

**Texas A&M International University
TAMIU Faculty Senate
Friday October 7, 2022
12:00 p.m.– 2:45 p.m.
WHTC Rm. 125**

I. The meeting was called to order by the Faculty Senate President, Dr. Ruby Ynalvez at 12:01 p.m.

II. *Roll Call*: Dr. Ruby Ynalvez, Dr. Hayley Kazen, Dr. Marvin Bennett, Ms. Jeanette Hatcher, Dr. Li-Zheng Brooks, Dr. Seong Kwan Cho, Dr. Deepak Ganta, Dr. Puneet Gill, Dr. Ariadne Gonzalez, Dr. Tatiana Gorbunova, Dr. Andrew Hazelton, Dr. San Juanita Hernandez, Dr. Kate Houston, Dr. Kameron Jorgensen, Dr. Runchang Lin, Dr. Diana Linn, Dr. Gilberto Martinez, Dr. Mehnazz Momen, Ms. Marcela Moran, Dr. James Norris, Dr. Leonel Prieto

III. *Our Guests* were given the floor:

Dr. Stephen Duffy

Dr. Duffy approached the Faculty Senate with two requests for help, a long-term and a short-term one. The long-term request is that he would like the Senate to look into issues related to academic assessment, specifically WIN courses, core curriculum courses and the AEIRS. Specific issues to look into are:

- How are classes that get accessed assigned?
- How are general assessment duties assigned?
- How is the data from those classes collected and distributed?
- How is that data used in regards to program and class development?

He would like to get a 'white-paper' type report on these issues from the Senate by May of next year so that they can look over it during the summer.

The short-term request is that TAMIU is going into a new QEP development phase and they would like to get feedback from faculty and students on ideas for a new QEP. Dr. Duffy's office will generate a short survey that he would like the Senate to distribute to the faculty and then use the results of the survey for a general discussion forum.

Dr. Pablo Arenaz

Dr. Arenaz announced that he was in Austin last week to present our budget to the Legislative Budget Board (LLB). The big item this year in all of the educational systems is educational affordability. What the chancellors presented to the LBB is that they will not raise tuition for the next two years if, in turn, they receive full formula funding; including enrollment growth, group insurance, support for the Hazlewood Act, and some funding for mental health.

Dr. Arenaz also reported that they are in the process of separating the office of VP for Student Affairs into 2 offices; a VP for Enrollment Management and a VP for Student Engagement. Juan Garcia will continue on in his role as Interim VP of Enrollment Management and they will begin a search to fill the position for VP of Student Engagement.

Dr. Thomas Mitchell

Dr. Mitchell made several general announcements to the Senate:

- The Faculty Development Leave Committee met and will be forwarding their recommendations on the 6 applicants to Dr. Mitchell soon.
- The University Promotion and Tenure Committee will meet on November 18th.
- The schedules for Wintermester and Spring will go live today. So please announce that students need to go see their advisors. Registration starts late October-early November.
- They are currently putting the 4-day campus presence in all job ads and offer letters.
- Reminded the Senate that TAMIU does have Ethics Point (as a System requirement) that does allow for anonymous submissions and it will send back a report to the submitter.

Dr. Randel Brown (TAMIU Ombuds Officer)

Dr. Brown presented his annual report to the Senate (see attachment). Currently he has been visiting every department to introduce himself and to give the faculty more information about what the Faculty Ombuds Program does. The Ombuds person is an independent, neutral and impartial resource for faculty to use to help resolve issues prior to filing a formal grievance.

Dr. Brown announced that he has heard from faculty about 4 general issues:

- lack of communication about issues going on in a department and/or college,
- better clarity in communicating more precisely,
- unfair or unequal treatment,
- fear of retaliation when people speak out.

