

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate
Meeting No. 83
January 18, 1978

1. Chairman Vincent called the meeting to order at 2:20 P.M.
2. After the roll call, the Minutes of Meeting No. 82 were amended by deleting the word "computer" from 3. A. 4, page 1; the Senate then approved the amended Minutes.
3. Reports of Officers:
Chairman's Report:
 - A. Chairman Vincent welcomed Dr. Robert L. Blocker, Mr. Joel Duskin's replacement from the School of Fine Arts, to the Senate.
 - B. The Chairman reported on the two Deans Council meetings held since the last session of the Senate. At the December 19th meeting, the Council approved a stipend increase for Graduate Assistants from \$3,300 to \$3,600 for nine months. At the January 17th meeting, the Council appointed a Commencement Committee, headed by Dr. Neal Houston, and endorsed the recommendations from the Conference Committee on Departmental Governance.
 - C. Chairman Vincent reported that Mr. Harris, Director of Health and Hospital Services, explained that Clinic policy is to issue an excuse slip to a student if he is examined and found to be ill; if he is not ill, no excuse slip is given. Mr. Harris will change the wording in the Handbook to clarify this policy.
 - D. The Chairman announced that the Board of Regents approved the interim policies on determining academic workloads and small classes, which were explained to the Senate by Dr. Franklin in October. A copy of these policies has been attached to the latest Faculty Bulletin.
4. Committee Reports:

Mr. Snyder, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee for Evaluation of Academic Administrators, presented his report to the Senate. (See ATTACHMENT #1, sent under separate cover.) Dr. Blocker moved and Dr. Sartin seconded the motion to accept the report. MOTION PASSED. An open hearing on this report, designated Senate Bill #83-1, will be held on Wednesday, January 25, 1978, at 3 P.M. in Science 135.
5. Old Business:
 - A. The Liberal Arts Council sent a letter to the Senate (ATTACHMENT #2) requesting that two parts of the Policy on Merit Criteria be amended.

5. A. Dr. Vincent presented the recommendations of the Executive Committee on the request: i.e., that item 1, a proposed amendment to statement 5 of the Recommendations for Merit Raises, not be accepted; that item 2, a proposed amendment to statement number 7 of the same document, be accepted. Dr. Irwin moved and Mr. Snyder seconded the motion that both recommendations of the Executive Committee be accepted. MOTION PASSED.
- B. At this time the Senate discussed the report of the Conference Committee, "Proposed Faculty Governance Policy." Dean James Reese, Dr. Larry Pollock, and Dr. David Jeffrey, members of the Committee present at the meeting, answered the Senators' questions on intent and meaning of the document.

Dr. Blocker moved and Dr. Lackey seconded the motion that the Faculty Senate endorse the document, "Proposed Faculty Governance Policy." MOTION PASSED.

The Senators suggested some editorial changes in the document (see ATTACHMENT #3). In addition, the Faculty Senate approved the following motions in regard to the document:

1. Mr. Snyder moved and Dr. Burr seconded the motion to strike section 1 under Recommendation VI. MOTION PASSED.
2. Dr. Blocker moved and Dr. Rodewald seconded the motion to strike section 7 under Recommendation IV. MOTION PASSED.
3. Dr. Burr moved and Dr. Pollock seconded the motion that before the final document is written, it be turned over to a competent member of the English faculty to put it into terse, precise language. MOTION PASSED.
4. Dr. Malpass moved and Dr. Johnson seconded the motion that the Faculty Senate request the Administration to circulate the "Proposed Faculty Governance Policy" recommended by the Conference Committee with the Minutes of Senate Meeting No. 83 so that the faculty may understand what the discussion was about. MOTION PASSED.

Dr. Malpass thanked the members of the Conference Committee for reporting back to the Senate. Chairman Vincent commended Dr. Pollock and Dr. Jeffrey for the long hours and effort which they put into the formulation of the document.

6. Dr. Leslie Thompson moved and Dr. Lackey seconded the motion that the meeting be adjourned. MOTION PASSED and the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

7. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be February 8, 1978, at 2:15 P.M. in the Aztec-Caddo room of the University Center.

