

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

April 19, 2012

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
LSC 304

Members Present:

Tracy Bilsing (CHSS), Donald Bumpass (COBA), Erin Cassidy (NGL), Kevin Clifton (CFAMC), Jeff Crane (CHSS), Donna Desforges (CHSS), Diane Dowdey (CHSS), Mark Frank (COBA), Debbi Hatton (CHSS), Renee James (COS), William Jasper (COS), Gerald Kohers (COBA), Lawrence Kohn (COE), Paul Loeffler (COS), Sheryl Murphy-Manley (CFAMC), Dwayne Pavelock (COS), Javier Pinell (CFAMC), Tracy Steele (CHSS), Dough Ullrich (COS), Ricky White (COS), Pamela Zelbst (COBA)

Members Not Present: Len Breen (COE), Randall Garner (CJ), Chad Hargrave (COS), Joyce McCauley (COE) and Debbie Price (COE)

Called to order at 3:30 by Debbi Hatton

Minutes of the April 5, 2012 meeting were approved with Amendments with two abstentions.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs:

Faculty Handbook - Renee James, chair of the committee, reported that her committee had reviewed the Faculty Handbook's online table of contents and its links. A vast number of links to websites failed to connect to a "live" website. Not only were there numerous inactive links, but the committee suspected that the links did not always go to the newest, updated policies. Gerald Kohers noted that the last major revision of the Handbook had been in 2009. There followed some discussion as to who or which office was responsible for maintaining the Faculty Handbook. Should it be the Provost's office or a faculty member? It was decided that the issue would be raised by Chair Hatton with the Provost at their next meeting to find a permanent home for the Faculty Handbook where the staff would be responsible for its maintenance and upkeep. This will be important because in the next academic year, another committee will be charged with reviewing the whole Faculty Handbook. The Senate voted unanimously to accept the committee's report.

Committee on Committees:

University Committee Appointments - Gerald Kohers, chair of the Committee on Committees, handed out proposed nominations to university committees for those positions which are either directly appointed by the Senate or recommended by the Senate for appointment to serve. There followed some discussion as to whether or not the Senate should appoint faculty to the Women's Advisory Committee which has been defunct (or inactive) for at least five years. There followed a general discussion as to whether or not to nominate faculty to any committee that is known to have never met. It was determined not to appoint new committee members to defunct committees with the proviso, that if there was a request for a committee to be appointed, it would be done. Other topics related to the appointment of university committees were related to reward committees – such as excellence in teaching. There was some question as to whether appointees needed to be tenured. Also, there was discussion as to whether past winners should be the members (again, teaching was the example used). After a discussion regarding the Curriculum Committee and other modifications, the Senate voted unanimously to forward the committee's nominations with some modifications.

Faculty Senate Survey – Gerald Kohers distributed copies of the survey results for 2011-12. A general discussion followed. It was reported that the number of respondents was considerably lower this year – in the 20% range which is down from 37% the previous year. It was noted that there had not been a follow-up e-mail reminder to faculty which may account for the lower response rate. Senators reviewed the survey to identify possible issues for the Senate to address in the coming Academic Year (2012-13). High among the concerns of the faculty who responded to the survey were:

1. IDEA
2. Communication
3. Graduate Support
4. Parking – Senators thought they should concentrate on the cost of parking decals and the increased fees rather than simply the number of parking spaces in relation to the number of decals sold which has been investigated previously.
5. Investigate if Sam Houston has a culture of intimidation, sexism, racism, ageism which can make it a hostile environment in which to work.

There followed a discussion regarding typed comments on the Faculty Senate Survey. Senators reviewed the comments with an eye not only to the issues raised but also to determine if an individual could be identified by the comments, i.e., were they sufficiently specific that the anonymity promised by the Senate for respondents could be jeopardized. Finally, Senators agreed to insert lines after each comment so it would NOT be evident that a number of comments came from the same source. Comments

will simply be organized by college. Self-identifying comments (as determined by Senators) were redacted also to insure privacy of the individual. Copies of the survey with the numerical results will be posted on the Faculty Senate's Website. Copies of the written comments will be given to President Gibson and Provost Hebert. The Senate voted unanimously to accept the full report as redacted.

