

Texas A&M International University
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting
April 6, 2018

- I. *Call to order* by Dr. Ken Tobin at 12:00 pm.
- II. *Roll call*: Present: Dr. Kenneth J. Tobin, Dr. Marvin E. Bennett III, Dr. Ruby A. Ynalvez, Dr. Frances G. Rhodes, Dr. George R. Clarke, Ms. Malynda M. Dalton, Dr. Puneet S. Gill, Dr. Ariadne A. Gonzalez, Dr. Diana Linn, Dr. David K. Milovich Jr., Ms. Marcela Moran, Dr. James A. Norris, Dr. Jason Norris, Dr. Lola O. Norris, Dr. Leonel Prieto, Dr. Maria D. Vilorio, and Dr. Oswaldo A. Zapata Not present: Ms. Destine D. Holmgreen (represented by Joe Gutierrez), Ms. Vivian Garcia, Dr. Philip S. Roberson
- III. *Minutes for March 2018 were approved by the Faculty Senate.*
- IV. *a. Our guest University President Dr. Pablo Arenaz discussed the following:*
 - Dr. Arenaz attended this week the first of the three meetings (programmatic coaching reviews) scheduled at College Station, TX.
 - TAMIU data for Systems Strategic Planning stacked well across categories. The one category in which we still lag from our expectation is research expenditures. However, we definitely have started towards improvement. Our research expenditures have doubled since 2010.
 - Other universities are catching up. For example, Central Texas, with 20% the faculty size of TAMIU receives \$2 M per year in NSF funding. We need to pick up our pace.
 - This academic year, TAMIU submitted a total of 84 grants, which is a consistent average compared to past academic years. TAMIU submitted a total amounting to \$65 M.
 - More faculty members need to look at opportunities in the science and engineering fields. We need to tap into minority programs by the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Health, and the Department of Energy.
 - The visit to Washington D.C. earlier this year opened an opportunity for a research meeting with the Army Research Laboratory in the Office of Naval and Air Force Research. TAMIU presented our role in the forefront of artificial skin research. Dr. Arenaz hopes to establish TAMIU as a key research university in this new area of military research.

- A role for TAMIU as a potential research university for the Homeland Security and Custom and Border Protection is also another goal of Dr. Arenaz.
- TAMIU budget will increase by 2% in the next academic year. Expenditure will increase by 2% in the next academic year. This prospect is based on our increase in credit hour production. Built into this is a 1.5% error, as it is contingent on 2018 Fall enrollment. Our goal is to reach 8,000 students enrolled.
- The new legislative period is approaching. The prospects are bleak. The classification will be changed from “*special items*” to “*nonformula funding*”. TAMIU will likely receive less money in the formula. Finalized outcomes for TAMIU will be decided during the Legislative Budget Board hearing in August 2018.
- TAMIU 6-year graduation rate has increased to 53.8%, placing us top in the system. TAMIU graduation rate is also higher than most schools in the University of Texas system.
- TAMIU ranked in its debut in the 2018 *U.S. News and World Report’s Best Colleges: #70* among Best Regional Universities in the West United States.

b. Our guest University Provost Dr. Tom Mitchell discussed the following:

- There was an emphasis for an overhaul in the faculty candidate search process. Faculty search is one of our time-consuming services. We invest our time and money to interview candidates. However, we are late in making offers, and we lose our top candidates. *We need to change this.* Interviews need to begin in late January to allow official offers to be sent in by late February to early March. This schedule entails that the search process should be initiated in the Fall. For example, job descriptions should be finalized by the start of the Fall semester in August. Search Committees should be formed by the end of the Spring semester that precedes the Fall semester when the candidate search will start.
- Processes for curriculum matters need adjustment so that decisions and catalogues are finalized by April 1. Most of the procedural requirements for the progression from the departments to the colleges then to the university should ideally be done in the Fall semester.
 - A question was raised: The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) meeting was held 4 weeks ago. Why has the catalog not been done since this UCC meeting?
 - (*President, Dr. Arenaz*) Revisions were sent back to some departments, and some of these revisions are still pending. Dr. Arenaz emphasized that making curriculum changes is the responsibility of the faculty. It is neither the registrar’s nor the associate registrar’s job description to proofread and edit curriculum changes. It was suggested by Dr. Arenaz

that the UCC becomes the standard committee of the Faculty Senate with representation from each of the Offices of the Deans'. Each dean or associate dean would serve as an official member of the committee. The committee chair would be the faculty member. The committee secretary position would be rotated amongst the associate deans. This would be a way to use the Offices of the Deans' to help with curriculum paperwork.

