

Meeting No. 26

October 18, 1972

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

Absent
Mr. Hall, excused

Ex Officio Members Present
Vice-President Lewis
Vice-President Beasley
Dean Walker

Guests Present

Ms. June Irwin	Mr. B. F. Walker	Ms. Gladys Atherton
Mr. Wendall Spreadbury	Mr. James Garrett	Ms. Ava Bush
Ms. Carolyn Price	Mr. C. R. Shoenewolf	Mr. T. J. Stanly
Ms. Elizabeth Davis	Mr. J. C. Green	Mr. William Bos
Mr. Will Barclay	Mr. Cecil Jones	Mr. H. M. Clements

1. Mr. Nall called the meeting to order at 4:15, the roll was called, guests were recognized, and the minutes of Meeting No. 25 were approved.
2. The business of the meeting was a general discussion of the report of the Professional Welfare Committee, FACULTY EXCELLENCE: Criteria for Faculty Evaluation and Appraisal.

The Chairman called on Mr. Bourbon, chairman of the committee, for comments and chronological proceedings of the committee on the topic. General assumptions under which the committee worked were: (1) That time should be spent in faculty evaluation before promotion is recommended or made. (2) That there should be a quota percentage limit of faculty in the upper two ranks--currently 50%. (3) That rank and salary should be separated; rank is not to substitute for salary. (4) That School councils will draft additional criteria. Mr. Bourbon also outlined the spirit under which the committee operated.

Several questions and comments followed. Names of those making comments will not be shown except where pertinent to specific answers. (Items a-i and n-p originated with Faculty Senate members; items j-m originated with guests.)

- a. One Senate member stated that he thought the criteria for evaluation and appraisal were arbitrary and lacked flexibility. He asked why we should require the Ph.D. since it is not related to good teaching. He recommended that any changes in current policy be delayed until we can identify our superior teachers. The committee response was that additional flexibility is provided as outlined in a footnote of the proposal.

- b. Is the 50% maximum in the upper two ranks now prescribed by schools? No. The rule is now university-wide. The proposal from the committee would add flexibility.
- c. Three Senate members said that in their discussions with constituents, complaints were made about the proposed minimum number of years in rank. The number of years is too long.
- d. There is no grandfather clause in the proposal for changes from current policy.
- e. Would the proposed 50% quota system by schools help? Vice-President Lewis said that in his opinion the 50% quota system on the upper two ranks, if amended to apply by schools, would solve the problem.
- f. Remove the proposed maximum percentages in each rank. Replace this by filling the percentage quotas from the rank immediately below.
- g. There appears to be no provision for School Council action. Committee response was that there is; it appears in Item #7 of the proposal.
- h. Can a department be left out of the procedure being recommended? Possibly, since action is being recommended at the School council level.
- i. What is "or the equivalent" for years of teaching experience? In the past, the Deans' Council has voted on exceptions. Vice-President Lewis posed the question "What is graduate teaching experience?" (This question was not resolved.)
- j. One guest did not think that the extra years should be included; that this part of the criteria should remain the same as in the current Faculty Handbook.
- k. Only impose the 50% quota in the two upper ranks and delete all the other proposed percentages by ranks.
- l. Where does responsibility for each action lie? The recommendations should spell this out.
- m. Would the University consider freezing the two top ranks and study the situation? Study the question of quotas by schools to see if there are any special circumstances. Gauge the recommendations by instructional goals in each school.
- n. The critical rank in terms of percent of total faculty is that of assistant professor.

- o. The instructor rank allows the University flexibility in setting quotas by rank.
- p. Salary may preclude outstanding people from coming to SFA.

Mr. Nall summarized. He declared that the report would be sent back to the committee for restudy.

Mr. Bourbon asked for a straw-vote feeling of the Senate on some of the matters raised during the meeting.

Possible Course of Action

Senate Straw Vote

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Impose quotas by schools | Yes |
| 2. Impose quotas by each rank | no concensus |
| 3. Have 50% quota for professor and assoc. prof. and no other ranks | mostly No |
| 4. Some additional quota by factors other than rank | Yes |
| 5. Keep current years in rank and years of experience | evenly split |
| 6. Require additional time in rank and experience | mostly No |

- 3. The meeting was adjourned at 5:50. The next meeting will be November 15.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Baker
Secretary

REVIEWED:

John T. Lewis, III
Vice President for Academic Affairs

DATE:

12-6-72

APPROVED:

[Signature]
President

DATE:

12-12-72