

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

6 February 2014  
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Austin Hall

**Members present:**

Nancy Baker (CHSS); Tracy Bilsing (CHSS); Donna Cox (COE); Jonathan Breazeale (COBA); Don Bumpass (COBA); Madhusudan Choudhary (COS); Kevin Clifton (COFAMC); Tom Cox (CHSS); James Crosby (CHSS); Randall Garner (COCJ); Joan Hudson (COS); C. Renée James (COS); Mark Klespis (COS); James Landa (CHSS); Paul Loeffler (COS); Dennis Longmire (COCJ); David McTier (COFAMC); Sheryl Murphy-Manley (COFAMC); Diana Nabors (COE); Dwayne Pavelock (COS); Stacy Ulbig (CHSS); Doug Ullrich (COS); Mary Anne Vincent (COHS); Anthony Watkins (COFAMC); Pam Zelbst (COBA).

Matteo Zuniga (IT) was also present.

**Members not present:** Helen Berg (COE); Mark Frank (COBA); Richard Henriksen (COE); Hayoung Lim (COFAMC); Jeff Littlejohn (CHSS); Debra Price (COE); Lisa Shen (NGL).

**Called to order:** 3:30 p.m. in Austin Hall by Chair Dr. Renee James

**Approval of minutes:** December 5 minutes and January 23 minutes approved.

**Chair's Report**

Dr. James reported on the meeting she and Dr. Baker had with Provost Jaimie Hebert last week. She announced that the provost would hold a general faculty meeting in about three weeks. At the meeting, the provost will share his goal of having the university's policy approval process formally documented (for reference), and he will introduce the idea of a single, consolidated student fee.

There is a roundtable with Provost Hebert and President Dana Gibson scheduled for Thursday, February 13, devoted to "The Changing Role of Faculty." All are encouraged to attend.

Other topics Dr. James discussed with the provost included the consensual relationship policy, the issue of collegiality in tenure decisions, and the guidelines for the excellence in teaching, research and service awards. Dr. James has heard back from David Hammonds (in Human Resources) on the consensual relationship policy; he has agreed to look at other universities' policies for comparison and then contact Faculty Senate again.

On March 6 Faculty Senate will have a panel of guests to discuss intellectual property issues: Rhonda Beassie (TSUS attorney), Bill Angrove (of DELTA), and Dan Davis (Director of Technology Development; he deals with intellectual property development for SHSU). Dr. James asked the senators to send any questions they may have that they would like answered on this date.

## **New Business**

### **Faculty Senate Website**

On Feb. 20, Faculty Senate will host Elisa Crossland of DELTA to help Faculty Senate improve its webpage. The provost recommended that Faculty Senate have her help, as she aided Academic Affairs with updating and streamlining their webpage, with excellent results. He also suggested that Faculty Senate allow DELTA to manage the regular updates of the Faculty Senate website, rather than having to make requests of the current tech support person (Stephen Kuperman), who handles multiple tech support issues.

### **Excellence in Teaching, Research and Service Awards Guidelines**

Dr. James said the provost would like Faculty Senate to review the guidelines on the excellence in teaching, research and service awards. Dr. James asked the senators to consider the following questions: Do we want these committees to follow our guidelines? (They are not uniformly doing so at the moment.) Do we want these committees to follow the same criteria every year, or should the committees have the flexibility to change the criteria from year to year? What is the eligibility for these awards? If someone wins one, can s/he win the same award again? Are clinical faculty, etc., eligible for awards, or is just the tenured and tenure-track faculty eligible?

One senator asked why the CHSS awards for these categories have disappeared as of 2013-2014. Another senator answered that these awards were dependent upon Dean John De Castro, who is no longer dean.

Regarding who is eligible to win an award, one senator suggested that we use the same criteria as we used to decide if a faculty member is considered faculty or part of the administration. Another senator asked if we could we create a new award for clinical faculty, but others objected on the grounds that there are very few who would fit this category. A senator suggested that a department or college could create such an award if they felt the need for one.

