

TEXAS A&M INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting
March 3, 2017
WHTC 125

I. Call to Order by Dr. James Norris at 12:05 p.m.

II. Roll Call: Present: Dr. James Norris, Dr. Kenneth Tobin, Dr. Marvin Bennett, Dr. Frances Rhodes, Dr. George Clarke, Ms. Malynda Dalton, Ms. Vivian Garcia, Dr. Ariadne Gonzalez, Ms. Destine Holmgreen, Dr. David Milovich, Ms. Marcela Moran, Dr. Lola Norris, Dr. Leonel Prieto, Dr. Jacqueline Romano, Dr. Lourdes Vilorio, Dr. Ruby Ynalvez, Dr. Oswaldo Zapata

III. Our Guest was given the floor:

Dr. Tom Mitchell:

The Senate Executive Committee met with Dr. Mitchell in February to discuss the results of the November 2016 Faculty Survey. Dr. Mitchell agreed at that time to write up his responses to the Survey, as were discussed with the Executive Committee during that meeting, and he presented this write-up to the Senate (included in these minutes). He also asked the Senate, and it was agreed, that he send these comments to the entire Faculty.

Discussion of these results followed and Dr. Mitchell stated that "many of these concerns come from a lack of information or a lack of understanding. That there were reasons for many of these actions and the reasons don't always filter down to the Faculty."

Dr. Mitchell also presented the Senate with a 'headcount' of enrollment for Spring 2017, broken down by academic unit and degree (included in these minutes).

It was also announced that an Investiture Ceremony for the 6th President of Texas A&M International University, Dr. Pablo Arenaz, will take place on Thursday, April 13, at 11 a.m. in the Recital Hall.

IV. Our new Senate members were welcomed:

Dr. Ariadne A. Gonzalez (Department of Psychology and Communication) and Dr. Jacqueline E. Romano (Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy) were welcomed to the Faculty Senate.

V. Minutes of the December 2nd Faculty Senate meeting were approved with minor revisions.

There was discussion at this point of Ombud's information and new member pictures that need to be forwarded to the webmaster for inclusion in our website.

VI. New Business

- Faculty Assembly Planning

It was suggested that we have a Faculty Assembly to discuss the results of the Faculty Survey and Dr. Mitchell's responses to it on the *reading day* (Tuesday, May 9th) and that the Senate could possibly supply food and drinks. There were concerns expressed that the attendance would be low if held on *reading day*. An alternate suggestion was to hold the Faculty Assembly on Wednesday, April 19th from 5 until 6 p.m. (a time in which no classes are held), possibly in WHTC room 116 if it is available. It was also agreed, by general consensus of the Senate, that this assembly be for Faculty only. Finally, it was suggested that the Senate Executive Committee meet before the April Senate meeting to provide some of the components for the upcoming Assembly.

- Starving the Beast

Dr. J. Norris introduced to the Senate a documentary that was shown at the last Texas Council of Faculty Senates called "Starving the Beast", which attempts to show that, in the name of saving money, certain politicians are attacking higher education. This documentary is available in our Library.

VII. Committee Reports

The Academic Oversight Committee - see attached minutes.

The Budget and Finance Committee - no report

The University Ethics Committee - no report.

The Committee on Creation, Composition, and Responsibilities of Committees - no report.

The Committee on Faculty Work Environment and Morale - see attached minutes.

Dr. Tobin reported that the Committee has received the nominees for TOY/SOY and are currently organizing the Faculty classroom observations for TOY.

The Faculty Handbook Revision Committee - no report.

The Distance Education and Instructional Technology Committee - no report.

The Technology Advisory Committee - see attached minutes.

Dr. Vioria reported that they are looking at a new LED lighting system to replace the current one in all of our classrooms. It was also reported that Angel is still available to us until May 1st. After May 1st you need to contact OIT to gain access to it.

The Assessment Committee - no report.

VIII. Other Business

It was brought to the Senate's attention that for those teaching this summer the new Teaching Evaluation will be piloted during summer 2017.

IX. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Faculty Survey – November 2016 (Summary of Comments)

Question: What major problems or concerns do you have about the university, academics, shared governance, etc?

