Baylor University Faculty Senate

Newsletter

November, 2000

_____

The 2000-01 Faculty Senate officers and membership:

__Chair:__ Jay Losey (Arts and Sciences)

__Chair-elect:__ David Longfellow (Arts and Sciences)

__Secretary:__ Charles Weaver (Arts and Sciences)

__Publicity:__ Buddy Gilchrest (Education)

Arts and Sciences:		
Linda Adams		
Robert "Bob" Baird		
Rosalie Beck		**Engineering and Computer Science:**
Anne-Marie Bowery	**Business:**	Don Farris
Ray Cannon	Joe Cox	**Law:**
Tom Hanks	Mark Dunn	Marianne Auld
David Longfellow	Van Gray	**Libraries:**
Jay Losey	Karen Johnson	Kathy Sparkman
Linda McManness	Charles Stanley	**Music:**
Jim Patton	Jane Williams	Jane Abbott-Kirk
Richard Riley	**Education:**	Michael Jacobson
Eric Rust	Fred Curtis	**Nursing:**
Sara Stone	Buddy Gilchrest	Martha Sanford
Charles Weaver	Pat Sharp	**Truett Seminary:**
Ray Wilson		David Garland
Joe Yelderman		
David Young		

Comments from Jay Losey, Senate Chair:

Contraversy and Civility

Issues

The provost, Don Schmeltekopf, and I have co-authored an article in this newsletter regarding post-tenure review. The charge of the Tenured Faculty

Development Plan Task Force also appears in this article. I want to thank Don Schmeltekopf for his leadership on this important and necessary facet of faculty governance. I wish the task force success in this significant endeavor. I'm confident that, because of the high esteem with which the faculty members comprising the task force are held, the task force's report and recommendations will be ultimately implemented.

Further, the Part-time Faculty Ad Hoc Committee is in the process of being created. The charge to the ad hoc committee is to issue a report and recommendations regarding the responsibilities and opportunities of undergraduate part-time faculty. The committee will deliver the report and recommendations by the end of the spring semester of 2001.

Finally, I'm pleased by the response of the administration, specifically President Robert Sloan and Vice President of Human Resources Marilyn Crone, to the Faculty Senate's request that the administration reconsider its decision regarding Baylor's contributions to the retirement fund for Senior Lecturers. This long-standing issue has, in my view, finally reached a satisfactory conclusion. The dialogue between the administration and the Faculty Senate, which began in earnest in early 1998, has been productive. The key recommendations of the Lecturer Ad Hoc Committee have now been implemented.

Civility

The three foregoing and overlapping initiatives lead me to reflect on the need for civility in conversations among faculty members and, specifically, among faculty members and administrators. The foundation for civility is trust; and trust must be an integral facet of civility in moments of disagreement. Civility in this context might be likened to Alistair McIntyre's claim that the university at its best is a place of "constrained disagreement." What has most impressed me early on as chair of the senate is the indefatigable labor of administrators&emdash;the president, the provost, the vice presidents, and the deans&emdash;to accomplish the mission and goals of Baylor while, at the same time, pursuing, sometimes passionately, their agendas. As chair of the senate, I've been privileged to attend administrative meetings. These meetings are always civil, open to everyone's ideas, and focus on the pressing issues of the moment. Sitting in meetings with the president, provost, vice presidents, and/or deans, I've been struck by the civility of the discourse even when, for example, I've expressed my disagreement with the majority position.

Civility is an absolute priority for us all. I've already said in the October newsletter that my first priority is open, collegial conversation between the senate and administrators. I suppose these remarks are a further manifestation of that priority. What I want to assert is that civility&emdash;the willingness to consider objectively another colleague's perspective even when it diametrically opposes one's own&emdash;will continue to aid the cause of the faculty in all issues pertaining to faculty governance.

Comments from

Jay Losey, Senate Chair

Donald D. Schmeltekopf, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

TENURED FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

One of the ever-growing realities of higher education today is evaluation and assessment. These bureaucratic-sounding words were not dominant in higher education when many of us began our careers twenty-to-thirty years ago. Then, the emphasis for faculty was on demonstrating the requisite credentials to qualify as an academic, secure a tenure-track position, achieve tenure, and attain promotion to full professor. While there was nothing easy about this advancement, the process was basic and straightforward. Similar standards might be applied to institutions as a whole. Expected then was a qualified faculty, a good library, adequate resources, and a sound administrative structure. If all of these components were in place, few, if any, questions were asked either by accrediting bodies or by the public.

While the foregoing scenario may be an oversimplification for some universities, it is certainly the case today that matters have changed

substantially with regard to the evaluation and assessment of both faculty and institutions, including the leadership of institutions. The principal reason for this change can be summed up in another bureaucratic-sounding word: accountability. The push for accountability in higher education comes from many sources and for many reasons (not the least of which is the competition for money). But its telltale signs are everywhere, from new standards issued by accrediting bodies, to state-mandated policies and goals regarding expected educational results, to more activist institutional boards in both the public and private sectors, and to the enormous public attention given to the various national ranking systems of educational programs and other features of our institutional life.

