

Faculty Senate Minutes
January 11, 2011 • Cashion 111
3:30 p.m.

Members Present: Senators Baker, Erich; Baker, Lori; Baldrige, R. S.; Beal, Ron; Beard, DeAnna Toten; Beck, Rosalie; Blackwell, Frieda; Cannon, Raymond; Claybrook, Doug; Duhrkopf, Richard; Hanks, Tom; Harvey, Barry; Hurtt, David; Johnsen, Susan; Jordan, Mary Ann; Long, Michael; Losey, Jay; McKinney, Tim; Madden, Stan; Nuebert, Mitchell; Nunley, Patricia; Odegaard, Tom; Parrish, Michael (substituting in Spring 2011 for David Longfellow); Patton, Jim; Patteson, Rita; Sharp, Pat; Shoaf, Mary Margaret; Spain, Rufus; Still, Todd; Stone, Sara; Supplee, Joan; Walter, Janelle

Members Absent: Senators Beckwith, Frank; Myers, Dennis; Paschal, John

I. Call to Order

Chair Cannon called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

II. Invocation

Senator Neubert offered an invocation.

III. Greetings from Judge Starr

Judge Starr brought New Year's greetings to the Senate. In doing so, he reported that student applications were up in quantity and quality. The President also noted that the emotional and financial needs of Baylor students are great and is hoping that the scholarship initiative "How Extraordinary the Stories" will be a tremendous success so as to ease some of their strain.

IV. Approval of Minutes

Senator Baldrige moved that the December 2010 Faculty Senate Minutes be approved as distributed. Senator Blackwell seconded the motion. The Senate unanimously affirmed the motion.

V. Old Business

A. Role of Library Faculty on Tenure Committee

Senator Beal raised a concern regarding whether Library faculty should serve on the university tenure committee. Spirited discussion ensued among Senators. Chair Cannon drew the conversation to a close by suggesting that the Senate continue to ponder this matter.

B. Contacting of Faculty Senate Chairs regarding Handgun Policy

It presently appears that any State legislation passed relative to the carrying of handguns on college and university campuses will not be binding upon private institutions of higher education. As a result, Chair Cannon has postponed contacting Senate Chairs at like schools.

VI. Committee/Liaison Reports

- A. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (Myers)—No report
- B. Academic Freedom (Longfellow)—No report
- C. Enrollment Management (Beck)—No report
- D. Student Life (Stone)—No report
- E. Liaison Reports
 - i. Council of Deans (Cannon)—No report
 - ii. Athletic Council (Blackwell)—No report
 - iii. Personnel, Benefits, Compensation (Madden)—No report
 - iv. Personnel Policies (Beal/Nunley)—No report
 - v. Admission (Harvey)—Senator Harvey reported that inquiries, applications, and net deposits were up. At present, the average SAT score of applicants is 1271. He also noted that minority applications were slightly down and that male applications were slightly up.
 - vi. Staff Council (Patton)—At a December 14, 2010 meeting, Dr. Kevin Jackson reported that the residence halls were presently at 103% capacity. Dr. Jackson also noted a 76% increase in counseling appointments for students and an increase in drug cases for judicial affairs. Judge Starr was also present at the meeting. At a January 11, 2011 meeting, there was conversation regarding a staff ombudsperson, future staff-sponsored luncheons, the endowed scholarship effort, and the fourth annual relay for life.

VI. New Business

A. Ombudsperson

Robert Baird has indicated to Chair Cannon in writing that he will not be willing to serve another three-year term. He is willing, however, to serve another one-year term. The Executive Committee recommended that he be appointed to a one-year term. Senator Blackwell seconded this motion. The Senate was unanimous in its support of the motion.

B. Senate Involvement in the Strategic Planning Process

Senator Neubert was asked by Chair Cannon to lead the Senate in a discussion regarding the strategic planning process in which the university is presently engaged.

Senator Neubert raised the following questions: What are the most *effective* ways to gather meaningful information from faculty? Similarly, what processes do you suggest should be followed to ensure a *fair* process? He then divided the Senate into a number of groups to discuss these questions.

Following on, Senator Neubert asked, “Is there a unique role the Faculty Senate can play in one or more of these processes?”

Senate suggestions included the following:

Departmental level discussion (comfort level; effectiveness); focused discussion; on-line questionnaire (flexible; easy to capture; confidentiality); Faculty Senate involvement in the evaluation and implementation of strategic planning; opportunity to provide feedback; review previous strategic plans; work on draft so that there might be something to respond to (roadmap of issues); Faculty Senate vet matters relative to academics; multiple ways and times to gather input; help to prioritize drafted initiatives; Senate sponsorship of town hall meetings around certain topics; departmental focus group discussions; link on Senate website to generate, facilitate discussion and to disseminate information

After conversation on the above questions among the Senators, Senator Neubert raised the following questions: What are the big picture university-wide *areas or topics faculty consider important* to discuss? Are any of these content areas particularly critical for faculty to provide input? If so, which?

Senate suggestions included the following:

Academic freedom and the Christian mission; curriculum issues; size and composition of the university; composition, make-up of the faculty; infrastructure (classroom and office space); continue diversity efforts, expanding “Baylor bubble”; service as part of faculty role

Subsequent to the January meeting, Senator Neubert filed the following report:

Senate Involvement in Strategic Planning Process Discussion during Faculty Senate: January 11, 2011

There are three major components of the strategic planning process - the Process itself, the Content it yields, and the Vision (goals and plans) that result from analyzing and synthesizing the content.

