

Minutes

FACULTY SENATE

March 26, 1996

The Faculty Senate convened at 3:30 p.m. in the Conference Room, Blume Conference Center, Hankamer School of Business, with Chair Kathy Hillman presiding.

Present: Adams, D., Baird, Barker, Basden, Getz for Buddo, Conyers, Davis, Edwards, Farris, Wilson for Fox, Garner, Goforth, Gordon, Hillman, Jensen, Johnson, K., Johnson, P., Longfellow, Luper, Massirer, Monk, Pippin, Robinson, Rolf, Stone, Thomas, Tipton, Supplee for Wallace, Wiley, and Willis

Absent: Adams, L., McGee, Whipple, Youngdale

Guests: Charles Beckenhauer, Wilma Griffin, Donald Schmeltekopf

Agenda

I. Invocation

The invocation was led by Robert Baird.

II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February meeting were approved as submitted.

III. Items from Dr. Donald Schmeltekopf or the Council of Deans

A. Civil Rights Policy - A draft copy of the Civil Rights Policy has been submitted to the Provost and Council of Deans. Action on this policy is pending.

B. Calendar Committee Survey - The Calendar Committee is conducting a survey eliciting response from many areas of the University, including the faculty, in order to plan the calendar. Items being questioned by the survey include: options for a Fall Break, extended Thanksgiving Holiday, and allowing weekend dorm move-in.

C. Proposed New Faculty-Contract letters - This item was postponed until the arrival of Dr. Donald Schmeltekopf.

D. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board - The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board must review and approve new off-campus programs. Programs involved may need to write justification statements.

E. Enrollment Minimums - University-wide enrollment minimums have been established for summer school, including 10 students for undergraduate classes and 5 for graduate classes. The School of Education's limits are 15 and 7 respectively. While there will certainly be exceptions, the implication is that summer school contracts may not be guaranteed in future summers.

Question - What is the reason or purpose for these enrollment requirements?

Response - Mostly a revenue problem. In special situations some undersized classes will be allowed. Faculty are encouraged to visit with their specific Deans and Chairs.

Observation - There has been some prior discussion regarding this issue in many units, but not all units have addressed required enrollment numbers. These standards are not intended for Summer 1996 but for future summer sessions. The School of Education requirement has been in effect in the past. Observation - Time lines should be established so schedules can be adjusted. By what date will decisions be made regarding canceling a class? This is important for both students and faculty so schedules can be planned. Further discussion of this item was deferred awaiting the arrival of Dr. Schmeltekopf.

F. Excused Absences and Make-up Exams - The following modification of the policy passed by the Council of Deans was proposed:

"The student bears the responsibility for the effect which absences may have upon class participation, announced and unannounced examinations, written assignments, reports, papers and other means of evaluating performance in a course. At the same time, if a student's required participation in a university-sponsored activity causes that the student be absent from class, and if the student seeks to make arrangements prior to the absence to complete scheduled assignments, the faculty member should make an effort to work with the student to grant the student's request. "Students are usually allowed to make up classwork and/or tests missed because of serious illness or accident or death in the family. Staff members in the Office of Student Life will make every effort to inform the faculty member concerning class absences on behalf of the student in these instances."

Senator Davis moved to amend the statement (shown in bold) and was seconded by Senator Barker.

Much discussion followed. It was pointed out this statement is being issued to help "good" students who may be penalized by interpretation of existing policy. Current university attendance policy is in reality a "Regents" policy not a faculty policy. Good students should not be penalized by policy, and it is difficult to consult a Dean since problems in these areas often cross school and departmental lines. Many absences appear to be choices made by students such as Student Foundation trips, whereas some are not, such as music ensembles and athletics.

A vote was taken on the amended motion. The motion to accept the amended policy passed:

Faculty Salary Equity Study

Since guest Schmeltekopf had not yet arrived, and guest Wilma Griffin had, Senate Chair Hillman requested that the agenda order be adjusted to allow Griffin to present her report listed as agenda item IV-H, Report from the Faculty Salary Equity Committee. As the chair of the committee, Griffin gave a brief overview of the study. Both Texas A & M University and the University of Texas have completed similar studies which have resulted in salary increases for women.

