

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
February 17, 2011

Members Present:

Tracy Bilsing (CHSS), Len Breen (CoE), Donald Bumpass (CoBA), Rebecca Bustamente (CoE), Erin Cassidy (NGL), Jeff Crane (CHSS), Donna Desforges (CHSS), Mark Frank (CoBA), Debbi Hatton (CHSS), Renee James (CoAS), Bill Jasper (CoAS), Gerald Kohers (CoBA), Paul Loeffler (CoAS), Drew Lopenzina (CHSS), Sheryl Murphy-Manley (CoAS), Dwayne Pavelock (CoAS), Ling Ren (CoCJ), Doug Ullrich (CoAS), Ricky White (CoAS).

Members Not Present:

Carl Brewer (CoBA), Chad Hargrave (CoAS), Hee-Jong Joo (CoCJ), Joyce Mc Cauley (CoE), Sheryl Serres (CoE), Tracy Steele (CHSS).

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 by Senate Chair Frank.

Minutes Approved:

Motion to approve minutes from February 3, 2011 passed unanimously.

Chair's Report:

Meetings with Pr

- 7) SHSU has ten programs identified as Low-Producing (LPP.) The university has sent justification to THCB on the programs. Hopefully the explanations will be sufficient to retain the programs.
- 8) The decision to move exclusively to eCollege has been made. The transition from Blackboard to eCollege will take place over four to five semesters. The colleges have been asked to volunteer for the transition order. The College of CJ will go first followed by COBA.
- 9) Bill Angrove has no problem

2. Chairs Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Effectiveness (AP 820317)

Background: Campus faculty members voiced concern that the student evaluations score from the IDEA system is being overly relied upon by some department chairs in their FES teaching score. Under the Faculty Evaluation System, as described by AP 820317, a detailed list of possible evaluation components is provided to department chairs under Section 2.0 of the policy.

Recommendation: A letter should be sent to all department chairs from CAD reminding them of APS 820317, which was revised on September 23, 2009, and asking them to base their evaluations of teaching effectiveness on factors other than just IDEA student Evaluations.

Outcome: The Senate voted to discuss the concerns with Provost Payne before moving forward with the recommendation.

3. Pre-drop Evaluations for On-line Courses

Background: Concerns have been raised that students who drop an online course prior to the designated drop date are still allowed to evaluate the professor under the IDEA system as long as the evaluation was done before the drop date. Questions have arisen as whether these evaluations should be considered reliable in the final review. If not, could the rating be dropped from the system?

Recommendation: The Academic Affairs Committee discussed this concern, but decided not to take action on this item unless more information was provided. Since the IDEA student evaluations were anonymous, how could they be removed from the system after a student drops a class? Additionally, this concern extends to faculty teaching courses in the classroom because students are allowed to drop the course up until the final, while, IDEA forms are distributed earlier in the semester.

Outcome: The Senate agreed that this is a sensitive issue that should be addressed with Bill Angrove and Rita Caso. Chair Frank will inquire about the concerns (?)

4. Problems with Scholarship Applications and Scholar X

Background: Faculty members have expressed concern about the administration of Scholar X, scholarship applications, and faculty recommendations forms. Below is a partial list of issues that need to be addressed:

- a. The faculty form used to evaluate scholarship application asks about the patriotism of the application. Our initial impression was that this item should be deleted from the evaluation form.
- b. Instances were noted when data was keyed into the system incorrectly. We will investigate whether this was human error, or a computer problem.

c. Sometimes it is hard to get an accurate list of eligible students for a given scholarship. When a list is provided, there are errors on it, such as academic Major, contact information, etc. In at least one case, a student was told they received a scholarship, only to find out later that they were not eligible.

d. Students apply for a scholarship, and then do not receive feedback so they are not sure they are being considered for scholarships.

e. Faculty members request information from the scholarship office, and calls are not returned in a timely manner.

Recommendation: