

Baylor University Faculty Senate Meeting
September 11, 2018
Draper 152♦ 3:30-5:00pm

Members Present: Senators Bolen, Bradley; Cordon, Matt; Dodson, Derek; Sheffield, Jennings for Elkins, Nathan; Ellor, James; Farwell, Beth; Flippo, Renee; Garner, Brian; Hansen, Christopher; Horace Jr., Maxile; Hultquist, Beth; Hurtt, Kathy; Korpi, Michael; Barbara Purdum-Cassidy for LeCompte, Karon; Leutholtz, Brian; Long, Mark; Long, Michael; Macgregor, Jason; McGlashan, Ann; Neilson, Bill; Nichols, Curt; Nuner, Joyce; Parrish, Maxey; Pittman, Coretta; Potts, Tom; Pounders, Steven; Raines, Brian; Julie Ivey for Robinson, Eric; Rodgers, Denyse; Schubert, Keith; Souza-Fuertes, Lizbeth; Stone, Sara; Strakos, Josh; Stroope, Mike; Supplee, Joan; Taylor, Mark; Umstead, Randall; Walden, Dan; Wilcox, Walter; Wilfong Jr., Stanley and Staff Council Representative Heather Guenat.

Members Absent: Senators Leidner, Dorothy and Sielaff, Steven.

I. Call to Order

Senate Chair Randall Umstead called the meeting to order at 3:34pm.

II. Invocation

Senator Mark Long offered an invocation.

III. Approval of Minutes: May 2018

Senate Chair Umstead presented a modified attendance list as substitution for the draft. Senator Wilfong Jr. made a motion to approve the minutes with the new attendance list for the Senate meeting of May 8, 2018, with amended changes. The motion was seconded by Senator Supplee and the minutes were approved by the senate.

IV. Vote: semester substitution representative for School of Education (Dr. Barbara Purdum-Cassidy)

A motion was made by Senator Hurtt to have Dr. Barbara Purdum-Cassidy substitute Senator Karon Lecompte while she is on medical leave during Fall semester. The motion was seconded by Senator Rodgers and the motion carried unanimously.

V. Chair's Report—Randy Umstead

Since the beginning of the semester the Executive Committee has met several times. After the Faculty Senate Retreat on September 18, Acting Vice Provost for Administration and Dean of the School of Music, Gary Mortenson and Vice Provost for Graduate Professional Education and Professor of Management Gary Carini asked for feedback from that meeting and when Senate Chair Umstead contacted them, he mentioned several themes:

- Faculty were not clear where we were in the process of *Illuminate*. Was it continuing as last semester or was a process being developed?
- Faculty were not clear on how, when, or where to submit proposals for inclusion in *Illuminate*.

- Faculty were surprised to hear that in summer ideation sessions they did not want a steering committee, even though the sense from the Faculty Senate was that they did.
- It would be important to address all process questions in a very clear manner, which would help for *Illuminate* to be well received.
- It would be helpful to clarify how to replace faculty and staff lines, when to apply for retirement replacements, and whether or not hiring proposals needed to be tied to *Illuminate*.

In other words, faculty were receiving different messages from different departments and schools. Both Acting Vice Provost Mortenson and Vice Provost Carini addressed some of these issues at the General Faculty Meeting on August 22, and others were covered subsequently. Senate Chair Umstead's perception is that the faculty are being included in these conversations in a positive manner.

Senate Chair Umstead conducted an orientation for new faculty senators on the first Tuesday of class.

The provost's office reached out on Aug 27 to set up appointments with Senate Chair Umstead and the Executive Committee. They have hired an outside consulting group called Kennedy and Co. to think of ways to maximize the functioning of the provost's office. The Executive Committee is open to take suggestions to that meeting. One of the themes that Vice Provost Carini has mentioned is that they hope to turn the provost's office more into a service center rather than headquarters by the end of the year because most decisions are made in a very centralized fashion and their goal is to be more transparent and move away from the old model.

VI. Report: Illuminate Steering Committee and Faculty nomination—Randy Umstead

On August 29, Senate Chair Umstead met with both vice provosts for a follow up on *Illuminate* processes. They wanted to identify Faculty Senate input for nominating members to the *Illuminate* Steering Committee and continue discussions on how the process could work. It was a very productive meeting. The result of the meeting and later conversations with the Executive Committee was that Faculty Senate would put forward approximately three names of senators and Vice Provost Carini would choose one to serve on the *Illuminate* Steering Committee. The broader call to all faculty by email would be to nominate faculty to serve on the *Illuminate* Steering Committee and the five different subcommittees to serve on the five initiatives.

