STC Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Tuesday, April 23, 2019

Members present:

Bruce Griffiths, Nathan England, Sandra Ledesma,

Bill Greene, Eric Reittinger, Mark Murray, Roy Escaname, Linda Jackson, Britney Leckey proxy for Sean Kennedy, Richard Smith, Aaron Wilson, Khalid Salmani, Mehrzad Mahmoudian- Geller, Laura Salas, Margarita Vangeulova, Steve Miller, Sharon Rice, Shannon Perales, Darnel Miller, Steve Miller, Daniel A. Montez

Faculty/Guest present: Benito Garza, Saeed Molke, Mayra P. Garcia, Daniel Montez Sr., Juan C. Gaytan, Tom Guinn, Bryan Smith, Mario Lopez

Meeting Call to Order at 4:00 p.m.

President's Report and Voting Items –Bruce Griffith

Diane Teter attending and participating in the retirement ceremony today.

→ OLD BUSINESS Mark Murray asked to be moved up on the agenda to present first on the Faculty Senate Elections update: elections done different Rass decided to do election methods how they do their surveys without the usual email reminders. There was a 48% voter turnout better than normal but still had issues.

For president elect Bruce Griffith was the only one on the balot. Congratulations to Bruce. Vice President there were two candidates Mehrzad M. Geller with a vote of 161 and Richard Smith with a vote of 152. Issues with getting nominees for the Business Public Safety 3 nominees need and one to do a one year term to stagger the time frame of officers needed but only two were running for the four positions: Jorge Martinez and Javier Reyes. Two positions will need to be nominated at the retreat. One for a year appointment to end at the end of this year and one of them a One year appointment and would come up again in next year's election. This is the issue with Business Public Safety and Tech. This is also the issue with Nursing Allied Health two people were needed and only one person accepted the nomination that was Henry Cortez. There will need to be a nominee for a one year spot and a special election to fill that for the second year. For BAT there was one position and two nominees Dr. Benito Garza with 20 votes and Ruben Flores with 36 votes. Ruben Flores was elected. Social Behavioral sciences top contender Sylvia Flores, then Tim Weber there was a tie for third place between Juan Ramirez and Rolando Longoria. There is a constitutional rule that FS can not have two senators from the same department but that did not apply to the tie. The constitution may have to be reviewed again because run offs are problematic. RASS will work with this issue and in the next couple of weeks a run off will be submitted to elect who takes that spot. Unless a candidate withdraws. Rolando Longoria won the election. Math and Science an issue there as well because of the issue of only two from each department rule unless we do not have enough people running. Math and Science: Hanan Amro was elected, Joanna Cordova Biology second and the third persona was Juan Gaytan and with Hanan there are already two people from math department and had skip down to the next nominee and Eric Garcia was Math skipped to Nadia Carrion from Biology. For the Math and Science department the election service time is not staggered correctly either. Will need to review paper work and identify who can serve as senator and not affect the two people from department only rule if a senator is needed for a one year

spot. Not enough people ran for election and therefore the issue of staggered service years arises and special elections must be applied. The last one is Liberal Arts also quite a few issues. Volunteer to be secretary constitution says they have to be fulltime permanent. We did not meet the qualifications according to the Constitution running for secretary. The new president will have to nominate someone. The Constitution does not say you cannot nominate someone who is not a full time faculty. Nomination is a one-year spot. The other issue from past meeting was approval of parliamentarian but actually the nomination period had ended and that did not go up for a vote. That position will have to be a nominee as well for a one-year position and a special election will have to be administered for the second year. A discussion on staggering should be a topic of conversation reason being that the secretary and parliamentarian positions did not come up for election at the same time as President and Vice president as there is a possibility carry over will be on the executive committee. The constitution committee will need to come up with a recommendation for this.

Mark Murray's term is termed out and willing to assist but not in a senatorial capacity. Therefore, secretary, parliamentarian and two positions from tech and two from NAH will all have to be nominated and there will be that run off issue in social behavioral again.

Side Note: Sean Kennedy notified Mark Murray that Lee Basham was on the ballot from liberal arts and full time permanent so he would take the spot and would not need an appointment or nomination.

→ Taskforce on student activities at STC and how to integrate faculty to promote their STC student club activities 2-4 volunteers needed and taskforce will meet during the summer.

Mehrzad Mahmoudian- Geller volunteered to attend meetings in Summer II Aaron Wilson will also attend meetings in Summer II Geller will take the lead and contact members during the summer and report back.