The reason given for the survey was that if salary inequity existed, it should be corrected. If not, then the perception of inequity should be addressed. The study went beyond just gender and included all inequities or perception of inequities. Griffin then distributed copies of a printed report (attached).

She explained some of the methodology: selecting numbers of faculty per academic unit, examining only tenure-track faculty, and comparison grouping to assure anonymity.

The data has been presented to the University Administration, who will share the information with Deans and Department Chairs.

Question: Was there evidence of bias in the survey?

Response: Yes, but it was subtle.

Question: Due to the potential for bias, and the involvement of several "players," should a neutral individual or group examine the results for best interpretation?

Statement: In the past when a lecturer was promoted to Assistant Professor, he or she was often compensated less than a new faculty assistant professor. According to Cindy Dougherty this is no longer a practice. Compensation is now equitable. It was also pointed out that salary increase for promotion was not evident university wide.

Question: Is denomination a factor? There is a perception that Baptists receive better compensation.

Response: Griffin will ask Tom Bohannon to run the collected data examining the denominational **Question**. **Statement-**When compensation is based on certain "established" criteria such as scholarly productivity, a faculty members assignment may preclude achievement in this area. The assigned teaching load may not provide opportunity for this type of productivity. This should be considered in this and future studies. The committee will continue the study and is examining:

1. How to inform the faculty about the results.
2. How to deal with grievance that may arise as a result of the study? How should it be handled? The suggestion was to use an informal approach first, then rectify through the formal appeal process.

Many other **Questions** were asked, including:

Is there any way to distinguish between researchers and teachers?

Could a female teacher differ from a male researcher?

Where do lecturers fit?

How do differences in disciplines fit in?

The study will look at librarians as the next group. Their faculty salary comparisons will be made with Texas universities and Big 12 universities. Guest Griffin concluded her remarks and departed.

Faculty Workload Task Force - John Wilson, committee member, reported for Joe Cox, chair, who was in Dallas (see previously distributed report).

This report is the first step in the process of defining a finished faculty workload policy. The Task Force attempted to develop a descriptive policy which reflected the current situation at Baylor. The Task Force never attempted to develop an algorithm or formula for release time, due to the complexity of the University. The Task Force believed the actual workload of a given faculty member should be determined by negotiation and the situation in a given department. Faculty and the administration should be able to work out an equitable solution.

Three or four clarify **Questions** were asked of John Wilson, and also of other Senate members who worked on the Task Force. No conclusions were reached, and the report was tabled.

IV. Standing Committee/Liaison Reports

A. Staff Council Liaison- Senators were asked to read "Staff Council Update" on page 12 of the March 1996 Baylor News.

B. University Committee on Committees - Lucille Brigham submitted a motion to "sunset" the Church-State Studies Committee. If approved, the committee would return to serving as Journal Editorial Board only. The motion passed.

The Agenda was again adjusted when guest Dr. Schmeltekopf arrived at 4:40 p.m..

Agenda Item III C - Draft copies of the new letters of appointment for General-Tenure, General-TTPA and General Lecturer-Fall and Spring semesters, Full time, were distributed. Dr. Schmeltekopf began his remarks stating the basic reason for the "new" letters was that the addendum to previous years' letters conflicted with both the Baylor University Personnel Policy Manual and other Baylor Policy. With the publication of the new faculty handbook, the addendum will not be needed. The legalistic tone of the former letters seemed rather stark, and the new letters are friendlier.

The basic changes in the letters were pointed out, including: Paragraph 1 - There is no statement about committee number limit or requirement;

Paragraph 2 - The Fall beginning date is the Monday before Fall semester classes instead of Thursday at the general faculty meeting, as in the past.

Paragraph 2 - This letter of appointment and applicable provisions of the Baylor University Personnel Policy Manual constitute the complete contract.

