

Meeting No. 75
9 February 1977
Stephen F. Austin State University
Faculty Senate

Absent:

Ms. Ann E. Chandler (Excused)
Mr. Joel W. Duskin (Excused)
Mr. Charles W. Logan

Ex officio Members Present:

Dr. John T. Lewis, III
Dr. Carl Keul

Visitors:

Mr. Mark Burroughs
Dr. R. G. Dean
Mr. Bill Dunn
Dr. E. Diane Ford
Dr. Bernard-thomas Hartman
Dr. James M. DiNucci
Dr. Fred Rodewald
Ms. Rhonda Straubing
Dr. Byron VanDover

1. Chairman Bourbon called Meeting No. 75 to order at 3:20 pm.
2. Minutes of Meeting No. 74 were approved as written.
3. Reports of Officers:
 - A. Chairman's Report: Dr. Bourbon discussed the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the President. Traditionally, many faculty have assumed that when issues pertaining to faculty involvement and governance were raised in the Senate, it has been in the spirit of confrontation. Although this has not always been the case, many faculty have believed it to be so. However, it is important to realize as issues are debated in the coming months that the fact that reports and recommendations are being made is not viewed by the President as an attempt at confrontation. He views this as a relevant area for faculty involvement in governance and that the Senate should debate the issues and if recommendations are made, they should originate from the Faculty Senate. As representatives of the faculty it is the responsibility of the Senate to debate policy and make recommendations to the administration. Recommendations made by the Senate are viewed by the President simply as recommendations, not confrontation. The President holds the authority to reject, to suggest amendments or change, or to accept those recommendations.

The Screening Committee for the Vice President has received over 60 applications and is busy screening them now.

The Deans Council met on 8 February and adopted a form to be used in the evaluation of department heads and administrators. The schedule for that evaluation will be established next week.
 - B. Treasurer's Report: Dr. Sartin has not received a print-out since the last meeting. The last balance was \$776.42 as of 31 December 1976.

4. Reports of Standing Committees:

- A. Student Affairs (Dr. Young): Missing minutes from 1975-76 Senate meetings have been located and report will be ready for March meeting.

There was an excellent response on the traffic questionnaire with many helpful suggestions. Report at March meeting.

- B. Faculty Government and Involvement (Dr. Dickson): Resubmitted report from Meeting No. 71 (Attachment No. 3., Meeting No. 71.) which had been tabled in Meeting No. 72 until other committees had a chance to function (report is recopied here as ATTACHMENT NO. 1.). Dr. Vincent moved and Dr. Russell seconded to accept the report. Acceptance approved.

Recommendation concerning modification of faculty evaluation forms (ATTACHMENT NO. 2.). Dr. Burr moved and Dr. Vincent seconded to receive report for action in March. Motion to receive report carried.

Returns from questionnaire asking for preferences on next years University committees: 166 responses.

- C. Academic Affairs (Dr. Vincent): Submitted report on departmental governance (ATTACHMENT NO. 3.). Dr. Beaty moved and Dr. Young seconded to receive the report for action in March. Motion to receive report carried.
- D. Ad Hoc Committee on Rank-Tenure Quotas (Dr. Lackey): Questionnaires on rank and tenure given to each senator. Senators will be responsible for distribution and collection of questionnaires from their constituency and return to Dr. Lackey.

Recommendation of promotion and tenure procedures (ATTACHMENT NO. 4.). Dr. Vincent moved and Dr. Russell seconded to receive the report for action in March. Motion to receive report carried.

5. Old Business:

Professional Welfare (Dr. Malpass): Report concerning faculty teaching loads received in January (Attachment No. 1, Meeting No. 74) presented for Senate action. Dr. Malpass moved and Dr. Vincent seconded to accept the report and its recommendations for submission to the President. Motion carried with 21 yes votes and 2 opposed.

6. New Business:

- A. Last year the Senate recommended that emeritus status be established for people retiring from the faculty. The administration now requests the Faculty Senate to recommend criteria for the granting of emeritus status. Referred to the Administration and Finance Committee (Dr. Russell). Report is needed in time for the Board of Regents meeting in April.
- B. Mr. Richardson recommended the following resolution:

"RESOLVE THAT PERMANENT FULL TIME FACULTY
AND STAFF MEMBERS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS
BE EXEMPTED FROM MANDATORY PARTICIPATION
IN STUDENT HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE WHEN
ENROLLED AS STUDENTS."

The resolution was received for consideration in March.

7. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Wednesday, 16 March at 3:15 pm. in the Aztec-Caddo room of the University Center. Because of the Spring break, the meeting will be one week later than normally scheduled.
8. Meeting No. 75 was adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted:


Kenneth G. Watterston, Secretary

MEMO TO: Faculty Senate

ATTACHMENT NO 1.
SENATE MEETING NO 75.

FROM: Faculty Government and Involvement Committee

DATE: October 5, 1976

SUBJECT: Report on current system of screening committees for deans department heads, etc.

1. The methodology of the Faculty Government and Involvement Committee was rooted in an effort to interview the members of the screening committees for selecting deans for the School of Forestry, Liberal Arts, and the Graduate School. These committees have functioned (are functioning) quite recently and afforded an opportunity to survey the impressions of persons with recent experience with respect to the roles, selection, and efficacy of faculty screening committees.

The Faculty Government and Involvement Committee members divided the members of these specific screening committees among them, spoke to as many of these persons as possible, and solicited the opinion of persons who were not on any of the current screening committees. The Faculty Government and Involvement Committee then tried to extract the apparent points of general consensus in the responses of those queried by the Committee.

2. The consensus gleaned from the separate interviews was that the present system of selection, functioning, and efficacy of dean/department head screening committees was, with its faults, about as effective as is possible. The current approach provided a reasonable balance of faculty participation and administrative decision making.

3. Beyond this general consensus, more specific suggestions were made to enhance the overall effectiveness of the screening committees.

Among the items occurring most frequently were:

- a. The screening committees should be made up exclusively of faculty members. No upper echelon administrators should be participating members of the committees.
- b. With respect to item (a), upper echelon administrators are of considerable value to the committees as resource persons and should continue as ex-officio members to be available to the committees for information essential to the committee upon request of the person chairing the committee.
- c. Workable and flexible "guidelines" should be provided the committee prior to its deliberations and consideration of applications. These criteria should not be too arbitrary or restrictive of the committee's discretion. The guidelines might distinguish between screening of on-campus and off-campus applicants.
- d. Departments should give considerable care to the selection of their departmental representatives on the screening committees. Care should be given to selecting persons who will reflect a genuine departmental consensus, rather than someone who will be primarily interested in grinding their own personal axes or achieving some unrealistic goals not in the general best interest of their department and school. These representatives should be admonished to keep their constituents informed of those parts of the committee deliberations which are not being temporarily held in confidence among the screening committee members.
- e. All future screening committees should be given adequate lead time for evaluating applicants.
- f. It is desirable that screening committees be able to meet every applicant in person. Funds should be made available to the committees for bringing off-campus applicants to the campus to meet the committees, interested administrators, and pertinent faculty members.
- g. It is imperative that at least one person from outside the particular school be included on a screening committee for selecting a new dean.
- h. The inclusion of a student representative on dean selection committees might be considered.

- i. Prior to beginning the screening process, committees should make reasonable distinctions between those parts of the committee's work which should be done in executive session and those facets which might be more open.
- j. Committees for selection of department heads should be elected by departmental faculty. In the case of small departments seeking a new head, the department might function as a committee-of-the-whole.
- k. All committees should be chaired by persons selected by the members.
- l. The committee should report out a slate of candidates with the final selection made by the administrator responsible for the direction of the department or school.

4. It should be noted that the Faculty Senate has previously received and approved a recommendation by the Senate Academic Affairs Committee concerning procedures for selecting new deans (Minutes, Meeting No. 65, February 11, 1976). The recommendation stated:

Procedure for selecting a new Dean:

- a. Consideration be given to having deans selected (graduate dean included) from the present faculty. (a number of qualified people are available, probably at upper academic and professional ranks; selection of a dean from this group would provide an additional opening in the upper two ranks.)
- b. In the selection process for the graduate dean, a selection committee be established and graduate faculty representation be included from each of the Academic Schools in the University. Responsibility would be:
 - a. To provide input on the criteria for selection.
 - b. To screen applications and to prepare a suitable list of applicants to be presented to the president.

Refer to the minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting No. 11, May 5, 1971, Appendix A. (See attachment 2)

- c. This same procedure (outlined in item 2 above) would be implemented in the selection process for academic deans for schools; faculty representation on the committee would be from departments of the school. Whether representation from the University at large be involved would be left to the discretion of the president. A motion to adopt these recommendations was approved.

ATTACHMENT NO. 2
SENATE MEETING NO. 75.

