

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday, November 1, 2024
LIB 101 and Zoom

The meeting was called to order at 10:02 AM.

Roll Call

Abbott X	Acho X	Barnett	Burke, A. X	Burke, M. X
DelloStritto X	Dice X	Dillon X	Du X	Dunlap SUB
Elkins X	Ernst X	Gates X	Gullion X	Hynds X
Lambert SUB	Landrum FMLA	Lucero Jones X	Miketinas X	Morgan A
Petersen X	Richmond X	Rosa-Dávila X	Sen X	Sit SUB
Smith X	Talleff X	Terrizzi X	Trujillo-Jenks. X	Van Erve X
Woods X				

TCFS Representative: Shawnda Smith
Parliamentarian: Jacob Blosser

Faculty Guests:

Dr. Vivian Casper English, Rhetoric & Spanish
Dr. Rebecca Fredrickson Prof/Interim Dir of Career Connections
Dr. Ellina Grigorieva Division of Mathematics
Dr. Rachel Poland Nutrition & Food Sciences / HOU
Dr. Linda Rubin Faculty Ombudsperson / Professor, Division of Psychology & Philosophy
Dr. Chanam Shin College of Nursing / DEN

Staff Guests:

Ms. Stephany Compton Librarian Academic Outreach
Mr. Scott Martin Manager of Curriculum, Catalogs, & Academic Communications

Approval of Minutes

October 11, 2024, Meeting Minutes
Motion to approve, D. Hynds; second, M. Burke.
Motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve, R. DellaStritto; second, J. Terrizzi.
Motion passed unanimously.

Guest Speaker: Dr. Henry Torres

Chief Information Officer (CIO)

Dr. Torres shared background and journey to TWU including being the CIO for seven campuses through the Arkansas State University system. Since arriving to TWU, Dr. Torres has been examining the 130 classrooms of technology across campus including many with technology that is over 15 years old.

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

He sees the need to improve processes related to budgeting so that technology can be standardized, and costs reduced related to updating technology when it's maintained. He aims to attend Faculty Senate meetings to hear concerns and needs of the faculty related to classroom-related technology and research-related technology. Dr. Torres shared that he has secured 24/7 support for faculty on Canvas, noting also the expansive storage that is available on Canvas. He is developing a road map for the next five years to move TWU forward using what we have as well as what we need to meet the technology needs of the TWU system. There will be sizeable changes in the way some processes are handled as the new technology is integrated. One key process to be focused on will be the onboarding of new faculty, with new software program being built to replace the existing process. He is working on a new log on process that will allow faculty and staff to have a single log on to access all the systems needed to work (e.g., email, Canvas), and looking at expanding technology options for faculty while limiting the number of vendors that TWU contracts with for technology. As it relates to budgets, a reconciliation report should be online through Oracle and available for faculty and administrators to access online as well as print. Dr. Torres noted that these changes have coincided with 12 vacancies in technology, of which 9 have been filled.

Faculty Senate discussion of contact center support currently being implemented to expedite addressing technology concerns in the classroom. Note also that the QR code on the computers in the classrooms has improved the response times and outcomes (QR code scan prompts ticket that is expedited for response). Discussion of the twu.edu/classrooms website that notes what technology is available in each of the classrooms. Discussion of emails bouncing back on established email addresses. Dr. Torres noted that anything that looks malicious or that includes content that looks like a credit card or social service number, it will be blocked. Software updates are being monitored more closely so that we can prevent appropriate emails from being blocked. Discussion of what faculty can do to detect AI written assignments. Turnitin recently removed AI option, but also that option is not always accurate or unbiased in reviewing for AI. Discussion of budgetary support and as well as faculty support for how to work within AI-related challenges. Discussion of the duplicity in software (e.g., Zoom, Teams, RingCentral) as well as the three different multi-factor authentications used at TWU and how disruptive it is to work efforts. Dr. Torres noted that the revised process (noted above) should address some of the redundancy in the multi-factor authentication. Discussion of the timelines for response to projects and service desk tickets. Dr. Torres noted a change in metrics on how these are being addressed so reductions in response time should be noted. He also noted that he randomly submits a "mystery shopper" ticket to randomly test the system and response times.

