

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 17, 1998**

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

Present: D. Adams, L. Adams, Baird, Basden, Beckner, Bowery, Buddo, Carini, Chinn, C. Davis, E. Davis, Farris, Genrich, Gordon, Hillman, K. Johnson, P. Johnson, Johnston, Longfellow, Losey, McGee, Rolf, Supplee, Stone, Wiley, Willis, Yelderman, Youngdale

Absent: Conyers, Jensen, Tipton, Weaver

I. Invocation

Howard Rolf led the invocation.

II. Approval of January 20 Minutes

The minutes of the January 20, 1998 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Lectureship Positions at Baylor

Jeter Basden gave the report to the Senate. He expressed appreciation to committee members who had worked hard on the report, although he acknowledged that the committee was not finished with its work. At this point, the committee is inviting questions and concerns from the senate, Dr. Schmeltekopf, and the Council of Deans. After receiving these comments, the committee will incorporate them into the report.

Basden then made some general remarks about the report. "Lectureship" in the context of the report means full-time, not part-time positions. Baylor's system of lectureships is rather unique in the university world--where Baylor has lecturers, most research institutions have graduate assistants. AAUP guidelines do not address lecturers. At the Council of Deans the following concerns were addressed: Recommendation 4 (p.3), which deals with notice dates, gave some of the deans a problem because they do not feel they can make predictions about need that early in the year; recommendation 6 (p.4)--the deans felt that recommendation is not needed because it is already policy in that anyone with appropriate credentials may apply for tenure-track positions as they become available; recommendation 7 (p. 4)--questions regarding status of adjunct graduate faculty members because it is generally reserved for teachers who are not a part of the university; recommendation 8 (p.5)--concern that the policy on benefits should start from this point forward, and that it not be retroactive; recommendation 13 (p.6)--differing opinions on whether or not lecturers should be involved in governance, some departments want lecturers involved in committee work, some don't.

Questions Raised/Discussion

At this point a discussion about the report and the general condition of the lectureship position began. Many of the questions asked were simply put as a matter for the Committee to consider and so are not answered.

Is it likely that departments might choose not to continue a lecturer's employment after the 6 years when there has to be two year notice?

Can a full-time lecturer take outside employment also?

Is the University interested in moving toward graduate assistants? Or are we going to stick with the system we have? Basden's sense was that the University is happy with the current system and interested in making it work better.

Why does the administration seem to prefer having lecturers rather than tenure track professors? The feeling seems to be that the administration sees lecturers as expendable, those that get to do the dirty work, and as less expensive. Concern was expressed that a two tiered faculty system causes problems within the university in the area of morale. Are we running into the problem where the administration is essentially replacing tenure track positions with lectureship positions? If the administration is concerned about running into financial problems and not having the flexibility offered by the lectureship program as it now stands, the proposed plan for financial exigency that was passed by the Senate in the summer of 1996 would deal with that problem.

What about the fact that often lecturers are given no guidance as to what is expected of them as far as teaching goes?

How are academic freedom concerns addressed with lecturers? There was concern that it is the lecturers who are sometimes pressured to give in on academic freedom issues.

One suggestion was that the University simply do away with tenure track requirement for associate graduate faculty positions, so that all tenure track faculty would be regular members of the graduate faculty and associate status could be used for lecturers.

If the six year review is left to the departments, that leaves possibility open for departments to use the review as a winnowing process to get rid of people. Under this system, if a lecturer doesn't get approved as senior lecturer (see sec. 5), he or she is will be given a one year terminal appointment.

Were lecturers contacted or surveyed on their opinion? No. Several people on the Senate had spoken to lecturers about the report once it had been distributed, and the report was received favorably by the lecturers who have seen it.

Was there any debate on the length of time for the appointment? Yes, but the consensus was that two years was the best that could be done.

After discussion ended, Buddo asked about how the Senate wanted to deal with the major issues that had been raised (financial exigency and the global issue of how lecturers fit into Baylor with regard to governance, tenure, etc.). Should they be addressed formally or informally? It was decided that McGee and Buddo would raise the concern about the financial exigency plan with Dr. Schmeltekopf and make the following recommendation:

Motion:

The Senate requests that the administration review the Policy and Procedure for Responding to Financial Exigency by Reducing Academic Programs (6/17/96) and the Procedure for Discontinuance or Reduction of Academic Programs Not Mandated by Financial Exigency (6/17/96) as a means to address the issues of flexibility with regard to the lectureship position at Baylor.

Yelderman moved that the recommendation be presented to Dr. Schmeltekopf; Longfellow seconded; the motion carried.