- It was raised that the challenging component this year was the lack of Adobe Professional Software needed to approve the curriculum forms.
- It was also raised that curricular and program changes were done without the knowledge of the faculty.
- A more serious issue was that some mandates (e.g. college wide mandates) given to faculty affected curricular changes that were developing. At times, adhering to these mandates meant a realignment of the developing curriculum.
 - *(President, Dr. Arenaz)* The curriculum is the faculty's charge. However, there were changes that have been enacted from the President or the Provost because of their broader view of the curriculum.
- It was suggested to consider establishing departmental curriculum committees. The Provost, Dr. Mitchell, will discuss this with the deans.

V. *Old Business*

a. *Vote to Endorse Accessibility Matters Module:*

- Discussion on the Accessibility Matters Module was initiated on the Senate floor.
 - There was a motion for the Senate to endorse and heavily promote the module without enforcing a requirement.
 - It was raised that some quiz questions were unnecessarily detailed such as requiring the knowledge of law numbers and years of enactment.
 - It was raised that a consideration for a specific version of the module tailored for face-to-face classrooms should be presented to Academic Technology.
- The Faculty Senate voted to recall the Accessibility Matters Module for a redraft to create (1) a shorter module and (2) a module that provides additional instructional techniques for the classroom.

b. *General Faculty Survey Results:*

- Dr. Marvin Bennett provided the Faculty Senate with a hard copy of the survey results summary. Refer to Handout #2.

- The upcoming Spring Faculty Forum will be the stage for the administration to address these faculty concerns face-to-face.
- As the list on page 3 of Handout #2 denotes, there are many areas in which the TAMU administration is doing its job well.

c. Fixed-Term Faculty Survey Results:

- The Ad Hoc Fixed-Term Faculty Committee compiled the results of the Faculty Senate Survey of Fixed-Term Faculty. A copy of the survey results was provided and discussed by Dr. Tobin on the Senate floor. Refer to Handout #3.
 - Of concern is item 4: We have an array of circumstances on campus that do not seem to be consistent with the intent of the TAMU policy to “recruit and retain faculty talent.”
 - Some units have fixed-term faculties employed in serial one-year appointments. Some units have faculties employed for multiple years with no opportunity to seek promotion.
 - The Fixed-Term Committee, along with Dr. Tobin, will meet with Dr. Mitchell on April 13, 2018 to discuss these concerns.
- The TAMU System Policy 12.07 was also discussed.

d. Planning for Spring 2018 Faculty Forum April 12, 2018:

- This forum will be the stage for the administration to address face-to-face the faculty concerns captured by the results of the General Faculty Survey.

VI. New Business

a. Proposed Changes to the Description of the University Ethics Committee (discussed by Dr. Lola O. Norris):

- Changing the Faculty Handbook language for the Honor Council to conform with the Student Handbook was discussed.
- The Faculty Senate proposed to change the current description on the Faculty Handbook by adding a reference to the current Section 10.02 of the Student Handbook and a link to this section of the Student Handbook.
- The Faculty Senate voted to agree on this proposal.

b. Ongoing Technology and Distance Education Issues:

- A consideration for an after-hour technology Help Desk for students was suggested.