Provost Forum – Dr. Angela Bauer

SB 17

- Provost Bauer noted that two of the four listening sessions have occurred (on Dallas and Houston campuses). Denton campus discussions will be November 11 in Denton (3 pm), and November 12 in Denton (3:30 pm). These listening sessions will include faculty in the discussion in addition to the General Council and the Provost. Her perception of the listening sessions has been positive thus far.
- Provost Bauer also noted the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month occurring today with a talk by Dr. Christina Bejarano, who will discuss political mobilizing, followed by a dessert reception.

Academic Affairs Advisory Committee

- Dr. Bauer shared a revised name for the Budget Advisory Committee; now to be called the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee (AABAC). The committee will be comprised of eight faculty (i.e., one faculty representative from each of the academic colleges, who will be elected by the faculty, one Faculty Senator [Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee), one member at large from Dallas and Houston) in addition to seven Ex Officio members (i.e.,

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

Provost, CFOO, Director of University Budgets and Capital Planning, University Advancement, Institutional Research, Curriculum and Strategic Planning, ORSP). She also shared a draft mission and scope of responsibilities for the committee (e.g., strategic planning and resource alignment, budget analysis and monitoring, efficiency and cost management, investment recommendations, faculty engagement in resource optimization, communication, and transparency). Annual reports will be submitted by the AABAC to Faculty Senate, the Provost, and Chancellor. Draft document outlining the composition and charge of this committee will be distributed for review.

- Faculty Senate discussion of why the committee is focused on academic affairs. Faculty Senate Leadership and Provost Bauer discussed emphasis on academic affairs because it is the area under the Provost's purview. It was noted, however, that focus would not preclude this committee from reviewing and discussing budgetary concerns or spending in other areas of the University. Faculty Senate will receive links to budgets available for the University as well as internal audits for the past five years and external audits for the past two years for review and transparency. Faculty Senate acknowledged the Provost's efforts in this short time and our appreciation.

Process Engineer

- Provost Bauer discussed the process engineer that is being hired to streamline processes as well as the culture around those processes in late 2024. First initiative will focus on the hiring process and be led by Tony Sanchez in collaboration with the process engineer (L. Kuntz).
- Faculty Senate discussion of process engineer visiting Dallas and Houston campuses and administration. Provost Bauer noted that processes are centralized, so campus sites may not be needed.

Graduate Admissions Initiative

- The Provost's Office will be facilitating a series of workflow workshops (led by K. Kaskel-Ruiz) to improve graduate admissions processes.
- Faculty Senate discussion of new graduate student funding, how much is available to each department and can funding be distributed in the spring as well as the fall. It was clarified that departments can divide funds across semesters to award to graduate students who start in the fall, spring, and summer, if they so choose.
- Provost Bauer noted that the issue of graduate student pay was raised during the recent tuition fees hearing (requesting 3% increase in student fees and tuition) and that she is investigating factors contributing to current graduate student pay. She also noted that if you submitted a request for differential fee increases and they were denied, it may be related to the proposed across the board tuition increase.

Texas Success Initiative Test Completion Initiative

- Provost noted a full-on TSI completion initiative with a multi-pronged approach to getting all TWU students to meet the TSI requirement (e.g., intentionally planned time with peer mentors during orientation days and Pioneer Camp to complete TSI, social media campaigns, hiring faculty to increase developmental education course sections offered, advising changes to prevent advisors from waiving TSI requirement).

Learning Communities

- Deans have been asked to share with the Provost how they plan to develop and implement learning communities and living learning communities within their departments.

Open Searches

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

- Searches are ongoing for the Deans of COPE and CHS, as well as the Executive Director for the Center for Faculty Success. National search for the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will post soon, with the position for the Dean of CAS to follow in the spring.

TWU Online Programs

- As we move toward being a system, we need to determine how to equitably allocate revenue generated from fully online programs not housed on any particular campus. A task force has been convened to see how other systems handle this and they will be making recommendations in the near future.

Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Success – Dr. Shannon Scott

Professional Development Opportunities

- Professional development events upcoming include Zoom workshops on November 7th on how to use AI in research, and November 12th on how to increase student motivation (practical tips to reengage students shared by our instructional design staff). A workshop is being developed on how to design your course with AI in mind (e.g., ADA compliance, class structure, assignment design).
- TWU is currently in negotiations with Watermark for the CV platform to replace Sedona. In addition to the CV platform, the Watermark platform will also include additional features such as a performance review system feature and a student course evaluation feature that will allow evaluations to be conducted within Canvas (to increase completion rate to 50-70% range). This new platform is anticipated to be in place by the fall of 2025. Dr. Scott also noted that a career trajectory module will also be available in the system to support faculty who are going up for tenure and promotion and would benefit from a more transparent understanding of “what is happening and when” during the promotion and tenure process. The Watermark system will also integrate with online faculty profiles. It also has the capability to develop templates that might be needed for accreditation purposes.
- Faculty Development Leave and Grant applications are out and are due in November to ACAs.
- Opportunity forthcoming for an AI community partnership (for ~10 faculty who will work on AI use and integrating it into their course pedagogies).
- Training on Ally, as an accessibility tracker what will be used to meet the upcoming accessibility requirements, is also forthcoming.
- Request for support in securing volunteers for commencement. Please consider volunteering yourself and encourage your faculty and staff to volunteer. Email request forthcoming.

Speaker Report - Dr. Emarely Rosa-Dávila

- The new health science center may be completed in phases (part completed in May and part in June), so construction work zones should change over the summer. For the Breckenridge construction, be advised that Administration Drive will eventually be closed completely to traffic for a period of time – look for email notification.
- Related to capital construction, the Provost is looking at space use as she searches for office space that could be repurposed (e.g., creating shared office space for faculty teaching online, looking for space for QEP offices). Senate discussion of how many faculty have multiple offices and how many emeriti faculty have offices.
- Speaker noted that she will be attending the Board of Regents meeting next week and will report back. Please consider joining online or in person if in Houston. Speaker will send out additional details for faculty and senators interested in attending.

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

- Speaker noted that SB 17 specific language is being drafted for use within course syllabi for spring semester. Faculty can choose to use the language, if appropriate for their course.

Unfinished Business

Second Readings

- URP 02.235 High Stakes Testing – Requesting to be archived
 - Reminder that Dr. Scott noted that the program or college is allowed to have a testing policy without having a corresponding university-level policy.
 - Motion to approve archiving, J. Terrizzi; second, C. Acho.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- URP 01.315: Records Retention Email – Requesting to be archived
 - Motion to approve archiving, J. Terrizzi; second, C. Acho.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
- URP 01.310: Records Retention – Updated
 - Motion to approve updated policy, W. van Erve; second, R. DelloStritto.
 - Motion passed unanimously.

New Business

Discussion of Faculty Performance Review System

- Senate discussion that academic components criteria should be aligned to the new rating system, regardless of how many levels end up in the new rating scale. Consideration of three-point scale may be cleaner approach (e.g., needs improvement/effective/exceptional). If a 5-point scale is adopted, then top three ratings should receive merit. A quota-based system, where not everyone can be awarded top rating, should not be used. Discussion of 3- versus 5-point scale, some faculty favored a 5-point scale over the 3-point scale.
- Faculty Senate request for Provost Bauer to discuss her prior institution's rating system. Discussion of 4-point system at Dr. Bauer's previous institution, noting ratings of 3 and 4 were meets and exceeds expectations. She did not experience any faculty pushback with the rating system. She did note that there were opportunities to reward faculty who had significant achievements within her former institution, but that was not linked to their evaluation/score. Dr. Scott commented that feedback had been solicited from seven IHEs about their rating scales and evaluation system. Generally, regardless of the 3, 4, or 5-point scale, faculty were displeased with their system. Faculty Senate discussion of need for clarity of how merit is being awarded. Noted that historically TWU has had two systems associated with merit – one tied to the PRC evaluation, another less transparent system associated with the Deans' discretionary merit awards. Clarity is needed on how merit will be allocated for each level of evaluation and what percentage of funding will be allocated for peer evaluations versus Deans' evaluations. Discussion of need to regularize the process for how individuals receive raises across the board.
- Faculty Senate discussion of promotion and tenure (P&T) criteria, noting that the criteria need to be objective to support the work of the PRCs and decisions being made by the Deans. Senators emphasized that the PRC evaluation should be the most important as it is an objective review by peers with subject knowledge in the respective field. Additional discussion of concerns related to faculty well-being as well as the stress associated with merit that comes from the fact that merit is the only reasonable opportunity to adjust your salary (no cost of living raise available).
- Related to P&T criteria, Dr. Bauer added a point of clarification—though TWU has yet to receive the official R2 designation, TWU does have existing faculty expectations, research expenditures,

