

# FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

December 4, 2007  
Room 303 Cashion  
2:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** Senators Blackwell, Bowman, Boyd, Brown, Cannon, Cloud, Connally, Cordon, Charles Weaver (for Diaz-Granados), Duhrkopf, Gardner, Garner, Green, Kayworth, Korpi, Longfellow, Lehr, Long, Losey, Myers, Ngan, Nunley, Pennington, Purdy, Rajaratnam, Rosenbaum, Sadler, Spain, Stone, Sturgill, Supplee, Tolbert, Vitanza

**Members Absent:** Senators Miner, Talbert.

## I. Welcome and Invocation

The meeting was called to order at 2:04. Senator Cloud offered the invocation.

## II. Guests: **President John M. Lilley** **Executive Vice President and Provost Randall O'Brien**

*Provost:* I am sensitive to your time demands at this point in the semester, and I'll keep my comments short. Thank you for your blessing on the certificate of enrollment and also on the posthumous diploma. We hope we never have to use these, but, unfortunately, two of our students have recently lost their lives. I wanted to report to you that we will be awarding these as part of the December commencement for these two students. We won't present these at commencement exercises. We will do this at a more private ceremony.

*President:* It won't surprise you that football has taken a lot of my time recently. I think this came out to a good place, and I think it will help us in several different ways.

I am on campus more than The Rope would make you think and as the campaign ramps up, I will be spending more time here. We are identifying the 100 individuals we need to be in conversation with most. We have already said we want to have another \$1 billion more than we already have. We will go into the quiet phase of the campaign, but there will be no publicly announced campaign until we have reached about half of our goal. That's typically the way these things get done. I think the strategic planning we are doing will continue to help with this. I am always amazed how many people there are who have values that fit with Baylor's values.

*Senate Chair:* The Senate Executive Committee met with the President and Provost yesterday and we had a good discussion about the Senate graduation resolution. We've added a few things since the version we circulated, for example, asking faculty to RSVP if they will attend.

*President:* I know that, once you have done commencement for a few decades, it doesn't necessarily make your heart sing. We have to remember we are not doing it for ourselves or for our students; we are doing it for their parents.

I would like to open the floor for questions.

*Senator:* I talked with a colleague about nominating people for the board and got the question about what the process is for this. *President:* Contact the general counsel's office and they can give you information on that. Let me say a few more things about this. A board member must be a Baptist. There is also the BGCT component of the board. The Regent's governance committee is having its first committee on this next week. They are already inviting nominations.

*Senator:* You mention the BGCT members of the regents. Can you give us your opinion on the health of the BGCT right now? *President:* I don't know if I can say a lot. Budgets are being cut. I do think our relationship with the BGCT is very important. I think our history and traditions are very important, and I do like our historic Baptist principles. For fundraising, we expect to have lots of different people of different affiliations.

*Senator:* Given what you just said, with the Atlanta meeting coming up, are there any plans to designate an office on campus or a person to maintain our relationship with Baptists. *President:* To be honest with you, I think I am that person. We do have, at the Bobo Baptist Student Center, a direct representative.

There was some discussion about the desire to preserve some campus buildings, particularly the Harrington House.

### **III. Guest: Reagan Ramsower, Vice President for Finance and Administration**

First, I did want to clarify something the president said. When he talked about checking off boxes, he was talking about students. When we look at the students who are applying and compare the boxes they check for religious affiliation to their churches they attend, they don't always agree.

Before we look at the campus master plan, I want to say two things. This really is a vision. This is absolutely not a done deal. All these dreams are going to require money and we don't yet know when the money will come. I don't know what will happen in the next 5 years. Having said that, I think there is real value to dreaming. For example, I was in a meeting with city planning this morning. We were talking about how, if you have a green

space between 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> street, all the way downtown, you would have a corridor that would just draw people. If it was to ever happen, it would be 30 years, but if you don't start talking about it, it's never going to happen.

On the plan, you can see 12<sup>th</sup> Street, La Salle and the river. This is the space we've defined as the Baylor area, whether it's property we own or property we would like to influence. This is a little different since we have not previously tried to influence areas like this. We are working closely to try to have more of a presence in areas beyond the ones we actually own.

Where did this plan come from? This is driven entirely by the major strategic planning process. We know that we have not captured every need, and we will continue to get new things coming in this year. However, a lot of pieces do start settling in. We sat down and started working with the land planners. We looked at issues like architectural similarity when we talk about placing buildings. We've been out talking to the facilities subcommittee of the Senate. We've talked a time or two with the Downtown Summit.