c. *Discussion of Faculty Teaching Loads:*

- Dr. Mitchell discussed the Teaching Loads categories on the Senate floor. Refer to Handout #1. The following were some points of discussion:
 - There is an apparent inconsistency in teaching loads across colleges. For example, instructors in one college are under a 12-hour load requirement, while instructors in the College of Arts and Sciences are under a 15-hour load. Teaching load requirements for Assistant Professionals vary from 12 to 15-hour across colleges.
 - Instructors are calling for a 12-hour teaching load requirement. Dr. Mitchell is in favor of maintaining a 15-hour teaching load for instructors.
 - Given an instance that an academic semester schedule has been finalized, an instructor who has a 12-hour teaching load under the schedule will still need to be uploaded to a 15-hour teaching load.
 - Visiting Assistant Professors (ABD) are not evaluated for research and publication.
 - Research Productive (defined as at least scores of “5” and “4” in research evaluation for two consecutive years) Tenured Faculties are under an 18-hour teaching load requirement/2 semesters. These faculty members can request for additional releases. These releases require an official proposal that will undergo an evaluation by a committee. A recommendation to the college dean is then placed by the committee for the college dean’s approval. A release approval requires a specific research product to be produced within a month after the semester.
 - Release application must be placed in September for a Spring semester release time.
 - If you are given a release time, it should be release time that will go to a job that is significant enough to replace teaching the students.
- There is a need for teaching load consistency across colleges. We also need an accurate and consistent communication regarding load requirements to our faculty.
- One concern the Faculty Senate needs to address in future Senate meetings is whether the teaching load document discussed by Dr. Mitchell (Handout #1) is consistent with the Faculty Handbook.

VII. Committee Reports

- a. Academic Oversight Committee: (see previous section, Faculty Survey Results)
- b. The Budget and Finance Committee: Nothing to report.
- c. The University Ethics Committee: Nothing to report.
- d. The Committee on Creation, Composition, and Responsibilities of Committees: Dr. Frances Rhodes shared that there will be no election this year because each position has only one nominee. She will be meeting with respective deans to fill up the remaining positions that received no nominee.
- e. The Committee on Faculty Work Environment and Morale: Classroom observations have been submitted to the Office of the Provost.
- f. The Faculty Handbook Revision Committee: Votes are pending.
- g. The Distance Education and Instructional Technology Committee: Nothing to report.
- h. The Technology Advisory Committee: Quality Matters certification will only be given to AP courses and core curriculum courses.
- i. The Assessment Committee: Nothing to report.
- j. Ad Hoc Committees:
 - Evaluation: Nothing to report.
 - Fixed-Term Promotion: Reports were given in the discussion of Old Business. The Fixed-Term Promotion Guidelines for the School of Business will be presented in the next meeting.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned by Dr. Tobin at 2:23 p.m.

**Teaching Loads
Currently
By Year (Fall & Spring Only)**

Category: Teaching & Service Only

Instructors (MA/MS):	30 hours
Visiting Assistant Professors (ABD):	30 hours
Clinical Faculty (CONHS):	24 hours
Assistant Professionals (Ph.D.):	24 – 30 hours*
Associate Professionals (Ph.D.):	24 – 30 hours*

Category: Teaching, Service, and Research/Publications

Tenure-Track Assistant Professors:

Year One:	12 hours
Year Two:	15 hours
Years Three – Six:	18 hours

Tenured Faculty:

Research Productive: (Scores of 9-10 on Research for 2 consecutive years totaled)	18 hours
Default: (Scores of less than 9 on Research for 2 consecutive years totaled)	24 hours
Regents Professors:	12 hours
Chairs:	6 hours
Deans:	3 hours

*Variation depends on number of preparations, class sizes, and department needs.

Category: ARSSB

Instructors:	30 hours
Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors: (non-doctoral teaching loads)	18 hours
Faculty with Doctoral Teaching Loads:	12 hours

Principles:

1. Any reduction in the standard teaching load has to be justified by administrative assignments or special research projects and must be approved by the chair, the dean, and the provost. A course reduction for any of these reasons should be equivalent to at least 135 hours per semester (equivalent to 45 hours of FTF time, plus 90 hours of course preparation/grading/student interaction time).
2. No overloads are to be promised or paid until advanced approval is granted by the chair, the dean, and the provost.

