

Baylor University

Faculty Senate Newsletter

April, 2000

The **1999-00 Faculty Senate** officers and membership:

Chair: Robert Baird

(Arts and Sciences)

Chair-elect: Jay Losey

(Arts and Sciences)

Secretary: Charles Weaver

(Arts and Sciences)

Publicity: Buddy Gilchrest

(Education)

Arts and Sciences:

Linda Adams

Robert "Bob" Baird

Rosalie Beck

Anne-Marie Bowery

William Jensen

Phillip Johnson

David Longfellow

Jay Losey

Dan McGee

Richard Riley

Sara Stone

Joan Supplee

Charles Weaver

Ray Wilson

Joe Yelderman

David Young

Business:

Gary Carini

Joe Cox

Charles Davis

Mark Dunn

Karen Johnson

Jane Williams

Education:

Fred Curtis

Buddy Gilchrest

Deborah Johnston

Engineering and

Computer Science:

Don Farris

Law:

Marianne Auld

Libraries:

William Hair

Music:

Jane Abbott-Kirk

Christopher Buddo

Nursing:

Sandra Genrich

Truett Seminary:

David Garland

Comments from Robert Baird, Senate Chair:

Senate Elections, Year-End Report, and the Polanyi Center

The Elections

With almost 60% of the College of Arts and Sciences faculty voting, five new senators were elected and two reelected. Anne Bowery from philosophy and Chuck Weaver from psychology/neuroscience were reelected to second terms. Ray Cannon, mathematics; Tom Hanks, English; Linda McManness, Spanish; Jim Patton, psychology/neuroscience; and Eric Rust, history, were newly elected to three-year terms. Martha Sanford was elected from the School of Nursing; Van Gray and Charles Stanley from Hankamer School of Business; Pat Sharp from the School of Education; and Michael Jacobson from the School of Music. The Law School and Truett Seminary had no vacancies to fill this spring.

Those leaving the Senate after having served one or two terms are Chris Buddo, music; Gary Carini, management; Charles Davis, accounting; Sandra Genrich, nursing; Bill Jensen, art history; Phil Johnson, Spanish; Deborah Johnston, health education; David Longfellow, history; Dan McGee, religion; and Joan Supplee, history. Buddo and McGee are former chairs of the Senate and Deborah Johnston has served for two years on the Senate Executive Committee. Jensen, Johnson, and Longfellow, along with Buddo and McGee, are leaving the Senate after having served two three-year terms. This is the loss of considerable leadership. For all of us, I express appreciation to them for their service to the faculty, and I express personal appreciation to them for their work on the Senate this year.

I say that we will lose all of that leadership potential, but actually that is yet to be seen. The Senate has amended its Bylaws to permit the selection of an individual as chair-elect who otherwise could not be selected because he or she soon would be rotating off the Senate. For some time, senators have been concerned about the limits placed on those eligible for selection as chair-elect due to the term rotation policy of the Senate. This year, therefore, we amended the Bylaws to read: "A person selected as chair-elect of the Senate will at the completion of his/her current term as senator become 'senator-at-large' for the time needed to complete his/her duties as chair-elect, chair, and immediate past chair. At the conclusion of the 'senator-at-large' term, the individual shall not be eligible for reelection to the Senate until one year has passed." This makes available a larger pool of experienced senators for selection. Designating the person a "senator-at-large" avoids interfering with the election process for selecting representatives to the Senate.

Year-End Report

The Senate and the administration have been discussing for some time the university's Dismissal Policy. Changes in that policy recommended by the Senate were approved by the administration in April. Under the new procedures, dismissal charges against a faculty member would be heard by a newly created Dismissal Committee rather than the Tenure Committee as was the case under previous guidelines. The president and the faculty will each appoint five members to this committee. The administration has been responsive to Senate concerns that, in addition to the accused faculty member receiving in written form any charges brought against him/her, the new procedures spell out explicitly a faculty member's right to have access to the list of witnesses and a summary of any evidence expected to be presented at the hearing. The dismissal process contains three crucial stages. First, the Dismissal Committee must decide if there is probable cause to cancel the tenure of the accused. If the committee decides that there is no probable cause, the accused and the accuser are notified and the process is concluded. If the committee thinks the charges are sufficiently serious such that if they were true, grounds would exist to consider revoking tenure, then the committee sets a date for a hearing. Second, if as a result of the hearing, the committee decides that there is insufficient evidence to support the factual allegations of the charge, then these findings of fact will be reported to the president and the process is terminated. Third, if the committee decides that some or all of the allegations have been supported by the evidence, then the committee makes a recommendation to the president about the revocation of tenure. At that point in the process, the president has the final decision regarding whether the tenure of the accused shall be revoked. Some members of the faculty, including me, would like for that final decision to rest with the faculty. However, all final tenure decisions at Baylor rest with the president, and this aspect of the dismissal procedure is consistent with that general policy. The new policy was overwhelmingly approved by the Senate as an improvement over current procedures. I appreciate both the work of the Senate and the administration in developing these new guidelines.

