

**Texas Tech University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Meeting # 238
December 10, 2003**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, December 10, 2003 in the Lankford Laboratory in the Electrical Engineering Annex with President Nancy Reed presiding. Senators present were: Kvashny, P. Johnson, Byerly, Gray, Harter, Held, James, Kuriyama, Nathan, Schaller, Troyansky, Watts, Dukes, Jones, Sherif, Duemer, H. Johnson, Baker, Jackson, Masten, Sinzinger, Reifman, Russ, Shriver, Marshall, Quinn, Dolter, Meek, Curry, Hoo, Marbley, Marks and Spallholz. Senators excused were: Roberts, Halsey, Soonpaa and Tacon. Senators unexcused were: Wilde, Aranha, Buelinckx, Alford, D'Amico, Dunham, Williams, Camp, Floyd, Garner, Gelber, Ellis and Hsiang.

I. Call to Order. President Nancy Reed called the meeting to order at 3:18 pm.

II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance. President Reed recognized Provost Marcy and Vice-Provost Brink. She also recognized invited guests Maurice Welch, Copy Services Manager, and Hope Calvillo, Copy Tech Supervisor.

III. Approval of Minutes from Meeting #237. President Reed asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Senator Reifman moved to approve them. The motion was seconded. President Reed asked if there was any discussion or revisions. None were suggested, and the minutes were accepted as written.

IV. Invited Guests. President Reed introduced the invited guests, Maurice Welch and Hope Calvillo. Welch thanked everyone for the opportunity to come and talk about course packs. He noted that everyone should have picked up sample course pack books at the door, as well as a pen and notepad. Inside the book is a gray card. One of the situations that happens within CopyTech each semester is that approximately one week before the start of each semester they get inundated with course packs. The Monday before course pack season (what they call course pack season) in September, they had approximately 40 course packs in house. By Friday they had 200, indicating that 160 had been turned in during a five day period. What they try to do as much as possible is to conduct promotions so that they can get course packs turned in earlier. Since he has been involved with CopyTech for six years, they average about 220 course packs for the fall semester, and for the spring semester they average about 180. If a professor submits the course packs between Dec.1-5, they actually give those students a 20% discount. Not only does this help the students, it also helps CopyTech because they are able to complete their product in a timely manner. If the course packs are turned in Dec. 8-12 there is a 15% discount for the students, and the following week, a 10% discount. They are asked the question, what about giving either the department part of that discount, or giving the professor part of that discount. This is something they do not do for various reasons. Some other people may do this, but CopyTech does not because they believe it is double-dipping on the students. This discount is something that they started two and a half to three years ago. They surveyed many of the professors that brought in course packs and asked them what CopyTech could do to actively promote an earlier submission date. One of the points that came from the survey was that a discount should be given to someone, and CopyTech chose to participate in this. Welch asked if anyone has any other ideas regarding what CopyTech can do to actively pursue an earlier submission time, please contact Hope Calvillo. Her email address appears on the front of the red book that was passed out. A course pack sample book was also passed out. What they use most is coil binding and they also have tape binding. If they produce 5,000 booklets each semester, 4,500 are coil bound. A few are three-hole drilled and a few are tape bound. If you notice on the inside of the red book, there is a course pack submission form and this is the form you fill out to submit your course pack. They put in some pages after that to fill out the sample book. They have seven to eight different color stocks that they can put on the front. If you submit a course pack they will keep it in an electronic format. A lot of professors will use the same course pack

semester after semester. They will simply let CopyTech know that they used it in a previous semester and CopyTech will go to an electronic file and pull it and make a new cover for it with new dates. Many times a professor will say he wants a small section changed. In electronic format they can take that section out and put a new section in and then print it. Right now they have had approximately ten course packs already submitted (from last week up through today). They also have a list of campus mail stops. Everyone should have received one in their book. They will leave extras on the table. Welch asked if anyone had any questions for him or Hope.