Faculty Concerns (* means more than one response)

Teaching

- * too high a teaching load, too large classes especially freshman level
- * cutting Writing Center's budget results in fewer and more poorly-trained tutors
- * reduce course load on instructors to 4/4 to be more efficient teachers
- * no faculty compensation for teaching overloads
- * more faculty support for development leave
- a 'report it' concern about a student did not remain anonymous
- commitment to international service learning thwarted by too large of a student enrollment
- adjunct faculty teaching WIN courses
 - allowing papers on any topic
 - giving objective testing in a WIN class
 - assigning group work under-mines good students and graduating student's GPAs
- too much emphasis on making students happy rather than educating them
- too high a demand on frequent course changes, each course becomes a new-prep
- the push for more students but no push for increased faculty or space
- completing application and online training every year takes away from instructor prep time
- difficulty in teaching in music rooms not properly sound-proofed
- liability of taking students to off-campus events

Research

- * administrator rights for faculty on research computers lacking
- * teaching a full load and maintaining office hours 4 days a week prevents research
- lack of institutional funding for lab equipment maintenance
- IRB need more personnel to keep up with requests
- more support for research faculty's permanent residency (green card) status
- no incentives to encourage, support and reward for high-quality research
- lack of graduate programs for professors who must physically collect data for research
- more space is needed to house equipment
- no support for full-time adjunct research or conference travel
- lack of funding for undergrad research or supervising masters theses
- difficulty when doing purchases with Purchasing
- slowness of Support Services' assistance for those grants with strict timelines/deadlines
- lack of research leave for junior faculty
- more support for collaboration with other people from the same field outside of TAMIU
- unable to afford software for research that the University has no license for

Service

- * added expectation on service over and above research and teaching
- service disproportionately distributed to junior and lower-level faculty
- too much faculty committee work disrupts teaching

Students

- * Graduate Students
 - too many students allowed in graduate courses
 - quality of grad research assistances not experienced to complete research work
 - allow professors more leeway in hiring GRAs
 - not enough graduate assistances

- provisional admission of grad students with 2.5 GPA
- * advising issues
 - advisors putting students in classes that are out of sequence
 - poor advising causing students to lose scholarships (30 SCH per year rule)
 - lack of accessibility to Academic Success Coaches means faculty do most of the advising
 - Student Advising suggesting that freshmen take too heavy a course load
 - students registering for classes they are not prepared for
- "community college" effect on some students, unaware of what is needed to succeed
- student evaluation process changes every year
- registration for students in some colleges is a mess

Administration

- * curriculum and academic initiatives should be faculty-led
- * faculty with 15+ years should have the option to attend commencement/convocation
- * lack of clarity about tenure requirements continues to be a problem for junior faculty
- not much support for new faculty if hired on a temporary status
- many Title IX complaints for non-sense reasons
- harsh post-tenure review process
- processing of reimbursement for travel takes too long
- PPE submission deadlines are too compressed
- catalog change forms do not go through in a timely manner
- Colleges have "haves" and "have nots"; faculty are placed in a caustic work environment
- needing the OK from deans to write a grant and having grant-writing micro-managed
- major curriculum changes being made by some Deans and the Provost against faculty advice
- lack of written policy in some colleges for fixed term faculty seeking promotion
- need more money for labs and computers
- scheduling professional development activities during class time
- developing programs that do not have a high growth potential over those that do
- lack of transparency of Budget Advisory Committee in department budgets
- under-development of Sculpture program due to its being tied into Ceramics program
- lack of a partner-hire commitment by the University leaves partner-hires in limbo

Other

- * nonfunctioning computers and drop-down screens in many classrooms
- OIT Help Desk should have separate qualified staff to support faculty
- constant OIT computer updates results in loss of links to UConnect and teaching resources
- slow response of computers and computer booting due to Win 10 update
- low quality or absence of TV monitors/PCs in classrooms
- having one printer available for the whole department
- lack of timely response to computer upgrades and printing challenges
- faculty not made aware of security updates done to computers which slows down work output
- AC is turned off in class/office in afternoon
- being forced to use Digital Measures

