

**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 Brown-Kee (COHS), Don Bumpass (COBA), Kevin Clifton (COAM), Brandy Doleshal (COSET), Jamie Bu (COE), Randy Garner (CJ), Donovan Haines (COSET), Michael Hanson (NGL), John LaRue (COAM), Bobby LaRue (CJ), Ken McIntyre (CHSS), Lee Miller (CHSS) Not Present (

(COE) 3) Damon Hay (COSET), Jan Taylor Morris (COBA), Susan Skidmore

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~~ the draft policies to ~~make~~ sure they comply with the law?

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 performs 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 as checklists 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 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 seemse colleefinita.