IV. The minutes for the September 2nd Faculty Senate meeting were approved with no corrections.

V. The Senate took a short recess for a group photo.

VI. Old Business

a. Approval of the College of Nursing and Health Sciences PPE (see September Senate minutes). Senator Hatcher announced that the Senate, voting by ballot, the PPE was approved by a vote of 16 in favor and 3 abstained.

b. Faculty Senate Ethics Committee report:

Senator Houston reported that in an attempt to increase faculty engagement the Senate Ethics Committee has reached out to all of the faculty by email and requested that they submit any questions, comments or issues either directly to Senator Houston or anonymously through a Survey Monkey link that was supplied to them. It was announced that the Ethics Committee will meet in October to begin compiling faculty feedback and report back to the Senate.

c. A&M Faculty Senate Council Meeting:

Senator Martinez was the TAMIU Faculty Senate's representative to the A&M Faculty Senate Council Meeting. Senator Martinez reported that the main emphasis of the meeting was to discuss the formation of a Texas A&M University System Assembly of Faculty Senates. The meeting was to discuss the formal name of this Assembly, the bylaws and the mission statement (see attachments). The Assembly will consist of all of the Senate Presidents and will met twice a year, once virtually and once face-to-face and then report directly to the Chancellor.

VII. New Business:

Discussion of the inclusion of a 4-day campus presence in the Faculty Handbook.

Senator Gorbunova was requested to compile a list of general comments from the Senate regarding their thoughts on the inclusion of a 4-day campus presence in the Faculty Handbook (listed below). Senator Ynalvez volunteered to check the handbooks of the various A&M Universities to see what they might have in regards to this issue.

Since the majority of the comments were in favor of not putting a 4-day presence in the handbook a vote was called and seconded and the vote was unanimously against putting the 4-day presence in the handbook. So, this issue will not be presented to the faculty for a vote.

- No flexibility between online vs. face-to-face classes.
- One criteria for all is not good.
- Place of work has no relevance, there is no need to include this.
- Reads very punitive as if Administration does not trust faculty. Faculty spousal hire issues.
- Not good for people who are in the field for research, public expectations - which public?
- Educate people on what it is like to be a college professor and how different it is.
- No need in justification after Covid.
- We have to be accessible to students but we understand it as educators. We are accessible on Saturdays and Sundays. We say email is the best option to reach us.

- Against additional restrictions imposed on a faculty.
- The location of the job was misinterpreted by new faculty, tenured faculty are expected to be on campus. It will be specified in job descriptions.
- Lack of communications and lack of expectations. If it is in the handbook - it is a precedent for it being part of the PPE evaluations.
- We are flexible, we don't want students to commute and drive to campus to talk to us.
- Dr. Mitchell pushes face to face, contract for new faculty - is an issue.
- This should be a conversation, but not part of the handbook.
- Nursing and Health Sciences clinicals are done on the weekends.
- People left because they found out at the new faculty orientation when it was mentioned. Go out, talk to the faculty who don't do it and ask how to help. There is no leave for a Saturday or Sunday or night classes with HR!
- Is an expectation a requirement or is it not?
- We are not getting to 10000 students by 4 day presence, field work faculty - will not be on campus
- Handbook changes have to be voted on by faculty.

VIII. Committee Reports

1. Awards Committee:

Senator Moran reported that they have completed an adjusted timeline for faculty awards and will be sending chairs and directors information about the timelines and nomination procedures.

2. Assessment Committee:

Senator Brooks reported that the Committee will began reviewing the past administrator assessment instruments for possible revisions and looking at the Spring semester timeline for when the assessments will be made (see attached minutes). In addition, this Committee was charged with reviewing the assessment requests presented to the Senate by Dr. Duffy.

3. Budget and Finance Committee: nothing to report.

4. Faculty Handbook Revision Committee: see previous report on the 4-day presence.

5. Fixed-term Faculty Committee:

Senator Martinez reported that they met to discuss the language present in the document for the provision of fixed-term faculty to move into a tenure-track faculty position. The Committee concluded that they needed more clarification on what criteria is being assessed of people who want to move into a tenure-track position. It was also mentioned that the School of Business have different criteria for their fixed-term faculty (their accreditation requires certain research expectations). It was suggested that the Fixed-term Faculty Committee be the core of a larger ad hoc committee to bring in more fixed-term representatives from other academic units.

6. Academic Oversight Committee:

Senator Kazen announced that we will be having a Faculty Assembly on November 9th and asked the Senate to tell their faculty to RSVP by October 14th. The 'mean vs. median' issue with PPE's has been resolved and will be addressed at the up-and-coming Dean's Council meeting. AEFIS training for Faculty PPEs and portfolios will begin as soon as the Academic Oversight Committee receives their training (see attached minutes).

