

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES, DRAFT

13 February 2007
Room 303 Cashion
3:42 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Robert Miner, Susan Johnsen

I. The meeting was called to order at 3:42 pm. Senator Green gave the invocation.

II. Guests: President John M. Lilley
Executive Vice President and Provost Randall O'Brien

Dr. Lilley began with positive remarks about the Board and about prospects for faculty and staff salaries. Dr. Lilley suggested that faculty members should be cautious about what they read intimating conflict among Board members about specific issues. For example, if there are problems concerning relations between the Regents and the Alumni association, we have a mechanism by which we can deal with them; and the Alumni Association does have editorial independence. The recent Regents meeting conveyed an upbeat note and the conviction that we are headed in the right direction. Concerning the football facility, our benefactors wanted it to happen; we have arranged funding through a bond, so that the money for the building will be treated as endowment and funds spun off of that endowment will be used to pay off the building. At the January Board meeting the Regents approved a 4.5% pool for salary increases and the immediate vesting of retirement, as well as replacing the graduated contributions to retirement with a 10.8 contribution across the board for all faculty and staff. *Senator question:* How can we quantify those benefits? Lilley: I've never seen how that is done. *Senator:* It would be nice to see the payback for dollars invested in the Alumni Association. *Senator:* Concerning the football facility, in

this case where we are replacing one facility (the Streich Tennis Courts) with another, is there an issue about the previous name of the Tennis Center and that facility's being replaced? *President Lilley*: We're looking at that, and we know we have to be mindful about how we deal with that situation. We will certainly find a way to thank our benefactors. *Senator*: What about the academic units that hold classes at the Streich Tennis Center? *President Lilley*: You'll be able to use the tennis center this semester; I'm not sure about the fall. *Senator*: Concerning the salary issue, how is the extra 1% above the 4.5% going to be spent? *President Lilley*: We intend to reserve it for the very best performance. *Senator*: With respect to our financial modeling, we are planning a faculty that is about 35% lecturers; will these lecturers be a part of our community? And what will be their status? Will they be Senior Lecturers? Or will we move to the kind of national model where we bring in people for 3-5 years only? *President Lilley*: Some of our lecturers will be graduate students who will be short-term faculty; others will be long-term faculty members. We'll advertise nationally for lecturers as we do for other faculty members, and we will intend to employ them long-term. We'll never come to the time when we have a condescending attitude toward teachers of our undergraduates. *Senator*: Will you reiterate what you said about the salary increases? What does it mean to talk about "the very best?" *President Lilley*: We hope you get the best evaluations you've ever gotten. Those who get the rating, "superior performance in all areas" deserve the extra 1%; the Regents want to be sure we are discriminating in our judgment. *Senator*: Are Distinguished Professors set off from the other faculty for these purposes like they were in a recent email? *Provost O'Brien*: That email was sent to the addresses that I inherited; I wanted to be sure the communication went to everybody. Those Distinguished Professors now report to their own academic units. *Senator*: What about credit for tenure? When faculty members come in, do they have a fixed timeline for tenure consideration? *President Lilley*: Yes, we need to see what these people can do for Baylor; we want to test their fit with Baylor. Normally, we should be cautious about putting people up early because that short-circuits our processes. And we should be super-cautious about putting people up for tenure when they have not completed 6 years. *Senator*: Suppose a faculty member goes up for tenure in 3 years; if they fail, do they get the terminal contract then or since they went up early do we say they get another shot? *President Lilley*: I'm not sure. *Provost O'Brien*: Everybody here realizes that we are process-challenged; it's much worse than we have imagined. We have pretty much always been a "mom and pop" university, and now we realize that processes and procedures cannot be as loose as they have been. We have three

