

# FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 4, 2008  
Room 303 Cashion  
3:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Senators Blackwell, Bowman, Boyd, Brown, Bob Piziak (for Cannon), Cloud, Connally, Cordon, Diaz-Granados, Duhrkopf, Gardner, Garner, Green, Kayworth, Korpi, Lehr, Longfellow, Long, Losey, Miner, Myers, Ngan, Nunley, Pennington, Purdy, Rajaratnam, Jim Patton (for Rosenbaum), Sadler, Spain, Stone, Sturgill, Supplee, Randy Wood (for Talbert), Tolbert, Vitanza.

## **I. Welcome and Invocation**

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. Senator Ngan offered the invocation.

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

*Provost:* The chair of Senate emailed us and said we were free to discuss what we'd like to, but there were a few items he would like us to consider addressing: the issue with the faculty handbook and the Geology department, and the tenure decisions.

First, concerning the Geology department, there is a concern that the administration is not following the published policy with respect to base salary increases. They have issued a paragraph describing their concerns. It is true that what they said is taken out of the faculty handbook. I would like to read from the preface. "This faculty handbook is not intended to be either an official policy and procedures manual or a contractual document. The faculty handbook is not a part of any contractual commitment, expressed or implied, nor is it intended to create any legally enforceable obligations." It also says you can click on the website to get additional information. When you download the faculty evaluation and compensation policy from the website, the document is taken from the faculty handbook. The bottom line is that, at this point, there really is no official compensation policy. The administration relies on annual instruction that's given out. We have a base level of merit and we have had an additional pool these last two years. Thankfully, Dr. Leeper is heading a committee to try to get our policy structure in order.

*Senator:* What would you call what's in the faculty handbook? *President:* Outdated. We are pushing the regents to help us recover the lost salary for those two years when there were not increases. However, the only way that's going to happen is if it's delivered based on merit. We recognize that different

people have different teaching responsibilities and anyone with any weighting should be eligible to be rated as excellent.

There was some discussion on the use of decimal weights in the faculty evaluations. *Provost:* We did have some chairs that would evaluate one faculty member as a two and another as a five and, when I looked at the spreadsheets, the 'meets standards' professor would get a 4.5 percent increase and the exceeds would get 4.75 percent. This did look like a very small differential. It has been pointed out that, just like we can have grade inflation, we can have evaluation inflation. You may have one department that's very tough and another where everyone is evaluated at a four or a five. The important question is, how does this impact the raise pool. I could have a faculty member evaluated at a three in one department who is actually better than someone who gets a four or a five in another. I am not qualified to evaluate all faculty on campus. That's why we rely on the chairs and the deans.

*Senator:* I am concerned with the loss of institutional memory on these issues. When the merit system was established, it was understood that there would be a good base raise, and the merit would be on top of that. What's in that faculty handbook is what we agreed to, and that has been lost.

*Senator:* What is the goal of not having a base raise? Is that coming from the regents? *President:* This is from the regents, but I also endorse it. *Senator:* Would you still say that if there was a 20 percent inflation rate? *President:* We shared with you in the long-term budget what is built in for salary increases. We would not get this in any across-the-board basis. There was some discussion about the history of the removal of a base salary increase. *Senator:* Right now, it's easy to not worry about this because inflation is low. There is now an expectation of accelerated inflation. To have a system that denies the base salary increase doesn't make sense to me. *President:* Other universities have dealt with this, and how they handle it is to put more money into the raise pool during these years and to distribute it based on merit.

*Senator:* People who meet professional standards should have no erosion in their standard of living. You can still use merit to reward behavior. If you don't do that, you have a situation that's called learned helplessness. This will be a situation that will be very hard to change.

*Senator:* I would be interested in what the impact of this was last year. How many people ended up with a raise that was below the inflation rate? Were there people who were rated at a three or two who lost buying power?

*Provost:* Last year, I believe the President heard your concerns. Originally, the conversation in Pat Neff was that meeting professional standards would not justify an increase. After some concerns from faculty, faculty who met professional standards were given 2 percent.

