

MSU Faculty Senate

November 2018 Minutes

The 2018-2019 MSU Faculty Senate met at 3:00 PM on **November 8, 2018**, in Wichita I and II.

Senators present:

Jennifer Anderson
Chuck Bultena
Jesse Carlucci
Dave Carlston
Randy Case
Sarah Cobb
Rodney Fisher

Catherine Gaharan
Attapol Kuanliang
Tammy Kurszewski
Nathan Jun
Adam Lei
Marcos Lopez
Matt Luttrell

Stacia Miller
Bev Stiles
Linda Veazey
Lynette Watts
Charles M. Watson
Bradley Wilson

Guests:

Courtney Snyder (Staff Senate Representative)

Call to order: 3:00 PM

Housekeeping:

Approval of Minutes and Approval of Agenda

Official October minutes were not available. For the agenda, Senator Fisher moved; Senator Watts seconded. The agenda was approved unanimously.

Current Business:

1. Web and Mobile Apps Policy

This policy would cover mobile application security. Chair Carlston introduced it. The senators discussed the policy and endorsed it.

2. TCFS Update

Senator Watts gave her report from the Texas Council of Faculty Senate. Her full summary is attached to the minutes.

The highlights of concerns:

- Annual Reports
- Faculty Salaries

- Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
- Enrollment and Retention
- Faculty Workload Policies
- BCBS Insurance for Texas Health Select
- Family –Friendly Work Areas

Senators discussed Senator Watt’s report. The Faculty Senate agreed to send representatives to the next meeting: February 15-16. Senator Watts noted that this meeting will include a representative from BCBS Insurance.

Committee and Other Reports:

1. Administrative Council (Dr. Carlston):

No meeting.

2. Board of Regents (Dr. Carlston):

The Board of Regents met the day after the Faculty Senate meeting. There are three new board members and a new chair. The Board is reconsidering its meeting structure and considering having meetings take place outside of the formal board meeting. In addition, the board would like to see more data on the exit trajectory for on-campus v. online graduates.

Additional items included approving endowments for Music and Nursing, as well as discussing the faculty-staff phase of the capital campaign. Chair Carlston emphasized the importance of encouraging faculty and staff to give before MSU asks alumni and donors.

3. Academic Council (Dr. Fidelie)

Academic Council met online to approve catalog changes.

4. Other active committees:

No reports.

5. Financial Report (Dr. Anderson):

Treasurer Anderson reported that the financial report is \$3200.

Old Business:

None

New Business:

Senator Miller brought up online and hybrid courses. Student evaluations for online and hybrid courses may not adequately evaluate online instruction. The evaluation instrument has not been updated since 2010. In addition, many evaluations are left uncompleted by students in online classes; this could make their use in annual reports and tenure and promotion difficult. The West College of Education would like these to be revamped.

Senator Miller moved to adjourn; the vote was unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 3:39 PM.

Submitted,
Linda Veazey,
Faculty Senate Secretary

Dave Carlston,
Faculty Senate Chair

Next Meetings:

The next **Executive Committee meeting** will be at **3:00 PM on Tuesday, December 4** in the **Mass Communication Conference Room**.

The next **Faculty Senate meeting** will be at **3:00 PM on Thursday, December 6** at the **Wichita Falls Museum of Art**.

TCFS Report from Senator Watts

Texas Council of Faculty Senates Summary

October 26-27, 2018

Oct. 26:

We had an opening session speaker, Ralph Wilson, present a talk about how the Koch brothers have donated their way into major universities all over the U.S., including several of the systems in TX; he reported these donations come with tight stipulations, they overrun academic freedom, they take away some of the faculty governance, and they damage academic integrity. His website is unkochmycampus.org if anyone would like to examine the information and reports. Ralph also reported Sourcewatch is a website to see who the Koch brothers' partners are (he said when universities refuse their donations outright, their partner companies will make offers, and many administrators may not know the partnership they have with the Koch brothers).

The next presentation was on the state of tenure and non-tenure track faculty in higher education. Several systems reported tenured and tenure-track faculty do not respect those faculty who are not on tenure track. The panelists (along with the Senators) unanimously agreed respect for all lecturers, professors, etc., no matter what their professional pathways are, should be respected. Language in several systems has been changed to phrases such as Academic Professional Track (Texas A&M has adopted this language). Many of the universities have developed multiple tenure track and professional track titles to fit faculty desires to either be primarily researchers or instructors and craft their percentage of time devoted to those pursuits accordingly. Not all titles and promotions are tied to tenure track. The requirements for these particular pathways have been hashed out at the departmental levels. For those faculty who are not on tenure track, contract time periods vary from 2 years to 6 years (the 6 year contracts come with a 3 year probationary period and then a 3 year contract).