offices working on policies. Many areas of University life need refinement and revision. *Senator*: If they come up early, can they still come up after 6 years? *President Lilley*: For most major universities, it's up or out period. *Senator*: Having served on the tenure committee, I observe that the committee is unhappy about the idea of having people come up a second time. *President Lilley*: In some departments, it's left to the individual whether or not he or she goes up early. *Senator*: Departments now are being told that lecturers can or cannot vote on certain appointments; the English department has been told lecturers cannot vote on Chair appointments. *President Lilley*: Lecturers should have a vote on department heads, but not on tenure. *Senator*: About the selection and evaluation of chairs, we get conflicting information from the Deans. *President Lilley*: We are not sure even where all our policies are. *Provost O'Brien*: Some departments do and some do not allow lecturers to vote on hiring issues. When the administration makes a decision, it is sometimes criticized as a top down decision, but somebody's got to make a decision about who can do what so we don't leave a "catch-22" down in the department. We want to involve everybody we can so that all contribute to a conversation in which we develop a policy we can distribute to the University. *President Lilley*: Certain policies need to be University wide. When it comes to representation and voting, there needs to be conformity across the University. *Senator*: Sometimes lecturers may be in the majority and could overrule the tenured faculty; perhaps we need more caution there. *President Lilley*: On University wide issues, this is the place to consult. Personnel policies are a top priority. *Provost O'Brien*: Monthly the Executive Committee meets with the President and me; issues were raised yesterday, and I wasn't there to address those concerns but I would like to do so now. *Senator*: There is a perception of disorganization in the Provost's office especially with regard to policies; things seem not to run very efficiently. *Provost O'Brien*: I agree that this perception is largely accurate; it didn't happen this year or the last or any specific year, but it's been our institutional history. The first thing we must do is work on these things every day, and Jim Benninghof is doing that. The perception is reality and we are working on it all day every day. *President Lilley*: How many of you are Associate Professors? Have you talked with your chairs about release time for research? *Senator*: We got an email asking if we were interested in this, but we were also told it can't happen this year. *President Lilley*: It is still not too late to hire a lecturer to replace some of our associate professors. *Provost O'Brien*: We want to make this replacement issue the chair's problem, not yours. You can still approach your chair on this, and it is not too late. You have the full support of the Provost and the President. *Senator*: What do you

mean by a reduced teaching load? *President Lilley*: The details depend on the plan proposed by the faculty member. We are trying not to get in the middle of course-load reduction plans; that's left up to the Chair and the faculty member. *Senator*: It would be helpful if we could start these things in the fall at the same time we are concerned with promotion and other issues. *Provost O'Brien*: When we get pushed, we sometimes hurry policies into place when they need more deliberation. *Senator*: Where are we on the Dean evaluation process? *Provost O'Brien*: Since there is something of a culture of paranoia about this issue, it means we'll do hard copy evaluations and each faculty member will evaluate only his own dean. *Senator*: We've never assumed we would evaluate other Deans than our own. *Provost O'Brien*: The Deans are being evaluated this month. To be sure that the evaluations have teeth, the Deans' contracts are going out later than everybody else's contracts so that we will be able to factor in their evaluations. *Senator*: Faculty members are frustrated because they've had Deans in place for many years and have never been able to evaluate them. *President Lilley*: Our process needs to include the evaluation of the effectiveness of entire offices. *Senator*: These evaluations need to include Associate Deans. *President Lilley*: Usually you don't evaluate associate Deans on an annual basis. *Senator*: We commend you for focusing on policies and procedures. As you look at those we encourage you to look at the people who are implementing those policies and procedures. *Senator*: Associate Deans are usually appointed without consultation with faculty. *President Lilley*: We will evaluate all these people periodically.

Laura Hilton, Steppin' Out Steering Committee:

We encourage student involvement in community service. We want your support to come out on March 24 to help people. At the end of the day we have a big celebration with food on the campus. Please sign up within your department and encourage your colleagues also to sign up. We brought you T-shirts! 1-5, Saturday, March 24! (There were a few moments of pleasant chaos while people accepted and traded t-shirt sizes.)