7. Committee on Creation, Composition, and Responsibilities of Committees:

Senator Jorgensen reported that they met with the university assessment officers about the proposal to establish a new standing University committee; The Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness Committee. It was requested that they come up with an appropriate mission statement and committee composition, so that it could be considered for inclusion in the handbook (see attached document). It was suggested that this committee could be an ad hoc committee for a time so that it be can reviewed by the Senate.

8. University Ethics Committee: See previous report.

9. Distance Education and Instructional Technology Committee:

Senator Momen reported that there are changes coming to Blackboard to make it more user-friendly and OIT are doing a lot of new training to inform faculty of the changes. Also Learning Technologies Week is scheduled for October 31st through November 4th and they are currently accepting presentation proposals. A stipend of \$150 for a successful proposal will be given and the deadline for submission is October 21st.

10. Technology Advisory Committee:

Senator Kazen reported that the Blackboard issues we had at the beginning of the semester were actually DUO authentication issues and have been fixed. The problem of faculty being locked out of their computers is still an unresolved issue (see attached minutes). Also, there will be an HR meeting soon about the faculty sick-leave policy and Senator Kazen will be our representative at that meeting.

IX. The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

What is a Faculty Ombuds Officer?

The Faculty Ombuds Officer will serve as an independent, neutral, and impartial, confidential, and informal resource for faculty at Texas A&M International University. The Ombuds Officer will strive to adhere to the professional ethical principles and best practices as defined by the International Ombudsman Association.

The Faculty Ombuds Officer is elected by the Faculty Senate and appointed by the university for a three-year term. The Faculty Ombuds Officer is a designated neutral, neither an employee nor a management advocate. The Ombuds officer is empowered to facilitate the timely and equitable mediation outside of the faculty grievance process. The role of the Ombuds officer is to foster a resolution to issues prior to the initiation of the filing of a formal grievance.

Characteristics of the Faculty Ombuds Officer Program

INDEPENDENCE: The Faculty Ombuds Officer is independent in structure, function, and appearance to the highest degree possible within the organization.

NEUTRALITY AND IMPARTIALITY: The Faculty Ombuds Officer, as a designated neutral, remains unaligned and impartial. The Faculty Ombuds Officer does not engage in any situation which could create a conflict of interest.

CONFIDENTIALITY: The Faculty Ombuds Officer holds all communications with those seeking assistance in strict confidence and does not disclose identities of those seeking assistance or confidential communications, unless given permission to do so. The only exception to this privilege of confidentiality is where there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm.

INFORMALITY: The Faculty Ombuds Officer, as an informal resource, does not participate in any formal adjudicative or administrative procedure related to concerns brought to his attention.

Services Provided by the Faculty Ombuds Officer:

Faculty will be able to seek guidance regarding concerns at any time, without fear of reprisal. The Faculty Ombuds Officer will hear individual or broader systemic faculty concerns confidentially. Whereas the response of the ombuds officer will be tailored to the dynamics of the situation and the nature of the concerns, generally the ombuds officer's role will be to assist parties in reaching informal resolutions that are consistent with the rules and policies of the university. The ombuds officer may supplement, but not replace or interfere with, formal processes available to the university community. The ombuds officer does not serve notice to the University, cannot impose remedies or sanctions, or enforce or change any policy, rule, or procedure. However, the ombuds officer may serve as a communication resource and catalyst for institutional change for the university by reporting trends and identifying opportunities to enhance policies and procedures.

More specifically, the Faculty Ombuds Officer will:

- Provide faculty members with individual assistance with university related conflicts or concerns
- Listen impartially and give unbiased feedback
- Provide a confidential place to collaboratively explore complaints, clarify issues, and consider options
- Point faculty toward available services and resources
- Assist with early problem-solving, to minimize the escalation of conflict
- Encourage and empower employees to find their own solutions to problems
- Provide support for addressing workplace problems
- Facilitate communication when conflict arises
- Serve as facilitator in group problem-solving
- With the employees' consent, consult with university units and departments to obtain more information about an issue and explore options about the issue and explore options for conflict resolution
- Suggest the redirection of matters to formal channels when appropriate
- Identify and report about campus trends and problem areas
- Make recommendations regarding changes in policy and procedure
- Promote equality, inclusion, and access for all persons
- Advocate for and model fairness, equity, and a healthy work environment

You can reach me through email at brown@tamiu.edu or my office phone at (956) 326-2679. In addition, you can always call me or text at my cell number (956) 206-4231.