Process Questions: What are the most effective ways to gather meaningful information from faculty? Similarly, what processes do you suggest should be followed to ensure a fair process?

Question 1 Summary

Fair, Effective Processes

1. Departmental discussions
 - a. Comfort, size
2. Focused discussions
 - a. More specificity in questions
3. On-line questionnaire
 - a. Flexibility, quant, confidential
4. Involvement in evaluation or prioritizing
5. Opportunities to provide feedback
 - a. Particularly academic issues
6. Use of previous input

7. Faculty Senate hosting meeting on particular issues
8. Use faculty Senate website to gather and disseminate information

Group Comments

What are the most effective ways to gather meaningful information from faculty?

Similarly, what processes do you suggest should be followed to ensure a fair process?

Group 1: Generate a list of things to decide (focused discussions) working draft; History of BIC process-send a representative out from Faculty Senate to each department, but you need a starting point of ideas.

Group 2: Departmental structure-so everyone has input college level. Faculty senate-executive committee-for issues that cut across many units. A structure for faculty to give another venue for faculty input-Town Hall Meetings sponsored by faculty senate. Need to feel comfortable and empowered-"it's worth my while". Focus on goals. Something to respond to. Staff council, alumni and faculty senate-student, retired faculty.

Group 3: Online questionnaire; targeted luncheons; call it something other than strategic planning.

Group 4: create focus groups with departmental/school required participation (similar to construction of the tenure committee). If a general call, many faculty are too busy and strategic planning is a lower priority. How can the faculty senate be involved in the selection of plans for implementation.

Group 5: Via departments: consensus, concerns, goals: only thing that makes sense to pursue. Input has most impact on "what do we want to be?" Then gathered at school level, maybe not...schools collect department input. School unit level? Nothing good can come of it. Issue of trust in recommendations from faculty (avoid 2012 process).

Is there a unique role faculty senate can play in one or more of these processes?

Group 1: Sponsor some meetings of their own; role in evaluating documents; and website of faculty senate.

Group 2: Check with constituents as to proceed in specific units. Place on Senate website for input that perhaps didn't make it into department process. On-line questionnaire for faculty. Involve faculty senate in evaluation process-input before final document. Look at older strategic plans to see what should be kept.

Group 3: No response.

Group 4: Faculty senate subcommittee can participate in evaluation of strategic suggestions. End of the game input by faculty senate.

Group 5: Our group didn't address this issue.

2. Content Question: What are the big picture university-wide areas or topics faculty consider important to discuss? Avoid statements of opinion or judgment related to the topic.

Question 2-Summary

Important Issues to Discuss

1. Academic freedom and Christian mission
2. Curriculum issues (balance of programs)
 - a. Goals of programs
3. Size and composition (undergrad/graduate) of BU
4. Composition of faculty-tenure track, clinical, adjunct, lecturer.
5. Classroom/office space
6. Diversity initiatives
7. Connection with community

8. Role of faculty service in responsibilities

Group Comments

What are the big picture university-wide areas or topics faculty consider important to discuss? Avoid statements of opinion or judgment related to the topic.

Group 1: (1) Academic freedom and the Christian mission (faith and learning); (2) ratio of graduate/undergrad students; (3) offering alternatives other than/or for PhD degree programs as market changes-goal of PhD education; (4) staff benefits (tuition); (5) curriculum issues- who determines curriculum-how independent are colleges: the honors college-programs and courses; (6) student recruitment: student quality and transfer of credit; (7) role of the institutes-special role of institute faculty/distinguished professors; (8) size of the university; (9) alumni relationship; (10) role of science education at Baylor.

Group 2: (1) recruitment; (2) retention-premed/prehealth; (3) how Baylor sees itself in 10 years-balancing teaching and scholarships; (4) hiring-tenure track/lecturers; (5) faith and learning-how we continue as a Christian institution, how implemented; (6) liberal arts core curriculum and balance with professional schools; (7) size of university-enrollment and make-ups, undergrad or grad—what niche should Baylor fit?; (8) pre-med/pre health students-33%-more intensive counseling for others paths; (9) facilities-space for office and classrooms.

Group 3: Overemphasis of STEM programs humanities/arts get equal emphasis; online instruction; *ratio of tenure-track to lecturer positions; lack of preparation for liberal arts education; reemphasis on faculty service as part of performance evaluation; technology; outcome of a university education-what should it be?

Group 4: stability in tenure and promotion requirement; Christian focus (or not); balance of teaching and research efforts (which trumps); continue diversity efforts; expanding Baylor bubble.

Group 5: curriculum; course content; facilities; fund-raising/development; resource allocation-building vs. academic programs; pay/compensation; cats to replace bears.

Group 6: new and existing graduate programs; remuneration; infrastructure-classroom and office space; faculty make-up, changes.

Are any of these content areas particularly critical for faculty to provide input? If so, which?

Group 1: All of these but especially #1 and #5.

Group 2: #2, 5, 7

Group 3: No response

Group 4: No response

Group 5: curriculum

Group 6: No response

VIII. Adjournment

The Senate adjourned at 5:08 p.m.