

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, January 19, 1999**  
**303 Cashion, Hankamer**  
**MINUTES**

---

**Present:** Abbott-Kirk, Adams, Baird, Beck, Beckner, Bowery, Buddo, Chinn, Counts, E. Davis, Dunn, Farris, Genrich, Gilchrest, Hillman, Jensen, K. Johnson, P. Johnson, Johnston, Longfellow, Losey, McGee, Stone, Supplee, Tipton, Weaver, Wilson, Yelderman, Young

**Absent:** Carini, Conyers, C. Davis

**I. Invocation**

The meeting began at 3:35 PM; Ray Wilson gave the invocation.

**II. Consideration of Agenda**

The following items were added to the agenda:

Approval of Minutes for Meeting of December 15, 1998

Addition to Chair's report: Meeting with the Provost regarding clarification of Policy on Lecturers

Move discussion on Grievance Policy to Item III

Defer discussion of Enrollment Management/UPC meeting until K. Barge (Communications) present.

**III. Grievance Policy (Jim Wiley)**

The completed Grievance Policy was distributed electronically prior to the meeting (and is included as Attachment 1). Senators were asked to review the policy before the February meeting, at which time the Senate will take formal action. K. Hillman pointed out that the document as now written does not specifically identify the academic units that will be represented on the Grievance Committee. McGee acknowledged this, and it will be considered during the formal discussion and vote in February.

**IV. Discussion of Y2K Problem and Salary Concern**

Don Hardcastle, Director, ITC, addressed the Senate regarding the University's compliance with Y2K standards. In particular, Hardcastle addressed questions addressed to McGee by Terry Roller (Art), with respect to potential problems with payroll on or after January 1, 2000. According to Hardcastle, the University is in compliance with all generally accepted standards and timelines. While acknowledging the possibility of some unexpected problems, Hardcastle stressed that ITC

expects most of these to be minor. Regarding the question of payroll specifically, Hardcastle reported that under the worst of circumstance, payroll checks could be completed and signed by hand and delivered to faculty on the usual payroll date. Senators asked several questions concerning more general Y2K problems, to which Hardcastle reiterated that most "doomsday" predictions are extremely unlikely, and may be motivated by reasons other than legitimate concern.

**V. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of December 15, 1998.**

The minutes had been distributed and corrected prior to the meeting, and were approved by acclamation. Final copies will be distributed electronically.

**VI. Faculty Evaluation of Administrators (Chris Buddo)**

Buddo, McGee, & W. Beckner met with Marilyn Crone, Vice President for Human Resources in late December. A sample survey instrument was discussed (and will be distributed to Senators electronically), a tentative timeline was developed, and a tentative list of those to be evaluated was prepared. (These are included as Attachments 2, 3, and 4 respectively). As currently proposed, each administrator will be evaluated every other year: Administrative and Academic Personnel will be evaluated in one year, and Staff/Service Personnel will be evaluated in the alternative year. As proposed, the evaluations will be carried out during the Spring semester each year. The results will be shared with individuals at two "reporting levels" of administrative oversight. It is expected that evaluation of higher-ranking administrators will be shared with members of the Board of Regents, though most likely this will be restricted to members of the relevant Regent subcommittees, rather than the entire Board. The Senate agreed to add Associate Deans to the list of administrators to be included, and will take under advisement the recommendation that BIC administrators be added.

The Senate discussed several aspects of the proposed evaluation plan. First, who will be asked to complete the evaluations? There are no plans to include any demographic information (to increase the likelihood of confidentiality), so a breakdown of evaluations by faculty rank or type will not be possible. After considerable discussion, a consensus emerged that all full-time faculty will be included, but adjunct faculty will not. Faculty will be asked to evaluate the Dean of the respective schools or colleges, and all faculty will be asked to evaluate administrators in the library and graduate school.

Second, the Senate discussed potential problems with assurances of confidentiality and/or anonymity. The elimination of (potentially-identifying) demographics will reduce this likelihood. The Senate agreed to ask those who are developing and administering the survey to seek evaluation and approval from the University Committee for the

Protection of Human Subjects in Research. This review will be mentioned in the cover letter accompanying the survey, to provide further assurances to those completing the survey.

Third, the Senate discussed who should conduct the surveys (the Office of Research and Testing, or a private outside agency), and whether they will be administered electronically (such as through e-mail or web pages) or with paper-and-pencil measures. A straw vote indicated that those with a preference supported an in-house evaluation, and a consensus emerged favoring electronic data collection (with paper-and-pencil options available for those who prefer it).

These recommendations will be forwarded to Crone's office for action.

## **VII. Enrollment Management Issue and UPC Meeting**

Kevin Barge (Communications) addressed the Senate, reviewing the highlights of the Faculty Forum held on January 14, 1999. Additional comments were made from the floor. Specifically, Senators expressed concern that the recruiting materials continue to advertise small courses taught by full-time faculty, when the pressures of increased enrollment have resulted in larger classes, increasingly taught by non-full-time instructors. It was suggested that the University be more forthcoming with prospective students regarding the true state of affairs.

In addition, Senators expressed the opinion that the exact nature of these discussions remains unclear. Are we deliberating whether or not to increase enrollment, or has this decision already been made. If so, should we be discussing how best to deal with the problems caused by increased enrollment?

