

Faculty Senate Minutes

10 October 2006

Room 303 Cashion

3:30 p.m.

Members Present: Senators Baldrige, Blackwell, Cannon, Diaz-Granados, Hartberg (for Duhrkopf), Longfellow, Losey, McGlashan, Pennington, Purdy, Rosenbaum, Sadler**, Stone, Supplee, Johnson (for Tolbert), Vitanza, Park (for Wilcox*), Chonko, Gardner, Kayworth, Nunley, Rajaratnam, Cloud, Johnson (for Connally), Johnsen (for Robinson), Cordon, Boyd, Green, Sturgill, Brown, Myers, Garner, Miner, Spain.

*Serving remainder of Randall O'Brien's term

**Serving remainder of Susan Wallace's term

I. Welcome and Invocation: Meeting called to order 3:35. Welcome back to Trish Nunley. Welcome to substitute representatives. The invocation was given by Steve Sadler.

II. Senate Chair Dianna Vitanza introduced the Senate's Guests: President John M. Lilley, Provost Randall O'Brien, and the President's Chief of Staff Karla Leeper.

President Lilley: We have had good reactions to the Sociology Department's Study of Religion in America; we're grateful for this extensive positive reaction to the work of our faculty members. I have attended a luncheon for this year's Cherry award winner; we're happy to have Dr. Anton Armstrong (the Harry R. and Thora H. Tosdal Professor of Music at St. Olaf College in Minnesota) as our Cherry Lecturer who will be on campus during spring term 2007. Our School of Engineering accreditation team has just been here, and we feel very good about that accreditation process that is now complete.

Provost O'Brien: Our series of seminars for chairs have begun. There has been no change in our hiring practices. The series of seminars for chairs on key issues will continue. We've completed a template to use in our advertisements for new faculty members; we think it is good and that you will be satisfied with it. We paraphrase Baylor's mission and vision and say something about the kind of faculty we are seeking. If you see anything you would like to comment about, I'll come to the next Senate meeting and we'll address any issues you have then. The evaluation of Deans will happen this fall, though logistically we are having some difficulties. I understand that you are interested in faculty evaluations of Deans during this semester, but at the moment we are having some difficulty in determining how to set up those evaluations. For example, should we do such evaluations online? And we need to make sure we can get the evaluations done and processed appropriately. The Council of Deans will review the instrument; we do not want to surprise anybody. I do want you to know that we are working toward getting this job done.

President Lilley: We are down to three finalist candidates for Vice President for Development.

Questions:

Senator Question: A primary concern in the discussion when the Faculty Senate Executive Committee last met with you was the tenure appeals decisions; many faculty members are disappointed in the outcome of that appeals process. What are your comments? *President Lilley:* We can only talk about process and about how it feels to go against faculty advice. There was relatively little pressure, and most of that came from faculty members. We looked very carefully at all the evidence and came to our conclusions. We believe we did the right thing, but we cannot talk about our reasons.. The efficiency of the process was inhibited by faculty travel during the summer. *Senator question:* You appeared to tell us you would base your decision on the evidence; all the departments and the faculty committees involved gave specific recommendations which you overturned, and it's hard to envision a decision like those you made that was not influenced by political considerations. *Provost O'Brien:* I can tell you that when I saw pressure applied to Dr. Lilley, I saw that it was counterproductive; it worked against the goal of the person seeking to apply pressure. We respect your impressions of the appearances, but please consider that candidates who are denied tenure have thirty days to respond and give evidence offsetting reasons for their denial. Consider also that it is conceivable they might succeed. *Senator comment:* It stings very deeply. *Senator comment:* The English department candidate was recommended by the department and by all of the relevant bodies. *President Lilley:* You did not see all the evidence I saw. *Senator question:* Please clarify: did you see evidence we did not see? Did the Tenure Committee see all that evidence also? *President Lilley:* Yes. We see the same evidence. *Senator question:* As the appeals process is set up, would you be able to give an account to the Tenure Committee of the reasons for your decision? *President Lilley:* The process here is not set up in that way; I prefer it to be set up in that way, but that's not how it is here. Baylor's processes could be better. *Senator comment:* Part of the reason people are upset is that you said you would not get involved in overriding faculty decisions, and faculty breathed a sigh of relief thinking you would respect the process. *President Lilley:* Let's remember 23 or 24 of these tenure decisions went very well; and remember that people can disagree about the interpretation of the evidence. To leap to the conclusion that we have not respected your point of view is a mistake. We are engaged in shared governance. We do not want to politicize this process in the way you think we have done. *Senator comment:* Faculty recommendations that result from following proper processes do not constitute political pressure. *President Lilley:* I assure you that I look very carefully at the advice of the faculty, but I cannot guarantee I'll always agree. *Senator Question:* How do you regard faculty governance, especially in light of our experience with the previous administration? How do you see shared governance? *President Lilley:* For this process the shared governance is very thoroughly laid out; it calls for the decision finally to be mine. I had to be open to changing my mind or the appeals process would be a fraud. *Senator comment:* We have a six-year process; we meet as a faculty once a year; the tenure committee spend countless hours, and when their recommendations come to you, they are very well evidenced. *President Lilley:* We have respected the process, and we have come to these decisions knowing that they would

