

Baylor University Faculty Senate Meeting

May 8, 2018

Truett Seminary 107 ♦ 2:00-3:30pm

Members Present: Senators Baldrige, R.S.; Bolen, Bradley; Cordon, Matt; Elkins, Nathan; Ellor, James; Farwell, Beth; Beal, Claudia for Faucher, Mary Ann; Garner, Brian; Hansen, Christopher; Hultquist, Beth; Stanley, Charles for Hurtt, Kathy; Johnston, Hope; Korpi, Michael; LeCompte, Karon; Long, Mark; Macgregor, Jason; McGlashan, Ann; Mencken, Kimberly; Morgan, Ron; Neilson, Bill; Neubert, Mitch; Nichols, Curt; Nuner, Joyce; Parrish, Michael; Pounders, Steven; Raines, Brian; Robinson, Eric; Rodgers, Denyse; Schubert, Keith; Sielaff, Steven; Souza-Fuertes, Lizbeth; Stone, Sara; Supplee, Joan; Umstead, Randall; Walden, Dan; Wilcox, Walter; Wilfong Jr., Stanley; Woody, Margaret

Members Absent: Senators Leidner, Dorothy; Leutholtz, Brian; Newberry, Byron; Ostlund, Sandor; Stroope, Mike; and Staff Council Representative Lamar Bryant

I. Call to Order

Senate Chair Ann McGlashan called the meeting to order at 2:02pm.

II. Welcome to New Senators

Senate Chair McGlashan welcomed the new faculty senators: Derek Dodson, Renee Flippo, Michael Long, Horace Maxile Jr., Maxey Parrish, Joyce Nuner, Coretta Pittman, Mark Taylor, Tom Potts, and Josh Strakos.

III. Invocation

Senator Margaret Woody offered an invocation.

IV. Approval of Agenda

Chair McGlashan requested a motion to approve the agenda with the flexibility to make changes as needed. Claudia Beal, standing in for Senator Faucher made the motion, and it was seconded by Senator Supplee. The agenda flexibility was approved by the senate.

VI. Guests: Dean Gary Mortenson and Vice Provost Gary Carini

Acting Vice Provost for Administration and Dean of the School of Music, Gary Mortenson, mentioned that he is a huge believer in shared governance. He explained that President Livingstone approached both the Vice Provost for Graduate Professional Education and Professor of Management Gary Carini and himself, asking them to be the provost placeholders and to assist with the transition until a permanent provost is in place. Part of their job is to keep things moving, such as contracts, deans and provost office staff evaluations, and establish a path of sustainability for the future provost. The processes are working and nothing is being held up anymore in the provost's office. One goal is to engage the deans in constructive dialogue on how they can support the future provost as well as involve the staff in the provost's office in voicing their perspectives. They are working very hard to establish best practices, viable paths forward, to make the office more sustainable. He also mentioned that all the deans had

been evaluated by him. Vice Provost Carini's area has been to move forward with the Academic Strategic Plan, engaging many people across campus. He then opened the floor to questions.

One senator asked about the deans' evaluations—that it had it been a provost's office evaluation and not one that included faculty. Acting Vice Provost Mortenson explained that a void was left when former Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness Michael Matier left, as he had been in charge of overall evaluations. They are aware of this and there is a schedule for the dean evaluations by faculty to take place.

A senator asked why the contracts were backed up in the provost's office and Vice Provost Mortenson responded that there was a five-to-ten day period when there was a backlog but now it was being addressed. He also commented that an enormous amount of thought and effort are going into how to make the provost's office better. There are best practices that can lay the groundwork and they are developing a series of documents they hope will be useful for the incoming provost.

Another senator noted that she had read in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that the provost position is the most volatile and turned-over position in the nation. Vice Provost Mortenson mentioned he saw two kinds of people who are interested in becoming provost: those who see it as a stepping stone to the presidency of a university, and those who seek to leave a legacy as the caretaker of the academic side of the equation. He prefers the second kind.

One senator asked if there was anything Acting Vice Provost Mortenson needed from us, the faculty senate. He asked us to continue what we are doing, that our work is invaluable, and that he highly appreciates the work we do. The collective wisdom that can be brought to bear on the university's critical processes is essential going forward. He also noted that the whole conception of the Academic Strategic Plan came about with a sense of urgency; President Livingstone articulated the need for this plan in her inaugural address. Nevertheless, he stated that the plan will be presented to the regents at a very high altitude and that he believes it will be approved. Furthermore, there will be room for input and refinement and if there are things that cannot be done, there will be room for adjustment. Nothing will be set so our opinion is invalidated. The ultimate goal is that Baylor can grow into the best version of itself, without giving up its essence, and reaching more of the potential that is already here. All universities need to grow; otherwise, they are doomed in today's world.

