

**Texas Tech University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Meeting # 243  
May 12, 2004**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, May 12, 2004 in the Escondido Theatre in the Student Union building with President Nancy Reed presiding. Senators present were: Kvashny, Johnson, Wilde, Buelinckx, Byerly, Harter, Held, Kuriyama, Nathan, Roberts, Schaller, Troyansky, Watts, Dukes, Sherif, Duemer, Johnson, Jackson, Masten, Sinzinger, Reifman, Russ, Shriver, Camp, Marshall, Quinn, Dolter, Garner, Gelber, Meek, Curry, Hoo, Marbley, Marks and Soonpaa. Guest include: Bruce Sarjeant, Masha Rahnamamoghadam, James H. Smith, Linda Donahue, Marc Giaccardo, Charley Myles, Michael Smucker, Melanie Hart, John Miller, Brent Cejda, Chance Brooks, David Doerfert, Elizabeth Louden, Todd Chambers, Gad Perry, Lynn Whitfield, Chris Letchford, Audra Morse, Clifford Fedler, Susan Hendrick, James Carr, Gopal Lakhani, Don Lucas, Arturo Olivarez and University President Jon Whitmore.

**I. Call to Order.** President Reed called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm.

**II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance.** President Reed recognized several guests: Provost William Marcy, Vice-Provosts Jim Brink and Liz Hall, President Jon Whitmore, and the incoming Senators for next year.

**III. Approval of Minutes.** President Reed asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting. Senator Reifman said that on page 3, line 10, the question mark should be changed to a period. On page 6, paragraph 5, line 4, the word “be” should be inserted in between the word “to” and the word “able.” Senator Troyansky said that on the next to last page, paragraph 3, line 8, the word “peculiar” should be changed to “particular.” President Reed asked if there were any other emendations to the minutes. Hearing none, she said that the minutes were approved as emended.

**IV. Invited Guest.** President Reed introduced Texas Tech University President Dr. Jon Whitmore, who provided a summary of the year. He said it has been his pleasure to serve as the fourteenth President of Texas Tech for the last eight and one half months. He said it has been a real learning experience and continues to be. President Whitmore said that he wanted to brief the Senate on the budget, primarily for next year. He said he would be taking the budget to the Board of Regents on Thursday and Friday, which will be the operational budget that will start on September 1 and run for a twelve month period. In general, it is a positive budget, but only so because the students are paying more tuition. That is where any positive side to the budget has come from. In the '05 budget we will be offering funding for another three percent salary increase on top of the three percent one that was given in March. That is a total of six percent in merit-based salary increases in that six month period of time. It is unusual that one would get two raises in that short period of time, and we will be on a cycle of looking annually at the ability to give raises in the future. Because we have raised tuition for the spring semester and now have raised it again for the fall semester, we were able to carve out a significant number of dollars. The total of the faculty/staff merit program based on the new tuition increases amounts to 8.2 million dollars. It takes a lot of money to give a relatively modest raise to a fairly large number of people. He said he thought it was important to do that and would hopefully put us a little bit back on track in improving our salaries relative to other institutions. President Whitmore said that he read in the Chronicle that the average salary increase was 1.6 or 1.7 percent across the United States. Some institutions probably did as well or better than we did and others not so well. That is in a context of not having raises for some time. The biggest chunk of the new tuition dollars goes to merit raises for faculty and staff. The second biggest chunk goes to financial aid, and that is 6.25 million new dollars from tuition increases that are going back into financial aid, essentially for the students who can least likely pay that increase. A lot of that money is need-based; a smaller proportion is merit-based. We are also going to create 40 new faculty lines out of these new tuition dollars, with 3.6 million dollars in funding for those lines. A lot of those lines are funded at entry-level. There are some that are funded more at the Associate Professor level and a few that are funded at a more senior level. Most of those are likely to be matched up with new endowed chairs, which the deans are in the process of attempting to find donors for. In the fall, we should release 40 new faculty lines to be searched for. We have not released them yet. The money will not come in until the fall, and most of the new faculty will not join us until next

