Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
Lamar University  
October 5, 2016  
Mary and John Gray Library, Spindletop Room 8th floor

Presiding: Sarah Tusa


Call to Order: 3:30 p.m.

Guest Speaker-Dr. Kevin Dodson, Dean of the Reaud Honors College
- Each attending Senator received a copy of the Honor College Student handbook which was designed to help students and faculty be able to negotiate through the Honors academic requirements.
- The handbook contains the Honors Contract that faculty working with these students need to complete and submit.
- Dr. Dodson would like to add all Interdisciplinary Honor Societies to the list currently in the handbook. Please let him know as soon as possible about your individual disciplines honors societies.
- The Honor College has moved to the first floor of the new administration building.
- Two classrooms are available for Honors courses to be held.
- The public grand opening of the new administration building will be Friday November 11, 2016.
- Great Plains Collegiate Honors Conference will be help here at Lamar University in the spring from March 31-April 2, 2017. More information to follow.
- If you would be interested in developing a seminar (1 hour) or topics (3 hour) honors course, contact Dr. Dodson with the information. The Honors College is looking for creative ways to engage honors students (think outside the box), something both faculty and students can have fun in the courses.
- There are currently 355 students enrolled in the Honors College. GPA must be at least a 3.4 for entry into the college.
- If you have any students who are excelling in your courses, please refer them to Dr. Dodson for early entry into the Honors College to get them on track for Graduation as possible Magna, Suma, and Cum Laude Honors.

Approval of Minutes from September 7, 2016 meeting:
- Purnendu Mandal was reported as absent and wishes to have his name removed as he had not been appointed to serve on Senate until after that meeting occurred.
  - Valentin Andreev moved to approve with the correction
  - Vivek Natarajan seconded the motion
  - Minutes approved by acclamation
Faculty Senate President’s Report:

- Dr. John Bello-Ogunu, VP Diversity and Inclusion will be the guest speaker in November.
- Sarah will be out of town on November 2, 2016. Vivek Natarajan will preside on that day.
- The Texas Council of Faculty Senates (TCFS) Meeting will be held late October. Sarah and Mavis will be attending. Sarah asked that if anyone has any questions that they would like to see taken to the Council, please let Sarah and/or Mavis know as soon as possible.
- Vivek and Sarah met with Dr. Kevin Smith last week to discuss the parts of the SACS report that Senate is responsible for.
- Sarah and Vivek will meet with Dr. Tony Martin next week. We also need to get data from Greg Marsh. Senate members will be asked to give their input at a future time.
- Sarah acknowledged a suggestion from the Faculty Issues Committee that better committee continuity is needed in the future. Committees have raised issues about dealing with concerns only to discover the concern had already been dealt with or that concerns that needed follow-up were not conveyed to the new committee and issues remain unresolved. Sarah asked all Committee chairs to consider formulating a report at the end of the year focusing on what the committee has accomplished and still needs to accomplish so it can be forwarded to the committee next year for better follow-up and thereby improve continuity.

Faculty Senate Committee Chair Reports:

- **Academic Issues-Melissa Riley**
  - No committee report
  - The next meeting for the committee will be next Wednesday 10-12-16 Room and time to be sent out soon.
  - The committee will be looking into Procter U issues.
- **Budget and Compensation: Rick Carter**
  - The committee met on 9-28-16. The committee determined that they could not do much without having some specific issues to deal with. It was opened up to the full Senate for possible issues that need to be addressed. Please let Rick know as soon as possible if there are specific questions regarding the budget and compensation.
- **Faculty Issues: Jennifer Daniel**
  - Parker room 205 has been reserved for all future meetings of the committee.
  - The committee is scheduled to meet next Wednesday 10-12-16 in Parker room 205 at 3:30 pm.
  - Minnie Piper award is a priority. Jennifer is still having difficulty with securing an appointment with Dr. Kevin Smith. Jennifer will continue to follow-up.
- **Research and Development: Cheng-Hsien Lin**
  - Has 12 members on the committee. First meeting to briefly follow the Senate Meeting today.
  - Packets requesting Developmental Leave are due by Friday November 4, 2016 to Sarah Tusa.
  - Cheng-Hsien is still trying to find out from Dr. Marquart as to how much funding is available from unused leave in last year’s account. It was suggested that he contact Carol Lindsay his administrative assistant to secure a date and time for the meeting.
  - Cheng-Hsien also pointed out that some previous applications asked for sporadic leaves of 2-3 weeks at a time as opposed to full semester or year. Anything in concert with Fulbright awards are usually for one full year of leave time.
- **F2.08 Task Force: Nicki Michalski**
  - Recommendations by the F2.08 Task Force can be found in Appendix A. Please review and send any comments or questions to Nicki as soon as possible.
  - Will need to look at compliance issues in the future with the recommendations.
- **Faculty Salary Equity: James Slaydon**
Funding for CUPA data has been approved. We are comparable to 48 other schools in the TSUS System. Greg Marsh is currently working on the invoice.