Note: The summary of faculty concerns (in black) comes from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate based on their collation of faculty survey comments and the response to the concerns comes from the Provost, Tom Mitchell (in brown).

Mainly Administrative Issues

- The administration needs to better listen to the concerns of faculty and not implement changes in a top-down manner. Communications remain a major issue and decisions that impact faculty are too commonly found out about in a roundabout way and in general there is a lack of transparency. Administration needs to better listen to the concerns of faculty and not implement change in a top-down manner.

Communication is never perfect. We are all painfully aware of that and constantly try to improve. I am not sure which decisions are considered to have been “top-down,” and I would need to know that to be able to respond to how faculty should have or could have been involved or why the decision was made not to involve them. Having been the Faculty Senate President for two consecutive terms and a senator for a couple of other years, I believe in shared governance and think that we do a good job of it at TAMIU. Faculty are involved in selecting their colleagues through serving on search committees, in recommending their colleagues for tenure and promotion, in writing and approving curriculum, in deciding how to assess their programs and in actually doing the evaluation of their programs, and in participating in an advisory capacity for any number of university and system functions

- There are too many conflicting mandates (increased enrollment, new programs, Signature Courses, Catering to ISD’s, More Online teaching, and more) and there is a lack of a unified vision. Many faculty feel stressed, frustrated, and confused. In addition, they feel like they are being pulled in too many directions and this is significantly impacting job performance.

The unified vision that links most of these initiatives is to provide educational opportunities for a variety of constituencies, each with different needs. Online courses, for example, enable students who cannot come to campus to take courses (those living at a distance, those whose work schedules make face-to-face traditional courses prohibitive) while also enabling on-campus students to take an additional course or two that they can complete around their other class or work schedules. Signature courses provide first-year students with an exciting interdisciplinary learning experience that we hope will stimulate them intellectually and motivate them to explore new ways of knowing the world. New programs provide additional educational options sought by our students while also helping us to increase enrollment. In an era of diminishing state resources, increasing enrollment – and thus increasing tuition and fee collections – is the only way we can make up lost state funds and hopefully hire additional faculty (we are understaffed in most disciplines) and provide merit pay. As to the stress that these and other changes cause, that is an unfortunate consequence of change for some people. As Matthew Arnold wrote in 1852 of Victorian reactions to industrialization and the emergence of science and the decline of faith: “For what wears out the life of mortal men? / ‘Tis that from change to change their being rolls;/ “Tis that repeated shocks, again, again, / Exhaust the energy of strongest souls” (“The Scholar-Gipsy”).

- There is a complex array of issues associated with adjuncts. They lack access to resources like printers, copies, office space, and keys to open classrooms. HR processes

like asking for transcripts each semester could be streamlined. Poor pay and lack of benefits like health insurance is an issue. Additionally the concern was expressed that we have become too reliant on adjuncts.

- a. The degree to which adjuncts are used varies by discipline. In general, however, the university relies less heavily on adjuncts than do other comparable universities, but, yes, we have had to increase the use of adjuncts in order to accommodate growing student demand for classes at the same time that we have had state cuts that have limited funds to add faculty lines. Increasing class sizes has been another strategy to accommodate demand while having fewer resources.
- b. HR does not demand transcripts every semester of adjuncts.
- c. Neither Faculty nor Adjunct Faculty are given keys to classrooms. Departments are expected to provide adjuncts with printer/copier support, but not offices. We do not have offices to spare.
- d. Pay: Our pay rates for adjunct faculty are in line with other regional campuses and are significantly higher than LCC. Adjuncts with a master's degree are paid from \$2,200 to \$2,500 per 3-hour class, based on experience. Adjuncts with PhD., EdD., and JDs are paid between \$2,500 to \$3,000 per 3-hour class, with some paid slightly higher based on the labor market and experience. Funds to pay for adjuncts, overloads, Wintermester, Maymester, and summer come from funds from vacant faculty lines and staff positions.

- The proliferation of course releases has a negative impact on programs.

