

**Baylor University Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**22 January 2013 • 3:30 p.m. • Cashion 110**

Members Absent: Rosalie Beck (ill), DeAnna Toten-Beard; Jim Patton (surgery); Mary Margaret Shoaf.

Attending as a substitute: Lily Souza-Fuertes (for Michael Long)

- I. Call to Order
- II. Invocation offered by Tim McKinney
- III. Review of Minutes from the 11 December 2012 Meeting: Approved.
- IV. Presentation by Dr. Chris Rios Regarding the Establishment of a Selection Committee for Outstanding Dissertations and Theses:
  - A. Dr. Still introduced Dr. Rios, Assistant Director of Graduate Studies, reporting on the project. Dr. Rios presented a Powerpoint report (attached below), naming committee members and the informing idea: “that we should recognize our best students” by offering the dissertation award. Dr. Rios showed a list of some 24 or so of our aspirant institutions who already do this. He added that the average time spent determining the award winner is 7 weeks. The usual prize is some sort of award, most often money (in the \$1,000-\$3,000 range).
  - B. Model Programs: Notre Dame, UT-Austin, University of Maryland, several others.
  - C. The current intention: to form two categories of awards, STEM (science, technology, engineering, and Mathematics) and Humanities fields.
  - D. Nominations are to come from each department (every thesis or dissertation-granting department will send forward a nomination for one of its Ph D. graduates.) The nomination will include a letter of support expected to be especially useful for the judges of the awards.
  - E. To be awarded by calendar year
  - F. Criteria: the plan is that the committee will make up its own criteria as well as the process.
  - F. An award will be given in a public program, and it is thought that the program will have considerable impact.
  - G. Dr. Rios noted that the award will also give to the individual who wins it an opportunity to compete for regional and national dissertation awards.
  - H. Procedures: the Graduate School is to initiate the process, the Graduate Directors vet them, and the graduate faculty winnow them. On 1 March of each year: call for nominations; 20 March: Nominations due; 16 April: award made.
  - I. Anticipated Workload for 2011-2012 (based on past numbers of Ph. D. and M.A. graduates, but useful as a model). 21 nominations are expected for theses, 16 for dissertations..
  - J. There is also to be a “Faculty Mentor Award” and an “Administrative Support Award.”

- K. Why a standing committee? Dr. Rios noted that if there is a standing committee, the faculty have more control, at the cost of somewhat less control for the graduate school.
- L. Questions followed. One senator asked if there would be external reviewers. Dr. Rios suggested “No”—that external review would unnecessarily complicate the process.

Another asked how one would compare, for example, an auditing dissertation and an English literature dissertation? Chris said he had no idea personally, but that he notes that other institutions manage to do it. He adds, “It’s clearly difficult.”

- L. Asked “What do you ask of the Faculty Senate?” Dr. Rios suggested that the process would be, first to name a standing committee, then to run a pilot project.

Discussion followed. One senator said that a pilot project seems wise before we go into endorsing or refusing the proposal. Dr. Still asked if we might ask the graduate school to run a pilot project, then report to us. Ron Beal moved the suggestion; Barry Harvey seconded it. David Hurtt asked for documentation of time spent on the project by dissertation judges, and for documentation of the means of project. The vote was called, and the motion passed.

- V. Master Teacher Policy (see attachment for policy as it came to the Faculty Senate)
  - A. Dr. Still referred to the (attached) Master Teacher Policy proposal, and noted that it has been on our docket for at least 6 years. Now, it has been approved by the Deans and administration. He noted one correction—to remove the word “following” in the phrase “following October.” He called for a motion. Lori Spies made the motion, Mitch Neubert seconded it, and the motion passed unanimously.
- VI. Proposal from the Office of the Registrar Concerning Dropping and Withdrawing from Classes (see second attached document)
  - A. Dr. Still directed our attention to the document (attached), rehearsed the current “WP/WF” policy, noted that it has been widely considered cumbersome, and suggested that the proposed policy is considerably streamlined.
  - B. Discussion followed: Questioned on one aspect of the proposed policy, Dr. Still said that he was fairly certain that the proposed policy represents the common practice of “aspirant institutions.”
  - C. Moved by Anne McLachlan, seconded by Janelle Walter, the motion passed with one negative vote.
- VII. Election of Senate Election Commission
  - A. Dr. Still noted that according to the revised bylaws, the process begins earlier (this month), that Senators will be told if they are eligible for re-election, and then the process will continue.

He added that we now need an “Elections Committee”: he suggested Lori Baker (former elections coordinator and Faculty Senate Secretary) and Byron Newberry. The motion was made and seconded, discussed briefly, and passed unanimously.

