiggle room, she clarified that the Fall 2007 semester has not been taken into account. She added that the appeals process for the policy is not yet in place. *Tarver* asked if Balch wants him to send the policy to all members of the Faculty Senate (since there was not a copy for everyone). To this she agreed. Then she fielded a question by *Jones* regarding which date is the date of record for each type of semester or course. After this, *Ellery* asked about consequences this policy has for students. Interim Dean Mears responded that the policy, once the six-drop limit has been reached, basically requires that a student fail a class, pass a class, or "completely withdraw" from the university. It was also added that on Rampart, in the self-service module, there is a portion entitled "View Holds" (where a student can see how many drops he or she has left). Balch offered to answer any other questions regarding the policy and offered to speak to anyone or any group about it. She announced that e-mails describing the policy had been sent to "all current students". *Ellery* then asked her how faculty members may find out about the policy; she replied that information is available on the Registrar's Office's web page. *Sleutel* suggested that there be an e-mail (with an attachment) sent to faculty; *Jones* also asked that it include a copy of the new law, as well as an explanation of it. Then a senator described an apparent loophole in this legislation that students in a certain discipline will probably be sure to find. The reply by Balch was that (still) the THECB had given the policy its blessing. *Flynn* expressed concern that the passage of this law (and the enactment of the resulting policy) will now give Balch "too much to do". The response from her was that there is a hybrid position in the Registrar's Office that has been created to alleviate the situation. Mears added that the legislation itself is being appealed. Finally, *Ellery* asked Balch if she is the arbiter in drop exemption cases. She replied that she is not, and she identified the relevant dean in a given case as the person with "the final say". Her last statement was that her tendency is to approve an exemption if a student provides documentation.

D. Interim Dean Mears: The first issue introduced by Mears was that of a new law regarding instructional material and the need for it to be made available in formats accessible to students who are blind,

otherwise visually impaired, and dyslexic. He stated, specifically, that materials published after January 2004 "must be made available in" what is known as "alternative format". He advised the senators that, as they make materials selections, they should check publication dates and ask book representatives about the availability (where applicable) of materials in this format. He mentioned that this is "part of a national trend", and he made it clear that there are exceptions (such as old and out-of-print titles). He stated that if faculty have students in the categories relevant for alternative format materials, the Office of Student Life contacts the publisher (who provides the needed materials within fifteen days). Then, in response to a question by *Snowden*, Dean Mears clarified that the legislation in question is House Bill 3382 (and its corresponding Texas Senate bill). He emphasized the fact that if an item to be ordered was published after the aforementioned date, "it must be available" in alternative format (or it cannot be adopted). He again reiterated the fact that faculty have to check about this before adopting materials. *Ellery* then asked him how it would be possible to know at ordering time whether or not materials are available in this format. Mears replied that "representatives will be aware" of whether they are or not. *Husein* then asked when these guidelines will take effect. Mears stated that they begin to apply to materials to be "adopted for next fall". Another question by *Ellery* concerned materials "off the (worldwide) web". Mears replied that for such items there is software available to help students deal with it. He clarified that the new legislation applies exclusively to "hard-print books". *Snowden* then asked a question about what might be possible with regard to making available material that he himself has written; Mears replied that either he will have to choose other material or arrange with a publisher to make his material available in alternative format. The final concern raised with regard to this matter was voiced by *Bybee* regarding how multifaceted the phenomenon of dyslexia is (i.e. the varied forms of it that exist); Dean Mears stated that his office will assume the burden of dealing with that complexity. Then the dean moved to the other issue he had been invited to speak to, namely, that of a certain service the Office of Student Life has been providing for years--issuing notices of (though not confirming the causes of) some student absences. He clarified that his office will continue, as a courtesy, to issue notices in cases of medical emergencies, requests by parents that faculty be informed of family-related absences, and the like. However, he mentioned that his office would perhaps not continue to issue notices in cases of students actually referred to Student Life by faculty for absences the faculty are already aware of. He expressed the view that this is "an unnecessary step" and mentioned that some such cases are excused absences (and some are not); and he clarified the fact that only faculty can officially excuse absences. He stated that his office is "a conduit of information" but does not validate reasons for absences. He explained that the issuance of the type of notice he would like to see discontinued "never was formal policy" and wondered aloud about the possibility of the practice being changed by the upcoming fall semester. Hutchinson mentioned that the CITR will now be handling the New Faculty Orientation as of this fall and that word about a standard policy on this issue (if possible) could be conveyed then. Finally, *Tarver* described this as "an educational issue for faculty, old and new", saying "we can work on that".