Let's take a look at the ideas behind this. For one thing, we are defining an area that's not entirely our property. This is somewhat driven by the fact that, within 10 years, you will have to exit Interstate 35 to an access road that will enter campus at 12<sup>th</sup> street and University Parks Drive. That means that the 8<sup>th</sup> Street exit will go away, along with many others. We also want to come in on La Salle and cut off some of the campus entrances there. Right now, the campus is very porous. We'd like to limit access for security reasons. We are also working on a research park. It's not part of this particular plan, but we have some good ideas and we think we'll be able to create this in concert with companies, the city and the county. We are thinking toward the next 20 or 30 years here.

Let's quickly talk about some of the features in the current plan. Neill Morris going away; we would like this to happen as quickly as possible. The A.F.R.O.T.C building needs to go away. That corner would be much prettier if it was green space, but we must find a new home for R.O.T.C. The plan is for the Student Union Building to become an academic building and to construct a new SUB. Why? When we did our study it looked like it would be 2 million more expensive to refurbish the structure to do what we needed than it would be to build a new structure from scratch. Repurposing the SUB lets us eliminate the MP Daniel access to this part of campus.

In thinking about access to campus, we think about three kinds of streets: the kind people drive on every day, the kind that are not intended to be driven on, but can be, and then surfaces like grasscrete, which looks like grass, but can be driven on in an emergency. When we settle in, we will do more studies to find out what kind of access we need where.

One of the major strategic plans was to expand Family & Consumer Sciences. You see this expansion here. We are drawing shapes here to show this, but the shapes don't mean anything in this figure.

We are envisioning a parking garage south of Pat Neff Hall. You can see that Harris House and Harrington House are gone. I would anticipate Harrington house going down pretty quickly. I leave it up to you to help advise us about how critical preserving the original Harrington house is.

You see some green space between campus and the interstate. We don't own all this property right now, but everyone knows that we want it. As quickly as we can, I'd like to clear out all this space and make it a green space. This will have a nice visual appeal. We will tear down Ivy Square. This could happen soon, but we have to find a new space for Clinical Psychology. I think this will happen in the next 5 years.

*Senator:* When they put this frontage road in, will it go in the same place as the current one or will it take a slice of campus. *Ramsower:* When you get down to the Pizza Hut, there's not much space between the frontage road and I-35. There's more space further north.

On University Parks Drive, you see the Highers Athletics Complex and the Simpson Athletics and Academic Center. All of this area is built on a landfill. We are having to spend a lot of extra money here. This is going to be a very large building, larger than the Mayborn Museum. How will people get here? There's a foot bridge under University Parks here that we will have to widen. It was pointed out that this path floods, and there was some discussion about changes in the dam on the Brazos.

*Senator:* What's going to be in that big bldg? *Ramsower:* That will be all the coaches, the athletic success center, the training rooms and the workout rooms. If you've ever had an injury and need a whirlpool for therapy, that will be there. That, by the way, will be available to everyone on campus.

*Senator:* I want to point out the dangers in the area south of the Eighth Street parking garage. *Ramsower:* We know this is a problem. This is part of what we are talking about when we say we want to influence this whole neighborhood. It would be an absolute disaster if it was widely believed that we were an unsafe campus.

There is a university development house near the River. The law school is thinking about expanding, and there are ideas for a multi-purpose athletic complex near the river. Any of these structures are gigantic. Even if you try to dress these up, they are still just one giant box.

*Senator:* One of the things that got displaced by the Athletic Center was the swimming pool. Where is that going to be? *Ramsower:* I'll get to that later in the presentation.

As you go over to the Ferrell Center, you see we have a new parking garage. It uses La Salle as the entrance and exit. You also see a nearby on-campus track facility on the other side of La Salle. It would displace these intramural fields, which will need to go some place else.

Coming south on La Salle, we have some entrance streets, but they will not go all the way into campus. An important feature of this plan is the extension of campus all the way to La Salle. We envision a large residential facility in this area, but this is a long way away. We are thinking about creating a pedestrian mall on 2<sup>nd</sup> street. Third Street becomes the La Salle entrance. It runs all the way in and comes around Jones Library. The new Student Union Building would go north of this, south of the SLC. The Goebel Building is gone and is replaced by an Olympic-sized swimming pool. This area becomes the student center of campus.

The area between McCrary and the Fine Arts Building becomes the arts center, potentially with a parking garage in the middle. This has become a very important area for us to figure out. We are going to be interviewing a number of architects to do this and potentially other areas of campus. This doesn't mean re-skinning buildings. Campuses are kind of fun because of all the different architectural styles you see.

Over near the science building, we have a Science Annex. This is just a name. In my mind, that would include a number of the science departments. It would also include Clinical Psychology and Communications Sciences and Disorders. As you can see, it would be a good-sized facility. We are working hard to rebuild Carlile Geology in the loading area near the science building.

