

Texas Tech University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Meeting #230  
January 8, 2003

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, January 8, 2003 in the Langford Laboratory in the Electrical Engineering Annex with President Shane Blum presiding. Senators present were Kvashny, Wilde, Buelinckx, Byerly, D'Amico, Harter, Held, Howe, James, Kuriyama, Reed, Roberts, Steinhart, Watts, Dunham, Dukes, Jones, Sherif, Duemer, Johnson, Baker, Bai, Frailey, Mann, Russ, Shriver, Floyd, Quinn, Lucas, Willis-Aarnio, Bradley, Curry, Hoo, Marks, Spallholz and Tacon. Senators excused were Alford, Donahue, Marshall, Aranha, Soonpaa, Dolter and Camp. Senators unexcused were Blanton, Gray, Lee, Williams, Yang, Halsey, Reeder, Stinespring and Hsiang.

**I. Call to Order.** President Shane Blum announced the Call to order at 3:21pm.

**II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance.** President Blum introduced the guests in attendance: Chancellor David Smith, Provost William Marcy, Vice Provosts Jim Brink and Liz Hall, University Daily photographer Jenny Hansen, University Daily Reporter Kelly McAlister, Neil Pearson, and Director of Federal Relations for the TTU System Alberto Cardenas.

**III. Approval of the Minutes for Meeting #229.** (Please note that approval of the minutes was actually addressed following comments by our invited guest). **Senator Held** pointed out that the correct name of the Student Government representative in attendance at the December meeting is Leigh Mauer, not Lee Nard as stated in the minutes, and her title is Vice President. The minutes of meeting #229 were approved with this correction.

**IV. Invited Guest.** President Blum introduced our invited guest, Dr. David Smith, Chancellor of the TTU System. The Chancellor then gave a short presentation that focused on two topics: the legislature and the presidential search. Dr. Smith stated that this legislative session would be a difficult one given the report out of the Comptrollers office that projects a 9.9 billion-dollar deficit for the next biennium. The Chancellor pointed out that this estimate does not include the current services funding for the enrollment growth that has occurred across Texas. He explained that there are another 600 to 700 million dollars that must be given to the universities and community colleges to pay for the students they currently have in class. Dr. Smith went on to say that the Comptroller has also revised the projections for this year's budget and is reporting that the State has a 1.9 billion-dollar shortfall. The Chancellor stated that we are not certain what will happen, but he is concerned. We mentioned that we could get a letter for a freeze, or a budget cut from the State of Texas on E and G funds in the next week or two. He stated that if a cut does occur the intent of TTU is not to impose that cut on the faculty, or student services. The Chancellor went on to say that it would take a lot of work to achieve those savings and we don't know exactly what it will mean. He also stated that at this point we don't know if the cuts will apply to the agencies and higher education, or only to the agencies. Chancellor Smith commented further that his concern is that when you have a 1.8 billion-dollar shortfall in the current budget cycle and you are already almost six months into the budget year it is really a 3.6 billion-dollar problem if you annualize it. He stated that this is a problem that may have to be applied across the breadth of the State budget in order to achieve the desired savings. The Chancellor said that TTU would look at a number of ways to minimize the impact of any cuts, for example the university will explore the possibility of paying only the interest on its tuition revenue bonds over the next two years. Dr. Smith said TTU would be pushing hard to have the State fully fund its base employee benefits packages, which is not currently being done. He stated that this costs TTU around 2 million dollars. The Chancellor also stated that TTU would be pushing to preserve funding for its special items, such as funding for the Agriculture program. Dr. Smith reported that there is a great deal of discussion in Austin right now on a concept called deregulation of tuition that has been brought forth by the University of Texas. The Chancellor explained that deregulation means that the individual Boards of Regent get to establish tuition and fees independent of the legislature. He reported that the Chancellor of UT wants to package deregulation with the proposal that all students with a family income under \$41,000 get a ride. Chancellor Smith pointed out that most of these students already get this through a variety of mechanisms so this may not be as much of a give as it appears. He pointed out that there is an article in the Austin