What TAMIU is doing right (* means more than one response)

General

- * Faculty members have good relations with all levels of the administration
- * Increased involvement of faculty and staff in the decision making process
- * Provides resources to promote a healthy work-life balance
- * Merit raises are supported
- * Funding for attending conferences is strong
- * Maintains an excellent environment for teaching
- * Support for research equipment and support for research in general is strong
- * Focus on undergraduate research and study abroad programs as well as international travel
- * Robust and numerous opportunities for student engagement across the campus exist
- * Support for student activities, outreach, and learning is strong
- * TAMIU does a good job serving the people of Laredo and the South Texas region
- * The growth of the university seems robust, well planned, and is aspirational
- * Have a beautiful campus thanks to the work the Physical Plant staff
- * The faculty survey and the work of the Faculty Senate
- * Library strongly supports both teaching and research
- Academic freedom is supported
- Fosters interdepartmental collaborations
- Has an atmosphere that promotes the free exchange of ideas between faculty and students
- Now have a more constructive approach to solving problems
- Some units have positive leadership that promotes an effective team environment
- Support for STEM students is strong.
- TAMIU works to promote student graduation in four years
- Some colleges are revising program in a positive manner
- Has great support staff
- Lecture series that are open to the public

Dr. Arenaz (President)

- * Dr. Arenaz has fostered a culture that has attracted many talent faculty
- Dr. Arenaz is willing to listen to concerns

Dr. Mitchell (Provost)

- Dr. Mitchell is active in seeking ways to increase enrollment

Dr. Raminez (VP Student Success)

- Dr. Raminez strongly promotes TAMIU
- Student recruitment is strong

Dr. Kilburn (VP of Research)

- * Research support is great including the IRB staff and other support staff
- * Strong support for grant submissions

Dr Gaskins (VP Information Technology)

- * Several favorable responses supporting the work of OIT

Senate To Do's

Academic Oversight

- Conduct a survey to promote greater uniformity and transparency of shared governance across the campus
- Conduct a survey of class size by rank, college, discipline, and type (i.e. WIN courses)
- Survey faculty to learn about preferred balance between research, teaching, and service
- Survey faculty to learn what programs might have the maximum impact for TAMIU
- Review post-tenure process and examine what other university's are doing right.

Budget and Finance

- Fostering more transparency and openness into the budgeting process
- Examine how course fees are allocated across campus.

Ethics

- Examining the confidentiality of student reporting

Committee on Committees

Awards

- Encourage faculty leaders to take on a mentor role for junior faculty

Handbook

Assessment

- Examine processes for reporting and gathering of data SACS with an eye for efficiency
- Monitor the on-going process to develop a new student evaluation instrument

Distance Education

- Develop a plan to improve OIT support in online and live classes

Technology Advisory

- Increase quality of monitors/computers in the classroom
- Help with speeding up Win 10 configure time so that classroom time is not wasted
- Develop a plan to improve OIT support in online and live classes
- Process to obtain Admin rights to research and office computers needs to be streamlined
- Have OIT better communicate when they plan to conduct security updates
- Make sure computers are ready for the semester before it begins

TAMIU Faculty Senate

Ad hoc Fixed-Term Faculty Committee

Meeting Minutes

March 27, 3:00 PM

Members Present: Vivian Garcia, Destine Holmgreen, Phil Roberson

We reviewed the compiled results of the Faculty Senate Survey of TAMIU fixed-term faculty.

A copy of the survey results was provided to Senate President Ken Tobin (and appended hereto).

The TAMIU System Policy 12.07 was also discussed and is appended hereto.

