

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
JANUARY 27, 2005**

**Senators Present:** Christopher Baldwin; Jim Carter; Jim DeShaw; Stacey Edmonson; Mark Frank; Mary Gutermuth; Marsha Harman; Deborah Hatton; Lady Jane Hickey; Joan Hudson; Gerald Kohers; Paul Loeffler; Bill Lutterschmidt; Holly Miller; Philip Morris; Debra Price; Gary Smith; Patricia Williams.

**Senators Absent:** David Bailey (professional conflict); Steven Cuvelier (professional conflict); Peggy DeMers (professional conflict); David Henderson (professional conflict); Joe Kirk (illness); Tom Kordinak (professional conflict); Valerie Muehsam (professional conflict); Christopher White (professional conflict).

Chair Harman called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

The principal order of business was finalizing the faculty recommendations for the revised Faculty Evaluation System policy. Various subcommittees of the faculty senate worked long and hard to help to ensure that the revised FES policy would: (1) contribute to the pursuit of excellence at SHSU by both Faculty and Administrators; and, (2) provide accurate and fair evaluations as a measure of faculty performance.

The subcommittees that worked so diligently with Chair Harman, Provost Payne, Vice President Muehsam, and Dean Brown are listed below.

**Subcommittee on Weights for FES:**

Steven Cuvelier  
Stacy Edmonson  
Gerald Kohers  
Tom Kordinak  
Paul Loeffler

**Subcommittee on Teaching/Research:**

Peggy DeMers  
Jim DeShaw  
Debbi Hatton  
David Henderson  
Bill Lutterschmidt  
Valerie Muehsam

**Subcommittee on Philosophy of FES:**

David Bailey  
Chris Baldwin  
Mark Frank  
Mary Gutermuth  
Joe Kirk  
Debra Price

**Subcommittee on Professional Development:**

Joan Hudson  
Holly Miller  
Phillip Morris  
Gary Smith  
Chris White  
Patricia Williams

As a result of the work of the various subcommittees, the Faculty Senate made the following recommendations to the Provost and Academic Policy Council regarding the revised draft FES policy.

- 1.** Because a variety of inputs are necessary to give the [teaching] evaluation validity, two primary sources of information may be a teaching portfolio prepared by the faculty member and a [Chair's] conference with the individual being evaluated. In accordance with college and/or departmental policy, each faculty member may present a teaching portfolio and update it.
- 2.** Remove “grading practices” as one of the measures of professionalism since it is already and appropriately contained under the Content and Pedagogy sections.
- 3.** Replace the entire grouping of items under the subcategory of Effectiveness with departmentally defined measurable items for which the faculty member can then be held responsible.
- 4.** Refer an evaluation of the initial use of the IDEA system to the Faculty Evaluation Committee for recommendations for future maximum operability.
- 5.** Rename the current section entitled “Report on Research, Publications and Creative Accomplishments” to simply “Scholarly Accomplishments” and define scholarship in subcategories as being inclusive of artistic and creative accomplishments among other things.
- 6.** Delete the sentence “Subject to approval of the appropriate Deans, the departmental chair may add additional categories or activities in accordance with departmental/college expectations.” This section should be clearly defined at the outset of the evaluation cycle. The Subcommittee on Teaching and Research also listed examples of the kinds of activities the Chair might consider.
- 7.** Faculty within departments develop a form that represents the professional judgment of the faculty concerning the types of activities that should be evaluated under the category of scholarly activity and that should be used by the Chair in a written format both to guide and offer feedback to faculty for tenure, promotion, and merit.
- 8.** All FES policy proposals originate from properly informed departmental and college faculty.
- 9.** Quality and significance of research be an essential ingredient in the evaluation of scholarly activity.
- 10.** Professional Development activities be retained as a separate category in the FES Academic policy Statement, or barring that outcome, that Professional Development's importance be recognized in the proposed FES system by being explicitly mentioned in section 1.02 and by being listed as a potential item for consideration in each of the Teaching, Scholarly Accomplishments and Service Categories.
- 11.** Clarify the differences between reassigned time and released time and the way in which they will be assessed in the evaluation of a faculty member.

**12.** Adopt weights as they are expressed in Option 3 of the Weights Committee Report. For a four course workload, this would mean weighting FES 1 at .30; FES 2 at .15; FES 3 at .25; FES 4 at .20, with a residual of .10 to maximize faculty scores. For a three course workload, this would mean weighting FES 1 at .22; FES 2 at .10; FES 3 at .38; FES 4 at .20, with a residual of .10 to maximize faculty scores.

**13.** The faculty in each department develop measures to arrive at a score for FES 1 that includes professional development, student evaluations, the Chairs assessment, and other appropriate considerations for the evaluation of teaching.

These recommendations were transmitted to Provost Payne, Vice President Muehsam, Dean Brown and the Academic Policy Council. A substantial portion of these recommendations and others made earlier by the Faculty Senate were incorporated into the new FES Policy passed by the Academic Policy Council. **The Faculty should consult with their Chairs and Deans as well as members of the Faculty Senate for information and copies of the revised FES policy as it was passed on Feb. 2, 2005.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Carter