We are planning for a green space between the main campus and the new residential district over closer to La Salle. This will also include some commercial property. *Senator*: I see you have an academic building over near the residential area. This is going to create some long walks across campus. *Ramsower*: This campus plan is much larger than our current campus and it depends on some transportation solutions, including bikes and trolleys. *Senator*: How would that work if you were handicapped? *Ramsower*: We would have to have a handicapped-accessible bus. I'm afraid we will work through the next two generations before we have complete ADA compliance.

*Senator*: With this larger campus, do you anticipate an increase in enrollment? *Ramsower*: This plan is not driven by an increase in enrollment. In many cases, we are just trying to fix problems that we have.

The business school has said that they would like to move out of their current facility and move to a completely new facility on campus. If so, the new facility might go north of the current facility. The old business school building would be repurposed for other academic departments to use.

We see an extension to Morrison Hall. *Senator*: Were you talking about doing away with Waco Hall? *Ramsower*: No. *Senator*: Is there a proposal for a new building for international education? *Ramsower*: No. This is the first I have heard about this. *Senator*: What's your timeline for when we will have new green space for academic use? We use spaces like this for activity-based instruction. *Ramsower*: Your comment is a good comment. I have

not given thought to this and this is the first time this issue has been raised. How well would the new green space between campus and I-35 work? Let me take that into consideration.

*Senator:* As this develops, you are taking away a lot of parking lots. Where are the cars going? *Ramsower:* This has occurred to me also. When I bring this up to the architects, they want to first think about where the buildings go and then worry about parking needs. We do have one new parking garage proposed between McCrary and Hooper-Schaefer. This is probably going to be harder on us than it is on students. They are getting on board with the idea that they should bring their cars to campus and then bike or walk between classes. This campus is clearly becoming much more of a sustainable campus where there are more walking trails than there are parking lots.

*Senator:* While we are thinking about new buildings, why not think about parking garages under the buildings? *Ramsower:* We can't. The water table is too high. There was some discussion about the SUB and desires to keep it as a student building. *Ramsower:* We are planning to preserve many features of the building. Under no circumstances would we do anything to make this building go away.

*Senator:* For residents of Old Main and Burleson, parking is moving farther and farther from our building. If you have to carry a stack of papers and books, it's a long walk to your office. This is fine if you are 20 years old, but it can be a problem if you are 50 or more. *Ramsower:* If you need is to carry a bunch of stuff in, I think you do need a way to let people drive in and unload. There was some additional discussion about removal of parking lots near Pat Neff and the need to access these buildings. *Ramsower:* We are going to have to have an internal transportation system. We can look at this map and consider what we should tear down to make room for more parking garages.

*Senator:* What is the process for accepting a final version of this plan? *Ramsower:* The next step is to take it to the Regents in February and let them know that this is the version as of this year. I don't know that it ever becomes rigid. In general, this is just a plan. Each individual project on it would require Regent approval. I am open to your suggestions, but the architect is going to ask me what we want to do.

*Senator:* I think this plan is too high-level to show the parking issues. *Ramsower:* The only thing I know to do is to build a garage closer to the center of campus. I know the architect is going to tell me that this is not a good idea.

**IV. Guests: Diana Garland, Dean, School of Social Work  
Elizabeth Davis, Vice-Provost for Financial and Academic  
Administration**

*Davis:* Diana has been chair of a committee looking at the faculty evaluation form. There seems to be a lot of variation and I've had a lot of people ask me what it means to meet professional standards. I suggested to Randall that we bring this up. At the department chair orientation in August, this was a line item, and once we got rolling, this discussion lasted an hour. His promise to the department chairs was to have a committee appointed to look at the form and to decide what changes needed to be made. There was also a little concern that just meeting professional standards would not merit a raise. There were some misunderstandings across campus about how these terms should be interpreted.

*Garland:* I was notified that I would be chairing this committee. I don't think anyone volunteered. What you have in front of you are two forms. One is the current form; the second is a draft of the new form, which is followed by a new sheet of instructions. The final page is a sample of professional standards. We are offering this out for departments as an example and we expect each to develop their own criteria for professional standards.

First of all, under areas of evaluation, we took out tenured and tenure track faculty and put all full-time faculty. We changed assigned service to administrative responsibility. We have workload percentages for only three areas, teaching, research and administrative responsibility. We found out that in some cases, faculty were filling these forms out for themselves. We've made it clear that this should be done by the supervisor, and we've changed it to past tense pertaining to the most recent calendar year. We tried to make it clear that tenure guidelines are related to professional standards, but meeting these standards does not guarantee tenure.

We provided a rating scale that puts meeting professional standards at the midpoint. We've also removed the Provost from the review and we allowed for evaluation in each area as well as the overall evaluation at the bottom.

*Senator:* We have such a range of service in the department that doing service doesn't really mean anything. We are encouraged to do service.

There was discussion of how the service category is not a significant part of the evaluation, inconsistencies in the service expectation and how this will change in the new form.