Senator Schaller asked if Welch could clarify the copyright position, since it did not seem clear what the little box says on the Course Pack Submission Form. Welch said that CopyTech has asked Legal Counsel numerous times about copyright. Legal Counsel advises them that the little blurb in the form should be used to indicate that the professor is not using in excess of what Legal Counsel considers to be Fair Use for the book. They do not want someone to come in with an entire book and say that they want to use this book for a course pack and CopyTech makes 100 copies and sells them to students. They are putting the burden of copyright back on the professor to say "I took a little bit of this and a little bit of that and here is what I am using." **Senator Schaller** asked if they were legally liable, in other words, and that there are no legal guidelines that they provide for their legal liability. Welch said that this was correct, that these are the legal guidelines that they get from General Counsel.

Senator Gray said that at one time CopyTech made the faculty sign a statement that said that they did not use more than ten percent of the work. He asked if this represents a change from that earlier position. Should the faculty use their own judgment now as to what is an appropriate amount? Welch said that he did not think that there is actually a percentage in the statement. Approximately three semesters ago Legal Counsel said that they wanted to remove that. It is left to a professor's discretion to make that ten percent judgment.

Senator Jones asked if Operating Policy 30.22 pertained to Fair Use. Welch said that was correct. **Senator Jones** asked Welch if he could summarize what Fair Use is. Welch said that it was his understanding that Fair Use is a ten percent margin. **Senator Jones** asked if faculty could go to that OP and find out exactly what the guidelines for Fair Use would be. Welch said that was correct. **Senator Jones** asked if faculty who sign this are certifying that they have complied with that. Welch said that was correct.

Senator Meek asked how faculty make sure that CopyTech uses the latest copy of a tape with all the most recent revisions and not an old tape. Welch said that faculty needs to make it clear to CopyTech that it is a newly submitted tape, unless there are just a few changes that allow them to change pages. Welch asked if there were any further questions. **President Reed** suggested he tell the Senate about the calendars. Welch said that desk calendars are available at CopyTech 145. They are approximately 22 x 30 inches. They were used for a promotion back in September. If members of the Senate would like one they can stop by CopyTech. Welch asked if there were any further questions. He thanked the Senate for inviting them and for letting them share their ideas.

V. Old Business. President Reed asked if there was any old business. **Senator Reifman** said that in the previous Senate meeting mention was made of the TLTC workshop on the topic of teaching and research tracks for faculty. **Senator Reifman** attended and offered a summary for the Senate. He recounted that Provost Marcy had said at the workshop that faculty could have some flexibility. At a certain point in their career faculty may want to focus on research in the lab or in the field, and at a later time in their career, they may want to focus more on teaching. There was a discussion of Boyer's concept of the scholarship of teaching. A person could be devoting his or her time largely to teaching but also be producing books or articles of a pedagogical nature. Reifman recalled the Provost saying that he did not see where someone would be able to advance and get tenure solely by being a content deliverer. But devoting time to teaching and producing scholarly articles on teaching could be recognized as a valuable form of scholarship. Some people who attended the session thought that someone should not be able to attain a full

professorship with a more teaching-oriented track and there was some debate about that. There was also some debate about whether there is a correlation between teaching skills and research skills; i.e., do they enhance each other or are they independent of one another. **Senator Reifman** said that he had attended a few other TLTC workshops and this one had by far the best attendance, suggesting that there is a great deal of interest in this topic. President Reed asked if anyone had any questions.

Senator Held asked if any formal change in the OP was anticipated. **Provost Marcy** said that what he was trying to emphasize is that there is actually more flexibility in the existing OP than a lot of people appreciate. **Senator Troyansky** said that they had been talking about people who come through the system and switched over to another track; was there also some discussion about people who would be hired at an entry level in such a position and that therefore a decision would have to be made about tenure as well as promotion to full? **Provost Marcy** said that there certainly have been people that have been hired with a different expectation than the standard teaching, research and service. He did not think that people are aware of that as a possibility. Certainly for departments, that may be a great solution for some things. Those things need to be negotiated at the outset for people that are untenured. Marcy then went on to say that later on, if they are changing directions for some period of time, that also needs to be adopted so that those people are not disadvantaged if they were to apply for promotion to full professor. President Reed asked if there was any further discussion on this topic.