Randel Brown

Texas A&M System Assembly of Faculty Senates

9-11-2022 Meeting

10:30am – 12:00pm

Texas A&M College Station

Attendees: Leonard Love TAMUSA, Wynn Chin UH, Jim Woosley TAMU, Kimberly Syptak Tarleton, David Rembert TAMUPV, Brian Matthews TAMUT, Yasemin Atinc TAMUC, Shelley Harris TAMUCT

1. Action item: Jim

- a. Meet with Chancellor (thank you, shirts, institutional memory)
- b. Contact TAMUK, TAMUCC, WTAMU

2. Texas Council of Faculty Senates

- a. October 7-8, 2022
- b. Embassy Suites
- c. Meet Friday at 10:30am

3. Action item: David, Leonard and Brian

- a. Mission/Vision statement

4. Action item: David

- a. Doodle poll for Zoom meeting days/times

5. Action item: Shelley

- a. Create constitution/bylaws template

6. Action item: David

- a. Speak with Chancellor's student group about infrastructure, communication

7. Discussion of budgets and future operating procedures

8. Voting items: Meetings

- a. 1x a month – Zoom
- b. 1x a large semester in person

Motion: Leonard, 2nd: Yasmin, Approved: Unanimous

9. Open invitation: Suggested that Joey and Winn have an open invitation to attend and assist in our development.

10. Adjourn

Notes from Texas Council of Faculty Senates and TAMU Alliance of Faculty Senates Meetings

(A) Last October 07, Texas university faculty senate presidents/speakers completed the Fall 2022 meeting of the Texas Council of Faculty Senates (**TCFS**). The meeting was held in San Antonio. You will find in TCFS News that TCFS identified eight themes of achievements, challenges, & faculty governance concerns across Texas university faculty:

1. Strategic Planning Processes
2. Creation of Ombuds Offices
3. Faculty Role in Budgetary & Salary Matters
4. Educating Faculty on their Role in Shared Governance
5. Post-tenure Review Policies
6. Top-down Restructuring of Academics
7. No-confidence votes
8. President & Provost Searches & Hiring Processes

(B) On the other hand, the newly formed TAMU Alliance of Faculty Senates met with Dr. James Hallmark (Vice Chancellor of Faculty Affairs) for a lunch gathering/meeting. Below are a few topics of discussion shared by James Woosley (A&M College Station):

1. Developing a task force to address formulating a system policy that protects faculty from any form of excessive communicative harassment and abuse perpetuated by students.
2. Partnering with THECB to better understand how to develop viable curricular programs.
3. Discuss integral parts of annual faculty performance evaluations, besides instructor and course evaluations, that critically determines the effectiveness of teaching quality.

James Woosley have been charged to meet with Vice Chancellor Hallmark to begin discussion related to stronger relationships and connections with the system. Some of the topics of discussions will be a possible web presence, semiannual sponsored meetings and other aids in helping our newly formed Alliance. There is a task force working on the proposed by-laws and constitution of the TAMU Alliance of Faculty Senates.

Prepared by RA Ynalvez

TAMU Faculty Senate President 2022-2023

10-26-2022

October 21, 2022



TCFS NEWS

A Message to our Member Institutions

TEXAS COUNCIL OF
FACULTY SENATES

Message from the President

Faculty colleagues,

Thank you so much for your part in making the Fall 2022 TCFS Meeting a highly productive and valuable experience. Together, we put in the work to effectively communicate as faculty governance leaders to benefit the universities we support through shared governance. I have no doubt that Texas higher education continues to improve as a result of bringing our minds and our voices together.

Our time in San Antonio was well spent. We are so fortunate to have had the opportunity to interact with one of the top higher education legal scholars in the United States, Professor David Rabban (UT-Law; former AAUP General Counsel), on several legal issues relevant to academic freedom and First Amendment Rights of faculty engaged in intramural and extramural speech.

Also adding to our professional development as faculty governance leaders, members of TACT and the AAUP shared best practices and legal concerns relevant to communicating with legislators.

Whether it was your first meeting or your 40th, I hope you see the value of improving as a faculty governance leader and communicating with your faculty governance colleagues across Texas.