→ Volunteer needed for Faculty Senate to supervise display corkboard postings for student club activities on Pecan Campus.

QUESTION: Why is this Faculty Senates responsibility?

In a club meeting it was clear from the director of student activities that they had a support staff they have for the student organization to spread the word. Student Organizations are looking at our activities and approving them but not clear as to why they have the authority to approve our club activities. The clubs needed to be responsible for removing outdated fliers and club organizations should keep open communication with Student organization but this is not an issue that Faculty Senate should be monitoring. Activites are under Student Organizations jurisdiction and not Faculty Senates. Statement was made that on the executive level email was going around that display boards were ready to be put up.

→ Remote Attendance through Balckbaord Colalborate- folder on top of Course Content when open FS Bb website: Diane is suggesting that we do this if we are unable to attend physically but physical attendance has always been the preferred option and not choice. This is not necessarily a good idea to have as an option for not wanting to attend physically versus wanting to attend via remotely all the time. Faculty Senate has always called for face to face participation and attendance. There are also limits to how many individuals can be in attendance at the same time. There also has to be pre-planning with IT department in order to have remote attendance available for the meetings 24 hours in advance. The other issues is that this is no longer a service provided by Education Technology but rather from Distance Learning. So, any questions must be addressed with Distance Learning. This is not to say that a session cannot stay open but this should be addressed with Distance learning and you can revisit the session. Guest links can be provided and can hear but not see the sessions.

Remote attendance is an option if you already know you will be somewhere else and you want to attend. An option for the planned exceptions.

Senate Roll Call: quorum not met

Approval of Minutes from March 26, 2019, 2019 meeting – Sandra Ledesma: Minutes cannot be voted on due to guorum not met.

Old Business

→ Policy related to Instructor/Student and Supervisor/Employee Romantic Relationships – Eric Reittinger & Nathan England: Last meeting Diane asked Eric and Nathan to review policy on consensual relationship policy so that what has happened in prior cases does not happen to all faculty. It was reviewed to see if changes were needed. Power point was presented and large, small and medium University institutions policies were analyzed and the larger institution fell under three main categories and the larger institutions had a blanket policy prohibiting any consensual relationship between faculty and students. A blanket policy is not what would be needed at this institution due to certain events such as a spouse of an active faculty member employed at the time wants to take classes at the same institution. The blanket policy would prohibit spouse from taking classes due to the relationship of husband/wife. There would then have to raise questions as to what type of policy must be set in motion, is it a faculty or staff policy? There is some institutions with very complicated policies for all areas of faculty and staff employees. Other institutions have different policies who feel they should not be regulating love. We are aware that there is a differential power and that some faculty members take advantage of that but does not protect our students from these types of faculty members. The third is also from large institutions that state consensual relationships are ok so long as the faculty or staff do not supervise or evaluate or teach the student in any way.

STC policy is oddly written and use too many words to state and restate the same policy that our faculty should not date students in their courses. It prohibits supervisors and faculty to enter a consensual relationship with any student enrolled in the faculty members class. The last one in another paragraph in STC policy states that it prohibits a faculty member to implicitly and explicitly suggesting or recommending to a student to switch majors or classes so they can have a consensual relationship in order to go around the policy. This is not a sufficient policy, it does make sense that faculty not be in a relationship with a student in your class due to the power over the student in that situation, but the policy needs to be expanded. Current policy is saying its ok to have relationship with a student's so long as they are not in your class, but there is still way to have power over student even if they are not in your class. The recommendation by Reittinger and England is that the statement in our policy combine staff and faculty and expanded to state that faculty/staff/ evaluator directly teaching instead of "just being in my class" shall not enter into any consensual relationship. Slight change in verbiage needs to be modified and recognize the ethical and moral boundaries that exist between students and faculty and make sure that takes precedence over relationships. First and second paragraph is ok wording to be revised.

Question: Would this also include father teaching daughter in the class or mother teaching daughter or son etc.... this is still a relationship and there is power over student etc....would this also apply? Is there something else in place for this type of relationship? This can be a topic for another discussion in next year's meeting.

Are there any consequences? What will happen? How will this be applied?

Eric Reittinger will look at other policies to identify other policies and the consequences that they may have if this policy is not adhered to.