Yes, it does, some programs affected more than others. However, we need to give release time if we are to increase our research productivity and if faculty are to advance in their careers.

- There is a need for decreased teaching loads (3/3) or releases when teaching excessively large classes. Also the loads were too high (5/5) for visiting professors and professionals. At the very least compensation for overloads should be considered.

- a. The standard teaching load for faculty who are expected to teach classes, research and publish, and provide service to the university is 4/4 in all colleges but ARSSB, where it is 3/3. For tenure-track faculty, the first-year load is 2/2, second year load is 2/3, and third, fourth, fifth, and sixth year load is 3/3. These lighter loads are designed to enable tenure-track faculty to begin a successful research agenda that will earn them tenure. Once tenured, full-time faculty have a 3/3 teaching load if they have been highly productive in publishing over the recent past (evidenced in annual evaluations of "research" activity) and 4/4 if they have not. Visiting professors and professional faculty are not required to do research, only to teach and to provide some degree of service. When hired they accept a teaching load of 4 to 5 classes a semester, the number depending on need and on class size. Because they do not have to spend the time and effort required to conduct research and publish, they should have a heavier teaching load than tenure-track or tenured faculty.
- b. We do not want full-time faculty to have overloads. It inevitably affects the quality of teaching or research or service or all three. We prefer to hire adjuncts. Community colleges routinely require or encourage faculty to teach overloads, sometimes double, even triple overloads. I have heard of LCC faculty teaching as many as 9 classes a semester. We are not a community college.

- Class sizes as an important issue. The general consensus is that classes are too big in freshman courses and the cap size for classes needs to be lowered. This is especially true of writing intensive courses in areas like the humanities.

See earlier comments about student growth and budget cuts and how we have tried to meet demand with fewer resources. The concern about the size of writing intensive courses, like freshmen English, is certainly legitimate. We will see if we can provide some relief.

- Arbitrarily changing evening schedule. It seems that a very few working students are dictating the class schedule for the majority of our traditional students.

The evening schedule is designed primarily for part-time students and graduate students, not full-time undergraduate students who generally prefer daytime classes. Moving the first period to 6 pm provides more time for working students to get to campus and it also provides time for TAMU staff who leave work at 5 pm to empty parking lots, thus opening up parking spaces sooner and making the campus a bit safer by reducing the number of students frantic to find a parking space.

- Class scheduling needs to be prioritized to help students graduate in four years. Amen.

Absolutely right. The Deans and the Provost have discussed this subject at every Deans' Council meeting. We are trying to spread out classes to accommodate students who need morning classes, or afternoon classes, or evening classes or online classes. We are trying to reduce the number of classes offered at popular times in order to reduce the odds of a student needing two courses offered in the same time slot. This fall, for instance, approximately 75% of the evening classes were offered at 5:30 TR or MW, only 22% at 7 TR or MW, and only 2% at 8:30 TR or MW. The Provost has asked Deans to schedule no more than 60% of their evening classes at 6:00 and not to schedule undergraduate classes for once a week, with exceptions allowed only for the 7:30 once-a-week time slot (to avoid blocking 4 time slots on MW or TR).

- Concern about the removal of faculty from the tenure-track and in the growth of non-tenured professionals devaluing tenure.

Professional track faculty have been hired as part of the strategy to accommodate growth at a time of decreased state resources. In the past, instructors with masters degrees were hired to teach lower-level undergraduate courses. Hiring PhDs as Professional track faculty allows us to cover classes, to assign upper-division undergraduate courses, and to provide greater job security through term appointments. Moving tenure-track faculty off tenure track and into professional track appointments has been done, but it is done only in special cases and should be and has been done rarely and for good reason.

- Appointments of administrators have been made without proper faculty shared governance. Also some administrators in supervisory positions do not seem to be qualified for these positions.

Faculty do not appoint administrators, and faculty do not appoint new faculty. When faculty are asked to serve on search committees for new faculty positions or for external administrative searches, they serve in an advisory capacity. Legally, only the Provost is empowered to make job offers to faculty candidates.

- There needs to be more stakeholder input regarding the initiatives and decisions made by OIT.

