

Meeting No. 60
October 8, 1975
Stephen F. Austin State University
Faculty Senate

Absent:
Gloria Durr (Excused)
Jerry Lackey (Excused)
Ralph Eddins (Excused)

Ex Officio Members Present: —
Dr. John T. Lewis
Mr. Charles Haas

Guests Present:
Dr. Robert Dean
Dr. Archie McDonald
Dr. Ronnie Barra
Dr. Tom Bourbon
Dr. Harry McDonald
Dr. Thomas McGrath

1. Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.
2. Minutes of Meeting No. 59 were approved as corrected.
3. Chairman's Report:
Chairman Ford reported on the Deans' Council meetings of September 19, 1975. The Deans' Council changed the requirements for clear entry in the fall for those freshmen entering on probation in the summer. Beginning in the summer of 1977, probational freshmen must take at least nine hours in two terms with a "C" average on all work attempted. The required GPA for transfer students will be a minimum of 2.00, effective Fall 1976. New scholastic requirements will apply to students new in the fall of 1976.
The Deans' Council at the September 19th meeting decided that in order to have a sufficient number of class days the following calendar for the 1976-77 school year was adopted:
Monday, August 30,--Registration will begin at 1:00 p.m.
Thursday, September 2--Classes begin
Monday, December 13--
Friday, December 17--Finals
Monday, Jan. 10, 1977--Registration will begin at 1:00 p.m.
Thursday, January 13--Classes begin
Friday, May 6--
Thursday, May 12--Finals
4. A treasurer's report was presented by Jesse Richardson. Approximately \$20.00 was spent to have work done by the Stenographic Bureau.
5. Dr. Ken Watterston reported to the Senate for the Faculty Government and Involvement Committee with respect to the annual questionnaire dealing with issues of concern to the faculty.

6. Dr. Bennat Mullen made a report for the Administration and Financial Affairs Committee concerning selection criteria for a new University President. The committee recommended the adoption of the items on the ranking of the Selection Criteria as the criteria to be used in the selection process. A motion to accept the criteria was passed. (See attachment 1)

Dr. Mullen introduced a resolution for the Senate to express appreciation to Dr. Ronald Claunch of the Political Science Department for his valuable assistance in compiling for computer feed back the responses to the selection criteria. A motion to do so was passed.

7. Dr. Bill Brophy, speaking for the Professional Welfare Committee reported that at the present time they felt it premature to make specific recommendations regarding the campus health program. Dr. Brophy moved that at the proper time a committee composed of students, faculty, and staff members be created to make specific recommendations to the President of the University. A motion to wait until the proper time was approved.
8. Reports concerning the merit pay raises:
 - A. Dr. Ford read a letter from the Department Heads concerning the proposed instrument for determining salary increases.
 - B. Dr. Fred Rainwater presented a petition: The proposed numerical ranking system which is before the Faculty Senate not be adopted; and that the present method or methods used to determine merit raises be continued as the guidelines for the heads of departments, until other guidelines acceptable to the faculty are established.
 - C. Dr. Jerry Vincent reported for the Ad Hoc Committee A presenting a merit criteria instrument. (See attachment 2)
 - D. Dr. Pat Russell, speaking for Ad Hoc Committee C stated that the committee felt that, given the widely disparate goals of the various divisions of the University, it is not possible to design an evaluation instrument that will measure faculty merit accurately across the campus. (See attachment 3)
 - E. Dr. Mullen moved that these instruments be referred to the Department Heads for consideration. The motion was amended by Dr. Burr to establish a time for further discussion.
Dr. Brophy made a motion to amend the amendment establishing a called meeting of the Senate on Wednesday, October 15, 1976 at 3:15 p.m. The motion passed.
9. Chairman Ford instructed the Secretary to send copies of the reports from Ad Hoc Committees A and C to the Department Heads.