American Statesman today on this issue (free tuition) that can be accessed through their web-site. The Chancellor explained that deregulation assumes that with tightening times, and maybe the inability to add as many students in places such as UT and Texas A&M, where enrollment appears to either be decreasing or leveling off, the only way to get marginal increases in revenue is through tuition because formula won't generate it for them. He stated that the proposal is, therefore, for the Board of Regents to go in and set tuition independent of the legislature. Dr. Smith commented that he personally has a little problem with this proposal. He stated that we are in a mode when we have more need for access, we are projecting that 500,000 more students will need higher education in the next fifteen years, and we already have one of the lowest rates of participation in higher education in the nation. The Chancellor commented that TTU students don't necessarily look like UT students. He stated that the percentage of students with zero family support expected and the number on financial aid is higher, and the average family income is lower than UT or A&M. The Chancellor went on to say that this doesn't even get into other issues such as the fact that we may serve more families with multiple children in school, and that endowments are not the same at all universities. Dr. Smith commented that if you set a State policy it should be for the whole State and not for one university. The Chancellor stated that he feels this policy was brought up too early in the legislative session. He explained that early in the legislative session we should be focusing on getting the legislature to focus on fully funding the formula, rather than giving them an alternative method of funding to the formula. Dr. Smith stated that TTU had argued with UT that the card could be played much later if we have, but lets keep the legislature engaged right now and feeling that they need to fund the formula. The Chancellor commented that he is worried about our families, and that the deregulation issue is worthy of the Senate and debate with our colleagues elsewhere.

Dr. Smith then entertained questions from the Senate on the topic of the legislature. **Senator Lucas** asked if there was an official statement from the university involving the plague status. **Chancellor Smith** replied that there was. **Senator Lucas** followed-up by asking if there was one to the faculty and students, or only to the media, because as of three o'clock he hadn't seen one on Tech Announce. **Chancellor Smith** stated that he would have to check with Cindy (Rugely), but there was a statement that was supposed to go out, including across the web. **Senator Lucas** asked if the Chancellor could check into that and if a statement wasn't sent out there should be some system put in place to make sure one gets sent if something like this happens in the future. **Dr. Smith** replied that he agrees with the Senator. **Senator Elbow** mentioned that the Chancellor had stated that it would be worthwhile for the look into the deregulation issue and asked if the Chancellor was requesting some sort of resolution. **The Chancellor** replied that if we are comfortable, he does not want to prescribe. He stated that it would be helpful if we discuss it, he is not looking for us to concur with him. Dr. Smith went on to say that even some advice through the Provost's office would be good if we don't think a resolution is the appropriate mechanism. He commented that he doesn't think we should give the legislature an alternative to formula funding. The Chancellor mentioned that although the Comptroller says she will not cut appropriations, no money has been added back to fund the growth in the number of students, so cuts in the student service money may be coming. **Senator Held** pointed out that if this happens our hopes of increasing student enrollment and using this money to correct a shortfall in faculty might backfire. **Chancellor Smith** said that he worries about this, and about accreditation issues. He went on to state that there is only so far you can go in increasing class size to respond to faculty shortages before you run afoul of accreditation requirements. Dr. Smith pointed out that we already have accreditation issues related to class size and number of faculty in some areas, such as business. **Senator Dunham** asked if the budget shortfall would result in cut backs in health care coverage. **Chancellor Smith** replied that the simple answer is yes, the legislature is looking at this and he is very concerned about it.

Chancellor Smith then discussed the presidential search. He stated that he has discussed the search with the President. He stated that he is going to try to match the success of the HSC search and the process will be about the same as the previous TTU presidential search. Dr. Smith said we are going to be looking for a CEO of Texas Tech University. He stated that the search advisory committee will be pretty much the same as the last time, if anything it will be more inclusive. The Chancellor said that there would be more student representatives than the last time, and that there will be a formal mechanism for soliciting community input. He mentioned that the Regents would be involved: either two or three, and one will probably be the chair. Chancellor Smith stated that he does not have someone selected, and he will stand by this. He went on to say that he is sure we will have some good internal candidates, and a lot of good external candidates. The Chancellor stated that help is needed in identifying good candidates and they have already begun

soliciting names from associations and presidents of other universities. He said that it has not been decided if a search firm will be hired. The Chancellor stated that he has discussed this issue with Dr. Marcy and the feeling is that although search firms do some administrative thing very well they are not effective at identifying new candidates; those that weren't identified in a previous search. He stated that we might use the university and the people and make a personal touch, which is what was done with the HSC search. Dr. Smith went on to say that the candidates in the HSC search seemed to appreciate this approach. He said we are leaning away from using a search firm. The Chancellor stated that are going to be looking for someone who can propel us in the area of quality and distinction and who can balance our academic enterprise. He commented that he is convinced we have an incredible product to sell. Dr. Smith said that ideally he hopes to have someone named by the next academic year, which will be tight. He stated that it might take a little longer, and Dr. Harrigan has agreed to stay on as long as necessary. The Chancellor mentioned that he will be meeting with Brian Nuby, one of the regent that may be involved, to try to move this forward a little faster, rather than waiting until after their February meeting in Junction.

