

**Texas Tech University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Meeting #240  
February 11, 2004**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, February 11, 2004 in the Lankford Laboratory in the Electrical Engineering Annex with President Nancy Reed presiding. Senators present were: Kvashny, Johnson, Wilde, Buelinckx, Byerly, D'Amico, Dunham, Gray, Harter, Held, Nathan, Roberts, Schaller, Troyansky, Watts, Dukes, Sherif, Duemer, Halsey, Johnson, Baker, Jackson, Masten, Sinzinger, Reifman, Russ, Shriver, Marshall, Quinn, Dolter, Gelber, Curry, Marbley, Marks, Soonpaa and Spallholz. Senators excused were: Marbley, Meek, Camp and Tacon. Senators unexcused were: Aranha, Kuriyama, Williams, Jones, Garner, Ellis, Hoo and Hsiang.

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

**II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance.** President Reed recognized Vickie Gustafson, Assistant Vice-President of Information Technology, Kathy Stalcup, Director of Technology Support, ATLC, Provost William Marcy, Vice-Provosts James Brink and Liz Hall, and Adam Boedeker from the University Daily.

**III. Approval of Minutes.** Senator Reifman said that on the last page, third line from the bottom, the word "roll" should be changed to "role." President Reed asked if there were any other emendations to the text of the minutes. There were none, and President Reed called for approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved as corrected.

**IV. Invited Guests.** President Reed introduced Vickie Gustafson and Kathy Stalcup. Vickie Gustafson thanked everyone for their time, and explained that her purpose for being there was to obtain input about some services that they want to provide. For the last two or three years, they have had an instrument called a portal in development. The first phase of development was meeting student needs. The next stage is to tie in the needs of the faculty. They have developed an instrument to try to assess what the faculty's needs are. The faculty's input is vital in making sure that they can meet faculty needs and she welcomes questions and comments at any time. Kathy Stalcup asked the Senate how many of them had heard of [www.raiderlink.ttu.edu](http://www.raiderlink.ttu.edu) or raiderlink.com. She said that although the focus has been on students, they are now trying to target faculty. She defined a portal as a single point of entry that provides two things: secure access to the information that you use on a daily basis and secondly, it is customizable to the needs of the user. You can see the accounts that you have authority over whether that is personal or professional. She asked the Senate what they would find useful as faculty in this kind of technology. She asked if there were any questions about the definition of a portal.

Provost Marcy asked what makes it secure. Kathy Stalcup said that it is the universal authentication or e-raider system that does this. The way it knows who you are is through your e-raider account. Secondly, it runs on a set of servers that have a lot of security built into the interface. They have dramatically improved security from the initial platform.

Senator Reifman asked if the faculty component of TechSIS is like a portal, that is, when you need to get class enrollment lists or grade your class it is specific to you and secure. Kathy said that the faculty information system for the web is a front end to a large mainframe system and it is made to be profile-specific. It is similar to a portal to the extent that it knows who you are uniquely and can associate various features with you like a class roll. It is different, however, in that a portal is more ubiquitous. The faculty information system is very specific to registration, grade rolls, etc. A portal would be focused on you and everything that you do as a researcher,

faculty member, etc. Vickie said that it is possible to tie those things into the portal and that is one of the reasons for the survey. Kathy said that in the pilot study that they did with the faculty with e-learning they did just that. She said that when she was teaching Psychology 1300 she could go into the portal and she had the roll there and could do everything without having to go and log in through the main frame. They need to know what services the faculty would find useful. She asked her assistants to begin distributing a survey to the members of the Senate for them to fill out. She said that the research that they have done on peer institutions indicates that most have a single point of entry. Some of them focus only on faculty and the portal does not include students. When the Senators completed their survey, Kathy thanked them for their time and reminded them that their input was critical and they would move forward only with an informed view as to faculty needs and desires. They will analyze the data from the survey and make it available on a web site that all Senators will have access to. Identities of those completing the survey will not be revealed. President Reed thanked the guests for attending the meeting.

