

**Texas Tech University
Minutes #200- Faculty Senate
October 13, 1999**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, October 13, 1999 in the Senate Room in the University Center with Present Nancy Reed, presiding. Senators present were Elam, Thorvilson, Giaccardo, Shin, Borst, Drager, Dunham, Hartwell, Held, Iber, Lewis, Lodhi, Meek, Newcomb, A. Perez, G. Perez, Reeves, Rylander, Schaller, Stein, Stompler, Tuman, Weinberg, Boal, Hein, Laverie, Hartmeister, Burkett, Lakhani, Zhang, Crawford, Khan, Spallholz, Cochran, Van Cleave, Boylan, Cardenas-Garcia, Carr, Cooper, Couch, Farley, McVay, Mross, Becker, and Parliamentarian Brian McGee. Excused from the Senate meeting were Lawver, Walker, Murray and Trost. Unexcused from the Senate meeting were Thomas, Norville and Pigott.

I. Call to order was announced by President Nancy Reed at 3:15 p.m.

II. Recognition of Guests- Donald R. Haragan, President Texas Tech University; Provost John Burns, Assistant Provost Elizabeth Hall, Professors John Howe, Bill Dukes and Ed Anderson. Kara Altenbaumer from the Avalanche-Journal.

III. Approval of Minutes #199 (September 8, 1999)- The minutes were approved with corrections. Senator Newcomb comments were over the Honors College and not over the graduate faculty as recorded.

IV. Remarks from Invited Guests.

Donald R. Haragan, President of Texas Tech University spoke to the Senate on the university's goals for the upcoming years. The goals included the following:

Continue striving to become what use to be known as a Carnegie I Research Institution. The goal has been changed somewhat and now the goal is to become one of the top 100 research institutions in the United States.

Become the university of Choice of the best undergraduates in Texas. This will be done by tracking the best students while they are still in high school and improving students' experiences at Tech.

Increase state funding to Tech by convincing the legislature to elevate Tech to the same status as UT and A&M. Many states have more than 2 flagship institutions of higher learning. Tech administration is asking for additional funding for 100 additional faculty, (50 faculty per biennium).

Increase the goal of Horizon Campaign to 500 million-dollars, since the present 300 million-dollar goal is nearly completed.

Begin construction of the English-Education-Philosophy before the end of the semester. Construction for a new Experimental Science Building, Animal Science Building, and renovation of Jones Stadium are also planned.

Expand and develop the present Honors Program into an Honors College.

Seek a major donor for the newly established Col. of the Visual and Performing Arts.

Expand the study abroad program so that every Tech student can spend at lease on semester abroad studying in a foreign country, most likely a country in Western Europe.

Seek legislative support for higher faculty salaries.

Goals for the future:

Get legislative support for Tech to become the head of its system, like UT and A&M.

Take steps to assure that Tech spends its funds within the guidelines of its mission.

President Haragan also announced that faculty and student representation for the TTU Presidential Search Committee is being sought. The search committee will be formed and the search will begin as soon as possible. With the end of announcements President Haragan opened the floor up for questions.

Haragan answered some brief questions from the Senate concerning the Honors College, the top 100 Universities, competitive programs, teaching loads, studying abroad and upgrading the facilities at Texas Tech.

V. New Business:

Ad hoc committee on Election procedures presented it's recommendation on their charge. After a brief outline by Senator Burkett, one of the committee members, the special rules of order listed were voted on and passed.

1. The Senate shall establish a Nominating Committee, which shall make every effort to nominate at least two people for each elected position (president, vice-president and secretary). If two nominations for each position are not found, the election of officers will proceed regardless. The committee is also responsible for ensuring that each person nominated for election is eligible and willing to serve.

2. The Nominating Committee shall present a list of candidates at the February meeting of the Faculty Senate. At that time, nominations from the floor of eligible and willing candidates will be placed on the ballot along with the other names. The Nominating Committee is responsible for determining that all candidates nominated from the floor are eligible to serve.

3. The Nominating Committee shall be responsible for printing the ballots, conducting the election, and identifying the winners.

4. Elections for new Faculty Senate officers shall take place at the March meeting of the Senate. At that time write-in candidates shall be accepted. Write-in candidates names must be written in the blank space provided on the ballot. The presiding officer shall ensure that the write-in candidates are eligible to serve.