Your colleague,

Joseph Velasco, TCFS President



Roundup Report Themes

TCFS identified 8 themes of achievements, challenges, & faculty governance concerns across Texas university faculty:

1. **Strategic Planning Processes**
2. **Creation of Ombuds Offices**
3. **Faculty Role in Budgetary & Salary Matters**
4. **Educating Faculty on their Role in Shared Governance**
5. **Post-tenure Review Policies**
6. **Top-down Restructuring of Academics**
7. **No-confidence votes**
8. **President & Provost Searches & Hiring Processes**

Looking forward to our Spring 2023 Meeting

Location and Date to be Announced



Minutes of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee Meeting

September 15, 2022

Faculty Senate Assessment Committee had a virtual meeting at 11:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. today (Thursday). Participants of the meeting include the following: Li Brooks, Kate Houston, and Runchang Lin.

The committee discussed the following two items:

- 1) Selection of chair for Faculty Senate Assessment Committee; and
- 2) Proposed timeline for Faculty Senate Assessment Committee.

Dr. Kate Houston nominated Dr. Li Z. Brooks to be the chair of Faculty Senate Assessment Committee. Dr. Runchang Lin seconded the nomination. Dr. Li Z. Brooks accepted the nomination to be the chair of Faculty Senate Assessment Committee.

Members of Faculty Senate Assessment Committee then discussed about the proposed timeline for Faculty Senate Assessment Committee. Members agreed to discuss whether other instruments need to be updated via e-mails among members during the period of Sept. 20 to Oct. 6. Virtual meeting would be scheduled for 11:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on Thursday when necessary.

Dr. Runchang Lin asked about the role of Faculty Senate Assessment Committee in academic assessment. Dr. Li Z. Brooks responded that the committee would ask the guest speaker (Dr. Stehen Duffy, the associate provost) what Faculty Senate Assessment Committee can do to assist in the academic assessment task force on October Faculty Senate Meeting.

Below is a detailed summary of the proposed timeline:

RECOMMENDED 2022-2023 TIMELINE FOR Faculty Senate Assessment Committee		
Task completed	Date to be completed:	Description:
Done by 2021-2022 Faculty Senate Assessment Committee		The updated version of Administrator Evaluation Instrument – DEAN was updated with reference to Deans’ comments by previous 2021-2022 Faculty Senate Assessment Committee. A survey was conducted among chairs, who opted for no need to update.
Done by 2022-2023 Faculty Senate	Sept. 15	Election of chair for Faculty Senate Assessment Committee and discuss the tasks to be done. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dr. Kate Houston nominates Dr. Li Z. Brooks to be the chair of Faculty Senate Assessment Committee. Dr.

Assessment Committee		Runchang Lin seconds the nomination. Dr. Li Z. Brooks accepts the nomination.
	Oct 2022	<p>Faculty Senate Assessment Committee discusses the other instruments (President, Provost, Library Director, Faculty Senate) as to whether they need to be revised or updated. The administrators' evaluations will be conducted in Spring 2023. Jeanette Hatcher, the parliamentarian and elections officer, will be responsible for coordinating with OIT in conducting the surveys. Jeanette coordinates with OIT. OIT sets up the on-line survey. Jeannette sends out an email to all faculty when the survey is ready, where the survey is, when it closes, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty Senate Assessment Committee members agree to discuss whether other instruments need to be updated via e-mails among members. Virtual meeting will be scheduled for 11:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on Thursday when necessary.
	Oct 2022	Faculty Senate Assessment Committee will ask Dr. Stephen Duffy, Associated Provost, the guest in Faculty Senate's October Monthly Meeting, what Faculty Senate Assessment Committee can do to help with the task force of academic assessment.
	November 2022	Faculty Senate Assessment Committee presents to the Faculty Senate all instruments and have all instruments ready to be submitted to Jeanette by December (latest January).
	November 2022	Ruby recommends that Faculty Senate Assessment Committee sends out emails to inform the administrators of the forthcoming evaluation when the instruments are ready.
	February 2023	The survey will be conducted.
	March or April 2023	Faculty Senate Assessment Committee summarizes the survey results.
	March or April 2023	<p>Faculty Senate Assessment Committee presents the survey results to Faculty Senate on Faculty Senate monthly meeting. Chair of Faculty Senate Assessment Committee sends the results to the respective administrators.</p> <p>The chair shares to Faculty Senate the results of the evaluation of the Faculty Senate (not the administrators).</p>

Minutes prepared and submitted by: Li Brooks

AOC Minutes

October 6, 2022

1:15-1:45 KL 420

Attendance:

Hayley Kazen

Leonel Prieto

Ari Gonzalez

1. Updates on AEFIS training (PPE)
 - a. COAS is 10/14
 - b. UC is 10/13
 - c. COED?
 - d. ARSSB?
 - e. CNHS?

Please let me know if you have not been contacted for training so that I may reach out to Karol.