III. Approval of February Minutes: *Ellery* moved the adoption of the minutes. The motion was seconded by *Husein*. The minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs: Committee Chair *Huckaby* reported that a decision had been made regarding the winner and runners-up for the Teaching Excellence Award but that (due to a decision made during Executive Committee deliberations) the names will not be revealed until the moment of the actual announcement (to be made during the April Faculty Senate meeting). He added that signatures were still needed from Faculty Senate President *Tarver* and from University President *Rallo* before the results can be considered official. The other issue mentioned by *Huckaby* was the IDEA (Individual Development and Educational Assessment) form. The committee has been working on a draft of a statement regarding uniform administration of this evaluation. (*Huckaby* reported that he began modifying a draft that had been sent to him, and that he subsequently made recommendations to the committee and took it [the draft] to the committee for further input and revisions.) However, senate discussion of IDEA this day centered on use, as well as administration, of the forms. Debated were the following issues--whether or not the IDEA should be used solely for the improvement of teaching or for administrative decisions and the awarding of Professional Achievement Award (PAA) points as well; whether or not uniform administration is truly an absolute necessity (depending on whether or not results are to be used only for teaching improvement); how weighty IDEA results really are (and should be) in the formulation of tenure and promotion decisions (and when IDEA results began to be included in portfolios); whether or not IDEA results are valid as a sole indicator of effective teaching; whether a policy regarding uniform IDEA administration (with ramifications for not carrying it out properly being clearly noted) is good, unnecessary, or, actually, a must (regardless of other matters) (simply because of unethical practices on the part of some faculty); whether or not such unethical practices should be halted at the departmental level or at the campus-wide level; and whether or not the validity of the IDEA as a teaching improvement tool necessarily implies its validity as a performance measure as well. It was agreed that the committee will put together, in final form, an IDEA-related proposal to be considered soon.

B. By-Laws and Standing Rules: Committee Chair *Ellery* reminded the senators whose terms are expiring that the elections for new senators for each affected department must take place by the third school week of April. He read, from the By-Laws, the relevant section, the details about how the elections need to take place (and, partially in answer to a question from the floor, he also read the relevant details about which faculty are eligible to vote, and to be elected). He also confirmed (in response to another question) that it is possible for a senator to serve successive terms. *Tarver* then mentioned the names of the senators in whose departments elections need to take place.

C. Student Affairs: Committee Chair *Nicholson* was asked by *Tarver* about the progress that has been made by the Room Utilization Committee (though this is not, technically, a Faculty Senate issue). *Nicholson* mentioned the funding that had been allocated for the committee's

initiatives, and he described the plans that have been proposed. He stated that one idea has been for one particular classroom within each college to be improved (i.e. equipped with a projector, DVD/VHS capabilities, and a document camera, as well as new tables and chairs). He mentioned that the committee had come to see the situation as one that can be described by the phrase "too much to be done, and not enough money" (with which to do it). He mentioned that the same pool of money as has been set aside for classroom renovation has also been set aside for office renovation. He added that the largest money item that has been recommended is a \$250,000 proposal to make certain classrooms more or less like computer labs that would be "updated on a regular basis". (He revealed that some departments have, through the years, been using their own money to do basically this same thing.) He observed that these initiatives will lead to certain other issues in the future, namely, the matter of who will be vying for ownership, access, and control of which renovated facilities. He mentioned original ideas that the committee had had—turning some classrooms into offices and student lounges; however, he stated, updating of technology (rather than true innovation) is what has been decided on so far. Finally, it was mentioned that *Tarver* would visit with the deans about this issue.

V. Unfinished Business

A. Senate Website: *Tarver* expressed a word of public thanks for how the Faculty Senate website (overseen by *Husein*) is "now formatted like the rest of the ASU site" and "looks very good". *Ellery* asked if the *Faculty-Staff Handbook* has been posted on it; *Husein* replied that it has not been (but stated that it can be). *Jones* mentioned that "some policies are online". *Tarver* stated that "we are in a quandary as to where we are" with regard to *Faculty-Staff Handbook* updating (and notification about the updating process).

B. Textbook Cost Containment Recommendation: *Tarver* reiterated how Provost Coers had found out that House Bill 188 does not, after all, have ramifications for higher education institutions. *Tarver* also mentioned that he (*Tarver* himself) had read the wording of the bill and had not seen a mention of higher education implications, either. He mentioned that he had made to the provost the statement, "We're complying...Don't worry about it." He stated, however, that Faculty Senate Vice President Brian May has reported that this matter "will be an issue for us in the next legislative session" (words of *Tarver*).

VI. New Business

A. April Senate Elections: *Tarver* reminded the other senators that the elections for the offices of vice president and secretary will take place April 9th in Cavness 100. He said that there will be a report on the senate's accomplishments this academic year, followed by a question-and-answer session with President Rallo, and then by a short meeting at the end for the elections to take place.

VII. Roundtable Items

A. Honorary Doctorates: *Flynn* reported that the Honorary Doctorate Committee had planned to award its first degrees this spring at commencement, but that this had to be postponed until the December

ceremony. He reported that F.L. "Steve" and Pollyanna Stephens, for their leadership in the transition to the TTU system and for all the other ways in which they have helped ASU over the years, have been designated as the recipients of these doctorates. He mentioned that another honorary doctorate recipient, for the spring of 2009, would be designated as well.

B. Request from Dixon: Senator *Dixon* requested help from the other senators (asking them how he might successfully raise funds for the ASU Natural History Collection, the eighth largest in the state, through the acceptance of recyclable cell phones and printer cartridges, while avoiding violations of the regulation that states that such items, if "bought with state money", may be thrown away but not recycled).