5. In all cases, the name of a candidate must be marked (checked off) in the space provided. A vote for a write-in candidate is not valid unless there is a check mark next to the name. If a ballot has a write-in candidate identified, but there is no check mark next to the name, that ballot shall be considered as void.

6. At the time of the election the presiding officer is responsible for explaining the rules concerning the election of officers to the Faculty Senate prior to balloting.

7. After the February Faculty Senate meeting, the chair of the Nominating Committee shall prepare election ballots. Absentee ballots shall be provided for any senator who cannot attend the March meeting and who meets the requirements stated in Section 1 of the Faculty Senate By-laws. Absentee ballots shall be available in the office of the Faculty Senate during the balloting period as specified in Section 1 of the Faculty Senate By-laws.

8. If on any ballot, no candidate receives a majority vote, then there will be a runoff between those candidates receiving the two highest vote totals.

9. A person can only be nominated for one elected office at a time. A senator nominated for more than one position must determine which position he or she chooses to run for prior to any vote being taken.

Ad hoc committee studying the Workload Policy, chaired by Senator Walt Schaller, presented his committee's resolution on the Workload Policy. The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Teaching Load generally approves of the recommendations contained in the report of the Faculty Workload Policy Committee. The Workload Policy Committee has proposed a series of revisions in the way in which faculty teaching load credit is calculated. The report recommends that teaching load calculations be revised so that additional teaching load credit is given for such activities as teaching large sections, coordinating teaching assistants, teaching writing intensive courses, teaching new courses, and developing courses for electronic delivery. One immediate effect of adopting the proposed OP is that the report submitted annually to the Coordinating Board would more accurately reflect the amount of teaching carried out by the Tech faculty. The new calculations may also make it possible to reduce faculty teaching load while still meeting the minimum teaching load of 9 semester credit hours per semester (or 18 per year).

There are concerns that the revised equivalencies in the proposed OP may result in increased teaching load for existing faculty in some departments. These concerns are addressed in recommendation #2.

After a lengthy discussion with several Senators asking question and voicing their concerns an amendment to recommendation #2 was agreed upon, by the Senate, to be added to the resolution. After several points of clarification and points of information a motion was made to add the amendment to the Workload Policy under it's recommendation #2. Motion passed with a majority vote.

Senator Held made a motion, seconded by Newcomb, to vote on each of the Workload Policies recommendations one at a time. Motion failed.

More questions and concerns were voiced on 8R of the Workload Policy recommendation. After some discussion, Senator Boylan proposed that the Workload Policy be tabled in order to study the comments from the Dean of Arts and Sciences. A vote was taken and the motion failed.

Senator Newcomb moved that the Senate proceed with the vote on the Workload Policy and the motion was passed. The Workload Policy was then put before the Senate for a vote, with the amendment that was added, and the resolution passed as follows:

Consistent with its general approval of the intent of the recommendations contained in this report, the Senate Ad Hoc Faculty Teaching Load Committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) The Faculty Senate urges the administration to implement the proposed recommendations and to take the steps necessary to make it possible for departments and colleges to reduce actual teaching loads whenever that is consistent with meeting the minimum teaching load requirements and to do so in a way that is equitable among the various colleges and departments.

(2) Full time faculty without graduate faculty standing shall not be required to teach more than four courses (or their equivalent) per semester (or eight per academic year).

The proposed OP does not distinguish between Graduate Faculty and non-Graduate Faculty. Since, under the existing OP, standard teaching load differs for those two groups, the new OP must ensure that members of the Graduate Faculty (and those with comparable research responsibilities) do not find their teaching loads increased in order to make it possible for other faculty members to enjoy a reduction in their teaching loads.

Consistent with current practice, faculty members shall remain free to volunteer to teach additional courses.

(3) Full semester hour credit should be given, with the approval of the unit head or dean, to faculty in team-taught courses, especially when those courses are interdisciplinary.

Faculty who team-teach courses often attend all of the class meetings, even when they are not lecturing. Class preparation is often more time-consuming because of the need to work with the other faculty, especially in interdisciplinary courses. If full semester hour credit is not awarded to each faculty member in team-taught courses, then those faculty will probably have to teach such courses as an overload. Awarding full credit for team-taught courses would also encourage faculty to engage in interdisciplinary teaching; under current policy, there is no incentive to teach such courses.

