

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

October 19, 1999

303 Cashion, Hankamer

MINUTES

Present: Abbott-Kirk, Adams, Baird, Beck, Bowery, Buddo, Cox, Curtis, Davis, Dunn, Farris, Garland, Genrich, B. Luft (for Gilchrest), Hair, Jensen, K. Johnson, P. Johnson, Johnston, Longfellow, Losey, McGee, Riley, Stone, Supplee, Weaver, Williams, Wilson, Yelderman, Young

Absent: Carini, Counts

I. Invocation

The meeting began at 3:35. B. Hair gave the invocation.

II. Consideration of Agenda

Discussion of tuition remission for faculty and staff (brought by D. Johnston) was added under "New Business." The agenda as amended was approved by consent.

III. Committee/Liaison Reports

A. Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Environment (J. Losey, Chair).

No report

B. Faculty Committee on Enrollment Management (D. Johnston, Chair)

Enrollment in the Challenge Program for Fall 1999 is 244 students, down from 282 in Fall, 1998. New freshmen and transfer applications for Fall 2000 are down 3.5% and 6.5% respectively, compared to Fall 1999.

C. Faculty Committee on Physical Facilities (J. Yelderman, Chair).

Construction on most projects is somewhat behind schedule. Also, concern was expressed over the current procedures by which contracting jobs are awarded. Without competitive bids, Waco Construction often has little incentive for timely or cost-effective work.

D. Faculty Committee on Student Life and Services (R. Wilson, Chair)

Senators are encouraged to communicate to Wilson student comments and concerns about their experiences at Baylor.

E. Athletic Council (M. Dunn, Liaison).

Baylor had 68 student-athletes graduate in the most recent academic year, which is second in the Big 12.

F. Staff Council (J. Abbott-Kirk, Liaison). No Report

G. Benefits and Personnel Committee (F. Curtis, Liaison). No Report.

VIII. Old Business

A. Small group meetings with President Sloan: November 30, February 1, and April 11, all at 3:30. Baird asked that Senators let him know if one of these times is impossible for Senators, and he will schedule accordingly. It was suggested that these three meetings be coordinated by the current Chair of the Senate, the most recent Past Chair, and the Chair-Elect.

B. Promotion Policy.

The promotion policy is scheduled to be presented at the next meeting of the Council of Deans, which will be attended by Baird and Losey.

C. Dismissal Procedures. Baird met with N. Bice, University Counsel, and has started the process of discussion. Bice will need to work with B. Underwood on this, but Baird did express a sense of urgency.

D. Tenure with Condition.

Baird distributed a sample of the letter which is mailed to successful tenure candidates, attached as Appendix A. Baird suggested the addition of the phrase "as established in your tenure review" to the last paragraph (see Appendix A). This was moved by Longfellow, seconded by Beck. After discussion, Wilson introduced a substitute motion, supported by Longfellow and seconded by Beck, that the portion of the final paragraph

after the sentence indicating that the tenure review had been successfully completed be eliminated (see Appendix). Motion passed.

E. Scholarly Expectations Document.

Baird responded to e-mail from a representative of the School of Nursing, in response to a remark attributed to the Provost. According to this person, the Provost stated that no one would receive tenure without at least 2 publications. Baird and Losey had asked the Provost about this remark, and he stated that this was not his intent, though he did acknowledge the University's desire to pursue more rigorous research/publication standards.

Questions were raised as to the nature of the peer-review process as it is done during the tenure evaluation. Weaver suggested that a tenure committee was almost certainly incapable of meaningful peer-review, since few if any of the tenure committee members are able to evaluate the merit of publications outside their own fields. Even departmental committee review is likely to be colleague-review, rather than peer-review, and asked if the University has considered evaluation from peers outside the University.

Senators raised other concerns regarding the University's newly-adopted increase in scholarly expectations, especially

- Will faculty who were hired under the previous standards of scholarly expectations be evaluated according to those standards?
- What role will departments have in determining expectations and evaluating the scholarly output of colleagues?
- Has the administration made a meaningful effort to provide the additional resources (reduction of teaching loads, support of release time, etc.) to allow faculty to accomplish those goals?

F. Combining of Grievance and Hearing Committees. No action taken.

G. Description of Senate in Faculty Handbook.

Baird reported that the Provost approved describing the Senate in the Faculty Handbook according to the Senate's Constitution. The Constitution reads: The Faculty Senate is the representative, deliberative, and legislative body of the Baylor University Faculties. *[This was the report given to the Senate; but Baird since has learned that he misinterpreted the Provost. This is an issue he and the provost are still working on.]*

V. New Business

A. Tuition Waivers for Faculty and Staff.

Current policy allows for faculty and staff to receive tuition waivers for course at the Undergraduate and Masters level, as well as courses in the School of Law, but not for courses at the doctoral level. Johnston reported that she was approached by a colleague about this policy, with concern that some individuals were receiving tuition waivers for doctoral courses. This matter was referred to the Benefits and Personnel Committee.

B. Committee on Committee's Reporting Procedure.

The Committee on Committees requested that they be allowed to contact the Administration regarding incoming Committee Chairs prior to approaching the respective faculty members. This will reduce the potentially embarrassing situations where faculty members who were nominated by the COC to serve as chairs are later rejected by the Administration.

The Senate approved this modification.

C. "Reporting lines" for Arts & Sciences Senators

Baird asked Longfellow to review the previously determined "reporting lines" to make sure that each department in A&S was receiving regular information from a Senator.

VI. Announcements

President's Faculty Forum: Thursday, October 21, 3:30, Kayser Auditorium. Senators were encouraged to remind their constituents.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45.

Respectfully submitted,

Chuck Weaver

Appendix A

Example Tenure Letter

(Original modifications shown in **bold**. Deletions shown in ~~striketrough~~. Final version non-italicized.)

DATE

Dear Dr.

I congratulate you on a successful tenure review.

The process of awarding and accepting tenure marks a significant transition in the ongoing relationship between you as an individual member of the faculty and the larger institution. It is both a recognition of the contributions you have made to Baylor University during the years of your pre-tenure appointment and an indication of an increased level of mutual responsibilities and expectations between you and the University. In granting tenure, the University makes a commitment to you and in return expects that, as a tenured member of the faculty, you will actively support the Christian mission of the University and will continue your commitment to excellence in your teaching, your scholarly activity, your service to the University and community, and your personal and professional relationships with your students and colleagues.

Based on your review and in accordance with Baylor's tenure policy, Baylor will grant tenure to you effective June 1, 20XX. , ~~provided that the quality of your service and conduct, as established in your tenure review,~~ continues until that date, as we certainly anticipate will be the case. ~~Best wishes for successful completion of your tenure track appointment.~~

Sincerely,

Robert B. Sloan, Jr.

President