Visitors:

Dr. H. Weyland
Dr. Roy Cain
Dr. Carroll Schoenewolf
Dr. Patricia Russell
Dr. James Magruder
Dr. Kirby Duncan
Mr. Al Cage
Dr. W. T. Bourbon
Mr. David Howard
Mr. George Cooper
Dr. R. G. Dean
Dr. Ken Watterston

Absentees:

Mr. Charles Logan (Excused--I11)
Dr. Beverly Young (Excused--I11)

Ex Officio Members Present:

Dr. James Reese

Fred A. Rodewald
Secretary, 1977-78 Senate

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: The Liberal Arts Council
DATE: December 5, 1977



The Liberal Arts Council requests that the Faculty Senate ammend statement 5 of the Faculty Senate Recommendations for Merit Raises to read as follows:

In the MERIT CRITERIA Category "I. Teaching" is divided into sub-categories in order of relative importance. Within these subcategories specific criteria are listed. Based upon these specific criteria, each sub-category (A, B, and C) is to be judged by the Head of the Department on a four level basis: A--Outstanding, B--Satisfactory, C--Needs Improvement, and D--Unacceptable.

[The original statement says: In the MERIT CRITERIA Category "I. Teaching" is divided into sub-categories in order of relative importance. Within these sub-categories specific criteria are listed, each to be judged by the Head of the Department on a four level basis: A--Outstanding, B--Satisfactory, C--Needs Improvement, and D--Unacceptable.]

We also request that statement number 7 be ammended to read as follows:

In the MERIT CRITERIA Category "III. School and Department Service" the specific merit should include consideration of the amount of time devoted to any of the sub-categories in "III. School and Departmental Service."

[The original statement says: In the MERIT CRITERIA Category "III. School and Departmental Service" the specific merit should be determined by the amount of time devoted to any of the sub-categories in "III. School and Departmental Service."]

The reason we request the change in number 5 is that we believe that following the original recommendation and rating a faculty member on each of the criteria listed would force Department Heads to make judgments in areas in which they do not have adequate information to make an evaluation, as for example in Criteria A,1,a (Class preparation) and C,3 student awareness of progress. We also believe that as ammended, the recommendations could be followed with a form that is more flexible than one determined by the recommendations as they now stand.

SUGGESTIONS FOR EDITORIAL CHANGES IN THE DOCUMENT
"PROPOSED FACULTY GOVERNANCE POLICY"

Re RECOMMENDATION II. Philosophical Statement

In paragraph two, line three, delete "ongoing" or replace with "current."

Re RECOMMENDATION III. Major Responsibilities

In paragraph one: correct spelling of "conducive"; change last sentence to read, "policies and events which affect departmental policy."

In paragraph two: change the first part of sentence one to read, "The decisions of the Chairman should be made"; delete "ongoing" in sentence one; in line four, replace "or" with "and/or"; delete "informal consultations" in line six; replace "professional status" with "professional interests." Rewrite paragraph two to read: "Decisions reached by the Chairman should promote sound academic and administrative policy. The departmental faculty should be informed of all such decisions. The Chairman should hold regular departmental meetings and should seek the advice of his faculty on all matters of departmental policy."

In paragraph three: (4). Change to read, "Evaluation and development of programs and curriculum" in order to be consistent in style. (7). Delete "The" at the beginning of the sentence for the same reason. (8). Delete "an" and add "procedures" to the end of the sentence.

Re RECOMMENDATION IV. Selection

1. Should use active voice. Replace "prejudice" in line three with "regard." Revise to read: "A Search and Screen Committee will be used in all searches for departmental Chairmen. Each search will be open and without prejudice for inside or outside candidates."

3. Sentence two should indicate that all committees shall consist of an odd number of members.

4. Add "from the departmental faculty" to the end of the statement. Alternately, the last sentence might read, "The majority shall consist entirely of departmental faculty members except in those cases in which the department consists of fewer than four members."

5. Delete "Normally"; change "should" to "will" in sentence two and "should" to "shall" in the last line; change "impracticable" to "impossible."

7. Define "appropriate academic administrative experience."

8. Rewrite the first part of the sentence to read: "The Dean will convene the committee" deleting "appoint a committee chairman pro-tem for the purpose of convening."

9. Delete the first period and change the next word from "They" to "who."

10. Delete the last three words of the sentence.

12. Insert "may" between "who" and "have" in the second line of sentence one.

Re RECOMMENDATION V. Term of Office

Change "period" to "term" or "term of office."

Re RECOMMENDATION VI. Evaluation

Add "of Chairman" to title.

1. Revise to read: "The faculty, chairmen, and deans must be constantly aware of the quality of the academic and administrative activities of their departments and should communicate their concern when departments do not meet high standards of performance."