summer. He has asked the Provost to create a new 40 person hiring plan that will address several issues at the university that are part of our strategic initiatives and part of what he talked about at his inauguration. New faculty will be needed to deal with the surge in students in certain academic programs within the institution. We also have an agenda to raise our research profile, and some of these faculty lines will help us raise our sponsored project income because they will be faculty who will be teaching but will also be conducting research in the fields where it is appropriate to expect sponsored research to be forthcoming from those faculty. We are going to use almost \$900,000 for new instructional equipment across the campus from these tuition dollars, and the Provost has issued a call to deans to give him their priorities. Instructional equipment is classroom equipment of all kinds, not just scientific laboratory equipment. We probably have a need for 4 or 5 million dollars worth of new equipment for instruction, but we will at least be able to make a dent in that. We might be able to give an increase in funding beyond that amount. There is about \$870,000 in the budget for new staff members to help deal with the increase in the number of students. These will be primarily in the direct student services area, and within that, for some new advisors. That is how the money will be spent from the new tuition increases. One of the things that President Whitmore has learned from talking to faculty is that the university has not invested enough money in the research area. He commends people for having 56 million dollars worth of sponsored research at the institution without really the right infrastructure in some areas to support that. One of the areas of concern is start up money, and part of the new lines will go to faculty who need some laboratory or start up equipment in order to do the kind of research that is necessary. The institution has not really had a revenue stream set aside to do that, and so it has had trouble hiring particularly science and engineering faculty who need these start ups because they are getting offers elsewhere. So the President has set aside at least 2 million dollars for start up funds for faculty that are being hired right now and that will start in the fall, and then an ongoing set of dollars for new positions that will be released in the fall to be searched for and then come on board in '05. A lot of that money is coming from some of the unspent salary money because the money will be coming in for new faculty but it will take nine months to hire them, and we will be using those salary dollars for salaries for the new faculty. We have also had some other shortages in the research area. One is a desire by the people who are generating indirect costs to have more of that money returned to them by the institution so that they can continue to expand their research. Last year approximately \$700,000 was returned, and this year we plan to double that return. Vice-President Sweazy will be the one overseeing that process. We are going to put more money back into the research infrastructure through returning a higher amount of dollars from indirect costs back to those who have generated it. We also have developed a separate million dollar allocation for grant match. Often this is equipment support match; sometimes RA support. Prior to this, at least in recent years because of tight times, grant matches sort of had to come by cobbling together funds from deans or the research office. By putting a million dollars of grant match money into the research office, it will be more likely that we can support equipment for more applications for grants than we have been able to do in the past. Because we are providing some new dollars for this, some seed grant programs that used to exist and have been strapped because those monies have been used for grant matches and some other things will probably be able now to come back on line so that there will be some funding to help support people to jump start some new research efforts. Our short term plan is to hire 40 new faculty and in the longer term 100 new faculty. President Whitmore said that his feeling is that faculty at a research university like Texas Tech need to be doing research. Some of them will be doing research in the humanities or the arts or the social sciences where good library information is the key resource for the kind of research that they will be doing. There will be people hired who have more of an opportunity to apply to federal and state government in the sciences, engineering and in certain areas of agriculture, and in particular, where we believe we can grow the amount of research and the amount of research income in sponsored research that is done here at Texas Tech. For every new faculty member that we hire, we hope for them to have a teaching agenda and an active research agenda and also the public service that is expected of faculty. We are hoping that this will allow us to adjust some teaching loads because they have gotten too heavy with the growth in student population, not for everyone but certainly for those that have research programs that they need to be spending time on. These are some of the things that we are doing to try and bolster our research effort. President Whitmore said he believes that it is not unrealistic to think we can move from approximately 56 million dollars in research this year to 100 million or more within the conceivable future; not within two years but within four or five or six years. He said that he did not know if we could do that without new faculty coming on board. But with them coming on board, with some start up money, with some seed grant money, we should be able to do that. We also had a very successful grant writing workshop. We hired some folks that we had used at the University of Iowa; they

