Members Present (20):
Irfan Ahmed (COBA), Nancy Baker (CHSS), Tracy Bilsing (CHSS), Madhusudan Choudhary (COS), Mark Frank (COBA), Randy Garner (CJ), Deborah Hatton (COFAMC), Richard Henriksen (COE), Joan Hudson (COS), Mark Klespis (COS), Jeffry Littlejohn (CHSS), Paul Loeffler (COS), Dennis Longmire (CJ), David McTier (COFAMC), Sheryl Murphy-Manley (COFAMC), Diana Nabors (COE), Gary Oden (COHS), Lisa Shen (NGL), Stacy Ulbig (CHSS), Douglas Ullrich (COS)

Members Not Present (11):
Helen Berg (COE), Jonathan Breazeale (COBA), Don Bumpass (COBA), Donna Cox (COE), James Crosby (CHSS), Diane Dowdey (CHSS), Karla Edison (COE), James Landa (COHS), Dwayne Pavelock (COS), Tony Watkins (COFAMC), John Domino (CHSS - on leave for fall 2014)

Called to Order: 3:30 pm in Austin Hall by Chair Nancy Baker

Special Guest: Jeanine Bias, Associate Dean of Students for Student Conduct and Advocacy

Minutes Approved: Minutes for the November 20 meeting were approved unanimously with minor revisions.

Title IX
Dr. Baker welcomed Dean Bias, who was visiting Senate to address questions about the University’s sexual misconduct policy and procedures. Dean Bias is SHSU’s Title IX Coordinator. She had volunteered for the position to ensure SHSU is a safe campus, and to make sure the University is in compliance with the TSUS system policies regarding sexual misconduct and Title IX.

Dean Bias stressed that the primary goal of Title IX is to provide support for the victims, not to punish the perpetrators. For instance, a new provision to the TSUS policy was just finalized in October 2014 to create Confidential Advocates for the victims. This change will be implemented at SHSU in the near future.

Dr. Baker reiterated questions raised during the last Senate meeting regarding students who may be victims of domestic violence. Should faculty report such knowledge to the Title IX coordinator? Are faculty also obligated to contact law enforcement, or only advise the victim to do so? Would reporting procedures vary whether the perpetrator is also a student? What if the incident happened off-campus?
Dean Bias verified that as long as one of the parties involved in a Title IX-related incident, including domestic violence, is a student, faculty with knowledge of the case should report to the one of the Title IX officers. Faculty are not obligated to report the information directly to the police. When the victim is an adult, it would be his/her choice to contact law enforcement. The Title IX Coordinator will also contact the victim and present all the available reporting options and supporting resources.

The University is required to conduct an independent internal investigation upon receiving a Title IX incident report, regardless of police involvement. Dean Bias would be in charge of investigating incidents involving students, and recommending the appropriate actions, such as removing the victim or the perpetrator from student residence. The investigations would be conducted confidentially to protect the victim’s privacy.

A senator asked whether the threshold for making reports would be different if the parties involved were faculty or staff. The answer is no, incidents involving SHSU employees are also covered by Title IX and must be reported. In such cases, Mr. David Hammonds, the Vice President for Human Resources, would serve as the Deputy Coordinator in charge of the investigations.

A different senator asked why the Huntsville Police Department (HPD) is not contacted for every incident. Dean Bias explained that the victim may choose not to file a complaint with law enforcement. Moreover, the University Police Department (UPD) would be contacted if police presence is needed for incidents occurring on campus.

What are the statistics on Title IX-related reports at SHSU? Dean Bias shared data for the current year. There have been 4 cases involving employees (1 relationship violence and 3 reports of sexual harassment) and 23 cases involving students. The student cases included 7 reports of sexual assault, 7 domestic violence, 5 sexual harassment, and 4 requests for resources, such as ways to handle online sexual harassment.

