

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 8, 2005, at 3:30 PM in Rogers 109

Present: Senators Baldrige, Boyd, Brown, Chonko, Cloud, Connally, Cordon, Cox, Diaz-Granados, Garner, Green, Hanks, Lehr, Mathis, McGee, McGlashan, McManness, Miner, Ngan, Norman, O'Brien, Patton (Chair), Pennington, Pinney, Purdy, Robinson, Rosenbaum, Rust, Spain, Stanley, Sturgill, Vitanza, Wallace, Williams.

Absent: None.

Invited Guests: Mr. Will Davis, Chairman of the Board of Regents; Ms. Donell Teaff, Regent; Dr. Lynn Tatum, President of the local chapter of the AAUP; Dr. Truell Hyde, Vice Provost for Research; Mr. Kit Riehl, General Counsel's Office.

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:31 PM. Following the Chair's welcome Senator McGee offered the invocation.
- II. The minutes of the Senate's February 2005 meeting, distributed earlier by e-mail, were unanimously approved.

III. Announcements:

A. Election Commission. Senator Rust offered a brief report on the Faculty Senate elections currently in progress. All indications are that the balloting is proceeding smoothly in the new format. Dr. Steve Gardner was released from service on the Election Commission because he is running for a Senate seat himself.

IV. Board of Regents Chairman Will Davis.

Chairman Davis offered information on the search process adopted by the Board of Regents to find a permanent successor to President Sloan. Two committees, one made up entirely of regents and an advisory committee consisting of representatives of the various Baylor constituencies, have been constituted and are working with Mr. Bill Funk of a national firm specializing in finding candidates for top administrative positions at academic institutions. The General Counsel's Office will act as a clearinghouse for information, will accept suggestions for potential candidates, and will help safeguard the confidentiality and integrity of the undertaking. The process may take 6 to 12 months, including the interview phase, but could end sooner if circumstances are favorable. The advisory committee with four faculty members on it will participate in the interview process and help narrow the field of candidates. The latter have to be Baptist. A simple majority vote of the Board of Regents will decide on the next President.

Following Mr. Davis's presentation, numerous questions, observations and suggestions were offered from the floor of the Senate. Senators expressed their desire for the next President to be an academic of superior standing, to have the capacity to heal the divisions presently marking the campus, to offer inspired leadership regarding all Baylor constituents, and to be committed to the principle of shared management of academic matters. Senators also offered specific examples highlighting the discrepancy between optimistic statements about Baylor's financial situation coming from the administration as opposed to dozens of unfilled faculty positions all around campus and the impossibility in many departments of staffing classes for the fall.

Chairman Davis stated that an Interim President will be chosen at the next Regents Meeting on April 28 without a search process. The individual will be someone currently on the Baylor campus. Senators expressed vocal opposition to the possibility that the individual chosen might be someone closely associated with the current administration. Mr. Davis indicated that the permanent, not the interim President, will have the authority to make administrative personnel changes down to the dean level. He also expressed the view that the College of Arts and Sciences is too big and will likely be split up in the foreseeable future.

In closing remarks, both Chairman Davis and Ms. Teaff voiced their view that the search process seems a solid one and as open as possible for input from all concerned parties.

The Chair of the Senate thanked the visitors for their time and candor in discussing the matter at hand.

IV. Old Business.

A. Open Senate Meetings. Senator Stanley, Chair of the ad hoc committee, indicated that the committee has met and continues to discuss possible recommendations. Presently some 75 percent of peer schools surveyed have open sessions for Senate meetings, even though most appear to be University Senates rather than Faculty Senates. Changing Baylor's procedures would require complicated new constitutional by-laws and attention to a whole range of logistical challenges. It is the sense of the committee that the current climate at Baylor is not favorable for the introduction of open Senate meetings. Following a straw vote, the Senate instructed the ad hoc committee to monitor the situation informally but to withhold recommendations on the issue for the time being.

B. SACS Committee Report. Senator Cloud reported that the committee continues to receive additional information and that the document remains open to further amendments and modifications. While Dean Lyon has expressed a desire to work informally with Senator Cloud's committee to resolve the issues internally within the university, most Senators seem reluctant to pursue the matter further at this point, especially given the sensitive nature of some of the material and not knowing who the Interim President will be.

C. Document Review. Senator Robinson, assisted by Dr. Hyde and Mr. Riehl, presented to the full Senate the revised policies on Intellectual Property and Faculty Misconduct in Research at Baylor. Both policies had been previewed extensively by Senator Robinson's committee and the entire Executive Committee of the Senate and had earned their endorsement. After brief discussions and minor editorial changes, the Senate approved both documents unanimously.

V. Committee/Liaison Reports

A. Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Environment (Senator McGlashan, chair): No report.

