

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

6 February 2014  
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Austin Hall

**Members present:**

Nancy Baker (CHSS); Tracy Bilsing (CHSS); Donna Cox (COE); Jonathan Breazeale (COBA); Don Bumpass (COBA); Madhusudan Choudhary (COS); Kevin Clifton (COFAMC); Tom Cox (CHSS); James Crosby (CHSS); Randall Garner (COCJ); Joan Hudson (COS); C. Renée James (COS); Mark Klespis (COS); James Landa (CHSS); Paul Loeffler (COS); Dennis Longmire (COCJ); David McTier (COFAMC); Sheryl Murphy-Manley (COFAMC); Diana Nabors (COE); Dwayne Pavelock (COS); Stacy Ulbig (CHSS); Doug Ullrich (COS); Mary Anne Vincent (COHS); Anthony Watkins (COFAMC); Pam Zelbst (COBA).

Matteo Zuniga (IT) was also present.

**Members not present:** Helen Berg (COE); Mark Frank (COBA); Richard Henriksen (COE); Hayoung Lim (COFAMC); Jeff Littlejohn (CHSS); Debra Price (COE); Lisa Shen (NGL).

**Called to order:** 3:30 p.m. in Austin Hall by Chair Dr. Renee James

**Approval of minutes:** December 5 minutes and January 23 minutes approved.

**Chair's Report**

Dr. James reported on the meeting she and Dr. Baker had with Provost Jaimie Hebert last week. She announced that the provost would hold a general faculty meeting in about three weeks. At the meeting, the provost will share his goal of having the university's policy approval process formally documented (for reference), and he will introduce the idea of a single, consolidated student fee.

There is a roundtable with Provost Hebert and President Dana Gibson scheduled for Thursday, February 13, devoted to "The Changing Role of Faculty." All are encouraged to attend.

Other topics Dr. James discussed with the provost included the consensual relationship policy, the issue of collegiality in tenure decisions, and the guidelines for the excellence in teaching, research and service awards. Dr. James has heard back from David Hammonds (in Human Resources) on the consensual relationship policy; he has agreed to look at other universities' policies for comparison and then contact Faculty Senate again.

On March 6 Faculty Senate will have a panel of guests to discuss intellectual property issues: Rhonda Beassie (TSUS attorney), Bill Angrove (of DELTA), and Dan Davis (Director of Technology Development; he deals with intellectual property development for SHSU). Dr. James asked the senators to send any questions they may have that they would like answered on this date.

## **New Business**

### **Faculty Senate Website**

On Feb. 20, Faculty Senate will host Elisa Crossland of DELTA to help Faculty Senate improve its webpage. The provost recommended that Faculty Senate have her help, as she aided Academic Affairs with updating and streamlining their webpage, with excellent results. He also suggested that Faculty Senate allow DELTA to manage the regular updates of the Faculty Senate website, rather than having to make requests of the current tech support person (Stephen Kuperman), who handles multiple tech support issues.

### **Excellence in Teaching, Research and Service Awards Guidelines**

Dr. James said the provost would like Faculty Senate to review the guidelines on the excellence in teaching, research and service awards. Dr. James asked the senators to consider the following questions: Do we want these committees to follow our guidelines? (They are not uniformly doing so at the moment.) Do we want these committees to follow the same criteria every year, or should the committees have the flexibility to change the criteria from year to year? What is the eligibility for these awards? If someone wins one, can s/he win the same award again? Are clinical faculty, etc., eligible for awards, or is just the tenured and tenure-track faculty eligible?

One senator asked why the CHSS awards for these categories have disappeared as of 2013-2014. Another senator answered that these awards were dependent upon Dean John De Castro, who is no longer dean.

Regarding who is eligible to win an award, one senator suggested that we use the same criteria as we used to decide if a faculty member is considered faculty or part of the administration. Another senator asked if we could we create a new award for clinical faculty, but others objected on the grounds that there are very few who would fit this category. A senator suggested that a department or college could create such an award if they felt the need for one.

After discussion, the senators decided that the provost should annually send a charge to the chairs of the different awards committees and make sure that the new guidelines (revised in 2011) were sent to them. It appears, for example, that the chair of the Excellence in Teaching Award committee has not seen the new guidelines because that committee is supposed to start meeting in October with a

nomination deadline in November in order to meet deadlines for the Piper award nomination, rather than a February deadline.

**Motion: Faculty Senate recommends that each year in August the provost prepare a charge for the Excellence in Teaching Award, Excellence in Service Award, and Excellence in Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments Award committees, including a recommendation and the 2011 awards guidelines written and approved by Faculty Senate, as attached.** [Guidelines from 2011 are attached at the end of the minutes.]

**Vote: 24 yes, 1 no. Motion passed.**

### **Parking Issues**

Dr. James brought up a parking ticket issue. UPD has been ticketing anyone who parks with his/her car's side over the sideline by a couple of inches. A faculty member had asked Dr. James to discuss with the Senate whether UPD was being unreasonable in ticketing for this infraction.