came in, and we had 100 people who attended that workshop. We will replicate that in the future so that we will have more faculty who can learn more about either writing grants for the first time or writing better grants for better opportunities for success in the future. Those are some of the things on the research front that we have moving forward, partly supported by elements in next year's budget. President Whitmore said that he would like to discuss a couple of other items before entertaining questions from the Senators. They are in the process of looking at some new buildings to help expand our academic space. One of them is the College of Business building that has been talked about for many years and is moving forward. The plan calls for a new building at this point. There had been discussions about remodeling the old one. If that happens, then they are beginning to look at the old building, which has a lot of teaching space in it, and bringing about some major renovations of that building for use across the campus by everyone. These are in the discussion stage as we do not have full funding for these activities, but they are something that we want to try and do in the future. The other issue that President Whitmore brought up in his inauguration that he thinks we need to be working on is working hard to diversify our faculty. The faculty really have the final say in who gets hired in many ways. They conduct the searches, they put the pool of finalists together, they interview them, and they make recommendations through their department head to the dean. President Whitmore said that he is asking the faculty, as we search for additional faculty, to work hard to bring in women candidates, to bring in underrepresented minority candidates, and to work hard to find qualified people in those pools. The institution will be stronger if we are more diverse. The President will work through the deans and the Provost on this. The President asked the Senate if there were any questions on these or other issues.

**Senator Roberts** said that the faculty will be getting a three percent pay increase in the fall and that 40 new faculty were being hired. Some organizational studies have shown that it is not just the absolute amount of pay but the relative amount of pay that is important. The pay for entry-level positions has to keep increasing in order to compete for faculty on a national level, and we end up hiring entry-level faculty at pay levels considerably higher than those of faculty who have been with the institution for a number of years. This throws the entire pay scale out of proportion. Having faculty with more experience and publications that are making less than new faculty can lead to morale problems and turnover problems. Periodically, the administration shakes loose a few dollars to address gross inequities, but obviously the amount of funds is limited. Would it be possible to have a more systematic way of handling these kinds of inequity issues?

President Whitmore said that is probably the toughest question in the world, and he thanked Senator Roberts for asking it. It is an issue that he faced at the University of Iowa and other institutions. It is not a new phenomenon. You need to hire additional people at whatever the market rate is, and in some cases that market rate in some disciplines has gone up faster than the ability of an institution to keep all of the people's pay at the highest possible level. President Whitmore said that is one of the reasons that he believes in merit-based pay increases, so that if there are particular people who are meritorious and they are behind where they need to be at least some adjustments can be made. In talking to the Provost, he believes that people are making some adjustments to some people. On the other hand, President Whitmore said that Senator Roberts is absolutely right that it is very difficult to find the dollars to give merit-based increases and simultaneously correct any inequities that may have been around for twenty years for a faculty member that may have been here for a long time. President Whitmore said that he does not have an easy answer but agreed that it is a problem. We have asked the deans to look at those issues when they are given a set of dollars for enhancement of salary. He said he did not think the dean is going to have enough in a given pool to meet some of the meritorious advances that need to be made and correct some of the basic inequities in salary. He said he thought that the only answer to that is a much larger pool. We had to take this one step at a time. We had enough money to do a three percent raise the first time around. The second time around we had enough money to do a three percent raise. If we had known maybe in one sitting that we had six percent all at one time, maybe we could have used a percentage of that to do basic adjustments rather than merit-based adjustments. President Whitmore said that certainly we can consider what Senator Roberts is suggesting in another round of raises, hopefully in the not too distant future, although he does not have money in place to give raises beyond the three percent. As you can see, just to raise people three percent is 8+ million dollars. Actually, that is six percent, putting the two together. President Whitmore asked if there were other questions.