After discussion, the senators decided that the provost should annually send a charge to the chairs of the different awards committees and make sure that the new guidelines (revised in 2011) were sent to them. It appears, for example, that the chair of the Excellence in Teaching Award committee has not seen the new guidelines because that committee is supposed to start meeting in October with a

nomination deadline in November in order to meet deadlines for the Piper award nomination, rather than a February deadline.

**Motion: Faculty Senate recommends that each year in August the provost prepare a charge for the Excellence in Teaching Award, Excellence in Service Award, and Excellence in Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments Award committees, including a recommendation and the 2011 awards guidelines written and approved by Faculty Senate, as attached.** [Guidelines from 2011 are attached at the end of the minutes.]

**Vote: 24 yes, 1 no. Motion passed.**

### **Parking Issues**

Dr. James brought up a parking ticket issue. UPD has been ticketing anyone who parks with his/her car's side over the sideline by a couple of inches. A faculty member had asked Dr. James to discuss with the Senate whether UPD was being unreasonable in ticketing for this infraction.

After discussing this specific situation, the senators engaged in a larger discussion regarding the parking shortage on campus and how it has hidden costs to the university. One senator said her college has lost adjunct faculty who refuse to deal with SHSU's parking shortage when they can work for schools in the Houston and Woodlands area that have ample parking. A number of different ideas were suggested as to how to ease the shortage of faculty parking, such as a dedicated faculty lot.

Another senator said the cost of the parking permit is prohibitive. He also suggested that faculty ought to have more leniency granted by the UPD when dealing with a parking problem. A different senator suggested the university grant a special loading tag that allows faculty to park "illegally" while loading and unloading his/her car; the senator pointed out that a pizza delivery person with a "vendor" tag has the right to do this, while faculty currently do not.

A senator asked if whomever is in charge of parking come to talk to the Faculty Senate regarding the cost of the tag, the amount of parking, etc. Other senators disagreed and said the Faculty Senate had more important things on which to work. Dr. James said she would pursue with the provost the idea of a special tag for those loading/unloading boxes while temporarily parked illegally.

### **Collegiality Questions**

Dr. Cox reported on the Faculty Senate's University Affairs committee's discussion of collegiality as part of tenure decisions. There was agreement that collegiality should be maintained as part of tenure decisions and that it should be based on work relationships rather than personal characteristics. There were a number of suggestions as to how to follow through on this: a performance review rubric (Dr.

Cox looked at sister institutions' collegiality rubrics); a substantive process of documenting collegiality; the creation of a more interactive process with chairs and deans to let new faculty know what collegiality looked like and that collegiality would be measured (in order to offer guidance on how to develop in that category).

Dr. Cox's study of collegiality rubrics and guidelines revealed widespread concern over how difficult it is to measure or judge collegiality. Few schools actually use a rubric or explicit criteria. There seems to be little hard data on how to measure collegiality. Sportsmanship, altruism, and civic virtue are all mentioned as categories within collegiality at other universities. Dr. Cox volunteered to provide additional reading on this topic for anyone who would like to know more and observed that collegiality is a topic of growing importance nationwide. Dr. James pointed out that the topic is growing in importance because the number of lawsuits (concerning tenure denied based on collegiality) is growing.

Dr. James read aloud the two questions Ann Holder uses to evaluate collegiality in the Newton Gresham Library. The text reads:

1. Evidence of the capacity and the willingness to function as an effective colleague in the accomplishment of the goals of the tenure unit (Use a 1-5 scale.)
2. Evidence of the capacity and the willingness to fulfill the future program needs of the tenure unit and of the University. (Use a 1-5 scale.)

A senator volunteered that it seemed to make sense to let departments determine their own guidelines, as collegiality is most going to impact one's departmental colleagues.

The issue was raised that perhaps tenured faculty members need to be held to standards re: collegiality more than untenured faculty, who are the current focus of this discussion. Another couple of senators suggested including this in post-tenure review, which occurs every five years. A remediation plan with counseling could be one consequence.

