

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

3 June 2014
2:00-3:30 p.m.

Members present: Nancy Baker (CHSS); Helen Berg (COE); Tracy Bilsing (CHSS); Jonathan Breazeale (COBA); Don Bumpass (COBA); Madhusudan Choudhary (COS); Kevin Clifton (COFAMC); Donna Cox (COE); James Crosby (CHSS); Mark Frank (COBA); Randall Garner (COCJ); Richard Henriksen (COE); Joan Hudson (COS); C. Renée James (COS); Mark Klespis (COS); James Landa (CHSS); Jeff Littlejohn (CHSS); Paul Loeffler (COS); Dennis Longmire (COCJ); David McTier (COFAMC); Sheryl Murphy-Manley (COFAMC); Diana Nabors (COE); Dwayne Pavelock (COS); Debra Price (COE); Lisa Shen (NGL); Stacy Ulbig (CHSS); Doug Ullrich (COS); Mary Anne Vincent (COHS); Anthony Watkins (COFAMC); Pam Zelbst (COBA).

Members not present: Tom Cox (CHSS); Hayoung Lim (COFAMC)

Called to order: 2:00 p.m. in LSC 304 by Chair Renee James

Minutes approved: Minutes for April 24 meeting approved

Special Guest: Provost Jaimie Hebert

Chair's Report

The Provost will be meeting with us today. He will tell us about the Regents' proposed changes to the faculty grievance policy; Dr. James believes the Regents have approved these changes. Dr. Hebert mentioned these proposed changes in the last meeting Dr. James and Dr. Baker had with him. The changes seem to have taken away faculty input into the process of hearing and deciding a faculty member's grievance. The changes have also caused an extreme truncation of the time period in which a person can file a grievance.

Senators discussed whether we ought to circulate the written comments on the survey. Anyone could get a copy by filing a FOIA request. The Provost and President will see a copy. In the past, the Senate has not distributed comments, preferring to keep the comments confidential and hopefully therefore more honest and useful. If we want to distribute the comments, we should perhaps make that clear **BEFORE** the next survey, so faculty can choose to be more circumspect in what they say. The numerical data will be made available on the Faculty Senate website.

Section 7.05 needs to be clarified. The requirement for a DPTAC letter summarizing the

proceedings of the Faculty Grievance Committee were misleading, as the provision to allow lawyers to be present caused the hearing to become a judicial hearing. There was no verdict; the group of peers made a recommendation to the president. The president had the right to have an advisory committee come in to advise her. Dr. Hebert assured the Senate that the Senate will be involved in re-writing the SHSU policy. There are still a few shades of gray in Dr. Gomez's revised policy that SHSU will need to clarify. If a lecturer is fired mid-semester, or if a faculty member is fired without cause, then these would both be granted a tribunal hearing.

There have been two drafts of the revised policy circulating; one draft stated that a faculty member with a grievance not related to termination could still proceed with a grievance committee. Another draft stated that this use of a grievance committee would also no longer be allowed.

A senator asked why the timetable was changed from 90 days to 10 days. Another senator expressed concern re: "10 days from the initiating event." What does this mean? The provost says it means the date on which the faculty member receives and reads the letter. A couple of senators commented that this is unclear and could cause problems. (Campus mail, a faculty member who comes in on teaching days only, how to document when a faculty member read the letter, etc.)

Another senator asked how the provost handles a split vote on tenure. The provost says that if there appear to be discrepancies in the recommendations and the candidate's record, he will trace back to the dean or even the chair of a DPTAC involved in order to determine why there is a discrepancy and how to understand the recommendation.

The provost depends upon DPTAC members to assess the quality of publications, teaching, etc.; the DPTAC summary letter is extremely important in the provost's decision making.

Dr. James asked what happens when a grievance is based on not following procedure; is this still grievable? Dr. Hebert is not sure. He needs to confirm which version of the revised policy the Board of Regents approved.

SHSU will continue to follow its current grievance policy until a new one is drafted, approved, and in place.

Senators asked the provost why the Board of Regents made this policy change, and what had been the problem for the Regents in allowing universities to follow their grievance policies as they existed? The provost answered that, at some universities, the TSUS had to assign a TSUS attorney to a university to represent the university in grievance committee hearings. Basically, the provost explained, because this was not handled well at some schools, all schools have to change their policies.

One senator asked the provost if new hires could be more carefully advised to track whether they are being mentored/assessed properly.