**Senator Camp** said that the two three percent raises were coming six months apart. The first one had a fairly positive effect on morale; the second one is not having that same positive effect. He said he figured that it was basically for two reasons. The three percent pool of money for raises excludes faculty who have been promoted recently. That created a bit of unhappiness for two reasons. The first reason is that it seems to be a contradictory message for the university to say hey, you have done a great job; you have been so successful that we are going to promote you, and by the way, you are not eligible for this raise. The second issue is one of equity. **Senator Camp** said that his colleagues that may have been promoted last year would be eligible for this raise but his colleagues that were promoted this year are not. And colleagues who will be promoted next year are eligible for this raise. It is a timing issue that does not seem quite fair.

President Whitmore said that it is very complicated and that it has to do with state rules which are often less than ideal for running a university. **Provost Marcy** said that faculty who were promoted in the fall of 2003 were also not eligible to receive the lump-sum payment that came in March. So they were disadvantaged in the same way that faculty that were promoted in the fall of 2004 were disadvantaged. There was no change in treatment in that respect. The state statute says that we cannot give two pay raises within a six-month period. We tried to challenge that and could not. So we are bound by that. President Whitmore said that faculty that were given a raise for being promoted were not permitted to receive another raise in that six month period of time. **Provost Marcy** said that they would give two raises within a six month period if they could. President Whitmore said that they had asked an attorney's opinion because they wanted to do it. The General Counsel's office and the Attorney General's office said that the President would be violating state law if he did that.

**Senator Camp** said that the second source of unhappiness is related to the President's comments that if they had a six percent pool they might have been able to address the salary compression issue. The data set from which administrators make the decision on who is meritorious and who is not meritorious is a very limited data set. A six-month gap does not really change that. You are in essence being rewarded twice for the same work, or if you did not have the work there, you are being denied a merit raise twice because you are looking at the same fairly narrow period of time. This led to the idea among some colleagues of his that this three percent raise might go more towards the idea of adjusting salaries in a way that is not on the same basis as the three percent was in February.

**Provost Marcy** said that actually the merit evaluations were based on the previous year's performance. The second set of evaluations are based on another year's data, so that is consistent. **President Whitmore** said that there should have been two separate evaluation periods. It is awkward, President Whitmore noted, but then asked, would you then like me to withhold the additional three percent for a longer period of time and then give it?

**Senator Held** said that he wanted to follow up on that same question. He said that it was his understanding that there about 30 faculty across campus that are caught in this catch-22 situation. Let us assume that there is a two- or three thousand dollar raise at issue per person. So we are talking about roughly, \$100,000 of extra money that could, in theory, be allocated in September by giving those people a six percent raise and everybody else a three-percent raise. He said that philosophically, his question is this. The faculty read the AJ and the University Daily. When a coach comes to you, and asks for a salary increase, somehow money is found to do that, even if it is for a magnitude more than the \$100,000 we are talking about. So the morale issue here is not trivial, and given the three or four years of low raises or no raises that we have endured, it is exacerbated.

**Provost Marcy** said the faculty that are on the exception list will in fact get three percent and a three percent in September. That has already been rolled into their base. So they are not being cut off from a three percent raise. The only thing that they missed is the lump sum payment.

**President Whitmore** asked if Senator Held was suggesting that the administration find another \$100,000 so that we can adjust these people if we can work it into the cycle that the state allows. **Senator Held** said yes. **President Whitmore** said he would certainly consider that. If we are back on the cycle of giving raises once a year, we might be able to find a way to do that. It might be off by a month or two for those people, but there might be a way that we can do that. They must have a full six months before the next raise comes and that is where the problem comes in. **Provost Marcy** said that they would lose the three percent rolled

into their base if they did that. **President Whitmore** said that it is complicated and that there are a lot of state laws that have to be taken into account. He said they spent a lot of time talking to lawyers and brainstorming trying to get around this thing and that they have not found a way to do it yet.

**Senator Marshall** said that given that this problem plagues other state universities, has the President heard of any attempts to reconcile this problem? **President Whitmore** said that he did not think that most of them gave two raises within six months. If you know of any, let us know and we will contact them. What we have done is unusual. Provost Marcy said that the easy way out would be to not give the first raise, and just give a raise in September. That was discussed as an option and President Whitmore said no; I want to make this happen now. It did create some problems.

