The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, November 12, 2003 in the Lankford Laboratory in the Electrical Engineering Annex with President Nancy Reed presiding. Senators present were: Kvashny, Johnson, Byerly, D’Amico, Gray, Harter, Held, Kuriyama, Nathan, Roberts, Schaller, Troyansky, Watts, Dukes, Jones, Duemer, Halsey, Johnson, Masten, Sinzinger, Reifman, Russ, Shriver, Camp, Marshall, Quinn, Garner, Gelber, Meek, Curry, Ellis, Marbley and Spallholz. Senators excused were: Dunham, James, Sherif, Baker, Jackson, Dolter, Marks, Soonpaa and Tacon. Senators unexcused were: Wilde, Aranha, Buelinckx, Alford, Williams, Floyd, Hoo and Hsiang.

I. Call to Order. President Nancy Reed called the meeting to order at 3:19 pm.

II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance. President Reed recognized Provost Marcy and Vice-Provosts Hall and Brink. She also recognized Adam Boedeker from the University Daily, Matthew Tonne from Raider Net News, and Jenna Hansen, a photographer from the University Daily.

III. Approval of Minutes from Meeting #236. The minutes were approved with the following change: on the last page, in the final sentence in the third paragraph from the bottom, the word “is” should be inserted between the word “it” and the word “his.”

President Reed said that it would be necessary to deviate from the agenda because of cross-campus obligations. She introduced Provost Marcy, who spoke about OP 30.15, which was scheduled to appear under Old Business. Section D of the operating procedure concerns the evaluation of administrators. There was a resolution passed last May, but there was not actually time for the administration to see what the Senate had passed. Provost Marcy said that this is an OP that is reviewed in every even-numbered year, so it is due for review next spring. Comments and suggestions for revision should be sent to Jim Brink, who will make recommendations to Provost Marcy for actual implementation. Provost Marcy has looked at the suggested changes to the OP, and feels that it needs to be looked at more broadly than just Section D. Section D only applies to department chairs, assistant deans, and associate deans. If you look at the entire organizational structure that the OP refers to, it starts with the president, the provost, deans, department chairs, etc. If we are going to make a revision to one component of it, we really ought to look at making it consistent all the way from the chancellor down to the lowest level. There are some fairly interesting discussions that ought to take place on that, and there are also some discussions that ought to take place on what the intended outcome of the revision should be. Is it accountability, is it improved performance, is it providing better feedback to the people that are in supervisory positions or those that are being supervised, and how does that interact with things like tenure, promotion, merit increases, the ability to hire department chairs, deans, provosts, etc? There are a lot of ramifications in revising that kind of structure. It would also be worthwhile to look at that appendix. There is nothing wrong with the appendix as an evaluation document, but it is fairly linear and there are differences in the way different supervisory positions function. The relationship of a chair to a dean is different than the relationship of a dean to a provost or a provost to a president. We ought to look at some of those things. Provost Marcy would invite a group selected to interact with Jim Brink and himself to work through some of these, and then as the actual revision date approaches, to come back with a joint understanding of what would be workable, and to look at some of the first-order and second-order effects and then make revisions if needed. The Provost said that he normally takes recommendations from Vice-Provost Brink but felt this would be a very interesting exercise. President Reed asked if there were any comments from the Senators.

Senator Dukes asked if that meant that there will be no action between now and the spring. Provost Marcy responded that there will be no action because it is not time for revision. The OPs actually specify the times and dates at which revisions take place. This one happens to be specified to take place in even-numbered years. Senator Dukes asked if there was any action that was going to be taken on the current wording. Provost Marcy said that those are already being
done. The OP is in force as written. These are actual changes to the existing OP. The existing OP language is, in fact, being utilized right this minute. But these would be over and above what is in the current OP. This OP is in force until it is revised in 2004. Provost Marcy asked if there were any other questions.

**Senator Meek** said that he was curious why the Provost said that it was in process right now when he could think of some areas that have not undergone this process. Provost Marcy said that the deans have certainly been instructed to utilize the OP. He said that in fact he has almost completed reviews of the deans that he is currently conducting right now. The deans should be doing the same thing. Arts and Sciences has gone through an intensive review, but he cannot speak for others.

**Senator Held** asked if the Provost would ever philosophically support the idea of subordinates having a supervisor removed if there is a unanimous objection or vote of no confidence. Provost Marcy said that he thought there was plenty of evidence that information provided by the faculty to the deans has resulted in department chairs being removed. He said that, in fact, he had removed one. It is hard to ignore those kinds of expression of dissatisfaction and they usually occur over an extended period of time. It is usually not something that suddenly becomes a crisis and then is dealt with at that point.