B. Faculty Committee on Enrollment Management (Senator Stanley, chair): Written report attached as Appendix A.

C. Faculty Committee on Physical Facilities (Senator Brown, chair): Written report attached as Appendix B.

D. Faculty Committee on Student Life and Services (Senator Chonko, chair): Written report attached as Appendix C.

E. Liaison Reports:

1. Athletic Council (Senator Connally): Written report attached as Appendix D.

2. Staff Council (Executive Committee): No report.

3. Personnel, Benefits, Compensation (Senators Ngan, Williams): No report.

VI. New Business.

A. By acclamation the Senate adopted the following resolution:

"The Faculty Senate of Baylor University, in response to a request from the Baylor Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, affirms AAUP's selection of Lynn Tatum to sit on the Advisory Search Committee for the President of Baylor University."

B. Senator Vitanza gave a brief report on the first meeting of the Advisory Search Committee under Lyndon Olson.

C. The Senate Chair indicated that the anticipated splitting up of the College of Arts and Sciences will likely be preceded by several large town-hall meetings.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric C. Rust
Secretary, Faculty Senate

Appendix A

As of last Friday night, we had the following data for admissions:

14,295 applications-up 37%

8,921 acceptances-up 29%

2,100 deposits-up 26%--224 of the deposits from provisional students

Transfers

984 applications-up 20%

268 acceptances-up 16%

44 deposits-up 2%

In addition, the enrollment management committee had a consultant here last week looking for ways to help Baylor improve its retention rates which are currently about 82%. Hopefully, some good suggestions will come forward.

Chuck Stanley

Appendix B

Physical Facilities Committee Meeting Notes

24 February 2005

Project Updates

1. Building drop off traffic circle (similar to the one at 5th and Speight) at the 7th and Speight intersection (Woman's Memorial Dormitory, Armstrong Browning Library, Waco Hall) – stepping back and waiting for feedback; will place removable bollards and have a 15-minute drop off zone

1. Removing 400 faculty/staff/student parking slots summer 2005 – postponed; further discussion to take place with all constituents

1. Academic Success Center (Sid Richardson Science Bldg) renovation – over two-year period; update HVAC
 - Field floors: i.e., basement and 1st floor – little change expected with recent organizational change [Hulme to Crone]
 - 2nd-3rd floors – mathematics and psychology will remain, expect renovation within the next 2 years (statistics to remain on 2nd floor of Marris McLean)
 - Development (Cindy Dougherty) continuing to raise money
 - Will need to coordinate classes after construction begins

1. Marris McLean Science Building – space available with annual 1-year extension – contact Lois Ferguson; no major projects at present; chemicals have been removed

1. Williams Bear Habitat – will double outdoor space for bears and simulate natural habitat; debris will be left in bottom and filled in to raise venue; view windows will be installed
 - Phase 1 – site work will be completed by April 1
 - Phase 2 – to be completed in September by Parents Weekend with dedication at Homecoming

- i. Bookstore renovation – received great feedback from focus groups and Town Hall meetings
 - ii. Benchmarking (comparing with other university bookstores) contract offer from Follett who proposes to invest \$1.7 million in project along with additional operational changes for a 10 year contract extension; benchmarking will be evaluated and decision made to use Follett or go to RFP (request for proposal); if approved, work could start late spring (entrance will be reconfigured to face 5th Street, taking in space from former computer store, cashier office annex, and telephone services – gaining approximately 4300 sq ft).

- i. Daniel Memorial Fountain – design replacement – water feature (with cascades) in park area scaled down to 16-ft diameter

- i. BDSC renovation - WTW of New York won design competition with no job guarantee; possibility of extending into bowl and back parking areas; could gain additional sq footage from top floor; plans are to house student organization offices, improve study areas, dining and community spaces, and preserve Barfield Drawing Room
 - Work to be done from donor dollars – estimate \$15-20 million

- i. Brooks Village – not official project at present; information gathering phase; site of present Brooks Hall (building deteriorating – 5th floor already closed for safety); plan to retain historical archway

- i. University Parks Drive gateway – potential location is site of Jim's Restaurant at Ivy Square

- i. Brazos River walk – working with City of Waco to develop walking path, lookout points; walk will extend from IH35 to LaSalle

- i. IH35 buffer – will be necessary with possible raising of IH 35 to buffer noise

- i. Future Renovation of 5th Street – raise street elevation, using pave stone and other curb adjustments; long range project will be aesthetically important, but will also address safety concerns of the steep curbs

- i. Landscape master plan – 32 action projects relating to parking, pedestrians; issues include maintenance paths, campus tours, walking malls, gateways, gardens,

memorials, and sculptures. In addition, this plan addresses a plant palette for Baylor, in keeping with her historical design.