C. Search in Psychology/Sociology Department: *Fuller* reported that Professor Paul Love is going to be retiring soon (and that his department is conducting a search for a social psychologist).

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell,
Faculty Senate Secretary

ASU FACULTY SENATE GENERAL FACULTY MEETING MINUTES
April 9, 2008

I. Welcome: The welcome was given by Faculty Senate President David Tarver.

II. Teaching Excellence Awards: These were presented by Academic Affairs Committee Chair David Huckaby. He explained the selection criteria and emphatically stated that all of the applications were impressive. The winner was Dr. Bonnie Amos (Biology). The runners-up were Dr. Shirley Eoff (History) and Dr. Roger Zarnowski (Mathematics).

III. Words of Commendation: Tarver commended both present and past senators for their progress on senatorial initiatives (and asked them to stand and be recognized).

IV. Senate Accomplishments: Tarver referred the attendees to a list of Faculty Senate accomplishment (this list was on the agenda sheets they received upon entering Cavness 100). In particular, he spoke about a few issues, such as the presence and current operation of the Center for Innovation, Teaching, and Research (CITR), directed by Dr. Trish Hutchinson (which, as was noted, oversaw this year's new tenure/tenure-track faculty orientation). He then invited the faculty members to stay in the same room (if they wished) after Dr. Rallo's remarks for the elections to be held for two Faculty Senate offices (vice president and secretary). He then yielded to floor to University President Joseph C. Rallo.

V. ASU President Rallo's Portion of the Program: The president thanked the faculty for coming and for their work for the good of the institution. He made reference to the fact that the April 2nd Vision 2012 presentations, made by Dr. Rallo himself and by several other university leaders, are now available online. Then he fielded the **questions submitted beforehand by faculty, which are listed as follows (along with his responses to them):**

1. "What do you think about the expanded use of IDEA (Individual Development and Educational Assessment) student evaluations in the review of ASU faculty performance, including the proposed point values given to above-average course evaluations in the PAA (Professional Achievement Award) System?"

Reply: Regardless of the position held by a given faculty member, and regardless of discipline, an analysis of PAA point allotments reveals both "commonalities" and "singularities" when various units are compared. So far, analysis of proposed PAA frameworks does not indicate any particular trend either toward, or away from, incorporation of the practice of awarding points for above-average IDEA scores.

2. "Faculty office space is in very short supply. Has this been taken into consideration with the many construction projects underway and in the planning stage?"

Reply: There is, to some degree, formula funding based on space utilization. Our ranking for the receipt of this funding has been bad. Our capital projects reflect some degree of priority given to instructional space and faculty offices (even space dedicated to the conducting of seminars). This issue will be taken into account as work on projects continues.

3. "Decision-making in the Provost's Office seems very slow. What can be done to fix this problem?"

Reply: It is important to keep in mind that this office is the focal point for decisions on both academic and student affairs issues. The creation of two new staff positions there should help make this entity "more agile" and more efficient. Still, it is necessary to remember that the personnel from this office continue to face a tough workload.

4. "Faculty have been told for years that there is not money for new programs, equipment, travel, etc. Where is the money coming from for all of the new programs and offices and positions?"

Reply: A million dollars have been set aside for permanent positions (that are, as yet, unfilled); positions are being created to "alleviate issues" faced by the campus community. Also, the issue of the number of part-time versus tenure-line positions is being addressed (as some 25 searches are in progress across the campus) in such a way that money is being saved. In addition, fund balances are being used more completely; actually, the relatively large amount of money the institution has had in savings has led (at times) to our being denied tuition increases we have requested. (Therefore, the spending of more of that money from savings puts ASU in a better position to potentially benefit from tuition hikes.) Finally, energy savings should also free up more money sought by faculty for the initiatives referred to in the question.

5. "We have no plan for updating faculty computers. Some departments get new computers for their faculty frequently...in other departments faculty members use the same computers for as many as 10 years or more. Overall, students have access to faster, newer computers than faculty. Will this change? If so, how?"

Reply: There is no specific plan concerning this as of now, but the problem will be fixed once there is a plan. President Rallo stated that he expects "to see requests" made regarding this situation. What we "need to avoid", he said, is a scenario of "inequality of access" to computers.

6. "I am interested in a couple of things. 1) the equity pay adjustments ~ when will they become effective; 2) what's going to happen for next summer school (2009) and the pay schedule. Will we be paid as we are this summer?"

Reply: Regarding the first part of the question, President Rallo reported that "we made a request at the last (Texas Tech University System) Board of Regents meeting in El Paso"; however, the Board "put on hold" (until May) our requests for increases in tuition and

fees. Regarding the second part of the question, the reality now is that monetarily speaking, “summer school won’t change”. However, Dr. Rallo said that we “need to be more sophisticated” in our ways of dealing with “the number and size of (summer) classes”. There have been too many small classes (which is not a fiscally profitable scenario). He further commented that we have not made “good use of money” by having to take money from “tenure-line hires” to finance summer school. Returning to the topic of tuition rates, he observed that we cannot change the amount that we charge at the moment that a student registers. He stated that the Board of Regents met again and, for the reason just mentioned, capped our tuition rates. He then reiterated the fact that a further decision about the rates will be made in May. He concluded by saying that our students will be able to register, but there is some question currently about the amount they will end up paying.