10. Dr. Pat Russell introduced three resolutions on insurance. The motion was made and passed. (See attachment 4)
11. Dr. J.H. Burr presented a petition asking the Senate that the policy on student evaluations be rescinded. Chairman Ford referred the issue back to the Academic Affairs Committee asking that in the meantime each Senator contact all members represented for their reaction.
12. Jesse Richardson introduced the following resolution:
In as much as the Attorney General of the State of Texas has ruled that sick leave accrues without limit, and that an employee upon leaving employment shall receive one-half of his or her accrued sick leave at their current rate of pay, and that said amount can add materially to the estate or financial security of the employee; therefore be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate hereby requests that the status of sick leave accounts be made known to each faculty member as soon as practical this school year and each school year in the future at the beginning of the year.
13. Dr. Pat Russell asked what progress had been made concerning the selection of a new Graduate Dean. Chairman Ford referred this to the Academic Affairs Committee with a progress report due in November.
14. Dr. Pat Russell introduced a resolution from the Senate stating that The Faculty Senate, as representatives of the general faculty, express deep sympathy to President Steen on the death of his mother. Resolution passed.
15. The motion was made and passed unanimously to request Dr. Steen to give the Commencement Address at the May, 1976 Graduation Ceremony.
17. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Ann Chandler
Faculty Senate Secretary

(attachments: 4)

RECOMMENDATION OF SELECTION CRITERIA

October 3, 1975

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The Committee recommends the adoption of the items on the ranking of the Selection Criteria as the criteria to be used in the selection process. The committee further recommends that the significance attached to each item be in accordance with the faculty rating of these items.

In accordance with faculty response to items 1-5 these recommendations are made:

1. Terminal degree in academic area should be from an accredited institution.
2. Selection should be from off campus.
3. Search should be nation-wide.
4. Selection should be final as opposed to interim.

A RANKING OF THE SELECTION CRITERIA

<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>RANKING</u>
3.86	Ability to work with various public sectors	88	Very Important
3.39	Recognition of important role of the faculty	52	Very Important
3.35	Possession of earned terminal degree	56	Very Important
3.30	Successful university teaching	49	Very Important
3.30	Previous success in a leadership role	50	Very Important
3.11	Successful university administrative experience	37	Very Important
3.05	Ability to formulate a philosophic statement	37	Very Important
3.02	Should be from off campus	50	Very Important
2.90	Interest in advancing research	28	Very Important
2.88	Professional recognition of a reg/natl scale	23	Very Important
2.83	Recognition of the role of the students in university administration	23	Very Important

The point values for the above items were:

- 1 - of no importance
- 2 - slightly important
- 3 - important
- 4 - very important

Results of questions 1 - 5:

1. Earned terminal degree in a academic field from a recognized institution.
 - a) internationally 6.4%
 - b) nationally 50.7%
 - c) accredited 41.6%
2. Should be from off campus.
 - a) yes 80.9%
 - b) no 16.6%
3. Chosen as a result of a nation-wide search.
 - a) yes 84.1%
 - b) no 14.4%
4. Should there be an age consideration? If so, what?
 - a) 35-55 16.5%
 - b) 40-55 18.0%
 - c) 45-60 13.2%
 - d) no limitation 49.4%
 - e) other - please indicate 3.0%
5. The search should be final and no acting or interim president should be appointed.
 - a) yes 83.4%
 - b) no 15.5%

MEMO TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Ad Hoc Committee "A" on Merit Raises
Dan Beaty, Ann Chandler, Wayne Johnson, Jerry Vincent

SUBJECT: Criteria for determination of merit

DATE: October 8, 1975

Based upon the charge of the Faculty Senate on September 10, 1975 and the job description of the faculty presented by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs in the Faculty Bulletin of October 2, 1975, the Committee presents the following report:

GENERAL STATEMENT:

- (1) The Committee feels that salary increases for 1976-1977 be based on merit.
- (2) The Committee recognizes that variations exist in faculty responsibilities between schools and departments, and that any criteria used for an evaluation must be sufficiently flexible to account for these variations.
- (3) Initial responsibility for evaluation rests with Heads of Departments in consultation with faculty members. Ultimate responsibility for evaluation rests with the Dean of the School and Vice-President for Academic Affairs.
- (4) Individual faculty members should be advised on the results of their evaluation and the specific merit raise for which they have been recommended.
- (5) The Committee is presenting criteria which it feels should be used in the determination of merit.
- (6) In the MERIT CRITERIA below, the category "I. Teaching" is divided into sub-categories which have arbitrary values placed to indicate the Committee's feeling of relative importance. Within these sub-categories specific criteria are listed, each to be judged by the Head of Department on a four-level basis: A-Outstanding, B-Satisfactory, C-Needs Improvement, and D-Unacceptable.
- (7) In the MERIT CRITERIA Category "II. Scholarly Activity" the sub-category "A. Research and Publication" and "B. Papers Presented," the specific criteria are listed in points of relative significance. No attempt is made to place any specific value on the sub-categories in "II Scholarly Activity."
- (8) In the MERIT CRITERIA Category III, "School and Department Service" the specific merit should be determined by the amount of time devoted to any of the sub-categories in "III School and Department Service."