I indicated in the last Senate Newsletter that the Senate has been involved in an effort to establish new grievance procedures that would combine the present Grievance and Hearings Committees. This would serve both to make the committee structure more efficient and to clarify procedures. The proposal recommended by the Senate has now been accepted by the administration. Finally, the Promotion Document that I also mentioned in the previous newsletter has now been approved by the administration. The document originated with a Promotion Policy Task Force chaired by Jay Losey and was refined in conversations between the Senate and the Council of Deans.

Speaking of Jay Losey, I wish him well next year as the new chair of the Faculty Senate. It has been my pleasure to work closely with him this year in his role as chair-elect. Indeed, it has been my pleasure to work with all of the senators, and I thank them for their support throughout a busy, often difficult, but productive year for the Senate.

The Polanyi Center

Although I would like to conclude my final piece for the Senate Newsletter on a high note, I feel responsible as chair of the Senate for addressing the creation of the Polanyi Center— one of the most divisive issues to have arisen on the Baylor campus during my thirty-two years on the faculty.

For the last Presidential Forum, the Senate received more questions about the Polanyi Center than on any other topic. As chair of the Senate, I continue daily to receive expressions of concern about the creation of the Center, especially from my colleagues in the sciences, but by no means solely from them.

The fundamental question the creation of the Center raises concerns the mutual trust and confidence between administration and faculty, which is the defining characteristic of a collegial relationship. The Polanyi Center's Internet home page includes immediately under the title of the center the phrase "advancing the understanding of science." This seems to be the basic purpose of the Center. The directors of the Center claim to be doing science; that is, they argue for introducing intelligent design into science as an explanatory category. Yet the Center was created without consultation with colleagues in the sciences. Another major purpose of the center is to examine the connections between science and religion, yet again it was created without consultation with colleagues in the Department of Religion.

Often the question has arisen in my mind, "How would my colleagues and I feel and respond if a Center committed to 'advancing the understanding of philosophy' were created without consulting those of us in the philosophy department?" How would members of any department feel and respond if a Center were created to further the understanding of that department's discipline without consulting the faculty of that department about the purpose of the center and its proposed directors?

The creation of the Michael Polanyi Center creates particular problems for the Philosophy Department because the director and the associate director of the Center have degrees in philosophy. The philosophy department was not consulted about the formation of the Center. Additionally, the creation of the Polanyi Center fails to take into account the role of the recently inaugurated Herbert H. Reynolds Lectureship in the History and Philosophy of Science. The result of a gift to the department by Chancellor and Mrs. Herbert Reynolds, the Lectureship will eventually evolve into a Chair in the History and Philosophy of Science and beyond that into an Institute. Importantly, this program is directed not simply by the Philosophy Department but by a committee representing the departments of Biology, Chemistry/Biochemistry, Geology, History, Physics, and Psychology/Neuroscience. No conversations with representatives of this committee took place concerning the creation of the Polanyi Center.

Let me reemphasize that the crucial issue in this whole matter is the collegial relationship between the administration and the faculty. Such a relationship could be affirmed by dissolving the Polanyi Center and starting over. If it is desirable for Baylor to have a center to explore the connections between science and other disciplines, a committee of Baylor faculty from across the disciplines could be formed. That committee could make recommendations about both the nature of such a center and its directors. The administration has responded to some of these concerns by agreeing to form a committee to evaluate the work of the director and associate director of the Polanyi Center, but this does not get at the basic issue of initiating a Center without faculty consultation.

As I look back over my years at Baylor, one of the most satisfying dimensions of my career has been the collegial relationship that I have witnessed between faculty and administration. Personally, I recall with gratitude my collegial relationships with Presidents McCall and Reynolds. When I became chair of the Senate, one of my first acts was to make an appointment with President Sloan. He graciously gave me almost two hours out of his busy schedule. It was an open, honest, collegial conversation. As indicated above, the administration has been quite responsive to faculty concerns this year in working with the Senate to develop new grievance, dismissal, and promotion policies. My hope is that this collegiality will continually be a dimension of our life together at Baylor. Would not the dissolution of the Polanyi Center and a fresh start with broad faculty input concerning such a proposed enterprise make a significant contribution to such collegiality? Might it not also generate an important discussion between the administration and faculty concerning procedures for the establishment of new centers and institutes at Baylor? Such conversations are the heart of mutual respect and confidence.