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

productivity, etc., that meet the Carnegie R2 expectations. There is not a need to revise criteria for P&T to increase research focus. Some discussion of the Provost's Office developing a document that outlines the current merit system, and having the Provost discuss with the Deans how they are allocating their funds.

- Additional Senate discussion of PRCs being advised to not rate faculty as exceptional. This suggests that TWU can't afford/doesn't have enough funding to award merit to the exceptional work currently being done by faculty. Having a different number of rating options won't resolve this issue.
- Historical perspectives shared that noted a former Vice Provost sought to change the culture of the university and advocated to limit evaluation of faculty as exceptional. At that time, ACAs and PRCs were advised to not rate individuals as exceptional. Discussion noted that the Faculty Senate has an opportunity to recalibrate the culture on merit, and to move toward a culture of excellence.
- Second point of clarification provided from the Provost—this appears to be much more of an issue than just the rating scale, and that collecting feedback on rating scales may not address the issue.
- Motion to table discussion of rating scale and its connection to merit pay to January, A. Elkins; second, R. DelloStritto.
- Motion passed unanimously.

Reports

Speaker Pro Tem - P. Landrum: No report.

Secretary - S. Dillon: Request to senators to closely review the minutes for errors as she is still recovering from a concussion and wants to ensure Faculty Senate proceedings are accurately reported.

Speaker Ex Officio - J. Terrizzi: No report.

TCFS Representative - S. Smith: No report.

Standing Committees:

1. Academic Freedom and Responsibility – D. Hynds: No report.
2. Academic Standards Committee – W. van Erve: No report.
3. Administrator Evaluations – C. Acho: No report.
4. Budget and Planning – M. Burke: No report.
5. Committee Selection Committee – J. Talleff: No report.
6. Constitution and Bylaws – A. Elkins: No report.
7. Elections – R. DelloStritto: Committee will meet to address election of AABAC once details are finalized by the Provost's Office.
8. Equity, Inclusion and Anti-Racism – J. Lambert: No report.
9. Faculty Handbook – J. Dunlap: No report.
10. Ad hoc Committee for Student Success – L. Trujillo-Jenks: No report.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn, J. Terrizzi; second, C. Acho.

Meeting adjourned at 12:45 PM.

Submitted Suzanna Dillon, Secretary

November 1, 2024

Texas Woman's University University Regulation and Procedure

Regulation and Procedure Name: Records Retention

**Regulation and Procedure
Number: URP: 01.310**

Policy Owner: Office of General Counsel

POLICY STATEMENT

This policy will ensure that necessary records and documents are adequately protected and maintained and will ensure that records that are no longer needed or of no value are discarded at the appropriate time.

APPLICABILITY

This policy is applicable to TWU Faculty and Staff.

DEFINITIONS

None

REGULATION AND PROCEDURE

- I. Administration
 - A. The University Records Retention Officer will be appointed by the President and will represent the University in all aspects of proper records retention efforts and will manage adherence to the University Records Retention Policies and Procedures. The Records Retention Officer will provide necessary training for unit administrators in proper storage and destruction of records, documents and transitory material.
 - B. Each department head will prepare a listing of major documentation used and maintained by the department and will adhere to storage and destruction requirements as minimally established by the Texas State Records and Retention Schedule. In addition, each department head will periodically review current-used records and forms to determine whether these records and forms are adequate and appropriate for each department's requirements.