The Provost said that he does not have a problem with that and that he has been in situations in which he has had to deal with it.

**Senator Spallholz** said that it was his understanding that in some of the colleges the chairs rotate. He asked if that was true and asked what the Provost’s position was on rotating chairs. Provost Marcy said that it was true and that it has pluses and minuses. Most departments that have rotating chairs have to have very strong leadership among senior faculty in the department. His experience has been that with rotating chairs, you often get a very non-risk taking behavior in leadership because the person knows that at the end of three years they are going to be back as a faculty member and someone else is going to be the leader of that department. If you have really strong faculty, that works very well. If you have very young faculty, then that may not work very well. Another consideration is that anytime you have an opportunity to hire externally a new department chair, that person probably is not going to come into a situation in which they know that in a few years that they are going to be up for a vote. You can argue both sides of that. When it works, it works well; when it does not work, it produces a department that is non-functional. Provost Marcy said that he has seen it work both ways.

**Senator Spallholz** asked what the estimate was of the split across campus of rotating versus non-rotating chairs. Provost Marcy said that he did not know but that perhaps Vice-Provost Hall or Brink might. It is usually the policy of the dean because the deans hire and appoint department chairs, so they make that decision. The most important thing is to have an effective department. If you have a strong faculty, the role of the department chair is more of an administrator. If you have a department that does not have strong faculty, you need very strong leadership in that position. So it depends on the situation. Departments change over time as retirements take place and new hires take place.

**Senator Held** asked as a follow-up to his earlier question that since there is nothing in OP 30.15 that would require the Provost to pay any attention to objections from the grassroots or even a groundswell, would you object to having any language inserted into OP 30.15 that would allow that to be implemented? Provost Marcy said that he thinks that there should be input not only from faculty but from staff to each supervisor’s level. Supervisors ought to be soliciting it, and they ought to be using it. If they are not using it, then the next level up ought to be asking serious questions why not—why do you not want to know that information? What you do with it is still a judgment call. In some cases you can have a department that is split into factions and the factions can basically view the department chair as a win/lose kind of proposition. So you may get information but you also know it is a contentious kind of problem. In other cases you may have a department that is satisfied with the status quo and does not want to change. So they may see the department chair as a really good person, and the dean may say the department needs new leadership. There are all kinds of views, but as far as getting input and using it, yes definitely. It is a bad thing for the delegation to end up in the dean’s office having to communicate that. That is a bad way to do it.

**Senator Spallholz** said that when he came to the campus as a new faculty member 25 years ago, one of the things that he was appointed to was an internal review committee for health and physical education. Are there internal reviews that are done today as in years past, and if not, why not? Are there internal reviews
that are part of your operating policy right now? Provost Marcy answered that the ones that are most obvious to him are the graduate reviews. We have gone through eight or nine of those. They take place with people outside the department and are usually administered by an associate dean of the graduate school; people in comparable positions that have some understanding of the discipline, and cover not only the graduate program but also the undergraduate program. They look at faculty credentials, teaching qualifications, success of tenure and promotion and research, etc. They are comprehensive and formalized. Senator Spallholz said that he did not know of any that have been conducted in his college in 25 years. Provost Marcy said that he would have to ask John Borrelli, Dean of the Graduate School, about this. Every graduate program has been reviewed in the last ten years. Senator Spallholz said that his department was reviewed in 1997 by the Coordinating Board for the doctoral program. This was an external review and not internal. Provost Marcy said that the ones that he was referring to are internal. Provost Marcy said he would have to look into the matter because he was told that everybody had been through them.

President Reed said that she can assure the Senate that the Agenda Committee will be meeting very shortly, at least by email, and discussing which committee will get this assignment. She said that she appreciated the opportunity to deviate from the agenda and introduced the invited guest, Vice-Provost Dr. James Brink, speaking on incentives for students to graduate on time.