With regards on AEFIS training, no I have not been contacted by Karol yet.

2. Updates on reporting mean AND mean of median
 - a. How do we disseminate information to our colleagues about reporting both?

If I am to make a recommendation on this, (A) I think the VP of Academic Affairs (Dr. Mitchell) will need to send out an email to faculty, we can ask him about it in our faculty senate executive council meeting; another option is (B) during the Deans Council Meeting, please report it to the council and I expect that the Deans will respond that they will send out the information to the faculty. If not, we will request them to do so. Likely they will mention that it's upon the faculty senate recommendation. (C) Dr. Mitchell might have a recommendation on how to disseminate the information.

3. Updates on Faculty Assembly planning
 - a. November 9 from 3:30-5:30 in AIC 223
 - b. Invites and RSVP-Cho (DONE; RSVP by 10/14 and then Ari will order food)
 - c. Technology-Hayley
 - i. Met with Carlos to test Top Hat. We have created temp accounts for faculty to use so that it is anonymous. The plan is to ask 3 questions (one at a time), and then participants will answer. Answers will be shown on the screens, and then table moderators will lead discussion and take notes
I like this idea because if not through this system- some faculty members might dominate the conversations during the assembly, worse will go out of topic and will use the assembly to gripe. Our goal is to make this assembly productive come up with the both the positive and negative things or issues that affect

their morale; and to gather directly from the faculty what they think will effectively boost their morale. May I say few words in the opening of the assembly? I will just use 3 minutes.

d. Moderator recruitment-Leonel. Recruit senators?

4. Open agenda
1. Mean vs mean of median: AOC recommends both be reported (RESOLVED)
2. Faculty assembly: November 9
3. Electronic PPE: Training occurring this month for AOC members
4. Compile report from Kate's survey and faculty assembly
5. HR directive concerning sick leave-May we contact HR to see if an AOC member can be in the policy creation process?

-Yes, I think that's a very good idea. In this regard, there will be faculty inputs. My recommendation is instead of us directly contacting HR, I think it will help if Dr. Arenaz or Dr. Mitchell will tell HR that the faculty should be represented. Would like me to add this as an agenda to our upcoming Executive council meeting this October?

Dr. Kameron Jorgensen, Dr. Jeanette Hatcher, Dr. Deepak Ganta

I. 1st 22-23 COC Meeting

- 9/19/2022, 11am-12:30 pm,
- In Attendance: Dr. Kameron Jorgensen, Dr. Jeanette Hatcher, Dr. Deepak Ganta, Karol Batey, Bob ***
- Committee met with Assessment Office (Karol and Bob) to discuss proposed new committee. After discussing, the committee asked for a mission statement, and membership details. The following was sent to Dr. Ynalvez in response to this request.

Proposal for Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness Committee by Karol Batey and Bob Wilkerson in the University Institutional Effectiveness Office

Committee Mission:

The mission of the Texas A&M International University Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness Committee is to:

1. oversee, review, and guide the coordination of all assessment processes and activities;
2. represent and coordinate with academic, student support services and administrative offices on assessment policies and procedures;
3. monitor use of department, office, and institutional-level assessment results for programmatic and institutional improvement;
4. provide feedback to departments, offices and the institution on assessment activities and results.

Committee Membership:

- College of Arts and Sciences – 3 from different departments
- College of Education – 2
- School of Business – 2
- University College – 2 (1 for Academic and 1 for student services)
- College of Nursing and Human Services – 2
- Graduate School – 1
- Institutional Advancement – 1
- Student Services/Student Success – 2
- Finance and Administration – 2
- President - 1
- SGA President
- Faculty President
- Staff Senate President

II. 2nd COC Meeting

- 10/05/2022, 10:50am-11:50 am,
- In Attendance: Dr. Kameron Jorgensen (chair), Dr. Jeanette Hatcher, Dr. Deepak Ganta
- Committee reviewed mission and information provided by assessment office. The following comments, questions, and concerns were agreed upon.
 - This proposed committee has members appointed by the deans and upper administration so is it necessary to have this group be a “Standing Committee” as part of the university committees under faculty senate oversight?
 - If this proposed committee is made official through faculty senate, what does that entail? Handbook addition, who is responsible for appointment members, etc?