Another senator asked the provost whether the committee recommendation on IDEA (and alternative measures to be used on FES) has gone anywhere. The provost said that the recommendations went to Council of Academic Deans (CAD) and the deans had some concerns. The CAD sent it to the Council of Chairs to let them work with it. The provost asked the Council of Chairs to give him a quick turn-around. The provost is hoping to hear back from them soon, at which point he would like to move forward with revising how teaching is evaluate2 (hi) 0.2is evar. OJ ET Q(nyw) -0..2 (nt) o(t) 0.2 (t) 0.2 0.2il eva(i) 0.2 ((oon, at

Tuition Revenue Bonds (TRBs)

The Provost says that SHSU is submitting 4 TRBs, of which he thinks we have an excellent chance of getting one and a good chance that we will get two. Getting more than two is unlikely. The top priority for the TRBs is the biology/nursing/allied health building (predominantly expanding biology, to meet the needs of Allied Health). The second priority is the Allied Health/ Health Sciences facility in the Montgomery County area (location to be determined). The third priority is a new art complex; the provost is pushing hard for this, as SHSU has needed a new art complex for a long time. The fourth TRB is a library renovation. The third and fourth priorities will probably not occur this legislative session; it usually takes more than one session for a TRB to happen. But by publicly stating SHSU's needs and seeking state funding, we can have SHSU development staff engage in fundraising for the buildings, to get funding for a new building started. For example, the new building SHSU is starting now was possible thanks to a \$10 million donation, which Dr. Gibson was able to match by securing \$10 million in bonds, thus funding the entire project. The new building will be on the corner near the Post Office, behind the Tokyo Grill.

A senator asked if a university faculty/staff lounge could be created, to allow for a central place for socializing and collegiality. The provost said he supports this idea; he has seen it in place at the LSC, and it seemed to work well. The problem is that with the premium on space right now, setting aside space for such a lounge is not likely to be approved.

A senator asked what has happened to the building near campus that formerly housed Shipley's donuts; the provost said that SHSU has bought it and is trying to decide what to do with the space. Dr. James Landa suggested that SHSU turn the Shipley's space into a coffee shop that would be operated as a co-op and staffed by nutrition students, pro-golf students, and business students. Another senator brought up the idea of a food pantry for students with food uncertainty and the trouble they are having finding a location; a different senator replied that the Episcopalian student ministry is offering a space for the pantry.

Meeting adjourned at 4:14 pm.

Revised 09-11-2014, 1:17 pm

Sam Houston State University
Academic Policy Statement 900417
Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Sam Houston State University
Academic Policy Statement 900417
Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion
Page 2 of 17
As Revised by Faculty Senate, June 2014

"However, tenure does not create a property interest in any attributes of the faculty position beyond the annual salary. By way of example only, tenure does not create a property interest in laboratory space, a particular office, the right to teach graduate students, or

Sam Houston State University
Academic Policy Statement 900417
Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Sam Houston State

Sam

- 4.10 Written notice of non-appointment and denial of tenure. Written notice of a decision not to reappoint will be given to a tenure-track faculty member no later than March 1 of the first or not later than December 15 of the second academic year of probationary service. After two or more academic years, written notice shall be given not later than August 31 that the subsequent academic year will be the terminal year of appointment. The notice required by this section is not applicable where

University to the profession, community, state, and nation, including
academic or professionally-related public

given to each of the four categories may be determined by department and college tenure and promotion documents; however, greater weight shall be given to teaching and creative or scholarly activities than to service or collegiality. Successful performance in any

- (5) Honors, awards, and other special recognitions
 - b. Significant professional service
 - c. Documentation of teaching performance utilizing summaries of student evaluations
 - d. Any further documentation that clarifies achievements in other sections or includes other material supporting promotion or tenure
- 6.3 Faculty are expected to maintain the highest level of standards and integrity and therefore, proven instances of academic fraud or dishonesty by faculty with regard to submitted material within the portfolio may

- 8.3 If the performance of the faculty member is judged to be satisfactory to continue in probationary status, the department chair will discuss the results of the review with the faculty member (with a view toward improving performance) and provide her/him with a copy of the written report.
- 8.4 At Sam Houston State University, the title of instructor denotes a tenure-track probationary appointment and is used to appoint a faculty member who is near completion but does not have the terminal degree in his/her area. The maximum period that may be served in the rank of instructor is two years. In unusual circumstances, a petition for a one-year extension may

Sam

!
!
!
!

!
!
!
!

"#\$%&'()*+,-./:01233456!
789. :#-!91!; , +80:1!*), %&!=' . . %:##!
>8(#!?!@A354!

Revisions of Academic Policy 900417

Section 2.01

!

!
!
!

!
!
!

"#\$%&'()*+,-./:0123456!
789. :#-!91!; , +80:1!*), %&!=' . . %:##!
>8(#!?!@A354!

!
!
!
!

!
!
!
!

"#\$%&'()*+,-./:01233456!
789. :#-!91!; , +80:1!*), %&!=' . . %:##!
>8(#!?!@A354!

*If a candidate was successful in all of the categories, why would he/she not receive tenure?
What is the purpose of this statement?*

Section 7.03

From:
!

1.1 With regard to the DPTAC formed as a result of 7.02, in the case of a probationary faculty member, the members of the DPTAC should be appointed to review the performance of the probationary faculty member every year beginning with the second year of employment and continuing

!

?!
?

