Texas Tech University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Meeting #232  
March 12, 2003

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, March 12, 2003 in the Lankford Laboratory in the Electrical Engineering Annex with President Shane Blum presiding. Senators present were Kvashny, Buelinckx, D’Amico, Gray, Harter, Held, Howe, Kuriyama, Lee, Reed, Roberts, Steinhart, Watts, Dunham, Dukes, Jones, Sherif, Halsey, Baker, Bai, Frailey, Mann, Russ, Shriver, Camp, Marshall, Quinn, Lucas, Bradley, Curry, Hoo, Marks, Soompaa, Spallholz and Tacon. Senators excused were Alford, Byerly, James, Dolter and Donahue. Senators unexcused were Blanton, Wilde, Aranha, Williams, Yang, Duemer, Johnson, Reeder, Stinespring, Willis-Aarnio and Hsiang.

I. Call to Order. President Shane Blum announced the Call to order at 3:19 pm.

II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance. President Blum introduced the guests in attendance: Vice Provosts Liz Hall, Dr. Elizabeth Teagan, Director of the TTU Advising Center and McNair Scholars Program, Amy Maynard and Tara Higgins from the Center for Campus Life, University Daily photographer Jenny Hansen and University Daily Reporter Angela Timmons.

III. Approval of the Minutes for Meeting #231. Senator Held pointed out that the word “in” in the first sentence of his comments in the last paragraph of section IV should be replaced with the word “of.” The minutes of meeting #231 were approved with this correction.

IV. Invited Guests. President Blum pointed out that Max Hinojosa, Vice President of Operations, is on the agenda as one of our invited speakers. Unfortunately, Max was unable to attend today’s meeting. President Blum stated that Max’s presentation has been rescheduled for the May meeting. President Blum then introduced Dr. Elizabeth Teagan, Director of the TTU Advising Center and McNair Scholars Program, and called the Senate’s attention to the handouts that Dr. Teagan had provided. Dr. Teagan then gave a short presentation on the McNair Scholars Program at TTU. Dr. Teagan explained that the McNair Scholars Program is a program that emphasizes undergraduate research. She stated that, thanks to the generosity of TTU, this year is the first year that the program will be offered to students who are currently freshman. Dr. Teagan said they are inviting students to apply who are freshman, sophomores, juniors and seniors who are not graduating seniors. She stated that to be eligible a student must be a first generation college student with low income. Dr. Teagan pointed out that these students must have a desire to do undergraduate research. She mentioned that the focus of the program is not simply to prepare students for graduate study, but to prepare student to become college professors. Dr. Teagan pointed out that the recruitment period begins now and extends through the fall semester. She then mentioned the three handouts that she had provided and explained that they contain a lot of information on the program. Dr. Teagan concluded her presentation by volunteering to answer any questions we might have.

Senator Held asked if the program overlaps with Howard Hughes. Dr. Teagan replied that a student could be both. She mentioned that the requirements are a little different for HH. Senator Howe asked if it is correct that the McNair program is entirely for undergraduates; it does not have a graduate component. Dr. Teagan replied that up until last year that was true. She stated that this is the first year that the Graduate School is offering scholarships for students who were McNair scholars as undergraduates.

President Blum then introduced Amy Maynard and Tara Higgins from the Center for Campus Life who discussed the Freshman Convocation and the First Year Reading Program. First, Amy discussed the First Year Reading Program. She mentioned that starting last semester the Center for Campus Life began talking with the English Department about researching and implementing a Freshman Reading Program. Amy pointed out that the idea is that one book would be selected for use in English 1301 classes (composition) and the students would write the first composition about that book. This same book would also be used in the residence halls, at orientation, at Red Raider Camp, etc. Amy stated that last semester a committee was put together to make the book selection. She pointed out the book that will be selected for fall 2003 will be one of the three choices that appear in our handout. Amy stated that the committee would like to get our input, and input from other faculty members, on these books in order to make the best possible final selection. She mentioned that one of the ideas that came up during the process of exploring the reading program was to have the author, or someone associated with the book, come and speak at a freshman convocation. Amy stated that the Provost’s office is supportive of the idea of freshmen convocation, and has agreed to handle the details of the academic ceremony. Tara then spoke to us on some the specifics of the convocation. She stated that it is currently in the planning stages. Tara reported that the convocation is tentatively scheduled for either September 3rd or 4th, which is during the first week of classes. She reiterated that they would like to tie it in with the First Year Reading Program. Tara mentioned that they would try to get students involved through Red Raider Camp, Double T Days and other contacts that they have with first year students through their office. President Blum then asked if the Senate had any questions about these two programs. Senator Howe mentioned that many freshmen CLEP out of English 1301, and that the reading program could be incorporated into a number of other basic survey courses that are offered in History and
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V. Old Business. President Blum discussed the report from the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee regarding its review of how OP30.15 is being implemented. This OP deals with the annual review of administrators. He mentioned that this report was supplied in written form prior to the start of the meeting. President Blum commented there is diversity in the answers that were obtained from the deans of the various colleges. Senator Mann asked if the committee was given the charge to review the OP itself. President Blum replied that it was not, but this could be done if we wanted to suggest changes to the OP. Senator Held commented that he would like to see the committee evaluate the OP. He went on to say that he feels that the faculty ought to have the right to overturn a chair or dean based on a vote of no confidence of a certain level. The Senator stated that he would like to see some democracy in the retention of administrators, and this OP has none; administrators are evaluated by their superiors, but the peasants can’t revolt against the overlords. Senator Mann asked when the OP is scheduled to be reviewed again. President Blum replied that it is to be reviewed March 1st of every even numbered year by the Vice Provost with a recommendation for revision presented to the Provost by April 1st. He went on to say that the OP is dated November 5, 2001, and as of today it is the same. President Blum commented that the OP is not very lengthy, and is rather broad, and he would like to have more direction on other things the committee should look into in regard to this OP. Senator Mann replied that OP means operating procedure, therefore the OP should state the basic requirements that must be followed for this review. President Blum mentioned that some colleges do not use attachment A; they use their own evaluation forms. Senator Lucas commented that in the nine years he has been here input has not been solicited from the faculty in the Music Department. He stated that the response by the dean states that he will solicit faculty input as appropriate. President Blum commented that the lack of faculty input that exists in some colleges might be related to the fact that the OP states that faculty input may be solicited as appropriate: so it is the “may” that is causing the problem. Senator Shriver commented that he is surprised that the OP does not state that faculty input must be solicited, and either Attachment A, or a substitute that has been approved by someone a step up the administrative ladder, must be employed to solicit the input. Senator Lucas asked if recent input on the OP has been solicited from the Provost. President Blum replied that the committee did not check with the Provost’s office, only with the college deans. Senator Mann asked if the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee could be asked to review OP 30.15 and come up with suggestions for revisions. President Blum stated that this would be done. Senator Held stated that he thinks a poor review should result in some actionable consequences, therefore the committee should consider incorporating some form of actionable consequences into the OP. Senator Lucas commented that administrators not accountable to the faculty, as the faculty is accountable to the students. Senator Lee asked what is the purpose of the wording “as appropriate” in the OP, and commented that this seems like a big loophole in the OP. President Blum replied that this is part of the language in the OP that is contributing to the problem. Senator Spallholz commented that he would like to see a vote taken each year by the faculty on whether an administrator should continue in their position, and the results should be reported back to the faculty.