*Senator:* In our department, we have faculty who can make their whole pay raise in a few hours of consulting. Others don't have that opportunity.

*President:* Is your point that these people are consulting instead of fulfilling their obligations here? *Senator:* My point is that the reward for exceptional

service is so small that they don't have the incentive to pursue it. *Senator:* Nobody gets above a 2 in teaching or service in my department. *President:* It looks like we need to do more training. This isn't our intent. The system isn't perfect, but I'd like to get it operating efficiently.

*Provost:* On the tenure issue. Those decisions have been made. I have visited with each of the deans who had candidates up for tenure, and we went over all the candidates who were up. Each dean was invited to give us their best thinking on each candidate. I also met with the tenure committee and went through all 29 (*sic*) names, shared with them the thinking of the administration and invited feedback. I've come back to meet with the president to share this. Decisions have been made and the next step will be to write letters to all of the candidates. Copies will be given to the respective deans. The deans will hand deliver these letters. I will also communicate with the chairman of the tenure committee and inform the chairman of each decision. Each dean will also confer with the chairs, but we have decided to ask the dean to do the delivering of the letters.

*Senator:* In the last Senate meeting, you said the tenure candidates would be notified by Feb 23. Can you explain that gap? *Provost:* I did say that. Remember that the president chimed in saying not so fast. He was actually out of town on 3 occasions and that prevented us from working. We worked three late nights and at other times during the day.

*Senator:* The newspaper reported that you were lobbying congress. Is it legitimate for us to be lobbying congress? *President:* Yes. We have new lobbyists we have employed, the firm of Patton Boggs. We had proposals that were prepared and, when we sat down with our senators and representatives, we got to business right away. *Leeper:* I am working with Truell Hyde to schedule a visit the Patton Boggs folks to campus. They believe that we have more potential than we are taking advantage of. They want to meet with our research folks to see about making us as competitive as we can be.

*Senator:* On what date will deans deliver the letters? *Provost:* I don't think we can tell you. *Senator:* Is it likely that they will receive letters before spring break. *Provost:* We don't know. We don't know the workload of general counsel. We'll do our part, but I don't know how to speak for them. I would hope so. We will do everything we can. *Senator:* The letters that go out, they are not standard? *Provost:* We use a template, but there is one paragraph that varies from candidate to candidate. When we write that paragraph, legal counsel tells us it's very important for them to look at it.

*Senator:* Is it possible to have a category on the evaluation forms that says "exceeds in most areas?" *Provost:* There is a new form that's being devised for next year. I think it's going to be a lot different from the current one. *Senator:* I'm going to second this. There are a lot of people who excel in two out of three areas. *Provost:* I know that several senators were on the committee that worked on this document.

*President:* On the issue of tenure, we really need to clean up our processes. We think we train on these issues, but sometimes it's been disappointing. This is not a policy change, but it's a change in the procedure. *Senator:* I didn't find out until the day before letters were due that CVs were required from the external evaluators.

*Senator:* I have heard from several chairs who are being evaluated that they are not getting any feedback from the evaluations. This doesn't help them much if they are not getting feedback. *Provost:* We did evaluate the deans last year and I went over the evaluations with each dean and that process was very effective. I understand that this kind of thing needs to be done with chairs as well.

*Patton:* I was on the tenure committee and I'd like to give some evaluation on this. I think the Senate can relax its vigilance on ideological issues. There are only a few times when I have seen this come up during a tenure decision. Also, it is important for you to know that, on every decision where there was a no vote, these folks have come to visit with us, face-to-face, until we decided that there was no need for discussion. I think there is always room for disagreement, but I don't think you can ask for anything else. My personal view is that this tenure situation is working as well as it could be. *Provost:* I want you to know how much your words mean to me and the President.

