

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

September 17, 2026
3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.
Austin Hall

Senators Present (27): Hosam Abdelhady (COM), Traci Austin (COBA), Miltonette Craig (CJ), Kevin Crouch (chair), Magdalena Denham (CJ), Bryan Espinosa (CAM), Christopher Greenleaf (COHS), Debbi Hatton (CAM), Kelly Jordan (CHSS), Owen Kelly (COM), Dianna Kim (NGL), Naomi Krawzik (COSET), Nick Lantz (associate chair), Kimberly LaPrairie (COE), Ali Mchiri (COBA), Hannah Menendez (secretary), Olga Minich (COSET), Ricardo Montelngo (COE), Erin Owens (NGL), Jill Pagels (COE), Erica Pasquini (COHS), Berna Rahi (COHS), Bradley Seaberg (CHSS), Kyle Stutts (COSET), Cihan Varol (COSET), Darren Williams (COSET), Fabrice Conte Williamson (CAM)

Senators Not Present (4): Jennifer Child (CHSS), Elizabeth Gross (COE), Andy Noble (CAM), Xiaobo Belle Wang (CHSS)

Call to Order
3:30 PM

Approval of Minutes
September 3rd, 2026 meeting – minutes approved

Introduction of new senators not present at last meeting

Standing Committees Reports

University Affairs: APS 950609 - Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes

- Review of previous policy that seemed to have nothing in it. Committee thought the new policy was fine as is and moves to approve the policy
 - o Senator suggests circling back because there may be concerns from specific senators not here.
 - o Chair calls for vote, approved unanimously

Academic Affairs – APS 110511 - Appointment, Workload, and Evaluation of Chairs

- Recommendation of committee is to accept with minor changes
- Chair of AA committee said there were inconsistencies within the policy and the committee was confused about several points and wished to seek clarification on how DPTAC committee chairs are chosen, which faculty were included in evaluating department heads, and what happens when the chairs receive a poor evaluation.
- Senator had question about evaluation of department chairs and what the policy says about a three-year review versus the one-year review
- Senator had question about tenure-track vs. clinical faculty, because the three-year chair evaluation is by tenured and tenure-track faculty only, which seems unfair when some departments are majority clinical. Committee chair said that concern was included on their recommended changes.
- Several senators agree that there needs to be more transparency and that the review of the chair should be all faculty not just TT/Tenured

- Senator suggests that staff should also be included in evaluation of chairs who oversee them
 - Senators ask whether staff has their own process for evaluation supervisors
 - Original senator says staff voices should be included in evaluating department heads. Other senators agree.
- Committee chair says it is unclear in the policy what happens if the chair receives a poor evaluation or a vote of no-confidence. There are a lot of “shoulds” in the policy that need clarification on the process.
- Chair provides options for vote on the policy to the committee.
 - Senators ask for more clarification on the policy
 - Chair asks for second on the motion to accept the committee’s recommendation. There is no second, policy is tabled until next session and Chair can get clarification.

Faculty Affairs: APS 800215 - Externally-Funded Faculty Activities and Leaves

- Committee Chair asks Senate for input from anyone with experience with externally funded activities/leave
- Committee Chair says committee about concerns about the following points in the policy:
 - Number of course buy-outs allowed from ORSP
 - Too-subjective timing and the timelines in the language of the 3.01(a) and 3.01(b)
 - Language that discourages probationary faculty from pursuing these opportunities
- Senator asks if there is any information about how this policy plays into FES, because some faculty get a 0 FES score for teaching if they have course buyouts for external opportunities
 - Committee says that is unclear in the policy and that’s one of the things that needs to be addressed because the policy is discouraging to probationary faculty
 - Chair asks if there needs to be more specific FES policy addressing external opportunities
 - Senator says FES is too department-specific to have faculty-wide policy
 - Senator says the vagueness might be good on the timeline because then administration can’t reject specifically based on particular dates and disqualify faculty who get information about grants late or suddenly
 - Senator points out that faculty have to get letter of support from chair before applying, does that count as notification?
 - Senator says there should be a two-tier system: earliest notification of the possibility of the grant, and then immediate notification when grant is received. Another senator says that is in the policy already.
 - Senator says the grant approval from dean should come when the intention of the grant/ during the application, not after the grant is awarded
 - Senator asks what happens if too many grants are approved before awarded and there ends up being too few faculty because they didn’t expect all the grants to be awarded
 - Another senator points out the buy-out goes toward adjunct to cover classes for faculty taking an external opportunity
 - Senator suggests the language be changed to “preliminary” approval of the dean, to give opportunity to approval to be changed if there are changes between application approval and award of grant
 - Committee chair says policy as written might also discourage faculty from inviting colleagues to participate

- Senator says that those people would usually be included in the grant-writing process and would have to already have pre-approval from the dean in the declaration of intent
 - Comm. Chair says the policy is more focused on what the probationary faculty should be doing to make sure they get tenure
 - Senator says that policy should probably make it clear that departments should not give 0s on the FES for teaching for a buyout
- Senate chair says it sounds like we want to request a revision of the policy to make it clearer and make some minor changes in the language.
 - Committee did not give us a recommendation.
 - Motion to accept with minor revisions discussed
 - Motion passes

New Business

Senate Committee Assignments

Two new policies in the Teams folders, both minor revisions:

- Faculty Affairs: APS 840901 - Phased Retirement for University Faculty
- Academic Affairs: APS 840502 - Admission Standards for Undergraduate Students

Also on the docket will hopefully be the tabled policy from today.