A few senators raised questions about the statistics. Dean Bias explained that the data reflected reports that were made, not incidents that took place, during the year. There are no time limitations for reporting Title IX incidents, and unfortunately some victims may feel more comfortable reporting an incident upon completing their degrees or at the end of employment, rather than at the time of occurrence. These reports are difficult to investigate since perpetrators and witnesses may no longer be at SHSU. Moreover, due to privacy and confidentiality considerations, the Title IX office, the Counseling Center, and the police all keep separate statistics. Thus a single incident may be reflected multiple times in the data.

When addressing concerns with underreporting, the dean acknowledged that she suspects only a limited number of incidents are ever reported, although the true proportion is unknown. Moreover, while education and training efforts on campus have increased the number of Title IX reports made, not many students are willing to move forward with an investigation, such as identification of the perpetrators.
Has any Title IX investigation ever resulted in expulsion of students or termination of employment? The answer is yes. The Dean of Students and the employee’s supervisor and the Human Resources Department would make such determinations, respectively. Dean Bias further stressed that threshold for the internal university Title IX investigation is one of “preponderance of the evidence” rather than “beyond reasonable doubt.” The dean also noted that while Title IX policies have always been victim focused, there have been recent efforts to proceed more cautiously.

One senator noted the mandatory Title IX training for SHSU employees and wondered if similar training is available for students. The answer is yes, all incoming students, including transfer students, must complete 2 hours of mandatory training as required by the Campus Safety Act.

Lastly, Senators and the SHSU community are encouraged to visit the University’s Title IX website (http://www.shsu.edu/titleix/) for more information.

Chair’s Report
The report (see Related Documents) was pre-circulated via email.

Proposed Medical School
Provost Herbert indicated that newspaper reports of an SHSU medical school opening in 2017 in the Conroe area is inaccurate. The administration is still exploring funding and programming options for a possible land donation. In addition, a lengthy, multi-stage process must take place before any proposed new medical program is approved, and no formal proposal has yet been written, let alone submitted to any higher authority.

Moreover, the Provost would like to reassure faculty that the university is committed to ensure current campus resources would not be hurt by potential new endeavors.

Bearkat OneCard
Dr. Baker shared responses from the Higher One management to questions submitted by Senate through Dr. Vienne. A few senators noted that while Higher One’s OneSupport helpdesk can provide assistance over the phone, the helpdesk’s contact number is not readily available online. Consequently, those in need must visit the SHSU Bearkat OneCard office in person to contact the OneSupport helpdesk, which greatly reduces the usefulness of this service.

Consensual Relationship Policy
Senators shared a number of issues regarding Mr. Hammonds’ response to Dr. Baker about the status of the proposed consensual relationship policy. Specifically, senators did not feel Mr. Hammonds has adequately addressed the concerns that the strict disclosure requirements in the policy draft may violate faculty privacy by forcing them to disclose their sexual orientations.

For instance, the existing policy draft calls for disclosure whenever two faculty members in a relationship may be asked to evaluate one another. However, peer-evaluation is a common and encouraged practice, and faculty members are likely be asked to evaluate one another from time to time, especially in smaller departments. Therefore, senators would also like the policy to specify the types of evaluations that would warrant relationship disclosures.
**Miscellaneous Rumors**

In addressing rumors that a 4/4 teaching load may become the standard workload, the provost flatly rejected the idea as unfounded. There are no plans to change the University’s current balance as a research and teaching institution.

**Committee Reports**

**University Affairs Committee Report – Campus Parking**

The report (please see Related Documents), which was provided by Matt McDaniel, the Assistant Director for Parking and Transportation, was shared with senators electronically.

Overall, while senators appreciated Mr. McDaniel’s efforts in creating the report, many were also concerned by the lack of concrete plans to address the growth in both student and employee population in recent years. Senators also raised questions about the possible shortages of handicapped parking spaces, plans for gated lots, and parking lot attendees’ training for handling patrons who need to use the loading docks temporarily. Senator Watkins will forward these questions to Mr. McDaniel on behalf of UA and Senate.