President Smith then entertained questions relating to this portion of his presentation. **Senator Stinespring** commented that the Chancellor's CEO comment reminded him of an article in the paper that suggested that the appeal of OSU is that the president is truly a CEO, whereas this president is not, and asked how he would characterized this position to the candidates. **Chancellor Smith** replied that on the system level the person is not the CEO, which was the issue with Dr. Schmidly. He stated that President Schmidly had talked to the board to see if the model could be where he reports like A&M used to, which is around the Chancellor. The Chancellor stated that the board's comment was that our system is not going to change. He went on to say that on a day to day basis, the person who he holds responsible, has the ability to move money, and is only accountable on a high level to him is the president. Dr. Smith stated that he ultimately hires the person, but as he has always done with his people he will run it. He said that the president is responsible for managing budget and maneuvering within that, and although there is accountability to the Chancellor, the president is responsible for making the day to day decisions.

**Senator Held** commented that in a number of his speeches, the Chancellor has mentioned shifting the priorities of the University more toward academics than athletics, and asked how successful the Chancellor feels he has been in this area. **The Chancellor** replied that we are just starting. He went on to say that part of it is perception, only 25 million dollars of the 850 million-dollar budget is going to athletics. Dr. Smith mentioned that where we are going to show it is the way we are going to push academic initiatives in this legislative session and in the next campaign. He stated that it won't happen overnight, but we are pushing scholarships, stipends and fellowships.

**V. Old Business.** President Blum mentioned that the Budget Study Committee would meet after the Faculty Senate Meeting to discuss the faculty grievance policy. There were no other items of old business.

**VI. New Business.** President Blum introduced Gary Elbow who discussed SACS reaffirmation process. Dr. Elbow mentioned that the reaffirmation study is due in the spring of 2005, and that the process is completely different from what it was 10 years ago when we last went through what was then called reaccreditation. He said that in the old days we did a great big self-study and there was a large steering committee with a lot of specific task committees under it. Professor Elbow stated that the new system requires two reports, one of which is called a certification of compliance and the other is a quality enhancement plan. He went on to say that under the old system the certification of compliance had 468 must statements, and now we have 60 standards that we have to meet and it is up to us to indicate whether or not we are complying with these standards. Professor Elbow commented that all of us are going to be hearing over the next few months about what it is going to have to be done at our level with respect to compliance to the standards for programs. He explained that most of it is going to involve establishing learning outcomes, assessing those outcomes and demonstrating that we have responded to the assessments where that is necessary. Dr. Elbow stated that the certification of compliance is due at the end of August 2004, and that most of it is electronic on the web. He said that compliance would have to be demonstrated at the college, department, and program level. Professor Elbow reported that there are 12 standards that must be complied with and there are another 48 standards that are not as rigid. He stated that number 12 of the required standards is that the institution has a quality enhancement plan; which is some sort of an overall plan for the improvement of education within the university. Dr. Elbow mentioned that he would

push very hard for broad participation in the decision as to what the focus of the quality enhancement plan will be. He stated that Sue Couch will probably be the Chair of the Quality Enhancement Plan Committee and Peter Westfall will be Chairing the Certification and Compliance Committee. Professor Elbow said that he and Dr. Couch are already starting to talk about strategies to elicit participation and that one of the units that will be involved is the Faculty Senate. He stated that the Quality Enhancement Plan is due in June 2005 and the committee from SACS will come in March or April of 2005. Dr. Elbow said that the committee will consist of approximately 7 to 9 people and they will focus primarily on counseling us on the quality assurance plan.

**Senator Held** asked to what extent is our unfortunate faculty to student ratios jeopardizing our reaccreditation. **Professor Elbow** replied he does not think they are. He went on to say that SACS has no set standard for faculty to student ratio.

