

Texas Tech University
Minutes-- #207 Faculty Senate
May 10,2000

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, May 10, 2000 in the Senate Room of the University Center with President Nancy Reed presiding. Senators present were Elam, Thorvilson, Borst, Hartwell, Held, Iber, Lewis, Lodhi, Meek, Newcomb, A. Perez, Reeves, Rylander, Schaller, Tuman, Walker, Weinberg, Hein, Hartmeister, Thomas, Lakhani, Khan, Cochran, Van Cleave, Carr, Cooper, Couch, Farley, McVay, and Trost. Senators excused from the meeting were Stombler, Laverie, Zhang, Spallholz, Boylan, Cardenas-Garcia and Pigott. Senators unexcused were Lawver, Giaccardo, Shin, Drager, G. Perez, Stein, Boal, Murray, Burkett, Norville, Thompson and Crawford.

- I. Call to order** was announced by President Reed at 3:17 p.m.
- II. Recognition of Guests:** Provost John Burns, Vice Provost Jim Brink, Assistant Provost Liz Hall, Gary Elbow, and the Presidential Search Committee consisting of Nancy Reed, William M. Marcy, Kathleen H. Harris, Carmen Roman-Shriver, Vivien G. Allen, Michael A. Jones, Kenneth R. Davis, Fred Hartmeister, Homer "Pee Wee" Roberson, Diane Scovell, Hershel Mann and Ernest E. Smith. New elected Senators: Linda Donahue, Peggy Willis-Aarnio, Al Smith, Uzi Mann and Lance Keith.
- III. Approval of Minutes** for meeting #206 were unanimously approved as reported.
- IV. Presentation:** by Dr. William M. Marcy member of the Presidential Search Committee. Dr Marcy spoke on the "logistical concerns" of the search process. The committee received about eighty "viable" applications for President of Texas Tech University, and after initial inspection half or about forty were kept. With the help of the search firm of Hydrant & Struggles, a uniform document package of the remaining candidates was assembled. After assembling the document packages on each candidate the committee again cut in half the applicant pool to about twenty. Soon after this the Search Committee looked at the twenty remaining applicants and picked eleven people for interviews. Before the interviews could be set-up in Dallas, four people dropped out or withdrew leaving seven people, of which, six interviewed in Dallas (one person could not make the interview). The interviews took about two hours and from these interviews three people, so far, have either come to campus or will come soon.

On or about June first the search committee will meet and decide, "Have we seen all the candidates that we want to see, or would like to see." If the committee can answer, "yes" to this question it will then make its recommendations to the Chancellor. By law, there is a 21-day delay between when the final list is offered and when the Chancellor and Board of Regents can act upon it.

To further lengthen the search process, after the Chancellor receives the final list of names, a new process begins. The Chancellor may take several weeks, to talk to "the shareholders of Tech" and receive comments from other interested people. Also, all the candidates to date have expressed an interest in coming to Tech for more visits with faculty and staff.

On June fifteenth the committee will meet and decide if there are any other candidates that we may want to bring on campus, if

So the entire process will start over. At the end of Dr Marcy's remarks several questions were asked.

Newcomb: How can we contact the committee about the search?

Marcy: by writing a letter, email, or through the committee's web site. Newcomb; Does the Chancellor want faculty input?

Marcy: Yes, and I would like to state now that we have had absolutely no pressure from the chancellor concerning any aspect of the search.

Lakhani: how many names will be sent to the Chancellor? Marcy, Anywhere from two to four, but he wanted three. Hartwell; Are nominations still open? Yes

Held: Some of the faculty is upset because the candidates are coming on campus at the end of the semester. This leaves the possibility of a dark horse candidate coming in, visiting the campus, and becoming president without any faculty input. Why are the on-campus visits so late?

Marcy: The time it took to get all the documentation for all forty candidates took a long time and delayed the process.

Reed: The search firm did an extensive background check on each candidate, including references, credit, as well as a criminal background check.

Borst: Why was Thomas Keinath invited, he does not have any experience at the President or Chancellor level?

Marcy: He is more than a Dean (which his title implies), as over 300 faculty report to him. We liked him for other factors as well including his ability to cope, and commitment to diversity.

Hartmeister: I believe it is a 21-day waiting period rather than a 28. Marcy; Yes, you're right.

Couch: How will we be notified of possible future candidates' visit during the summer?

Reed: Check the Faculty Senate Website.

- V. Announcements:** President Reed stated that the next candidate, David Schmidly will speak tomorrow (Thursday May 11, 2000) at 1:15 in Room 169 in the Human Sciences Building.

Vice Provost Brink announced Gary Elbow will direct the university's next Self-Study. The on-site visit will be in 2004. The Faculty Senate unanimously indorsed Elbow's appointment.

- VI. Committee Reports:** Chair Lodhi spoke for Study Committee C. He reported on the committee's work on term limits and collegiality. The Committee developed a campus-wide survey, but there was only a 27% return rate. From the survey the committee developed five recommendations.

After Lodhi's comments there was a question and answer session concerning the committee's recommendations.

Newcomb: Is the committee recommending term limits for Deans? Lodhi: No, term limits were not considered for Deans.

Tuman: Did the committee get a sense of why some people who were in favor of collegiality, were in favor of it?

Lodhi: No. All of the comments written concerning collegiality were against using it in the evaluation process.

Meek: If we (the senate) accept these recommendations do we send them to the President?

Reed: Yes, they are sent to the President.

Couch: How many people responded to the survey? Lodhi: 244.

After some discussion, the recommendations were tabled and will be carried over to next year for possible action at that time.

Senator Cochran spoke for Study Committee B concerning two reports, the first of which concerned the changing of OP 32.01 will bring Tech into compliance with the Texas Open Meetings Act. The change in OP 32.01 impacts letters written in the tenure and promotion process, they are no longer confidential.