disappoint some faculty members. *Senator question:* How do you envision your relation with the Regents? Many of them seem not to have a good understanding of their role in the life of the University. *President Lilley:* I have had several conversations with the Regents and reminded them of their role as policy makers, not as managers of the University. Overwhelmingly, they are very good about this issue. Conversation about changing the structure of the Regent Board is ongoing. We need to recruit Regents to increase funding and to bring the Baylor family together. *Senator question:* What can we do to avoid these kinds of tenure problems in the future? What can we do as a Senate to refine the tenure process to reduce the lack of agreement in the future? *President Lilley:* We need to improve our processes, to make them more user-friendly; there is no one thing we need to do. I don't want to say the faculty made a big mistake, and I don't want you to say I made a big mistake. We all need to exercise the best professional judgment we can. When in doubt about a tenure track faculty member, say no. *Senator question:* What can we do at the department level? *President Lilley:* One thing is not to grant years of credit for tenure; we need to have sufficient time to observe the candidates. Another is that it's important for people to get consistent feedback; we need to tell everyone annually exactly where they are with respect to the tenure issue. *Senator question:* I was disappointed that you see this issue as a matter of disagreement; we are committed to faculty governance just as it works at universities all over the country; we all need to be on the same page about faculty governance. *President Lilley:* No major university has a different set of processes as to where the decision is finally made; I think we're not as far apart as you may think. We engage in shared governance. *Senator question:* In the search for Vice President of libraries, to what office does that position report? *President Lilley:* That position will report both to the President and to the Provost. *Senator comment:* Trust must be the coin of the realm. Can we also schedule a discussion about collegiality? Where does this consideration fit into the tenure process? *President Lilley:* That dimension of the tenure process is subject to abuse and needs to be dealt with very carefully.

III Chair Vitanza thanked President Lilley and Provost O'Brien and Chief of Staff Leeper; she then introduced Vice President for Student Life Dub Oliver. Mr. Oliver made the a Power-point presentation explaining the goals of the Office of Student Life and how he sees the role of that office in achieving the goals of Vision 2012.

Questions:

Senator question/observation: Friday's *Wall Street Journal* mentioned that students are no better off after their college education because of the dominant focus in higher education on research. *Mr. Oliver:* Perhaps we should consider the activity of advising student organizations as a teaching responsibility. The issue is very complex, but when students look back, they think about the faculty members who most influenced them. *Senator question:* How do you work with us in the School of Nursing? Many of our students just do not feel a part of the Baylor experience. *Mr. Oliver:* That is a challenge, and I need to go to the School of Nursing so I can get an insight into what might be done there. *Senator question:* There are many questions about Brooks College from a faculty member constituent; the constituent comments and questions are these:

I am making a formal request to you as my senate representative that the senate look into how the Brooks College initiative was proposed and accepted. What are the educational implications of this very different approach to the Campus, Living, and Learning environment? What faculty members were involved in the decision making process? It appears that there was not university wide participation in the decision making and implementation process. Is this true? If there was university wide involvement, when and how did it occur? For instance, was the academic freedom and environment committee of the senate consulted? Was there an announcement about it at a university faculty meeting as there has been with University 1000 and QEP initiative? What if other faculty wish to be housed in the Brooks College or serve on the board of trustees? Is there a formal application process? Are the faculty members serving in said capacity receiving additional stipends for their participation? If so, were other faculty given equal opportunity to apply for these stipends as they are for Faculty development grants and participation in university 1000 and for sabbaticals? Has the university considered if it is fair to give a single department that much direct daily access to a large student body pool who has yet to decide a major particularly if this choice occurred without university wide notification that such an educational opportunity was available? Are there other departments that might like to move into these quarters? Were other departments given adequate opportunity to be so involved if they so desired? It may well be that all of these issues were decided with due faculty involvement and I am just unaware that a university wide call for participation in this important academic initiative went out.