→ Discussion on Results of Faculty Satisfaction/Climate Survey and comparison form last survey previously posted on Bb FS website: Survey took place in the Spring of 2019 and the sample size was 470 and 26% responded favorably and 79% are represented by dual credit, adjunct. Favorable working conditions, supported by department chair. 77% strongly agree that their job duties are clear. 76% their chair keeps them informed. 76% their satisfied with their teaching independence. 52% agreed that duties are spread out fairly in department. 9% strongly agreed they often burnt out by their jobs. 50% agree that STC is on the right track for the future. Notable number of faculty reported a lack of information when it comes to others units of the college. For example: 35% didn't' have an opinion of the process of Human Resources. 29% did not have an opinion about Faculty Senate and 26% did not have an opinion about the Fraud and Ethics Hot Line. These units might consider faculty focused outreach. 36% of traditional faculty strongly agreed they knew what was going on in the college by comparison 48% of dual credit adjunct said this. Dual credit program continues to be a subject of debate, only 29% strongly agree that dual credit classes were just as rigorous as college classes. Among dual credit adjuncts 69% of them strongly agreed. This is the breakdown and it is to be published on the Faculty Senate webpage for the rest of the details to this report.

Question/Comment: A confusion as to why or how the open-ended questions did not appear on the survey. The first survey administered prior had open ended questions. There was a discussion and emails back and forth to fix this and go over the qualitative data. There was compromise with Dr. Petrosian but was not the best survey but it was ok but not what Faculty Senate was expecting. Prior the comments boxes were something that had been fought for and now they were removed all together. The number of questions were reduced as well. Have any of you ever taken a survey at this college where there are no open-ended questions? Or comment boxes? Suggestion is that this be changed for the next survey. Concerns on the number of faculty actually completing the survey or lack of awareness of Faculty Senate and who we are.

Forming a committee would be helpful to start coming up with what we would like to see in the upcoming survey and start as soon as possible. Suggestion to invite RASS into a meeting with FS to reevaluate the survey and make the changes and make sure that the survey doesn't come back the way FS doesn't want it.

New Business

- → Newsletter committee- Nathan England: Starting it up again and wanting to create an ad-hoc committee and get more writers and some who can help with lay-out. Bill Carter was in charge of writing and posting for the newsletter. This should be a topic for the next meeting/the retreat and starting a new News Letter and it can be one way to help get the word out about what Faculty Senate is and does. Myra from Starr county is willing to help write the newsletter. Newsletters can be e-mailed and have some printed and placed in faculty areas.
- → Mumps, Measles and Tuberculosis Eric Reittinger: Received e-mails from a faculty member that a person in her class was diagnosed with mumps and faculty member is 18 months pregnant and exposed with mumps. She received an emergency e-mail Friday night that they were coming into her class on Monday and speak to the whole class about symptoms of mumps and let them know they were in a classroom with someone who had mumps. That Monday faculty had to go to the doctor to make sure she didn't get the mumps but the students who had the mumps was sitting in the classroom.

Clarification was made by Sandra Ledesma that this student had actually already been cleared of mumps by the health department and able to return to the classroom. The counseling department had received this information too late from the health department and STC has no control of that. This is an issue that Faculty Senate can do very little with other than suggest if there is something that can be done to change the process of informing us more quickly. Discussion of possible affordable clinics on campus for students and faculty to readily have immunizations.

→LHE cap in summer- Khalid Salmani: Inquiry if there was already a prior discussion in FS on the amount of summer courses/LHE's for the summer and if there was a cap. The answer was yes. There is a 9 LHE cap for the whole summer. Aware that it varies through departments as some are 5.1 LHE courses which changes the number of courses that can be taught. Khalid stated that before one could do up to 20 LHE's in the summer for the entire summer: two courses throughout summer 1,2, and 3. It was dropped down to 15 LHE's but it is still over the faculty handbook guidelines and it is not very clear. The wording is not very clear and states that 9 LHE during summer one or summer two or 12 over summer three. It is not clear how many you can teach all together or during each summer session. Issue raised that it is not clear in handbook that the 15 LHE's is the cap and the rules are applied so differently in various departments. Seeking clarity on this issue and the lack of uniformity. Would like this to be discussed further.

This is something that needs progress and uniformity throughout the College. If this has been discussed for the past 2 years a revisit is required and to at least categorize it per department. This can also be an issue to be discussed with the Curriculum Committee.

→ We will see everyone at the retreat September 14th.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:19 p.m.