7-8 (taken together). “What is the status on the faculty salary base increase for Sep 1, 2008? Dr. Rallo stated this increase was to make our 9-month salaries more competitive in Texas and to reduce the need for summer salary...I was wondering if he (Dr. Rallo) sees any salary raises in the near future?”

Reply: Dr. Rallo stated that he foresees both equity- and merit-related faculty/staff increases, but he warned that the Board of Regents may approve tuition increases below the levels we have requested. These tuition increases would constitute the most reliable way to not only fund salary increases, but also to finance projects.

9. “I haven’t seen anything publicized about the tenure track and non-tenure eligible salary/promotion changes that have been proposed from the President. Has there been any kind of formal recognition of this/announcement etc. to notify non-tenure eligible folks know about the ‘new’ program and how to proceed with utilizing it?”

Reply: The president simply stated that he needs “to have the chance to approve” the changes (in their final form).

(Paraphrases of) Additional Questions Asked by the Faculty at the Meeting Site (Cavness 100) (with Paraphrases of the Replies by Dr. Rallo) (Except Where Quotation Marks Indicate Direct Quotes):

1. Will there be fewer faculty teaching fewer summer courses?

Reply: “That conversation has to happen.” A three-semester model (in which spring, fall, and summer semesters are reckoned as equal periods, and in which faculty teach during two of the three [the two of their choosing, if they desire to choose two of the three] is something worth considering. “We need to be creative” in our approach to our challenges such as low summer enrollment and small classes (which are “not beneficial”).

2. “Formula-funding courses are seen as reasonable, right?”

Reply: “Yes.” If they bring in more revenue and students, more will be made available. For every 500 new students, \$3,500,000 is generated. “We need to enhance and expand programs.”

3. (There was a comment with reference to the fact that fund balances for one-time use cannot be used for salary allocations.)

Reply: We tell the members of the Board of Regents that we understand the above-mentioned fact.

4. Are faculty retention numbers available?

Reply: I will ask Vice President (of Finance and Administration) Sharon Meyer about them. With regard to retention-related initiatives, the idea of faculty leave is being looked into.

5. Will the new dorms be in operation by fall?

Reply: They will be, “or they’ll lose money” (reference here was to the contractors, whose contract states that they must finish by a certain date). Over the summer, the implosion of University Hall will take place. We will ask for a new dormitory there (“out to Dena”). There is a housing waiting list of 300 people. Also, there will be a store within Centennial Village. We are also proposing an expansion of dining facilities in the University Center.

6. What are the plans for the use of the area ASU owns that is behind Colts Stadium?

Reply: We have in mind for it to be “mixed-use residential space”. At the Board of Regents meeting in Lubbock there was a question about long-term leasing of that space. Several ASU representatives, at that meeting, made the case that the aforementioned area is “extra space” that can be put to various uses. The regents are not convinced, however, that such is best for the Texas Tech University System (TTUS). After one year, the issue will be revisited.

7. (The suggestion was made that there be a lounge, within the University Center, exclusively for faculty.)

Reply: This is a great idea. Figuring out how and where we might make it a reality would be the next step.

8. What is the status of the proposed College of Nursing and Allied Health?

Reply: Before each TTUS Board of Regents meeting, there is a meeting to set the Board of Regents meeting agenda. At these meetings prior to the actual Board meetings, there was (in recent months) an opportunity to meet with regents individually (concerning this

and other issues). TTUS Chancellor Kent Hance spoke concerning the possibility of some funding for the start-up of this proposed college. The college will probably be approved, and there probably will be a timeline for it that will be handed down. The entity, if approved, could come to exist even if there is not yet a building to house the college. The approval could come as early as May of this year. (Incidentally, the Hardeman Building, upon being renovated, will be “offline for 18 months”.) Space (for the new proposed college) will be needed for clinical and other purposes.

Follow-up Question: "Your initial response was related to the physical building. However, we don't need a new building to start a new college. When would the actual administrative 'structure' for the new college be established?"

Reply: The structure will go into place immediately following the motion approval at the Board of Regents meeting which is in early May.

Second Follow-up Question: “So, are you saying the organizational structure would be up and running before the actual physical facility was completed, meaning this May?”

Reply: Yes, it would be a "virtual" College in May, this May, 2008.

9. Since you were hired by the Texas State University System and have since witnessed with us the transition to TTUS, do you believe this has (or has not) been a good move?

Reply: I have not seen a downside. There is a synergetic relationship with Texas Tech University. We are well-treated. We have the 4 + 1 Program and the Honors Program arrangement with them. Participating in their budgetary system gives us access to designers. We hope that will enable us to have public art displayed in the Hardeman Building. There has also been Texas Tech/Angelo State representation at events in Washington, D.C.

10. Why have reverse osmosis water fountains not been installed in all buildings on campus yet? (This question was posed by the same faculty member who had asked questions about the College of Nursing and Allied Health, though it was a question that was unrelated to the former ones. Seeing this same faculty member preparing to ask another question, Dr. Rallo exclaimed, “May! The College of Nursing and Allied Health will be up and running in May!” [Laughter ensued.]