Several other questions were brought forth for inclusion in the reports

- What is the purpose of increased enrollment? Is it to increase revenue, to enhance the University's reputation or standing, or are there other goals? Will an increase in enrollment truly increase revenue, or are the attendant costs greater than the increased tuition dollars?
- Will the increase in student enrollment be matched by an increase in full-time faculty?
- Will the increase lead Baylor to lose its "small school value," like University-wide collegiality among faculty and students?

Finally, Senators expressed concern over the ultimate message that may be transmitted to the Provost and the University Planning Council. Some faculty insist that the pressures of increased enrollment

have not caused substantial changes in the nature of their work, while others feel that the pressures have seriously compromised what they are able to accomplish, both in terms of classroom instruction and in terms of student mentoring. It is important for those involved in making the decision to recognize that faculty may not speak with one voice on this issue.

### **VIII. Committee Reports**

#### **A. Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Environment (Bob Baird).**

The Committee will soon begin discussing procedures to be used in the oversight of evaluations.

#### **B. Faculty Committee on Enrollment Management (Elizabeth Davis)**

Admissions have been changed to begin admitting students in the 3rd quartile in their high school class with ACT/SAT scores of 23/1080 (ACT/SAT scores) and those in the 4th quartile with ACT/SAT scores of 24/1100.

E. Davis was asked about any attempts by the committee to raise admissions standards. The only change thus far is that some students who would have been granted regular admission status last year are now being admitted into the Challenge program.

#### **C. Faculty Committee on Physical Facilities (Joe Yelderman).**

Science departments are now engaging in the programming stages with the architects. By the end of the summer, the architects should be able to make some determinations on needs and the building costs to meet these needs. Should the building costs greatly exceed initial expectations, then either fundraising goals will be increased to this level or plans will be scaled back.

#### **D. Faculty Committee on Student Life and Services (Gary Carini). No Report.**

#### **E. Athletic Council (Mark Dunn). No Report.**

#### **F. Staff Council Liaison (Nancy Chinn). No Report.**

**G. Task Force on Promotion Policy (Jay Losey). See VII (A) above.** The Task Force met with the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Environment on January 12, 1999, and the final report of the Task Force has been distributed to Senators. (See Attachment 5). Senators are asked to study the report and be prepared to discuss it and take action at the February Senate Meeting.

#### **H. Senate Newsletter and Web Page (Buddy Gilcrest)**

The web page continues to be developed. The next Senate Newsletter will be distributed in late February. The deadline for suggesting materials/announcements for the this newsletter is February 15.

Senators were reminded about the faculty forum scheduled for Feb. 4th, 1999, and will be reminded by e-mail, which may be forwarded to their constituents.

## **IX. Miscellaneous**

### **A. Chair reports on:**

(1) Request to Provost regarding status of Faculty Dismissal Policy, Policy on Financial Exigency and reduction of Academic Programs, and Reduction of Academic Programs not mandated by Financial Exigency.

The Provost indicated that the Faculty Dismissal Policy has been forwarded to N. Bice, University Counsel, and Bice is expected to contact McGee and Baird.

The Policy on Financial Exigency and reduction of Academic Programs, and Reduction of Academic Programs not mandated by Financial Exigency have been forwarded by the Provost to Charles Beckenauer.

(2) Status of Recommendations on Lecturers  
McGee and Baird had asked the Provost to clarify Administration's implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force. The Provost indicated the University will consider an appointment to Senior Lecturer as a promotion, and this promotion brings with it increased job security (i. e., longer-term contracts) and increased compensation.

(3) Church Activity in Faculty Annual Report.  
McGee had been contacted by a tenured faculty member regarding the role of church activity in annual evaluations. This faculty member shared a memo from his or her Dean, which stated that such a report was expected, and would be part of the evaluation.

McGee spoke with the Provost, and the Provost stated that the University does not require a report on church activity for tenured faculty (though it does prior to tenure). However, many tenured faculty will include

this as part of their "community service" activities.

(4) President's Faculty Forum, 2/4/99

A written announcement has been distributed through campus mail. Senators were asked to notify those faculty for whom they have communication responsibilities. All faculty are encouraged to submit questions to McGee, with the deadline for submission January 25, 1999

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Chuck Weaver*

**ATTACHMENT 1:**

PROPOSED UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE POLICY

**ATTACHMENT 2:**

Proposed Survey Questions for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators  
Faculty Evaluation: Draft of possible questions

**ATTACHMENT 3:**

Draft of Process and Timeline for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

**ATTACHMENT 4:**

Proposed List of Administrators to be Evaluated

**ATTACHMENT 5:**

PROMOTION POLICY DOCUMENT  
PROMOTION POLICY TASK FORCE

**Appendix A**

Alternative Titles  
Faculty Promotion Policy

**Appendix B**

Statement on Scholarly Expectations at Baylor University

**Appendix C**

Promotion Policies of the School of Law and the Department of Chemistry

**Baylor Law School**

Faculty Evaluation, Contract, Renewal, and Tenure

[Law School Appendix A-19: Timetables](#)

[Department of Chemistry Promotion Statement](#)

---

[Home](#)