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Faculty Senate   
Held on: March 5, 2008, 3:00 pm   
Held at: 8th Floor John Gray Library

Faculty Senate Meeting  
March 5, 2008  
  
Attending: Arts and Sciences: Kenneth Dorris, Mike Matthis, Steve Zani, Kyehong Kang, MaryE Wilkinson, Sheila Smith, Rose Harding, Dave Castle, Jeremy Shelton, Ray Robertson, Dianna Rivers, Emma Hawkins, Terri Davis, Nancy Blume, Don Owen, Randall Terry, George Irwin, Chris Bridges, Kenneth Rivers Business: Alicen Flosi, Soumava Bandyopadhyay, Jai Youn Choi, George Kenyon Education and Human Development: Fara Goulas, Kim Wallet-Chalambaga, Lula Henry Engineering: John Gossage, Malur Srinivasan Fine Arts and Communication: Kurt Gilman, Ann Matlock, Nicki Michalski, Zanthia Smith, Monica Harn, Randall Wheatley, Sumalai Maroonroge Library Sarah Tusa, Jon Tritsch Lamar State College Port Arthur: Mavis Triebel  
  
Not Attending: Arts and Sciences: Mary Kelley, Hikyoo Koh, Chung-Lhih Li Business: Celia Varick Education and Human Development: Elvis Arterbury, Joel Barton, Barbara Hernandez, Jane Irons Engineering: Selahattin Sayil, Brian Craig, Che-Jen “Jerry” Lin, Paul Corder, Mien Jao Fine Arts and Communication: Kurt Dyrhaug Developmental Studies: Umporn Tosirisuk  
  
Call to order 3:05  
  
Approval of minutes: Approval of the minutes was moved by Emma Hawkins and seconded by Lula Henry.  
  
Staff Appreciation Day Report: Kurt Gilman  
o Please attend and encourage others to do so.  
o Please mention to your deans that this event is coming up and their contributions will be appreciated.  
o Last year was very successful. Mark Asteris set up extra tables and they were all filled.  
o The staff really enjoyed the gift cards as door prizes.  
o The date is April 4.  
  