Vice Provost for Graduate Professional Education Gary Carini then addressed the senate by saying that he feels it is a privilege to serve in this role and that he believes the expertise and creative energy we have at Baylor is incredible. Regarding the Academic Strategic Plan, President Livingstone will present it on May 10 to the Board of Regents. It is a 40-page document that describes the five initiatives (Health, Data Sciences, Materials Science, Human Flourishing, Leadership and Ethics, and Baylor in Latin America), the facilities needed, and the budget. At this moment, nothing is cast in concrete, so if there are not investments or faculty commitment, then they will go in different areas. The first task he had was to look at the subgroups, providing input at a very macro level; it still needs to be perfected. If accepted by the Board of Regents, we will go forward on May 14. He envisions we will form a group comprised of process-oriented faculty to look at different disciplines, to study where the deeply embedded

knowledge and processes are. Faculty will be involved prior to going into the content of the five initiatives. It will be faculty-designed and faculty-driven. He realizes that until now faculty did not feel as part of the process, but shared governance needs to be taken incredibly seriously. The current stage is the presentation of the draft Academic Strategic Plan to the Board of Regents.

Questions:

One senator mentioned that it seems there is a missing piece; there has been plenty of informal faculty input, but there has not been shared governance on the vetting side, on the decision-making side. Do you think the process will address that?

Vice Provost Carini said yes, and that they need representation for vetting as well as expertise. The five Initiatives emerged through input from faculty and they will continue to need faculty input going forward as well.

Another senator asked if there would be a group leading this and how members would be identified.

Vice Provost Carini said that he will be sending out an email asking for input; that if faculty have an expertise in a certain area, they should go to their dean and mention they would like to participate. He would like faculty to surface and say they would like to participate in designing this.

A senator asked who will be the driving force behind these initiatives and Vice Provost Carini stated that if nobody surfaces to take the lead, they will not go forward.

One senator mentioned that with the Academic Strategic Plan, we are creating major changes in our culture and one myth is that we can shut everything down at 5:00pm. However, with online courses, such as in Nursing and Social Work, that is not the case. Culture takes longer than programs to change and there needs to be a consciousness of these subtle transitions. We really need the resources that are not always available to accommodate our needs. How are we accommodating this new broader image in terms of support services that at this point are still molded in the traditional role?

Vice Provost Carini mentioned that they are looking at the need for investing in infrastructure; where it needs to be available 24/7, we need to invest in that. The broader question is how do we create a more entrepreneurial culture that reflects we are outside of the bubble, that geographically we have a truly global reach? How do we change culture one person at a time? We have systems in place that have served us well in the past; as we become a new place that is much more entrepreneurial, with the support of financial models that encourage and provide incentives, we need to align our systems and change the way we do things; things cannot take as long. In the education industry we hear of disruption that is coming in through venture capital money, which is showing us new ways of doing things. What a great opportunity for us to begin to change our culture. If there is the 8-5 mentality, we clearly need to move away from that. So faculty will be involved in designing processes. The provost's office is looking into what we need to change and what the challenges are. In different areas across the university we are look at processing time, respecting transparency, shared governance, accountability; all these are important and we need to build the process. Regarding your first point, we will invest in IT.

V. Approval of Minutes: April 2018

There was a request to change the comment on parking in order to reflect the opinion of the faculty senate. There were also some changes regarding who was absent in the previous meeting.

Senator Robert Baldrige made a motion to approve the minutes for the Senate meeting of April 10, 2018, with amended changes. The motion was seconded by Senator Karon LeCompte and the minutes were approved by the senate.

VII. Report of Nominating Committee: Voting

Chair McGlashan gave thanks to the Nominating Committee: Ron Morgan, Bill Neilson, and Ann McGlashan. The slate that was put forward includes the following senators:

Chair-Elect:	Brian Raines
Secretary:	Lilly Souza-Fuertes
Publicity Officer:	Chris Hansen

Senator Stone made the motion for the Faculty Senate to accept the slate by acclamation and all approved.

VIII. Vote on change in language of bylaws: date of new Executive Committee

Chair McGlashan explained that she found out the reasoning for the dates for the Executive Committee to take office: the beginning date was the first General Faculty Meeting of the academic year and it used to take place one week before the beginning of classes. The request has been to change the dates from August 1 through July 31, under Article II. There was no motion since it came from the Executive Committee and there was no discussion. All were in favor.

IX. Final report: updating committee structure—Matt Cordon

Senator Cordon commented that the provost's office reviewed and made minor changes to the committee structure regarding the schedule of rotation of tenured faculty; secondly, he wrote a draft and will circulate it this summer; and, thirdly, Senators Woody and Cordon will meet with IT in order to hopefully have the website ready by first week of classes.