*Senator:* This comment about merit pay does bring up the issue of the 10 percent service on the evaluation. Because this is limited to 10 percent, the kind of work the tenure committee does can't be adequately acknowledged. I'm wondering if the category of assigned service could be broadened to include responsibilities like this. *President:* Do people on the tenure committee get a course reduction for this? *Patton:* I don't think they need to get a course reduction for this. I don't consider this to be extraordinary service. Chair of the Senate is. There may be other jobs I'm not thinking of. *Senator:* I'm thinking that this 10 percent limit affects people's willingness to serve on these committees. *President:* I feel like the weights should be built on the teaching responsibility. If a person is getting release time from teaching to do something else, then the weights should reflect this. It sounds like this issue of weights needs to be reconsidered. *Senator:* Teaching and services are not evaluated here. *President:* Clearly, if you are teaching 2 courses a year, we should expect a lot more for scholarship. If you are teaching more, we should expect less in scholarship. *Senator:* In my department, our evaluation is based entirely on scholarship. Someone who is doing an outstanding job on teaching is not rewarded and someone who is doing poorly is not punished.

*Senator:* Something has bugged me about percentages. We do this in the spring for the past calendar year, but we may find out in the spring that some new responsibility that is going to require a lot of time, but we didn't know that when we set the load for the next year.

*Senate Chair:* There were several questions about the focus on the university webpage. John Barry sent a response to me, which has been distributed.

### **III. Guest: Pattie Orr, Vice President for Information Technology and Dean of Libraries (University Sustainability Committee)**

Thank you for inviting me. I want to talk about the sustainability progress we are making. You already know that we have a sustainability committee, which I am chairing. We have representatives from several areas including students, staff council, dining services, groundskeeping and housekeeping. We divided into 4 subgroups, a communication and education group, policy and contracts, recycling and sustainability, and a research group.

On paper consumption, we just crossed over into half a million pages saved since the fall on our public printers. We have now paid for the cost of all those duplexers. If you have your own department lab or office printer, you could add a duplexer and the savings would ultimately pay for it. Our help desk can help you with this.

On policy and contracts, we have negotiated a good price for recycled paper. Your department can now order 30 percent recycled at that cost. We have also launched phase one of the recycling initiative. We have rolled out 420 single-stream recycling containers throughout our residence halls. We have found that it's important to have buy-in from every aspect of this committee. This has been a good place where it's good to have people like housekeeping on the committee. If we don't make a sustainability plan that's sustainable, then shame on us. I think a lot of efforts like this have been started before, but they have been difficult to keep going.

We are in this contest called Recyclemania. We have been number one in the Big 12 for four weeks in a row. Schools are rated per capita. We are currently 76 out of 167 schools, nation-wide. The way you will know if we are doing well is if you go around campus and see big blue dumpsters. These are for recycling. Another thing we did was to go with blue bins that are not locked. This will make it easier to put things in. These bins take paper, cardboard, plastics and aluminum. We are doing single-stream recycling, so we don't have to sort. Near a soda machine, we may put a bin that only takes cans, but that's to help eliminate contamination.

*Senator:* One reason I thought we had locks on dumpsters was because we were recycling exam materials. *Orr:* I don't know about that. I would say you would want to shred these materials. We are also getting signs for these dumpsters that say mixed recycling, so people will know what can be put in. We won't be doing glass recycling because our recycler, Sunbright, doesn't accept glass. If you want to put your glass in the Goebel dumpsters, that would be great because they can take them.

*Senator:* How about books? *Orr:* We can take these. If you have a lot of these, you may want to contact me.

Also, available to you free is a white box that you can put under your desk that says Baylor recycling. You can put paper, plastic or cans in there.

In phase two, we will put containers in some of our public spaces. In phase three, we will go to every building to talk about what you need container-wise for your building. We are going to try to pick out some models of containers that are suited to the building.

We have a website, [www.baylor.edu/sustainability](http://www.baylor.edu/sustainability). Our committee's report will be posted there as well as statistics on how we are doing with Recyclemania. I hope we will have a full recycling plan in place in 2008.

*Senator:* I would like to compliment you on the drive to get this going. I found that Baylor University has been the number one contributor to the landfill. That's another target you may want to look into.