**Senator Camp** said that he was confused because the problem with the promoted faculty is not the lump sum in February it is the 5K or 4K or whatever the increase is in September which would be there regardless of whether the lump sum in February came in.

**Provost Marcy** said that if we had given a raise, that could only become effective in September. Then the promoted faculty would be on track and synchronized. They did not get the lump sum, but they are getting their base salary increased by whatever that recommendation was, plus whatever increase they will get from their promotion.

**Senator Camp** said that it sounded like two raises to him, but Provost Marcy is saying that it is okay under the state statute. **Provost Marcy** said their base rolled forward before this next raise comes in. **President Whitmore** said that it was complicated and that the simplest thing would have been to just wait until September and just give three percent, and if we get another three percent do that in September too. We decided we would rather get that money into the hands of the entire faculty, minus the twenty, that we could. **Provost Marcy** said that they also did not know whether they could give a raise in September because at that point in time the twenty dollar increase for student hours had not been there. **President Whitmore** said that if the Regents had said no, you cannot raise tuition again we could not have done it. In retrospect it is great to say you could have done it this way, but at the time you make the decision you do not know whether you are going to have that or not. What if we had not gotten the second three percent? Then you would have waited with the first three percent until September. **President Whitmore** said he thought we got more effect out of those dollars, although it has put some people in a very strange position.

**Senator-Elect Lucas** said that approximately five years ago it was reported in a Senate meeting that on one occasion the turnover of faculty that were not coming back due to changing jobs, retirement, all categories, was 25 percent. In ten years of serving on the faculty, he has often heard that faculty retention is something that the administration is very concerned about. Other than the specific faculty merit-raise issues that we have been discussing here, is there any other plan in place for addressing faculty retention, because he believes that faculty morale is exceptionally low.

President Whitmore said that hiring 100 new faculty might help. This will allow the workload to be shifted around a bit. He said that he hoped that people would see hiring new faculty as a positive thing. If not, let him know because that is the path we are marching down. The raises are intended to be a positive development, but if the Senate has other ideas, let him know. **President Whitmore** said that the other thing that is very important to him is keeping a strong library. Our library has advanced a number of steps to number 56 in the country, which is much more positive than the quality of the library was five or six years ago. Those kinds of resources being available for the faculty are some of the things that help them to want to stay in a given location. But there is no question that other universities pay more and we will have faculty raided from time to time. Of course, we are raiding faculty from time to time ourselves, so it works both ways.

**Senator-Elect Lucas** asked if there could be other items for consideration in a climate where the state is devaluing higher education. **President Whitmore** said he would challenge the Faculty Senate to work on that issue and come forward with some ideas. Hopefully some of these ideas would be cost-neutral, some might cost a small amount of money, and some might cost millions, and then we will see where we go with our budgets. President Whitmore said that if the Senate thinks that there are other things the administration

could do, or if they think the administration should spend the 8 million dollars differently, on different raises to faculty, those are all things the President would like to have a report about and to respond to.

**Senator-Elect Giaccardo** said that several years ago the Senate used to give reports to the President and the Chancellor regarding Tech salaries relative to the Big Twelve. This year he took a look at them relative to salaries and also to overall compensation. While salaries have remained at eighth or ninth place in the Big Twelve, in terms of compensation we are down at eleven. Certainly there are institutions in the Big Twelve that we cannot compete with in terms of salary, but the compensation levels are very interesting in terms of overall benefits because about three years ago the Faculty Senate went through an entire year-long exercise with a committee headed by our current President, Nancy Reed, to come up with a package of benefits for the faculty. **Senator-Elect Giaccardo** said that he is wondering where that went because the Faculty Senate has already done this research. If you go back and look at its history, you will see that the Faculty Senate has done a lot of reports on issues like day care that go back ten or twelve years. Would it be possible to unearth some of those well-researched and well-founded recommendations and move forward on them so that maybe we can move to the middle in terms of overall compensation, rather than being next to last?