III. Approval of Minutes: Minutes were approved as corrected.

IV. Announcements

A. Election Commission appointments: Ellen Brown needs to be replaced on the commission. Nomination: Anne McGlashan. After Senator McGlashan declined her nomination because the Constitution

precludes two members from the same academic unit, Robert Cloud was nominated and elected by acclamation.

B. The following people have agreed to serve on the Ad-Hoc committee on Associate Professor appointments: Jaime Diaz-Granados, Bob Baird, Eva Doyle, Gerald Cleaver, Frieda Blackwell.

V. Old Business:

A. Selection and Evaluation of Chairs: *Chair Vitanza* led a discussion of relevant documents and pointed out recent revisions in the document Departments will not elect a Chair search committee, but the dean will name a search committee in consultation with the department . Are there recommendations for further revisions to the Council of Deans' version? We can continue to seek changes, or we can just say we find it unacceptable. *Senator*: It looks acceptable to me; it is a policy and it's better than a lot of different *ad hoc* procedures. *Senator*: The only way it's workable is with the changes that the Chair has added in brackets. *Chair Vitanza*: The revisions do deal with some of our concerns, and Provost O'Brien and Vice Provost Bennighof have agreed to them. **Motion by Senator Cannon**: I move we accept the document with these amendments. **Second: Senator Myers.**

Discussion. **PASSED**

B. Compensation and Benefits Update: *Senator Cloud*: We believe we have encouraging news from Reagan Ramsower. And the 1% funding for faculty increases above the 4.5% = 1.5 million dollars. Are all faculty members in all departments eligible for this additional increment? President Lilley's answer is yes, but it requires evaluation of "superior in all areas ." The administration is looking to continue improving faculty salaries in coming years, and that intentionality about increases hasn't happened in previous years.

C. Policy on Committees Update (*Senator Cordon*): No news yet. We'll meet again in the next couple of weeks.

VI. Committee/Liaison Reports

A. University Curriculum Committee (*Senator Myers*): [See attachment A] Faculty need a voice in curriculum change at the University level. There are programs and courses approved that do not flow through normal processes. Our current Provost is interested in our being an active committee. The SACS review suggests we need a subcommittee on the General Education curriculum: What are our goals for general education

at Baylor; we'll need help on that point. About U1100: The Committee decided not to approve the course. The Engaged Learning Groups: Our Senior Vice Provost's response to our concern that the courses associated with the EGL's had not gone through the appropriate curriculum process was, "That train has already left the station." Elizabeth Davis has sent out the U1000 evaluations. *Senator*: My concern with U1100 and the ELGs is that they never went through the normal curriculum processes. *Senator Blackwell* indicated that the ELGs went through the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee.. *Senator Blackwell*: The A&S curriculum committee saw them as very like the freshman seminars; we'll still have to decide what credits they will satisfy. Discussion. **Senator Green Motion: The Senate resolves that the ELGs are not acceptable to meet degree requirements because they have not gone through normal curriculum procedures. Second Senator Cannon. PASSED.**

B. Ad Hoc Committee to Recommend Ombudsman (*Senator Supplee*): See attachment B. Discussion. **Motion Senator Longfellow: that the document be amended to modify the qualifications to require that the person be either a Full Professor or a retired Full Professor. Second Cannon. Vote: PASSED.** Report received and accepted.

C. Academic Freedom (*Senator Longfellow*): No report.

D. Enrollment Management (*Senator Sturgill*): No report.

E. Physical Facilities (*Senator Brown*): No report.

F. Student Life (*Senator Chonko*): No report.

G. Liaison Reports

- i. Council of Deans (*Chair Vitanza*):
 - a. In the future individual academic units will play a larger role in fundraising..
 - b. There is a new process for reviewing grant applications, which moves the responsibility for examining the financial implications of grant proposals as well as the requirement for additional space back to the chair and the deans. The Office of Sponsored Programs will no longer take responsibility for reviewing proposals in these regards.
 - c. Dean Diana Garland raised the possibility of Baylor establishing a Center for Hispanic Studies and solicited input from those individuals and departments who might have an interest in such a center.
 - d. The discussion of salary increases at the Council of Deans meeting raised serious concerns that were later addressed.
- ii. Athletic Council (*Senator Sadler*): No report.

