

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

24 January 2018

3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.

Lowman Student Center Building, RM 241a

Senators Present (27).

Donald Albert (COSET), Burcu Ates (COE), Maria Botero (CHSS), Siham Bouamer (CHSS), Leonard Breen (COE), Valencia Browning-Keen (COHS), Don Bumpass (COBA), Kevin Clifton (COAM), Brandy Doleshal (COSET), Jamie Durán (COE), Randy Garner (CJ), Donovan Haines (COSET), Michael Hanson (NGL), John Lane (COAM), Bobby LaRue (CJ), Ken McIntyre (CHSS), Lee Miller (CHSS), Marianne Moore (COHS), Carolyn Moore (COAM), Willis Oyugi (CHSS), Benjamin Park (CHSS), Vlad Radoias (COBA), Stephen Rapp (CHSS), D.T. Ratnapradipa (COHS), Nancy Stockall (COE), Kyle Stutts (COSET), Anthony Watkins (COAM)

Senators Not Present (3) Damon Hay (COSET), Jan Taylor Morris (COBA), Susan Skidmore (COE)

Called to Order:

3:00 p.m.

Special Guests. Dr. Richard Eglsaer –

Conversation concerning new proposed Academic Policy Statements (APS) for

- *Faculty Performance Review*
- *Faculty Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion*
- *Meritorious Faculty Performance*
- *Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty*

Dr. Eglsaer – Talked first about the new faculty evaluation policies. A lengthy discussion took place and these minutes are an effort to capture the spirit of the conversation.

This policy is not a “done deal.” The goal is to get some ideas to the faculty and then have conversations with the faculty and then have the faculty senate return some recommendations. He acknowledged the Senate caucus meetings in each department and mentioned that there will be town hall meetings at a later date.

He acknowledged that there are some parts of the new policies that are difficult. He disagrees with some parts of the draft policies.

Parts of the draft he likes include –

Examples of what chairs should consider in making their evaluations.

The proposed modifications on documenting service, though he is unsure exactly how they will be operationalized.

That it continues to include collegiality as a measurement.

He likes that this document allows for problems and issues to be address annually rather than allowing them to fester for several years before being addressed. This can allow for concerned colleagues to help someone who may be having difficulties.

Parts of the draft that concern him include -

While he thinks collegiality is an important part of a faculty member's review, he questions the feasibility and reasonableness of quantitatively measuring and documenting collegiality on a 10 point scale as proposed in the draft.

Senators had a number of questions and comments for the Provost concerning the draft policies, which the Provost answered -

Questions (Q): When does legal counsel examine and edit the draft policies to make sure they comply with the law?

Concern (C): Concern that provision in the policy where a low score triggers an automatic review.

Q: Why is SHSU concerned about collegiality when other schools in the SHSU system's evaluation documents do not show that they measure it?

C: Since this policy allows for a low score triggering a review at any time, it eliminates the tenured faculty's 5 year review and thus eliminates tenure.

C: When the IDEA student evaluation system was adopted, it was agreed that the score would not be considered alone, but along with other factors. This policy draft causes it to be considered alone.

Q: Will faculty who have been hired under the current APS on Faculty Evaluation be allowed to be judged by that system throughout their tenure process, or will they be measured by this revision?

A: The new policies do cannot affect the TSUS rules (3 year straw vote, 5 year tenure vote) and the criteria for tenure are set in the departments, not by this policy.

C: Collegiality is not presented as a requirement of faculty's interaction with each other, but rather in the relationships between administrators and faculty and will be used to stifle faculty critique of administrators and administrative decisions. Concern over what might constitute insubordination might be in our setting.

A: This is not the intent of collegiality. Faculty have the right to have earnest dialogue and be part of the shared governance of the colleges. A faculty not cooperating with an administrator who is trying to carry out their duties (like investigating a Title IX complaint) would be insubordination. Discussing and disagreeing are not insubordination. The tenure process is a two ways vetting process. Does this person fit the department's culture and does the department meet the individual's needs? Either one can say "this is not working."

C: A poor FPR score can trigger a performance review for a faculty member, but no such scoring mechanism exist for administrators.

A: If a faculty member has concerns about an administrator's performance, the correct procedure is to speak with that administrator's supervisor and eventually the provost.

Q: Why is the 10 point scale necessary?

A: It unrealistic to think that everyone performing at the top of the scale. This new scale allows for a more realistic grading of faculty performance. The top of the scale will be rarely used and the bottom of the scale will only be used to help correct problems.

C: This system could unfairly penalize the group of university professors for the bad behavior of a few professors who are gaming this system. If our faculty is doing well, then it should be reflected with high evaluation ratings.

C: The examples given in the teaching evaluations are a checklist of things that must be met, not examples.

A: That is not the Provost's view. His view is that they are examples, not a checkoff list. He believes that a department will evaluate teaching with the proper contexts known by the departments.

Q: Why were new documents drafted rather than revising the existing documents?

A: The question was asked, "is the current FES" adequate to meet current needs of faculty evaluation?" People said no. It was too disjointed. The teaching forms are inadequate. Academic affairs had received lots of complaints about the forms. The service component in FES is problematic. Looked at in combination with the post tenure review policy, which was put together under the pressure of a legislative mandate and 15 years later it doesn't do the job.

C: The time spent in service is difficult to quantify and record.

Q: Can you give us some models where other schools measure and rate collegiality like SHSU is doing?

A: Not off the top of his head, but most of them are in awarding of tenure policies. Please give feedback in this area.

Q: There have been DPTACs where TSUS legal counsel has had to identify what constitutes "collegiality." Why does not that definition appear hear? It seems that this tool and definition of collegiality expands beyond what the law allows it to.

A: If there is problem with collegiality, for it to be binding, it must be recorded that an individual has been spoken to about the problem annually.

C: It is concerning that in the case of merit, if someone scores below a threshold of low scores, they will not be considered for merit. Why is this implemented?

A: He hopes that if people have an off year, a chair or DPTAC would consider this in their rating.

C: The Faculty Senate is taking very seriously the responsibility to get faculty input and investing a lot in it. What is the plan on how to use the faculty and Senate's feedback? Will the Senate be able to have a representative at the Council of Deans to be part of their discussions?

A: The Senate will come up with a counterproposal. Then there will be discussion back and forth between the deans and the senate. It will eventually go to the academic affairs council, and we have a voice there (the Senate chair and chair-elect). Right now the plan is for the Senate chair and chair elect to be at the meetings with CAD to discuss the Senate's proposal. But if wanted, it could be a group meeting with the full Senate and CAD.

The Provost's idea of shared governance is that he must listen to the views of the faculty. If he makes a decision that is contrary to what the faculty wants, he has to explain why he cannot do what they want.

Q: Do you think this policy will motivate faculty to work hard to perform well?

A: This policy is irrelevant to faculty motivation. Faculty come here because they love their discipline.

A number of concerns with the application of Student Evaluations were voiced.

Dr. Eglsaer then mentioned that CAD was reexamining the doctoral professor's workload.

New Business:

With Ken McIntyre's departure from the University Diversity Committee, Vlad Radoias from COBA has agreed to represent the Senate.

Adjournment:

4:58 PM