Chair's Report

- Update from meeting with Staff Senate Leadership that Chair and Assoc. Chair attended. They mentioned two items of discussion:
 - Collaboration on portion of Faculty Handbook between faculty and staff for putting together resources of interest to employees of SHSU. Staff senate agreed to this collaboration.
 - Staff senate brought to Faculty Senate leadership the Employee Emergency Fund, which is available to any SHSU employee to apply for in the event of an emergency or disaster. Apparently Staff Senate knew that people had applied and heard nothing about it, and after investigation found that there was no money in the fund, and that the fund is supplied by donations. Staff Senate invited Faculty Senate to collaborate on getting that fund funded.
 - Senator suggested that faculty bring this back to our departments. Fund can be donated to via annual giving.
 - Senator suggests that at next meeting between faculty & staff senate review how staff evaluate department heads
 - Senator brings up donation of sick hours. Another senator clarifies that one can donate hours to general fund or to specific people.
 - Senator asks if there are restrictions on why you can take leave
 - Another senator says it has to be medical leave and can only be used once you're out of paid sick leave
 - Senator asks if you can use donated medical time to take care of sick family
 - Senator answers that pool leave is more restricted, but person-to-person donations are less restrictive, but recipient was to be on FMLA, which can be personal or family.
 - Senator points out that donated time is taxed income.
- Wellness Committee Member – 1 year appointment.
 - WC addresses the health and wellness initiatives on campus.
 - There are general members from colleges and departments on campus

- Olga Munich volunteers to be the faculty senate representative on the Wellness Committee.
- Senate Guests
 - Dr. Jennifer Bunn (Graduate School) and Dr. Jacob Chandler to visit Senate on Nov 5th Meeting – updates on process of graduate applications
 - Dr. Esther Olaleye VP Research & Sponsored Programs Chief Research Officer on December 3rd
- Dr. White Meeting Recap
 - Drivers of enrollment growth were “new lanes of opportunity” (CBE, Poly, dual-enrollment, Bearkat Connect w/LIT, etc.)
 - Bearkat connect – students on probation can take classes through LIT and one class at SHSU so they can get their grades back up, instead of students dropping out or transferring completely
- President’s Council Recap
 - Spoke with Dr. Galliard
 - Took questions from Senator LaPrairie
 - *There is still quite a bit of discussion in our department and college, especially about how APS 980204 and the revised FES policy are supposed to work together. The Provost’s email said faculty must have a “5-year average FES score of 3 or higher in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service” to satisfy post-tenure review. My reading of APS 980204 is that this means a five-year average of at least 3 in **each individual area**—not an overall average across the three. Section 2.06 says “for each” area, and 2.07 refers to falling below 3 “in any area.” That said, after some of our recent college discussions, it does not seem like everyone is interpreting it that way, so I think there is still some confusion.*
 - Dr. Galliard’s answer: “Yes, the requirement is a 5-year average of 3 or higher in each individual area: teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.”
 - *There is also a related question with APS 820317. Since that policy creates a weighted overall FES Summary score but also identifies 3 as the minimum “acceptable” score for the individual FES areas, we are trying to determine whether faculty are expected to earn at least a 3 in each area annually, regardless of the overall weighted score, or whether the overall FES Summary score is what determines acceptable annual performance. This matters as we revise our departmental FES guidelines, so any clarification you have received would be really helpful.”*
 - Dr. Galliard’s response: Regarding the second item, the following is correct, “*the overall FES Summary score is what determines acceptable annual performance.*” In other words, on an annual basis, a score of 3 or higher for the FES summary score (not the individual areas) meets the minimum standard of performance (and thus makes the faculty member eligible (but not guaranteed) to receive a merit increase in salary).

Discussion in Senate

- Senator points out that the policy means that faculty member could have a score where they get merit but not get promoted.
 - Some departments could interpret this differently
- Senator asks if someone is put on a post-tenure performance plan if that means they are not eligible for merit, because the scores being averaged differently then someone could be put on a PT performance plan but still receive merit.
- Chair points out that the reason for the changes is that an FES should actually mean extraordinary.
- Senator discusses how this policy encourages faculty to be average across categories instead of being extraordinary in any one category, which might not be what is best for the

university. University wants us to be extraordinary while also not dropping the ball on any other responsibilities.

- Senator points out how this policy might impact students negatively if faculty are under too much pressure.
- Senator says this policy doesn't really make the 5 more impressive because the scale is smaller (3 average instead of 2.5 in some departments).
- Assoc. Chair says there have been questions about whether post-tenure review is an attack on tenure. 3 is meant to be doing their job acceptably, and that in his department they have realized that their 3 has very high standards compared to other departments.
- Senator says that they hoped the policy would force the standards for FES to be clearer across
- Chair says that the provost said the post-tenure review is also there to protect tenured faculty and tenure itself to prove that tenured faculty are still doing their jobs.

Chair and Assoc. Chair will be meeting Anne Galliard and Provost Yenduri and will bring questions raised during this meeting to them.

Announcements

- Faculty Senate Reception with Dr. White MOVED to October 20th 4-5pm.
 - If you didn't get that email, contact the senate chair
- Senator asked about the Blackboard report Senator Munich put together.
 - Senator Munich said she met with Bb representatives about those complaints. Representatives pointed out to her that other countries/places have different needs. She asked them for more flexibility with the design of Bb and told them they're stupid. The representatives said they hear everyone's concerns and will work on solutions
 - Senator asked when the Bb contract is up
 - Senator said SHSU tried to switch to a different one and everyone decided to go back to Bb.
 - The company that runs Bb went bankrupt last year.
 - Senator Munich offers to send anyone the packet who wants it.
- Chair got an email from Jamilyn White with the website update, which will update faculty profiles on the website based on the feedback they received.
 - Chair will put that information on Teams.

Adjournment: 4:47 PM. The new executive committee met briefly after the adjournment.