## VIII. Reports

### A. Global Education Task Force (Lori Spies)

Dr. Spies noted that the committee had met, formed subcommittees, and commissioned areas of subcommittee research. The review is now in process.

### B. Chair Report (Still):

1. He reported that he continues to meet with the Deans Council and with the President’s Chief of Staff (Karla Leeper). He asked specifically about news of the Baylor Alumni Association in its relationship with the administration and Regents. “The process continues,” was the essential message.
2. He added that he also queried the appropriate persons about the issuing of contracts electronically. The process will cost the Provost’s office a great deal less time and effort.

### C. Student Life (Wood): No report.

### D. Staff Council (Koehler):

1. Sue Koehler reported on a new approach to issuing the faculty-employee car tags by University Parking;
2. The Staff Scholarship Fund is growing, both from donations and from the annual “shirt sale,” which garnered over \$200 for the fund.

### E. Athletic Council (Neubert): No report.

### F. Admissions (Burlison): Debra Burlison made a general report; Dr. Mary Ann Jordan reported on the 1 Nov admissions; the number was very high. “We’ll be looking for dormitory space again, I suppose” she added.

## IX. Other Matters Arising

Concerning the final examination questions raised by Janelle Walter in earlier Senate meetings, Dave Hurtt presented the practices of several comparable institutions. He concluded that we have similar numbers of days between final examinations and graduation, in dead days, and in the overall duration of finals.

Dr. Still said he would present Dave Hurtt’s document to Beth Willingham and her committee for their consideration.

## X. Adjournment, almost 20 minutes before 5, was greeted with widespread rejoicing.

Submitted by Tom Hanks, Secretary to the Faculty Senate

## **MASTER TEACHERS AT BAYLOR UNIVERSITY**

### **Draft proposal—1/10/13**

#### **MASTER TEACHER FACULTY**

Master Teacher appointments were created to be the highest honor granted to Baylor faculty members for sustained excellence in teaching at Baylor University. The appointments are based on the profound impacts of faculty members in the classroom and on students' lives as judged by the record of the faculty members' achievements and the observations of the various nominators. Master Teacher appointments are honorary, Baylor lifetime appointments.

#### **REPRESENTATIVE ATTRIBUTES DESIRABLE IN MASTER TEACHER NOMINEES**

Faculty members of any rank may be appointed Master Teachers (subject to the length-of-service requirement listed in #3 below). The following list is representative of the types of qualities desired in a Master Teacher:

1. Knowledge and use of effective and engaging pedagogy;
2. Advocacy for teaching and learning, as reflected by characteristics such as:
  - a. Passion for teaching and learning,
  - b. Engagement of students—mentoring undergraduates and/or graduates in research, active learning classes, group work, service learning, and/or community-based learning,
  - c. Impact beyond nominee's own courses—e.g., curricular development, mentoring of other faculty colleagues, publications, presentations, or web resources; and
3. Sustained (minimum ten years at Baylor University) commitment to teaching excellence.

#### **NOMINATION PROCEDURE, SELECTION COMMITTEE MAKEUP, AND COMMITTEE ACTION**

1. The Provost shall issue a call for nominations (with a limit of one per nominator) at the beginning of May in years ending in 4 or 9 with a deadline of 5:00 p.m. on the first Friday of the following October. The Provost shall forward all nominations to the Master Teacher Selection Committee by the third Friday of October for preliminary review. Nominations may be made by former students of the nominated faculty member (whether or not the former students are currently enrolled at Baylor) or by current or former staff, faculty, or administrators personally familiar with the nominated faculty member's record of teaching achievements and other contributions to teaching.
2. Each nominator shall assemble a Nomination Dossier consisting of the following and submit it to the Selection Committee:

- a. A current CV, which may be provided to the nominator by the appropriate academic dean; and
- b. Letters of support from the nominator and other individuals familiar with the nominee's teaching.

These materials should shed light on the desired qualities of a Master Teacher, as listed above, by describing the following achievements:

- a. The nominee's length of service at Baylor;
- b. External and/or internal teaching awards;
- c. Peer reviewed, educational research grants and/or publications;
- d. Pedagogical materials developed for use at Baylor or other institutions;
- e. Impact of the nominee's teaching on the achievement of former students; and
- f. The impact of the nominee's teaching activities within the department as effected through mentoring, sharing pedagogical insights, and developing curriculum.

3. The Selection Committee is comprised of:

- a. Two administrators—one from the Provost's Office and one other (dean or vice president), selected by the Executive Council;
- b. Four faculty members—a Master Teacher and three others or two Master Teachers and two others, selected by the Faculty Senate (appointees need not be Senators);
- c. One staff member—selected by the Staff Council; and
- d. Three students (two undergraduates, selected by Student Government, and one postbaccalaureate student selected by the Graduate Student Association).