(4) The following paragraph should be added to Section #8: "Equivalencies":

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN STUDIO/DISCUSSION TEACHING: One class contact hour of professional studio (professional as defined by State of Texas professional licenser requirements), subject to minimum student enrollment requirements, in courses scheduled to meet more hours per week than the semester hour designation of the course is equivalent to .75 teaching load credits.

This paragraph would cover courses in architecture, landscape architecture, and interior design, where faculty meet up to nine hours per week with students for a six-hour course.

The following recommendations are less substantive than the preceding ones but the recommended changes would eliminate certain ambiguities in the proposed OP.

(5) Section 8(h) should be rewritten so as to make explicit that chairpersons for dissertations and master's theses may be given 1 credit per student regardless of the student's number of semester credit hours (e.g., if a student is enrolled for only 1 hour but is doing 3 hours worth of work).

Some graduate students may need to limit the number of hours for which they are enrolled (to remain under, say, the 99 hour limit) by enrolling for only 1 hour of dissertation credit.

(6) In Section 8(o), 'may' should be changed to 'shall' to reflect current practice.

(7) In Section 8(d), include engineering labs among the examples of the kinds of labs that this section covers.

(8) In Section 8(n), the force of 'will' is unclear. This paragraph should be explicit as to whether new tenure-track faculty are entitled to the stated course load reduction or whether it is at the discretion of the area coordinator or unit head.

(9) Sections 8(n)-8(r) pertain to actual teaching loads in contrast to equivalencies and should be grouped under a new Section 9: "Teaching Load Reductions."

Whereas 8(a)-8(m) state equivalencies which may or may not affect actual teaching load in any given semester or year, 8(m)-8(r) affect the actual teaching load more directly.

(10) Section 8(c) should be changed so that it does not imply that courses with more than 25 students cannot be writing intensive.

(11) The second paragraph in Section 8(d) is unclear (especially the final sentence) and should be clarified. Does it imply that a one-hour lab will be given one semester credit hour or .67 (as per the first paragraph)?

(12) In several places it is unstated whether the teaching load reduction is for one semester or one year. Although we assume that it is for a semester, this should be stated explicitly (as it is in other paragraphs).

VI. Old Business:

Budget Study Committee, chaired by Senator Held, presented his committee's resolution. After a vote to suspend the rules was passed, the motion to accept the Budget Study Committee's resolution was also passed. **Resolved that the Faculty Senate 1) post the "Parking Feasibility Study" draft on the Faculty Senate's web page (www.ttu.edu/~senate/), with agreement from the Office of Operations. 2) notify all faculty at Texas Tech that the report is posted and that major changes in our parking system are being proposed, and 3) request that any concerns should be conveyed to the Faculty Senate office (E-mail-SENATE@ttu.edu or FAX 742-0525), as soon as possible.**

Study Committee B, chaired by Genaro Perez, spoke about the drop policy and handed out the comments from Rob Stewart, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences. The Senate asked Perez to have his committee present a recommendation as soon as possible, perhaps at the November meeting.

Senator Perez also indicated that his committee has spoken with Vice President Schmidly and has invited Schmidly to attend the November meeting in order to make a presentation about Tier 1 status as a Research Institution. President Reed asked Senator Perez to inquire if Dr. Schmidly could delay his presentation until the Senate meets on December 8, 1999, because the Senate has another invited guest for the November 17, 1999 meeting. He said that he would ask Dr. Schmidly if his schedule permitted another time.

VII. Announcements:

Ad Hoc Committee on the Presidential Criteria. The committee members include Charlotte Dunham, Jack Becker, Kim Boal, Sue Couch, immediate past Senate President Timothy Floyd, and current Senate President Nancy Reed. This committee is not involved in the search but rather in the criteria for selecting the new president.

Chancellor Montford expects to announce by the end of the week the members of the Presidential Search Committee. His appointees cross gender, race, colleges and schools at the University. There will be staff and student representation as well as faculty and regents. The faculty will have the majority vote on selecting the top three finalists.

VIII. Adjournment. There being no further business before this body, adjournment was announced by President Reed at 5:35pm.

Respectfully submitted

Jack Becker
Faculty Senate Secretary
1999-2000