Senator Nathan said that at the last meeting Vice-Provost Brink made a presentation about incentives for graduating on time and that he is concerned about whether just raising the issue in the Senate in a single session is an adequate format for getting Senate input or whether the Provost's Office would welcome some sort of more formal involvement by the Senate. A lot of important concerns were raised. He said that he would personally recommend that the Senate have some sort of more formal involvement.

Vice-Provost Brink said that it is the Senate's decision rather than his decision; they do whatever they want to in terms of their business and their advising. He said that his purpose all along has been to expose these sets of ideas to as many people as possible and invite discussion and additional measures. He said that he thought that they had a good discussion at the time that he was before the Senate, but that if there is subsequent thought on this, he welcomes it.

Senator Nathan said that he would recommend that the Senate become more formally involved, perhaps by means of a study committee. President Reed asked if anyone would like to second the motion. **Senator Schaller** seconded the motion. President Reed called for a vote. The motion was passed with **Senator Marks** abstaining. President Reed said that the issue would be assigned to a committee shortly.

VI. New Business. President Reed said that the packet containing the minutes also contained a copy of Student Senate Resolution 39.09 and that she hoped the Senators had had a chance to examine it. She described it as an extraordinary document that had been hand delivered with a gold seal. The resolution states that students would like to see course objectives, expectations, required texts, and syllabi prior to enrolling in a course. President Reed pointed out to the student that delivered the resolution that she cannot possibly do that herself because she does not have the software to do it. The student said that the plan was that faculty could send it as an attachment to the Provost's Office and they would be responsible for posting it on the web. President Reed said that there were a number of pitfalls to the resolution and wanted to open it up for discussion and see if the Senate would like to send it to committee for further analysis.

Senator Marks said that his first question was about the document itself. He asked if it was a document from the Senate of Texas Tech University, since it bears the seal of Texas Tech University and it says "Texas Tech University Senate Resolution." He asked whether they in fact are the Senate of Texas Tech University? President Reed clarified that it was the Student

Senate. **Senator Marks** asked when the Faculty Senate passes a resolution do they affix the seal of Texas Tech University to it? President Reed responded that the Faculty Senate does not even have any stationary. **Senator Marks** asked whether the Faculty Senate proclaims itself to be the Senate of Texas Tech University. President Reed said that the Faculty Senate mentions that it is the Faculty Senate relative to other Senates.

Senator Watts asked why the students need course syllabi in order to find out the textbooks—could we not just send the list of textbooks. President Reed said that the faculty could do anything. One of the issues that were brought up at the Agenda Committee meeting was that you do not always know what you are teaching, or which section you are teaching or exactly which class, before pre-registration. So you do not know about the textbook, and it would be impossible to list it since faculty teaching assignments are often made at the last minute. So there are some pitfalls in even submitting a textbook list, even though we are supposed to submit one to the bookstore.

Senator Dolter read an excerpt from the resolution, “Be it further resolved, that each individual course instructor submits his or her official course syllabus to the Provost Office before registration begins...” and said that he felt sorry for those poor people who have not even been hired here yet. If pre-registration happens well ahead of time, the lead time would be tremendous and so that is not possible.

Senator Harter said that she revises her courses every time that she teaches them and that she usually uses the semester break to do that, and so to have to have her revised syllabus by the middle of the previous semester would be very difficult. She said that she could not incorporate new articles and information that came out in the meantime.

Senate Vice-President Shriver said that he had said the same thing in the Agenda Committee meeting. He said that what it could promote is that you would now have the wrong textbook listed on the syllabus, and you have people going to the bookstore asking for it, and having them say that is not even the book for that class. So you could promote misinformation by having old copies posted. If you post a syllabus and do not replace it with a new one, the old one might still be there and students might not read carefully that it has the old date.