**V. Old Business.** President Reed introduced Vice-President Shriver. He said that the job of the Nominating Committee was to solicit names of those individuals who would be willing to serve as Faculty Senate officers. If Senators have questions about eligibility, it is important to keep in mind that they have to have some years left on the Senate. Those rotating off in 2004 are not eligible. The Nominating Committee called and emailed people on a list of eligible Senators. Most of the responses indicated that people would like to serve but had special circumstances that prevented them from doing so. Having been an officer twice, Vice-President Shriver said that he could understand that serving as an officer does require devoting some time to it. But he noted that it is impossible to run the Senate without officers, and at this point they have one potential nominee for three offices. So they decided that they would take this issue to the floor of the Senate and urge members to run. There are many important issues that need to be addressed next year. People typically said that they are in their first year and that they did not think they were ready yet, but that is the time to serve because it still allow Senators time to serve a second term as an officer if they so desire. Vice-President Shriver said that he had passed out a sheet with descriptions of what the officers' duties are, which were taken from the web site so that Senators could get an idea of what is involved. Serving does take a little bit of time, but the President gets some release time. The Vice-President and Secretary do not. The primary duty of the Vice-President is the Academic Council. The Secretary does have to listen to tapes of meetings and transcribe the minutes and that does take time. President Shriver said that he was going to pass a list around and that if Senators were interested and eligible they should please write their name next to the appropriate office that they were interested in. Ideally, the President should be a tenured faculty member because there are difficult issues that need to be handled, and a tenured person would feel more comfortable discussing them. You can learn a lot by serving. You can learn a lot by serving as Secretary because there are things that you do not catch just sitting here and that you pick up by going back through the minutes, and it can be very informative. The Nominating Committee will check the list and make sure that everyone is eligible. They would ideally like to have two nominees for each position so that Senators will have a choice when they vote. They will ask each person to write a brief description indicating the strengths and experience that they would bring to the position. It is not necessary to have great qualifications or extensive experience to serve as an officer. President Reed asked if there were any comments or questions.

Senator Nathan asked about the timetable for the elections. Vice-President Shriver said that the By-Laws indicate the election is supposed to be held in March. Once they have the nominees, they will send a list out. At the March meeting the nominees will each say a few words about themselves and fill out a form. The Nominating Committee will distribute some information about the candidates by the March meeting. President Reed added that the President serves as a

member of President Whitmore's Budget Advisory Council. Those Senators with a particular interest in budgetary matters might consider serving as President in order to be able to sit on the Budget Advisory Council. There are also free lunches in December and May at Commencement. Once the new officers are elected they will pay a courtesy call on President Whitmore. Serving as an officer is a good way to get to meet people across campus. President Reed then asked if any of the Senate Study Committees had any business to report.

Senator Nathan reported that Study Committee B had met three times and that they expect to be able to report at the next session. Senator Schaller said that the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee had one meeting right before the end of the fall semester, and they should meet again in the next few weeks and have something to report. President Reed asked that any reports be available by the April meeting especially if they involve issues that have to be voted on such as changes in the OP. She said that they have just sent to the Academic Programs Committee the charge of dealing with the official absence policy, which Senator Watts brought up at the last meeting, so they have not yet had a chance to act. President Reed reported that the Budget Advisory Council has been meeting frequently and examining many documents, but that at this point she could not divulge anything because it is confidential. They have not taken any action yet, but there is rumor of action. She is saving all her notes, handouts, and CDs, and the incoming Senate President will be given this material. President Reed asked if there were any reports from any Faculty Senate liaisons to the different committees around campus. There were none, and President Reed moved on to new business.

**VI. New Business.** Senator Reifman said that at the previous meeting, he had raised an issue regarding the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). At the meeting, President Whitmore said that he would have to study it further to decide if this was something worthwhile to participate in. Senator Reifman said that he had located the web site and written the address on the board if any Senator or anyone in the Provost Office would like to study the matter. It is an attempt to measure educational quality more directly, what goes on in the classroom, the amount of discussion between professors and students, paper writing, etc., as opposed to the cruder U.S. News & World Report. It costs approximately \$7,000 for a university to participate in the survey. At the time he looked this up, the '04 survey had closed and they were still taking sign-ups for the '05 survey.