IV. Invited Guest: Dr. James Brink. Vice-Provost Brink asked that INGOT (Incentives to Graduate On Time) sheets be distributed to members of the Senate. He said that he appreciated the opportunity to appear before the Senate and talk about some ideas that they are discussing, and that they want to discuss with the Senate. They have taken the opportunity to discuss these ideas in as many forums as possible across campus. It was just a week ago that Dr. Brink addressed the Student Government Association. These ideas are receiving a great deal of approval and understanding. Vice-Provost Brink said that there is no reason to read the sheet, but that he would outline it very quickly. Our purpose is to encourage students—not to punish them—but to encourage them to apply themselves more rigorously and move towards successful completion of courses and graduation in a more timely manner. We have been aided in this endeavor by our state legislature, which is increasingly aware of the fact that students are taking what they think to be an inordinate amount of time. In conjunction with the state legislature’s posture of steadily reducing the amount of state assistance that comes to higher education, they are providing ways and means of encouraging a more timely graduation with the purpose in mind of freeing up some resources on college campuses. It stands to reason that if students take a long time to complete degrees and more and more students are coming in at the beginning of the process, the mix is getting larger and larger. If resources are static in terms of space or faculty, it also stands to reason that students are not receiving the greatest opportunities to take courses in a timely fashion because courses fill up. I am speaking because I wanted to make sure you have had a chance to look over this piece of paper before we begin to talk about it. There is a preamble which discusses the philosophy behind what both the state is engaged in and what we are proposing for Texas Tech. The first part of the specifics has to do with what the state has already done. These measures are in place and they include—and some of you are very familiar with this one—the $1000 rebate reward/award to students who finish within three attempted hours of their degree plan. Now that is not time-sensitive that is hour-sensitive so they can take any amount of time to get to that position but they must finish within three attempted hours of their degree plan. The second major monetary incentive to graduate on time is the B-On-Time Loan program which will go into effect this January. This program is designed to encourage students to move more rapidly towards graduation by making interest-free loans available and forgiving those loans if the student graduates for most degree programs within four years with a B or better average. That includes all transfer work and that includes all credit by examination work as well. The amount of money available for that this January will not be overly generous, but nevertheless the Coordinating Board is beginning that process and for those students who graduated no earlier than the academic year 2002-2003 from high school, applications for B-On-Time loans will be available. Then you will see two rather punitive measures the state has taken, not against students necessarily (although that may happen) but certainly against universities. Those two measures include a provision that student credit hours that we report for students that have taken the same class more than twice will no longer receive state formula. This state formula amounts to about a third of our total budget, that is, in the aggregate, and so it is important to us, and this could be a major factor. In addition, the state is no longer paying formula for students who take 45 or more above their degree plan. So in these two measures what the state is saying is that we do not want students to take up space beyond what they should be earning towards their degree.
Those are the four measures that the state has introduced, and here follows then what we have in mind, what we have decided to discuss. We are open to criticism not only of these particular measures but other suggestions that people may have. One part of the problem is really a semantic one or a rhetorical one in that students often confuse—and in some cases advisors confuse, and parents confuse—“full time student status” with “full load.” “Full time student status,” designated by us to qualify a student for federal financial aid, is twelve semester credit hours. A “full load” is a minimum of fifteen hours. You can do the math very easily. If, as the state requires, every degree program must have 120 hours or more, if you are only taking twelve hours a semester that is going to take you ten semesters—that is five years right now. If we can begin to educate not only incoming students and their parents, but also the whole university community to the fact that 15 semester credit hours is what is expected of every student, then we will go a long way to getting students to complete their degrees in a more timely manner. The second measure that we want to discuss (I should say parenthetically that in light of this a number of departments are “scrubbing” their degree programs to see if there cannot be ways to reduce the number of hours that may have been excessive, that may have been added to the program in the last few years in sort of an evolutionary way. They are examining the degree program to see if every course in the degree program is absolutely needed for the integrity of that degree. A number of them have reduced their degree programs substantially, in one case that I can think of, over sixteen hours a semester) is called the three Ws. A student enters the university and gets three Ws. I know this body has discussed this in the past. I certainly have been involved in discussions in the Academic Council about the withdrawal policy. A lot of faculty do not care for it very much at all. Under this provision there would no longer be the WF conundrum, which is little invoked by the way, the WF part of it. Rather a student would have in a sense three “get out of jail free” cards when that student enters the university. A student could use those any time after the add/drop period to withdraw from a course, no questions asked, no WF. A student could do it up to one week before final exams. At the end of using up those three however, that student is committed to stay in the course.