VI. New Business. President Blum recognized Senator Lee who distributed ballots for the Faculty Senate elections. He also mentioned that Senator Howe had removed his name from consideration for Secretary. President Blum then introduced the candidates and gave them the opportunity to make a brief statement. He also mentioned that each candidate provided a 75 word personal statement and these are attached to the agenda. The candidate for President was Nancy Reid, the candidates for Vice President were Alon Kvashny and Brent Shriver, and the candidate for Secretary was Brian Quinn. Once the voting was completed, the nomination committee collected and tallied the votes. The results of the voting were as follows: President elect is Nancy Reed, Vice President elect is Brent Shriver and Secretary elect is Brian Quinn.
Senator Lucas brought up an email that his Associate Department Chair had received from Sandy Martinez concerning sweeping of the graduate tuition fund accounts. Vice Provost Hall explained that what has been happening is that graduate tuition accounts have been undergoing evaluation and that they have been frozen for evaluation, not swept. She went on to explain that TTU is analyzing all possible accounts to find ways to fund summer school. Therefore, the accounts were frozen and department chairs were asked to respond to the question what have you encumbered or promised. The encumbered funds were then set aside. Senator Lucas responded that at this time we are not allowed to encumber these funds because of a hold in the accounting office. Vice Provost Hall replied that this hold should be removed in two or three days. Senator Lucas commented that these monies are considered state monies and asked why they are not considered local monies. Vice Provost Hall replied that it is because they are called tuition. Senator Held commented that the Budget Study Committee had great concerns about the renaming of what used to be called the general use fee as tuition for exactly this reason; because it blurs the distinction between state funding and locally raised money. He went on to say that his understanding is that this money is locally raised and should be called as such. The Senator reported that in Biology they have been given a similar directive, and it is his understanding that if the money is not encumbered it is not accessible. Therefore, he wants some clarification as to what “promised” means. Vice Provost Hall answered that all she can say is that they have been getting feedback from department chairs as we asked them to do where they say we have promised graduate students that they can travel for X amount of dollars, we need X amount of dollars to fund scholarships. We have been turning this information over to Sandy and she has been helping department chairs possibly find alternative sources of funding. She went on to state that one of the things they have discovered as they have been trying to wrap their minds around where money is, where it comes from, what we do with it, etc. is that many times department chairs are not aware of all the monies they have available, such as graduate course fees. The Vice Provost explained that if enrollment is higher than expected money form graduate course fees goes into a fund called fund balance that builds up if the department chair does not revisit the budget and move this money to spendable accounts. Therefore, they are trying to educate deans and department chairs on where money comes from and where it goes. Senator Lucas asked how this relates to having a specific name that money can be encumbered with. Vice Provost Hall replied that this sounds like a scholarship office rule to her, but she will look into it.

Senator Held commented that now that local tuition has been raised by 21.5% maybe some money might come back to the faculty for raises at some point, and asked Vice Provost Hall to look into this as well.

Senator Lucas commented that in the spring two years ago at the last Faculty Senate meeting Chancellor Montford talked about a fund that Senator Held had asked about that involved local monies. The Senator reported that Chancellor Montford stated at this time that he had taken over this fund for some of his purposes. When asked if this fund had been used to provide or supplement merit pay raises the Chancellor replied that this fund, which amounted to between 6 and 12 million dollars, had been used for this purpose. The Senator stated that this was a vote of no confidence in the faculty by Chancellor Montford. He went on to say that he agrees with the statement by Senator Held that as money becomes available from the tuition increase it should be used to provide merit raises for faculty, particularly since a fund that was used for this purpose had been diverted to other uses.

VII. Announcements. President Blum announced that the Faculty Senate offices would probably move to the administration building at the end of April. He also announced that Senator Dunham has agreed to serve as the faculty representative to the SACS Compliance Certification Committee.

VIII. Adjournment. President Blum adjourned the meeting at 4:43pm.

Respectfully submitted
Brent J. Shriver
Secretary, Faculty Senate