Faculty Senate Meeting
May 5, 2015

Senators Present: Bart Ballard, April Conkey, Kathleen Rees, Armando Ibanez, Christine Fiestas, Barbara Cooke, Elizabeth Janzen, Joachim Reinhuber, Ed Butterworth, Richard Miller, Stan Hodges, Don Jones, Daniel Burt, Melody Knight,ellia Weinu(an97 -.1(i)har)6.9(a)((c)4(harar)aj)6(B)11b oo6(i)6(z Tw
us Ayala-Shueneman, Amit Verma ((1)-7())]TJ 0.004 Tc -0.002 Tw [(,)2(J)14(os)4(ep)10(h S)11(ai)]TJ 0 Tc 0 Tw
n replied yes.

f Minutes from April Senate Meeting:
a asked for approval of the previous meeting minutes.

erma stated that the minutes prepared were done by the previous senate and asked if
enate would accept the minutes not necessarily approve them.
n to accept was made, seconded and finally unanimously approved.

n Provost:
dy gave an update to the Faculty Senate.

d of Regents met last week and approved tenure of various faculty members.
et for next year looks good. TRB started with music building and a classroom building
e tennis courts. Recently, A&M System has come in and refinanced monies and found
ol of money to match the cost of both buildings.
ous launched a strategic plan retreat. Discussed high level portions such as mission
ment and vision. In the fall, will go to departments and colleges.
Resource Committee has met for about a month now to reallocate one million from
core to core positions. Currently, all recommendations have added $800,000 in items.
mittee will push for over one million as there may be issues with the type of money.
andy asked if there were any questions.

Question on HEAF funds was asked. Dr. Gandy stated that there is a bill currently that would increase HEAF funds. This would give us an 80% increase. It is estimated we would receive nine million. Some of these funds could be tied up in the new building, as the system may ask one million to be tied to the new building. HEAF funds

Strategic Plan Retreat Update:

Dr. Verma suggested the senate bring a motion and vote.

Discussion was started on Section 1 including: there are not enough domains, this is not as comprehensive and is missing favorable comments section.

Senators were previously asked contact their departments or college they are representing to get feedback. Dr. Allred stated that she received 20 responses from the College of Arts and Science. She indicated that she had not been able to summarize the results as they were very detailed. She stated that they listed many concerns such as the question research framework (how they were developed, how do they measure instruction). Some felt the questions prejudicial to individuals that teach required courses versus electives as well as big courses versus small courses. Lots of concerns and worries were voiced. Some questioned how the questions were measured as well as worried about the open ended questions. Some indicated that they missed the open ended comments as both positive and negative were used for personal growth. Dr. Allred thanked the Senate for working and helping getting input from departments and colleges and is happy to forward the information.

Dr. Challoo suggested that the comments be forwarded to the committee to work on item development.

Dr. Miller stated he was on the original committee and the questions came from Kansas State as they used them as a guide. Dr. Miller also gave insight on the justification for the questions.

It was suggested again that the SRI draft be sent back to the committee with comments senators have received. It was also suggested to expand the committee to include student representatives both at the undergraduate and graduate level as the previous committee did not have student input. It was suggested to approve Section 4 then send the SRI draft to the committee.

Dr. Sherman stated that education has changed and is changing before faculty.

Dr. Rees suggested that faculty can select which questions pertain to certain courses or certain sections.

Dr. Verma asked if there was an agreement that the current SRI is flawed.

> It was stated that music did not like existing SRI but that may be different for other departments.

It was stated that with the addition of a student representative that a representative from OIR needs to be incorporated in the discussion to ensure suggestions can be done. Dr. Verma agreed to that.

It was sta2( )9pDtaat0(d tC2_0 h.14(12(he cc(put)2(D(e r)7(ec F)8(a2(he)9(f)-7.(1.95 p)10(n(at)2(

Verma stated that will