*Senator:* Can the faculty senate discuss this and then get back to you? I think our constituents need to have some input on this.

*Senator:* I think this is an improvement over last year. I asked people what items on the last form meant, and I got lots of different answers.

*Senator:* Why does unsatisfactory come first? *Garland:* It can be turned around.

*Senator:* I worry about the description of marginal. The descriptions you have here may hold for a lot of people, but I don't think they are appropriate

for everyone. *Senator:* My understanding is that these descriptions are for a particular department. We are going to have to come up with descriptions for our own departments. *Senator:* You will have to tailor this to your own department.

*Senator:* Two comments. I would rather not see this sample perpetuated. If you want departments to come up with their own criteria, ask them to.

*Senator:* I have concerns about the teaching evaluations. Students don't evaluate on the criteria of whether I am doing a good job as a professor.

*Senator:* Are teaching evaluations required for tenured faculty every semester? It seems like they are only required every third year.

*Senator:* Our self-evaluations go into this. If so, when should they be done? Ours are expected November 14. I think the timeline needs to be clarified.

*Senator:* Can we distribute this to our constituents? *Senator:* I would think comments on this should go to Elizabeth. *Senate Chair:* Would it be constructive to send comments to me and have me compile them? If you have comments, please send them to me and I'll compile them and forward them to Diana and Elizabeth.

## **V. Approval of Minutes**

A **motion to approve** was made by **Senator Long** and seconded by **Senator Cloud**. The minutes were approved with no opposition.

## **VI. Old Business**

### **A. Graduation Resolution**

The committee looking into graduation attendance has met. We wanted to avoid changing too much all at once. The very last item on this resolution is new, requiring faculty to RSVP. If we approve this, we will introduce it to the Council of Deans for discussion. We would like department chairs and associate deans to promote this with their faculty.

*Senator:* Was there discussion about having departments report the number of faculty rather than individuals. *Senate Chair:* The idea would be to have the chairs report numbers. The wording was changed to reflect this.

*Senator:* It was originally suggested that we find out why faculty are not attending graduation. Has that part been done? *Senate Chair:* That was my idea, that we needed to find out why faculty aren't attending.

*Senator:* We should look into the university providing the gown and then faculty could provide their own hoods. It has gotten very expensive.

*Senator:* I have a gown that has been available for anyone who wants to borrow it and it's been used 4 times in the last 20 years.

The **resolution passed** with one vote in opposition.

## **B. Faculty Contracts and Letter of Appointment Process**

Bud McGregor responded and said they would have this information to us for the January meeting. Also, they will present the new software, probably in February.

## **C. Department Chair Evaluation**

Copies of the current Appointment, Evaluation and Job Responsibilities of Department and Division Chairs policy were distributed.

*Senator:* What I would like to see is an annual evaluation of chairs. President Lilley said he didn't see any reason we shouldn't be able to do this.

There was discussion of the dean evaluation policy, how it was developed and adopted. There was a **motion** that we go into **executive session**. The **motion** was **seconded** and **approved** without opposition.

At the conclusion of executive session, no action had been taken on matters discussed.

## **D. United Way**

Our totals for this year are \$60,200.

## **VII. Committee/Liaison Reports**

### **A. University Curriculum Committee (Myers)**

We are in conversation about the scope and boundaries of this committee. *Senator:* Is this committee just concerned with undergraduate curriculum? We are beginning to duplicate course content in graduate courses. *Myers:* The committee is giving focus to the creation of an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee first and then it will consider the role of a curriculum committee that addresses graduate curriculum matters.

*Senator:* A couple of my constituents were concerned about the strategic planning process and proposals that have been approved but not gone through the curriculum committee. *Senate Chair:* We talked about this yesterday and the answer was that these proposals need to go through the appropriate committees even after they are approved as strategic plans. *Senator:* It still seems that there should be a separate consideration of academic programs. They should not be thrown in with athletic programs.

### **G. Lecturers (Lehr, Sadler)**

We have a lot of comments. We are trying to figure out a way to present these comments in a way that is not threatening to the lecturers. *Senator:* When we were talking about chair evaluations, it was pointed out that lecturers are included in some departments and not in others. We need to have a clear definition about what we mean by terms like departmental faculty.

## **H. Liaison Reports**

### **ii. Athletic Council (Connally)**

We met this morning. There was some discussion about opportunities to have interaction between faculty and new coaches.

## **VIII. New Business**

*Senator:* On compensation for the ombudsperson, Jim Bennighof called two weeks ago about the standards we used for the ombudsperson. There was discussion about compensation and how extra salary might compromise the neutrality of the ombudsperson. The point was made that this compensation should be understood as release time. This may not be the case for, say, a retired faculty member who fills the position.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40.

Respectfully submitted,

David Sturgill  
Secretary