The final presentation for the day was the round up report for each university. Concerns were:

- Annual Reports for faculty/Student course evaluations (Several institutions are revamping these.)
- Faculty salary (Multiple complaints were voiced about the disparity in pay between programs/departments as well as average pay being lower in some institutions versus others for the same departmental structure.)
- Promotion and tenure guidelines along with non-tenure track policies (One of the universities has an appeal process: if the faculty member gets a "no" at any stage, he/she can launch a formal appeal for a hearing, and if he/she chooses not to have a face-to-face hearing, the person can submit a dissent in writing.)
- Enrollment/retention (Some universities reported growth, and others reported continued flat numbers; reported growth was between 1% and 5%.)
- University climate studies (There were many issues such as workload that were discussed, leading to the climate studies and some workload studies.)

-Faculty workload policies/studies (Some places were instituting workload studies in-house; one institution has results from this, and others have not conducted the study yet but are working on the process.)

-Field of study concerns (If a lower-level course is required for a program but is not listed in the degree plan, programs cannot make the courses mandatory.)

-BCBS insurance (Several Senators reported their plans are now more expensive with BCBS TX and feel there are fewer procedures and medications covered [and at a higher cost to the employee] than even previously covered with BCBS TX [before the switch to United Health Care].)

Family-friendly work areas (Some institutions were having to implement limited/no-children at work policies as some faculty/staff had been making a habit of bringing their children to work on a fairly regular basis.)

ADA implementation (I brought this up as a concern for faculty as part of the workload issue as well as timeframe issue.)

Oct. 27:

This morning was more discussion of the major themes that came from the round up reports on Friday. Although nine themes were identified, only four were discussed in detail, and there was one question that came up regarding HB2504.

BCBS of TX concerns were raised again, especially in the area of reduced coverage and higher premiums and out-of-pocket costs when procedures or medications were not covered. There were concerns regarding physicians who were left out of the system, and I reported our HR department encouraged us to flood the BCBS site to get our physicians back in. Other concerns noted were that family versus single coverage, while the same as far as what is covered, differs in premium cost. There were concerns of fairness/feelings of being penalized by having a family and having to pay much higher for the same plans. (A few Senators reported BCBS TX may not be just a TX company.)

-The recommendation was to have an ERS representative come to the Spring meeting.

Senators could submit questions/concerns to the rep to minimize company talking points.

-There was also a recommendation for an ad hoc committee to investigate medication and procedure coverage issues. One Senator felt as though the company could drop medications previously covered on a whim, as well as add them back on that same whim.

At this time, only one person was interested in being on this committee.

More discussion regarding workload occurred. One of the universities was going to be bringing in an outside company for their workload study, but this is in the beginning stages. Other universities did have in-house studies, but results are not yet available. Items to be included were considerations of class sizes (varies by department) and time devoted to teaching, research, service, and training. I got the following workload policy link from the University of Houston (crafted after an in-house study):

http://www.uh.edu/af/universityservices/policies/review/mapp/183/120501_r_03272018.pdf

There was some discussion about the field of study issues mandated by SACS; if lower level courses are mandated by programs to be included in the field of study, they have to be listed on

the degree plan, or students cannot be required to take them. If these required courses are not on the degree plan as requirements approved by THECB, then programs may be in violation of SACS accreditation.

-There was a recommendation to have a SACS representative to come speak at the Spring 2019 meeting.

One discussion point about enrollment/retention was that several universities are holding faculty responsible for retention. A few universities were working in conjunction with academic partnerships, which are third party entities that work on recruiting. It appears enrollment is up in these universities, while those who dropped their academic partnerships have experienced either flat or dropping enrollment. A few places have hired a VP for enrollment management, but these hires have just begun, and no results have been gathered. Regarding retention, the Senators agreed having introductory courses as face-to-face only would give students a grounded connection with faculty, leading to retention.

One Senator asked a HB2504 question: Are faculty to be loading their course evaluations onto university websites as part of the bill? That requirement *is* part of HB2504, and several faculty did not realize course evaluations were to be on the website. Additionally, not all parts of the syllabus have to be loaded; there are only specific components that have to be available. Several of the Senators noted they put all of their syllabi online.