

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES, DRAFT

5 December 2006
Room 303 Cashion
2:05 p.m.

Members Present: Senators Baldrige, Blackwell, Cannon, Diaz-Granados, Duhrkopf, Kayworth, Ngan, Longfellow, Losey, McGlashan, Miner, Pennington, Purdy, Rosenbaum, Sadler**, Stone, Supplee, Johnson (for Tolbert), Vitanza, Park (for Wilcox*), Chonko, Gardner, Rajaratnam, Cloud, Connally, Cordon, Boyd, Green, Sturgill, Brown, Myers, Garner, Spain.

*Serving remainder of Randall O'Brien's term

**Serving remainder of Susan Wallace's term

Members Absent: Senators Nunley, Robinson, Tolbert, Wilcox.

Welcome and Invocation: 2:05, Chair Vitanza called the meeting to order. The Invocation was given by Senator Garner

Guests:

Travis Plummer, Internal Vice President of Student Government and Chair,

Student Senate: The student government wants to focus on two topics. The first: We understand the need for Baylor faculty to do research, but we want the mentorship and service to students that we have always considered to be an essential part of a Baylor education. The second: We want to publish evaluations of Baylor faculty members, and we want to work with the Faculty Senate toward accomplishing this goal. We'd like to create a joint committee to find a mutually agreeable instrument and one with results that we could publish. (We would aim at objective and subjective questions of all kinds that do not evaluate just the student's grade expectations.) Students have a right to know in what they are investing their tuition, to see syllabi for the courses they are entering, and generally to have any information required to enable better decisions about their courses. We hope you will join us in lobbying together for a successful outcome of this sort.
(Discussion)

Approval of Minutes: Approved as distributed.

President John M. Lilley and Provost Randall O'Brien: 3:30 arrival, suspended

agenda: *President Lilley:* I am ready to respond to your questions. *Senator*

comment: Concerning the saga of the Math department: thank you; some progress has been made and we are told we will be back into our Sid Richardson quarters by the spring semester. The other thing is that it appears that the reason we'll be back so quickly is that hardly any renovations will be done; the money allocated for the upgrade of that building appears to be insufficient. Might you be able to find some funds to finish the refurbishing of the Sid Richardson building in an appropriate manner? The department is not asking for a lot; just renovation of some offices; for example, the "rat room" vacated by the Department of Psychology is not in good repair. *President Lilley:* You are asking that we don't cut quite so close to the quick? We'll try to do that. *Provost O'Brien:* It should be possible, because our financial model is very conservative, and we may have some funds to redirect toward your project. (Discussion) *Senator comment:* The Bill Dembski hire; it has a few of the scientists quite concerned; what do you know of that situation? *Provost O'Brien:* We did not know anything about this until Friday; I was informed then by the Chair of the Faculty Senate. I was surprised to learn of this situation on campus. The situation is now under control and is now being handled and managed in a manner that will be appropriate for our University. *President Lilley:* You should all purchase *The Language of God* by Francis Collins, a book that makes very clear the compatibility between religion and science; in my view it's a very good statement. *Senator comment:* There will be some strong reactions to this situation. *Provost O'Brien:* One concern is procedural irregularities; the Dean of the School did not know about this situation, nor did the Chair of the department. Paperwork was processed after the fact, after November 1, and the funds were a gift that did not come through ordinary grant channels. We are returning the money for this position, and the position is being terminated. (Discussion.) *Senator comment:* The hire was exceedingly offensive to those of us concerned about the reputation of the sciences, especially as regards admission to medical school. *President Lilley:* Let me reiterate: please read the Francis Collins book; it is a good accessible account of the relation between evolution and religion. *Provost O'Brien:* I think it's best to leave the resolution of this matter around procedural issues; otherwise, the intelligent design issue will hit the *Chronicle* and other journals and magazines. *Senator comment:* Has there been reconsideration of the book publication by Baylor University Press (edited by Schmeltekopf and Hankins)? *Provost O'Brien:* The book did not pass the peer review carried out by the Baylor Press. *Senator question:* Concerning the current policy for promotion: (1) Can we revisit the criteria for picking external evaluators? (2) Is there flexibility about the criteria for promotion, especially for people who earlier made decisions about the course of their careers in terms of criteria then in effect for promotion and tenure? *President Lilley:* This is a big shift, and a tough

one, especially for those who came thinking Baylor was one kind of place and are now seeing that it is another kind of place. We are not giving up on the value of teaching. Given that we are going through this change, we must be fair but we must also be firm. In terms of external review, we ask people to review only research, but the letter soliciting evaluations should give account of the responsibilities of the faculty members involved; first-rate reviewers at first rate institutions almost always judge fairly about the research of those they are evaluating. It's a misapprehension that colleagues at first-rate universities will not be fair. Service is important, but excessive amounts of service can never be a substitute for research. *Senator response:* We do well at bringing people in and explaining the expectations we have; our problem now is that we have very valuable faculty members who have done good work and we should be smart enough to find a way to be fair to the associate professors who came to Baylor with different expectations. *President Lilley:* We will reward people well for what they do for the University, but without publication and external review they will not achieve the rank of Professor. *Senator comment:* Can the University provide resources for the associate professors who want to work toward achieving promotion to Full Professor, resources comparable to those offered new assistant professors? *President Lilley:* We need operational plans for getting adequate resources to the associate professors who want to achieve full professor. Those should come from the chairs of their departments, carefully thought through with the faculty member and presented as plans to the administration. *Senator comment:* A Chair can say no to a faculty member's proposal. (Discussion continued.)

