

**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.

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