One of the last features of the university to come under the public microscope of accountability is the tenured faculty, under the notion of "post-tenure review." While some policymakers view tenure with suspicion, the post-tenure review policies that have been put in place across the country actually have had the opposite effect: strengthening tenure precisely because there is a credible and operative process of accountability. Such accountability has, since the implementation of post-tenure reviews, taken two primary forms: "formative" and "summative." "Formative" reviews stress development and opportunities, while "summative" reviews stress administrative action if a faculty member does not meet agreed-upon goals. Of the eighty-eight institutions surveyed in a book by Cathy A. Trower, 25% have formative policies, 69% summative policies, and 6% hybrids (combining both). The process of accountability in post-tenure review we believe most appropriate at Baylor is formative, not summative.1

In June 2000, Baylor's annual Academic Summit was devoted to the theme, "Trends and Challenges in Higher Education: Evaluation and Assessment." Assisted by the invited speaker and consultant, Dr. Frank Horton of Southern Illinois University, we considered and discussed six areas of academic life in which evaluation and assessment are important nationally and at Baylor. Those areas were teaching, department chairs, deans and other administrators, tenure, post-tenure, and academic programs. Each of these topics was addressed by our speaker/consultant and each topic was discussed at length by a focus group. Each focus group then presented a report to all the summit participants, identifying important issues to be further explored and making relevant recommendations.

Not surprisingly, the report that received the greatest attention was from the group focused on post-tenure review. Here is a summary of a few crucial observations contained in the final report of this group:

- *Post-tenure review is probably coming regardless of how we feel about it.*
- *We (the university) should create a process in responseto our own needs rather than having it imposed on us.*
- *Any process of post-tenure review must not constitute a threat to tenure, but should be used instead for the purpose of faculty development.*

Significant faculty development requires significant resources, but the expenditure of these resources is in the university's best interests.

One of the conclusions of the focus group&emdash;and this conclusion is extremely important&emdash;insures that post-tenure review be used for faculty development&emdash;that is, to provide opportunities for faculty to fulfill their teaching and research agendas and responsibilities. We endorse the following statement from the focus group report: it is "absolutely necessary to separate post-tenure review from the revocation of tenure in a manner that follows the AAUP's assessment reported in the June 26, 1998 Chronicle of Higher Education: 'If a college wants to revoke tenure . . ., it should use a separate process, in which the burden would remain on the institution to prove that a tenured professor is incompetent, rather than on the professor to prove that he or she isn't.'"2 This approach is the one we want to follow at Baylor&emdash;that is, to separate post-tenure review from the process for the revocation of tenure.

We are proposing that we call our plan the "Tenured Faculty Development Process." The core idea of the plan is that, while tenured faculty would continue to be evaluated annually for the purpose of determining compensation, another periodic review&emdash;perhaps every five years&emdash;would be conducted by departments and deans to determine the faculty member's goals and accomplishments regarding teaching, research, and service. Additionally, the faculty member would be evaluated on how he/she supports the broader goals of the department and the university. This understanding and evaluation would then be used to allocate resources such as summer sabbaticals, research equipment, travel funds, and other faculty development opportunities.

The final recommendation of the Academic Summit focus group was that a ten-member task force be appointed to develop a plan, including implementation procedures, for a tenured faculty development process. It was further recommended that seven members of the task force be appointed by the Faculty

Senate and three by the Provost. The latter members would include one dean and two department chairs.

We are pleased to report that this recommendation has been approved by all parties. The seven faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate are Robert Baird, Mark Bateman, Georgia Green, Carole Hanks, Baxter Johns, Linda Livingstone, and Dan McGee. The three appointed by the Provost are Steve Green, Larry Lyon, and Jim Patton. The chair of the task force, appointed jointly by the Chair of the Senate and the Provost, is Jim Patton. The charge of the task force is to establish a set of recommendations regarding a system of faculty development that fulfills the aim of the "Tenured Faculty Development Process" as noted above. The task force has been asked to submit its final report to the Chair of the Senate and to the Provost by April 2001.

We are grateful for the mutual support of the Faculty Senate and the administration in developing this project. We are also grateful for the wise and sensible recommendations of those who participated in the "post-tenure review" focus group at the Academic Summit this summer. They provided excellent counsel, and we now look forward to receiving the report and recommendations of the task force.

Notes

1. Cathy A. Trower, ed. Policies on Faculty Appointment: Standard Practices and Unusual Arrangements. New York: Anker Publishing Co., 2000.

2. See "Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response." The Chronicle of Higher Education. Documents. 15 June 1998: 1-9. As quoted by the focus group.

Faculty Senate Meeting Dates

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

November 14, 2000	*February 13, 2001*
December 12, 2000	*March 20, 2001*

January 23, 2001	*April 17, 2001*
	May 8, 2001

President's Faculty Forum Meeting

Scheduled for 3:30 p.m. in Kayser Auditorium

Thursday, February 15, 2001

President's State of the University Address

Barfield Drawing Room, Bill Daniel Student Center

Wednesday, April 18, 2001

Faculty Senate Website

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

Please send suggestions to buddy_gilchrest@Baylor.edu.

The Senate wishes to thank:

Tresa Gilchrest for assistance with the Faculty Senate Newsletter.