**New Business**

**New Syllabus Submission Timetable**

It was brought to the Senate’s attention that CHSS faculty in one department were asked to submit their spring semester syllabi by a date much earlier than previous years’ deadlines. One senator thought the early deadline would give college administration more time to ensure all the required texts, or links to the texts, including the policy for academic dishonesty and the American Disabilities Act (ADA), are included in every syllabus. On the other hand, the early deadline may not provide sufficient preparation time for some faculty, and other colleges are not following the same timetable. A different senator also noted that ADA Policy is under review.

**Academic Bullying**

Dr. Baker asked whether senators are aware of any academic bullying on campus, as the topic had come up during another recent meeting. Several senators indicated the affirmative. One senator shared an instance where a junior faculty member was forced to include a senior colleague in his/her publications, even though this colleague had not contributed to the research.

Another senator shared an example in which one faculty member was physically shoved. Other senators pointed out that criminal acts such as physical violence should be differentiated from unethical or uncollegial behavior. One senator also felt that bullying behavior can be addressed through filing of grievance, and a faculty member in his department has gone through such a process with a satisfactory outcome.

Lastly, a senator pointed out that issues with bullying have been adequately addressed in section V.2.1 of the TSUS policy regarding employee discipline and dismissal, while other senators felt that this issue may need to be revisited pending the revision of the faculty grievance policy.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:55pm**
Proposed Medical School
The provost answered many questions that senators and other faculty have asked me in recent weeks about the proposed new medical school in the Conroe area. These questions pertain to the timeline, the funding, how the location was chosen, the impact on SHSU’s main campus and current programs, and when/how the program would receive accreditation (and whether students would get their money back if the program failed to receive accreditation).

The provost says that the claim (reported in the Houston Chronicle) that the school could open in 2017 is inaccurate; the approval process has many stages to it that take quite a bit of time, and there is at the moment no formal proposal that has been written (let alone submitted to any higher authority).

The proposed medical school came about because a developer offered a large parcel of land south of Conroe to SHSU for the express purpose of building a medical school or a health sciences center. The developer stipulated that this offer was contingent on SHSU having a plan in place by December 2015. President Hoyt said yesterday at the Faculty Senate Christmas party that having a medical school in Huntsville would not be possible, as there are no nearby facilities offering medical residencies, while the Conroe location is near such facilities.

According to the provost, as part of the planning phase President Hoyt and Carlos Hernandez (Vice President of Finance) have been considering different funding models. There is no definite funding model at this stage. It is true that there are significant costs associated with starting a medical school, and that there would be no state formula funding for the first two years in which students were enrolled in the new program.

In initial talks with the TSUS Board of Regents, Pres. Hoyt was asked to do nothing formal re: a medical school proposal until the current session of the state legislature ends in August. The TSUS administrators want to make sure there are no distractions from the Tuition Revenue Bond request to fund 80% of the costs of a new Biology building at SHSU. (The TRB requests $60M, which would be 80% of the cost of the new building. SHSU would raise the rest of the money through bonds.)

Once the legislative session ends, it would become possible to start to the process for proposing a new medical school (or health sciences center, another option). The process is likely to be lengthy (requiring years), even if there is no opposition at any level of the process. If and when SHSU’s proposed new medical school is approved, the following would then need to occur: 1) fund and build the building, 2) hire administrators who would need to be in place for one year, 3) hire faculty, who
would need to be in place for two years, 4) receive probationary accreditation and allow the first class of students to enroll. After students have been attending classes for two years at the medical school, then formula funding for the state becomes available. If the school fails to achieve full accreditation, the students enrolled under probationary accreditation are allowed to complete their degree, but no additional students are allowed to start the program. (There would be no “refunding” of student tuition in such a scenario, as their degrees would be considered to have occurred under probationary accreditation, therefore giving them degrees from an accredited program.)

Perhaps the most important point in the entire discussion of the proposed new medical school is that the provost feels very strongly that the medical school (or any new program) should never come at the expense of SHSU’s current programs. The provost is proud of SHSU’s strengths and determined not to allow anything to harm the university.

