Meeting: Faculty Senate Date: April 3, 2018
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: BA 290
Adjournment: 3:30 p.m.

Minutes

Members present: Tim Wilson, Annette Taggart, Gerard Huber, Johanna Delgado-Acevedo, Stephen Starnes, Bilal Abu Bakr, Juan Araujo, Julia Ballenger, Sarah Mitchell, Charlotte Larkin, John Smith, Jason Davis, Susan Stewart, Yelin Ou, Daniel Kelly, Kurtis Williams, Chad King (President), Benjamin May, Rebecca Worley, Sandy Hayes (for Sean Anderson), Gracie Brownell, Brandon Randolph-Seng

Members absent: Curtis Jones, Benton Pierce, Greg Lubiani, Debra Mahoney, Jiaming Sun,

Issue/Topic	Summary of Discussion March 6, 2018, Senate minutes were approved with minor	Decision/Action Minutes were
	modifications	approved with corrections as needed.
Invited Speaker	The meeting opened at 2:00 p.m. President King introduced Dr. Lee Young, Vice President for Enrollment_Management_and Retention, shared the following: Plan student growth What is the appropriate proportion of growth for undergraduate and graduate school projected (i.e., 60% graduate, 40% undergraduate)? International student enrollment has declined Need to expand marketing to recruit more students Recruit individual students with dreams and aspirations and not FTEs Projected enrollment for the freshman class is 1,000 to 1,500 The question becomes: "Where will we place the new freshmen?"	
	President King asked: • What students are admitted to the university? • Are students meeting the standards? • Issues of retention Dr. Young informed the group of, • Need to maintain requirements of the university and integrity of the Admissions Office • Top 30% of the class	

	 ACT- 970 GPA- 3.0 Exceptions- addressed by a committee Recruitment is only one part Retention is critical Students are encouraged to take 15-18 hours to graduate in 4-4 and one-half years Many students cannot register because of a financial balance Ability to pay is the greatest factor in retention In addition, Dr. Young stated that we need to identify our unique identity. Who are we? What is our brand? He has developed a Marketing Plan. More money is needed for advertising and scholarships. A retention rate of 71-72% is the goal. High percentage of new students are PELL eligible and Work Study.
Communications	President King shared the following information with the Senators after meeting with the provost: • Future of the Professional Track advancement is part of the appointed Special Faculty Task Force • The proposed Liberal Arts School will be part of the Liberal Arts Program • Dr. Keck asked all professors to have final exams during final's week • Dr. Dobbs reported that midterm reports and early intervention reports may be automatically generated from the new LMS • Faculty Senate Luncheon will be Monday, April 9, 2018 • President King was interviewed by the East Texan (March 9, 2018) and Texas Tribune • The appointed Task Force timeline is 3-5 years
Committee Reports	 Academic Life: Senator Larkin did not have a report Academic Practice: Senator Ballenger did not have a report Admission and Retention: Senator Kelly did not have a report Curriculum: Senator Pierce did not have a report

	 Budget: Senator Starnes did not have a report Faculty Senate Awards: No report Organization of the Senate: No report
Unfinished Business	No unfinished business
New Business	President King asked for suggestions on the Tenure and Promotions Policy Document:
	• Section 2.4 Line 5, third word. This should be assistant professors, not associate professors, correct?
	• Section 2.5 Please clarify whom the phrase "denied a second time" applies to. Does this reference a candidate going up early twice or just a candidate who goes up early once and then goes up in the 6th year?
	• Section 3.1 – Why is this only a 1 year extension? What if more than one extenuating thing happens to a candidate?
	• Section 6.1.1 – Please explain why the inclusion of the following statement "no additions, deletions after submitted?" Why couldn't this limitation be applied only after the file has been submitted to the college?
	• Section 6.3.3 Please explain the rationale for why committee members that voted at the department level abstain at the college level.
	• Section 6.6.2 The Senate was concerned about empowering the Provost with the ability to recommend against based on projecting future needs or availability of resources is not acceptable. They feel that this is damaging to the integrity of the entire tenure process when it can be done against the recommendation of the other committees. Does the Provost alone have the ability to determine the future of the university, or the projected financial state? Please provide explanation and
	comment.
	The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.