- C. Each department head will periodically review the policy to determine any special circumstances that necessitate changes in the retention periods. Requests for changes in retention periods or deviations from specified retention periods should be made to the Records Retention Officer, and may be implemented only after approval.
- D. In the event of a governmental audit, investigation, or pending litigation, record disposal may be suspended at the direction of the General Counsel. In addition, the General Counsel would be informed of any situation that might give rise to legal action as soon as the situation becomes apparent.
- E. The University Records Retention Officer must submit a complete records retention schedule to the State and Local Records Management Division of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission.

II. Applicable Records and Documents

This policy applies to all records and documents generated or received by the university in the course of the University's operation, including both original documents and reproductions. It also applies to records stored on computers and microfilm as well as paper records.

III. Retention Periods

The retention periods for University records and documents are established as a minimum by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission in the current version of the Texas State Records Retention Schedule. This retention schedule indicates the minimum length of time listed records series must be retained by a state agency before destruction or archival preservation. If federal or state statute or regulation specifies a longer retention period for any records series received, created or maintained by an agency, the statute or regulation overrides the agency retention schedule.

IV. Destruction Schedule

- A. All University records and documents will be destroyed or reviewed for archival purposes according to the retention schedule, except as stated in the Texas State Records Retention Schedule:
 - 1. "A state record may not be destroyed if any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit, open records request, administration review, or other action involving the record is initiated before the expiration of a retention period for the record set by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission or in the approved records retention schedule of the agency until the completion of the action and the resolution of all issues that arise from it, or until the expiration of the retention period, whichever is later."

- B. The Records Retention Officer will notify the appropriate department head of any deviation from the approved records destruction schedule; in the event of litigation, the General Counsel.

REVIEW

This policy will remain in effect and published until it is reviewed, updated, or archived. This policy is to be reviewed once every six years. Interim review may be required as a result of updates to federal and state law or regulations, Board of Regents policies, or internal processes or procedures.

REFERENCES

None

FORMS AND TOOLS

None

<p>Publication Date: 07/02/2021</p> <p>Revised: 07/02/2021</p>
--

Texas Woman's University University Regulation and Procedure

Regulation and Procedure Name: Records Management Email

**Regulation and Procedure
Number: URP: 01.315**

Policy Owner: Office of General Counsel

POLICY STATEMENT

It is the policy of Texas Woman's University to provide for the efficient, economical and effective management of electronic mail records in accordance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 13, Sections 6.91-6.97 (State Agency Bulletin Number One, Electronic Records Standards and Procedures). TAC Chapter 13, Section 6.92(c), provides that the agency head or designated records management officer must administer a program for the management of records created, received, retained, used, or disposed on electronic media.

Texas Woman's University desires to adopt a policy for that purpose and to prescribe guidelines and procedures for the management of electronic mail consistent with the Electronic Records Standards and Procedures and in the interest of cost-effective and efficient recordkeeping, including long-term records retention for the Archives of the State.

APPLICABILITY

This policy is applicable to TWU Employees.

DEFINITIONS

1. "Electronic mail message" means a record created or received on an electronic mail system including brief notes, more formal or substantive narrative documents, and any attachments which may be transmitted with the message.
2. "Electronic mail receipt data" means information in electronic mail systems regarding the date and time of receipt of a message, and/or acknowledgment of receipt or access by addressee(s).
3. "Electronic mail System" means a computer application used to create, receive, retain and transmit messages and other records. Excluded from this definition are file transfer utilities.