Comments from Marilyn Crone, Vice President for Human Resources:

Creating an Opportunity for Real Change

(the Kind that Makes Us Better)

Recently, my colleagues in organizational development and I were preparing to partner with Faculty Senate and Staff Council on a survey of faculty and staff perceptions regarding various university services. During our discussion, one colleague observed what proved for me to be a BFO (Blinding Flash of the Obvious): When we only survey opinions and then pass the data on to those whose services have been evaluated, we short-circuit a process which could effect real change. In other words, positive change probably comes about best when we have a continuous loop consisting of the following:

1. Working with service providers to get input on what should be measured to improve their products and services;

2. Getting preliminary evaluation of service providers from the customers who receive the services;
3. Creating and revising the survey instrument based on input from service providers and customers;
4. Conducting the survey;
5. Assessing the gaps between an individual or department's own perceptions of how well they're doing and what the customer survey reveals;
6. Using the survey and the responses of the service providers to determine the changes to be made to better satisfy their customers;
7. Making those changes;
8. Getting feedback on the perceived effectiveness of the improvements;
9. And starting the cycle over again.

We saw that the road we were about to travel down again—simply conducting a survey and sharing the results with those being evaluated—was, at the very least, not the best road. In fact, it could be a significant distraction from accomplishing our long-term, strategic objectives: improve **major staff work processes** that accomplish the non-academic work (operations) or support the academic work of the University. We should ensure that those customers who are being served—students, faculty, and staff—will have the chance to give feedback on service measures, both "before" and "after" process improvements in these services. Our goal is to *change the right things* to serve our customers better and *fully accomplish the University's Mission*.

What is a major staff process? I'll use an example from my own division: How we administer benefits to our faculty and staff. How would the process improvement objective be accomplished? We'd take each major process and look at it separately, using a team approach. The team would include some of the people who "own" the work process in question, i.e. who are vested in its improvement and who know how it works or is supposed to work (often called process experts). The team would also include faculty and staff members willing to work on the particular process. How long would the process improvement take? *On average*, probably 1-2 months so that the team members would stay motivated and, more importantly, so that we would move ahead to realize positive improvement as quickly as possible.

In the case of the benefit administration process, the team to review it would probably include Richard Amos, Director of Compensation and Benefits, Dick Jackson, Beverly Tieman, and a few faculty and staff members. Colleagues in the Organizational Development (OD) Department would train the team leader in basic process redesign skills. OD would work with the group to determine "customer" (faculty and staff) requirements of the process as well as the current degree of satisfaction with the service being provided. Normally, this information would be gathered by surveying opinions of faculty and staff using randomly selected focus groups or individual interviews. (An aside: Mr. Amos will have an advantage here, since you already may have received a benefit survey by the time you read this). After receiving feedback on requirements and

degree of satisfaction, the team would map-out the flow of the current process(es) that we use to administer benefits. Then they would identify any "variances." Common examples are excessively long service delivery times, overly complex processes for providing the service and redundancy of steps. Next, the team would redesign the process and implement the changes. Finally, there would be follow-up with faculty and staff members to ask: Are your requirements being met? Are you satisfied with what you're getting (both quality and quantity)? Are you receiving better services and the right type of services? And most importantly, has it improved significantly from what it was before?

You may be reading this and giving thanks that you don't participate in such initiatives for a profession! What I hope you do agree with is the conclusion drawn from representatives of the Faculty Senate and Staff Council—*that such work process improvement efforts will provide the greatest opportunity for real change in how we operate our University.*

Will you still get to give feedback to those who serve both you and others in our community? Yes, assessment mechanisms like surveys and focus groups will continue but they will be part of a larger context that we believe will ultimately serve all of us better. If you have an interest in contributing your thoughts and expertise to the overall process improvement project or if you have opinions as to the processes most in need of improvement, please contact me. Thank you.

Faculty Senate Meeting Dates

All meetings scheduled for Cashion 303 at 3:30 p.m.

April 18, 2000

May 9, 2000

President's State of the University Address

Wednesday, April 19, 2000, 3:30 p.m.

Barfield Drawing Room, Bill Daniel Student Center

Faculty Senate Website

http://www3.baylor.edu/~Fac_Senate/senatehome.html

The Senate website has minutes, meeting dates, membership, and other important information. Please send suggestions to: buddy_gilchrest@Baylor.edu.

The Senate wishes to thank:

Randy Francis for assistance with the Faculty Senate web page and

Tresa Gilchrest for assistance with the Faculty Senate Newsletter.