He also mentioned that the rotation of 6/4/4 should be 5/4/4. The Faculty Dismissal Committee has a rotation on a three-year cycle; and there was a name change on the Calendar Committee.

XIII. Recognition of outgoing faculty senators

Chair McGlashan explained she was changing the agenda order in case somebody needed to leave early. She mentioned how blessed we are to have so many wise people who want to be on Faculty Senate. She then called those senators who are rotating off this year: Ron Morgan, Margaret Woody, Byron Newberry, Kimberly Mencken, Mary Ann Faucher, Mitch Neubert, Mike Parrish, Hope Johnston, Sandor Ostlund, and Bob Aldridge.

X. Proposed wording for change in Senate by-laws: vote in September – Chair

Chair McGlashan mentioned that we had several problems in using the correct terminology for voting as it appears in the Faculty Senate Constitution. It appears we tried to

make it too complicated and in danger of leaving some people out. The new version that Senator Umstead proposed is:

“Article II. b. All full-time faculty members holding CONTINUING appointments within academic units and with ranks below the rank of academic dean are eligible to serve and vote.”

It will not be voted on today, but we will wait until September.

XI. Report: Council of Deans – Chair

Chair McGlashan explained that the Acting Vice Provost for Administration and Dean of the School of Music, Gary Mortenson had presided the meeting and Vice Provost for Graduate Professional Education and Professor of Management Gary Carini gave an impressive report regarding the Academic Strategic Plan. The deans said they would prefer even less detail in the Plan. Vice Provost Mortenson discussed how the provost’s office could do better.

One senator asked when the faculty would see the wording of the Academic Strategic Plan and Chair McGlashan asked that it not be completed over the summer, to leave room for changes when faculty come back. Another senator mentioned he had read it, that it is a long document with overarching themes and that much of it pertained to Arts and Humanities. They have also asked for our input online.

XII. Report: Exec Com Meeting on Academic Strategic Plan—Chair

The Executive Committee (EC) had a meeting with Vice Provost Carini which was very productive. The Committee’s concerns were put forward; he took many notes and wants to meet with the EC in the summer.

XIV. Old Business

Senator Woody mentioned that the Committee on Committees report is due at the first meeting in the Fall.

The Provost Search Committee received feedback from different groups that met with the candidates. President Livingstone will make her decision to hire or not. The candidates met with the EC, some program directors, there was an open forum with chairs and interviews in the provost’s and vice provost’s office.

One senator noted that it had been announced that there would be some Town Hall Meetings for faculty to meet the provost candidates. She understands that some candidates would prefer to be as anonymous as possible given their current positions, but would the faculty be informed of this? Another senator explained that the forums in this format included approximately 80 people but they were under a more controlled environment. This was the first provost search that was so open and had so much overall campus input.

A senator who participated in the activities for the three candidates stated she would have preferred to have had another chance to submit input after all three had been on campus.

It was mentioned that each candidate had his/her strengths and weaknesses, but they believed that each one was capable of doing the job.

One senator asked if the final decision was made by the Regents or by President Livingstone and it was clarified that the President made the final decision.

XV. New Business

Senator Elkins mentioned that he would not be present next Fall and asked for a motion to have Jennings Sheffield be his substitute for Fall 2018. Senator Pounders made the motion and it was seconded by Senator Supplee. The motion was approved by the Senate.

Chair McGlashan stated she needed to mention that there is a letter addressed to President Livingstone that is circulating across campus. It is not addressed to the Faculty Senate. The letter is based on a negative reaction to the Title IX training and ends in a request for a meeting with President Livingstone. Chair McGlashan said we have not dealt with this in the senate because it did not come to us; the President reached out to her and Chair McGlashan met with the Executive Committee. There are some issues that will probably go to the Academic Freedom Committee. We cannot do anything about it, even though some senators signed the letter and others expressed concern.

One senator mentioned that we haven't seen the letter and Chair McGlashan explained it was not her letter and it had not been referred to the Senate.

Another senator asked how the letter was being circulated. Chair McGlashan said it was person-by-person, in a chain. Last time she saw it, it had 83 signatures and it is addressed to President Livingstone.

A senator asked what they did not like in the letter and Chair McGlashan said it was a criticism of the Title IX training, which they think goes against Baylor's morality code. The academic freedom issue is that we should be able to deal with these issues as we feel fit.

Another senator asked why we were discussing this letter if it was not referred to us and Chair McGlashan explained that a senator asked her to bring it to today's meeting and so she had to comply.

XVI. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Senator Baldrige. The motion was seconded by Senator Farwell and approved by the senate. The meeting was adjourned at 3:32pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Lizbeth Souza-Fuertes
Recording Secretary