Old Business:

Honorary Degree Nomination: Jacques Sys has been recommended by the committee for Honorary Degrees to receive an Honorary Doctorate Degree. Last spring, we concluded that we did not have enough information to support the recommendation. *Senator comment:* We still have no additional information. **Motion not to approve the recommendation:** Senator Connally; **Second:** Senator Cloud. **Vote:** Unanimous.

Honor Code/Honor Council (Jane Baldwin): We have met to consider the revision of the Honor Code. The problem we were focusing on because of our conversations in the last Senate meeting was "witnessing conduct that was dishonorable and not reporting that conduct." We gave a great deal of thought to the issue of the enforceability of that part of the code: it's hard to detect a failure to report a cheating incident; can such a failure be detected and thus enforced? We believe it can be detected, in the same way that tearing a page out of a library book can be detected. Should it be

classified as a dishonorable act? We believe it should be. Also, we note that there is an educational component to the Honor Code. Think of Enron and the people who finally came forward and reported the cheating going on there. We want to encourage honorable behavior. Furthermore, this provision is consistent with other policies of the University, for example the hazing policy. That policy, like the one we propose, encourages students to do the right thing. We came to the conclusion that the provision should stay in the Honors Code. *Senator comment:* The policy is on the web. *Senator question:* Does this policy apply to faculty members as well? *Professor Baldwin:* Yes. But we do not mean to detract from the right of faculty members to deal with such incidents as they judge appropriate. *Chair Vitanza:* Do we want to take action on the Honor Code? **Motion by Senator Sturgill:** I move that the Senate endorse the latest draft of this policy. **Second by Senator Duhrkopf.** **Vote:** Passed.

Center for Teaching and Learning: *Chair Vitanza:* The presentation at the November meeting by Doug Rogers and Laine Scales raised the question of whether or not we should take action on their proposal to establish such a center. Do we have any interest in endorsing that proposal? *Senator comment:* Since there are limited resources, I'm not convinced we should be in the business of endorsing strategic plans that have not gone through the planning process. *Senator comment:* Dr. Rogers's intent was to get our input about the idea. *Senator comment:* I like the proposal, but I think it should go through the regular planning process. We should not be in the business of evaluating strategic plans—not that we oppose or dislike the proposal.

Situation of the Math department: Chair Vitanza read an email from Regan Ramsower affirming that the math department would be back in Sid Richardson by the fall term. *Senator comment:* We may get new rugs, new paint and bathrooms that work!

Proposed Promotion Policy Resolution (Chair Vitanza):

Resolved: Whereas the Faculty Senate has endorsed 2012, including its emphasis on “research and publication as the path to the discovery of new knowledge”; and whereas the revised promotion policy requires associate professors seeking promotion to full professor to “have an established record of publication”; and whereas the teaching assignments for many current associate professors have historically precluded an emphasis on research; and whereas the opportunity to accomplish the research necessary to be promoted to full professor should be equally available to associate professors regardless of the length of their tenure at Baylor; therefore, be it resolved that the Baylor University Faculty Senate encourages the President and the Provost to work with the

Senate to develop and implement a pro-active plan to provide opportunities for course reductions and sabbaticals for associate professors tenured prior to the adoption of 2012 who desire to establish a record of publication necessary for promotion to full professor.

Discussion: *Senator comment:* In light of our conversation with the Associate Professors, should we not postpone action on this resolution until after the coming meeting with Associate Professors and the administration? *Chair Vitanza* provided a brief explanation of the content of the meeting with associate professors and the need for a meeting between the associate professors and the administration about the issue.