One senator asked everyone if their departments had discussed collegiality in reviewing junior faculty before the tenure vote; several senators said yes. This senator was not sure if collegiality was a worthwhile category to continue. Dr. Cox pointed out that if collegiality is removed, there could still be personalities at work in tenure decisions, but there would be no legitimate way to discuss such issues. Another senator said the provost was clear that he wants collegiality included in tenure decisions. A different senator commented that it would be more fair and honest to include it.

One senator asked if we should raise the issue with Rhonda Beassie when she visits Faculty Senate. Another senator said if collegiality is going to be part of the tenure process, maybe it ought to be part of FES; he would like junior faculty to have input

on this and require all departments to draw up their own guidelines. A different senator said that the provost does not want collegiality in FES but he does want it in tenure decisions. Dr. James emphasized that it would be unfair to not discuss collegiality until one could possibly be denied tenure based on something never defined or discussed. Another senator suggested that Ann Holder's guidelines could serve as a starting point for discussion; perhaps these ought to be provided to all department chairs. A different senator suggested the Council of Chairs would be an appropriate place to discuss this; Dr. James will make this suggestion to the provost.

Another senator suggested that collegiality should be discussed annually as part of FES, whether or not it impacts merit pay. A senator supported this point, but worried that faculty will end up having to document their collegiality. Dr. James said she thought it would be more likely that the burden of documenting things would be on those wanting to say one is not collegial. There was discussion about what collegiality means; several agreed that collegiality (or a lack thereof) is about being obstructionist, rather than being unpleasant or disliked.

Most senators seemed to agree that we ought to invite the Council of Chairs to engage in a discussion of the issue of collegiality and that collegiality be an annual discussion with tenure-track faculty, perhaps as part of FES (whether it impacts merit pay or not). One senator suggested that the Council of Chairs encourage department chairs to start the dialogue on collegiality at the department level.

The issue was tabled until our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Revised 02-18-2014 at 9:30 am.

## Excellence in Teaching Award

The annual Excellence in Teaching Award recognizes exemplary university instruction by tenure/tenure track faculty. Since our primary mission is to assist students in identifying their talents and interests, and to facilitate students' intellectual growth through intense practice and effective mentoring, quality university teaching is the most important characteristic of our community of scholars. Outstanding faculty named for this honor will receive a commemorative medallion and a \$5000 award.

### Eligibility

To be considered for this award a faculty member must be full-time and have completed five years of university service at Sam Houston State University in a tenure-track faculty position. Having been granted tenure is not a prerequisite for consideration; past recipients are ineligible for subsequent awards.

### Process

Since the number of nominees has traditionally been several hundred, the committee will "narrow the field" with the goal of enabling a fair and close evaluation by the committee. Subsequently, a final group of three to six candidates will be extensively reviewed by each committee member using the following guidelines:

As a first step in the process, the committee will gather names of the nominees and request from the Registrar's Office a list of the number of students each candidate taught in the preceding academic year. The committee will compute a relative ratio that will have the number of nominations as its numerator and the number of students in classes as its denominator. This ratio will be used to condense the group of candidates into a cohort of twenty with at least one representative from each college by taking the top ranked candidates in each college.

The committee will invite these remaining candidates to submit a formal statement of teaching philosophy along with a vita, and to request letters of support from colleagues, students, and alumni. The candidates' departmental chairs will be asked to provide a letter of recommendation that may include rankings of the individual within the departmental faculty by student IDEA scores and FES-chair evaluations during the past five years. The department also will provide syllabi for the preceding academic year. The committee will then evaluate and review these materials to reduce the number to a manageable list of three to six finalists.

The last step in the evaluation process will be classroom visitations to observe each finalist while teaching his/her class(es). When necessary, the committee will agree upon an equivalent evaluation for off-campus or on-line instruction.