Appendix C

Student Feedback of Faculty Larry Chonko

Purpose: This is a committee to implement a plan for the publication of a form of student evaluations. This is a committee charged with working out the details. The committee has stressed the use of the term "feedback" rather than "evaluation."

Progress: To date, the committee has undertaken the following:

1. The "feedback" from students will be a part of the University student evaluation procedure. "Feedback" questions will follow the scale questions found in the current student evaluation procedure.
2. The "feedback" questions will be introduced with a statement indicating that these questions are not part of faculty performance evaluation processes.
3. The "feedback" process was tested in the Fall, 2004. Classes were volunteered by members of the committee and other faculty. Classes were both large and small and in a variety of disciplines.
4. Statistical analyses was performed to ascertain if any differences occur between the 15 student evaluation questions and the 9 (as of now) "feedback" questions. Recommendations/changes will be made based on these analyses.
5. Reporting. Results of the "feedback" will be made available to students through BIN. No results will be made publicly available from the Fall 2004 test. The test was conducted to evaluate the "feedback" system and discover any landmines that might arise.

The nine questions tested were:

1. The instructor communicated his/her ideas clearly
2. I felt free to go to my instructor for assistance
3. The instructor used clear, relevant teaching tools
4. The course provided an appropriately challenging intellectual experience
5. This class significantly improved my understanding of the material
6. I would take another course from this professor
7. Instructor appears to be well prepared for each class
8. Instructor answers student questions effectively
9. Instructor is accessible to talk with students on course matters outside class

Eventually, when "feedback" is posted, it will be accompanied by a description of the class provided by the faculty member teaching that class.

Results of Test

1. Approximately 33 sections of classes participated in the test. Approximately 1000 students were enrolled in those sections with the largest section having 172 students and the smallest 6 students.
1. Most of the students answered both the regular teaching evaluation questions and the faculty feedback questions which were located on the back of the form, prior to the open end questions that have traditionally been part of the teaching evaluation program at BU. There was some drop-off in response to the two sets of questions but, in most cases, the drop off was very small.
1. Two questions, one from the "old" set of questions (item 16 "The instructor explained material clearly") and one from the new set of questions (item 1 "The instructor communicated his/her ideas clearly – see list above), the largest mean difference was 0.29 on a 6 point scale. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Tests were employed to examine differences and there were only two sections in which there was a significant difference in response to these two questions --- Bus 1301-01 and Bus 1301-02. The absolute differences were 0.22 and 0.26. Class sizes in these two cases were 172 and 172
1. Similarly "old" question 9 ("The instructor was well prepared for each class") and "new" question 7 ("Instructor appears well-prepared for each class") were compared. Same test. Only one class (Bus 1301-01 yielded a statistically significant difference, but the absolute difference was .10.
1. The members of the committee have received other feedback from faculty. Briefly, this feedback has come in the form of: 1) those who do not like the idea at all, 2) those who believe the efforts of the faculty feedback committee should be coupled with the regular teaching evaluations, and 3) those who believe that the question ("I would take another course from this professor" is inappropriate from the perspective of student learning and pedagogical intent.
1. One of the participating faculty members encouraged students to comment of the feedback procedure used. The comments received were:
 - I feel the idea of online evaluating is well intentioned and could be valuable if you are interested in taking a class across schools; however, I'm skeptical as to how valuable the ratings will be given the subjective nature of the scale.
 - Question 19 ("The course provided an appropriately challenging intellectual experience.") was very hard to answer. Is it asking if the

challenge was appropriate or challenging? I would prefer to know the latter.

- Feedback about feedback: It's a neat idea and I don't mind filling in the little bubbles, but I don't think it provides much of an advantage over the current talk-to-your-friends-system.
- Student Evaluation: I don't understand how these questions are going to be helpful at all. They are incredibly vague and would not make me decide on a course one way or the other. Try message boards or have students develop class/major specific questions.
- Maybe have questions about workload and about expected grades.
- I think the student survey is silly and generally a waste of effort for all parties involved.
- Good idea, but perhaps better questions than those being used.

Final Thoughts

The committee plans to conduct faculty/student focus groups to gain more depth of insight into the subject of faculty feedback. **A focus group for all faculty is scheduled for March 23 at 3:30PM in Rogers 109.**

Please feel free to e-mail any comments to me and I will get them to the committee:
Larry_Chonko@Baylor.edu

Appendix D

GPA's of student-athletes are very high. Overall academics are good regarding the new NCAA academic evaluation model (Academic Progress Rate) with the exception of men's basketball which should be no surprise. We've hired an Equestrian Coach, spring athletic programs are doing well, winter sports were successful with Women's BB being the strongest and getting a lot of press. We also discussed the \$90 million athletic fund raising campaign and most individuals in the room were very supportive.

Dale Connally