- iii. Staff Council (*Chair Vitanza*): No report.
- iv. Student Government (*Chair Vitanza*): One student government representative is trying to persuade the Regents to take a stand on the issue of the TXU coal plants. In response to an inquiry, Chair Vitanza reported that she had met with the joint Academic Affairs/Student Life Committee of the Regents at the last two Regent meetings, addressing the composition and functions of the Senate and issues currently under discussion.
- v. Personnel, Benefits, Compensation (*Chair Vitanza*): No report.
- vi. Code of Ethics (Senators Cordon, Robinson): The first meeting is 3/5.
- vii. Strategic Planning (Senators Cordon, Robinson): The first meeting 3/8.

VII. New Business: Chair Vitanza distributed copies of an email from a faculty member stating a number of concerns and asked that the senators look over the document that came from the faculty member through his or her senator, pending action at our next meeting.

Adjournment: 6:25.

Faculty Senate Meeting
February 13, 2007
Attachment A

University Curriculum Committee (UCC)
Faculty Senate Report
February 13, 2007

Members: Antonios Augoustakis, Tom Bratcher, Adair Bowen, Lori Greenwood, Doris DeLoach, Keith Francis, Mary Lynn Klingman, Kevin Klausmeyer, Ann McGlashan, Dennis Myers, Byron Newberry, Wesley Null, Jerry Waltman, Bonnie Savoldi, Jeff Steely; Tony Talbert, Peter Van Walsum, and David VanHoose. (18 members)

Agenda #1: Propose new name, role, and structure

- Rename committee: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
- Purpose: Review new courses, course changes, and mediate course duplication/overlap
- Goal: Increase faculty review of program/course changes at university level
- Restructure membership: 15-16 members; faculty representatives from all Schools/College curriculum committees and from faculty within Schools/College and Library.
- Issues: Provost delegation vs. committee initiated review; value of university-level faculty review vs. value of timely program/course approval; and broad review of all program/course changes vs. narrow review of course duplication/overlap.

Agenda #2: Propose general education goals and an assessment and curriculum improvement plan

- SACS noted an exception related to identification, assessment, and improvement of general education outcomes.
- Sub committee on General Education Goals and Curriculum Improvement- Francis, Klingman, Myers, Savoldi, Steely; and Talbert.
- Engage faculty and academic administrators in creation and review of proposed general education goals and an approach to assessment & improvement.

Agenda 3: Review proposed University 1100 course.

- Request for approval was denied
- A contribution to the first-year educational experience
- Proposed without prior approval of School/College faculty and curriculum committees
- Implications of adding university-wide degree requirement were not fully investigated
- Future of program uncertain
- Requested distribution of findings of University 1000 surveys to Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Meeting, 2 13 2007
Attachment B

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OMBUDS POSITION

DRAFT 22 JANUARY 2007

Purpose of the Position:

The University Faculty Ombudsperson is appointed jointly by the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate and serves to resolve problems, questions or disputes for the Faculty in an informal, impartial, and confidential manner. The Ombudsperson is neither an agent of the University nor an advocate for the Administration or Faculty, but is an advocate of fair process and an agent of impartial mediation. The Ombudsperson operates independently of the University's formal grievance procedures, has no decision-making authority, and is independent of the University's normal academic administration. Above all, the Ombudsperson operates under strict confidentiality and serves as an alternative to administrative channels, frequently operating as a place of first resort to resolve concerns, problems and/or disputes related to issues of administrative and faculty rights and responsibilities. The Ombudsperson works with the full cooperation of all University personnel and promotes the values of fairness, equity, justice and mutual respect.