What we hope to achieve by this idea is to convince students to make commitments to their academic work earlier on in the semester, rather than sign up for a number of courses and then at a certain point decide either I am going to be successful or I am not, maybe maximum effort maybe not, but just in case, I think I will bail out. And then there is special pleading to the faculty member—please give me a W and the faculty member very often as I indicated earlier does not want to fight this fight and says “Alright, goodbye.” Our point is this, that while that student is occupying that seat without making a sincere academic commitment to that course, another student who wanted to sign up for that course but could not because we have more students than we have faculty, that student is not able to take that seat. So we want a commitment from students, and that is what accounts for items four and five. Item three, “establish an institutional tuition ceiling at 15 hours,” thereby encouraging students to take more hours than 15 and not have to pay institutional tuition. They still have to pay fees, and still have to pay state tuition because we do not have the provision to absolve people from that, but institutional tuition would save them a significant amount of money and might serve as an incentive for them to take more hours than 15. Items 4 and 5 have to do with the idea of commitment to classes and commitment to academic work. The state has said they are not going to pay us formula for a student who takes a course more than twice, so we are saying you cannot repeat a course more than twice. This means a course in which the student received a grade, not a W. Item 5 says that no course may be repeated if the student has earned a grade of C or above. I am somewhat astonished by the fact that a good many students receive Bs in courses only to repeat them in order to get a higher grade. I have heard from students who do not like this particular measure tell me, well I usually sign up for a bunch of courses knowing I am not going to do well in one with the intention of repeating it. Again, that takes up a chair. Let’s get a commitment earlier on—let’s fill that chair just one time by that student with a sincere commitment to academic success. Then finally, create an opportunity for students to take even more semester credit hours by making summer school a regular term alongside the two smaller terms. Right now we are already doing this in engineering and in architecture because those disciplines found it very difficult for students to complete projects within the five and one-half weeks of the first summer term. What was happening was that students were taking incompletes and then finishing up the second summer term but not enrolling. Therefore they were ineligible for student financial aid and yet they still had living expenses in order to complete those projects. For those students and for those disciplines for the last two years we have been running a long summer term. We think that this may be a further incentive for students to take 15 semester credit hours in the summer. These are the measures that we envision, that we hope will serve as incentives. I want to point out that none of these measures work to the hardship of the student who must take fewer hours and must take longer in order to complete the degree. There is nothing here that works
against that student. It is very important to keep in mind that this is not punitive. What we are trying to do is to encourage students to consider what constitutes a full class load and what constitutes an academic commitment. Vice-Provost Brink asked if there were any questions.

Senator Kvasnny said that his department has about 20 percent of their students come in from other disciplines. Basically they are freshman and this program will not help them in any way. They still have to be in the program over 5 years because they bring a lot of credits with them. If you switch degree programs, could that be counted as the beginning of that program? Vice-Provost Brink said not in terms of what the state has done. You can get amendments to the bills, but the first four measures on the first page are all state measures, so there would be nothing to cut any slack for the student who sees the light and decides to become a landscape architect.

Senator Nathan noted that the state cuts off formula funding after two enrollments, but item four says three enrollments. Vice-Provost Brink said that he would change that to read “a course may be taken only two times.” Senator Nathan suggested the wording: “course may be repeated for credit once.” He asked why 3 Ws, was there any study done of the typical number of Ws people have? Vice-Provost Brink said that they thought two was too few and four was too many, and therefore settled on three.

Senator Harter asked if a student fails a required course twice, does that mean that there is no way they can get a degree? Vice-Provost Brink said that they have toyed with what to do in that situation. We do have cases now and they are anecdotal, nevertheless we know of students who have repeated a course eight times. We have discussed the idea of charging the student the full cost of education for those additional courses. That would be significant, but that may be a way to deal with these situations. We are really trying to get the student to make that commitment early on. I know it is not simply a question of will. Students pay for the Pass Center, the University Writing Center, and a good many other services on this campus that are designed to help them succeed academically. Most of the students who avail themselves of those services do so only when they are in trouble. We realize that this set of proposals will necessitate some culture changes—culture changes for the university community, faculty, and staff, as well as for students and parents. One of those culture changes might be that these services are not indications of failure; they are services that you should avail yourself of early on in order to succeed. This is why this proposal is designed for the incoming class in the fall of 2004. The other students currently here are grandfathered.

Senator Held asked about the concerns expressed by the student senators. Vice-Provost Brink said it was primarily the question of the Ws—they wanted more. There were some other concerns about repeating courses with C or B. Students were saying that they want to get into graduate school or professional school and felt that in their major they should be allowed to repeat courses no matter what grade they receive. Senator Held asked if Vice-Provost Brink was convinced by that. Dr. Brink responded that he was not. Senator Held said that the standards for pre-meds are different and they are extremely concerned with GPA. If the students are willing to spend the money to repeat the course we should not say in a patronizing way that they cannot do that. Senator Held said that he has a serious problem with number 5.

Senator Spallholz asked if the student pays his way after however many chances, what is the concern? Vice-Provost Brink asked the Senate, how many of you think the full cost of education incentive should go into effect for exemptions from these provisions?