Senator Dolter said that he was concerned about what the students’ objectives are. Course objectives and what is actually taught is written in the student catalog, is it not? President Reed said that it was. **Senator Dolter** said that he thought something like this is subject to abuse like almost every aspect of education is today.

Senator Duemer said that it is completely superfluous to what is already in our catalogs. It seems to place an undue burden on faculty to try to meet students’ arbitrary expectations. He said that he does not see any reason why the Senate should bother to act on the resolution.

President Reed asked if the Provost’s Office was going to do anything about this. **Provost Marcy** said that logistically, there are about 4,000 courses. The Provost has no mechanism or server where they could logistically post 4,000 complete syllabi every semester by November or somewhere in that time frame. **Provost Marcy** said that the argument that he had heard was that they wanted booklists so that they could order the textbooks online and get some price breaks. That seems like a benefit to the student if it were possible. When he served as Dean, the syllabi were posted on departmental servers, and they were made available in a fairly expedient way. President Reed said that she had to confess that this was not the case throughout the campus. **Provost Marcy** said that the Provost’s Office does not have any resources that would be adequate to post the syllabi or to keep them posted. President Reed asked if the general consensus of the Senate would be to ignore this or do something about it.

Senator Held said that as liaison to the Student Senate, he would like to at least suggest that we offer the students the gesture of courtesy in submitting a reply, and that the content of the reply

would essentially be a summary of what the Provost just said because they in their resolution have targeted sending these syllabi to the Provost's Office. If we can explain to the students that the Provost has told us that this is logistically not possible, then we can leave it at that, pending further suggestions from them. If they can figure out a way to pay for it or to expedite it on their own or through the departments, that would be fine.

Senator Marks suggested that the Senate does not yet agree that the only problem is logistics on the Provost's part, electronic logistics. If the Student Senate says, just send it to us, have we then pledged to resolve to require every professor on campus to do so? **Senator Marks** said that he assumed in these 4,000 courses that we may not be taking into account every section, so there may be quite a number of different syllabi and different schedules, so the number is larger than 4,000.

Senator Johnson said that she was still stuck at "Whereas, there is a need for students to see course objectives, expectations, and required texts." She would like a little more explanation from these students before we can resolve anything, especially concerning her and what her workload would be. President Reed said that she was not quite sure that she followed. **Senator Johnson** said she would like to know what their need is that would require her to expedite a syllabus in October for January.

Senator Duemer said he was concerned that the faculty would have to post these syllabi in the middle of the fall semester for the following spring semester. Does that obligate us to follow those syllabi, and have we really considered the implications for our academic freedom in terms of revising our syllabi even before the class is offered?

Senator Meek said that we need to point out to the students that much of the information is already available in the catalog and perhaps a lot of the answers can be found by providing the students with a list of departmental web sites where much of the additional information is already available. President Reed said that she knows from her own experience that departmental web sites are not always what they should be.

Senator Johnson said the issue is academic freedom and about people telling her what to do months in advance when there are other things she is supposed to do besides teach. We not only have scholarship we have service. It makes her angry that there is a resolution in front of the faculty that they have had no input on and all of the sudden the faculty are getting a resolution.

Senator Watts said she would like to ask the Student Senate what processes they have that will address complaints when students read the wrong syllabus and then buy the wrong book.

Senator Kuriyama said that some of the course descriptions are posted on departmental web sites so that should make some of these people feel their concerns are being addressed.