2. Revise sentence one to read: "In order to strengthen evaluation of departmental operations, the department Chairman will be evaluated annually by the Dean of the school. A written report of the Chairman's performance will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs." Sentences three, four, and five should be reduced to: "When the Dean begins the process of the annual evaluation of the Chairman, all evidence bearing on the Chairman's performance must be weighed carefully. If this evidence reveals" In this paragraph, evaluation is referred to as "full-scale" but as "confidential" in paragraphs (3) and (4); a consistent adjective should be used.

(In general, Recommendations III, IV, and VI should use the active voice rather than the passive to clarify who it is that takes a particular action.)

PROPOSED
FACULTY GOVERNANCE POLICY

RECOMMENDATION I. The title of the chief administrator of academic departments shall be Chairman.

RECOMMENDATION II. Philosophical Statement

The chairmen of academic departments occupy unique positions in the University. They are the chief executives of the departments, responsible for the implementation of department, school and university policy, and frequent participants in policy formation. Thus, they are administrators, the quality of whose performance has fundamental impact on the success of the institution in attaining its specific goals.

Simultaneously, the chairmen of departments are faculty members who are expected to exemplify those faculty qualities most valued by the academic community: teaching excellence, ongoing scholarly and creative activities, and a commitment to university and community service.

RECOMMENDATION III. Major Responsibilities

The primary responsibility of the Chairman is to establish and maintain within the department efficient and open operations which create a climate conducive to the pursuit of knowledge. The Chairman should provide leadership and direction to the department. The Chairman should serve as the chief advocate for the department both within and without the University and effectively communicate to the faculty and students those policies and developments which impact on the functioning of the department.

The decisions the chairmen reach relative to their responsibilities should be made and implemented in the context of collegiality and ongoing communication with the departmental faculty. Such communication includes both the institutional forms required or allowed by university policies (such as regular departmental meetings or established committee systems) and informal consultations seeking the counsel and advice of the faculty on matters which affect academic programs or the professional status of the faculty.

More specifically, the administrative responsibilities of a department chairman include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Recruitment of faculty and support staff
2. Evaluation of departmental members for retention/termination, tenure, promotion, and merit raises
3. Preparation and administration of the department budget
4. Program and curriculum evaluation and development
5. Encouragement of the professional growth of faculty and staff

6. Preparation of catalog materials, schedules of classes, and teaching and collateral assignments of departmental faculty/staff
7. The development and supervision of an effective student advising system
8. Maintenance of an effective and efficient departmental office

RECOMMENDATION IV. Selection

1. A Search and Screen Committee will be used in every Departmental Chairman search which will begin with the assumption that it will be open, without prejudice for inside or outside candidates. Should considerations indicate that a fully open search may not be a viable choice, a decision limiting the scope of the search should be made prior to the selection of the Committee. Such a decision will not be made without consultation with the departmental faculty.

2. The Committee will be constituted by the Dean of the School on consultation with the faculty of the Department and on concurrence by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President.

3. The Committee shall have at least five members. Larger membership will depend on the size of the Department and the complexity of its programs.

4. Once the size of the Committee has been established, the Department shall elect its specified number of representatives to the committee. Faculty members eligible to vote will be those on full-time contract with the University who hold faculty rank in the Department. In all cases the faculty shall elect a majority of the Committee.

5. Normally every Search and Screen Committee will have representation from outside the Department. No more than one-third of the Committee should be from outside the Department, except in those cases where the small size of the Department or other major considerations make this provision impracticable. While outside representatives will ordinarily be appointed, they may be elected by the departmental faculty if it seems appropriate or proves necessary to meet the provision that a majority of the Committee should be elected by the departmental faculty.

6. The Dean, after consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the departmental faculty, shall then fill the other positions on the Committee, from within and/or without the Department, with a view toward creating a balanced committee which can best represent the interests of the Department, School, and University.

7. Toward the goal of increasing the ability of the Committee to focus on the administrative capabilities of the candidates, at least one member of the Committee should be an individual with appropriate academic administrative experience.

8. The Dean will appoint a committee chairman pro-tem for the purpose of convening the Committee for its organizational meeting; at this time the Committee will elect its chairman and other officers.

9. The initial report of the Committee must include multiple candidates and will be submitted to the President via the Dean of the School and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. They will append their recommendations to those of the Committee.