OIT has a technology advisory committee. Please forward OIT recommendations or complaints to Dr. Brian Gaskins. He will also supply you with the membership of the advisory group and will likely invite you to join it or attend the meetings.

- There needs to be greater transparency when it comes to how merit pay increases are decided.

Merit pay is based on annual evaluations. Merit pay within academic departments is or should be based on the faculty member's rank within the department, that rank being based on the annual evaluation. To be totally transparent would require that deans reveal the evaluations of every member of a particular department, and that is not something that they think wise. Faculty would likely not support that either. In any case, a Chair's evaluation and recommendation for merit is reviewed by the Dean (and thus can be adjusted if thought justifiable). Then the Provost reviews the deans' recommendations. Finally, the President reviews everyone's recommendations. There are checks and balances, in other words. As a reminder, a 2% merit pool means only that the amount of money in the pool is 2% of all filled vacancies in that college. Those who rate the highest in their unit will get more than 2% and those that rank lower than average will get less than 2%. The State of Texas prohibits across-the-board pay raises. All raises must be based on merit.

- A few indicated that faculty pay is low and there is no clear path toward advancement.

TAMIU ranks at the top of A&M System regional universities in faculty salaries. As to having a "clear path toward advancement," that path lies through promotion to associate professor and professor, both of which depend on a faculty member's record. Advancement to administrative positions for a faculty member begins with providing a record of leadership within the faculty and with seeking leadership positions when those positions become open.

- Faculty needs to have access to view all grant account balances for their research funds.

Excellent idea. I've been told that occasionally PIs have not spent all of their available funds, the money returning to the funding agency. Dr. Kilburn will now monitor expenditures and work with PIs to help them spend their funds in a timely fashion.

Administrative and Faculty Senate Issues

- TAMIU is trying to become a Tier 1 university when we haven't even achieved Tier 2 status yet. We need to strike a more realistic balance between research, teaching, and service given our status as a regional university.

A Research I university, among other things, needs to accumulate \$100 million a year in Research expenditures; TAMIU currently is a little over \$3 million a year. TAMIU has never aspired to be a Tier 1 university and probably never will, given our mission and the region we serve. We do aspire to increase the quantity and quality of research produced by faculty and students. TAMIU may have once been a teaching institution decades ago, but for at least the last decade, it has consciously sought to create a balance between teaching and research, and all indicators are that it has done just that. There is no going back for any of the colleges, but especially for ARSSB. ARSSB must have an even higher standard of research expectations for its faculty than do the other colleges because it has a PhD program and must maintain AACSB accreditation, which has increased its research expectations for schools seeking to acquire or maintain AACSB standards.

- Gender discrimination and psychological (not necessarily sexual) harassment is an issue at TAMIU.

Civil Rights law prohibits gender discrimination; violations should be reported. In terms of gender balance in administration, two of the four vice presidents are female and four of the six deans are female. I have no idea what is being referred to a "psychological harassment." Harassment in any form is unacceptable.

- Worry about a severe deterioration in academic standards

Not true, better not be. BUT if true, please provide evidence of this to your Dean and to the Provost. Academic standards and performance expectations for both faculty and students must and will remain high.

Faculty Survey – November 2016 (Action Items)

Question: Specifically how would you like the Faculty Senate to confront or take care of your problem or concern?

Ideas to be Discussed at Future Faculty Forum

- Identify the faculty vision for TAMIU. Lets see if diverges from that of the administration and determine common ground that both faculty and administration can agree on. The objective is to find a more unified focus for the university.
- Discuss how to involve faculty in the decision making process through public forums and more informal venues.
- Discuss how we can strike a more realistic balance between research, teaching, and service given our status as a regional university.
- Discuss revision to the ideal faculty workload in the handbook given current realities
- Discuss how to develop a faculty lead mechanism to determine the potential appeal of existing programs and especially how they might impact existing programs. Think about a mechanism for how such an effort could inform ongoing efforts in this area led by the administration.