University Affairs Committee:

Online Courses and IDEA – Erin Cassidy, chair of the University Affairs Committee, distributed a report on IDEA and online classes. Her committee found that there is general agreement across the university that students score IDEA differently if a course is face-to-face or online. For online courses, students tend to score IDEA based on the organization of the course and its material. In face-to-face classes, students tend to score IDEA based on the professor. The Committee concluded that there should be a separate instrument to evaluate online courses than the IDEA form which was created to evaluate face-to-face classes. Senator Cassidy noted that, across the university, there was no consistent approach for dealing with the disparity between IDEA scores for online or face-to-face classes. Online tend to be lower. Some colleges adjust IDEA scores, others do not. The Committee made several recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SHSU BASED ON COMMITTEE FINDINGS:

1. A study should be run in each college on the disparity between online and on-site course scores.
2. SHSU should create or adopt a distinct evaluation form for use in online courses.
3. SHSU should explore ways to improve student response rate to online course evaluations and should educate faculty on the best practices for posting course evaluation announcements and reminders.
4. Consistent guidelines should be recommended to chairs and deans for how to compare evaluation scores from on-site and online courses.
5. SHSU should provide faculty with more training, focused not just on the technologies of online education, but on skills and best practices for how to move away from the "digital correspondence course" model and instead develop skills in online pedagogy and build rich, interactive online courses.
6. Greater consistency should be observed in when IDEA evaluations are opened and closed, especially in online classes.
7. A standardized process should be consistently followed for returning to faculty the student comments received from IDEA; these are often not received by faculty, despite the fact that they are a critical source of feedback.

There followed a broader discussion of evaluations. One Senator reported that faculty may contact Martha Blume to set when the evaluations for online courses open and close. From the general discussion Senators realized that there was a considerable discrepancy on which evaluations for face-to-face classes were distributed and the time and date by which they were to be returned. Chair Hatton warned that some IDEA

forms are re-cycled if the front page was not filled out. She and others in her department found in the spring of 2012 that their packet included IDEA forms which had been partially filled out (but only the back page). It was generally acknowledged that Faculty should look out for this. The Senate also noted that there was a discrepancy in terms of how much course specific information was pre-filled in the IDEA forms. For example, the course number, etc. Some come filled out with this identifying information and others do not.

As the discussion of evaluations continued, it became clear that there is a discrepancy among colleges and departments regarding the return of written comments by students. Some faculty reported that they do not receive any comments from students back and others received either copies of hand-written comments or typed comments.

Ultimately, the Senate voted unanimously to accept the committee's report with amendments that called for consistency and standardization on distribution and collection as well as the dissemination of comments to faculty.

Online Compensation - Erin Cassidy's committee also reviewed the compensation for creating online courses. Her committee found that there was great variation across the university in terms of compensation for creating online courses. There were several variations but it was particularly noted that some colleges give \$2000 and others do not pay anything for the creation of a new online course. The committee called for more consistency in compensation but its recommendations are not binding. The Senate voted unanimously to accept the report.

Chair Report:

Core Curriculum - Chair Hatton reported on the progress of the Core Curriculum Review Committee. The committee will work through the summer. Chair Hatton reported that they were presently working on forms to be sent to Departments to add courses to the Core. Departments should submit these forms by October 1. The University Curriculum Committee should make recommendations by February 1 of 2013. It will continue up the chain of command to the Coordinating Board in February of 2014 and will be in place by the fall of 2014. Dean Tayebi and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Eglsaer are co-chairs of the 27-member committee. Chair Hatton reported that the intent is to create a smaller CORE that will give students a level foundation of information – what all students should know.

Raises – Chair Hatton reported that they are still possible. Faculty should know by early June. SHSU's budget for 2012-13 was based on 0 Enrollment growth but the university expected growth of 2 to 3%. More students applied in the first four months of

2012 than in the entirety of 2011. Pay increases will come if the Board of Regents approves the increases in fees and designated tuition at their May meeting.