Senator Gray said that his response to Senator Held’s point would be to suggest that students have an opportunity to change their grade designation to pass/fail if they feel they are in over their head. In our department we make an effort to give an exam prior to that date so that students have a general sense of how they are doing. Senator Gray said he is concerned about encouraging students to take more than 15 hours. When students come to see him about withdrawals it is usually because they are taking 18 hours and cannot handle it or because their work commitments are too great. I arrange my workload imagining that students have four other courses, not five or six. Regarding jobs, have any new provisions been made to advise students early on about the need to take out more loans and not to waste too many of their hours working in part-time jobs. Vice-Provost Brink said that this is part of the culture change that we need to make. Regarding number of hours, there is nothing here that says students must take any number of hours. What we are saying is that we want students to take more responsibility for their academic progress. This
institutional tuition ceiling may be an incentive for that student who can make that decision with some advice along the way. I know of cases where advisors, upon meeting an incoming freshman for the first time, will advise them to take 12 hours per semester. That is not good advice. Regarding the work issue, we recognize that students have to work, although a great many parents tell me that they are paying for the schooling, and the student is working to earn spending money. How many jalopies do you see in the student parking lot? Here is part of the culture change: maintaining an upper-middle class lifestyle as an undergraduate student may not be the most desirable way to finish a degree on time. There is nothing here that says that they cannot. We are trying to provide incentives. With interest rates as low as they are right now, advisors might encourage students to even consider bank loans with four and five-percent interest.

Senator Spallholz said that regarding the upper-middle class lifestyle, a lot of campuses do not allow students to have cars on campus. That might encourage academic study on campus in the library if cars were not available. It would also solve the parking problem perhaps. Vice-Provost Brink responded that he is pretty brave, but not that brave. When he reviewed the measures with his freshman class this semester and asked them, what about if we said you cannot have a car, how many of you would attend another university? All the hands went up.

Senator Camp asked regarding making summer a regular term, are you talking about adjusting the start and stop dates of both the fall and the spring? Vice-Provost Brink said that it would probably be an 11-week term with a little bit longer class time in there. The way the calendar is structured right now we would be hard pressed to have three 15-week terms, with the holiday schedules that are mandated and with the commencement exercises, final exams, etc. Senator Camp said that there are universities that have full-time trimester systems. Vice-Provost Brink said that their faculty go around haggard with dark circles under their eyes. We would be very careful in how we would construct this but the idea would be to have a long summer term. Note the parenthetical material there for faculty on nine month contracts might be very attractive.

Senator Roberts said that our student body is not necessarily that affluent. Many students are working because they have to. With a lot of our graduates underemployed and working at low-paying jobs just to make ends meet, they are going to have a tough time paying off loans even at low interest rates. Vice-Provost Brink said that there is nothing here that works against that situation. He asked the Senate how many of them ever had a student that said “I am sorry I missed your class or exam because I had to work.” Part of the culture change involves students realizing that a minimum-wage job that they are holding in order to pay for expenses at school does not take precedence over school. Senator Roberts noted that one of the goals of Texas Tech is to increase retention and increase the percentage of students that graduate. If we limit the number of withdrawals it might be working at cross purposes. Vice-Provost Brink said it might indeed, but that it also might have the opposite effect—that students might apply themselves more rigorously and complete their degrees in a more timely manner.

Senator Meek said that the proposed provisions could be helpful to some of his students but that he was confused by the terms “three attempted” or “six attempted” hours. Vice-Provost Brink responded that there is a difference between earned hours and attempted hours. Attempted hours are all the hours that a student is signed up for after the add/drop period. The way these programs work is on the basis of attempted hours, so if a student drops hours along the way, that is part of the maximum. Senator Meek asked if there is a limit on dropping courses. Vice-Provost Brink said that under the provisions there would be a limit. You could have three Ws and then you would not be able to drop courses any longer. You can drop as many as you want during the add/drop period. For those students who suffer a catastrophe, something beyond their control, and must withdraw from the university, those Ws that appear on that transcript would not be part of the three that they have, because that is a catastrophic situation and not one of commitment.

Senator Camp said that any changes that occur during add/drop do not affect the attempted hours. Vice-Provost Brink said no, that it is only after the counting period, what the state calls the counting period.