Senator Gray said that, speaking from the standpoint of the humanities, what faculty can do to specify in advance for students what they might encounter in our courses is to include more detailed information about whether there is a major paper required or whether their grade would be based on exams. That is the kind of situation that might surprise students when they get to a class and discover that they have a 15- page paper due and they really had not been counting on it. **Senator Gray** said he was wondering if the Senate could resolve to pass this along to the departments, something which says that the Faculty Senate would like to encourage departments to maintain a web site which provides more thorough information about courses in a timely fashion, without necessarily conceding the point that students have a right to tell us ahead of time what we are going to have to have in the course syllabi exactly. President Reed asked if Senator Gray would like to present that as formal motion, that the Senate draft a resolution to this effect. **Senator Gray** said he thought that not too many Senators would agree with such a resolution.

Senator Held said that he understands part of the emotional reaction, but the Student Senate is a separate standing body, and they do not need to turn to us for approval of their resolutions and

the reciprocal is also true that we do not turn to them for approval of our resolutions. **Senator Held** said that he would have liked for them diplomatically to have come here and explain the logic behind this but as a scientist he thought he could deduce that one of the main motives is that two of the whereas clauses concern textbooks. **Senator Held** said that he thought it would be at least in our interest to inform the Student Senate that they should be able to get information about textbooks for the coming semester from the three bookstores in town that sell those books well in advance of the first day of the semester. If there is any problem in obtaining that information, perhaps at that point the Senate can meet with the bookstores and assist them in getting that information out because clearly all of us have to commit at some point to order textbooks.

Senator Spallholz said that it seems like the bookstore might publish a list of the books that are ordered for the next semester. Is it six months in advance that textbooks have to be ordered? President Reed asked if anyone knew whether the bookstore makes that information available. **Senator Johnson** said that in her college they have to order books so that they are already on file at the beginning of November, so it is not like they are hiding any information. The students can come to any one of the staff members and find out what is on order. **Senator Held** said that the students may not realize that. President Reed said that she can write a letter to Jack Steinmetz and suggest the bookstore avenue if that has the approval of the entire Senate.

Senator Schaller said that what came to his mind is the possibility that they would be looking at the three drops in their college career. He said that this could be understood as a response to the fact that after the first week if students wound up in the wrong course they might possibly have to use one of their three possible drops. Even if not before pre-registration, at least during registration week, let them see what is being required for a course, and they might decide it is a course that they should drop before the semester starts rather than afterward.

Senator Jackson said that a student can come to the professor whose course they sign up for and ask the professor for an advance copy of the syllabus before the class starts or ask if the professor can tell them informally about the requirements. If the students are that concerned about it, instead of placing the burden on the faculty, they can contact the instructor. President Reed asked if there was any further discussion.

Senator Duemer said that he thought there was a big difference between having prices available for students and having syllabi available online. His concern is that when multiple sections are available, students will start looking at syllabi and taking courses with the fewest requirements. **Vice-President Shriver** said that if you had that information and then information on ranking of instructors you could carefully pick your way through the degree program, taking the path of least resistance to complete your degree program. **Senator Dolter** said that this was the abuse he was referring to earlier.

Senator Reifman said that although he did not think it had arrived at Texas Tech yet, at other universities you have privately functioning web sites where students can log on and write an evaluation of a professor. A student can start up a web site called Texas Tech Professors.com that you can log on to and see how the faculty are evaluated. That is the future--students freely writing on the web what they think of us and then picking the courses of least resistance, or picking the professors with the most colorful personalities, the best sense of humor, and so forth. Vice-Provost Brink said that it already exists. There is an outfit called Pick a Prof that is already doing that. **Senator Reifman** said that the one that he had seen was from his undergraduate school, UCLA, called Brew N' Walk.com. President Reed asked if there were any further discussion on this. She said she would draft a letter suggesting that the textbook information is available through the bookstore and also point out some of the pitfalls regarding syllabi being made available too early. **Senator Held** added that the letter should refer the students to the minutes of this meeting. President Reed asked if there were any additional new business.