I. Draft Revision of O.P. 32.01

The Committee considered the proposed revision of O.P. 32.01, which establishes the general promotion and tenure standards and procedures of the University. The University General Counsel advised University administrators recently that the Texas Open Records Act requires the University to disclose letters from outside evaluators to all who request them. The General Counsel advised that this O.P. should be revised to eliminate references to the confidentiality of letters from outside evaluators, and this proposed revision strikes these references throughout the O.P.

The Committee makes no recommendation concerning the revision to the O.P.

The Committee submits the following resolution:

Whereas the members of the Faculty Senate believe that decisions on promotion and tenure are aided by comments received from outside evaluators and that the comments from outside evaluators will be more candid if the comments are confidential as in the present University O.P. 32.01, and

Whereas the General Counsel has advised the University administration that outside evaluators' comments are subject to disclosure under the Texas Open Records Act, and

Whereas this interpretation requires the O. P. 32.01 be revised to delete references to the confidentiality of outside evaluators' comments, therefore

Be it resolved that the Texas Tech Faculty Senate requests that the Texas Tech University administration seek a legislative solution to the elimination of confidentiality for outside evaluation letters in the promotion and tenure process.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

II. Draft Revision of O.P. 74.04

The Committee considered the proposed revision of O. P. 74.04, which would revise the University's policy on intellectual property rights. The draft makes several substantial changes in the way that the University manages intellectual property created by faculty members, including reducing the faculty member's share of royalties for patented inventions. The committee could not study all of the issues involved because of the lack of time remaining in the academic year. Further, this O.P. would apply to the Health Sciences Center, and the Study Committee B and the HSC-SOM (School of Medicine) Executive Committee would like to confer about material concerns. As such, Study Committee B submits the following resolution.

Whereas the time remaining in the academic year prevents a full consideration of the changes that the draft revision of O. P. 74.04 would bring, and

Whereas the draft revision of O. P. 7404 proposes significant changes in the manner in which the University would manage intellectual property developed by faculty members, and

Whereas the draft revision of O. P. 74.04 proposed significant change in the method and rate of allocation royalties to faculty members for patented inventions, and

Whereas the draft revision of O. P. 74.04 proposes a single policy governing intellectual property rights that would apply to both Texas Tech University and the Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center, and

Whereas a joint response from both institutions would communicate faculty concerns about changes in the policy in a more efficient manner, therefore

Be it resolved by the Texas Tech Faculty Senate that the Senate urges the University administration to postpone further action on the consideration of the draft revision of O.P. 74.04 until the Faculty Senate and the HSC-SOM Executive Committee can consider the matter fully and make recommendations to the administration.

Throvilson- The new OP calls for a reduction of faculty members on the Intellectual property Committee, who determined this?

Cochran- That's a good question, ultimately the Board of Regents is responsible. This may have been done to bring us into line with A&M.

Throvilson- Is there any way we can suggest that this reduction is inappropriate? Cochran- Hopefully our joint response with HSC will convey our feelings about this.

President Reed stated that she and Jim Hebner, her counter part at HSC, sent a letter to Dr. Schmidly requesting more time to consider changes in OP 74.04.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

No one was available from the Faculty and Status and Welfare Committee to speak on the changes to the grievance policy (OP 32.05).

Senator Iber spoke on behalf of Study Committee A and their work on minority retention on campus. He stated they are preparing a questionnaire.

The Academic Programs Committee responsible for looking into the issue of regular campus wide-up computer up-grades and TechSIS met one time to discuss these issues, according to Senator Lakhani.

New Business- Senator Tuman asked if a committee was looking into academic dishonesty, plagiarism, and/or cheating (by students)? It is a real problem and I would like a committee to look into this.

Cochran- There was a program on cyber-plagiarism given at the TLTC, at which I spoke. The TLTC has a bibliography on the subject they can share with you. Tuman- I have no trouble detecting it, I just wanted to be more proactive. The Senate voted to consider plagiarism as a topic for next year.

Senator Cochran offered a resolution congratulating the Faculty Senate Officers for 1999-2000. The senate voted in favor of the resolution.

Announcements- Upon a request from Senator Newcomb, President Reed stated that the senate resolution passed some time ago, concerning sexual orientation was sent to President Haragan. Haragan has sent it to the Provost Council for a recommendation.

President Reed reported on a meeting she had with Michael Heintze, Vice President of Enrollment Management concerning the new drop policy. He stated that the requirement to eliminate faculty signatures from the drop request slips came about because of the number of students forging faculty signatures on the slip. Heintze did not know anything about the change in the drop date.

Before the installation of new officers President Reed thanked Faculty Senate's Office Coordinator Patty Pledger, Parliamentarian Brian McGee, the Agenda Committee and all committee chairs for their help. Reed will, however, stay on the Presidential Search Committee. After these brief comments Reed turned the meeting over to the new President, Charlotte Dunham. President Dunham thanked Ex-president Reed for her help throughout the year and also thanked Vice President Walt Schaller and Secretary Fred Hartmeister for agreeing to serve as Faculty Senate officers.

President Dunham stated that there were three things that she is interested in doing next year as president. She wants to establish a good working relationship with the new in-coming president of TTU. It is important to start out in a positive way. Secondly, she wants to work with the student government to have in place by Spring 2001 a teaching evaluation system. A committee has been formed to work over the summer on this. And lastly, she wants the Faculty Senate to work toward a comprehensive family policy, which will include, day care, maternity leave, and life partner benefits. This is something that corporate America is doing and Tech could be the first university in Texas to have these benefits. And with the words "have a great summer" the meeting was adjourned

Respectively submitted, John T. (Jack) Becker Faculty Senate Secretary