MEMO TO: Faculty Senate

MEMO FROM: Faculty Government and Involvement Committee
Faculty Senate

DATE: February 3, 1977

SUBJECT: Recommendation concerning modification of current forms for
faculty evaluation by administration.

1. The responses of faculty members concerning the forms used during this past school year for administrative evaluation of faculty showed the following items as the most common features of the responses:
 - a. Forms should be made clearer, with less ambiguous or uncertain terminology.
 - b. Care should be taken to eliminate bias as much as possible in the criteria and their application to faculty.
 - c. Administrative evaluation should be complemented with student, peer, and self-evaluations.
 - d. Forms should also encompass work done in summers.
 - e. Faculty should be evaluated on some sort of absolute scale, applied only to themselves, and not in any sort of competition with fellow faculty members.
2. In Faculty Senate Meeting No. 73, December 8, 1976, the Faculty Senate was informed of a letter, dated December 8, 1976, which Faculty Senate Chairman Tom Bourbon received from President William R. Johnson. Dr. Johnson notified Dr. Bourbon that he approved of Faculty Senate recommendations on merit criteria for faculty evaluation, with specific changes he had made.
3. The Faculty Government and Involvement Committee recommends that ensuing modifications in the faculty evaluation forms be made to comport with the statement of merit criteria for faculty evaluation contained in Attachment No. 1, Faculty Senate Meeting No. 73, December 8, 1976.

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Affairs Committee
Malpass, Chandler, Snyder, Jeffrey, Lackey, and Vincent, Chairman

SUBJ: Departmental governance: report and recommendations

DATE: February 9, 1977

The following summary is based on responses contained in 225 questionnaires returned from the faculty by January 31. This response (57% of 395) is considered by the committee to be more than sufficient to provide an accurate gauge of faculty preferences on the various aspects of departmental governance.

The title most preferred by the faculty for departmental leaders is "chairman" (41%) with an additional 17% opting for "chairperson". It should be pointed out that neither title carries with it the implication of rotation of office, an aspect of concern to some faculty. Thirty-five percent of the respondents favored the title of "head".

For the selection procedure, 37 percent preferred election by the department while 37 percent favored administrative appointment from two or more candidates selected by the department. Nineteen percent preferred administrative confirmation of a candidate selected by a departmental committee. No clear cut choice is apparent except for the strong preference for a great deal of faculty involvement in the selection process. Most faculty believe that it makes little difference as to whether or not the department leader comes from within the department. It would probably be safe to assume that the feeling is for getting the best person no matter where he/she comes from.

As to whether or not a department leader should have a set term of office, faculty opinion was deadlocked at 49% for each side of the question. Of those who favored a set term, most favored either a 3 year or 5 year term and by a wide margin indicated that a leader should be allowed to serve 2 or more consecutive terms. Half of the respondents indicated that department leaders should be considered primarily administrators by both faculty and administration. Thirty-five percent felt that they should be considered faculty while the balance preferred to think of them as both faculty and administration.

According to 93% of those who returned the questionnaire, department leaders should be evaluated by their faculties and most preferably every year or every other year. Fifty-six percent favored a system in which the faculty took on greater responsibility for the operation of the department while 38% did not. Moreover, 96% felt that departmental policy should be based on input from the faculty in the form of consulting with the leader, participating directly with the leader, or providing recommendations from the faculty as a whole or a representative committee.

The question asking for those areas in which a department leader should be required to follow faculty recommendations produced the following results: promotion (35%), tenure (37%), salary increases (28%), appointment and termination (39%), budget (39%), curriculum (66%), scheduling (53%), and summer teaching assignments (43%). The following standing committees are listed with percentage figures indicating the proportion of respondents who felt that these committees should be operating within departments: executive (advisory) (72%), evaluation for promotion and tenure (51%), graduate (64%), scheduling (48%), planning (59%), and curriculum (76%).

In summary, the opinions and preferences expressed by our faculty on the questionnaire are, for the most part, in line with the most commonly occurring forms of departmental governance as revealed on our national survey (memo of 6 December, 1976.)

On the basis of input from our faculty and information gleaned from the national survey, the Academic Affairs Committee makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation I

Department leaders shall have the title of "chairman"

Recommendation II

Selection of department chairman

A. A department may use either of the following optional procedures for the selection of its chairman. The option to be employed will be decided by majority vote of the departmental faculty.