President’s Report: Kurt Gilman  
TCFS Meeting on 2/15-16: TSUS CFS Meeting, Feb. 15, 2008:  
Dr. Ken Craycraft, VPAA, presented the following remarks upon inquiry:  
o There are more uncertainties with legislative session coming up than any other previously. Who will become the new speaker will be the key. Lot of competition for that upcoming race. Many delegations are competing for favors from the candidates. Democrats could get more seats in House. Dan Gattis is one of the names that we are hearing. Craddick is catching flack about his leadership this past session.   
o Higher education will be discussed and ultimately controlled by Legislature next year.  
o Do not think the four independent schools will be assigned to systems this term. TX Southern still hurting. If you assign one to a system, should assign all four.  
o Still are discussing Closing the Gaps with Legislature and CB.  
o TSUS is important to the State. We serve special populations in areas where there are small population pockets. We are a “cheap” investment in this state’s future. This must be stressed with Legislature.   
o One of our primary concerns will be the formula funding that we hope will include increases for FTE students.  
o We need to address faculty salaries. Need to be brought to the state’s average. We need to do a better job of telling our story to Legislature. If we don’t, we won’t be able to recruit and retain. We (admin.) are very frustrated about salaries. Benefits (parking, gym use, etc.) are also important factors. Salary inequities are also a problem. We have an inverted pyramid. May need to reduce the number of administrators to reduce the cost on some campuses. There is a Regent’s committee that will be addressing this issue. The Board recognizes this as a major serious concern, especially the new members.   
o Accountability standards are a tremendous drain on our campus resources. We are trying to prioritize the standards by utilizing those indicators that make sense: retention, graduation rates, FTE funding and reducing costs. We need to individualize the needs at each school.   
o In regard to Angelo State there have been some unintended consequences. TX Tech has agreed to accept the buildings Angelo but we are in a legal debate over the associated debt. Depending on the legal outcome, our borrowing rate could be hurt.   
o I (Craycraft) will orchestrate all future president hiring. I will solicit candidates, get input from elected officials in state and make sure every group on each campus is heard. The Chancellor will make the final recommendation to the Regents.   
o Our System enrollment is up about 2000 students for the semester.   
o Building utilization is very important part of the state formula funding. It is a question that we must answer to the Higher Education Committee of TX Legislature. The method used now for accounting is a very poor method which fails to give weights that are appropriate in measuring usage. We are going to take our concerns forward. State gives incentives to fill our existing space but it should reward schools for graduating students at risk with higher needs also.   
o The Coordinating Board was at one time 18 members, then governor reduced it to 12 and it was just recently reduced to 9 members. They are addressing concerns about methods used to report data to CB and Legislature.  
TCFS: Panel discussion: Facilitating cooperation between Senate & Administration  
o communicate widely; broader community  
o agenda position with board of regents  
o monthly news letter  
o defining: what is communication supposed to accomplish?  
o subordination (image & division of labor)—who does Senate report to?  
o 2 levels: senate & committees  
o pres. & provo. attend meetings (and run them!)  
o flow of communication: senate representation on committees  
o difference between being right & being effective  
o audit shared governance policies—Senate Policy Binder  
o follow through—close communication loop  
o transparency  
o know where to fight each battle; is it a system battle?  
o Senate leadership Team  
U.T. Brownsville: border fence that divides campus; resolution by TCFS  
o -Resolution supporting bill, proposed by U.T. Dallas to allow faculty representative on boards of regents  
TACT legislative visit on 2/15:  
o more funding (fully) of formula; less special interest  
o faculty salary bill  
o college readiness  
o textbooks—not a faculty issue  
Legal Issues & Academic Freedom—Dr. David Rabban  
o tension between individual & institutional academic freedom  
Issues & Trends in Higher Ed. Accountability: Susan Brown, assist. commissioner, planning & accountability division, THECB  
o funding tied to accountability system  
o based on outcomes  
LU joined VSA (what parents need to know to shop universities)  
  
Encourage students to take NSSE survey  
  
Syllabus Files: open for students to see-student page, my.lamar  
  
Travel Reimbursements: Shortage of staff positions  
  
BOR: LU has most small classes of Universities within TSUS System  
  
Academic Issues: Jeremy Shelton  
o The survey is not completed. We are still waiting for some classes to submit their responses.  
o We targeted core classes that had a good representative sample of students required to complete them.  
o 280 students responded.  
o The top reason for not doing the on-line survey was “I forgot”. This was closely followed by “I didn’t know,” “this is inconvenient” and “I don’t have the time”.  
o It does not seem to be a technology issue.  
o Apparently we (the faculty) are the primary reason they aren’t doing it based on not providing the information and not letting them (the students) know that we pay attention to the results. We need to remind them several times and perhaps give extra credit for completing the survey.  
o This is not going to change and we are not going back to the paper system. That is futile and we need to go to the administration and get them to help us to push the students to complete the survey. The administration needs to build in an incentive.  
  