**President Whitmore** said that if the Senate really wants any of these issues to leapfrog the administration's efforts to increase salaries, which is at the top of the President's list, and then what do you want to have as the priority?

**Senator Marks** said he would like to opine that a pay raise for faculty is a good idea.

**Senator Held** said that President Whitmore is very concerned about giving students the most bang for their buck, and students expect good teaching. With the President emphasizing the importance of research, will faculty that are focused on teaching be given short shrift?

**President Whitmore** said that if someone is doing a good job, regardless of whether it is research or teaching, they should be rewarded for that. He said that you will not hear from him, nor could you point to anything he has written, that would indicate that he would stop giving raises except for anyone doing sponsored research. He said that he comes from a field himself in which there is no sponsored research of any significance, so he would think that unfair because he is going to be a faculty member. **Senator Held** asked if the President could see how a chairperson might interpret it that way. President Whitmore said that he could, but that they would be wrong, and that he could not control how people interpret things. He can try to articulate things as clearly as possible. President Whitmore said that he thinks the Provost feels that way too but that it is really more his bailiwick than the President's. The chief academic officer is the one that ought to be monitoring and making sure that things get done fairly. President Reed said that there was time for one more question.

**Senator-Elect Letchford** asked, what input will the faculty have in selecting where the 40 new faculty that will be hired will go? President Whitmore said that the process that is in place now is that departments who want new faculty ought to decide what areas they ought to be in and faculty should talk to their department head and the department head will bring their suggestions forward to the dean, and the dean will bring them forward to the Provost. The Provost already has a big stack of things on his desk that people are asking for, and President Whitmore said that he suspected that for 40 lines they would get requests for a couple of hundred. The criteria that ought to be used is where is our growth in students occurring and where are some of the areas of research that we have strengths in? **President Whitmore** said that he has articulated that the areas of water and southwestern studies are two areas that we are already strong in and that we might want to advance some further faculty positions in those areas. That does not mean 40 positions in those areas. Then the Provost will put together a plan that will say here is what we are going to do with these 40 lines. The other thing we have to realize is that hopefully we will have forty more at some point in the future. If we can hire 40 more positions in a single year it should have a huge impact on the institution. That is not including the 40 that we hire every year due to turnover. **Provost Marcy** said that, actually, Tech hires 80 new faculty a year as a result of turnover, which is about 10 percent. President Whitmore said that this would be about 120 new faculty. **Provost Marcy** said that, actually, they will backfill about 30 positions as a result of summer sessions, so they are looking for 150 new faculty.

**President Whitmore** said that the new hires should make a big difference on campus, but that strategic decisions had to be made about which areas are strong and about where the demand is, and those should be guided by some of the elements of our strategic planning and thinking.

**President Whitmore** said that before he left, he had a bit of celebrating to do. He said that he had something that he wanted to give President Reed for her service as President of the Faculty Senate this year. It takes a lot of time to do that and she has been very successful and effective. **President Whitmore** said that he would stay around for the reception and would be happy to answer any other questions that the Senators may have.

**V. Old Business.** President Reed said that the Senate would proceed with the meeting according to the agenda. Under old business, she asked if there were any committee reports to be given at this time. Hearing none, she moved on to new business.

**VI. New Business. Senator Troyansky** said that we had already talked a bit about retention at this meeting, but once we lose people we have to replace them. One of the issues that has come up in his department with regard to this is that when new people are hired the state requires that there be a waiting period of 90 days to insure them. He said that he wondered whether the administration is doing something to lobby the state on this, or to find some way around it. Some colleges may have increased salaries a bit to provide a kind of bridge from whatever people were covered by before to what they are on now. They have been filling vacancies that quickly came open with one-year people rather than tenure track, and this means that they will be uninsured for one third of their nine-month contract.