Senator Watts said that she was not sure if this would qualify as new business, but her faculty asked her to bring to the Senate a concern about excused absences for approved university-sponsored activities. This semester, a faculty member in her school was told that he had to approve and accommodate fifteen excused absences for members of the Meat Judging Team. Are fifteen absences--approved or not--acceptable? She said she would like to hear the reaction of other Senators and proceed from there. President Reed said this applies not just to the Meat Judging Team, but also to other absences which they just claim as their right. You are supposed to help students make it up no matter what excuse they have. Any discussion on this?

Vice-Provost Brink said that there is an OP that mandates that a student on recognized university business be allowed to make up material that is missed. Not excuse the absence, but allow them to make up the material that is missed. It must be an official university function. There are a good many regularly scheduled extracurricular official university events. Students should not be punished for being in them but rather allowed to make up missed material. What cannot happen is, "you missed an exam and I allow everyone to throw out an exam, so we are going to throw out that exam." That is not allowing them to make up missed material. Do you see the distinction?

Senator Watts said that she saw the distinction but that she still has a problem with the amount--the number of absences. When do approved university excuses become excessive? **Vice-Provost Brink** said that in this instance (and he hopes our campus never becomes so large that we cannot do this) the person in question might call the Meat Judging Team advisor and inquire about that. Senator Watts said that she was not sure that that was the solution. **Vice-Provost Brink** said that gives a solution and information and maybe also sends a message that this does seem excessive.

Senator Sinzinger asked if you have so many extracurricular events going on, if you have so many students then missing exams, is this a trend-- that they might have to make up 15 extra exams to accommodate all these students? **Vice-Provost Brink** said that he does not know how excessive this is, but these have to be official university events that take students off campus. This is not about boning up for a chess match; it is about forensics, athletics, Meat Judging Teams.

Senator Duemer said that he can see both sides of this issue. He said that he was very lucky as an undergraduate to be able to take part in a great number of extracurricular activities. It is a great benefit to our undergraduates. On the other hand, he is concerned that this could become quite an imposition for a lot of faculty, helping students make up that time above and beyond our teaching responsibilities and for which we are not compensated for.

Senator Gray said that if we are concerned about what places constraints on activity, most sports, for example, will have NCAA rules. We have all had athletes in class who have never had 15 absences--the NCAA would not allow it. **Senator Phillip Johnson** said that when you start making policies to deal with isolated issues you run into problems. If you have problems, call the advisor of that group or club and ask them why there are 15 absences. More than likely, you will get an adequate answer.

Senator Held said that he would also suggest that that information be conveyed in writing and copied to the Dean of Students so that at least the Dean is aware of the pressure that is being put on some of these associations.

Vice-President Shriver said that at least in the case of athletes we get a form that asks us to evaluate their performance twice during the semester. You wonder if the same thing is not needed for some of these other groups where students are gone so much that maybe it is the burden of that group to monitor the performance of its members. No one ever knows whether it hurts their performance or not. Some members of these groups are absent even more than athletes.

President Reed asked if Senator Watts wished to pursue the matter further. **Senator Watts** said that she would take it back to her faculty.

VII. Announcements. President Reed said she had several announcements. **Study Committee A has been designated to look into OP 30.15 which concerns the evaluation of administrators. The Status and Welfare Committee is looking into the reduction and/or waiver of fees for faculty and staff family members to participate in some of the Texas Tech activities, including enrollment in the university, as this is done at other places. Study Committee B is pursuing an idea which came a year or so ago and is also come up again.** We have recently received a series of reports from other schools in the state of Texas--other Faculty Senates--and the issue is regarding the ombudsman for the faculty. This is an issue which some of us remember that Provost Marcy talked about during his interview process with the Senate. We have not come up with anything yet for the Budget Study Committee, but we are trying. President Reed said that Vice-President Shriver was going to make some comments on the Roundup Reports that we obtained from a recent meeting of Faculty Senate representatives in Austin.