Reply: I'll check into that. What I have noticed is that the reverse osmosis fountains that exist bear a sign indicating that they have been installed courtesy of the Student Government Association.

11. Will ASU really be able to acquire the Western Mattress Company building?

Reply: The owner is supportive of the idea. I “saw proposed diagrams”. They point to the possibility of having apartments/condominiums for art students; these units would

have 10- to12-foot ceilings. This would lead to the presence of more people in downtown San Angelo after 5:00 p.m.

12. How much of a 'green' component will there be within the construction of Centennial Village?

Reply: There will not be any. Hardeman will be the first building of the type asked about, since it will be a LEAD (Leader in Energy And Sustainable Design) certified silver building. There will, however, be greenery along Rosemont Drive due to landscaping.

Final Notes on this portion of the program: (1) there was a brief mention about the addition of a "virtual college". (2) Dr. Rallo thanked the faculty members for their attendance and participation in this session.

VI. Announcement Prior to Senate Elections (and Other Faculty Senate Business):

Lynsey Flage, representing the Staff Senate, announced that the Staff Senate has asked the Faculty Senate to collaborate with it on the two-hour reception to be held the day after the Employee Service Awards ceremony (which is scheduled for the evening of May 1st). She mentioned that the time for the May 2nd reception has not been set yet. She added that invitations to it will be sent out, and she encouraged those present at this Faculty Senate meeting to attend the reception.

VII. Faculty Senate Deliberations:

(Senators Present: David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), Brian May (Faculty Senate Vice President), Jack Barbour, Ron Bybee, David O'Dell, David Huckaby, Toni Sauncy, Martha Sleutel, John Nicholson, Chris Ellery, Steven Snowden, Jeff Womack, Mary Sanders)

Tarver asked for a motion concerning approval/non-approval of the March minutes. *Bybee* moved their approval. *Nicholson* seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved by a 13-0 vote.

Tarver then asked where the checks for the Teaching Excellence Award recipients come from. *Bybee* replied that they come from the office of Provost Don Coers. *Tarver* assured the other senators that he would, in an orderly and timely fashion, take care of the necessary arrangements regarding the checks.

CITR Director Hutchinson, also in attendance at this portion of the meeting, announced that President Rallo has approved some "new faculty/staff awards beginning this fall". They are to be administered by CITR, and she mentioned being excited about that fact. Other CITR initiatives she mentioned were a "faculty mentors program" and a

certification process “tying faculty development to” certificates to be recognized for points within the PAA program.

Tarver issued a reminder of when departments need to elect replacements for outgoing senators. Some senators, who know who their replacements will be, mentioned the names of their new departmental representatives. There was also a mention of which senators still need to have elections in their departments. With the help of By-Laws Committee chair *Ellery*, there was clarification regarding which persons within a department are eligible for election to the Faculty Senate.

The discussion concerning the vice presidency resulted in the election of *Sauncy* by a unanimous vote. Before the vote, *Tarver* noted that (since the vice president later becomes the president) the course reduction received by the president is “not commensurate with the amount of work” he or she must do; he also noted, however, that “the work is rewarding” because of how it leads to improvements of various kinds needed by ASU faculty, students, and staff. He also mentioned that it has been rewarding for him to sit in on various meetings and freely state his opinions (as an advocate for the faculty).

With regard to the election for the post of secretary, an idea that was mentioned was the possible use of a certain amount of uncommitted Faculty Senate funds to hire someone to take notes at meetings and transcribe them later. Vice President *May* stated that he could work on such an initiative this summer. Senator Jamal Husein (who was ill and unable to be present) was nominated by *May* (the motion was seconded by *Sauncy*); ten senators voted for the motion (there was one vote against it). *Tarver* reported that he would notify Husein of his election; *Nicholson* suggested that he do so in such a way as to leave a physical record of such notification.

Ellery publicly commended *Tarver* for all his work as Faculty Senate president. The commendation was echoed in a round of applause from the other senators.

Womack brought up a roundtable topic sent to him by one of his constituents. He asked if policies and procedures for academic retention and suspension are still in effect since some students who have been advised had grade point averages lower than 1.9. *Tarver* replied that the deans have conversations, when they meet, regarding “students on probation and suspension” (and, specifically, the numbers of them as well as the relevant processes involved in the determination of their status). He described these conversations as “active” and “ongoing” and stated that for these reasons he was surprised to hear the statement that changes appear to have taken place. He concluded his reply by stating that he would address this matter when he next meets with the deans.

The final roundtable matter concerned the need for more effective communication from the Registrar's Office when a hold on a student's registration originates there.

Huckaby assured the other senators that, although he prefers to remain in his current position as chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, he could be considered a "backup" choice for secretary if Husein declines the post.

Ellery moved that the meeting be adjourned. *Sauncy* seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously (at 4:38 p.m.).