**President Whitmore** said that his understanding is that this is a ruling passed by the legislature during the last session in order to try to balance the budget. He said he did not think it was a good way to save money but that it was seen as that. He said he will be making plans for the legislative agenda items over the summer and if this is something that the Senate wants them to explore, they will explore it. Usually once those things happen they are hard to reverse because they came into being because there is a huge savings. But that does not mean that we should not move forward with some argument to restore it. Even if it is gradual, we could do it a third at a time and two years from now we might have the problem solved. His personal feeling is that it is not a good ruling so it may be something we would like to look into.

**Provost Marcy** said that the administration went through a lot of calculations on that, with regard to faculty, graduate students, and part-time faculty. To have handled all the shortfalls would have cost approximately 3.5 million dollars per year. They were able to do something with graduate students that cost about 2 million dollars. The faculty part of that would be about a million dollars a year because of turnover. They cannot use state appropriated funds for it. They have to use what are called designated funds which come from student tuition. It is not clear that the administration has the authority to use student tuition to pay for the faculty shortfall. The administration also went to the state to see whether, if the university wanted to pay it would they let us pay it, and they have not gotten a ruling yet. There was an indication that even if they wanted to pay it they would not be allowed to pay it because that would undermine the liability of the state insurance fund by having these people come into the fund 90 days sooner than they were intended to because they would then be able to file for benefits. **Provost Marcy** said they ran into all kinds of technical problems but that they did look at that very hard to see if there was a way they could get around it. **President Whitmore** said that whether we like it or not, we have to remember that we are sort of employees of the state. While higher education is not normally operated by state bureaucratic institutions, somehow it comes under the same set of rules. **Provost Marcy** says that this ruling applies to all state agencies, not just higher education. **President Whitmore** said that even if the administration could find the money to pay for it, the issue is whether the state would even allow it. The issue may come up from other state employees not in higher education, and the administration will be looking for that. **President Reed** asked if there were any other new business. Hearing none, she moved on to announcements.

**VII. Announcements. Senator Held** said that in his opinion this was the most open-door; user-friendly administration that he has seen in the 18 years that he has been at Texas Tech. One exemplary example of that has been information. He asked President Whitmore to give us information about the current number of faculty so we have a benchmark to know when we hire 40 more. What the Senate has in this handout that

Senator Held distributed today, front and back, are two independent sources of information. One, that looks like a spreadsheet, is from institutional research, and the arrow at the bottom points to the total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty according to their database, which is 913. On the flip side, you have a fax from President Whitmore sent to Senator Held today clarifying the actual calculation that he is planning to use as a benchmark. President Whitmore said that the calculation is the Provost's and while it is complicated, he arrived at the same number, 913. **Senator Held** said that this was correct. Part of the function of the Faculty Senate is to be an oversight body. Part of our checks and balances function seems to be to ensure what the administration says is fact. This is a very important issue for faculty morale. He asked the Senators to file the numbers away so that a year from now we can get an update. President Reed asked if there were any other announcements. Hearing none, she said that she would like to welcome the new Senators. There are actually 36 new Senators, although a number of those are returning. President Reed thanked her officers for this year; Brian Quinn from the library, who served as recording Secretary and whose minutes were exceedingly detailed, and Vice-President Shriver, who patiently waited in the wings, serving only the time President Reed, was out of town. She also presented a certificate to Professor Elbow who has served as Parliamentarian.

**VIII. Passing of the Gavel.** President Reed asked incoming President Gene Wilde to come forward so that she could hand him the gavel. President Wilde said that they had also prepared some certificates of appreciation from the Faculty Senate to the outgoing officers. President Wilde said that the incoming Vice-President and Secretary have met a couple of times to talk about which things they would like to carry forward in the next year. They have been talking with people on the Senate and around campus and would really like to hear what is on the minds of Senators, over the summer if possible, so they can come in in September with a well-formulated agenda so that we can accomplish as much or more as this Senate has this year. President Wilde said that he looks forward to working with the Senate and that he wished everyone a good summer.

**IX. Adjournment.** President Wilde declared the meeting adjourned at 4:23 pm.