10. Substantial disagreement among recommendations will be sufficient grounds for the President to direct the Committee to continue the search at any juncture.

11. Ordinarily, at least three candidates, recommended by the Committee, will be interviewed on campus. The itinerary for the interviews will provide ample opportunity for the candidates to meet departmental faculty, students, the Dean of the School, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the Search and Screen Committee.

12. After the interviews, the Dean shall invite comments from all departmental faculty and those students who have been involved in the process relative to the acceptability of various candidates. A summary of these comments should be forwarded, along with the Dean's recommendation and the final recommendation of the Committee, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

13. Official appointment requires the approval of the Board of Regents.

RECOMMENDATION V. Term of Office

The Department Chairman is appointed by the President of the University for an unspecified period.

RECOMMENDATION VI. Evaluation

1. The faculty, chairmen, and deans have the responsibility to be continually alert to the quality of the academic and administrative activities of their departments and to communicate concerns which mitigate against departments meeting their teaching, scholarly, and service obligations.

2. To the end of strengthening this process of on-going evaluation of departmental operations, the Department Chairman will be evaluated by the Dean of the School annually in terms of the major academic and administrative responsibilities of the office. A written evaluative report of the chairman's performance will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. When the Dean begins the process of the annual evaluation of the Chairman, consideration should be given to all aspects of the chairman's performance. Comments which may have been received relative to the chairman's performance and the advisability of retention should be

carefully weighed. If these comments reveal serious problems in the Department or that a majority of the faculty of the Department desire a full-scale evaluation, the Dean will consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and determine whether such an evaluation of the Chairman will take place. The Dean will report to those faculty members who expressed the initial concern the nature of his decision.

In this, as in the case of all administrative decisions, faculty members, as individuals or as a group, have the right to appeal formally this decision to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and then to the President.

3. At least once every three years the Dean will initiate a collateral, confidential evaluation of the Department Chairman's performance by the faculty of the Department. The instrument used in this formal evaluation shall request each faculty member to provide a recommendation on the continuance of the Chairman.

4. Confidential evaluations of a Department Chairman's performance by the faculty may be initiated at any time at the call of the Chairman, Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs, or President.

5. The Dean of the School will review with the Departmental Chairmen the results of the annual administrative evaluation and any evaluation by the faculty. After this review the report of the evaluation with recommendations based thereon will be submitted by the Dean of the School to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Following this, the Dean of the School will meet with the Department for a report on the evaluation.

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Elizabeth Wallace *EW*
Library Representative
SUBJECT: Senate Bill 83-1
DATE: February 8, 1978

After discussions with the Library Academic Advisory Council and with Mr. Cage, Director of Libraries, I would like to recommend that Senate Bill #83-1 be amended to include the evaluation of the Director of Libraries.

The following amendments are proposed:

- RECOMMENDATION I: A. The Academic Dean of each school and the Director of Libraries shall be evaluated once every three years.
- B. The evaluation of each Dean shall be made in the year following the evaluation of the departmental Chairmen in that Dean's school. No Dean of a school shall be evaluated until he or she has been in office for two years.
- C. The Dean of the Graduate School and the Director of Libraries shall be evaluated every three years beginning with the third anniversary of his or her appointment.

- RECOMMENDATION II: B. (1) c. The other Academic Deans of schools and the Director of Libraries.
- (2) The Dean of the Graduate School shall be evaluated by all members of the Graduate Faculty including the departmental Chairmen, the Deans of the schools, and the Director of Libraries.
- (3) The Director of Libraries shall be evaluated by the library faculty, the Associate Directors of the Library, and the Deans of the schools.

The evaluations of the Deans and the Director of Libraries, as indicated above, will be reviewed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. He will then prepare his own evaluation which, along with the evaluations from all other parties involved, will be given to the President of the University for consideration. The President and the Vice-President shall consult with each Dean and the Director of Libraries in regard to his or her evaluation.

- RECOMMENDATION III: Evaluation forms for the Deans and the Director of Libraries referred to in Recommendations I and II above shall be designed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs with the assistance of the Faculty Senate.

RECOMMENDATION IV: A School Council may supplement the evaluation form to be used for all School Deans with questions appropriate to that specific School. The Library Council may supplement the evaluation form to be used for the Director of Libraries with questions appropriate to the library.

RECOMMENDATION V: Each academic year the President and the Vice-President shall counsel with each Academic Dean and the Director of Libraries in regard to his or her performance in the past year.