

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

April 21, 2022
3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.
Remote via Zoom

Senators Present (22)

Samuel Adu-Prah (COSET), Mario Aschauer (CAM), Natalie Baker (CJ), María Botero (CHSS), Tim Brown (COE), Mona Cockerham (COHS), Brandy Doleshal (COSET), Mandy Duan (COBA), Debbi Hatton (CAM), Damon Hay (COSET), Nick Lantz (CHSS), Victoria Lantz (CAM), Junkun Ma (COSET), Sureni Mullegama (COM), Audrey Murfin (CHSS), Kevin Randall (COHS), Vlad Radoias (COBA), Karen Sherrill (COBA), Aneika Simmons (COBA), Zachary Valdes (NGL), Xiaobo Wang (CHSS), Anthony Watkins (CAM), Rebecca Wentworth (COE).

Senators Not Present (8)

Patrick Buzzini (CJ), Rhonda Callaway (CHSS), Tamara Cook (COSET), Geraldine Monjardez (CJ), Mary Petró (COE), Debbie Price (COE), Steve Rapp (CHSS), Kyle Stutts (COSET)

Called to Order

3:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

April 7, 2022, meeting minutes were approved.

Called to Order

3:30 p.m.

Special Guest

Dr. Kenneth McIntyre, Professor of Political Science, and member of the Academic Policy Review Group charged with drafting revisions to policies on P&T, FES, merit, etc.

Unfinished Business

Dr. McIntyre provided an overview regarding the latest revisions done by the Academic Policy Review Group on the following policies:

- 800722 – Merit Increases in Salary
- 820317 – The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured & Tenure Track Faculty
- 900417 – Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty
- 980204 – Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Members of faculty senate discussed the revisions done by the Academic Policy Review Group and created a document summarizing recommendations for changes in these policies. During this meeting it was discussed which recommendations would be sent forward. This was voted on and approved by the Faculty Senate. The resulting recommendations will be sent to the Academic Policy Review Group and the Provost (see enclosed summary).

Next Meeting
May 5, 3:30 p.m.

Adjournment
5:05 p.m.

Summary of FS Feedback on Second Revisions.

800722 – Merit Increases in Salary

- A repeated request to add verbiage stating the state’s policy prohibiting blanket raises. No such language
- Clarify “regular” faculty or avoid using it. This term is undefined.
- Request to include a deadline for faculty to appeal their FES 5 score. This should be in FES policy.

Other Comments

- There is a continued desire to see a parallel policy for non-tenure-track faculty developed.

820317 – The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured & Tenure Track Faculty

- Examples of teaching professionalism recommended for removal or rephrasing. One additional example recommended.
- Clarification on the meaning of certain terms or phrases requested.
- A repeated request to clarify the use of the “Summary Evaluation Score” for FES 2. It is also recommended that departments be directed in the policy to develop their own policy to address this. This is left up to the faculty at the department level. The faculty in each respective department will determine how the FES2 will be determined.

Other Comments

- CAM has been using the academic year for their evaluation schedule for the last 2-3 years at least. All university colleges should be on the same evaluation schedule – either the calendar year or the academic. This important inconsistency should be addressed.
- There is no instruction provided for how to evaluate FES X as there is for FES 1-4. FES X is a problem in the current system that should be addressed. There are complaints that chairs are not able or willing to evaluate the FES X responsibilities of faculty members and are granting them an automatic 5 on this measure. Since a teaching score of 5 on either student or chair assessment of teaching is very difficult to achieve, this effectively means that those who have no FES X will always be ranked lower on teaching than those who do have a course release, and faculty learn that you must have a teaching release to be competitive for merit. (This devaluation of classroom teaching is also not student centered.) The referenced policy (790601 on Faculty Instructional Workload) contains no guidance for how FES X should be assessed. Since addressing this would take some time to develop, Faculty Senate would like this to be addressed in the upcoming fall.
- Generally speaking, any references to a “syllabus” should differentiate between the master syllabus for the course and the professor’s use of a syllabus. Because courses can transfer to other schools and specific courses are often prerequisites to other classes, it is reasonable

to expect a professor to cover appropriate and relevant material according to the master syllabus. However, while a professor should adhere to a class syllabus, the particulars of that individual syllabus should be up to the faculty member's discretion.

900417 – Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

- A repeated request for *tenured instructors* to be addressed. It is suggested that either tenured instructors be included by name in the policy or that their titles be changed so that they are covered by the policy.
- A request that the amount of prior service credit for a faculty member be made available to the DPTAC.
- Recommend excluding from the DPTAC those with administrative duties of more than 0.5 FTE as is commonly practiced. – not changed; Administrators with 5. Or less are allowed on DPTAC
- 7.01 and 7.02. FS opposes the approval of the DPTAC chair by the dept. Chair and dean.

Other Comments

- FS would encourage a review of current tenured assistant professors to ensure the final statement in section 2.04 is not codifying previous poor decisions. Some have remarked that under prior administrations many tenured assistant professors (and instructors) were women and members of under-represented groups.
- In **8.01**, referring to the yellow highlighted sentence “Beginning with the second year of probationary service....” how does the DPTAC communicate its review to the chair? How does the tenure-track faculty member receive this information? There are cases where faculty are not informed of DPTAC concerns until the formal 3rd year review. FS would like to encourage adopting a clear and unifying approach to what are the best practices for communicating decisions to faculty at different steps of the review process.
- **Appeals** – not having a clearly defined appeal process means we are not serious about providing junior faculty with an honest appeal process. If an appeals committee no longer exists, then it should be formed. Junior faculty are not feeling too optimistic about this. At the minimum, the policy should put a time constraint on the administration to process any appeals in a timely manner. Faculty Senate recommends this be addressed in the fall. – this will be considered

980204 – Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

- Minor formatting suggested for readability.

Other Comments

- **Appeals** – No clearly defined appeal process in section 5.04. See comment above.