Dr. Kameron Jorgensen, Dr. Jeanette Hatcher, Dr. Deepak Ganta

- There are unanswered questions regarding the time commitment and the structure of the committee in terms of obligations of members. They stated faculty will score assessments. The chairs already do this so what is the purpose or extra value of this additional scoring?
 - Can the business of this proposed committee be handled by existing committees such the University curriculum committee?
 - It was mentioned that other universities already have a committee for this, but no concrete examples of what or how this was being done at other universities was given.
 - The handbook was referenced in regard to the committee tasks and above comments. The portions of importance are provided in section III.
-

III. Faculty Handbook References Regarding Creation of Committees

The Committee on Creation, Composition, and Responsibilities of Committees. The purpose of this committee is to make recommendations to the Senate concerning the management of University committees and to provide guidance to the colleges with regard to the composition of college and department-level committees. Membership in this committee will be by appointment by the President of the Senate, with the Chair elected by the committee membership.

University Committees

At the University level, there will be various standing committees as deemed necessary by the administration and faculty to ensure the accomplishment of the mission of the University. Additionally, ad hoc committees may, from time to time, *be appointed as needed and as approved by the Faculty Senate*. The exact number of these committees will change over time. *The control and administration of these committees is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate*; by concurrence it is meant that the Senate shall ensure that committee assignments are apportioned equally and that no individual is assigned to an inordinate number of committees. In the interest of clarity and flexibility, the phrase “free-standing academic unit” applies to any academic unit (e.g. the Killam Library) not aligned with one of the colleges and whose head, therefore, reports directly to the Provost. In cases where the appointments are made by department chairs, it is understood that chairs will do this in consultation with their Deans. (Continued on page 16)

Committee Assignment Procedure

While both the *composition and general standards will be set by the Senate* with regard to University committees, only standards will be promulgated to the colleges pertaining to committees at the college and department level. The intent is to provide equality in the area of committee assignments for members of the faculty. In that regard, the following guidelines are established pertaining to committee service by faculty and the functioning of committees at all levels within the University. (Continued on page 20)

Texas A&M International University/ Technology Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

September 15, 2022

1:30 p.m. Virtual

Meeting Facilitator: Dr. Hayley Kazen

Invitees:

San Juanita Hernandez– Faculty Senate Appointee,-not in attendance

Devang Khambhati-COAS-in attendance

Hugo Garica-SSB-not in attendance

Cynthia Pina-COED-in attendance

Sumalai Maroonroge-CNHS-in attendance

Omar Ramirez-UC-in attendance

Eva Hernandez-KL-in attendance

Marvin Bennett-President’s Appointee-in attendance

Fred Juarez-Finance and Administration-not in attendance

Tony Ramirez-IT-in attendance

Ana Gonzalez-IT-in attendance

Cathy Colunga-Institutional Advancement (Elizabeth Smith)-in attendance

Juan Garcia-Student Success (Rene Prado)-in attendance

Mike Munoa-IT; ex-officio-not in attendance

Enid Nunez-IT-in attendance

Welcome/ Roll call-

I. Welcome new members and guests

II. Review/Approve April 28 minutes

i. Ana Gonzalez moved to approve

ii. Marvin Bennett seconded

III. New Business

1. Virtual or face-to-face meetings

i. Vote was split, so we will have both options going forward with next month’s meeting being face-to-face.

ii. H. Kazen will send out a doodle poll in October to determine best time

2. Faculty accounts being locked-not related to repeated wrong logins

i. Several reasons this may be happening. It is a difficult issue because there are so many variables. Issue could be related to password change. When an employee changes their password, it must be changed on all devices. May also be related to Iphone issue with private wifi option turned on. OIT reminded committee that accounts may be unlocked after 30

minutes. E. Nunez requested faculty report to OIT when account lockouts happen so they may address the issue on an individual basis.