*Senator:* It used to be possible to get a higher price for, say, all-white paper. Have we looked into this? *Orr:* The price per ton is so low and single stream is so convenient for us that I think this will work best.

*Senator:* How about electrical usage and using things like motion sensors. *Orr:* I'm sure that energy will be one of the next things we look into. I think there is a lot we could do there. We are also looking into grants that are available to support these programs. A lot of this is about education, and you can't just do it once. We are working with orientation folks to help with this.

## **V. Approval of Minutes**

A **motion to approve** was made by **Senator Longfellow** and **seconded** by **Senator Blackwell**. The minutes were **approved** without opposition.

## **VI. Old Business**

### **A. Committee Memberships**

We have three appointments to make to the Tenure Committee. The executive committee met and we have three recommendations, from the libraries, Kathy Hillman, from the seminary, Lai Ling Ngan, and, from arts and sciences, Robert Baldrige. Is there any discussion of our recommendations? A **motion** to accept the recommendations was made by **Senator Pennington** and **seconded** by **Senator Longfellow**. The **motion passed** without opposition.

Next, we have the Faculty Dismissal Committee. The executive committee's recommendations are Chuck Weaver from Arts and Sciences and Pat Wilson from the Law School. A **motion** to accept the recommendations was made by **Senator Longfellow** and **seconded** by **Senator Purdy**. The **motion passed** without opposition.

We have five appointments to the Committee on Committees. Our recommendations are for Matt Cordon as chair, Linda Cobbs from libraries, Michael Stroope from the seminary, Pat Sharp from education and Greg Speegle from engineering and computer science. Linda Cobbs and I have

worked together well this year. *Senator:* I've served on this committee. We used to meet every Friday afternoon for the spring semester. About the time Linda became chair, there was pressure from some committee members to reduce the number of meetings. I think this is where some of the problems started. I think this condensed what used to be a very thoughtful process to something less careful. A **motion** to accept the recommendations was made by **Senator Longfellow** and **seconded** by **Senator Supplee**. The **motion passed** without opposition.

## **B. Committee Descriptions**

We have some committee changes I am recommending. I am still working with Diana Ramey on the enrollment committees. (A document describing these changes is available from the senate home page.)

The recommendation is to eliminate five committees, Campus Sculpture, Edgefield Residential, Ferrell Center Guidelines, Fort Baylor and Teaching, Learning and Technology. The Libraries Committee will be reconstituted. Orr will select two members at large and there will be a Faculty Senate appointment. The last one is removing the Faculty Committee on Facilities from the list of faculty committees. There is an effort to create a new facilities committee which will replace this one. For now, I'm not sure there is a point appointing 12 people to serve on this committee since it has not met.

There was some discussion on the idea that the Reynolds Lectureship Committee isn't needed since this has been eliminated.

*Senator:* I am concerned about what's happening with the Fort Faculty Committee. I am concerned that the faculty living here not being considered, and that now is not a good time to eliminate this committee. If we look at the campus master plan, there is no consideration given to the faculty and retired faculty that are living there. There was some discussion about Psychology and Neuroscience use of a house in Fort Faculty. *Senator:* I would second this 100 percent. I think we need this committee if it represents faculty concerns. *Senate Chair:* We don't necessarily need to eliminate this committee. We could just remove it from the responsibility of the Committee on Committees. Also, if we had effective representation on the facilities committee, it should be able to represent these concerns. *Senator:* I think the concerns of these faculty need to be heard.

*Senator:* There is some discussion about distributing the library around campus. *Senate Chair:* For electronic resources, I'm not sure this is a problem. What I am more concerned about are plans to have an automated system that would eliminate the possibility of browsing.

A **motion** to accept these recommendations was made by **Senator Cloud** and **seconded** by **Senator Longfellow**. The **motion passed** without opposition.

## **C. Election Commission**

*Sturgill:* Voting started today. We have contested elections in Arts and Sciences, Libraries, Engineering and Computer Science and the Honors College. The voting will run through Wednesday and we will count votes on Thursday afternoon.