Senator Held said that he would like to see some kind of escape clause, some appeals process, because Senator Harter pointed out a problem with two failures not being able to continue in a major. Three Ws might end up causing problems and students might end up getting into real trouble financially or
psychologically. Senator Held said he would like to see a clause inserted somewhere that says exceptions will be made for extenuating circumstances so that students do not feel locked in and that they have no way out in these situations. Is there a possibility of putting this into the policy? Vice-Provost Brink said that there always is. He said that he hesitates to do it in quite such sweeping language because it just invites an incredible amount of appeals, but maybe we can start with more restrictive language which would give some possibility under extreme circumstances.

Senator Johnson suggested that if you require them to repeat a course beyond the limit at a higher cost that may do it. The consequence of them having to take the course a third time is that it is going to cost them more money. It is not a matter of having to get an appeal or to get permission. Senator Johnson said that the B-On-Time loan program could be very lucrative, is this a full loan? Vice-Provost Brink said that it would amount to approximately $3100, they estimate, for the spring term. So that would be about $6200 per year. Senator Johnson asked how you qualify. Vice-Provost Brink said if you qualify for federal financial aid, you qualify for this program. Senator Johnson asked if the money will be there. Brink said that he believes that most of the money will be there for the spring term. Part of the tuition increase that he anticipates for the spring of $10 per student credit hour, twenty percent of that by statute must be set aside for student financial aid. Five percent of that is designated for this loan program. Senator Johnson asked whether conceivably if they are good students and work hard and apply themselves then they will be able to borrow their tuition and book money and it will be forgiven totally at the end of their four years? Vice-Provost Brink said that if they graduate within four years in most degree programs and with a B average or better, it is forgiven.

Senator Dukes asked if there are two times that they have taken the course and they do not pass it either of the two times, are they out of the degree, out of the college, out of the university, what are they out of? Vice-Provost Brink said that they have not yet decided how that is going to work. The suggestion here, and it is one that we have certainly considered but have not put into the proposal yet, was that the student could take it if the student paid full cost of education. We might have to put an outside limit on that to prevent taking it eight times because some students have their bills paid by someone else, so that is really not a good incentive either. Others have suggested that maybe the student needs to change the major.

Senator Camp said that on the B-On-Time program, when Congress passes tax legislation they usually index it for inflation. Will this 3.0 grade point average be indexed? Vice-Provost Brink said that he anticipated that there would be a sizable group of students that would make a sincere commitment to make those Bs and As in classes, and there would be opportunities for you to hear a lot of interesting stories. That is the state legislature that is doing that.

Senator Gray said that he is concerned about the short length of the add/drop period. Students only have about five days right now and that does not leave very much time to sample a course that only meets once a week. Is there any possibility of lengthening that a bit, so that students will have more of a sense of what the course will actually be like? Vice-Provost Brink said that part of the problem there is the state’s demands for counting students and sending information to the state, collecting tuition and so on. To extend that any longer would violate some state statutes in terms of us getting our money back. I think what we are trying to do is not encourage sampling. He said that he does not mean that in a punitive way, he means that students should inform themselves to the best degree they can and make a commitment.

Senator Dukes said that the other side of that is the time that you lose if you go to another class. If you are going to be losing the first two weeks, what are we giving the first two weeks for? Vice-Provost Brink said that is a good point, that it is very disruptive, and the seat does not become available for the student who wanted to take that course and was unable to because the class was full. During the add/drop period, students watch those screens at two and three-o’clock in the morning, waiting for a number to pop up and then they add it quickly.

Senator Marshall asked if there is any room here for incentives for transfer students. Vice-Provost Brink said that it is a good point and that they have not talked about it. The question arises, does the transfer student get the same number of W’s as the beginning freshman? What do you think? Senator Marshall said that it does not seem like they should because the others are here four years. Vice-Provost Brink said
he does not know what they are going to do about that but that he is interested in hearing any suggestions Senators might have. Senator Camp suggested giving them four Ws, one per year. Transfer at the second year, that is three, third year-two, etc. Vice-Provost Brink said that is a good idea.

Senator Schaller said that he is not sure what the problem is that is being addressed. Is it that a lot of students are taking 160 hours before they will leave or that they are taking five and a half years at 12 hours? Vice-Provost Brink said that it is five and a half years. They are not getting excessive numbers of hours. Part of the reason for the five and a half year average is that those transcripts are replete with Ws and courses repeated. Senator Schaller said that if all of our students took seven or eight hours, we could have 60,000 students here. Vice-Provost Brink said that is one of the reasons that metropolitan universities do have such high enrollments, because they do not have that many full-time equivalents. Senator Schaller said that the question of having to work is the real issue, it is not students who are taking 180 hours and they just cannot face the real world. Vice-Provost Brink said that he does not think it is altogether. We have evidence of advisors telling students that they are in their first semester and since you are going to be in this organization or that organization you should not take so many hours. I do not know that it is always a question of work why students take fewer than 15 hours. Forty percent of them in the fall of 2003 are taking 13 or fewer hours. Senator Schaller said that if you aggregate that you could enroll that many more students. He said that he does not have any class in which students show up one hundred percent even on test days. Vice-Provost Brink said that he has looked at room usage charts and almost all courses that approach their stated maximum had several over that maximum. So we are overbooking classes. Senator Schaller said that in freshman and sophomore classes on any given day he only has 60 or 70 percent attendance.