1. The department will operate as a screening committee of the whole and recommend to the dean of the school, for appointment, the names of those candidates who are acceptable to 2/3 of the departmental faculty

or

2. The department will elect by majority vote 5 faculty members to serve as a screening committee. The department will determine the evaluation criteria to be used by the committee and the number of candidates that the committee is to present to the department for consideration. No more than 2 faculty members of the same rank may serve on the committee and any candidate for the position of department chairman will be ineligible to serve on the committee. The chairman of the screening committee will be appointed by the dean of the school from the membership of the committee. From the candidates presented by the screening committee, the department will recommend to the dean of the school, for appointment, the names of those candidates who are acceptable to 2/3 of the departmental faculty

B. In the event that the dean of the school rejects those candidates recommended by the department, the department may select other candidates who are acceptable to 2/3 of the departmental faculty, or on a 2/3 majority vote, appeal the decision of the dean to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

C. In the event that the department is unable to recommend any candidates who are acceptable to 2/3 of the faculty, the dean of the school shall appoint a faculty member of the department to serve as an acting chairman for a period not to exceed one academic year.

Recommendation III

Term of office and review

- A. A departmental chairman is appointed to serve a term of unspecified duration subject to review every 3 years during his/her period of service.
- B. During the semester of the third anniversary of his/her appointment and every 3 years hence, the department chairman shall undergo a review administered by the dean of the school. A review shall include an evaluation and statement of confidence by the departmental faculty.
- C. A review of the department chairman may be called for at any time by the department chairman, the dean of the school, or the written request of more than 1/3 of the departmental faculty.
- D. Should the review indicate that the performance of the chairman is not acceptable to 2/3 of the departmental faculty, the dean of the school may initiate procedures for the selection of a new chairman, or grant the chairman an extension of service not to exceed one academic year at which time another review shall be conducted.
- E. In the event that the dean of the school should relieve a chairman of his/her duties the department may select a new chairman or on a 2/3 majority vote appeal the dean's decision to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

Recommendation IV

Duties and Responsibilities: The chairman as the chief executive officer shall represent the faculty of the department to the administration and shall be responsible for the communication and execution of University and school policies insofar as they concern the department. More specifically, the chairman shall be responsible, with the counsel and advice of his/her faculty, either directly or through committees, for:

- A. Recruiting new faculty and non-academic personnel
- B. Evaluating departmental members for retention or termination
- C. Recommending promotion and tenure
- D. Preparing and administering the departmental budget
- E. Preparing catalog materials, schedules of courses, and teaching assignments of departmental faculty

F. Developing departmental curriculum

- G. Encouraging faculty members in his/her department to improve themselves professionally through study, research, and participation in professional activities
- H. Maintaining and improving the quality of instruction and academic advisement
- I. Convening departmental meetings on a regular basis, but not less than three times per fall and per spring semester
- J. Overseeing and reviewing long-range departmental goals and objectives
- K. Maintaining departmental files, records, equipment, etc.
- L. Evaluating and improving the selection process, advisement procedures, instructional program, research activities and administrative activities of the graduate program, and formulating plans for its future development.

The chairmen are facilitators. Much of their effort should be expended in making it possible for the faculty and staff in the departments to function as professionals. The degree of success will depend upon the ability of the department chairman to obtain the support of both the faculty and the administration in the endeavors of the departments.

The Senate Ad Hoc Committee recommendation concerning procedures for promotion and tenure:

Procedure for Promotion and Tenure

1. Nomination or application for promotion or tenure may be initiated by any faculty member or department head. All applicants should submit any supporting materials, including a current vita, and any other information the faculty member wishes to include in support of his application.
2. (a) All applications for promotion received at the department level will be evaluated by a departmental committee comprised of faculty from all academic ranks higher than that of the applicant and who are not being considered for promotion. A department may elect to include one faculty member from faculty outside of the school in which the department is housed.

(b) All applications for tenure received at the department level will be evaluated by a departmental committee comprised of faculty who are tenured. A department may elect to include one committee member from outside the school in which the department is housed.
3. Committee recommendations for all applicants who have been evaluated by the departmental committee, along with the recommendation of the department head, will be submitted to the dean of the school.
4. All applicants will be reviewed by a School Promotion and Tenure committee consisting of tenured faculty from the upper two academic ranks who are not being considered for promotion. The committee may elect to include one committee member from faculty outside the school.
5. School committee recommendations for all applicants who have been evaluated by the committee, along with the recommendation of the school dean will be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
6. All applicants will be reviewed by a University Promotion and Tenure committee consisting of a tenured faculty member, from each of the schools in the University, who is not being considered for promotion.
7. Recommendations of the University committee shall be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.