After discussing this specific situation, the senators engaged in a larger discussion regarding the parking shortage on campus and how it has hidden costs to the university. One senator said her college has lost adjunct faculty who refuse to deal with SHSU's parking shortage when they can work for schools in the Houston and Woodlands area that have ample parking. A number of different ideas were suggested as to how to ease the shortage of faculty parking, such as a dedicated faculty lot.

Another senator said the cost of the parking permit is prohibitive. He also suggested that faculty ought to have more leniency granted by the UPD when dealing with a parking problem. A different senator suggested the university grant a special loading tag that allows faculty to park "illegally" while loading and unloading his/her car; the senator pointed out that a pizza delivery person with a "vendor" tag has the right to do this, while faculty currently do not.

A senator asked if whomever is in charge of parking come to talk to the Faculty Senate regarding the cost of the tag, the amount of parking, etc. Other senators disagreed and said the Faculty Senate had more important things on which to work. Dr. James said she would pursue with the provost the idea of a special tag for those loading/unloading boxes while temporarily parked illegally.

### **Collegiality Questions**

Dr. Cox reported on the Faculty Senate's University Affairs committee's discussion of collegiality as part of tenure decisions. There was agreement that collegiality should be maintained as part of tenure decisions and that it should be based on work relationships rather than personal characteristics. There were a number of suggestions as to how to follow through on this: a performance review rubric (Dr.

Cox looked at sister institutions' collegiality rubrics); a substantive process of documenting collegiality; the creation of a more interactive process with chairs and deans to let new faculty know what collegiality looked like and that collegiality would be measured (in order to offer guidance on how to develop in that category).

Dr. Cox's study of collegiality rubrics and guidelines revealed widespread concern over how difficult it is to measure or judge collegiality. Few schools actually use a rubric or explicit criteria. There seems to be little hard data on how to measure collegiality. Sportsmanship, altruism, and civic virtue are all mentioned as categories within collegiality at other universities. Dr. Cox volunteered to provide additional reading on this topic for anyone who would like to know more and observed that collegiality is a topic of growing importance nationwide. Dr. James pointed out that the topic is growing in importance because the number of lawsuits (concerning tenure denied based on collegiality) is growing.

Dr. James read aloud the two questions Ann Holder uses to evaluate collegiality in the Newton Gresham Library. The text reads:

1. Evidence of the capacity and the willingness to function as an effective colleague in the accomplishment of the goals of the tenure unit (Use a 1-5 scale.)
2. Evidence of the capacity and the willingness to fulfill the future program needs of the tenure unit and of the University. (Use a 1-5 scale.)

A senator volunteered that it seemed to make sense to let departments determine their own guidelines, as collegiality is most going to impact one's departmental colleagues.

The issue was raised that perhaps tenured faculty members need to be held to standards re: collegiality more than untenured faculty, who are the current focus of this discussion. Another couple of senators suggested including this in post-tenure review, which occurs every five years. A remediation plan with counseling could be one consequence.

One senator asked everyone if their departments had discussed collegiality in reviewing junior faculty before the tenure vote; several senators said yes. This senator was not sure if collegiality was a worthwhile category to continue. Dr. Cox pointed out that if collegiality is removed, there could still be personalities at work in tenure decisions, but there would be no legitimate way to discuss such issues. Another senator said the provost was clear that he wants collegiality included in tenure decisions. A different senator commented that it would be more fair and honest to include it.

One senator asked if we should raise the issue with Rhonda Beassie when she visits Faculty Senate. Another senator said if collegiality is going to be part of the tenure process, maybe it ought to be part of FES; he would like junior faculty to have input

on this and require all departments to draw up their own guidelines. A different senator said that the provost does not want collegiality in FES but he does want it in tenure decisions. Dr. James emphasized that it would be unfair to not discuss collegiality until one could possibly be denied tenure based on something never defined or discussed. Another senator suggested that Ann Holder's guidelines could serve as a starting point for discussion; perhaps these ought to be provided to all department chairs. A different senator suggested the Council of Chairs would be an appropriate place to discuss this; Dr. James will make this suggestion to the provost.

Another senator suggested that collegiality should be discussed annually as part of FES, whether or not it impacts merit pay. A senator supported this point, but worried that faculty will end up having to document their collegiality. Dr. James said she thought it would be more likely that the burden of documenting things would be on those wanting to say one is not collegial. There was discussion about what collegiality means; several agreed that collegiality (or a lack thereof) is about being obstructionist, rather than being unpleasant or disliked.

Most senators seemed to agree that we ought to invite the Council of Chairs to engage in a discussion of the issue of collegiality and that collegiality be an annual discussion with tenure-track faculty, perhaps as part of FES (whether it impacts merit pay or not). One senator suggested that the Council of Chairs encourage department chairs to start the dialogue on collegiality at the department level.

The issue was tabled until our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Revised 02-18-2014 at 9:30 am.