

**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY**

26 September 2013

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Austin Hall

Members present:

Nancy Baker (CHSS); Helen Berg (COE); Tracy Bilsing (CHSS); Jonathan Brezeale (COBA); Don Bumpass (COBA); Donna Cox (COE); James

subject to three-year review or annual review by their department chair are faculty. Those who are exempt are administrators, as defined by this administration. (See policy #980204 Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty.)

The resolution was passed unanimously.

FES Town Halls

The Academic Affairs Committee submitted a preliminary report on the FES Town Hall

New Business:

Various hypotheses were put forward as to why Faculty Senate input on policy appears to have been ignored. Some of the hypotheses were: university-wide transition leading to chaotic and unreliable follow-through on the part of some administrators and committees; the administration lacking respect for the Faculty Senate; or a shift in focus on the part of the administration from academic concerns to growth.

The question of whether our recommendation offers enough in the way of a vision of a streamlined policy process was discussed.

A suggestion was made that perhaps Faculty Senate should ask for greater accountability in the policy process from administrators, with a specific timeline. This was discussed, and it was decided that we will discuss this with the provost when he attends our next meeting, on Oct. 10.

Faculty Affairs Committee Report

Faculty Affairs submitted a report on DELTA related issues, along with a Nov. 29, 2012 Academic Affairs Committee report on DELTA issues addressed at that time in conversation with DELTA.

On the Faculty Affairs committee's report, the list of concerns for DELTA can be broken down into two categories. Items A, B, C, D, and J relate to compensation. The rest of the items on the list deal with technical issues. Items E, F, G, H, and I are questions that seem most pertinent to ask DELTA.

One senator asked, who authorizes DELTA to download a course from a previous instructor and semester, for use by a new instructor?

Questions of commission and ownership were raised regarding online courses. The issues of who controls the copyright of an online course and how instructors are compensated (and by whom – dept. chairs? deans?) were discussed and acknowledged to be murky. Additionally, it was noted that some instructors are promised compensation that never occurs (such as course releases, etc.).

On senator pointed out that online courses involve both instructional design issues vs. content issues. The evaluation checklist that DELTA completes for each online course (before the instructor is compensated) assesses instructional design, not content. However, DELTA is responsible for design, not content. Why are online courses being evaluated by design, which is their task, not the instructor's?

We need to ask about undergraduate evaluations. It's well known in CHSS that IDEA evaluations suffer in online courses – few students fill them out. This evaluation should be eliminated or recalculated. How pervasive is this problem? (For example, do 85% of online courses suffer from less than 30% of students filling out evaluations?) To what degree is an online course's evaluation different from an in-class evaluation? Another senator suggested that we look at IDEA's resources online that address this issue.

Please forward all DELTA questions to Dr. Donna Cox.

Social Media Committee