4. "Electronic mail transmission data" means information in electronic mail systems regarding the identities of sender and addressee(s), and the date and time messages were sent.
5. "Electronic media" means all media capable of being read by a computer including computer hard disks, magnetic tapes, optical disks, or similar machine-readable media.
6. "Electronic record" means the information that is maintained in electronic format in a computer for computer processing and the product of computer processing of that information that satisfies the definition of a state record in the Government Code §441.180.
7. "Electronic records system" means any information system that produces, manipulates, and stores state records by using a computer.
8. "Mailing list service" means an electronic mailing list hosting service (e.g., Listserv) used for discussions and announcements within a specified group of individuals. Subscribers to the service participate by sending information to and receiving information from the list using electronic mail messages.
9. "Records management officer" means the person who administers the records management program established in each state agency under the Government Code, §441.183.
10. "State record" means any written, photographic, machine-readable, or other recorded information created or received by or on behalf of a state agency or an elected state official that documents activities in the conduct of state business or use of public resources. The term does not include:
 - a. Library or museum material made or acquired and maintained solely for reference or exhibition;
 - b. An extra copy of recorded information maintained only for reference; or
 - c. A stock of publications or blank forms.

REGULATION AND PROCEDURE

I. Introduction

This policy applies to e-mail used within Texas Woman's University and e-mail used conjointly with the Internet, and does not supersede any state or federal laws, or any other agency policies regarding confidentiality, information dissemination, or standards of conduct. Generally, e-mail should be used only for legitimate state business; however, brief and occasional e-mail messages of a personal nature may be sent and received if the following conditions are met.

II. General Guidelines

- A. Personal use of e-mail is a privilege, not a right. Abuse of the privilege may result in appropriate disciplinary action. Management has the ability and right to view employees' e-mail. Recorded e-mail messages are the property of the agency and therefore the taxpayers of the State of Texas. Thus, they are subject to the requirements of the Texas Public Information Act and the laws applicable to State records retention.
- B. Employees should be aware that when sending an e-mail message of a personal nature, there is always the danger of the employees' words being interpreted as official agency policy or opinion. Therefore, when an employee sends a personal e-mail, especially if the content of the e-mail could be interpreted as an official agency statement, the employee should use the following disclaimer at the end of the message:
 - 1. "This e-mail contains the thoughts and opinions of (employee name) and does not represent official Texas Woman's University policy."
- C. If the content of the e-mail contains sensitive or confidential information the employee may use the following message at the end of the message:
 - 1. "This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message."

III. Scope

This policy applies to any electronic mail messages created, received, retained, used, or disposed of using the Texas Woman's University's electronic mail system.

IV. Retention Requirements

The Texas Woman's University approved retention schedule lists the record series that are created and the retention period for each series. It is the content and function of an e-mail message that determines the retention period for that message. All e-mail sent or received by an agency is considered a state record. Therefore, all e-mail messages must be retained or disposed of according to the agency's retention schedule. E-mail systems must meet the retention requirements found in Texas Administrative Code, Title 13, Chapter 6, Section 6.10. E-mail generally falls into several common record series categories. These are:

- A. Administrative Correspondence, 1.1.007

Incoming/outgoing and internal correspondence, in any format, pertaining to the formulation, planning, implementation, interpretation, modification, or redefinition of the programs, services, or projects of an agency and the administrative regulations, policies and procedures that govern them. Subject to Archival review. Retention: 3 years.

B. General Correspondence, 1.1.008

Non-administrative incoming/outgoing and internal correspondence, in any media, pertaining to or arising from the routine operations of the policies, programs, services, or projects of an agency. Retention: 1 year.

C. Transitory Information, 1.1.057

Records of temporary usefulness that are not an integral part of a records series of an agency, that are not regularly filed within an agency's recordkeeping system, and that are required only for a limited period of time for the completion of an action by an official or employee of the agency or in the preparation of an on-going records series. Transitory records are not essential to the fulfillment of statutory obligations or to the documentation of agency functions. Examples of transitory information are routine messages (can be recorded on any medium, such as hard copy message slips or in an electronic format on e-mail and voice mail); internal meeting notices; routing slips; incoming letters or memoranda of transmittal that add nothing of substance to enclosures; and similar routine information used for communication, but not for the documentation, of a specific agency transaction. Retention: AC (after purpose of record has been fulfilled).