Senator Marx said that he would like to move that the Senate pass a resolution of support for Chancellor Smith and President Whitmore. Senator Watts seconded the motion. President Reed asked if there were any discussion. Senator Held said that he would like to know what it is that the Senate is supporting. Senator Marx said that he believed that the governance and the accreditation of the university were in some peril right now. Chancellor Smith has been challenged from below and more importantly, from above. Senator Marx said that although he had little evidence to go on, if it is true that the Board of Regents has taken an active role in the operations of the university, then he believes that it has serious implications for our future, for our governance, and potentially for our accreditation. He said that we cannot put all of that into a resolution because we are kept from knowing anything. But at this moment, he believes that Chancellor Smith is unjustly feeling a great deal of pressure. Perhaps if the Senate speaks up and says that they believe that it is important for the President and the Chancellor to be in charge of the internal destiny of the university and for the Board of Regents to take care of external funding, opportunities, and challenges, then the university will be in good shape.

Senator Johnson asked if the Senate was just going to say it supports them, or how would the resolution be worded in order to address the problem that Senator Marx has described? Senator Marx said that since nothing is officially known and much is denied, he would not like to make

allegations that we can not back up. It would be potentially useful and not at all harmful to leave it at that. People will understand what we are saying without having to say something that is deniable.

Senator Dukes said that it appeared to him that this is an important issue. Something has been taken out of the Chancellor's hands, and it is his understanding that, according to SACS regulations, there was a violation, not on the part of the Chancellor, but on the part of the others that intervened. He said that he felt that it is important that we support the Chancellor and the President in these circumstances.

Parliamentarian Elbow said that there is a standard in SACS that says that the Board is to be involved with policy matters but not with direct day-to-day operations of the university. In that sense, if they did what it was suggested that they did, the Board members were out of line and technically would be in violation of SACS standards.

Senator Roberts said that Auburn University is already on probation as a result of their Board of Regents micromanaging the university. Parliamentarian Elbow said that on Tuesday he downloaded a lot of material on Auburn University. They did indeed get put on probation and are in danger of losing their accreditation. However, it was something that had gone on for a long period of time and it was egregious way beyond what our Regents seem to have done, not to belittle what they have done, that he was just putting it in context. It included some financial manipulations. So while there are some parallels with the Auburn situation, they are a little but further down the road, but it is the same kind of thing.

Senator Watts asked how much time will pass before we are actually reviewed by SACS. Parliamentarian Elbow said that it would be in spring of 2005, a year from now. The certification will take place next fall.

President Reed asked Senator Marx if he was thinking of a resolution to address both of them at the same time or two separate resolutions. Senator Marx said that he had in mind a single resolution and that he had included President Whitmore to make sure that there was no suggestion that we were criticizing him. President Reed said that she would draft a resolution and run it by the Senate for the wording. Senator Marx said that he would hate to ask the Senate to vote on something in which the wording is not clear. We could use very simple wording: the Faculty Senate expresses its support for Chancellor Smith and President Whitmore. President Reed asked if that was all. Senator Marx replied that it was that it is unusual. President Reed asked if it was one sentence. Senator Marx said that it was. President Reed asked if Senator Marx wanted to exclude that they are in charge of the internal destiny whereas the Regents are in charge of the external destiny. Senator Marx said that he did not think an explicit challenge to the Regents was warranted in that we do not know what they have done. President Reed called for a vote to have her draft a one-sentence resolution. The motion passed with one opposed and one abstention. President Reed asked if there was any other new business.

Senator Nathan moved that the Senate pass a resolution censuring Bob Knight for his recent public behavior, including his recent behavior in a television interview. Senator Watts seconded the motion. President Reed asked if there was any discussion.

Senator Roberts said that we do not know enough about it to censure anyone. We know what we read in the newspaper, which contains conflicting accounts. President Reed asked that if the Senate did that, would the Senate want it sent to him or to the University Daily.

Senator Nathan said that he just wanted the Senate to resolve to express a censure of Coach Knight for his recent behavior. He said that he realized that it is hard to assess the evidence that is available but that there is a lot of evidence out there. It was reported both in a memo that was released under the Freedom of Information Act by Chancellor Smith and in an interview on television by Coach Knight. There is also the additional evidence of the interview laced with profanities on ESPN, which was a poor representation of the university. It has damaged our reputation as an academic institution, and it is the Faculty Senate's role to stand up and say something about it.

Senator Marx said that the part that is definitely on the public record and is irrefutable is the interview, but that he had not seen it. Senator Nathan said that it is available on the New York Times web site. Vice-President Shriver said that if you were to take the bleeped parts out, there is not a whole lot left of his comments. If you were to make those kinds of comments in class, you would be in a lot of trouble.