Other Faculty Senate Issues

- Faculty senators should share senate minutes at departmental meetings.
- The Faculty Senate could make a statement about discrimination and harassment.
- Perhaps a poll of students (SGA) and faculty should be taken to determine the needs scheduling of our students.
- Lobby harder to reduce teaching loads--3/3 is more reasonable than 4/4.
- I would like the faculty senate to prioritize class sizes and adjuncts in conversations with administration.
- Prioritize the hiring of non-tenure track but full-time faculty to teach classes generally taught by adjuncts AND put in place methods to transition high-functioning adjuncts into full-time, non-tenure track faculty with full benefits
- The COAS College requires tenured faculty to be on four committees. The Faculty Handbook states that faculty should be on three committees. This should be rectified.
- Add language to the Faculty Handbook to force more openness regarding the merit process
- Add handbook language that ensure tenured faculty inclusion in the hiring of academic administrators
- Perform a formal review of OIT practices related to consultation of stakeholders.

Texas A&M International University
Colleges Headcount Report For Spring 2017
Focus: IR_ENROLLMENT_BY_MAJR-MINOR-Colleges as of 03/01/17

By Major

Coll	Degr	Major	FR	SO	JR	SR	UG	GR	PHD	Total	
COAS	BSCJ	Criminal Justice	101	93	183	230	607	0	0	607	
	BA	Psychology	52	91	154	256	553	0	0	553	
	BA	Undeclared-Dual Credit	323	120	20	0	463	0	0	463	
	BS	Biology	120	89	100	133	442	0	0	442	
	BS	Systems Engineering	19	25	31	73	148	0	0	148	
	BA	Undeclared	52	92	1	0	145	0	0	145	
	BS	Pre-Engineering	63	58	20	1	142	0	0	142	
	BA	English	19	23	42	55	139	0	0	139	
	BA	Communication	12	20	46	59	137	0	0	137	
	BA	Political Science	19	21	36	28	104	0	0	104	
	BA	Art	18	24	21	37	100	0	0	100	
	BA	Biology	26	27	16	31	100	0	0	100	
	BA	History	15	23	23	37	98	0	0	98	
	BA	Mathematics	14	16	25	38	93	0	0	93	
	BA	Sociology	7	11	23	35	76	0	0	76	
	BS	Chemistry	9	13	10	32	64	0	0	64	
	BM	Music	17	12	13	21	63	0	0	63	
	BA	Criminal Justice	3	9	17	11	40	0	0	40	
	BAAS	Composite	0	3	11	21	35	0	0	35	
	BS	Mathematics	4	1	11	18	34	0	0	34	
	BA	Spanish	5	7	9	11	32	0	0	32	
	BA	Music	1	1	5	8	15	0	0	15	
	BA	Hispanic Studies	3	2	0	6	11	0	0	11	
	BS	Science	2	3	2	4	11	0	0	11	
	BS	Pre-Engineering-Coll Station	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
	BA	Multidisciplinary Studies	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	
		MPA	Public Administration	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	49
		MS	Biology	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	38
		MS	Psychology	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	29
		MA	English	0	0	0	0	0	27	0	27
		MA	History and Political Thought	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	26
		MA	Counseling Psychology	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	25
		MA	Communication	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	23
		MS	Criminal Justice	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	23
	MA	Lang, Lit & Translation	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	16	
	MA	Sociology	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	13	
	MS	Mathematics	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	
	NDGD	Undeclared	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	
	NDUG	Exchange Program	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
		Undeclared	3	1	0	7	11	0	0	11	
ARSSB	BBA	Business Administration	123	117	167	230	637	0	0	637	
	BBA	Accounting	21	34	74	93	222	0	0	222	
	BBA	Management Information Systems	1	6	10	16	33	0	0	33	
	BBA	Mgt Info Sys & Data Analytics	5	4	9	9	27	0	0	27	
	BBA	Undeclared	3	0	0	1	4	0	0	4	
	MBA	Business Administration	0	0	0	0	0	148	0	148	
	MPACC	Accounting	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	50	

