

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
May 16, 2016 #350

Senators present were: Cox, Farmer, Sharma, Buelinckx, Zugay, Brittsan, Canas, Cargile Cook, Grair, Held, Kaye, Mayer, McCheney, Milam, Morales, Nite, Nokken, Ramkumar, Wilde, Arnett, Dass, Fleischman, Ritchey, Bayne, Dallas, Ghebrab, Nejat, Williams, Gilliam, Kalenkoski, Whiting, Yuan, Henry, Metze, Cassidy, Heinz, Hidalgo, Litsey, Weiner, Keene, Langford, Ankrum, Brookes, Donahue and Wascoe.

Senators absent were: Adams, Calkins, Carter, Hom, Morgan, Qualin, Rahamamoghadam, Skidmore, Surliuga, Crews, Richman, Siwatu, Soliman, Zuo, McGinley, Parkinson, James, Gring, Ortiz, McKoin and Orflia.

Guests were: Interim TTU President John Opperman, Provost Lawrence Schovanec, Senior Vice-Provost Rob Stewart, Andy King from the Review Board (IRB), Ombudsperson Jean Scott, Staff Senate Liz Inskip Paulk, Parliamentarian Gary Elbow and Richard Meek, recording meetings.

- Call to order – Dr. Michael Farmer, Faculty Senate President **3:17pm**
- Introduction of Guests **3:18pm**
Liz Inskip Paulk, Andy King, IRB Liaison, Jean Scott Ombudsperson, President, Provost, Sr. Vice Provost
- Approval of minutes, Meeting #349, April 13, 2016 **3:19pm**
Amended
- Welcome to newly elected Faculty Senators. **3:20pm**
Clifford Fedler from CE, Matthew McEniry from the Library, Richard Meek from Music, Alan Barenberg from History, Rich Rice from English, Robert Forbis and Toby Rider both from Political Science, Robin Verble from NRM, Amy Boren from AGECE, Kamaleshwar Singh from ENTX, Beth Thacker from PHYS.
- TTU President Opperman year-end comments. **3:21pm**
 - Desire for comments on Campus Carry, but first comments on President search:
 - Search committee met today, is moving forward to identify a group of applicants to interview in the next couple of weeks.
 - Campus carry: private institutions had an option, have spoken loud and clear; we really don't have anything to add; it is an issue we need to debate; thanks to Task Force;
 - Leaving debate to the Faculty Senate;
 - Campus Carry Committee will be created out of this; a number of issues have already been raised (whether or not certain things should be exempted based on adopted policy)
- Speakers:
 - Kathy Austin, Implement Electronic Procedures for Conducting Course and Instructor Evaluations. Update from Senior Vice-Provost Rob Stewart. **3:25pm**
 - Moving to online course evaluation process, with a target of implementation in Fall 2017. Pilot in 2016-17. Will look at implications for midterm review and T&P process. Talk of integrating with BlackBoard (access); we know we will go electronic in the next 2 years, still discussing how we will get there.
 - QUESTIONS:
 - Senator Held: What was the driving force for going electronic?