Summer Enrollment - Chair Hatton noted that enrollment for summer courses is down and scholarships are now being offered for summer courses.

CFAMC Dean Search – Chair Hatton reported that an outside firm has been hired to help with this dean search. This company should help to widen the pool of applicants and help with the vetting process only. The final decision on the hire will be in line with previous practices. It is expected that a new dean will be in place by August of 2013.

COS Dean Search – Chair Hatton reported that this search was progressing but there was no new information to report.

Summer Meeting – Chair Hatton reported that the Provost would like to meet with the Senate at some point in the Summer (perhaps July) to provide an update on budgets, raises and other issues. Senators generally agreed on Tuesday or Wednesday after 2 PM during Summer II.

Announcement by Erin Cassidy, NGL:

“The Library is seeking student research posters for public display in the Dan Rather display cases in the library lobby. If you have a student doing excellent research, encourage them to consider turning it into a poster presentation to build their resume and promote the student research at SHSU. More info, examples, templates, and contact info at: <http://shslibraryguides.org/studentdisplay>.”

Adjournment at 4:55 PM

Issues Related to IDEA Evaluation in Online Classes

Faculty Senate, University Affairs Committee Report, April 2012

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH:

- **Research supporting a discrepancy** between online and on-site evaluation scores:
 - A report by Dr. Alessandro Bonanno and Dr. Billy Brocato in the SHSU College of Humanities and Social Sciences evaluated IDEA scores within multiple departments of that college and found that the IDEA scores in online classes were lower by a statistically significant amount.
 - A 2007 report by Loveland comparing student evaluations of teaching in online and on-site undergraduate courses found that average student ratings of online classes were 20% lower than in on-campus classes (1, 15). The researchers concluded that “administrators...need to be aware that online teaching may result in lower...ratings, especially for instructors new to the online environment” (14). Furthermore, they assert that “existing evaluation forms may not capture all the factors that affect...ratings and thus put online faculty at a disadvantage because they can’t identify the source of the problems with their evaluations” (14).
 - A 2006 study by Davis, et. al., compared online and on-site versions of the same graduate courses, taught by the same professors. The researchers concluded that “online students tended to rate online course more extremely and more negatively than they did equivalent on-campus courses, notwithstanding their self-selection of online coursework,” and “the net result was a more negative rating for online courses” (33, 23). The study also noted “a risk of bias as a result of only 70% of enrolled students submitting evaluations” (34).
 - A 2006 article by Bangert asserts that “traditional student evaluations of teaching do not adequately assess...effective online instruction” (25). The author describes the development and validation testing of an alternative instrument specifically for online evaluation; the article includes a discussion of the pedagogical practices which should be uniquely measured.
- **Research denying a discrepancy** between online and on-site evaluation scores:
 - A 2011 study by Dziuban and Moskal concluded that course modality (online, blended, or on-site) did not impact student evaluation of course experiences.
 - A 2007 study by Kelly, et. al., found no significant difference in evaluations based on delivery method. They did find however that “face-to-face students tended to consider the instructor more important than online students,” whose evaluations in contrast were more focused on “course organization and instructional materials” (98).
- **Research on improving student response rates:**
 - Faculty reports from the Texas Council of Faculty Senates suggest that positive reward systems, such as entry into a prize raffle, have been more successful in increasing response rate than negative methods, such as withholding grades.
 - A 2005 paper by Norris and Conn suggests that there may be problems with coercion/reward strategies, as “requiring or rewarding evaluation completion would only lead to overly negative or overly positive instructor ratings” (18). They suggest that “timing of the initial announcement” plays a significant role in response, with best results from announcements 2-3 weeks before the semester end (18). Response rate also seemed to increase with postings in multiple locations and with follow-up reminder postings (18).
- **Survey of Practices of SHSU Deans:**
 - Dean #1: has no data concerning score discrepancies; has had no faculty complaints; would like to see research on online versus on-site scores in the college; during faculty evaluation, would take into consideration a possible discrepancy based on delivery method and look at the long-term picture or trend rather than the individual score.
 - Dean #2: takes two different approaches with merit and tenure; for merit, uses the adjusted discipline score for consistency; advocates the use of a weighted score for online classes to minimize the variation; allows faculty to ask permission to not use online scores for merit; for tenure, uses the higher of the discipline-specific scores and would take into account the faculty member’s willingness to do online courses.
 - Dean #3: no analysis has yet been made, but does think the IDEA evaluations have more variation for online courses; student failure rate in certain departments is higher for online courses, especially among graduate students.
 - Dean #4: agrees that the IDEA scores are problematic for online courses; only a minimal number of students respond to online course evaluations; told tenure and promotion committee to reconfigure IDEA scores for those candidates who are up for tenure and promotion in order to offset/take into account the discrepancy for online courses; understands the problem of quality online courses as opposed to correspondence courses and is considering workshops to aid instructors in course creation, but it will take time to achieve these goals.