The committee shall be newly appointed and convened for each single one-year selection process and then disbanded. At the first meeting of the Selection Committee, a simple majority of members present shall elect one of the faculty members as chair. Members of the Selection Committee shall be instructed by the chair regarding the strict confidentiality of information held, discussed, and evaluated in its deliberations.

4. The Selection Committee shall review all nominations, and identify any nominees whom it will include on a short list to be submitted to the Provost and President.
5. The Selection Committee shall evaluate and rank the short list of nominees by applying the set of desirable attributes delineated above to each nominee. The rank-ordered short list will then be forwarded by January 15 to the Provost for submission to the President.
6. The President, in consultation with the Provost, shall use this list as a basis for making the final decision(s) about Master Teacher appointment(s), notifying all appointee(s) by a formal letter and the Selection Committee Chair by e-mail. Following the announcement of new Master Teachers, the chair will send a formal letter to each nominator expressing thanks for his or her nomination.

## Drop Deadline Options

### Current

	<u>Day 1-12</u>	<u>Day 13-20</u>	<u>Day 21-40</u>	<u>Day 41-end</u>
Drop	removed	removed	DP or DF*	DF*
Withdrawal	removed	WP	WP or WF*	WF*

### For Consideration

	<u>Day 1-12</u>	<u>Day 13-50</u>	<u>Day 51-end</u>
Drop	removed	W	no drop
Withdrawal	removed	W	no withdrawal

\*Impacts GPA

### Reasons

1. The current scheme is inefficient and leads to administrative overhead.
2. The current DP, DF, WP, and WF practice is punitive.
3. The current scheme may force a notation to be assigned when either it is undeserved or when there is no sound judgment.
4. Peer institutions have moved away from the practice of using WP and WF, with no other Big 12 school currently using this system.
5. Counting WF in the gpa may hurt Baylor students in competition for medical, law, and graduate admissions. A new system should help level the playing field.
6. The idea being considered preserves a permanent record of a drop or withdrawal on the transcript as of the date of the drop or withdrawal.
7. The idea would solve an expressed concern where a student receives a DP or WP, but holds the drop slip until a point at which they are no longer passing.

## Baylor University Outstanding Dissertation and Thesis Awards

### Ad hoc Committee on Excellence in Graduate Research

- Susan Bratton – URSA, Environmental Science
- Dennis Johnston – URSA, Statistics
- Paul Martens – Religion
- Chris Rios – Graduate School
- David Echelbarger – GSA, Philosophy
- Megan Haggard – GSA, Psychology
- Sarah Lake – GSA, Psychology
- Jonathan Riddle – GSA, History

### Select Peer and Aspirant Universities

- Notre Dame
- Brown
- Iowa State
- University of Kansas
- University of Oklahoma
- Oklahoma State
- University of Texas
- Texas Tech University
- University of Missouri
- Texas A&M
- University of Nebraska
- Indiana University
- New York University
- University of Alabama
- Purdue University
- Georgetown
- The College of William and Mary
- University of California, Davis
- University of Iowa
- University of Maryland
- University of Minnesota
- University of North Carolina
- University of North Dakota
- University of South Florida
- University of Washington
- Virginia Tech
- LSU

### National Trends

- Award Cycle:
- Academic Year 60%
- Calendar Year 40%
- Selection Window:
- Longest – 12 weeks
- Shortest – 3.5 weeks
- Average – 7 weeks; (Minus the Christmas Holidays – 6.25 weeks)
- Prizes
- Plaque
- \$1,000 – \$3,000 per award

### Our Program

- Model Programs
- Notre Dame
- University of Texas
- University of Maryland
- University of North Carolina

- Council of Graduate Schools

#### Our Program

- Two categories
- Academic Calendar
- Department Nominations (Recognized by the Graduate School as the Outstanding Dissertation or Thesis from their department)
- Application materials
- Criteria
- Awards Presentations
- National Awards

#### Procedures

- Graduate School initiates nomination process
- GPDs nominate one from each department (2.5 week window)
- Selection Committee makes final decisions (3.5 week window)

#### Timetable

- March 1 – Call for Nominations
- March 20 – Nominations Due
- April 12 – Selections Due
- April 16 – Awards Reception

#### Anticipated Workload

2011/2012

- Total submissions: 82 dissertations; 92 theses
- Nominating departments for dissertations
- Humanities: 4
- STEM: 8
- Social Sciences: 4

#### Anticipated Workload (ii)

2011/2012

- Nominating departments for theses
  - Arts and Humanities: 8
  - STEM: 9
  - Social Sciences: 4

#### Two last points

- GSA Awards
  - Faculty Mentor Award
  - Administrative Support Award
- Why a standing committee?