Dr. Marquart wants the committee to look at other University or Systems comparable to LU for their guidelines in order to develop a feasible procedure for salary market equity increases.

No meeting has been scheduled at this time.

**Distinguished Faculty Lecturer: Jennifer Ravey**

Dr. Julia Fischer was selected as the Faculty Distinguished Lecturer for 2016. Her presentation will be on **Tuesday October 18, 2016 at 7:00 pm** entitled “Raiders of the Lost Art: the Monuments, Men and their Legacy,” in the Lamar University Theatre. Posters are available and there is a pdf format that will be mailed out to put on electronic bulletin boards. See Appendix B for .pdf the poster.

Please post posters in every department, but be sure to ask permission from the department before doing so to get their approval.

The committee will meet next Wednesday 10-12-16 at 3:30

**Old Business:** None

**New Business:**

- James Slaydon brought up that faculty computer usage is being monitored and reports are being sent to department chairs including the fact that weekend and after hours log on information is being trended. He felt everyone needed to be aware of this.

- Rick Carter announced that Dr. Scott Powers from the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida will be speaking on Exercise and Medicine at 11:30 AM in the John Gray Center Conference Auditorium on October 10, 2016. Dr. Powers holds a dual Doctorate, Works with the National Institutes of Health and in currently involved in three grants at present.
  - Presentation was cancelled on 10-6-16 due to Hurricane Matthew passing over Florida.

- Vivek asked for more volunteers to work with he and Sarah on the SACS self-study report portion relegated to Faculty Senate. Nicki Michalski and Jennifer Daniel were asked to join the team.

**Adjournment:**

- Vivek motioned to adjourn.
- Seconded by Valentin.
- Approved by acclamation at 4:10 PM.

Respectfully Submitted:
Dr. Judy Smith
Appendix A
F 2.08 Recommendations
Recommendations from the F2.08 revision task force

In the effort to clarify the faculty evaluation process and render it more accurate and useful to both faculty and the administration, the F2.08 revision task force makes the following suggestions:

- Each department or academic unit needs to review and revise their standards.
  - There need to be separate standards for tenure-track faculty and instructors. If there are teaching, clinical and/or research faculty in the department, each group needs its own standards.
  - The standards should be reviewed on a five year basis and revised as needed.
  - Standards need to be explicit so that committee members from other disciplines can apply them. The task force’s specific recommendations regarding methods for structuring evaluations are contained in Appendix A.

- The form needs to be revised.
  - The publication section should include a space at the bottom to indicate how many publications are required to achieve tenure and how many the faculty member has accrued toward that number. This will clarify the goal for the junior faculty member and assist those who are annually reviewing that person in determining if appropriate progress is being made.
  - The review by the departmental F2.08 review committee needs to be removed from the Appendix section and made part of the main form. As it currently exists, many departments do not use it or even realize it is there.

- Each department needs to establish a F2.08 review committee for the purpose of participating in the evaluation process.
  - In smaller departments (7 or fewer tenured faculty), the committee will be comprised of all tenured faculty other than the chair.
  - In larger departments, the F2.08 review committee responsibilities may rotate among a subcommittee on which all tenured faculty members will serve on a rotating basis. This way, each tenured member will evaluate all junior faculty members at several points in their tenure track process.
  - The formal deadline for review needs to be adjusted by at least one week to integrate the departmental F2.08 review committee’s feedback into the document. The signature of the committee chair needs to be added to the front of the form. The feedback from the committee will be included in the form, in each area, before the chair’s comment section. This allows the chair to read and integrate the committee’s feedback before making his/her own comments and numeric assignment of merit standards.