Senator comment: The problem is the unfairness of this policy; simply to provide an opportunity to get our research up to speed in the proposed way is not an effective way to address the inequity. The resolution should address the unfairness of the policy. *Chair Vitanza:* What kind of action can we recommend? *Senator comment:* Apparently the President has some misgivings about enacting the policy in its present form; we need the President to articulate his position to the associate professors. *Chair Vitanza:* I do not think there is flexibility in the President's position about promotion to Full Professor; maybe on the idea of compensation for associate professors, but not on the issue of promotion to Full Professor. *Senator comment:* I favor multiple avenues to promotion; the publish or perish stuff is assumed to be really good for Baylor. How does this policy contribute to what's really good for Baylor? How will this policy enhance the University or its reputation? *Chair Vitanza:* There is an issue of what other criteria might be used; if there are such criteria, we need to identify those criteria. *Senator Comment:* The criteria should be what they were at the time of employment: publication is appreciated but not required, etc. Each of us has made decisions based on the criteria operative at the time. You go full speed down one road, and you find out you've been traveling on the wrong road! *Senator Comment:* The unfair work load needs to be addressed for all faculty members. *Senator comment:* Chairs should not be able to dictate faculty members' teaching loads if faculty members are going to be evaluated only on their research. *Senator Comment:* Current associate professors are going to leap frog over us. Serving the University by teaching overloads or even four courses is not recognized by this policy; in fact the policy ignores this issue. *Chair Vitanza:* The administration is not receptive to promotion to Full Professor without the external review of publications. *Senator comment:* We should have been in our labs rather than serving as advisors to student organizations or holding long office hours, etc. *Senator comment:* What is the tangible form of gratitude to Associate Professors who have sacrificed for the well being of 2012? *Senator comment:* What about those who were promoted to Full Professor in the past who would not meet the current publication requirement? If you apply the rules to the associates, then why not also apply them to full professors?

Motion by Senator Duhrkopf: I move that we table the resolution issue until after the administration's meeting with associate professors. **Second:** Senator Longfellow. **Vote:** Passed.

Compensation and Benefits Update (Senator Cloud): We had a spirited discussion about base salary increases, a specific percentage was mentioned, and it was encouraging that Reagan Ramsower and other relevant parties agreed that we should have such an increase in base salary. Also health care benefits; the administration is reviewing options to minimize the increase for retired faculty members, although they caution that whatever might be done for retirees might impact the package available for the rest of the faculty. Tuition remission benefit: the administration is willing to revisit and reconsider that issue on behalf of the faculty. The issue again is that there is only so much money available for adjustments in compensation and benefits. Tuition remission looks like a recruiting tool, and that fact may also offer motivation for a positive change. *Senator comment:* Are exceptions possible in order to recruit? *Senator response:* Exceptions have been made in order to get some new faculty members. *Chair Vitanza:* Tuition remission is a major recruiting tool for staff. *Senator question:* What is the amount of our tuition remission commitments right now? *Senator response:* Perhaps \$300,000.

Policy on Committees Update (Senator Cordon): We received a request to eliminate the Honors Committee and the University Scholars Committee; our proposal is to suspend the two committees pending further examination. The committees are currently not functioning committees. *Senator comment:* Is it the preference of the Dean that these decisions be made by program directors rather than by University committees? *Senator comment:* There is a concern that the Honors College has been changing requirements within the Honors College for graduates of the College of Arts and Sciences; the Provost's office needs to be involved in these decisions in order to insure that the administrative structures function properly. *Senator response:* These committees are not functioning now, so let's suspend these committees. *Senator rejoinder:* The Provost needs to be involved because of the administrative complexities involving the Honors College and the College of Arts and Sciences. My concern is about how degree requirements are changed by the Honors College for graduates of the college of Arts and Sciences. *Senator Comment:* These are University Honors degrees, and it's peculiar for those degrees to be administered by a specific college within the University. *Senator comment:* The committee on Faculty Governance will discuss how people across the University can come together constructively to discuss this issue. *Senator comment:* The Dean of the Honors College is interested in increasing communication with other units of

the University. Perhaps the committees can be reconstituted in the spring to work more constructively. *Senator Cordon*: The committees are not meeting and not functioning, so to avoid the problem of having people seated on the committee who are not meeting, we are recommending suspending the committees for the spring term. *Senator comment*: The idea for new committees is to forge a new connection between the people who are contributing and those who are on the committees. (Discussion continued.) *Senator comment*: We in the sciences get feedback from our students that they are not being well served by the Honors Program.

Motion by Senator Cordon: I move that the Faculty Senate suspend both the Honors Program Committee and the University Scholars Committee, pending further discussion by the Committee on Faculty Governance and interested parties in the relevant programs that will conclude no later than the final day of the spring semester in 2007. **Second by Senator Cloud**. **Vote**: Pass with two abstentions.

Committee/Liaison Reports:

Academic Freedom (Longfellow): No report.

Enrollment Management (Sturgill): Admission committee has thus far admitted only the most outstanding students; we saw these early admissions decisions as a chance to get the most outstanding students.

Physical Facilities (Brown): No report.

Student Life (Chonko): No report.

Liaison Reports:

- i. Council of Deans (Vitanza): No Report.
- ii. Athletic Council (Connally): The athletic department has hired a new learning specialist. The fall term revenue was slightly above expectations.
- iii. Staff Council (Vitanza): No report.
- iv. Student Government (Vitanza): No report.
- v. Personnel, Benefits, Compensation (Vitanza): No report.

Senator Question: Will there be faculty representation on the committee to develop a code of ethics for the University? *Chair Vitanza*: Yes, our representatives will be Matt Cordon and Eric Robinson. We will take up the issue of the annual evaluation of Deans and Chairs at our next meeting

Motion to Adjourn by Senator Cloud; **Second** by Senator Baldrige; **Vote**: Pass.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:34.38.

Respectfully submitted,
Stuart Rosenbaum, Secretary