Senator Soonpaa said that unless each Senator has reviewed the evidence it would be inappropriate to censure anyone related to the university. Senator Duemer said that he agreed that we do not have enough information to censure anyone. If it had been any other basketball coach that had gotten into a shouting contest with the Chancellor, it probably would not have made the news. He said that it seemed absurd to him; do we not have anything better to do with our time than talk about a shouting match between the Chancellor and a basketball coach? Senator Johnson said that he thought that the Senate had better things to do and that there is more than one side to the story. Senator Marx asked if anyone of us got into a public shouting match with the Chancellor, would we come away with a reprimand? President Reed said that she was quoted in the New York Times as saying, "I think not." Senator Watts said that it baffled her to think that we have better things to talk about when the reputation of the university is at stake. She said it makes her angry that the world is watching us over a confrontation between a coach who has a foul mouth and the leader of our university. This regards our reputation and the work that we do here. She said that the impression that she was left with is that the coach is running the university, which should not be true.

Senator Dolter said that as a student at Indiana University, he had been on the receiving end of one of Coach Knight's tirades. He has problems with anger management; we all know that. He is being censured in many other courts of public opinion, not the least of which is the media. He said that he did not know whether he agreed that our reputation is really on the line. Texas Tech is renowned in many areas. The Thomas Butler affair has drawn attention to us as well. Each of us has our own area of expertise, and we should be proud of what we have accomplished. He said that he supported Dr. Marx and that directness has a certain amount of creativity to it. If we decide to go ahead and censure Coach Knight, what are we inviting? The basketball program since Coach Knight has taken over is now clearing a two million dollar profit. We are not dipping into academic funds to pay for the athletic program anymore. Certainly he is partly responsible for that. What would a public censure of Coach Knight accomplish for us? He said he wondered if we were not accomplishing the same thing in a vague way, but in fact a rather direct way, by supporting the Chancellor.

President Reed said that the Parliamentarian had just reminded her to remind the Senate that if we proceed with a vote to censure Mr. Knight and do not approve it, the UD will say tomorrow that the Faculty Senate refused to censure the coach.

Senator Held asked if motions from the floor are not required to go to committee unless there is a vote of two-thirds to actually have the vote at that meeting. Parliamentarian Elbow said that this was the case for action items.

Senator Jackson asked if there could be a delay on this matter. Rather than make a spot decision, he would like to talk to people in his department. Senator Nathan said that it could be reintroduced next month after people have a chance to consider it.

Senator Spallholz said that he did not see the episode on television so that he does not feel that he would like to censure Coach Knight without at least seeing it. Could we not have a transcript provided of what was said? That would be useful. In regard to the events that took place at Market Street, he said that he did not know exactly what happened there either other than what he had heard. Until we know exactly what happened it would be unfortunate for us to censure Coach Knight. According to the paper, he was actually commended for his ability to control his outburst. He said he did not feel that he could vote for censure at this point.

President Reed said that if Senator Nathan will withdraw his motion and Senator Watts withdraw her second, the Senate can bypass this issue for the moment. Senator Nathan said that if there are really some deep doubts about what went on at Market Street, then he did not understand why we passed the previous motion. You have to at some level believe that the Chancellor's position in that situation was the correct position in order to issue a statement of support for him.

Senator Johnson said that he thought the previous motion was because the Board of Regents had been improperly involved in the situation and that it had nothing to do with what happened at Market Street. We do not know what happened at Market Street, and there are conflicting descriptions of what happened.

Senator Marx said that he would like to suggest that the Secretary distribute the transcript of the ESPN interview with the next minutes. President Reed said that she had a web site regarding that because they have been getting a lot of email in the Senate. Senator Marx said that this will provide information in case the issue comes up again, rather than hearsay.

Senator Reifman said that he would like to suggest as two more pieces of reading, the Chancellor's memo which gives his side, and Coach Knight's press conference after the Monday evening basketball game against Baylor in which he addresses it, so the packet could include the transcript of the ESPN interview and the statements of each of the two principals involved in the Market Street incident. He volunteered to find something on the web if necessary. President Reed said that the Chancellor's memo is in the UD, but she thought they also quoted a good bit of what Mr. Knight said in the television interview.