Vice-President Shriver said that the one thing that struck him about the Roundup Reports is that there are some universities missing from the Reports, like Texas Tech and others. There is a lot of missing information and a lot of inconsistencies. For example, concerning enrollment, some universities say enrollment is up, some say it is down, some give very good numbers. It would be nice if there were some kind of format for these where people were asked to submit specific enrollment numbers, those kinds of things. In addition to inconsistencies in data, the other aspect that stood out was something that occurred at Texas A & M Kingsville. That institution hired a new President and that President rejected all tenure recommendations except for four and overrode the recommendation of the Provost. Since we have a new President, is this an issue that we want to raise with him? What is his position on changing tenure requirements in the middle of the game, so to speak? I cannot imagine that our Provost would be happy if every recommendation he made was overridden. Despite some ups and downs, it does look like the two big issues are enrollments are up almost everywhere, and one issue that came up repeatedly was the cutting in state funding and uncertainty about how institutions are going to make up that difference. The underlying theme is that enrollments are up in general, and we are being asked to do more with less. Other institutions are struggling with exactly the same issues that we are struggling with. It would be nice to get a consistent format on this where you could plug it in. Everyone is saying that the trend is toward increased enrollments in years to come, so unless something changes, we will be asked to do even more with even less. That is the central theme of these Reports. President Reed asked if there were any questions for Vice-President Shriver.

Vice-Provost Brink said that he just wanted to suggest that we have a very helpful and very capable Institutional Research and Information Management division. Whatever data you would like to see from us, we can make sure it will come forward. It probably is on the web site already.

Vice-Provost Brink said that he would also suggest that the Coordinating Board web site contains a good deal of this sort of statistical information and does it both as individual schools and in the aggregate.

Provost Marcy said that he had a discussion with Jon Whitmore about the tenure and promotion process which is well underway at this time. **Provost Marcy** said that he anticipates no changes that would be significant. **Vice-Provost Brink** said that it should be pointed out that it is the Board of Regents that grants tenure and not the President or the Provosts or the Deans or the Chairs. President Reed asked if there were any other comments on this issue.

Senator Held said that he wanted to ask the Provost whether there was any update on the information that appeared in today's University Daily with regard to our increase in enrollment vis a vis the Closing the Gaps Conference. Apparently the Chancellor was quoted as saying that he anticipates that we might be growing by an additional 2,000 or 3,000 student. **Provost Marcy** said that they are having a conference in Austin today as we speak. The President and the

Chancellor are attending it. If you look at the Closing the Gaps documents that are on the Higher Education Coordinating Board web site, they have a goal for Texas Tech of 37,500, and that has been there for about three years now. That is for 2010. Enrollment Management has a projection model that projects out for the next two to three years, and the estimates are that we will be up about a thousand students a year for the next three to four years, and then gradually after getting over a bit of a hump, will flatten out. Our numbers are probably in the low 30s. The Coordinating Board sets whatever number they want for Texas Tech via the 500,000 students that they are projecting will be in the system. In looking at where we are going to be this fall with the ten dollar tuition increase, we are looking at something like 20 new faculty lines in addition to being able to fill all vacant positions. That is going to give you some help, and we believe that this is probably going to continue for at least the next three or four years. We think we are going to be able to add 100 new faculty, but it is going to take us three or four years to do it. **Provost Marcy** said he met with the Deans yesterday about the process of setting up some criteria for actually allocating those lines to various departments. Deans may be meeting with department chairs about this over the next few weeks.

President Reed said that she had one other announcement that was brought up last time concerning the Budget Advisory Council. It has now met twice and basically what it is doing at this stage is instructing all of the members--and there are about ten or twelve--about how to read the budget for the university. We have not made any recommendations or done anything beyond simply learning how to read the budget. One issue that had come up that she does have permission to share concerns the Hi Tech Store. The budget that they were shown that is supposed to be for 2004, it shows no revenue from the Hi Tech Store. Apparently what they were told is that the IT Help Central is supposed to help staff with purchasing any computer hardware or software at a university employee discount. Going to the IT Help Central web page through the Texas Tech web page, **President Reed** said that she came up with the Hi Tech Campus Computer Store web page and they seem to think that they are still in business. They are showing the new location in the west wing of the Student Union and indicating the brands that they have for sale. President Reed asked if the Provost had any idea what was happening.