Paragraph 3 - This letter of appointment does not include summer employment. It further states that if summer employment is offered, a separate letter of appointment will be provided.

Many questions were then voiced. Does the statement in paragraph 3 concerning changes in the BU-PPM imply that all kinds of changes can be made with or without faculty input? In the past, changes seemed to occur and information about changes came by word of mouth. In the future, changes will be announced by official letter or memorandum.

Question-When will the Summer letter come out?

Response-I'm not sure; the summer letter will likely vary according to rank and or Departmental circumstances.

Question - The catalog is on a 2-year cycle which requires a 2-year plan. How will this be affected by the Summer letter?

Response-I'm not sure. More than likely, tenured faculty will receive their summer letters in the Fall.

Question - How will this be possible since summer class schedules are due in May, one year prior to the summer session?

Question - Is the intent of the summer letter to comply with the reduction in force policy?

Response - Yes, but it should also provide a procedure for fairly deciding who teaches. This issue is being discussed by the standing committee chaired by Senator McGee.

Question - Will the summer letter be conditional? Will it be based strictly on enrollment?

Response - I'm not sure. This has not yet been decided. The intent is for minimum enrollments to become a standard. They currently exist in theory but not in practice. (Dr. Schmeltkopf indicated that he is aware that a large number of low enrollment classes are taught by faculty without compensation. The faculty are generously providing this service for both the good of the student and the benefit of Baylor. This is commendable.)

Question - If summer contracts are extended and enrollment does not reach the minimum number, will the contract be rescinded?

Response - Yes, probably, but this issue still requires additional thought and work. Remember that this is intended for the summer of 1997, not 1996.

Question - What is the purpose of excluding or reducing summer school?

Response - It is a financial matter. Summer runs up to a million-dollar deficit. We have been instructed by the Board of Regents to address this serious financial issue. So that is our plan, to reduce this large deficit.

Observation - Are the Regents aware that this action causes faculty to develop great anxiety and mistrust? This reduction plan will not go over well with the faculty. Many may seek legal counsel. The reduction and the possibility of not teaching every summer imply a 10% salary reduction over a two-year period. Will the summer compensation change? Will it increase to make up the salary change?

Response - No, faculty members will be compensated 10% of their salary per course with a ceiling of 20% of salary. We are forced to do this because students are not taking full loads, and there is an increase in transfer hours. This causes a major financial problem at Baylor.

Observation - There are strong feelings among the faculty that they are being "squeezed" out. They are told not to count on summer salary. Will salaries for the 10-month contract be adjusted to match current 12-month income?

Response - The current 10% of annual salary per course is a high rate compared to other universities. Years ago we were low, but today we are in the high range.

Observation - Yes, that may be true but our current 10-month salaries do not compare well with other comparable universities' 10-month salaries. Thus our summer employment compensation rate comes close to making up for this broad inequity. Without summer salaries, we will fall significantly behind. Will our proposed 10-month contracts be increased to make summer school a true bonus?

Response - That is the intent. With good increases in Fall/Spring student credit hour enrollments, faculty salaries could be increased and summer employment would not be as important.

C. Student Life and Services - Lewis Barker, Chair, stated that the committee met on February 29.

Other - Senate Chair Hillman previously sent proposed changes to the BU-PPM to Senators via E-Mail. She stated that these changes should be carefully reviewed. Options for the Senate include a special called meeting to consider the numerous changes or to assign senators to each section since the items must be approved by May. Bill Thomas moved, with a second by G. W. Willis, that the Senate Chair appoint Senators to study the BU-PPM changes rather than calling a special meeting and that she should request that a faculty member be added to the Ad Hoc Personnel Policy Manual Revision Committee. The motion passed unanimously. Senators were asked to share their preferences for BU-PPM sections with Chair Hillman via E-Mail.

Senate Chair Hillman stated that unfinished agenda items would be placed on the April Senate meeting agenda if action needed to be taken. A handout of election results was distributed, and 1996-1997 Senate service preference sheets were collected.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Rusty Pippin, Secretary

Kathy Hillman, Chair