

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

23 January 2020
3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.
Austin Hall Building

Present: Yuan Zhao (COM); Maria Botero (CHSS); Siham Bouamer (CHSS); Nick Lantz (CHSS); Benjamin Park (CHSS); Natalie Baker (COCJ); Bobby LaRue (COCJ); Jan Taylor Morris (COBA); Vlad Radoias (COBA); Jaime Durán (COE); Daphne Johnson (COE); Mary Petró (COE); Susan Skidmore (COE); Nancy Stockall (COE); Dwayne Pavelock (COSET); Kyle Stutts (COSET); Damon Hay (COSET); Samuel Adu-Prah (COSET); Debbi Hatton (CAM); Kevin Clifton (CAM); Carolyn Moore (CAM); Marianne Moore (COHS); Kevin Randall (COHS); Michael Hanson (Library); Lee Miller (CHSS).

Absent:: Stephen Rapp (CHSS); Donald Bumpass (COBA); John Lane (CAM); Valencia Browning-Keen (COHS); Brandy Doleshal (COSET).

Call to Order.

3:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes.

Question: clarify language on back of first page, 5th paragraph

Move to approve: Hay. Second: Taylor Morris

Minutes approved.

Special Guests.

Faculty Review Policies Summer Committee:

Christopher Maynard – Vice-Provost - present

Stacy Edmonson – Dean, College of Education - present

Phillip Lyons – Dean, College of Criminal Justice - present

Bill Wells – Chair, Department of Criminology - absent

Jacob Blevins – Chair, Department of English - absent

Craig Henderson – CHSS - present

Juliana Lilly – COBA - present

Edward Morin – CAM - present

Darren William – COSET - present

Senator Summer Committee Members: Michael Hanson – Senate Chair/Library- present; Lee Miller – Senate Chair Elect/CHSS – present; Valencia Browning-Keen – COHS – absent; Bobby LaRue – COCJ – present; Mary Petró – COE – present.

Business:

Discussion of Proposed Faculty Review Policies with Summer Review Committee:

- Proposed Faculty Performance Review for APS 820317 The Faculty Evaluation System
- Proposed Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for APS 980204 Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
- Proposed Meritorious Faculty Performance for APS 800722 Merit Advances in Salary
- Proposed Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion for APS 900417 Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Several faculty members express thanks to the committee for all of the work. Particular appreciation is expressed to Michael Hanson for his leadership.

Dean Edmondson also sends kudos to the committee members. Appreciates hard work and transparent process, honest conversations.

Thanks to administration for hearing us and allowing the dialogue and transparency. Administration wants to make sure that the process is characterized by transparency and dialogue moving forward.

Question about the process of developing the concept of collegiality.

Dean Edmondson explains that there is a need for the language in the policy. Collegiality is not about being nice, friendly, etc.

The burden of proof is not on faculty member to demonstrate that they are collegial. Most of the time, people are collegial. IF there is a concern, someone needs to present evidence.

Like teaching, research, and service, collegiality needs to be demonstrated consistently (or the lack of it needs to be demonstrated consistently, with evidence.) There should be no surprises at the tenure/promotion decision. Some documentation should be occurring each year of the tenure run.

Importance of collegiality at **all levels** is noted, including tenured faculty, not just at the tenure/promotion stage. Discussion of examples.

Question about junior faculty reporting non-collegial behavior. Yes, the mechanism would be through the Chair and then the DPTAC. Mechanisms are in place to limit power, create checks and balances to balance power of Chairs and DPTAC. Conversations with Deans and faculty mentors are also encouraged.

When the policy language couched collegiality in terms of behaviors that mean you are collegial, it was too difficult to define. Decided to describe the absence of it.

Several senators voiced concerns about social biases. Factors of gender, race, etc. may be used unfairly in terms of perception of collegiality. Part of the ways that bias can be limited is the need

for documentation, over time, to show a pattern of behavior. Also, the peer review component is important in that not everyone would hold social biases.

Acknowledgement that the system may not be perfect, but is better than the secret ballot at the time of tenure decision.

DPTAC and Chairs are less likely to represent minorities so relying on those checks and balances so that is a concern.

Language 6.02b addresses bias. The behavior has to be blatant to hinder someone's ability to do their jobs. Other examples are discussed.

Question about the possibility of people being vindictive, retaliatory if they are called out for being non-collegial. In fact, volatile personalities might not be called out for non-collegial behavior because people are scared of them.

Discussion of additional safeguards in HR policies.