Senator Spallholz asked why course enrollments are not overbooked, like airline seats, because a lot of his students do not show up. It is not that we do not have seats. He said that he does not have any class in which students show up one hundred percent even on test days. Vice-Provost Brink said that he has looked at room usage charts and almost all courses that approach their stated maximum had several over that maximum. So we are overbooking classes. Senator Spallholz said that in freshman and sophomore classes on any given day he only has 60 or 70 percent attendance.

Senator Held said that on behalf of his colleagues he would like to thank the Provost for not putting in punitive measures considering the climate and the morale of the student body who are already being stressed out by the rise in tuition. We should be very grateful for an administration that cares. Thank you.

President Reed said that Senators who have further concerns can call or email Vice-Provost Brink with their comments.

V. Old Business. Senator Ellis said that when President Whitmore addressed the Senate last month, he said that before he would commit himself to including sexual orientation in the non-discrimination clause, he would study the matter. Senator Ellis said that he had himself done some study and that there is actually a Senate recommendation that was passed November 14, 2001 that has yet to be commented on by the administration. He said that he doubted that without the Senate’s prodding the administration would comment on it. He would like the Senate to vote that President Reed write a letter to President Whitmore asking that he respond to the recommendation made by the Senate on Nov. 14. President Reed asked that the motion be seconded. The motion was seconded, and President Reed asked Senator Ellis to read the policy to the Senate. President Reed then asked for a vote. The Senate voted that President Reed should write a letter, and she said she would do that very soon.

VI. New Business. President Reed said that Vice-President Shriver had some new business. Vice-President Shriver said that he would like to discuss the two announcements that we all received via campus mail. It is not that we are not happy for Dr. Burkhalter and Dr. Childress that they were promoted and probably deservedly so. The problem is the cost of sending the announcement to every single person on campus who subsequently discarded it. You might as well take money out of your pocket and discard it. I understand that this is student money, but nonetheless, Vice-President Shriver suggested that the Senate send a letter to Michael Shonrock and suggest that in the future could we not explore lower cost ways of sending announcements such as posting it on the web or sending one to every department that they can post on their door. The students ought to be the ones that say that there are better ways to use money than
sending out announcements that most people are not going to read. Vice-President Shriver moved that the Senate send a letter suggesting that they explore other low cost options of sending announcements. President Reed asked if anyone would second the motion. The motion was seconded, and President Reed asked if there was any discussion.

Senator Reifman said that he thought there was an even larger volume of paper material and that the announcement is just the tip of the iceberg. We can cut down a lot on paper communication, especially in the context of the cancellation of the recycling program. One example is the developmental leave application that is sent to all faculty. That is something that could be sent via email or that could be sent to a department chair and then any faculty members individually who would like a developmental leave application could request a paper copy. Routinely we receive a lot of paper memos that could seemingly have been sent more economically. Vice-President Shriver agreed and said that this was particularly true in the case of expensive mailings. When we are telling students that money is tight and we cannot hire faculty we should be conserving unnecessary expenditures. President Reed asked if there were any further discussion.

Senator Spallholz said that he supported Dr. Shriver and that he feels the university could become much more efficient in conserving mailings. The university should make a greater effort to post things on the web and save some money on the paper we are generating. President Reed said that there is a project that is underway now. The university has hired a company based in Chicago to discuss ways to promote the university and communication is an issue. A lot of the problem has been that people do not seem to know what is going on but even with all this excessive paper, nobody seems to know. So they are trying to figure out ways that communication can be more efficient. There is at least an attempt on the part of the President’s office that has hired this company to look into it. Senator Spallholz said that the University Daily could be used for announcements on campus of seminars and events. President Schmidly’s entire Annual Report to the Faculty could have been posted on the web. The announcement of promotions could have been posted on the web. Senator Held said, as a point of clarification, that he has been chair of the Student Publications Committee, and that the UD is not used for that purpose. It is an independent organization that does not take directives from anybody about putting in announcements about anything. Senator Reifman said that techANNOUNCE might be the best medium. President Reed asked if there was any further discussion about the request to write a letter to Vice-President Shonrock. President Reed than called for a vote. The motion was passed.