V. User Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the user of the e-mail system, with guidance and training from the Records Management Officer, to manage e-mail messages according to the agency's retention schedule. It is the responsibility of the sender of e-mail messages within the agency's e-mail system and recipients of messages from outside the agency to retain the messages for the approved retention period. Names of sender, recipient, date/time of the message, as well as any attachments must be retained with the message. Except for listserv mailing services, distribution lists must be able to identify the sender and recipient of the message.

VI. Maintenance of Electronic Mail

Records created using an e-mail system may be saved for their approved retention period by one of the following:

- A. Print message and file in appropriate hard copy file.
- B. Place in folders and save on personal network drive or C:drive.

C. Save to removable disk - 3.5 disks are not recommended for retention period of more than one year.

D. Transfer to an automated records management software application.

VII. Disposition of Electronic Mail

The process for the legal disposition of state records (including electronic mail) is subject to the same documentation requirements as any other format or medium. This usually requires agency permission and some type of disposition log to adequately document disposition and destruction of electronic records. Section 6.95 of the Electronic Records Standards and Procedures (relating to the Final Disposition of Electronic State Records) states that:

A. An electronic state record that is an archival record must be maintained by the agency through hardware and software migrations and upgrades as authentic evidence of the state's business in accessible and searchable form, except as otherwise determined by the state archivist.

B. A state agency must establish and implement procedures that address the disposition of an electronic mail record by staff in accordance with its approved records retention schedule and, specifically, must establish guidelines to enable staff to determine if an electronic mail record falls under transitory information (records series item number 1.1.057) on the agency's approved records retention schedule in order to encourage its prompt disposal after the purpose of the record has been fulfilled.

REVIEW

This policy will remain in effect and published until it is reviewed, updated, or archived. This policy is to be reviewed once every six years. Interim review may be required as a result of updates to federal and state law or regulations, Board of Regents policies, or internal processes or procedures.

REFERENCES

None

FORMS AND TOOLS

None

Publication Date: 07/02/2021

Revised: 07/02/2021

Texas Woman's University University Regulation and Procedure

Regulation and Procedure Name: High Stakes Testing

**Regulation and Procedure
Number: URP: 02.235**

Policy Owner: Academic Affairs

POLICY STATEMENT

Professional organizations and associations have warned against the use of any single measure for high-stakes outcomes. Educational institutions are cognizant of the pressure to maintain high pass rates on certification and licensure exams and understand stakeholder concerns about public safety, reputation, recruitment of students, competition, and accreditation.

University-level preparation programs are guided by professional and ethical responsibilities to graduate candidates who possess the knowledge, skills, competencies, and dispositions essential for practice. Thus, the purpose of this URP is to align high stakes testing practices at TWU with the guidelines of professional associations, state boards, and accreditation agencies.

APPLICABILITY

This policy is applicable to TWU Students and Faculty.

DEFINITIONS

1. High Stakes Testing means standardized testing used to provide results that have important, direct consequences for examinees, programs or institutions involved. High stakes testing does not include course or program examinations unrelated to licensure or certification.

REGULATION AND PROCEDURE

I. General Information

- A. Student performance on standardized high stakes tests related to licensure or certification may not be used to prevent candidates from program completion or graduation after all degree requirements have been completed.

- B. The fundamental purpose(s) and use of high stakes testing at TWU should be to assess candidate proficiencies, to provide diagnostic information for candidate remediation and intervention(s), and for curriculum development and program improvement.

REVIEW

This policy will remain in effect and published until it is reviewed, updated, or archived. This policy is to be reviewed once every six years. Interim review may be required as a result of updates to federal and state law or regulations, Board of Regents policies, or internal processes or procedures.

REFERENCES

American Educational Research Association [AERA], American Psychological Association [APA], & National Council on Measurement in Education [NCME]. 1999. The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, DC: AERA Publications, p. 176.

FORMS AND TOOLS

None

Publication Date: 07/02/2021

Revised: 07/02/2021