- Senior Vice-Provost Stewart: Compliance with ADA regulations not sole reason, but gave the most momentum; electronic makes process fair and equitable for all.
- President Farmer: feel free if you wish to write to Kathy with a question (kathy.austin@ttu.edu).
- Ombudsperson's Report, Jean Scott **3:29pm**
 - Workplace Bullying survey (data gathered in February);
 - Put together by Bullying Prevention Committee (Rob Stewart, Greg Brookes, Liz Paulk, all present today);
 - 279 responses, 34% fac, 63% staff;
 - 2 largest categories were respondents who had been here 5 yrs or less;
 - Detailed results will come in a newsletter;
 - Highlights: target of bullying? 40% said yes
 - Witnessed bullying in last 5 years? 60% said yes
 - Comments were typical: common feelings of fear, humiliation, competence undermined, poor leadership/supervision, intimidation, etc.
 - Health issues: common themes were depression, ulcers, anxiety, digestive problems, under doctor care/prof counseling
 - Nothing done about situation until someone left or was transferred to another unit.
 - Does bullying happen at TTU? Yes. Pervasive? No, but needs to be addressed
 - Possibility: setting up a joint committee between Faculty and Staff Senates to submit revisions to the OP; educational forums (make aware of what bullying is and what it isn't); some consideration of a code of conduct/looking at ethical principles statement.
 - Traffic in Ombudsperson office: 66 visitors since office established, with a range of issues, from getting perspective/options to an issue broader than bullying: toxic, hostile, negative work environment that occurs and is often characterized by a culture of fear. Fear of asking questions, getting info (lack of transparency), and a silencing of people (not a free, open environment).
 - Will try to work with persons on campus next year to have greater avenues for discussion that this environment is not acceptable.
 - Any suggestions for how I might work more effectively, open to them.
- QUESTIONS:
 - President Farmer: procedural comment for next President, not clear whether need a vote, but a joint drafting committee has just been proposed, will leave to next slate of officers and reps.
 - Senator Dallas: The numbers make it sound like bullying is pervasive.
 - Ombudsperson Scott: Numbers don't show that it is. Small sample.
 - Senator Dallas: Instead of making everyone going through sensitivity training, why not make just those who are having issues deal with it/be dealt with?
 - Ombudsperson Scott: they have to come to my office, not ready to do that.
 - Senator Brookes: roughly 5% responded, 40% of 5% responded with reported incidents; this is why it's not "pervasive".
 - President Farmer: parse definition between bullying and toxic work environment?
 - Ombudsperson Scott: bullying is targeted, workplace environment does not target any particular person, but is an atmosphere of intimidation.
- Dennis Arnett, Area Coordinator in Marketing, Rawls College of Business: Update on COB operations. **3:40pm**
 - Paul Goebel is the Interim Dean, looking for a new Dean in COBA;
 - Not being fast-tracked;
 - 33 applicants;
 - Candidates will be on campus in Fall 2016, hoping for new Dean Spring 2017/Fall 2017;
 - Other things: Differential tuition; faculty-student ratio has gone up drastically, need tenure track positions to keep quality of programs high, can hire new faculty with income from differential tuition;
 - New wing, 38,000 ft²; no classes scheduled in it for Fall 2016; will use it as soon as it is completed;
 - We had a lack of transparency, openness, and faculty governance; things are now going well. Moving back toward our previous environment/model, which is good.