Faculty Issues: Lula Henry  
o Last time the Senate met, there were concerns about faculty promotions and tenure. Our committee did discuss the issues.   
o Did all of the committees use the same criteria? They were given the same criteria. If they used it is another issue, and because we are not on those committees we cannot speak to that.  
o Should faculty be provided with the reasons why they were evaluated as they were? According to the faculty handbook, section 9.5, faculty are not entitled to a reason.  
o Is there ranking? Yes, the faculty handbook calls for ranking in each of the areas, at each level, and candidates should receive a letter from each level as the process continues.  
o Is there a funding issue at these levels? No, there is not.  
o Are there quotas? No, there are no quotas.  
o We have been working on a list of committees that department chairs can serve on. The list follows:  
o Academic Information Technology Committee  
o Administrative Information Technology Committee  
o Admissions Committee  
o Athletic Council  
o Budget Development Committee  
o Continuing Education Committee  
o Distance Education Committee  
o Educator Preparation Committee  
o Graduate Council  
o Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) Coordinating Committee  
o Honors Council  
o Information Security Committee  
o Institutional Patent Committee  
o Insurance & Benefits Committee  
o Judge Joe J. Fisher Lecture Series Committee  
o Library Committee  
o Long-Range Planning Committee (new 2006, all members ex officio)  
o Parking & Traffic Advisory Committee  
o Records Management Committee  
o Registration & Grading Committee  
o Risk Management Council  
o Safety and Health Committee  
o Scholarship Committee  
o Scholarship and Fellowship Advisement Council  
o Sick Leave Pool Committee  
o Student Advising and Retention Council  
o Student Disability Issues Committee  
o Student Service Fee Committee  
o University Animal Care Committee  
o University Information Technology Steering Committee  
o University World Wide Web Committee  
o We have decided that department chairs cannot serve on the following committees:  
o Classification/Compensation Committee  
o Faculty Performance Evaluation/Merit Salary Increase Appeals Committee  
o Faculty Promotion Committee  
o Faculty Promotion Review Committee  
o Faculty Salary Equity Committee  
o Faculty Senate  
o Faculty Tenure Committee  
o Research Council  
o Salary Administration Review Committee  
o Student-Faculty Relations Committees  
o Undergraduate Curriculum Council  
o Regarding the faculty handbook,   
o We want more clarity on page 1 of the draft.  
o On page 3 we wanted Dr. Doblin to look at issues of favoritism.   
o We also made some recommendations for wording.   
o Our final issue is the US Professor of the Year nominations.  
o There is a very involved process and the deadline is in April. Each application costs $95.  
o Does the faculty have a problem with nominating Dr. Joann Baker, our Piper Award nominee?  
o There is no objection.  
  
Budget and Compensation: Ann Matlock  
o The committee is currently working on two matters. The first is an analysis of salary raises for faculty, staff and administrators that have been put in place since the FY08 budget was published on the internet. We hope to have all of the information that we have requested very soon, so that we can report on this subject to the Faculty Senate.  
o The second project of the Budget and Compensation committee is our examination of the letters that faculty received from their chairs or deans last fall explaining their merit and equity raises. We still need letters from some departments, especially in Fine Arts and Communication, Arts and Sciences, and Engineering.  
o The Budget and Compensation committee will meet as usual, next Wednesday, March 19 at 3:00 in Room 204 of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Building.  
  
Development and Research: John Gossage  
o We have been discussing the procedures for junior faculty to get tenure and promotion.  
  
Distinguished Faculty Lecture: Steve Zani  
o We asked the chairs to help us promote the call for nominations. Only Glenn Utter really responded.  
o We have two nominations.   
o We have extended the deadline until March 21.  
o We asked the administration for assistance with the decline in interest. They suggested that we survey the faculty, so we are going to work on that.  
  
Old Business:  
o Our SACS liaison is Steffi Yearwood. Our assessment coordinator is Tom Matthews. They need us to endorse the outcomes or make suggestions.  
o The statement about quantitative analysis does not take into account that not all majors use quantitative techniques (i.e. French).  
o The question arises that do these statements refer to what students need to know upon graduation or in their major?  
o It is stated that all students are required to take a quantitative analysis class in the core curriculum.  
o The outcomes as presented are aimed at the University as whole, not specific programs.  
o The Senate is willing to state that in general there are no objections to the outcomes but there is some individual wording that we can comment on.  
  
New Business:  
o A nominating caucus is formed.  
o The library representative is Sarah Tusa.  
o The engineering representative is John Gossage.  
o The education representative is Fara Goulas.  
o The arts and sciences representative is Steve Zani.  
o The college of business representative is Alicen Flosi.  
o The fine arts and communication representative is Monica Harn.  
o The nominating committee chairperson is Fara Goulas.  
  
Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45.