CONCLUSIONS:

- The published research disagrees on whether online course evaluations are significantly different from on-site course evaluations; the limited amount of research conducted at SHSU suggests that there is a disparity in our local scores. However, regardless of difference or similarity in actual scores, research generally agrees that students focus on different course elements in online versus on-site evaluations.
- Instructors can benefit from the use of online evaluation forms that are distinct from on-site forms; this facilitates the evaluation of unique aspects of the online teaching environment and the identification of unique areas of weakness not addressed in on-site forms.
- Part of the disparity in online scores can be traced to lower response rates; striving to increase response rates can increase the total pool of student scores and decrease the risk of bias from students who were highly motivated to respond with overly positive or negative views.
- The deans at SHSU do not take a consistent approach to comparing or adjusting IDEA scores for online versus on-site classes.
- The definition of teaching effectiveness and the methods necessary to achieve it can differ between online and on-site courses. Moreover, research has identified a variety of key factors that can substantially improve student performance in and perception of online courses.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SHSU BASED ON COMMITTEE FINDINGS:

1. A study should be run in each college on the disparity between online and on-site course scores.
2. SHSU should create or adopt a distinct evaluation form for use in online courses.
3. SHSU should explore ways to improve student response rate to online course evaluations and should educate faculty on the best practices for posting course evaluation announcements and reminders.
4. Consistent guidelines should be recommended to chairs and deans for how to compare evaluation scores from on-site and online courses.
5. SHSU should provide faculty with more training, focused not just on the technologies of online education, but on skills and best practices for how to move away from the “digital correspondence course” model and instead develop skills in online pedagogy and build rich, interactive online courses.
6. Greater consistency should be observed in when IDEA evaluations are opened and closed, especially in online classes.
7. A standardized process should be consistently followed for returning to faculty the student comments received from IDEA; these are often not received by faculty, despite the fact that they are a critical source of feedback.

WORKS CITED

- Bangert, Arthur W. "The Development and Validation Of The Student Evaluation Of Online Teaching Effectiveness." *Computers in the Schools* 25.1-2 (2008): 25-47. ERIC. Web. 19 Mar. 2012. <http://ezproxy.shsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ835753&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- John M. Davis, et al. "Student Evaluation of Teaching in the Virtual and Traditional Classrooms: A Comparative Analysis." *Internet and Higher Education* 9.1 (2006): 23-35. ERIC. Web. 19 Mar. 2012. <http://ezproxy.shsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ800686&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Dziuban, Charles, and Patsy Moskal. "A Course is a Course is a Course: Factor Invariance in Student Evaluation of Online, Blended and Face-to-Face Learning Environments." *Internet and Higher Education* 14.4 (2011): 236-241. ScienceDirect. Web. 19 Mar. 2012. <https://ezproxy.shsu.edu/login?url=http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1096751611000388>
- Kelly, Henry F., Michael K. Ponton, and Alfred P. Rovai. "A Comparison of Student Evaluations of Teaching Between Online and Face-to-Face Courses." *Internet and Higher Education* 10.2 (2007): 89-101. ERIC. Web. 19 Mar. 2012. <http://ezproxy.shsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ796871&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Loveland, Karen A. "Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) in Web-Based Classes: Preliminary Findings and a Call for Further Research." *Journal of Educators Online* 4.2 (2007): ERIC. Web. 19 Mar. 2012. <http://ezproxy.shsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ907746&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Norris, John, and Cynthia Conn. "Investigating Strategies for Increasing Student Response Rates to Online-Delivered Course Evaluations." *Quarterly Review of Distance Education* 6.1 (2005): 13-29. ERIC. Web. 19 Mar. 2012. <http://ezproxy.shsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ874986&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Additional published research on various aspects of student evaluation of teacher performance in online courses can be found at:
[http://ezproxy.shsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&bquery=\(%22student+evaluation+of+teacher+performance%22\)+AND+\(%22online+courses%22\)&type=1&site=eds-live&scope=site](http://ezproxy.shsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&bquery=(%22student+evaluation+of+teacher+performance%22)+AND+(%22online+courses%22)&type=1&site=eds-live&scope=site)