- (9) The Committee recognizes the fact that individual faculty members would not necessarily qualify for merit under all the listed criteria. Nor does the Committee feel that the faculty should qualify for all of the criteria on any specific evaluation. The Committee's intent is merely to set forth the criteria under which a faculty member can qualify for merit.

Memo To: Faculty Senate

October 8, 1975

MERIT CRITERIA

CATEGORY I. TEACHING

- A. Classroom performance.....(70% of this Category)
 - 1. Preparation
 - 2. Organization
 - 3. Presentation
- B. Student-teacher relations.(20% of this Category)
 - 1. Maintenance of office hours
 - 2. Extra-classroom work, i.e., advising
 - 3. Concern for student problems, i.e. individual attention
- C. Grading practice.....(10% of this Category)
 - 1. Sufficient evaluation instruments
 - 2. Grade distribution
 - 3. Student awareness of progress

CATEGORY II. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

- A. Research and publication
 - 1. Book or monograph
 - 2. National review journal
 - 3. Regional review journal
 - 4. State review journal
 - 5. Non-review technical/professional journal
 - 6. Non-review popular
- B. Papers presented
 - 1. National
 - 2. Regional
 - 3. State
- C. Exhibits and/or performances
Relative significance to be established by appropriate departments.
- D. Continuing education, i.e., workshops, short courses, unpublished research
- E. Grant proposals
 - 1. Funded Grants
 - Major
 - Minor
 - 2. Proposals submitted but not funded

CATEGORY III. UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL, AND DEPARTMENT SERVICE

- A. Committee work
- B. Administrative assignments
- C. Professional development of students
- D. Recruiting

Attachment #3

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: W. Brophy, G. Durr, T. Franks, F. Rainwater, P. Russell

RE: Report of Committee "C" - Combination Across the Board
and Merit

The committee believes that, given the widely disparate goals of the various divisions of the university, it is not possible to design an evaluation instrument that will measure faculty merit accurately across the campus. While one school may be devoting fully half its faculty time to research, another may be involved in exporting large numbers of courses, while yet another may be committed full-time to on-campus teaching. In hopes of establishing a merit system that will reflect each school's perception of its role in relation to the university as a whole, we propose the following:

1. Each school will receive an identical percentage of its aggregate TSO salaries after adjustment of faculty numbers to account for hiring and attrition.
2. 50% of that sum should be allocated for base pay raises (across the board) and the remaining 50% should be assigned for merit raises.
 - a. The committee is opposed to a percentage of salary division for the base pay raise.
 - b. The committee is in favor of a flat dollar amount for base pay raises.
3. Each school will define merit criteria for its own faculty.
 - a. Each school will establish an ad hoc committee on merit.
 - b. There will be one member elected from each department. However, no committee will have fewer than three members.
 - c. The Dean of each school will conduct elections.
 - d. Any attempt at quantification will be at the discretion of the school.
4. Each member of the faculty will be informed in writing of the criteria for merit in his school.
5. The Department Head will use the published criteria to determine merit raise recommendations.

Respectfully submitted:

Dr. William J. Brophy	Dr. Fred Leon Rainwater
Dr. Gloria E. Durr	Dr. Patricia Read Russell
Dr. Thomas D. Franks	

P. Russell.

Three Proposed Resolutions on Insurance

1. The Faculty Senate requests that the office of the Comptroller issue annual statements to each faculty member setting out the faculty member's insurance coverages. We request that this be done early enough so that changes may be made before the October 1 paycheck.
2. Since it is already too late to have made adjustments for October 1 based on the coverage cards issued last week, the Faculty Senate requests that there be an extension of the time allowed for insurance changes this year.
 - a. The faculty protests the brief time allowed for consideration of the High-Low options on health insurance.
3. The Faculty Senate requests that the President of the University authorize the Fiscal Office to allow persons on nine month co-contracts to pay their year's health insurance premiums in nine (9) installments to be withheld from their paychecks.