Survey results suggest that:

1. For some fixed-term faculty in some colleges/departments, both morale and perceived support from tenured/tenure-track faculty is less than ideal.
2. We have array of fixed-term "labels" used on campus in addition to policy ranks of Assistant, Associate and Senior Professional (which is allowable by TAMU policy).
3. We have many examples of fixed-term faculty duties other than teaching, sometimes with released time, and others without released time.
4. We have an array of circumstances on campus that do not seem to be consistent with the intent of the TAMU policy, which is to "recruit and retain faculty talent" through extended terms of appointment. For example:
 - a. Some have employed in serial one-year appointments.
 - b. Some have been employed for multiple years with no opportunity to seek promotion.
5. The need for all colleges to have a written, Senate-reviewed evaluation and promotion policy is apparent. For example, some fixed-term faculty are evaluated with the same instruments, procedures, and timelines as tenured/tenure-track faculty, even when actual duties are disparate.
6. A final suggestion is for the University to develop an "umbrella" fixed-term policy statement to provide guidance to colleges and departments, with a goal of providing more consistency in hiring, evaluation, promotion, and retention of fixed-term faculty.

From page 11 (Section 2) of the TAMIU Faculty Handbook

and
of it
11. Honor Council. The Honor Council consists of faculty and students who have been elected by their peers or appointed by the Provost and who have undergone training in order to serve as case investigators and/or hearing panelists. The Honor Council serves to provide students with a means by which they may report academic dishonesty, to provide students with a means of appealing charges of academic dishonesty, and to provide the Provost with recommendations regarding general academic sanctions or remedial efforts appropriate to specific cases. This council shall have authority to create processes and operating procedures to implement the Honor System and to enforce the rules described in the Honor Code. Through the Provost's Office, this council shall be the central body responsible for maintaining records and for coordinating communication, prevention, training, remediation, and adjudication efforts for the Honor System. The Honor Council shall consist of 25 members; fifteen students including at least one graduate student (twelve appointed by the VP for Student Success and three by the Provost), and ten faculty members (nine elected by the faculty at large, and one appointed by the Provost). The Faculty Senate will conduct the elections of the faculty representatives. Members must be elected and appointed by September 1 of each academic year. Faculty members serve two-year terms; student members serve one-year terms. The Honor Council will hold general meetings at least twice each semester, and members of the council will serve on 3-5 member hearing panels when selected by the Chair of the Honor Council and the Provost.

Student
From page 51 (Section 10.02) of the TAMIU ~~Faculty~~ Handbook

The Honor Council reports to the Provost. The Honor Council will consist of at least ten 10 full-time faculty members and 15 University students. Five members are the required minimum for quorum to be achieved, of which must include two members from each constituency (faculty and students). At the first meeting of each year, the Provost will appoint the Chair and the Honor Council student representatives will elect a Vice-Chair. A faculty member will chair the Honor Council with the director of SCCE or designee serving as co-chair absent voting privileges, and the vice-chair shall be a student.

Voting members include:

1. At least 10 full-time faculty members (nine elected by the Faculty-at-large through the Faculty Senate elections process, 1 appointed by the Provost).
2. At least 15 TAMIU students, including at least one graduate student (12 appointed by the VP of Student Success and three appointed by the Provost).
3. Members must be elected and appointed by September 1st of each academic year. Faculty serve two-year terms; student members serve one-year terms. Both faculty and student representatives may serve more than one term on the Honor Council.
4. If faculty or student resigns or cannot complete term, a new member will be elected/appointed to finish the initial term.
5. The Honor Council will hold general meetings as needed.
6. General meetings and trainings are considered mandatory. In addition, all members are expected to attend at least one hearing per long-semester. Failure to adhere to mandatory general meetings and trainings will trigger a review of membership by the Honor Council.

7. A member may not vote when a case is considered a conflict of interest or may not be fair and impartial due to the nature of the case.

The Honor Council may consult with The TAMUS legal representative through the Office of the Provost as needed. A legal representative from the TAMUS will serve on the council in situations where there are obvious legal issues and concerns.

Texas A&M International University/ Technology Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

April 11, 2018

9:00 a.m. KL 253 OIT Conference Room

Meeting Facilitator: Dr. Maria de Lourdes Viloría

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

Catarina Colunga, VP for Institutional Advancement Appointee

Gina Gonzalez, VP for Student Success Appointee

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

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. Welcome/ Roll call
- II. Approve March 8, 2018 minutes
- III. New Business
 - a. How can we increase the quality of monitors/computers in the classrooms?