**President Blum** discussed the Ad Hoc Committee on the relocation of the Honors College. He stated that the Faculty Senate Office would be moving. President Blum said that he, Patty, Nancy and Charlotte went over and looked at the proposed space and he has a meeting with the Provost next week to discuss the proposed move. President Blum mentioned that something we might be concerned with, as faculty, is the proposal to move everyone out of McClellan Hall and the Honors College into it. He asked Provost Marcy if this is a done deal that is going to happen no matter what we say. **Provost Marcy** replied that he is not in a decision-making role regarding where the Honors College goes or does not go. He went on to say that he believes it is a done deal and we should use this as a bargaining chip to get our offices configured and enhanced so that they meet our needs beyond what our current expectations are. **Senator Floyd** asked where the new space is located. **President Blum** replied that the one they looked at yesterday is on the third floor of the east wing of the Administration Building. **Senator Floyd** asked who made the decision that we are moving out and where we will finally be located. **President Blum** replied that this decision came out of the President's office. **Senator Howe** commented that there is some appropriateness in being located in the Administration Building. He stated that years ago when he was President of the Faculty Senate it was promised that the Faculty Senate would be considered for Administration Building space, so in some ways this is going back to an earlier time.

**President Blum** reported that we need three people for the Nomination Committee. He stated that Patty has already talked to two Senators to be on the nominating committee, which identifies nominees for President, Vice-President and Secretary of the Faculty Senate for next year. President Blum said that the one rule is that you must be in your last year of service in the Faculty Senate, so if you out in 2003 you are eligible. He stated that at the next meeting the nominating will present the nominees to us, and we will have the elections at the following meeting.

**President Blum** reported that there are two items that did not make it on the agenda because they just happened very recently. President Blum then introduced Dr. Neal Pearson, retired professor of Political Science at TTU, who made some comments related to Byron Abernathy, a former professor at TTU who recently passed away. A summary of Dr. Pearson's comments is included as an attachment to these minutes. Following his comments Dr. Pearson entertained questions from the Senate. **Senator Held** asked if Abernathy conjectured that his support of labor unions was responsible for his firing. **Professor Pearson** answered that yes he did. **Senator Held** followed-up by asking if Abernathy couched this in terms of the McCarthy era. **Dr. Pearson** replied that yes he did. **Senator Held** commented that he was warned about tenure problems at TTU before he came here to interview in 1986. **Professor Pearson** commented that Gary Elbow was president of the Faculty Senate at TTU when Dr. Cavassos tried to abolish tenure and replace it with five-year rollover contracts, but the faculty voted to censure him and 86% returned a vote of no confidence. As a result, a set a grievance procedures was adopted. **Professor Elbow** replied that he would like to take credit for the establishment of a tenure policy, but it was really Don Harrigan who was instrumental in that effort.

**Senator Marks** then read a resolution requesting the support of the Faculty Senate for the Texas Tech University's College of Visual and Performing Arts and Department of theatre and Dance production of "Angels in America, Part One: Millennium Approaches." A copy of this resolution is also included as an attachment to these minutes. President Blum mentioned procedurally that he needed a motion and a second to discuss the resolution. **Senator Marks** made a motion to this effect, and **Senator Steinhart** seconded. A

vigorous discussion of the resolution ensued with comments by **Senators Held, Watts, Floyd, Lucas, Howe and Frailey**. **Senator Held** then offered a friendly amendment to the resolution that stressed the aspect of academic freedom. Senator Held's proposed amendment would replace the final paragraph of the resolution with "Therefore be it resolved that that the Faculty Senate **fully supports the principals of academic freedom and artistic freedom** and supports the ....." Senator Marks replied that he was happy to accept the friendly amendment. Additional discussion of the resolution followed, with comments by **Senators Frailey, Held, and Floyd**. **President Blum** called for a vote to suspend discussion on the resolution. The vote was unanimous. President Blum then called for a vote to accept the amended resolution presented by Senator Marks. All Senators voted in the affirmative, with the exception of **Senator Dukes** who voted no and **Senator Howe** who abstained.

**VII. Announcements.** **President Blum** announced that the Budget Study Committee would meet immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting.

**VIII. Adjournment.** President Blum adjourned the meeting at 5:03pm.

Respectfully submitted  
Brent J. Shriver  
Secretary, Faculty Senate