- Post-tenure review is also included in the appendix of the form. However, many departments are not using this section. The F2.08 review committee will also be tasked with completing a post-tenure review on each faculty
member who is due for review that year (each department determines their timeline which can range from annually to every 6 years). In the post-tenure review year, the committee will complete the comment sections and their chair will sign the front of the form. Each department chair will be responsible for maintaining the rotation of post-tenure review dates.

- Forms that do not include comments and/or the signature of the F2.08 review committee chair will be considered incomplete and will be returned by the Dean who has received them.
- Each year, department chairs will provide each faculty member with a document that provides a numeric breakdown of the F2.08 scores of all members (without names attached). This document will also be submitted to the Dean.

Please send comments and suggestions to nicki.michalski@lamar.edu
Appendix A

Scholarship/Research Suggestions Lamar University

Overview

Tenured and tenure track faculty are expected to participate in scholarship/research activities in an ongoing manner as part of a requirement for continued employment at Lamar University. We acknowledge that Lamar University is a diverse and emerging regional university. Therefore, recommendations presented herein are global in nature and each academic unit must prepare and continually review their scholarship/research documents.

Scholarship has been defined as a significant, creative, original engagement with an idea. Scholarship includes research that advances theoretical knowledge, professional application of disciplinary knowledge, or the production of a work of art. Research is pursued by all fields and assumes many forms. Among the terms used to describe research are: 1) scientific, 2) basic, 3) applied, 4) directed, 5) hard, 6) soft, 7) participatory action research (PAR), 8) quantitative, and, 9) qualitative. We acknowledge that both scholarship and research are essential elements for success in the academic world and verification of completion serves as a standard for evaluative and professional development.

Recommendations

- Given the uncertain nature of acceptances of peer reviewed articles and other scholarship, all research/scholarship should be evaluated over a rolling three-year period.
- All scholarship/research documents for the academic unit should be consistent with and aligned to other college and university documents. e.g., promotion and tenure, annual evaluations, etc.
- Each academic unit’s expectation regarding scholarship/research should be clearly written and articulated to all faculties from the first day of employment forward.
- The academic unit’s documents must clearly state the expectations for faculty with various options regarding achievement of satisfactory benchmarks.
- If publications are the primary source for satisfying the scholarship/research productivity benchmark, then each academic unit should develop a Journal Publication matrix identifying the journal and scoring criteria for evaluative purposes. This document should be updated yearly by the departmental committee (no later than October 31 of each academic year) assigned this duty. If other scholarship/research efforts satisfy the requirement, e.g., performing arts venues, professional engagements, etc., the evaluation criteria should be clearly articulated in conjunction with scoring criteria in written format. If additional scholarship/research opportunities are accepted as satisfying the criteria by an academic unit, these too should be detailed with rankings, scoring details and other validation processes so that all faculty are advised and understand the entire process. e.g., presentations, abstracts, letters, books, etc.
- Grants and contracts are highly encouraged; especially those that carry indirect cost recovery. Unfunded grants should not become a high score criteria for scholarship/research activity in a given year, rather if the grant is funded, this will be the time to incorporate the effort for evaluative purposes and the scoring should be defined in the overall document. We acknowledge that for some faculty articulating their time and effort for grant preparation is important (F2.08). This is consistent with the publication process and associated credit.
- Each department that uses creative activities should have a hierarchy list of categories. This should include adjudicated works (peer review) and what level (International, National, Regional…) the work was adjudicated. If the platform in which the creative activity is showcased is not on the list evidence from an outside source is required.
- In evaluating scholarship/research efforts within an academic unit, the top productivity category should be designed so that a maximum of 2.5% of faculty in the academic unit can achieve this ranking in a given year. Therefore, continuing reevaluation of the process and scoring criteria is essential.
- For scholarship/research productivity the process should be transparent and easily scored by an individual faculty member prior to any F2.08 review process.
- It is acknowledged that some academic units hire individuals who are not expected to participate in the scholarship/academic process; rather they are to function and emerge as Master Teachers in their respective disciplines. Thus, standards for their professional development should be clearly delineated, scoring criteria devised and documents aligned for consistency with college and university goals and rewards, with ongoing review.
- Recommended rating scale
  - 1- Unsatisfactory
  - 2- Marginal: Average does not meet standard
  - 3- Adequate (For example, meets standard over five year period. A score of 3 means that the individual faculty member being evaluated fully meets the standards for employment but has not excelled in this area. Some departments use the standard of two publications and 10 academic contributions over a five year period.)
  - 4- High Performance: (For example, meets standard over three year period. Three publications and 10 academic contributions over a three year period.)
  - 5-Exemplary Performance: (For example exceeds standard over a three year period. Five publications and over 10 academic contributions over a three year period)