Duties of the Faculty Ombudsperson:

- To promote fairness, equity, justice and mutual respect
- To avoid any situation that could create a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest
- To mediate disputes to seek a "win-win" resolution of problems
- To serve as an informal, confidential sounding board for faculty questions, issues, and concerns
- To hold all information confidential unless permission to release information is granted
- To break confidentiality only when there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm
- To act as resource of information and to explain university policies and procedures
- To direct parties to the appropriate office, department, or organization in the University or the community that might help resolve concerns
- To hear all of the concerned sides in a dispute and help analyze the situation
- To help evaluate various options to address concerns informally
- To recommend an appropriate course of action to resolve the issue and to inform all parties involved in the mediation of those recommendations
- To follow-up to make sure concerns are addressed
- To make appropriate referrals when informal options do not work

To give advice on how to maintain formal written records
To inform the administration of patterns of endemic problems or complaints in periodic meetings and recommend changes
To provide an annual progress report to the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

Faculty Ombuds Position Draft

22 January 2007

Page Two

Activities Not Part of the Faculty Ombudsperson's Duties:

To participate in formal grievance processes
To serve as an office of record
To mediate student issues
To mediate staff issues
To handle non-university related issues or disputes
To make policy or administrative decisions
To assign blame or guilt
To give legal advice
To assess sanctions
To maintain official records
To hold any other administrative position, sit on any grievance or tenure committees, or serve in the Faculty Senate

Qualifications:

Must be a tenured full professor or retired member of the Baylor University Faculty
Must be a member of the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) and attend at least one training session per year and the annual conference
Must be committed to the ideas of fairness, equity and justice
Must be a person of integrity recognized by both the administration and the faculty
Must adhere to the International Ombudsman Association code of ethics
Must be familiar with University policies and procedures, especially those pertaining to academic issues, grievances, faculty and staff personnel, and records.
Must be able to handle issues confidentially
Must be willing to participate in conflict resolution training
Must possess good communication and problem solving skills
Must possess decision making and strategic thinking skills

Must demonstrate organizational knowledge and networking skills
Must be sensitive to diversity issues
Must demonstrate diplomatic skills
Must have good presentation skills
Must be empathetic

An Ombudsperson Selection Committee shall be composed of three members appointed by the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs and three members selected by the Faculty Senate. The Committee will solicit applications for the position, will interview candidates and will submit to the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate recommended candidates for the position. The successful candidate will be selected by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate and approval of the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs.

Faculty Ombuds Position Draft

22 January 2007

Page Three

Terms of Appointment, Workload and Compensation of the Faculty Ombudsperson

The Ombudsperson will be appointed for a term of three years and will be eligible for reappointment for a second three-year term with approval of the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs and a majority vote of the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Ombudsperson will be available for consultation during all academic sessions and will maintain a separate office and records. Ideally this office will be housed in an area near the Ombudspersons for Staff and Students.

The Faculty Ombudsperson will be compensated in the following manner. During the regular academic year, the Ombudsperson will be entitled to a three hour per semester teaching load reduction and full compensation without teaching duties during the summer sessions. Necessary budgetary expenses for both teaching load reduction and summer salary compensation as well as the expenses for maintaining the Ombudsperson's office including the membership fees of the IOA, attendance at the annual conference and one training seminar per year shall be arranged through the office of the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs.

Faculty on modified service or retired faculty who are selected for this position will receive compensation equivalent to that stipulated above.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, in consultation with the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs, may counsel the Ombudsperson at any time regarding job performance.

If it becomes necessary to remove the Ombudsperson, the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs with approval of a 2/3rds vote of the Faculty Senate may do so as appropriate.

Changes made to the duties, compensation, and/or job description of the Faculty Ombudsperson may be done with agreement between the Executive Vice-President and Provost for Academic Affairs and a majority vote of the Faculty Senate.