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell,
Faculty Senate Secretary

ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

May 7, 2008

I. Roll Call

A. Members Present: David Tarver (Faculty Senate President), Michael Dixon, Jack Barbour, Jeff Womack, Martha Sleutel, Jamal Husein, Michael Buck, Steven Snowden, Chris Ellery, Ron Bybee, Cathy Johnson (for John Nicholson), David O'Dell, Guoqiangu Zheng, Mary Sanders, Brian May (Faculty Senate Vice President)

B. Others Present: Don Coers (Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs), Lynsey Flage (Staff Senate Chair-Elect), Greg Pecina (Executive Director of Business Services), Lynne Hughes (Senator-Elect from the Physical Therapy Department)

II. Comments from Guests

A. Provost Coers: The provost first addressed the issue of the upcoming (August) convocation. He reminded the senators that University President Joseph C. Rallo had mentioned during the August 2007 convocation that he wanted a more formal event to be held this year (as part of a meaningful first-year experience for incoming students). The event is to be held on Friday, August 22nd at 2:00 p.m., with faculty in their regalia. (Tarver mentioned that he had included the tentative agenda for that day's events in the senate meeting agenda today.) (Tarver also pointed out that although the formal style of the event may cause some rancor among faculty, the purposes of it include increased student retention, improved relations with students and parents, and "a positive mindset". He also mentioned that this also does not constitute an extra occasion on which regalia must be worn, since there is no longer an August graduation ceremony. He encouraged attendance at the event, and said that it is "well-planned".) Provost Coers then spoke concerning the fact that Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs Dr. Richard Beck has accepted a vice presidential position at Rogers State University in Oklahoma after "seven superb years of service". He added, "I know you join me in wishing him well." He stated that given the scope of Dr. Beck's ASU responsibilities, it is "critical to get someone soon to work alongside" the provost. Since July 1st is Dr. Beck's starting date at Rogers State, and since he will be taking some vacation time before then, Dr. Coers announced that he (Dr. Coers) intends to hire someone from within the campus (someone who is tenured and who has administrative experience). He mentioned that he wants to receive suggestions for a replacement "by very early next week". Then the provost turned to the matter of the administrative structure of the College of Nursing and Allied Health. He mentioned a board meeting of the Academic and Clinical Affairs Subcommittee of the Texas Tech University (TTU) System. He added that TTU System Chancellor Kent Hance had asked for a postponement regarding the proposed college's formulation because of ongoing (i.e. not yet completed) work toward the procurement of funding (more specifically, \$305,000 from the San Angelo Health Foundation). The provost stated that he is "reasonably confident" that the TTU System Board of Regents will approve the proposed college tomorrow. He mentioned having talked to President Rallo, who said that "we need an interim to get the college up and

running" and to oversee it for three years (before a national search is undertaken). He (the provost) added that he will be asking for recommendations regarding qualified individuals. He stated that the new college will house Nursing and Physical Therapy (and, possibly, Athletic Training also); he added that he would be happy to receive input (through various means) from the senators by early Friday (though he will not be in his office tomorrow). In the question-and-answer follow-up portion of his remarks, the provost responded to a question regarding whether the position to be opened for the short term in replacement of Dr. Beck would be an interim one or not; he stated that it indeed would be (for two years, and that the position and term of service had been approved by President Rallo). He further elaborated on the challenges that currently exist within his (the provost's) division, including the fact that Academic and Student Affairs Administrative Assistant Yzelda Sam Hinojosa will be "leaving after Christmas" (and, therefore, someone will have to be trained to deal with [especially budgetary] issues now dealt with by her). He mentioned some cosmetic changes to his office area, and also the arrival of Pam McKnight to join the workforce of his unit. He added that another major challenge is the fact that given the departure of Dr. Beck this summer, much help will be needed to take up the slack since so great a volume of work has been done in Dr. Beck's area of responsibility (especially regarding the heading up of Enrollment Management, Student Life, and University College). He stressed the fact that this is not merely staff position-type work, since it is authoritative in nature as well. Budgetary allowances for the financing of the needed positions are something that we will know more about after the next TTU System Board of Regents meeting. Provost Coers cautioned the senators that it is possible that the regents "may not approve more than half of what we" request, and he mentioned that TTU itself (he has been told) will end up with some six million dollars worth of unfunded mandates. He was then asked a question about the printing of *Faculty-Staff Handbook* tenure and promotion guidelines, and he stated that there is a new process with our inclusion within the Texas Tech University System. He said that the handbook is being "split into two parts" and can be posted faster; he also stated that he believes everything is now online (though he added that perhaps Dr. Beck can be contacted for clarification about the status of the handbook). He warned that with ASU's new Professional Achievement Award (PAA) system, tenure and promotion guidelines "can change". Tarver clarified the fact that the 2003 version of the handbook is the one that is accessible from the Faculty Senate's website. Ellery then asked the provost whether or not the recommendations of the Select Faculty Committee on Tenure and Promotion (SFC) would be adopted. The provost replied that he believes they will be, and he added that President Rallo wants some changes (and that the SFC would need "to look at" those). He dwelt briefly on the specific rank of associate professor. Finally, he cited/reviewed a list of relevant groups from which the SFC needs to gather input (itself, the Faculty Senate, and the Council on Academic and Student Affairs [CASA]).

