FACULTY SENATE MINUTES SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY 24 October 2013 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Austin Hall

Members present:

Nancy Baker (CHSS); Helen Berg (COE); Tracy Bilsing (CHSS); Jonathan Breazeale (COBA); Don Bumpass (COBA); Kevin Clifton (COFAMC); 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); Hayoung Lim (COFAMC); Paul Loeffler (COS); Dennis Longmire (COCJ); Sheryl Murphy-Manley (COFAMC); Diana Nabors (COE); Dwayne Pavelock (COS); Debra Price (COE); Lisa Shen (NGL); Stacy Ulbig (CHSS); Mary Anne Vincent (COHS); Anthony Watkins (COFAMC); Matteo (IT) was also present.

Members not present: Madhusudan Choudhary (COS); Donna Cox (COE); Jeff Littlejohn (CHSS); David McTier (COFAMC); Doug Ullrich (COS); Pam Zelbst (COBA); on leave: Tom Cox (CHSS).

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

Special guests: Jacob Chandler

Approval of minutes: October 10 minutes approved.

The University Curriculum Committee needs a new chair-elect. Dr. James asked the Committee on Committees to appoint someone within 24 hours.

Chair's Report

Dr. James reported on the latest meeting with the provost. The provost focused on the new Non-disclosure Agreement (NDA) and the flowcharts being created for policy revision and for the hiring process. The flowchart for the policy revision process should be complete by the end of the Fall 2013 semester. Effort certification for external grant recipients was discussed at that meeting as well; the provost will look into whether this certification process can be clarified or streamlined. One senator agreed that the process is in great need of being streamlined.

Committee Reports: Academic Affairs

The Academic Affairs Committee reported on the ongoing effort to revise FES 1 and 2. The analysis of data gathered at the two Town Hall meetings in 2012-2013 was summarized.

The committee suggested to the provost that: 1) the short form of the IDEA evaluation be used, and 2) for the FES 2 score, the adjusted scores be placed into categories rather than reporting a number. In addition, the report presented to the provost suggested that if a faculty member receives a score low enough to be of concern, that this score trigger a conference with the departmental chair to explore what factors could have contributed to the low score and what changes could be made. A senator expressed a hope that DPTACs would get more involved in mentoring faculty and coming up with creative ways to aid faculty in improving their teaching.

The provost has handed this off to the Faculty Evaluation System Committee, of which Dr. Dennis Longmire is chair. Dr. Longmire requested that anyone with specific comments on the Academic Affairs Committee report contact him. The provost told the Academic Affairs Committee that he planned to discuss the evaluation of teaching with the newly created Council of Chairs.

Several senators had thoughts to share regarding the IDEA evaluation forms. One senator commented that shifting from a numbered scale to four or five general categories could pose problems (for example, where to end one category and begin another). It was noted that the short IDEA form includes a question (for students) that should benefit some faculty at SHSU: "Do you feel that your academic background prepared you well for this course?"

One senator stated that his class sizes are often small enough that the IDEA evaluation results are labeled as "unreliable," yet the score is still used to evaluate this senator for merit and tenure/promotion, which seems unfair. Another senator commented that one standanjon fn0.64 2T3.0 1 Tf [unfu Dnr fcunf one

A member of the committee explained that this is a courtesy report to the senate of a special charge from the provost to the committee, and the report does not imply the entire Faculty Senate's approval. Another senator st

SHSU's NDA could not be the same as TSU's NDA, especially since both schools are part of the TSUS system. Chandler said he would need to review TSU's NDA more closely before he could comment on this.

As Jacob Chandler explained that the NDA has a different meaning than the senators were interpreting the NDA to have, one senator stated that the NDA is a binding contract. This senator further said that it doesn't matter what we are told the language is interpreted to mean, because we are legally bound by the language of the NDA. The language of the NDA needs to be softened. If someone signs the NDA as-is, that person is liable for all kinds of far-reaching problems, the senator cautioned.

Several senators felt the NDA's language in general was very harsh and implied that one can barely use one's computer for work: "I wilT3.01 T e

A senator offered that slide #1