## Procedure

For each review step the committee, through consultations with the previous year's committee, will carefully define the evaluation criteria with a weighted scale for each criterion. To take advantage of the diversity of faculty perspective, each committee member may independently set the series of weights for the criteria. To improve the review process, the individual rankings or reviews will be shared with the full committee. Reviewers will be allowed to question and defend criterion weights and results for individual candidates. Openness and free discussion of considerations are important to the process. In order to improve the precision of the collective selection when considering the compilation of all reviewers' scores, the highest score as well as the lowest score for each candidate will be eliminated prior to computing average scores. Finally, a list of relative ranking and mean score will be posted and debated by the group of reviewers in order to achieve final consensus.

## Schedule of Necessary Events

Due to the nature of the open nomination process and the sheer number of nominations typically received, precisely defined deadlines must be maintained.

- October 1: Computer Services posts a link and Academic Affairs provides notification to the university community to begin accepting nominations through November 15.
- December 1: Committee receives from Computer Services the number of students taught for each nominee and ranks nominees by the ratio: (number of nominations/number of students taught).
- December 15: Requests are made to the semi-finalists and their chairs with a due date of January 15.
- January 15: Committee begins the first review process and narrows the field.
- February 15: Remaining candidates are invited to submit letters of support and the cohort is further reduced to 3-6 candidates.
- March 15: Classroom observations are scheduled and visitation begins.
- April 7: President is notified of the committee's selection.
- April 15: President informs university community of the Teaching Award recipient.

Note: Where appropriate, such as in the College of Criminal Justice or in large departments in which personnel matters and the faculty evaluation cycle are addressed at the coordinator level, the terms "department" and "chair" should be replaced with the equivalent administrative unit or officer. When appropriate, the Newton Grisham Library should be considered as a "college" such that teaching faculty in the NGL may also be eligible for this award.

## **EXCELLENCE IN SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

### **Excellence in Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments Award Description:**

“Scholarly and creative accomplishments” is defined as published or performed original and/or creative works appropriate to one’s discipline.

The Excellence in Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments Award provides recognition to a tenured/tenure-track faculty member who has demonstrated an ongoing record of excellence in formulating, executing, and making public original works that have value in his/her discipline. The recipient of the Excellence in Scholarly and Creative Accomplishments Award will receive \$5000 and a medal.

### **Award Criteria**

A faculty member must have no fewer than five years of service at Sam Houston State University to be eligible for nomination. There should be substantial evidence that a nominee’s scholarly and/or creative accomplishments have had an unusually great impact. There should be substantial evidence that the nominee’s professional life has been characterized by a commitment to research, scholarly and/or creative accomplishments, as opposed to a one-time major achievement. There should be evidence of both past and current excellent contributions to the nominee’s discipline. Past recipients are ineligible for subsequent awards.

### **Selection Committee Appointment**

The President makes all appointments from University Faculty Senate nominations. There will be a representative from each college and the library on the committee. The chair of the committee will be chosen by the Committee on Committees no later than October 1 of the academic year. Members serve three-year terms expiring at the end of the fiscal year, staggered in such a way as to ensure continuity of the committee.

### **Committee Guidelines**

1. Scholarly and creative activities being reviewed should be those which occurred while the nominee was employed by Sam Houston State University in a tenured/tenure-track position.
2. Documentation supporting the nominee’s scholarly and creative activities should:
  - a. Provide sufficient evidence that the nominee did, in fact, contribute largely to the activity; and
  - b. Provide sufficient testimony to establish the significance/worth and scope of the nominee’s accomplishments.

### **Nomination Guidelines**

1. Each department will nominate a single individual, whose name and packet of supporting documentation will be forwarded to his/her respective College committee chair.
2. Each college will establish a committee to nominate up to two individuals from the pool of candidates forwarded by the departments. The one or two finalists from each college will automatically be eligible for the SHSU Scholarly and Creative Activities Award.



3. In addition to departmental nominations, peer nominations are encouraged to ensure that other outstanding candidates are considered. A substantial letter of support is required for peer nominations.