Provost Marcy said that what they are proposing is that, over time, the Hi Tech Computer Store is probably going to go out of business. The reason is that the large contracts that they have negotiated with Dell, Microsoft, Apple and others have undercut the Computer Store margins so badly that they cannot afford to actually maintain a physical store indefinitely. There are also opportunities for faculty to go out and buy online at substantially below what you would find ordinary online purchases selling for. Provost Marcy said that he himself was able to purchase a Dell computer at 30 percent less than the price offered on the Dell web site or through the Hi Tech Computer Store. Provost Marcy clarified that the zero revenue is actually a zero expense budget. What that says is that they are an auxiliary enterprise so that no university funds can go to them. They have to make enough money from what they sell to pay for the space they occupy and pay all their employees, all the fringes, all the benefits, taxes, and so on. And so the projection is that they are breaking even. **President Reed** said she was not able to determine if they were still providing repair service. **Provost Marcy** said there will probably be a reformulation of what they actually provide as service. Service is one of the few areas where they can probably make money. **President Reed** said that the revenue budget that they were looking at did mention parking fees and that she was assured that they were not going up yet. She said that they were going to meet again on Monday.

Senator Held said that given the proximity of that next meeting, would President Reed please inquire on behalf of the Senate, since we are the elected representatives of the faculty, what the raise expectation might be for the near future. **President Reed** said that, as President Whitmore said earlier when he addressed the Senate, it is coming from 75 percent of the tuition raise. Twenty-five percent is going to financial aid for students in the spring. He is going to ask the Board of Regents when they meet if in fact that 75 percent can go to faculty raises on merit only and if they agree, the projected revenue would then amount to two percent. **Vice-Provost Brink** said that the only addition that he would make is that this is going to be faculty and staff.

President Reed said that the two percent is also not a fixed amount; it is estimated on the tuition increase revenue itself, so there could be some slight fluctuation.

Senator Spallholz suggested that coming into the new year, a discussion might be made of the merit process in light of the fact that a two percent merit raise covering-- according to his departmental chair--a three year faculty review seems to him to be unnecessary. He said he would like to open it for faculty discussion. Would it not be better received --if it were two percent-- that the raise be across the board in some fashion, without having to go through a merit process and parceling out a very small amount of money? President Reed said that in this particular case because of the source of the revenue that it cannot be across the board. **Senator Spallholz** said that in future when these things come up involving small amounts of money, since faculty are not even provided with a cost of living increase, many faculty who are deprived of this merit process for various reasons suffer even more. President Reed said that she did in fact meet with President Whitmore in September and told him that this was a huge concern of the faculty and a morale issue, that the state has not given an across the board cost of living increase in ages. **Senator Spallholz** said that the only one that he can remember is when Montford first came in in the fall and we had a seven percent across the board raise in January. It would be nice if the administration had such clout today to do such things.

Provost Marcy said that there is actually a state law that says raises have to be based on merit. You cannot give across the board raises. **Senator Spallholz** said that with Chancellor Montford we received an across the board raise. **Provost Marcy** said that the authoritative source on that is Martha Brown, who is the legislative liaison. He said that he does anticipate that there will be another raise in September. He said there will probably be two raises back to back, and the two percent is the absolute minimum. It will be at least two percent, maybe a little more. President Reed said that she has occasionally gotten on her soapbox in these meetings and protested the erosion of faculty benefits. She has only had two meetings so far, but she is trying to speak for the faculty. She asked if there were any other announcements.

Vice-Provost Brink said that Commencement is December 20 and it is important for students to see faculty at Commencement. President Reed said that it is urged that you attend lest it become mandatory in the future.

VIII. Adjournment. President Reed adjourned the meeting at 4:27 pm.