The deans will also be nominating people to serve on the steering committees and the five subcommittees, so there are two groups of people speaking into that process, that is, the Faculty Senate (representing all faculty) and the Deans.

The process for the next steps for *Illuminate* was set forth. It was sent to the Faculty Senate and Deans for comments.

Model:

The Illuminate Steering Committee has one chair and nine faculty members, corresponding to the four pillars and five initiatives. One member will be from the Council of Deans, and another will be a member from Faculty Senate. Each of the five subcommittees would probably have five people. The total number will be approximately 35 people involved.

The committees will be tasked with a committee charge that guides the approval and denial of proposals; they will discuss appointment terms because they will not serve indefinitely, given that this is a 20-year plan.

They will develop and recommend a template as well as a process for review and feedback.

Moving forward plan:

Send this information out to deans and Faculty Senate for approval, and then move it forward to President Livingstone and take the following steps. This is not set in stone.

Last week Vice Provost Carini met with the Executive Committee (EC) and the concern was that if all funding is focused on Illuminate, how do we make sure that other necessary functions of the university continue? He assured us that not all resources will go to *Illuminate*.

The EC also addressed a concern over communication. For example, sometimes groups will go to the Faculty Senate (FS) with a hope that we can convey their message to all faculty, but the FS is set up to facilitate that type of communication.

The EC suggested the possibility of there being two or three larger campus-wide meetings, possibly facilitated by the Faculty Senate, where Vice Provosts Carini and Mortenson and perhaps President Livingstone would answer questions. We will need “over-communication” in order to compensate for last year’s “under-communication.” The EC proposed that the senate elect three names of faculty senators to be advanced as potential members for the Illuminate Steering Committee, of which we expect one to be seated on the Illuminate Steering Committee. The other issue is how to take the nominations that we receive from the faculty at large and identify names to move forward for the larger group of 35.

Questions:

One senator asked if the proposals being routed through this new system are new initiatives. Chair Umstead stated it would be for new initiatives, but this process would also be required of the 33 proposals received last year.

Another question was regarding proposals that might not fit within the five initiatives. It was explained that there was a risk that everything would fall under Human Flourishing. Nevertheless, if there are proposals that do not fit within *Illuminate*, they will go through the normal processes at the university level.

A senator asked if the Faculty Senate will vet all proposals. No, the Faculty Senate is looking at the process. The hope is that the Faculty Senate and deans will support the general process.

One question was who determines if the proposal goes through *Illuminate* or another channel? Will there be one place? Chair Umstead stated that at present the subcommittee would likely make that determination.

Another senator asked what the timeframe was for the steering committee and subcommittee setup? Chair Umstead said the plan was that it be in place at the end of September.

VII. Report: Provost Search Committee – Brian Raines

Senator Raines explained that the provost search committee had not met yet. The university hired a search firm to assist with the search. Consequently, the committee will probably meet less often in comparison to last year's search.

One senator asked if there was a deadline for choosing the finalists and Senator Raines mentioned they hoped to have them identified by the end of this semester.

VIII. Report: Student Course Evaluation Task Force – Brian Raines

At the Faculty Senate retreat Senator Raines had mentioned that four motions regarding student evaluations had been passed two years ago. He presented the results to Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Institutional Effectiveness Wes Null and he believes they were forwarded to Interim Provost McLendon, who did not approve them. Vice Provosts Mortenson and Carini would like to form a task force to revise the student course evaluation instrument. Additionally, other items included trying to incentivize students to complete the evaluations; one option would be to withhold students' grades until the end of the semester if they had not completed the evaluation; another would be to implement mid-semester evaluations for faculty who opt in, but in this case they would not be sent to chairs; the other option would be to implement a more uniform method of peer-teaching evaluation across campus. The revision of the course evaluation instrument appears to be the most controversial option. Baylor's evaluation is one of the longest ones compared to other universities.

The charge is to review the current questions and prompts included in the instrument and make a recommendation for the specific questions and/or prompts that should be included in a revised instrument. The task force should be comprised of no more than seven members; it should include a chair, a member from the Faculty Senate, someone from student government, and another person from IRT.

Questions:

One senator assumed that the chair would be decided upon by the actual committee and not from the administration? Senator Raines mentioned he was not clear on that but he would hope that would be the case.