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

In evaluating teaching, experts agree that the most important consideration is the use of multiple methods of evaluating teaching from multiple sources of data. What follows is a list of possible sources of data that departments may choose to use in evaluating teaching. Departments are encouraged to collaboratively develop standards for measuring effective teaching. [Evidence that may be measured is indicated in bracketed italics.]

1. Course Design and Implementation
   a. Evidence of your attempts to address a problem in student learning, identified either by the department or by you. [Documentation of the problem identified and your attempts to address it, along with your success and future adjustments needed.]
   b. Relevant course materials that demonstrate your continued investment in innovation and problem-solving in your course design and redesign. Evidence of your ongoing reflection on your teaching and appropriate

---

1 http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/guidelines
course redesign in your courses. [These may include syllabi, assignments, lessons, etc., along with narrative contextualization of how these innovations and adjustments develop out of self-reflective teaching practices.]

c. Flexibility and service to the department, college, and university in teaching a variety of courses that respond to institutional needs. [Evidence may include courses that are face-to-face, online, hybrid, evening, weekend, remote location, developmental, core, graduate, independent studies, honors courses, etc., as well as the willingness to teach courses outside your area of specialization or beyond your assigned duties when the need arises.]

d. Course and curriculum design, or team-teaching, with colleagues in response to identified needs and problems in the department or college. [Documentation of courses you have designed or redesigned in collaboration with colleagues, or documentation of team-teaching, along with documentation of the problem identified.]

e. Evidence of effective leadership and course management of online courses. [As demonstrated by testimonials from your teaching assistants or academic coaches. You may also provide evidence of the workload distribution within your online courses.]

f. Quantitative data documenting student learning as compared either to previous semesters (demonstrating improvement in teaching due to instructional innovations and revisions) or to departmental assessment for other sections of the course (demonstrating excellence in teaching practices). [Quantitative data demonstrating improvements in student achievement on learning outcomes via assessment methods such as exam grades, essay rubrics, etc.]

g. Evidence of leadership in student learning as demonstrated by effective advisement, management of instructional programs (eg. Stairstep, etc.), observation of student teaching, etc. [Documentation of advising, student observation, and other leadership activities.]

2. Evaluations of Teaching

a. A narrative contextualization of student evaluations, discussing your evaluation scores and comments within the context of your teaching duties and approach to teaching.

b. Letters of reference by peers who have observed you teach and discussed your teaching with you. An observer should attend one or more class sessions after discussing the instructor’s teaching approach, values, and goals for the session(s); the observer should review contextual materials (the syllabus, assignments students will or have complete[d], the instructor’s teaching philosophy, graded assignments demonstrating the instructor’s teaching through feedback, etc.) provided by the instructor; the observer should attempt to assess the instructor’s effectiveness by standards appropriate to the instructor’s values and goals and should use a combination of reliable observation instruments for formative and summative feedback (for instance, Angela Linse’s “Classroom Observation Checklist” or the University of Minnesota’s “Teaching Observation Form”) as well as evaluating both course materials and interactions with students; the observer and the instructor should discuss the observation and evaluation; the observer should write up a letter or memo regarding the observation(s). For more information, see https://tle.wisc.edu/teaching-academy/observing-teaching. For “peer observation guidelines and recommendations,” see http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/resources/peer/guidelines/. A training program for peer observers is recommended. Additional peer review techniques include reciprocal classroom visits, interviews with students about their learning experience, interviews with students about what they are learning (by a content expert), and assessing student work. [Letters of reference and/or classroom observation checklist.]

c. Mid-course feedback. If you administer a mid-semester evaluation, you might wish to share the data and how you responded to student feedback. [Data aggregated from mid-course feedback.]

d. Feedback from advisees (undergraduate theses, MA theses and exams, honors theses, etc.). [Letters, comments, etc. from students about the quality and impact of your mentorship.]