Recommendation on Compensation for Online Course Development

University Affairs Committee

Spring 2012

Information Collected from SHSU Deans:

Dean #1 does not compensate faculty for the development of a new online course. Feels it is an expected part of the faculty member's job, whether tenured, tenure-track, or adjunct.

Dean #2 gives instructors (tenured, tenure-track, or adjunct) a \$2,000 stipend (one-time payment, not a permanent salary increase) for creating a new online course. Stipend is funded from the college's received portion of the online course fees.

Dean #3 has had a few cases of providing release time to faculty for the purposes of developing a new online course. This time was given over the summer and was compensated as the equivalent of a summer course, using funds from the college's received portion of the online course fees. Indicated that, if the restrictions were lessened on online course fees so that the funds could be used for other purposes in the college, the opportunity to use them for these summer stipends would probably disappear.

Dean #4 did not detail exact amounts of compensation for online course development, but indicated that the amount given varies between graduate and undergraduate courses.

Committee Recommendation:

Whereas the initial development of an online course requires a substantial investment of time and energy;

whereas the time and energy required for new online course development increases when a faculty member is new to online instruction, and when a course is to be developed using high-quality online pedagogy and not merely as a digital correspondence course;

whereas the university should seek to encourage faculty to learn and practice the development of high-quality online courses;

and whereas the faculty across campus should receive fair and balanced treatment with respect to monetary compensation (or lack thereof);

it is recommended that the university establish a policy regarding compensation for the development of new online courses and apply it consistently across the colleges.

REPORT ON FACULTY HANDBOOK TABLE OF CONTENTS

Respectfully submitted by the Academic Affairs Committee

The members of the AA committee were assigned sections of the handbook to explore and find any errors, bad links, outdated information, etc.

The faculty handbook can be found here:

http://www.shsu.edu/~vaf_www/Faculty_Handbook/

Here is a list of the current sections and the problems discovered (probably not an exhaustive list):

Faculty Handbook

Section A: General Information

- [Introduction and Preface](#)
- [Commitment to Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity](#)
- [Description and Governance of Texas Higher Education](#)
- [Faculty Senate](#)

- [The Student Community](#)
- [University Mission, Goals and History](#)
- [University Organization and Administration](#)
- [University Services and Miscellaneous Information](#)

Section B: Academic Policies and Procedures

- [Academic Advisement and Mentoring](#) – SEEMS OKAY
- [Academic Dishonesty](#) - SEEMS OKAY
- [Academic Freedom and Responsibility](#) – SEEMS OKAY
- [Academic Grievance Procedures for Students](#) - WAS SCHEDULED FOR REVIEW ON 10/1/2008. WAS IT? ALSO A DEEP LINK AT THIS SITE IS A 'DEAD LINK'
- [Academic Instructional Staffing](#) – SEEMS OKAY
- [Academic Policy Statements](#) SEEMS OKAY, BUT WONDERING I F POLICY 820830 ON GRIEVANCE FACULTY PROCEDURE HAS BEEN REVISED (LAST VERSION IS 3/18/2005!)
- [Academic Probation and Suspension](#) – SEEMS OKAY
- [Acceptance of Money from Students](#) CAN WE MAKE CLEAR WHAT IS A RANK BELOW LECTURER? THESE FACULTY MEMBERS CAN GET PAID EXTRA, IF APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR.
- [Administrative Office Hours](#) SEEMS OKAY