Senator question: Contextualizing this larger issue of Brooks College, how do you reconcile Baylor traditions with the concept of Brooks College? Is this our long term goal: for students to become very closely identified with their college rather than with Baylor University? *Mr. Oliver:* Let me recount the history of the process that brought us to this point, beginning with the goals of 2012. We found we needed to avoid complete uniformity in the residence halls we put on campus, and we needed much more diversity. Our consultants advised us to give students choices about how and where to live and to provide alternative environments for students interested in having alternatives. We've already made progress with several living and learning centers, and we've increased our retention rate, especially for transfer students. Brooks College is just one piece of our effort to provide alternatives for students. Brooks Flats is going to house 324 students; Brooks College is designed for 367 students. There is an application process for all of our living and learning centers, and we have one also for Brooks College; students need to know what they are getting into when they commit to one of these living arrangements. We want students to feel a part of the resident community where they live. 59 students have already applied for Brooks College as of this morning. *Senator Question:* Of those 59, do they represent a variety of majors? *Mr. Oliver:* I'll get back to you on that question because I don't have the answer right now. *Senator question:* Why the term "College" in connection with a dormitory or a living community? *Mr. Oliver:* A residential college is a complete experience; its organization is different; its programmatic elements are different, etc. Our primary concerns last year were about financing rather than about these issues, but I'll be happy to come again and get more feedback from you. *Senator Question:* How does a college differ from a living and learning center. *Mr. Oliver:* A living and learning center provides courses in common

for its residents. *Senator Question:* We have a College of Arts and Sciences and an Honors College; It seems very confusing to call Brooks residence facility a college. This is the first I've heard of about the idea of a global village; if that is the idea then the languages would have been natural departments to have consulted. *Senator comment:* This is an example of how faculty members need to be involved in these decisions. *Senator comment:* We need an intensive language experience for students in some kind of living arrangement. *Mr. Oliver:* How can we accomplish that? *Senator:* Call the languages departments and get their involvement. *Senator Comment:* Some consideration needs to be given to how these academic arrangements are decided. *Senator comment:* Is it true that a lot of the impetus for Brooks College was already in place before you were even on the campus? *Mr. Oliver:* Yes. *Senator Comment:* There has been no open discussion of these issues among faculty and across the campus; please help us by working with us to get a decision making process in place that will avoid these difficulties. *Senate Chair Vitanza:* Will you respond in writing, along with Provost O'Brien, to the questions raised by the faculty member constituent (see above) about Brooks College? Concerns have to do with elitism and with calling the residence hall a college. *Senator question:* Most British people would run away from this idea; there is an element in this whole idea that is contrary to the goal of Vision 2012.

IV Old Business:

Compensation and Benefits Update (Senator Cloud): I Had meeting with Reagan Ramsower, and another is scheduled in two weeks to talk about compensation. Reagan appears to want to implement the idea of COLA without the use of the term. We'll also talk about tuition remission.

Committee to Recommend Faculty Ombudsman (Chair Vitanza): Provost O'Brien has appointed three committee members, and we have also appointed three committee members. We hope to get an Ombudsman appointed soon.

Web Site Recommendations (Senator Sturgill): You have received today a tentative list of reporting lines to the faculty—tentative because we have found faculty members listed who are not really members of the faculty. One question we have is what we want to do with these constituent lists? Please emphasize to your reporting groups that you want to represent them and encourage them to communicate their concerns to the Senate through you as their representative. On the issue about photographs, do senators have a preference?

MOTION from Senator Pennington: that we have our photographs put on the Senate website. SECOND: Senator Stone. VOTE: Passed.

Recommendation for a Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Governance (Senator Cordon): Senator Cordon distributed the following two handouts:

Handout 1: Development of University Policy on Faculty Committees

1. Definitions and Types of Committees

a. University-wide committees constituted on a continuing basis; generally made up of administrators, faculty, and staff and report to administrators.

E.g.,

- "University Committee"
- "Operational Committee"
- "Administrative Committee"

b. Faculty committees appointed by Committee on Committees.

c. Ad Hoc Committees.

2. Committee Descriptions

The committee descriptions should include the following components:

- a. Committee name.
- b. Committee description.
- c. The officer to whom the committee reports.
- d. Duration (standing or ad hoc).
- e. Composition.
- f. Authority.