According to Pablo Reyes, IT Manager, OIT will need to know the rooms numbers or at least the building name to address these concerns. Drs. Bernat & Bennett identified two classrooms that needed immediate attention – WHT126 & LBV 108. For example, some of the concerns stated in 2018 Faculty Senate Faculty Survey specifically relate to classrooms' projector screens being jet black or monitors being too small for instruction efficiency. According to Dr. Abrego there are currently 79 classrooms being serviced by OIT and to her knowledge all classrooms have 19-20 inch monitors. A possible solutions presented by Dr. Viloría is to place OIT AV Assistance Cards in each of the classrooms with a phone number and contact name so

that faculty can report these issues immediately and room locations can be documented. TAC decided to revisit this topic in the May 2018 meeting.

- b. Can we get help with speeding up WIN 10 configure time so that classroom time is not wasted?

Pablo Reyes explained that Windows 10 has different versions and OIT is currently working on Windows 10 LTSC (Long Term Servicing Branch). This version of Windows does not require frequent updates, which should minimize software update interruptions. OIT does send out software updates to all computers after working hours. However, the classroom computers are kept in a frozen state during the day and the WINDOWS updates for these computers happen over the weekend on Saturday afternoons until Sunday night. OIT is looking at different ways to speed updates. However, due to security reasons the classroom computers automatically go into sleep mode after 10 minutes of idle time. This topic will also be revisited in May 2018.

Dr. Bernat mentioned if the auto lock on the computers be extended for more than 10 minutes so as to prevent the computer to go into sleep mode. She mentioned that when this happens, she needs to reboot the computer which takes some time from her class time.

- c. How can we develop a plan to improve OIT support in online and live classes, especially after 6pm and on weekends? We will need more support with Academic Partners and more online classes.

OIT tried support hours on Saturday before but there was little demand for it. Nevertheless, OIT already keeps extended hours during Monday-Saturday class times, especially on weekdays. According to Dr. Abrego, OIT has technicians available until 10:30 p.m. In addition, there is already a built in system where faculty members needing assistance after normal work hours can dial extension 2310 –and they will be automatically be transferred to extension 2107 where an on-call OIT technician will respond. Furthermore, BLACKBOARD related assistance during after work hours can be obtained by emailing (elarning@tamiu.edu) where there will be someone on call most of the time.

- d. A process to obtain ADMIN rights to research and office computers needs to be streamlined.

This topic will be discussed at our next meeting once more. Currently, faculty requesting ADMIN Rights (see attached form) for their computers need to complete an Exemption Request Form (see attached form) that is routed through different departments which also includes President Arenaz. Faculty are concerned with the amount of time that this process takes – and how it needs to be renewed each year. . If getting all 5 signatures takes a day, it will take us at least a week to review a request. Dr.

Bennett mentioned that someone waited 6 months to get his admin rights. No mention of who this person was.

- e. What measures can OIT use to communicate when they plan to conduct security updates?

Classroom computer updates are done on Saturdays and Sundays and office computers run software updates on week days after 5p.m. Currently, classroom computers are kept in a frozen mode and are only unfrozen when updates or software patches are sent out. Particularly, approved RESEARCH computers are not on this schedule so patches are not sent out to these computers so that updates will not interfere with research projects with an approved EXEMPT form.

- f. Please make sure that computers are ready before the semester begins.

Dr. Abrego will check on why faculty requested software installs for specific classes is either not installed on a timely fashion or not at all. The software in question were specific to Engineering program (classes) like GIS specialized software, SPSS for students. Dr. Bennett mentioned about a situation where a software was requested in the summer and it was installed 2 weeks into the semester. This happened in the Fall. He mentioned that it may have been Dr. Tashtoush (in one of the LBV labs), but he was not sure. The other faculty was Dr. Tobin with a request for a GIS program.

Dr. Bernat asked if we have SPSS in the labs, because some students have been using R instead of SPSS. Dr. Abrego mentioned that SPSS is installed in all labs. Off campus use of SPSS can be done with the VM. We have 30 licenses available for VM.

Open Agenda