### **Committee Process**

1. Starting no later than December 1 of the academic year, the chair of the committee will begin soliciting nominations.
2. Peer nominations and college-level finalists will be forwarded to the chair of the committee no later than the 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in February.
3. The chair of the committee shall oversee the nomination process and the collection of all review materials from each of the nominees. The chair will provide access to these materials to each member of the committee.
4. Depending on the number of nominations received, the committee may choose to select 5-8 finalists from whom complete supporting documentation would be requested. The committee chair will communicate with each finalist as to the form and the type of documentation or other information that will be reviewed by the committee.
5. Every committee member will review the documentation provided and score each finalist, and the chair will rank order the scores of the candidates to determine the winner. The method of ranking will be determined by the committee before the scoring is accomplished.
6. Prior to communicating the decision to the Provost's office, the committee will meet to discuss the results, thus giving each member the opportunity to explain his/her ranking. A final decision will be made at this time.
7. The Committee chair will deliver the name of the selected candidate to the Provost's Office for further consideration no later than the first Friday of April. In addition, the chair will provide an executive summary regarding the committee process and decision to the Provost to ensure clarity regarding considerations and progression of the decision.



# Sam Houston State University

*A Member of The Texas State University System*  
Huntsville, TX 77341

October 27, 2011

## Excellence in Service Award Description

*"Service" is defined as contributions to Sam Houston State University, as well as professional and public services activities.*

The Excellence in Service Award provides recognition to a tenured/tenure track faculty member who has given exemplary service to Sam Houston State University and/or the community. The recipient of the Excellence in Service Award will receive \$5,000 and a medal.

## Award Criteria

There should be substantial evidence that a nominee's service activities have had a significant positive effect on Sam Houston State University and/or the community. There should be substantial evidence that the nominee's professional life has been characterized by a commitment to service activities as opposed to a one-time major involvement in such activity. In addition to evidence of a pattern of service over time, there should also be evidence of recent and/or current service contributions. Past recipients are ineligible for subsequent awards.

## Guidelines

1. Service activities being reviewed should be those which occurred while the nominee was employed by Sam Houston State University in a tenured/tenure track position.
2. Service activities are not restricted to those directly within a nominee's field of professional expertise. They may be directed at improving the internal functioning of SHSU, enhancing SHSU's image in the eyes of the community, or serving the nominee's professional community, or serving society as a whole.
3. Service activities are not restricted to those for which no remuneration was accepted by the nominee. Both "paid" and "unpaid" service should be reviewed. Service should entail at least some semblance of "giving of one's self."
4. Documentation supporting the nominee's service activities should:
  - o provide sufficient evidence that the nominee did, in fact, engage in the service activity



# Sam Houston State University

*A Member of The Texas State University System*  
Huntsville, TX 77341

- provide sufficient testimony to establish the significance/worth and scope of the nominee's accomplishments
- 5. The Selection Committee may decline to make an award if no appropriate nominations are received.

## Selection Committee Appointment

The President makes all appointments from University Faculty Senate nominations. Each college/library is to be represented on the committee. The chair of the committee will be chosen by the Committee on Committees during the nomination process and should be someone who has previously served as a committee member. Members serve three-year terms expiring at the end of the fiscal year, staggered in such a way as to insure continuity of the committee.

## Committee Process

- The chair of the committee shall oversee the nomination process and the collection of all review materials from each of the nominees. The chair will provide access to these materials to each member of the committee.
- Timeline: 2<sup>nd</sup> Friday of February – Nominations due to the chair  
1<sup>st</sup> Friday of April – Selection made and sent to Provost's Office
- Depending on the number of nominations received, the committee may use a tiered approach to first assess the initial nominations by reviewing general nominating information in order to select a cadre of finalists for which more complete supporting documentation is requested.
- Once the committee identifies the finalists, the chair will communicate with each finalist as to the form and the type of documentation or other information that will be reviewed by the committee.
- All committee members should carefully review all materials and a quorum of committee members is needed to make the final award selection.
- Once the committee makes their determination (which could be that no nomination is moved forward) their decision is to be communicated to the office of the Provost for further consideration.
- The Chair will provide an Executive Summary regarding the committee process and decision to the Provost to ensure clarity regarding considerations and progression of the decision.