The taskforce would be given a deadline, but to whom will they report back? Senator Raines explained that they hope to have the task force by the end of September and the deadline for

review would be December 14. The recommendations and the recommended timeline will be reviewed by the Council of Deans, Faculty Senate, and the Provost.

Another senator stated that since the task force is revising the instrument, will they make recommendations on how it is implemented in terms of how it is used for evaluating instructors? When evaluations were implemented, probably by the provost, it was agreed that these should never be used to evaluate an instructor's teaching. In fact, back in 2015 when the taskforce met, they did a qualtrics survey of every chair or anyone who was in the position of evaluating faculty teaching, and they asked to what extent student evaluations played a role in their evaluation of teaching. In response, some chairs said it was the only item they looked at and others said they never looked at them. He believes that the majority of chairs use them copiously and others use them exclusively. This was pointed out in the provost's office and they were told this practice is not following BUPP guidelines.

One of the other recommendations was in regards to developing a more robust peer-teaching evaluation, in order to encourage the practice of also using other forms of evaluation. Some academic units have a strong peer-teaching evaluation process and others do not.

One question was in relation to the date of when the revised evaluations would be implemented, and Senator Raines explained that one of the items of the task force is to determine a timeline for this, but it would probably be next year or 2020.

In terms of people on this task force, Chair Umstead suggested to Vice Provost Null that someone from the Baylor Women's Colloquium, which is one of the constituent groups most concerned implicit bias in the instrument, should be included on the task force. Another senator said someone from ATL should be on the task force as well. A graduate student was also suggested.

A senator asked if there was any discussion about evaluations reverting back to paper form. Senator Raines explained that although they have repeatedly requested it, he does not believe they will go back to paper as it used over 60,000 pieces of paper and sometimes they were lost.

One thought was to make the instrument shorter and easier for students, which would hopefully increase response rates. A concern has been that if there are chairs that are using this as the primary tool for evaluating teaching and there is a very low response rate, you are getting volatile data. Also, if you have a small sample size and return rate, you can have one response drop a faculty member from an outstanding performance to fall below the comparison group.

Another senator stated that we are aware from this study that these evaluations are being used inappropriately to evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure. Should we revisit this issue in Faculty Senate and propose another option or at least have a discussion with the provost's office? We know that they are being used inappropriately and the provost's office has acknowledged this, so perhaps we need to work on stopping this practice. Senator Raines agreed and mentioned one way to go about it would be to offer another alternative.

IX. Old Business

- **Proposed BUPP on University Committees**

Senator Matt Cordon was formerly chair of the Committee on Committees (CC) and now the chair is Dr. Margaret Woodydy.

Senator Cordon has drafted a new BUPP with the support of Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Policy Jim Bennighof and Vice Provost Null. As chair of the CC, Senator Cordon appointed people to committees and reported to the Faculty Senate. The issue is the one-off vote. The Faculty Senate should have ongoing oversight of the committees and not a one-off vote. Since there the composition of the committees is always changing (people rotate off or leave), it would be ideal for the Faculty Senate to have ongoing oversight and not just the one-off vote in September. One of the issues is getting the report done early and not only at the September meeting, so this BUPP is referring to this. There are some new items, such as a member of staff council and ex officio members. It reflects what the CC has been doing.

The CC webpage is not live yet but will be soon. If you go to the directory page, all of the committees are listed with descriptions and all of the members are there. However, it does not have a search option by name, as he was told by IRT that it would be a very complex process, but you can search by committee. Along with the webpage, faculty members on a committee will be informed by email.

Senator Cordon and Dr. Woodydy are still working on the master list of committees.

He requests that we give him feedback.

Questions:

One question was if Senator Cordon could add that the CC is an ongoing process and he said it was possible.

Another senator was happy to see that an ad hoc cannot duplicate the function of a standing committee. She asked if we could add a note that states if such a committee is suggested, that there would be an outline for the appropriate steps to take. In the past we have had ad hoc committees that duplicate official committees. Senator Cordon agreed and said that is why he believed it was imperative that the Faculty Senate have oversight.

Chair Umstead explained that one of the secondary challenges is that if ad hoc committee is not being carried out under the provost's umbrella, but under a different vice president, the Faculty Senate can address the issue but ultimately resolution belongs to the president.