- [Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity](#) SHOULD THE POLICY BE AMMENDED TO INCLUDE “SEXUALITY” AS WELL – i.e., “to provide equal opportunity for all persons in accordance with their individual job-related qualifications and without illegal consideration of race, creed, color, sex, SEXUALITY, religion, age, national origin, or disability.” WASN’T THIS JUST ADOPTED BY SHSU?
- [Alcohol Beverage Policy](#) SEEMS OKAY
- [Americans with Disabilities Act](#) SEEMS OKAY
- [Appointments to the Faculty](#) REVISE THE “APPOINTMENT OF CLINICAL FACULTY MEMBERS” POLICY TO REFLECT THE WORK THAT THE FACULTY SENATE JUST COMPLETED ON CLINICAL FACULTY.
- [Attendance Initiative](#) SHOULD WE CHANGE THE TITLE OF THIS LINK (?) – THERE ARE 3 DIFFERENT TOPICS: (1) INITIAL ENROLLMENT VERIFICATION; (2) FIRST ALERT; (3) TITLE IV FUNDING REQUIREMENTS. ONE IDEA TO CONSIDER: KEEP (1) AND (3) TOGETHER, SINCE THEY DEAL DIRECTLY WITH ATTENDANCE. SEPARATE (2) INTO ANOTHER LINK (PERHAPS PUT IT WITH MENTORING SINCE IT HAS TO DO WITH THE QUALITY OF A STUDENT’S WORK)
- [Attendance Policy for Classes](#) SEEMS OKAY
- [Audit Policy](#) “AUDIT POLICY” LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [Austin Hall Policy](#) “AUSTIN HALL” LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [Building Liaison Policy](#) SEEMS OKAY
- [Calendar](#) SEEMS OKAY
- [Campus Key Policy](#) SEEMS OKAY
- [Commencement Participation](#) SEEMS OKAY – I WAS SURPRISED TO READ THAT “A member of the regular faculty who cannot attend a commencement exercise is expected to notify in writing his/her academic dean or library director, as appropriate.” IS THIS COMMON PRACTICE?
- [Committee Structure of the University](#)
- [Confidential Data Policy](#)
- [Consortial and Academic Contractual Agreement Review](#)
- [Contracts](#)
- [Copyrights and Patents](#) COPYRIGHT COMMITTEE CORRECT AS OF 9/2006. NEEDS UPDATING; PATENT COMMITTEE REVISED 2003?
- [Curricular Changes and Textbook Adoption](#) LOOKS OKAY.
- [Curriculum Development and Evaluation](#) CURRICULUM COMMITTEE LOOKS OKAY, BUT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL IS SERIOUSLY OUTDATED. LISTS PAYNE AS CHAIR, HEBERT AS MEMBER, BONONNO AS SOCIOLOGY CHAIR, PAUL LOEFFLER AS FAC SEN CHAIR, AND PROBABLY OTHER ERRORS THAT WE SIMPLY DON’T RECOGNIZE.
- [Department Academic Distinction Program](#) LOOKS OKAY.
- [Designation of Distinguished Professors](#) LOOKS OKAY.
- [Dismissal of Faculty](#) LOOKS OKAY.
- [Drug-Free Work Place](#) NEITHER LINK WORKS
- [Emergency Closing](#) LINK DOES NOT WORK.
- [Faculty Adherence to Class Schedule and Faculty Absences](#) B-1 EMPLOYEE LEAVES LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [Faculty Availability](#)
- [Faculty Evaluation System](#)
- [Faculty Instruction Workload Policy](#) OK
- [Faculty Leave Policies](#) outdated, review needed 2005, TSUS OK Human Resources link bad
- [Faculty Study](#) bad link