**Miscellaneous Rumors**

Various rumors have come to my attention recently, and I asked the provost to address them.

The provost says that there are no plans for a 2-4% budget cut at this time; he seemed surprised to hear that this was a concern.

The provost says that there are no plans to change SHSU’s current emphasis on research and teaching. He expressed tremendous pride in the university’s identity and the faculty’s ability to balance both teaching and research and said he would be opposed to changing this. On a related topic, he flatly rejected the rumor that a 4/4 teaching load could be returning to SHSU as the standard workload.

**Bearkat One Card**

Kristy Vienne told the provost that the current FAC/STA identifier on the faculty and staff ID cards is due to a limited number of characters that can be entered into the system. The provost has asked her if it would be possible to have three different cards (student, staff, and faculty) instead of the current system of two cards (students and faculty/staff). Kristy Vienne is exploring this possibility.

Meanwhile, Kristy Vienne has been in contact with Higher One about concerns Faculty Senate raised recently. Benjamin Fromm, Vice President of Relationship Management of Higher One, replied to say the following:

> We approached our investigation looking for solutions beyond what our normal operating procedures allow. We looked for workarounds, even manual solutions, that would allow Faculty members more flexibility to activate their ID cards and to remove personal identifying information for those who provided it by mistake. Four conclusions were reached through our investigation;
1) Faculty members who contact the BearKat card office and request activation of on campus services can do so on a one-off basis without completing the activation process online. We’ve identified a manual solution to send status files for individual requests and we will monitor this process to ensure the volume remains reasonable going forward.

2) Removing or “Archiving” Faculty ID card information was determined not to be a reasonable option. While Archiving records is possible the process involves removing all data from our system for that record and we’ve determined this process would have undesirable effects. For those Faculty who have provided Higher One personal identifying information, we will want to maintain that information in our system as long as they are employed with SHSU. We would be happy to discuss our security policy and privacy policy with anyone who has questions about this.

3) OneSupport our Administrative helpdesk has been identified as a resource with specialized training who can be utilized to work directly with Faculty who are trying to activate or have questions. OneSupport offers a higher level of support than our standard Customer Care team.

4) Product Improvement. We’ve acknowledged the need for improvement with our Faculty ID card experience in addition to some of our recent changes. SHSU’s requests and concerns have been discuss at an executive level and our product teams are building improvements into our roadmap. We appreciate your feedback.

Consensual Relationship Policy
I contacted David Hammonds, Associate Vice President of Human Resources, to ask for an update on the status of the consensual relationship policy draft. (He had sent a draft of the policy to Faculty Senate last year, and Senate returned the draft to him suggesting that it needed major revision and could benefit from comparison with peer institutions’ policies.)

David Hammonds says there is no currently approved consensual relationship policy, but that recently there has been renewed discussion and consideration of putting one into place. His current advice regarding consensual relationships between faculty members is this:

To your question, consensual relationship language doesn’t prohibit or discourage one from dating a colleague unless the person supervises or evaluates the colleague or vice versa. This type of policy guidance is intended to help avoid the conflict of interest created in such situations.

In circumstances where a relationship develops or exists, the person in authority (evaluator, teacher, supervisor, etc.) discloses the existence to
his/her supervisor where alternative arrangements for supervision, evaluation, etc. are made to eliminate the conflict of interest.

**Extra meeting**
The provost graciously offered to have an additional meeting with the Faculty Senate leaders to address the list of items we were not able to discuss in our most recent meeting with him, due to time constraints. We will be seeing him again on December 16.

Submitted by Nancy E. Baker, via e-mail
Responses to Faculty Senate Parking Questions

Matt McDaniel, Assistant Director
Has the number of spaces kept pace with the growth in the number of people on campus?

• During the course of the year, we always see construction and the removal of spaces or the addition of parking spaces in different or displaced areas. Since 2011, we have seen a decrease in the number of spaces from approximately 7,806 spaces to roughly 7,755 spaces pre construction of the South Residential Parking Lot.
Are there currently plans to address the parking problems on campus? Timeframe?