IV. Issues Relating to Faculty Searches

McGee reported that some search committees have been told they must hire a Baptist. This restriction did not appear in the guidelines given out. Apparently, in certain departments Baptists retired and non-Baptists had been hired to replace them up to that point. The administration felt that it was time for those departments to do their part to maintain the Baptist ratio. It seems clear that the Regents are holding fast to the 50% benchmark for Baptist faculty members. Concern was expressed about how advertising for new faculty positions is being handled--don't necessarily want to advertise that only Baptists will be hired, but, at the same time, don't want to be duplicitous in advertising. The Senate discussed the changing dynamic of religious affiliation and expressed concern for future hires as the trend among Americans today seems to indicate less allegiance to particular denominations.

The question became what the best way to handle the situation might be. The best course of action seemed to be presenting the problem to the administration, first, and asking them to raise the issue with the Regents. A suggestion was made that the issue be raised at the Faculty Forum on Feb. 19th. Buddo agreed to draft a question for the forum that would deal with the issue of the 50% Baptist ratio. He would notify the President of the question before the Forum and then ask it along with other questions submitted.

The second issue in regard to faculty searches deals with Chair search procedures. The Religion Department is the first to use the new procedures, and there is some concern about this first implementation of the new policy. Members of the Faculty Senate were under the impression that the department in search of a new Chair would present a list of committee members and that the dean could accept the list or disapprove it. With the Religion Department search, the Dean of Arts and Sciences initially asked the faculty to submit a list of eight names of which he would pick four. When the faculty said that was not their understanding of the policy, the Dean said that they could submit a list of six names of

which he would select four. The faculty again stated that was not their understanding of the policy. The issue was then raised with Dr. Schmeltkopf who said that the policy could be interpreted the way the dean read it and allowed for the dean's selection process. The dean also chose the Chair of the committee. The question raised was whether the Senate should look at the document again?

Hillman moved that the matter be referred to the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Environment. Stone seconded. The motion carried.

V. Recommended Procedures for Study Abroad Programs

Sub-committee from international programs formulated some written procedures for the study abroad programs. It was the desire of the committee and the General Counsel's Office to keep the procedure fairly general to allow for flexibility. There will be an initial orientation for program directors, and then a second orientation for faculty and students involved in the programs to keep everyone up-to-date and informed on what is expected for director, faculty and students.

P. Johnson who served on the subcommittee that put the report together said that the hope was that this document would give the faculty members involved some written authority to do what sometimes needs to be done on these trips. Some Senators expressed concern about vagueness of the language as far as what the responsibility of the faculty member is.

VI. Summer Scheduling

There has been a request by a faculty member that the University consider shifting the summer schedule to a four-day week. Buddo felt that the suggestion should be forwarded to the Calendar Committee. Some discussion ensued about the relative merits of the idea. It was decided that the Calendar Committee can look at the feasibility of the schedule.

VII. Report on President's Faculty Forum

Buddo reported that the questions have been forwarded to the President. The format will be that Buddo will ask the question, President Sloan will give his answer and then there will be time for follow-up questions at the end.

VIII. Committee Issues

Michael D. Morrison, Chair of the Robert Foster Cherry Awards Committee, had requested that there be a change in the description of the committee. The new language suggested is in subpart (b) of the description:

"composed of 12 faculty members as follows: Arts & Sciences--4 (2 arts/2 sciences), Business--1, Education--1, Music--1, Law/Nursing/Libraries/Seminary--1 (on a rotating basis), Engineering/Computer Science--1, at large--3. At least one member should have served previously on the 'Selection Committee for Outstanding Professors.'"

Rolf moved that the change be adopted, Supplee seconded, the motion carried.

The Facilities Use and Campus Solicitation Committee has asked to be sunsetted. That Committee deals primarily with use of facilities by groups outside of the University. It was decided to take up this matter at a later date.

IX. Items from Council of Deans/Provost Schmeltekopf

A. Update on Statement on Scholarly Expectations

The Statement was amended slightly by council of deans and approved by President.

B. Suggested Benchmarks for Academic Units at Baylor University

The suggested benchmarks were handed out and comments will be solicited after the Senate has had a chance to look at the document.

X. Committee/Liaison Reports

A. Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Environment--Dan McGee, Chair

No report.

B. Faculty Committee on Enrollment Management--Howard Rolf, Chair

No report.

C. Faculty Committee on Physical Facilities--Joe Yelderman, Chair

No report.

D. Faculty Committee on Student Life and Services--Gary Carini, Chair

No report.

E. Staff Council Liaison--Linda Adams

No report.

XI. Other Items or Announcements

A. President's Faculty Forum: Thursday, February 19, 3:30-5:00

Kayser Auditorium.

All business being completed, Senate Chair Buddo declared the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Youngdale, Secretary