- [Gibbs Ranch](#) bad link
- [Graduate Faculty Status](#) OK
- [Granting of Honorary Doctorate](#) bad link
- [Grievance Procedure](#) TSUS OK. AP due review Aug 2007
- [Honors Program](#) AP review due Nov 2007
- [Interim Faculty Members](#) AP due review Apr 2006
- [Library Use Policy](#) OK
- [Logo Use](#) bad link
- [Medical Emergency Procedures](#) bad link
- [Members Not Employed by SHSU Serving on Thesis and Dissertation Committees](#) AP due rev June 2011
- [Naming of Buildings Policy](#) bad link
- [Nepotism](#) TSUS OK. Human resources bad link
- [Non-Reappointment and Denial of Tenure](#) ALL LINKS SEEM OKAY
- [Open Records Policy](#) LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [Orange Lighting Policy](#) LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [Outside Employment for Faculty](#) BOTH LINKS SEEM OKAY
- [Payments to University Employees for Services](#) BOTH LINKS SEEM OKAY
- [Peabody Library Policy](#) LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [Personnel Records](#) SEEMS OKAY
- [Political Influence](#) LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [Prerequisite Policy](#) SEEMS OKAY
- [Professional Librarians](#) SEEMS OKAY BUT LAST UPDATED IN 2004
- [Promotions in Rank](#) ALL LINKS SEEM OKAY
- [Research by Faculty](#) ALL LINKS SEEM OKAY
- [Retirement and Emeritus Status](#) ALL LINKS SEEM OKAY
- [Sam Houston Humanitarian Award](#) LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [SHSU Web Accessibility Policy](#) LINK DOES NOT WORK
- [Signatures](#) THE LINK FOR THIS SECTION IS NOT WORKING.
- [Smoking Policy](#) NEEDS TO BE UPDATED TO REFLECT SMOKE-FREE CAMPUS.
- [Space Management Policy](#) POLICY CLAIMS TO BE UP FOR REVIEW ON 8/2/2011. WAS IT?
- [Student Absences on Religious Holy Days](#) SEEMS OKAY.
- [Student Rosters and Records](#) STILL USING SAMMENU AND NELL. NEEDS UPDATING TO REFLECT THE NEW, DEMONIC BANNER SYSTEM.
- [Summer Employment](#) NO RELEVANT POLICY. SEEMS OKAY.
- [Syllabus Guidelines](#) JUST CURIOUS IF ANYONE ACTUALLY FOLLOWS ALL OF THESE GUIDELINES.
- [Tenure](#) LINKS TO RELEVANT POLICIES OKAY.
- [Travel](#) LINKS TO RELEVANT POLICIES OKAY, BUT WONDERING IF THE POLICY REGARDING TRAVEL TO WASHINGTON D.C. NEEDS UPDATING (FROM 2007).
- [University Administrative Computing System](#) INACTIVE LINK TO POLICY.
- [University Publications Policy](#) INACTIVE LINK TO POLICY. NO INFORMATION.
- [University Records Retention Schedule](#) 2ND LINK IS BAD.
- [Use of Telephone and Text Messages](#) POLICY LINKED.
- [Visitors in the Classroom](#) NO POLICY LINKED TO. MIGHT WANT TO INCLUDE LINK TO THE RELEVANT SYLLABUS POLICY REGARDING VISITORS.

- [Website Disclaimer](#) BAD LINK TO POLICY. THIS IS THE VERY DEFINITION OF IRONY, CONSIDERING THEY EXHORT USERS TO CHECK “THE ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, CURRENCY AND/OR SUITABILITY OF ALL INFORMATION.”

[Section C: Academic Policy Manual](#)

[Appendix I: Organizational Chart](#)

[Appendix II: Campus Map](#)

[Appendix III: Other Helpful Links](#)

We are working on creating a logical way of presenting these various aspects of the Faculty Handbook and will present this at the next meeting.