B. Staff Senate Chair-Elect Flage: Ms. Flage thanked the senators for all they did to help with the Service Awards Reception last week (this event was co-hosted by the Staff Senate and the Faculty Senate). She mentioned that there had been "good attendance", as well as "a positive response" regarding the reception. Then she mentioned the idea of the Staff Senate having a suggestion box (like the one Finance and

Administration has) to help serve the needs of "the entire ASU community". She stated that suggestions could be made "anonymously or by name" and that suggestions could be directed (via written indications) to the appropriate department/s or even to the Staff Senate. She asked the members of the Faculty Senate about their interest in being included among the parties to whom suggestions could be routed. There was no opposition to this idea. *Tarver* thanked *Flage* for the Staff Senate's inclusion of the Faculty Senate in the sponsorship of the Service Awards Reception, and he stated that "we were glad to contribute money to (the purchase of) the refreshments".

III. Approval of April Minutes: *O'Dell* reported orally on a few changes that needed to be made to the April minutes, which had been sent electronically to each senator. *Bybee* moved that the minutes be approved, pending these changes. The motion was seconded by *Snowden*. The minutes were approved unanimously. *Sauncy* asked that *O'Dell* re-send the minutes once they are corrected, and he agreed to do this.

IV. Miscellaneous Updates/Charges by Senate President Tarver: *Tarver* made reference to the CITER (Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research) bulletin (*Dimensions*). He mentioned being impressed by how "so much" has been accomplished at CITER "in so little time" "to help current and new faculty", and he added that the CITER has gotten "good reviews" for its Blackboard training. He told the other senators that CITER Director Dr. Trish Hutchinson "wants at least some" Faculty Senate members to review the CITER's Call for Proposals on Innovation Grants. He declared that this responsibility "will be assigned to Academic Affairs". *Tarver's* final announcement during this portion of the meeting was that during the last meeting of the deans, Greg Pecina updated that group on progress made on space utilization initiatives. The deans asked for clarification regarding the time frames to be considered relevant for various matters. *Tarver* mentioned that Mr. Pecina has been re-working some plans regarding some classrooms that originally were to be offline this summer. Finally, *Tarver* offered to go over finer details of space utilization issues with any interested senator on an individual basis.

V. Unfinished Business (Faculty Senate Secretary for 2008-2009): *Tarver* reported that *Snowden* has consented to serve (if elected) in this position. *Ellery* made reference to the fact that in April, an individual was elected *in absentia*; however, as was pointed out by *Tarver*, there was no acceptance of the position by that individual. *Ellery* reminded the other senators that the senate's by-laws call for an election with paper ballots being used. An election was called for. *Husein* nominated *Snowden*. *Ellery* seconded the nomination. The election of *Snowden*, as described above, was unanimous. *Tarver* pointed out the fact that only a sum of about \$200 of Faculty Senate funds has been spent lately; his purpose in mentioning this was to assure the other senators that funds could be used toward the purchase of a recording device to more efficiently capture senate proceedings. He then charged *Snowden* with working with Information Technology (IT) personnel toward that end.

VI. New Business

A. New Senators for 2008-2009: A list of the members of the next Faculty Senate was attached to the agenda for this meeting. It was

mentioned that the chair appointments are not yet final, and that membership within standing committees will be kept as much as possible like the composition they have had this year. It was also mentioned that *Husein* is not listed as a committee chair (of University Affairs), but that he is willing to serve if elected to such a position. It was announced that (with one exception, as noted above) the person whose name appears at the top of the membership list for each committee (Drs. David *Huckaby* for Academic Affairs, Jeff Schonberg [English] for By-Laws and Standing Rules, David *Tarver* for Student Affairs, and Toni *Sauncy* for External Affairs) would be responsible for calling the first meeting of his/her committee. *Snowden* asked by when this meeting would need to take place. *May* (next year's president) suggested that it take place by the second week of the fall semester (this was approved by *Tarver*). *Tarver* then called for this to occur "prior to the first meeting" of the school year so that the firm announcements of who the chairs will be may be made at that first (full senate) meeting. This was agreed to by all present.

B. Faculty Lounge: Greg Pecina then addressed the senators; he told them that he had received a call from President Rallo about the idea of a faculty lounge. He informed the senators that he will need "a wish list", input from them on what that would involve. He stated that at some institutions, a faculty lounge exists in the form of a food (and coffee) service facility (and that, at other schools, it is an open area set aside within the confines of a building that is otherwise dedicated to academic purposes). He informed the senators that President Rallo's idea is that of "a new construction". Mr. Pecina advised the senators that the lounge cannot be built by September 1st, but that he does want it included "in the next budget cycle". He mentioned that other plans that exist are, for example, for "a new 500-bed dorm in the footprint of University Hall or the Women's' High Rise" and an Allied Science building. He stated that The Center for Human Performance (CHP) or the Vincent Building may be possible places for a lounge (and that some foodservice facility will need to be set up in the latter building, anyway). He added that ASU students want a place in the Wellness Center of the CHP where they can purchase bagels, Starbucks coffee, and cold sandwiches. He said, "We want something an architect can draw up"; he added, though, that faculty would need to be heard from regarding what they would need a lounge facility to include. He also added that what will be built will need to be something the institution can afford. He announced that he will draft a memorandum to President Rallo and investigate a possible funding source. (He added that there was a faculty lounge in the University Center before that building was renovated.) Mr. Pecina concluded his remarks by saying that he will "try to make it (the lounge) happen" within the next 18 months; he expressed his hope that within that period of time, something that "fits other projects", and that the faculty can feel comfortable with, can become a reality. Finally, *Tarver* assigned the University Affairs Committee the responsibility of dealing with this issue (beginning with the fall semester).