IV. Open Agenda

- i.* Tony Ramirez reported that the outages we experienced at the beginning of this term have been resolved. OIT has created a backup log in for BB using same credentials. For the user, the change will be seamless, and it has been tested. The issue was related to dual authentication rather than Blackboard.
- ii.* Dr. Bennett brought up an issue related to the link Disability Services has asked him to use when setting up a student for alternative testing. The link does not allow him to log in. Tony Ramirez will look into it and get back to Dr. Bennett this afternoon.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm



Minutes of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee Meeting

When:	October 27, 2022
Where:	Webex
Time:	11:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
Present:	Li Brooks, Kate Houston, and Runchang Lin
Guest:	Dr. Stephen Duffy

Dr. Brooks started the meeting by welcoming Dr. Stephen Duffy and other members of the committee. After a brief introduction of the meeting agenda by Dr. Brooks, Dr. Stephen Duffy talked about the motivations behind the request to ask the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee to draft an e-mail to chairs on the last Faculty Senate Monthly Meeting in October.

1. Discuss drafting an e-mail to be sent to chairs regarding academic assessment.

Dr. Brooks presented a draft e-mail on three questions raised by Dr. Stephen Duffy in October's Faculty Senate Meeting on academic assessment. The three questions are related to the following: how faculty are assigned for courses to conduct the academic assessment, including WIN-courses and core courses; the collected assessment data are distributed to the faculty; and how data collected from class assignments are used to improve the curriculum. Dr. Stephen Duffy concurred with the accuracy of three questions raised in the draft e-mail and expressed his satisfaction with the framing of the e-mail. Dr. Houston suggested to add a question on communication of assessment results to faculty. All the participants agreed that it was very important to improve the communication flow on academic assessment from planning to data collection and distribution. A timely communication would facilitate the faculty to prepare the assessment assignment earlier and could relieve stress and anxiety from the faculty who would be responsible for data collection and report writing.

2. Set up goals for the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee for current year.

Dr. Brooks discussed about two major roles of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee. One is to oversee and analyze results from a biannual faculty survey evaluating administrators and the other is to provide assistance as needed to other assessment efforts of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Brooks proposed the following goals of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee for AY 2022-2023: 1) Review and/or update faculty survey instrument evaluating administrators (such as President, Provost, Chairs, Library Director); 2) Summarize faculty survey results and present to the Faculty Senate; 3) Provide feedback from the survey results to the respective administrators being evaluated; and 4) Assist TAMIU Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness Committee as needed. Dr. Brooks asked Dr. Duffy whether the proposed fourth goal of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee expressed clearly the role of the committee in assisting the task force on institutional assessment. Dr. Duffy mentioned that TAMIU Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness Committee is just a temporary name. The goal is to establish a university-level oversight committee to oversee the institutional assessment. The task force on assessment created in the Senate can make recommendations to standardize the process across the university. In this way, the assessment process could be streamlined and become more transparent to the



Minutes of the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee Meeting

faculty. Dr. Brooks mentioned that a word file of the proposed goals of the committee was in a shared folder on OneDrive and would be available for Dr. Houston and Dr. Lin to make changes. Dr. Duffy left the meeting before the discussion on next item in the agenda started.

3. Review administrator evaluation instruments for possible updates or revisions.

Dr. Brooks provided a summary of the questions on the administrator evaluation instruments. She said that she had standardized all the instruments according to the style of the revised administrator evaluation instrument – Dean which was done by the previous assessment committee in 2021. All the proposed changes to correct grammatical errors in the instruments were highlighted in yellow. Dr. Brooks welcomed Dr. Houston and Dr. Lin to make any changes to the standardized evaluation instruments after the meeting. Dr. Brooks mentioned that the first three questions on current administrator evaluation instrument – Library Director are incomplete sentences and are the same. Dr. Houston and Dr. Lin agreed that these incomplete questions should be replaced with new questions. Dr. Brooks asked both Dr. Houston and Dr. Lin to make suggestions on the new questions via e-mail communication after the meeting. Dr. Brooks indicated that she had talked with the interim library director (Ms. Malynda Dalton) and asked for her feedback on possible new questions. Dr. Brooks would share the information with other members via e-mail. They reached a consensus to try to finish the updates or revisions for the administrator evaluation instruments by this weekend.

Minutes prepared and submitted by: Li Brooks