	MS	Information Systems	0	0	0	0	0	39	0	39
	NDGD	Undeclared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	NDUG	Exchange Program	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
	NDUG	Undeclared	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
	PBUG	Undeclared	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	3
	PHD	International Business Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
COED	BS	Kinesiology	34	44	83	94	255	0	0	255
	BS	Elem Ed-Bilingual Emphasis	27	37	81	64	209	0	0	209
	BS	Communication Disorders	19	17	55	97	188	0	0	188
	BS	Special Ed-EC6 & All Lvl Cert	4	10	18	24	56	0	0	56
	BS	Elem Ed-ESL Emphasis	3	2	12	11	28	0	0	28
	BS	Elem Ed-Early Lrning Emphasis	13	6	2	0	21	0	0	21
	BSIS	Bilingual Education	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	6
	BS	Early Childhood Education	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	3
	MS	School Counseling	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	58
	MA	Education	0	0	0	0	0	47	0	47
	MS	Educational Administration	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	38
	MS	Special Education	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	29
	MS	Curriculum and Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	26
	NDCT	Administration	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	17
	MSED	Educational Administration	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	9
	MS	Bilingual Education	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
	PBUG	Undeclared	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	3
	NDCT	Educational Diagnostician	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	NDCT	Superintendency	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	MSED	Administration	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	NDCT	Principal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	NDGD	Undeclared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
CONHS	BSN	Nursing	124	119	157	198	598	0	0	598
	MSN	Nurse Practitioner	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	31
		Nursing Administration	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
UC	BA	Multidisciplinary Studies	4	6	10	46	66	0	0	66
	BA	Multidisc. Studies-PreLaw	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
College Total:			1301	1189	1497	2048	6035	794	17	6846

2. Faculty Survey – November 2016 (Action Items)

Question: Specifically how would you like the Faculty Senate to confront or take care of your problem or concern?

Ideas to be Discussed at Future Faculty Forum

- Identify the faculty vision for TAMIU. Lets see if diverges from that of the administration and determine common ground that both faculty and administration can agree on. The objective is to find a more unified focus for the university.
- Discuss how to involve faculty in the decision making process through public forums and more informal venues.
- Discuss how we can strike a more realistic balance between research, teaching, and service given our status as a regional university.
- Discuss revision to the ideal faculty workload in the handbook given current realities
- Discuss how to develop a faculty lead mechanism to determine the potential appeal of existing programs and especially how they might impact existing programs. Think about a mechanism for how such an effort could inform ongoing efforts in this area led by the administration.

Other Faculty Senate Issues

- Faculty senators should share senate minutes at departmental meetings.
- The Faculty Senate could make a statement about discrimination and harassment.
- Perhaps a poll of students (SGA) and faculty should be taken to determine the needs scheduling of our students.
- Lobby harder to reduce teaching loads--3/3 is more reasonable than 4/4.
- I would like the faculty senate to prioritize class sizes and adjuncts in conversations with administration.
- Prioritize the hiring of non-tenure track but full-time faculty to teach classes generally taught by adjuncts AND put in place methods to transition high-functioning adjuncts into full-time, non-tenure track faculty with full benefits
- The COAS College requires tenured faculty to be on four committees. The Faculty Handbook states that faculty should be on three committees. This should be rectified.
- Add language to the Faculty Handbook to force more openness regarding the merit process
- Add handbook language that ensure tenured faculty inclusion in the hiring of academic administrators
- Perform a formal review of OIT practices related to consultation of stakeholders.

Agenda for the Academic Oversight and Affairs Committee

Wednesday February 22 (1:30 to 2:30 pm) in room LVB 108

Present Senators Tobin, Ynalvez, Holmgreen

1. Share Final Version of the Faculty Survey for Release (see attached document)

The committee agreed to the revised version of the survey produced by Dr. Tobin. After this meeting Dr. Mitchell generated responses to the survey (attached). In light of this development perhaps the Faculty Senate should ask Dr. Mitchell how he would like the survey results be disseminated to the faculty.

2. Discussion of a Mechanism for Gauging Faculty Morale

The committee reasserted its desire to host a faculty forum this spring as venue where the survey results can be discussed with the administration.

3. Other Business

None

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.