3. Student Outcomes
a. Student success stories, such as information about students accepted into graduate programs, internships, employment, etc. accompanied by evidence of your contribution to this success. Also, evidence of student success in courses that follow yours in a sequence. Possibly, students who have declared a major in your department after taking your course. [Documentation of such success might include examples of excellent student work that demonstrate their successful achievement of your learning objectives, or examples of student work that, alongside your feedback, demonstrate a student’s improvement over the length of the course. It may also include grade information in sequential courses or evidence of your contributions to students’ acceptance into graduate programs, internships, employment, etc.]

b. Informal testimonials from students about the impact of your teaching on their academic, personal, or professional lives.

c. Evidence of leading students in undergraduate research resulting in public presentations or publications. [Documentation of such research projects and the results, including location, date, and type of presentation and/or publication.]

4. Scholarly Teaching and Continuing Development

a. Evidence of Scholarly Teaching as demonstrated by consultation of research on teaching and learning to solve problems identified by your or your department. [Annotated bibliography of research consulted, identifying specific lessons and strategies gleaned from research, what problems they are useful in addressing, and the faculty member’s implementation of such research-based lessons and strategies.]

b. Active participation in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as demonstrated by your design and implementation of research studies based on your teaching, applications for research grants, conference presentations, and publications on teaching and learning that grow out of your teaching and course design. [Documentation of research studies resulting in or intended for (in process) presentation or publication as well as any grant applications completed.]

c. Evidence of actively seeking out continuing training and professional development in teaching and learning, either on campus or at events and institutes elsewhere, coupled with a narrative explanation of how you have modified your teaching as a result of these professional development activities. [Documentation of participation in faculty development events or programs, either on or off campus, coupled with a narrative explanation of implementations in the classroom.]

5. Teaching awards for which you have been nominated or which you have received.

6. A statement of your teaching philosophy accompanied by evidence of successful implementation of your own goals and approach to teaching, demonstrating alignment of goals, learning activities, and assessments. [Statement of teaching philosophy; explanations of how you put this teaching philosophy into practice in specific, clearly identifiable learning activities and assessments; if available, data suggesting successful implementation of these learning activities and assessments.]

Sources consulted:

University of Toronto Center for Teaching Support & Innovation website. 
http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/topics/documenting-teaching/teaching-dossier/effectiveness.htm


University of Minnesota Center for Teaching and Learning website.  
http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/resources/peer/guidelines/

University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching website.  
http://www.crlt.umich.edu/tstrategies/guidelines
## Potential Guidelines for Annual Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (point-based system)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Point value</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory completion of assigned course duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and service to department (1c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service on Masters comprehensive exam committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Theses and dissertations count in research)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing of Masters comprehensive exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Theses and dissertations count in research)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/curriculum design or redesign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative course design or team-teaching (1d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective leadership and management of online courses (1e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to solve a departmental problem (1a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued reflection, innovation, and redesign in courses (1b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated improvements in student learning outcomes (1f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in student learning (1g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student success resulting from your teaching/advising (3a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Online Course Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with narrative contextualization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer observation of teaching with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter of support or classroom observation instrument (eg. Linse) (2b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-semester feedback and description of adjustments made (2c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisee/student letters and comments about your mentorship (2d, 3b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly teaching (4a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in professional development opportunities (re: teaching) (4b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating and assessing innovative teaching strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linked to SoTL research studies (4b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination for or receipt of teaching awards (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(receipt of award counts more than nomination)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching philosophy and evidence of implementation (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Distinguished Faculty Lecturer Information
One does not want to dare to wonder what Europe and its treasures would look like if the Monuments Men of the Allied army had not been formed. Inspiring future generations about the importance of protecting cultural heritage, the legacy of the Monuments Men lives on today.

—Julia C. Fischer

OCTOBER 18, 2016
7:00 P.M.
LAMAR UNIVERSITY THEATRE
BEAUMONT, TEXAS

A faculty member since 2013, Dr. Julia C. Fischer is an assistant professor of art history. Her lecture will present an overview of the Monuments Men of World War II, both in Europe and Japan. Going beyond what you saw in George Clooney’s The Monuments Men, Dr. Fischer will discuss Adolf Hitler’s plans to systematically loot Europe’s art treasures and the Monuments Men of the Allied army that was tasked with protecting, recovering, and returning the millions of stolen artworks. Dr. Fischer will also examine two 21st-century iterations of the World War II Monuments Men that were formed in Iraq and Syria.