- Old Business: Review of Committees
- OP XX.XX Emerging OP for Guns on Campus **3:44pm**
 - Senator Held: voiced objection to limiting debate to 15 minutes (PresidentFarmer: we can extend that); other issues on the floor do not compare to the rest of the agenda;
 - Committee considered, voted 5-3 not to approve the Operating Policy, felt compelled to explain via resolution, approved 6-2;
 - **Resolution on Campus Carry read by John Gilliam 3:48pm**
 - Senator Held: resolutions previously passed were all in accordance with our principles. We are a representative body. You are urged to vote consistently with your constituents. We have one friendly amendment at present, and I will present it at the end of the debate as a possible compromise;
 - President Farmer: Thanks and respect to the Committee; my concern with the resolution as it stands is twofold: 1. Does this obviate our presence or influence on the Committee that comes out of the OP (we will have a Faculty Senate member on the Committee, in accordance with the OP)?; 2. We have never been overridden on an OP before; there may be a cost to us affecting how this OP is interpreted and implemented moving forward, and to our relationship with Board of Regents.
 - Ron Milam: (**3:53pm**) A year ago, when I ran, I said I thought this would be the primary issue for the upcoming year, and it still is; I thought I was representing the Faculty itself on the Task Force, was disappointed throughout the entire process; I felt the Administration was in support of the Faculty, I thought the Task Force would come up with a position based on the sentiment/data from faculty; but I was constantly interrupted by questions regarding the legality of the position. I find it difficult (for me) to go in any direction other than what we have been saying for years. In addition, this bill endangers our students. Nothing has made me feel differently. I don't believe there is any reason whatsoever for students to be carrying guns into our classrooms or offices. The President has recommended that Faculty members may have a local option, but no one knows what will happen. My hope is that the to-be-formed Campus Carry Committee will address this issue immediately. Re. the resolution, I will support the Faculty position.
 - Senator Held: this is from a letter written by the President of UT Austin to the Chancellor, Feb. 17, 2016: the presence of handguns is contrary to our mission as educators in higher education (paraphrased). From a Nov. 16, 2015 letter from the President: the University can't fulfill its mission if guns are on campus (again, paraphrased) -- against guns on campus, emphatically. If we are going to compare ourselves to UT, let's listen to what the Faculty Senate there has to say.
 - President Farmer: I am not strongly opposed to the resolution, but have worries about our voice moving forward; I don't know whether a negative vote alters our vote, but it wouldn't enhance it. If we have SB 11, do we want to engage it on campus, or not. We can vote against the law, or support the president's ability to implement it.
 - Senator Held: rebuttal: will not jeopardize our relationship with the Administration, we have been reassured by Interim President Opperman. Our ability to participate will not be affected -- the OP includes faculty representation; (**4:01pm**)
 - President Farmer: direct response: yes, we will have a voice; it is my preference that we have 3/8-40% of the committee. If we say we can't endorse this in any way, we endanger our ability to have adequate representation.
 - Senator Cox: point of order: Does the Faculty Senate vote on OPs, yes or no - we could just vote without a resolution;
 - Senator Held: we need to explain to the community;
 - Senator Litsey: I am confused. Is the contention that there are two issues before the Senate? One to adopt, one to clarify?
 - Senator Elbow: Clarification: if you pass the resolution, you're saying you voted against the policy; really, this is one issue/one vote;
 - Senator Litsey: so the Resolution could fail, but OP could also fail. That would seem awkward;
 - President Farmer: Information: the Committee is saying say NO to the OP, offered a resolution to say NO, to give some depth in explanation. That's their job. They came to a decision, made a motion. If

we accept the resolution, we can't make any changes to the OP.

- Senator Held: we were rejected when we tried to put the Museum on the OP; rebuffed, were told no. Impenetrable document.
- Senator Nokken: It is a difficult task to sort out what was going on. 1. What does a no-vote mean? 2. We are dealing with definitions based on the law in other states; the changes put us in a worse/more difficult position; further, 1. many of us disagreed with the policy in general, and 2. we were ill-equipped to make any changes that met legal muster
- Senator Litsey: If we fail the resolution, but pass the OP/amend the OP, this gives pause for power of the Faculty Senate; if we pass it, we end debate on the OP, at least this shows that we have power;
- Senator Nokken: the Administration is in a similar position vis a vis the state, and did not want to venture into the spirit of the law; supporter wants us to further limit;
- Senator Kaye: Motion that every Faculty member on campus establishes a lab in every building, stocked by him;
- Senator Farmer: the amendment is so close to the resolution, it's a matter of style. Have talked to individuals about whether we would preamble OPs; want to say that we care about safety, think we do a good job of it, and that we can do that locally. Anyone who looks at our Guns On Campus OP will see a statement from the University at the beginning of the OP.
- Senator Elbow: there is a motion on the floor to pass the resolution;
- Senator Farmer: did not move the amendment at the moment;
- Senator Litsey: thinking strategically: what if we did not pass the resolution, but add an amended preamble to the beginning of the OP that expressed the resolution, and then passed the OP with the amendment.
- Senator Held: the first thing the Administration will do is talk to the Attorney General. We can't come back -- this is our last meeting of the year. This is now or never. My opinion in regard to wordsmithing the preamble: window dressing, not actionable, does not change the OP. It is beyond that stage now.
- Senator Held: introduce Friendly Amendment as a compromise.
- Senator Metz: can you explain the rationale for the amendment? **(4:11pm)**
- Senator Held: we have no power. We are an advisory body. We catch a lot of flack from colleagues who equate powerless with worthless. Our job is to speak truth to power, not to wield it. Our statement about the tenor of this law is important. The Friendly amendment to the Resolution takes the edge off the law -- we don't want to be seen as defiant, break the law. Wording to be inserted right before "cannot endorse", 5 words: "are compelled to accept, but" cannot endorse this OP. Approved by the majority of the Committee. Vote will be on the resolution plus those 5 words.
- Senator Wilde: Can the person advancing the motion also amend it?
- Senator Held: It came from committee, has already been voted upon, 6:1:1. Comes to the floor as part of the resolution.
- Senator Litsey: open on discussion for language of the friendly amendment? Suggest compelled to abide by, rather than accept.
- Procedural issue with motion/second ...?
- Senator Held: hesitant to word smith -- discussion could go on forever. This is the reason for the resolution.
- Senator Wilde seconds the motion Litsey made to change amendment language to "abide by": **4:16pm**
- Discussion?
- Vote on the amendment: change language to "abide by" instead of "accept"; motion fails; *Friendly Amendment "are compelled to accept but" stands;*
- Procedural issue: Senator Elbow: Secret ballot is admissable;
- Senator Litsey: procedural ballot: this is a vote on the resolution, with Friendly Amendment;
- Senator Brookes: clarification: write "yes" or "no", correct?
 - Correct.
- Senator Ramkumar and Secretary Ankrum left the room to count ballot votes.
- Announced 36-6, resolution with amendment passes **4:29pm**.

- Liaison Reports **4:29pm**
- Graduate Council Report, Stephen Morse NO REPORT
- Academic Council Report, Senator Ramkumar **4:26pm**:
 - SEE REPORT sent via email, distributed during mtg.
 - Office of Provost has listened to the views of the Senate, getting more input from us.
- Announcements:
- Senior Vice-Provost Rob Stewart-KU football game on 9/29/16 **4:33pm**
 - Thursday evening game (repeat of 2013) -- against Kansas, not TCU; experience from 3 years ago was that all went well, no problems. Main concern: parking, student/faculty access, Parking learned some things, will implement better strategies; parent pickup at CDRC, will be better this time. Library employees, availability in the evening, will be addressed. Hope to make a general announcement before everyone leaves. Maybe adjust syllabus to avoid any issues. It is family weekend, student Affairs working on how to make the most of Thursday/Friday opportunity.
- Senior Vice-Provost Rob Stewart - Writing Intensive Requirement
 - Transition of the writing intensive requirement to Communication in a Global Society, work done by Genevieve Durham De Cesaro; to give more autonomy to each individual major to determine what modalities of communication are relevant to that degree program, what course would fulfill communication/literacy requirement. Wants Faculty Senate to be aware.
 - Open for questions, comments. Input invited.
- LBGT Alliance: Suggested Language (hand out at door) **4:30pm**
- Laura Hines - Commencement **4:36pm**
 - Invitation to attend at least one ceremony;
 - Faculty involvement is important.
- Year-end Review - Michael Farmer **4:40pm**
 - Appreciated working with Provost, 2 presidents
 - Lawrence is tireless, meets faculty one on one all the time, constantly concerned with faculty welfare. Life-work balance -- thank you to Lawrence. Hardest job at University.
 - During 2016-17, we have had a grievance policy, passed Intellectual property, initiated and hired an Ombudsperson, had liaisons on every major committee across campus. The Senate still needs to grow, but we have been informed by having eyes and ears across campus. Thank you. Challenge in the future - getting information out into the faculty body more efficiently. It is a work in progress. My goal was to draw more attention to Faculty Senate and its role, and find more individuals to participate (ex. Academic Council); the amount of participation from junior senators (first year, first term senators) has grown greatly; I want us to think of ourselves as a co-governing body. I hope the Research Committee becomes possible (had no time); the Committee on issues for productivity is broadly supported by Provost Schovanec. I was scared of the job, but I had a lot of fun. I hope to see the Senate grow on its own. I will participate on committees at the President's request. Thank you, Jean, for your assistance in shaping the Ombudsperson's office.
- Passing of the Gavel **4:47pm**
 - Thanked the outgoing officers
- Adjournment- **4:48pm**
 - Moved: Senator Ramkumar; Seconded: Senator Litsey