#### **D. Criteria for Ranks of Master Teacher, Etc.**

This committee has not yet met.

#### **E. Ombudsperson Selection Committee**

The Provost's office has made its appointments and the Senate appointments have all agreed to serve.

### **VII. Committee/Liaison Reports**

#### **E. Student Life (Talbert)**

*Stone:* We had a meeting today. I brought up the concerns with the home page and lack of emphasis on academics. The student life office seemed very receptive to these concerns. Also, I brought up the need to get across the point that this is an academic institution, and that there is the expectation that you will be in class and that you will turn in your work on time. I was very interested to see Barry's response to the concerns about the home page.

*Senate Chair:* Is there an interest in inviting Barry here to talk about this?

*Senator:* Now that I have seen this response, I don't think it would do any good. It's clear that they have a completely different set of concerns than we do.

#### **H. Liaison Reports**

##### **i. Council of Deans (Cordon)**

They will meet tomorrow. I will be out of town, but Senator Green will substitute for me.

##### **iii. Strategic Planning Council**

The committee has not met yet.

#### **F. Associate Professors (Blackwell)**

We have had an *ad hoc* committee on promotions. We had two town hall meetings. The associate professors felt that this change was unfair and that associate professors were at a disadvantage. The consensus was that associate professors need to be evaluated based on the policies that were in place when they were hired. Especially in the sciences, it's unrealistic to expect people who have had a very high teaching load to quickly become top-tier researchers.



*Senator:* Do you have the number of people who are affected. *Blackwell:* We sent an email requesting comments to about 150 faculty members. Considering how large our faculty is, it's not a large number.

*Senator:* There are a number of lecturers who feel like it's much easier for us to do research off campus than on campus. We don't get paid for research on campus, but we do for research off campus. I don't know how we resolve this.

*Senator:* We have one staff member who has been here for 20 years and has been recognized as one of the outstanding staff members on campus. She has to have two other jobs off campus to make ends meet. We have done these people a terrible disservice. I know that is not an issue we can address, but it is a great concern of mine.

**Senator Duhrkopf** made a **motion to approve** the resolution from the *ad hoc* committee. The motion was **seconded** by **Senator Supplee** and **passed** without opposition.

## **VII. New Business**

### **A. Nominating Committee for Senate Executive Committee**

I'd like to go ahead and form this committee, even though our bylaws say it will be formed in April. This will give them more time to work. The chair-elect and past chair usually serve on this committee. Other senators volunteered. The nominating committee will consist of Senators Vitanza (chair), Green, Lehr, Blackwell, Pennington, Longfellow and Boyd.

### **Faculty Policies and Salary Increases**

*Senator:* Did I understand the Provost correctly? Did we ask him to tell us what the policy is with respect to salary increases? *Senator:* There are two problems here. One is the practice of prohibiting a base salary increase and the other is the state of the policies and the faculty handbook. *Senator:* One concern that was expressed to me is that we have assured SACS that we have this as a policy, and we are not adhering to it.

There was some discussion of the state of policies on campus and the lack of accessible, authoritative policies. There was also some discussion of how the practice of exclusively merit-based raises was instituted and why.

*Senator:* I think we are in a different climate than previous times. I think a lot of this is coming from the board and I don't think there's much the President can do about it right now. I think the university is being micro-managed to death. The executive committee has brought this issue back to the president time after time. I don't know where we go from here.

*Senator:* I was pleased to hear from Randall that faculty members who meet expectations are almost getting a raise equal to inflation. There was some

discussion of the range of raises based on faculty evaluations and how this compares to a cost-of-living raise.

*Senator:* Another thing to keep an eye on is faculty morale as the tenure decisions come out. There was some discussion on the expectation for the tenure decisions, and how the scholarship expectation compared to what faculty had been told beforehand. Discussion of the process for requesting outside letters and how the reputation of the institution from which the letter originated played into the evaluation.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Sturgill  
Secretary