# FACULTY SENATE MINUTES SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

23 October 2014 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. LSC 304

# **Members Present (20)**

Nancy Baker (CHSS), Jonathan Breazeale (COBA), Helen Berg (COE), Tracy Bilsing (CHSS), Madhusudan Choudhary (COS), Karla Edison (COE), Randy Garner

EKU, Marshall, Pace, Wisconsin, La Crosse, Angelo State U also use a similar, dual branded card. There are approximately 250 other universities around the country that have banking partners and utilize merged ID cards.

The HigherOne card requirement that faculty enter a graduation date for card activation was recognized as a problem and has been addressed. At the senate's urging, this requirement has been removed for faculty but remains in place for students.

A senator asked if HigherOne has any personal banking data about us if we decline to activate the card. Dr. Vienne said no such data is shared with HigherOne. Our name, address, email, and our SAM ID number are shared; all of which is directory, non-secured information.

Some people may have accidentally opened a HigherOne account during the activation process. If so, HigherOne will go through a verification, theft prevention process during which they may gather some personal or banking information. In this circumstance the account will be closed at the account holder's request. Accidentally opened accounts can not be closed by the University, but must be closed by the individual account holder.

In regard to Social Security numbers, SHSU has in the past sent the last four digits as an identifier. This has now been changed to a random personal identifier number. The full SS was never shared. A senator asked how these SS numbers could be removed. The University can work with HigherOne, if requested, to remove this information. The University is working with HigherOne to eliminate the SS procedure, but Dr. Vienne could not estimate when this would be complete.

9c-0.002 Tc 0.002

The Senate Chair stressed to Dr. Vienne that faculty have had problems utilizing their faculty ID's for research purposes due to the debit card appearance. Dr. Vienne expressed concern about this possibility and assured the senate that she would work to address this issue. Dr. Vienne wants the faculty to be happy with the process, but reminded the senate that working with a third party vendor sometimes places us at their mercy.

A senator asked if the University could theoretically produce its own card? Dr. Vienne explained that producing a basic photo ID is not difficult, the magnetic stripe which allows access to university resources is the problematic part.

Another senator expressed that the current card does not look like a professional ID. Dr. Vienne said that cards without the magnetic stripe could be made without any problem, but reiterated that tying these cards to any other system is the problem. The University could explore this, but the University cannot produce more than a single "official" ID.

A senator asked if this issue could be given to a smaller senate task force so that the Senate could move on to other issues. The Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to follow up on the topic.

#### **Chairs report**

Senate Chair Baker made a few remarks in regard to her Chair's report (please see Related Documents), which was emailed to the Senate prior to the meeting.

#### **Online Course-Development Support Committee**

The Provost suggested that the Online Course-Development Support Committee actually be a "task force." A senator asked if a task force format had been established. The Chair explained that the makeup would be the same as the committee makeup. There is some concern that "task force" sounds too temporary. What if long term oversight is needed? A senator expressed that the task force would allow investigation to begin more quickly and not require state approval. Sen. Loeffler suggested that we should have both. A motion was made that the Senate recommend to the Provost the creation of a task force, but we would also like the formal committee to be established. The task force would serve as a bridge to the formal committee. The motion passed (17 yes, 3 no, 0 abstention).

#### The Computer and Technology Standards Committee has been tabled.

#### **Faculty Grievance Policy**

In regard to the Faculty Grievance Policy and the new 30 day grievance procedure, the Board of Regents, during a September meeting, approved the 30 day grievance procedure, though no mention of discussion occurred in the meeting minutes. The provost explained that this change probably came about as a result of discussion outside of official TSUS meetings. This 30 day window supersedes the previously approved (May 2014) window of 10 days.

When does this 30 day timer start? Faculty will be asked to sign an acknowledgement letter upon receipt of the denial document, or within a day or two to allow for the initial shock to subside. This document will be signed by all involved administrators, and delivered to the denied party. It is not yet clear if the document will be delivered by the Department Chair, or the Dean.

There seems to be some confusion about the status of the University Grievance committee. The quick nature of this change has apparently left in question many policies and procedures.

#### **New Business**

#### New business items assigned to committees

The Senate Chair explained that she assigned issues to committees, outside of senate meetings, in effort to prompt action on new business items that have been added on the agenda for a few meetings, but which the senate has never gotten to discuss.

#### Publishing of student c h

Another senator commented that his computer's security software must be disabled in order to access the online training.

A motion was made to request that required training be distributed as PDF documents as opposed to mandatory online training. The motion was passed (15 yes, 0 no, 5 abstentions).

#### **Committees that do not meet**

A senator inquired about university committees that never meet. There seems to be confusion about how and who can call a committee meeting. If a committee would like to meet, yet the committee chair refuses, a senator suggested writing to the VP in charge of that area to encourage such a meeting. The Senate Chair requested additional information from the concerned senators.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm

### Faculty Senate Chair's Report 23 October 2014

In the interests of effectively managing our time for today's meeting, at which we will have special guest Kristy Vienne, I am submitting my chair's report in writing to the Senate in advance, via e-mail. During our usual time allotted to the chair's report, I will be glad to answer questions on any of the following topics.

#### **Updates on Old Business**

#### **Academic Policy Review Chart**

The provost appreciated Faculty Senate pointing out the omission of the Faculty Senate from the final approval stage of the Academic Policy Review Chart. He agrees that the Senate belongs there (in the Final Draft Prep/Approval box, which is the step AFTER Legal Edits), and he will amend the chart to reflect this.

## Academic Policy 900417 Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The provost has decided that the most efficient way to revise this policy is to create

#### **FES**

The provost wants the FES policy revised. He is currently waiting to hear back from the Council of Chairs with their response to the proposed changes to FES (put forward by the FES committee), especially regarding how teaching is evaluated.

In general, the provost hopes to see these three interrelated, major policies revised and improved during 2014-2015: Tenure and Promotion, Merit Pay, and FES.

#### **Online Course Development Support Committee**

This proposed new committee approved by the Faculty Senate was sent forward to the Council of Academic Deans. CAD and the provost would prefer that, rather than a committee, an ad hoc task force be developed instead, reporting to PACE (The Professional and Academic Center for Excellence). CAD and the provost feel a task force managed by PACE will be able to accomplish the same goals more efficiently and quickly, with less red tape.

**Computer and Technology Standards Committee** 

# **New Business Assigned to Appropriate Committees**

There have been some items of new business on our last several Faculty Senate agendas that we have not had time to address. Rather than wait until November or