3. Annual Review of Committees

a. Committee on Committees:

- i. Should request information from the chairs of committees, much like what Beth Miller did last year.
- ii. With respect to faculty committees, changes to committees, committee descriptions, etc., should be sent to the Faculty Senate for approval.

b. Administrative Committees? What role should these councils/offices play?

- Executive Council
- Council of Deans
- Staff Council
- Vice Presidents
- Provost's Office

4. Approval of New Committees

- Determine the authority and composition of the committee.

- Determine from this which council, office, or organization should approve the committee.
- Update the university committee policy to include the new committee.

5. Removal of Committees

- Administrative committees: the administrator or council responsible for oversight of such a committee should notify the Faculty Senate that the committee is being removed (or possibly follow another formal procedure?).
- Faculty committees may be removed by the Faculty Senate/President/Other Administrators/Other Councils upon recommendation of the Committee on Committees.
- In either event, the university committee policy should be amended to reflect the removal of the committee.

6. Publication of the Policy

- BU-PP 700-level policy.
- Web-based, with links to committee descriptions.
- Update the Faculty Handbook.

Handout 2: Outline of Procedure for Committee Structure Proposals

- Responsibility:** (1) Chair of Committee on Committees;
(2) Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Governance (which will need to be created). **Note:** The chair of the Committee on Committees will serve as an *ex-officio* member of the Senate committee.
- Recommendations:** Recommendations for changes to existing committees or for the addition of new committees may come from any member of the faculty, a faculty or other university committee, any other type of faculty group, an administrator, or a staff member in an administrative office.
- Process:**
- (1) This procedure will be followed in any of the following instances: changes to committees (composition, charge, reporting lines); elimination of a committee; removal of a committee from the Committee on Committee's selection process; and addition of a new committee.
- (2) The Committee on Faculty Governance reviews each committee proposal. In doing so, the committee communicates with the person or persons submitting the proposals and with the Provost's office.
- (3) The Committee on Faculty Governance sends the proposal to the full Faculty Senate for approval.

(4) Once approved, the Committee on Faculty Governance forwards the proposal to the Provost's office for its approval.

(5) If the Provost's office approves the proposal, it is sent to the President for his signature, much in the same manner as the approval of a BU-PP.

(6) Any rejection of a proposal is communicated to the Committee on Faculty Governance and to the chair of the Committee on Committees. This rejection will be communicated to the person or persons who originally submitted the proposal.

(7) The Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Governance will make every effort to resolve an impasse with respect to a proposed committee change. If this committee cannot resolve the dispute, then the committee will send the matter to the Provost's Office for resolution there.

(8) Upon approval by the President, the change to an existing committee or the addition of a new committee will be communicated to the chair of the Committee on Committees, who will make appropriate modifications to the selection of committee members.

Timelines:

(1) Proposals must be submitted no later than **November 1**.

(2) The process described above must be completed no later than **January 15**.

MOTION: To create the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Governance having responsibilities as described on the Outline of Procedure for Committee Structure Proposals. SECOND: Senator Cloud. VOTE: Passed.

Policy on Selection and Evaluation of Chairs (Senate Chair Vitanza): The document has been through the Council of Deans for their consideration. There are questions about how the search committee is established and about the process the committee follows in assessing the Chairs. In cases of difference of opinion within a department, how does one determine the stronger opinion of the department? How does the department make its wishes known? *Senator comment:* We need to know where the changes were made in the original document. *Senator comment:* It sounds like the search committee reports to the Dean and not to the department. *Senator comment:* We need to make suggestions about a particular paragraph and perhaps also about other parts of the document. *Senator McGlashan* agreed to report on changes from the original document. Senators agreed to make suggestions about changes in the document before the next Senate meeting, because we may need to act before the next scheduled meeting. *Senator comment:* If the document needs major changes, we may not want to act in haste. *Senator comment:* We may need to recommend that the chair evaluations be annual evaluations just like those of the faculty. *Senator comment:* I would be against a mandatory annual evaluation of chairs just because it's a lot of work; it takes a lot of time and effort. Perhaps there are situations where that would be advisable, but not in every situation. *Chair Vitanza:* We should study and make suggestions for changes that we can discuss systematically at our

next meeting. All agreed to follow this procedure. The Senate Chair will request that the Provost hold off on any action on the evaluation of chairs before we are able to deliberate carefully again and make suggestions for changes.

Academic Support for Athletes: Chair Vitanza sent an email to Mike Rogers questioning the wisdom of putting the Athletic Department in charge of academic help for athletes.