Agenda for Faculty Senate Workplace and Morale Committee

Wednesday March 1 (1:30 to 2:00 pm) in room LVB 108

In Attendance: Senators Tobin, Bennett, Milovich

On Leave: Dr. Gill

1. Discussion of Implementation of ToY Observation Process for 2017

The committee established a timeline for the ToY observation process. Before spring break the committee will schedule times for classroom observations from college nominees and confirm the participation of observers and get their availability. Each committee member received an assignment to help fulfill these tasks. An issue arose in that Dr. Gill, the nominee from the College of Education is currently teaching her class in a purely on-line format. The committee decided to ask Dr. Gill how she wants the observations handled. Also, the suggestion was made to ask for advice from observers who have experience with teaching on-line course. The first round of observations will occur after spring break during late March with a second optional observation during early April.

2. Other Business

None

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 pm.

Texas A&M International University/ Technology Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

February 14, 2017

11:00 a.m. KL 253

Meeting Facilitator: Dr. Maria de Lourdes Vilorio

Invitees:

Fran Bernat – COAS,

Hugo Garcia –ARSSBA,

Seong Kwan Cho- COED

Wendy Donnell – CNHS,

Nerissa Lindsey – KL,

Jose Maria (Joe) Gutierrez, University College

President's Appointee, Marvin E. Bennett, III

Trevor Liddle, VP for Finance & Admissions Appointee,

Albert Chavez, VP for IT Appointee

Vacant, VP for Institutional Advancement Appointee

Gina Gonzalez, VP for Student Success Appointee

Leebrian Gaskins, VP for Informational Technology/CIO, ex-officio

Dr. Patricia Abrego

Director of Instructional Technology & Distance Education

Pablo Reyes

Associate Director of User Services

Ricardo Ramirez

Associate Director of Student Information Services

Roberto Gonzalez

Associate Director of Instructional Technology Services

- I. Call to order
- II. Roll call
- III. Approval of minutes from last meeting which was held on October 5, 2016
- IV. Old Business
 - a) Blackboard Online APP (Cost \$ 1.99 for faculty) No report yet- Dr. Abrego recommended that this business be removed as a pending item since we do not have a status report as of yet.
- V. New Business
 - a) Adrian Dominguez Follow-Up Report and Presentation- Mr. Dominguez reported that Student Center 236, 230, 231 lighting was corrected. Cowart Hall 101 Screen was also taken care of. He also informed the TAC that the TAMIU physical plant dept. is currently working on replacing lights that are not working.
 - b) Mr. Liddle informed the TAC that there is currently a new contract in negotiation whereby new lighting systems will be replacing the existing ones. This investment by the TAMU system will be a campus wide initiative to replace the current lighting with LED lights, and controls for lighting. In addition, the new building will have 3 lighting programs one for teaching, a main classroom light, and one for video or movie presentations.
 - c) Hugo Garcia presented a concern related to the discontinuation of ANGEL as of May 1, 2017. Albert Chavez informed the TAC that the elearning.tamu.edu will continue to have access to course shells and/or additional course material as requested by faculty.
 - d) Dr. Bennett presented a concern regarding the assignment of classrooms and the system being utilized to do so. The TAC agreed to invite Mr. Garcia "Chelelo" to our next meeting in March to present the classroom assignment system.
 - e) If requested portable white boards are located in storage for faculty use just request them from Mr. Adrian Dominguez. (The reason this was mentioned is to help professors who teach in large classrooms with little or no white board space).
 - f) Document Camera Demonstration- TAMIU OIT Bobby Gonzalez demonstrated the new IPEVO document camera which has replaced the old systems. The IPEVO can record, capture and take snapshots. It is completely user friendly yet it cannot be

accessed from the existing control panels. In order to access the IPEVO faculty members will have to log in and click on the icon located on the desk tops. In addition, Bobby will be creating a folder to capture pictures, video or snapshots for faculty using these options. Please note date stored in the desk top folders which will be named IPEVO SAVED pictures will only be available 24 hours.

- g) Dr. Abrego briefly shared the A&M System Proctoring Solutions plans and the TAC has invited her to make a full presentation at the March 2017 meeting.
- h) Meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m.