C. Service Awards: *Tarver* mentioned that recipients of these awards are not receiving them until a year after the intervals of time for which they are given (e.g. ten year awards only after eleven years of service). The reasoning that is the basis on which this issue is being revisited is as follows (as he explained): if the person has served the university for the necessary number of years for the reward but, for

some reason, goes to work somewhere else (or is, for some other reason, unable to continue through year #11 or some other year beyond that for which an award is given), why should that person not receive a service reward? He mentioned that the deans have spoken in favor of the idea of sending the award to such a person.

D. Book Orders/ASU Bookstore: *Tarver* announced that Follett is once again the vendor and that Margaret Box is back on the ASU Bookstore staff. He also stated that she has reaffirmed due dates for book orders (March 1 for summer, April 1 for fall, and October 1 for spring). The reason for the fall deadline being so early, as was explained by *Tarver*, is that "the bookstore thinks of the potential for students selling their books back". (Incidentally, *Tarver* mentioned that there has been a rumor about a parking fee to be charged to faculty. He explained that he had asked President Rallo whether that would become a reality or not [and was told that it would not]. It is true, though, that improvements to parking lots may be discussed [but, if they are discussed and implemented, a way to institute a setup with a fee-free swipe card for access to the parking lots affected will be explored].)

VII. Roundtable Items

A. Status of PAA Framework/Setup for 2008-2009: Discussion on this topic featured concern over setup of the system; the view was expressed that the Administration needs to communicate something to the faculty concerning the as-yet-unresolved status of the framework for next year. There was a mention of a hindrance to the process, and speculation regarding whether Dr. Beck's departure will (or will not) further delay the process. Even doubt was expressed regarding whether the system will be in the works as announced by next year. *May* was charged with finding out the specifics of the current status of the process (and letting the Faculty Senate know about them).

B. Status of Salary Equity Review Process and Non-Tenure and Non-Tenure Track Faculty Proposals: *Tarver* stated that much will be learned about the status of the salary equity issue once the Texas Tech University System Board of Regents meeting takes place (on the 8th and 9th of May). However, another senator mentioned that Provost Coers has already mentioned that there will not be any new money for this initiative. Another senator added that many university committees will be incomplete this summer (thus making it impossible for the timeline set up by Dr. Beck and Dr. Bonnie Amos to be followed). *Tarver* interjected the fact that the proposals regarding non-tenure and non-tenure track faculty "did not make it to the Board of Regents agenda" (so the fall semester is when the next action on them may be taken). He concluded this portion of the roundtable agenda by stating that he would check on the salary equity review issue.

C. Office of Communications and Marketing: One senator expressed frustration over tasks that are left undone when personnel from this office are on vacation. Another senator mentioned diplomatic efforts that have been made to persuade this office be more proactive.

D. Important Searches: Next, roundtable discussion centered on who might be a worthy two-year replacement for Dr. Beck, on qualifications for that position (tenured associate or full professor with

administrative experience), and on the status of the search for the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies position. Regarding the latter, *May* reported that the search committee had reached "the video interview stage", and that applications had been received from "outstanding, experienced people" (even associate deans and graduate deans). He added that there has been "remarkably good response" to the job advertisement. He encouraged the other senators to mention the position in Academic and Student Affairs on the departmental level (so that names may be brought forward from there). *Sleutel* stated that a job description for the Academic and Student Affairs post (to forward to the various departments) is needed.

E. Final Miscellaneous Roundtable Remarks: *Ellery* mentioned that he has enjoyed his time as a senator, and he stated that perhaps next year the senate can have a parliamentarian. Another senator then mentioned the "monumental projects" planned by Dr. Rallo, including the investment of some \$40,000,000 in downtown San Angelo. That senator spoke of the possibility of next year's Faculty Senate being "reactionary" and asking President Rallo how such projects would benefit the university. Another departmental representative stated that whichever projects may be funded by local donations (and that, therefore, would not reduce university fund levels) should not be considered bothersome proposals. There was also discussion centered on the benefits (how much and for whom [besides art students]?) of ASU's potential use of the facility formerly owned by Western Mattress Company. One comment was that regarding issues such as these, there are "more questions [such as the reasons for some projects] than answers". Also, one senator expressed an objection (on the part of himself and others) to being told (in the form of an "edict") to attend the August 22nd convocation ceremony "in caps and gowns". One senator pointed out, in response, that this tradition had been brought up by Dr. Rallo at the August 2007 convocation (a point made earlier by Dr. Coers). Another departmental representative replied that at least the faculty do have access to what they need to wear (and, thus, that no new clothing will be required).

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:22.

Respectfully Submitted,

David O'Dell,
Faculty Senate Secretary