A senator asked if there is the possibility of switching the start of each committee from August to January given that we are evaluated from January to December. Senator Cordon said it would be difficult because, for example, the tenure committee meets over Christmas break and it would leave holes in student appointments, among other things.

One senator asked how the Faculty Senate oversight or involvement would be done, and Senator Cordon explained that it would be important to inform the chair of the Committee on Committees. When he was chair, his listing was the most up-to-date, and the best way to keep it so is to share the information. The chair of the CC could work with the Faculty Senate (FS), especially since the chair of the FS sits ex officio on the CC.

Another senator mentioned she never understood the fact that when there are ad hoc committees that go across schools, why there was not a place to find these ad hoc committees. She suggested this might be the time to open this on the website, so if there is an ad hoc across schools, it should be mentioned on the website. Senator Cordon explained that most people do things as it has always been done. The ad hoc committee is supposed to have a defined function and defined limit. Many ad hoc committees are unlimited and sometimes become permanent, but they should have a limited term and should not overlap with other committees. If we would follow as it should be, it would be different. He hopes that if there is an easy process, perhaps people will pay attention and follow it.

Chair Umstead suggested we leave this for revision and bring it back next month.

X. New Business

a) Selection of Faculty Senator for Illuminate Steering Committee

The Executive Committee (EC) put forward a motion: “The EC proposes that the senate elect three names of faculty senators to be advanced as potential members for the Illuminate Steering Committee (ISC), of which we expect one to be seated on the ISC.”

Discussion:

One senator asked that we go over the historical practice and rationale for allowing somebody else choose our representatives. Chair Umstead said he believed the last time we did this was with the provost search and before that, with the selection of Faculty Regents (which was not our choice). We also put forth a slate of options for appointment to the committees charged with implementing the Pepper Hamilton recommendations. Senator Raines believes it is a gesture on our part, that if we put only one person forward that they find unacceptable, it would be awkward, and we are trying to be collegial. Also, we are putting forth three names that the Faculty Senate agrees upon. Overall, it is in the spirit of cooperation and of shared governance.

Chair Umstead explained that when we put forth three names (or whatever number), we are saying that we would be satisfied with any of them.

One senator asked who would make the choice and Chair Umstead believes it will be Vice Provost Carini.

The Faculty Senate voted to approve the EC motion: “The EC proposes that the senate elect three names of faculty senators to be advanced as potential members for the Illuminate Steering Committee (ISC), of which we expect one to be seated on the ISC”.

Chair Umstead explained that in the past they wrote down names on paper and the EC counted them and asked if there might be an alternative method. He asked if there were any volunteers, and initially there were five people and then one person removed their name.

Senator Hansen made the motion to submit four volunteers and it was seconded by Senator MacGregor. The motion passed.

Chair Umstead stated that the next step was regarding the call for nominations from the broader faculty. There are a total of 71 nominations and we need a process to identify which of the names we forward on to Vice Provost Carini.

It was suggested that a group of senate volunteers meet the next day. The motion was made by Senator Hurtt to have a volunteer committee to work on this issue by the end of the week and it was seconded by Senator Stroope. The motion passed. The volunteers are Senators Nichols, Souza-Fuertes, Supplee, and Chair Umstead.

b) Student Course Evaluation Task Force

A motion was made by Senator McGlashan to accept the proposal to form the task force, with the Executive Committee appointing the chair of the task force. The motion was seconded by Senator Hurtt and the motion passed.

Other New Business:

- Senator LeCompte mentioned that the Faculty-in-Residence committee needs a Faculty Senate representative. Chair Umstead asked for anyone interested to let him know.
- The EC welcomes feedback to take to the Kennedy & Co. meeting. Chair Umstead was aware of the following potential suggestions:
 - The possible need to re-visit aspects of the faculty hiring process. For example, a full-time lecturer goes through a provost interview. Perhaps lecturer hires could be pushed to the dean's office or maybe the provost's office could add more people to the pool of interviewers.
 - There is too much about school and departmental budgeting that is opaque. It is mostly controlled by the provost.
 - There is the question of if there is a process by which new Vice Provost positions are created as well as a process for appointing/reviewing vice provosts
 - In regards to faculty recruiting, the fact that you can bring in only two candidates is not sufficient if we are working to be a R1 school.
 - Further ideas can be sent to Chair Umstead.

XI. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Senator Pounders. The motion was seconded by Senator Raines and approved by the senate. The meeting was adjourned at 5:03pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lizbeth Souza-Fuertes
Recording Secretary