President Reed said that Senator Harter had emailed her about issues involving campus litter not only in the classroom but all over the campus. Some of you may have noticed that it seems to be excessive this year. President Reed said that she had tried to reach Max Hinojosa who has not yet replied. She said they are trying to find out if perhaps there has been a change in the hiring of the groundskeepers or something of the sort that has led to this being suddenly a very noticeable problem. Vice-Provost Hall noted that Max Hinojosa has been very ill and there was some discussion about whether he would be hospitalized. She recommended that President Reed contact Doug Chowning, Director of the Physical Plant or Art Glick, Asst. to VP Operations. Dewey Shroyer is Managing Director of Grounds Maintenance. Vice-President Shriver commented that in some regards this designated smoking area issue is very much tied in to this. What we see in our building is a lot of people who go out into the little alcove areas of the building to smoke and also have their drinks and snacks and this ends up on the ground and that ends up blowing all over the place. If we could enforce all the policies we have, they seem to be interconnected. You make a mess one place and that ends up contributing to the litter. Senator Harter said that her email was on behalf of a colleague in her department who was particularly concerned about student littering in the classroom. If any Senators know of any faculty who are interested in that issue she would like to connect with colleagues that share that interest; to look at what faculty can do to encourage students not to leave a mess behind them when they leave the class. Parliamentarian Elbow said that he had some problems last year in Holden Hall in the evening of students trashing rooms. They were meeting in there. He called Kay Dowdy and she essentially told the students if they were bad they would not be able to meet in there any more and that helped a bit. That will not work for regular class meetings but if it is something that is going on with study groups or something like that, there are some levers that can be used.
VII. Announcements. President Reed asked if there was anything under Announcements. Senator Held said that he had received a copy of an announcement that tomorrow at lunch time there will be a discussion concerning whether or not Texas Tech needs teaching track positions. The conveners of the discussion are the Provost’s office. Senator Held said that he would like to ask the Provost’s office for the chance to bring this issue before the Faculty Senate at some point. Vice-Provost Hall said that they do not have plans for that. They were invited to attend the discussion by the Teaching, Learning and Technology Center. Senator Held said that one of the key questions is where the administration stands on this issue of whether there should be parallel faculty teaching and research tracks. Vice-Provost Brink said that there has been some discussion among the deans and a subcommittee of the deans to discuss issues involving the teaching faculty and those discussions are ongoing. The biggest conundrum is one of tenure and rewards. The Provost has a good deal of interest in this and a number of other people do as well. There will be some measure of conclusion and the Provost would share that. Senator Held said that before any action is taken or even considered the Senate ought to have an opportunity to evaluate it. Vice-Provost Brink agreed. President Reed suggested that if any Senators plan to attend the discussion that they might report back to the Senate as to what transpires if it does not turn up in the UD. Senator Held said that the UD has alerted us to the fact that there is now a Budget Advisory Committee at the presidential level and that he had not heard an announcement to that effect in the Senate chamber. Could President Reed explain what this is about? President Reed said that she had just read it in the UD herself. She is on the Committee and it had not yet met. It meets on November 20. She will report in December what it is about but does not yet know. She asked if someone else knew. Vice-Provost Brink said that it is the President’s committee, appointed with advice from the Provost and others, and it is a committee that will meet to discuss budgetary priorities and incentives. Vice-Provost Hall said that it is chaired by the Provost rather than the President and that it is advisory to the President. Vice-Provost Brink said that there is student representation and Faculty Senate representation, and other faculty representation. Senator Held asked what the other faculty representation category would consist of. Vice-Provost Brink said that the deans were asked to suggest faculty in their colleges who were knowledgeable about budgetary and financial matters; that is, who can read a spreadsheet. President Reed asked if there were any other announcements or any other business to be brought before the Faculty Senate.

Senator Reifman asked President Reed, as a new senator, whenever one has an idea what is the usual protocol? Should we email you as the President and indicate that this is something for you to entertain? President Reed said to email her and when the Faculty Senate Agenda Committee meets about ten days before the Senate meeting, anything that any Senator wishes to have put before us as a body can be put on the agenda. If it is an issue that needs to go to a committee, a big issue like parking; it can be assigned to the appropriate committee.

VIII. Adjournment. Senator Reed asked if there were any other announcements, and in the absence of any, adjourned the meeting at 4:40 pm.