

**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 (CJ), Deborah Hatton (COFAMC), Richard Henriksen (COE), Mark Klespis (COS), James Landa (COHS), Jeffry Littlejohn (CHSS), Paul Loeffler (COS), Dennis Longmire (CJ), David McTier (COFAMC), Sheryl Murphy-Manley (COFAMC), Stacy Ulbig (CHSS), Tony Watkins (COFAMC), Diane Dowdey (CHSS), Dwayne Pavelock (COS)

**Members Not Present (10)**

John Domino (CHSS - on leave for Fall 2014)

Irfan Ahmed (COBA), Don Bumpass (COBA), Donna Cox (COE), Mark Frank (COBA), Diana Nabors (COE), Gary Oden (COHS), Douglas Ullrich (COS), Joan Hudson (COS), James Crosby (CHSS), Lisa Shen (NGL).

**Called to Order**

3:30 pm in LSC 304 by Chair Nancy Baker

**Minutes Approved**

The minutes for the October 9 meeting were approved unanimously.

**Special Guest**

Kristy Vienne, Asst. VP and Director of OneCard Services

The Chair welcomed Dr. Vienne, who was invited to visit with the Senate and answer questions about the HigherOne BearKat faculty ID card.

The Chair also recognized Spencer Copeland, President of the SHSU Student Government Association, as being in attendance.

Dr. Vienne began with a brief presentation to the Senate.

This past March the University began the process of re-carding the entire campus. Previous design had been in circulation for 10.5 years, a bit longer than most universities. Security reasons were part of the decision to re-card. In accordance, the new card is dual stripe. Banner conversion was also part of the decision. Old cards were 7 digits, while Banner is 9, which needed to be adjusted. A new card system was purchased last March, as many campus systems needed to be integrated. This entire process took about a year.

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.

The University pays HigherOne to handle its disbursement process for students. This partnership has improved the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the disbursement process. Not only does the university save money, but students also get their money faster. Each card costs the University \$15, which is paid to HigherOne for providing this service.

A senator mentioned that UNT also uses the HigherOne card, but they also have a separate ID. Why must we use ours for both? Why did the University decide this? According to Dr. Vienne the initial decision, 11 years ago, was a convenient solution. At this time dual cards were not an option. In terms of managing all of the processes and access the cards are used for, the single card system works the best for the University.

A senator asked how many inactive, accidentally activated accounts currently belong to SHSU faculty. Dr. Vienne did not know but agreed to look into it.

A senator stated that HigherOne indicated to her that we could have a different, non MasterCard ID. Dr. Vienne was not aware of this, and suggested this information may be inaccurate. Additionally, a senator mentioned the fact that the card does not spell out FACULTY as being problematic. It is the understanding of the Dr. Vienne that two different card designs is not a possibility. Dr. Vienne also said that there may be a limit on the number of characters for that part of the card, a limit dictated by SHSU's use of the Banner system. Dr. Vienne would be in favor of such a solution, but HigherOne has indicated that this could not be done.

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 comments**

The Texas State University System is interested in publishing student comments on teaching evaluations.

A senator expressed concern about faculty privacy, yet the university attorney only seemed interested in student privacy. What about personal comments that could appear on such comments, such as an illness that revealed personal and private details?

A senator expressed the sentiment that this is a bad idea, and could be inflammatory. What about the lack of accountability due to the anonymity?

SGA President Spencer Copeland mentioned that teaching evaluations are presented to students as being confidential and intended for the improvement of the course, not for public dissemination. He also suggested that such distribution could have a chilling effect on the process for students.

Senator Watkins asked if IDEA is intended to provide information for faculty improvement, how does releasing these comments promote this goal? Senators asked if IDEA would approve of this, as IDEA is intended to provide formative feedback, not public summative feedback. Senator Sheryl Murphy-Manley suggested that they would not.

### **Required training videos**

Senator Murphy-Manley proposed that we receive PDF handouts as opposed to the requirement that we watch videos and participate in online quizzes. Having access to PDF documents would be clearer, more to the point, and would be more useful and take less time. The current process is burdensome.

A senator stated that while many of these requirements are set by the state of TSUS, the timetables may be set by SHSU.

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**