In the short term, or within a year, the only planned parking lot project as of 11/20/2014, is the South Residential Parking Lot that will mainly facilitate the parking needs of the residents of the complex with an estimated occupancy of 412-420 spaces. Between the construction transition of the Pirkle Engineering Building, South Dining Facility and the South Residential Complex, approximately 100 to 200 spaces will be made available to faculty/staff and commuter permit holders once the loss of P23 and P24 spaces occurs.

Within 2 to 5 years, conversations have started regarding the addition of a surface lot possibly positioned in the Old Colony area near the Janes’ Asphalt location that was acquired behind Rita B. Huff. Also, there have been brief conversations determining the feasibility of another garage structure with placement undetermined at this time. These are very fluid discussions and are subject to change.
How does our issued permits to available spaces ratio compare to other universities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Control Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Faculty/Staff Reserved</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Garage Contract Permits</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Student YR Mobility Decal</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Annual Mobility Decal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Annual Mobility Hangtag</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Student Annual Mobility Decal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Annual Mobility Decal</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Annual Mobility Hangtag</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Commuter Motorcycle</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Commuter Student</td>
<td>7,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Faculty/Staff Motorcycle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Faculty/Staff Hangtag</td>
<td>1,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Faculty/Staff Sticker</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Garage Contract</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Motorcycle Resident</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Remote Decal</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Resident Student Decal</td>
<td>2,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Count: 11,797
### Parking Resource Comparison

FY15 Statistics from August 1, 2014 to November 20, 2014 (Unless specified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Permits Sold/Issued to Faculty/Staff and Students</th>
<th>Number of Spaces</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHSU</td>
<td>11797</td>
<td>7755</td>
<td>1.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFASU</td>
<td>10505</td>
<td>7277</td>
<td>1.4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU (stats from webpage for FY14)</td>
<td>51392</td>
<td>36963</td>
<td>1.4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State</td>
<td>18884</td>
<td>10735</td>
<td>1.8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>16228</td>
<td>16375</td>
<td>0.99:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>14851</td>
<td>6586</td>
<td>2.3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star College</td>
<td>41517</td>
<td>26000</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: E-Mails were sent to representatives of each of these universities. No contact was made with TAMU and statistics From FY14 provided on their website were used for this report. All other reportees provided information ranging from August 2014 until 11/20/2014. Other universities that were contacted include: Texas Tech University, Tarleton State University, UT Dallas, University of North Texas, UT Austin, University of Arkansas and University of Missouri. As that information becomes available I can send an update to Faculty Senate.
If faculty are not able to secure a parking space prior to a class, what considerations will they receive if they illegally park?

- All citations that are reviewed through the appeals process are considered on a case by case basis. We consider several variables to include events occurring on campus, parking closures, proper signage and markings in the area, as well as, the appellant’s parking history. Ultimately, even though parking has surged beyond resources during peak hours, our office still requests that all permit holders park according to the rules and regulations. Illegally parking in a manner that blocks traffic flow or presents a safety concern can lead to a citation and a tow at an officer’s discretion.

- At this time, no blanket leniency has been given to the entire community for any parking violation.
How many spaces are reserved for individual members of the administration?

- There are currently 35 reserved spaces available on campus for members of Administration to include President, VP Level and Dean Level administrative members. 28 of those spaces are utilized and those that are not being used have the signs removed until positions are filled or the spaces are approved to be used as reserved zone spaces.

- We are researching the ability to have reserved spaces provided to faculty/staff and students within the higher demand parking close to buildings that will be offered at a premium. Costs and increases have not been determined yet for FY16 but a focus has been placed on collecting funds for new parking and structures.
How are parking fees utilized?

- Currently, all fees collected from parking services are used for the operation of the Department of Public Safety Services. This includes both the operation of University Police and Parking and Transportation. A maintenance budget for signage, striping and lot repairs is allocated for the year. A reserve budget is in place for unspent funds to be transferred at the discretion of the Director of Public Safety with the intended purpose of funding larger projects such as the addition of parking.