Recognition of Bobby's work on collegiality.

For pre-tenure faculty, non-collegial behavior can result in non-renewal of their contract.

Please talk to Chair if there is a problem; If that is not possible, faculty should go to Deans; Encourage faculty to document situations.

Clarification of need for both Chairs and Deans to have input on the reviews.

Policies are meant to help faculty achieve tenure and promotion, if there is a problem we wanted to allow for remediation so the tenure run is successful. They are not meant to be punitive.

If problems arise, they need to be addressed immediately, not the annual review process, third-year review, post-tenure review, etc.

Comment that as junior faculty, even if I was harassed every day, I would still be afraid to report it because the tenured faculty member would still have a vote on my tenure and promotion.

Burden of documentation of non-collegial behavior. Junior faculty would not be judged non-collegial for reporting someone's bad behavior.

Process of review: Ideally, the DPTAC, Chair, Dean's votes should align. If they don't, that is a flag to ask for more documentation. One vote does not have that much weight, so if one person is holding a grudge, it should not be too damaging.

Concern about a mechanism for recourse if a faculty member feels persecuted. Would like to see a mechanism to offer recourse to another body (the DPTAC members may not be aware the behaviors).

Chair's assessment of teaching effectiveness 2.02. "Professionalism" is a problematic term. Needs to be defined more clearly because of potential bias. See Policy #820317. Page 4/14 bullet #4 typo.

Student Evaluations – clarification

The State of Texas requires that student evaluations be conducted. No requirement to use in yearly evaluation of teaching, but the argument is that it is implicit that students should have some voice in teaching performance. It is appropriate, it should not be the ONLY component.

Call for another, more honest, approach to student evaluation.

Several questions about how student's perception of how easy the course is may affect evaluation score and how whether or not the student wanted to take the course may affect the score (particularly in degrees that are highly sequenced and students have no choice).

Brief history of how the IDEA instrument was chosen. That choice was made a long time ago. Maybe that should be reviewed by a university committee on student evaluation mechanism or a committee of Faculty Senate?

Susan Skidmore has done research on IDEA evaluations. It is actually considered one of the better instruments. Presents evidence.

So, are there other instruments? Are there other things that could be added to validate teaching effectiveness?

Policy states that "other inputs may include: peer observation of teaching, and others"
List is longer in this version of policy so allow for additional measures of teaching effectiveness.

IDEA scores factor into the FES (they have their own line). Did the committee consider incorporating the student evaluations into the Chair's evaluation of teaching? This might temper the weight of IDEA. See 1.04a combined language is the intent; the form on the back has separate lines so that may need to be adjusted.

IDEA training/workshop would be very helpful.

Note that regardless of the instrument, there are problems in using it as a single score input and it is given too much weight. Maybe give some weight to qualitative comments?

Some Chairs are using the IDEA score exclusively.

Each IDEA score counts for 6% of teaching effectiveness each cycle. IDEA overall is 20% (all courses, entire academic year).

Implementation: will we get clarification about how the IDEA scores will be converted to the proposed 1-10 scale? Colleges/Departments will decide how this is going to map out.

Question about clinical faculty: what about patient care? Clinical faculty are not under this policy. COM would have a different policy for clinical faculty. COHS has different expectations for clinical faculty. Examples from School of Nursing.

Other questions?

Deans are willing to return to answer questions. Advice to departments/colleges as they begin to work on establishing the criteria for each level of the new scales. The “floor” needs to be a “floor,” not aspirational. Define the floor as a place that would get people in trouble. Departments will own what that looks like, define minimum requirements/expectations. Encourage the departments to define the bare minimum as “this is what you need to do to keep your job”, then the expected level of performance as “this is what you need to do to succeed.”

Administrators and faculty members of the Summer Policy Review Committee leave 4:50pm.

Next two faculty meetings will continue to discuss input, questions, concerns.

Academic Affairs will be holding town halls. Senators are encouraged to attend. Collect input on policies from colleagues.

Call for mechanism to understand what happens to suggestions, revisions, input? Feedback loop. Provost seems open to this.

COE senators have a coffee meeting.

Departments without senators, senators are encouraged to reach out to faculty in departments in their colleges with no senators.

Senate can make a recommendation.

AAC – has final vote on policies at the end of this process.

Thanks to senate members of Summer Policy Review Committee.

Note that the committee itself signifies that we were heard.

Motion to adjourn: Taylor Morris, second: Susan Skidmore

Adjournment:

5:00 PM