Senator comment: “The fox is guarding the henhouse.” *Senator Comment:* We pointed this out to the Director of Athletics, and we feel we need another meeting to get this issue ironed out. *Senator comment:* How can we be sure that the tutors are not doing the work for the athletes? *Senator response:* Our tutors are as gifted with integrity as they are with academic competency. *Senator question:* What can we lose if we wait and let the situation develop before we make a recommendation? *Chair Vitanza:* Shall we invite Mike Rogers to visit with us about this issue? *Senator response:* Let’s wait to see what the committee produces before we do that.

Support for United Way: Chair Vitanza was asked to be the co-chair of the United Way fund raising drive. She accepted and would like the Senate’s permission to use the title “Chair of the Faculty Senate” in the correspondence about the United Way drive.

Senator comment: There is a political issue with Planned Parenthood of Central Texas; they are excluded from participation and funds cannot be directed to them through United Way.

MOTION from Senator Longfellow: that Chair Vitanza be permitted/encouraged to use her title as Chair of the Faculty Senate in United Way correspondence encouraging support of the United Way fund drive. SECONDED

VOTE: Pass with two abstentions.

V Committee Reports

Academic Freedom (Senator Longfellow): No report

Enrollment Management (Senator Sturgill): One meeting, nothing to report.

Physical Facilities (Senator Brown): No report

Student Life (Senator Chonko): No report

VI Liaison Reports

Council of Deans (Vitanza): The Council of Deans is working on the University Policy regarding Appointment, Evaluation, and Job Responsibilities of Department and Division Chairs. The document appears not to reflect the recommendations of the Senate committee appointed to develop such a policy. The Council of Deans discussed the process for submission and approval of proposals for Engaged Learning Groups. Two subjects raised by the Senate chair were discussed, the reporting lines of the Honor Council and the transfer of oversight of Academic Support Services for athletes to the Athletic Department.

Athletic Council (Connally): No report.

Staff Council (Vitanza, Sturgill): No report.

Student Government (Senate Chair Vitanza): Student government has observed an increase in student drinking; they want our suggestions, and we can talk about those at a future date. I am having lunch with the student government president tomorrow to talk

about what might be more productive interactions between the Senate and the student government.

Personnel, Benefits, Compensation (Senate Chair Vitanza): Richard Amos reported on our medical plan experience as being very good; the next increase in our insurance premium will be about 3% for faculty and staff. Retirees insurance is separate from faculty and staff, and their contribution is expected to increase by 9%. Maybe we want to raise an issue about this gap in costs? *Senator comment:* That gap in cost is unfair, and it is also unfair that faculty and staff have the same percentage increase; staff salary increases do not cover that percentage increase in medical coverage. *Senator comment:* The top level may need to be split so that higher paid employees pay more for their coverage. *Senator Comment:* We'll talk about this issue in two weeks with Regan Ramsower.

New Business: (30 minutes)

Brooks College: MOTION: Senator Rajaratnam: Let's change the name from Brooks College. SECOND: Senator Longfellow.

MOTION: to table the previous motion was made and seconded and PASSED.

Senator Question of Dub Oliver: How did Doug Henry get selected as master of Brooks College? What was the process? *Senator Comment:* The process was not open.

Everybody needed to be notified about the availability of the position. *Mr. Oliver:* That comment appears to be a fair criticism. *Senator Question:* How did the Great Texts department end up there? *Mr. Oliver:* Not all departments were contacted; we contacted those that tended to be more interdisciplinary. Some large departments were not willing—history for example—because they needed more office space. The decisive consideration was to create space for history and religion in Tidwell. (Much discussion ensued.) *Senator question:* On the issue of the trustees of Brooks College, how are they selected, what are their responsibilities? *Senator comment:* There is a problem with the term “Headmaster.” (Much discussion ensued.)

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: The Provost wants us to look carefully at the curriculum especially with regard to the issue of duplication of course content in various parts of the University. That committee needs to be involved in such issues as, for example, the approval of University before the committee was informed about it. The committee will get the faculty again involved in curriculum issues. Take note of the name change of the committee from the University Curriculum Committee to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Scheduling of classes in fall 2007 (Senate Chair Vitanza): Chair Vitanza passed out recommendations about fall 2007 scheduling and requested that Senators read the recommendations and make suggestions for changes at our next meeting. How would these suggestions affect your particular department or area?

Adjourn: 6:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Stuart Rosenbaum,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate, 2006-07.