Senator Dolter said that he hoped that the Senate reviews all the information, and that whatever it decides to do is in the best interest of Texas Tech University. It is in the best interest of Texas Tech to always support the Chancellor and the President and the Provost and our administrators. If there is an issue that we need to contend with then absolutely, let us contend with it. But let us make sure that what we do here will contribute to the overall welfare of our students and us. President Reed said that she personally appreciated his comments. There was a write up about some comments that she made in the Dallas Morning News, which generated some vitriolic emails from sports fans, in which she supported the Chancellor and did not say anything negative about Mr. Knight. Her support of the Chancellor angered sports fans.

Senator Held said that from past experience he would caution his colleagues that what was deliberated today will be presented in the UD in some form. It will then be read by television stations and other media outlets in the city and we may well expect TV cameras at our next meeting. He cautioned the Senate against pouring fuel on the fire. He said that although he was the last person to speak against activism in support of ideals that we all aspire to, he has learned over the years to pick battles. What we will be doing if we reinstitute this motion is to reignite the problem that has faded. He said that he questioned whether it was worth it to pile on in a fight, because we will then become fighters. In a way, it seems to contradict the philosophical underpinnings of the motion itself, because as faculty what we want to emphasize is circumspect deliberation and peaceful discourse. If we discuss the motion at the next meeting in any form, we will already have committed ourselves to a path that deviates from that goal. He said that he would urge the Senate to leave the motion on the floor, let it be voted on up or down, and be done with it.

Senator Spallholz said that he did not know all of the circumstances of the events that have taken place, but it seemed that it would be too bad in the spirit of fair play to censure Coach Knight, without giving him the opportunity to come and address the Senate. He said that he did not think that the Senate should censure anyone, keeping in mind free speech means whether you like it or not, unless that person would be given a chance especially with a person like Coach Knight who has a very high national visibility. He said that he thought we would ignite things even further if we were to censure him without having all the facts and letting some of the things that he might like to express be said here in this forum.

Senator Marx said that he believed that it was a good point and that he would like to focus, if we focus on this issue at all, on the one place where he has spoken and has not been disputed, that is, on an interview that he himself gave. With regard to the Saladgate incident, it would be prudent, if you have to decide what is going on, to listen to both sides and that would create a kind of circus.

Senator Dunham said that she thought that we get into dangerous territory when we start dealing with personality issues and personnel issues. Our focus should be more on process. That is why Senator Marx's resolution should be sufficient, that we support the process as initiated by the Chancellor and the President and that we are behind them rather than getting into he said, she said.

Senator Spallholz said that he thought that was the essence of the resolution that we had made earlier, in support of the Chancellor and in support of the President. He said that he thought it was wrong to censure somebody without having witnessed the incident. We should not censure the gentleman without giving him the chance to come to this forum and speak for himself, and maybe he would like to apologize. Maybe he will do so publicly anyway.

President Reed asked Senator Nathan if he still stood by his resolution. He said he would like to ask the person that seconded if she would like to withdraw. Senator Watts said she was willing to withdraw her second. Senator Nathan said he was willing to withdraw his motion.

**VII. Announcements.** President Reed said that the motion was gone but that she thought that the Senate had had a very good discussion about this situation. President Reed asked if there were any other announcements or comments.

Senator Held asked if there was an intention to reintroduce the motion. Senator Nathan said that he had not decided.

Vice-Provost Brink reminded the Senate that the President is being inaugurated on Saturday, Feb. 28, at 10:30 am and that they would like to have everyone gather in academic regalia at 9:30 am in the courtyard of the Student Union Building. The ceremony begins at 10:30 and should last no more than an hour. Vice-Provost Brink asked the Senators to pass the word along to their colleagues. There is also a reception the night before at the Texas Tech University Museum and everyone is invited and no academic attire is required. Senator Shriver said that actions speak louder than words and that if we want to show support for the President this is a visible way to do it. Senator Reifman asked about the banner bearers and banners and the protocol. Vice-Provost Brink said that they would take care of it and that they would have a dress rehearsal for the principal people.

**VIII. Adjournment.** President Reed asked whether there was any other business to be brought before the Senate. In the absence of any, she declared the meeting adjourned at 4:22 pm.