

**Texas Tech University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Meeting #235  
Sept. 10, 2003**

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

**I. Call to Order.** President Nancy Reed announced the Call to Order at 3:18 pm.

**II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance.** President Reed extended greetings from President Whitmore who could not attend, but will be the featured speaker in October. She recognized Dr. Donald Dyal, Dean of Libraries at Texas Tech as guest speaker. She called attention to the requirement that senators need to initial the sign-in sheet. If you are unable to attend, you need to call the Faculty Senate Office and let them know why. All senators should have received a form on which they indicate their schedule of classes. This information will be used to assign initial meeting times for Senate Subcommittees and Study Committees. Committee assignments are still being made. The Faculty Senate has liaisons to several university councils and committees. Four assignments still need to be made, including Enrollment Management Council, Affirmative Action, Recruitment, Admissions, and Retention, and the Sexual Harassment Committee. The other positions have been assigned.

**III. Recognition of Newly Elected Senators.** President Reed recognized new and re-elected Senators Johnson, Nathan, Schaller, Troyansky, Jackson, Maston, Sinzinger, Garner, Gelber, Meek, Ellis and Marbley.

**IV. Approval of Minutes for Meeting #234.** President Reed asked if there were any objections to approving the minutes. Senator Held suggested that on page 3, second paragraph, the word "meet" should be changed to "met." In the subsequent sentence, it should read "make us aware..." Senator Held complimented the Secretary from last year on his efforts. Senator Marks asked if recognition of the Provost and Vice-Provosts was appropriate. President Reed said that they could be recognized, but assumed that everyone would recognize them. President Reed then introduced them. Senator Soonpaa asked that on page 1, paragraph 2, the word "quests" be changed to "guests." The minutes were then approved.

**V. Invited Guests.** President Reed introduced Dr. Donald Dyal, Dean of Libraries. Dyal began by talking about the state of the Libraries. He noted changes that have taken place at the library during the nearly two years that he has served as Dean. In 1996 the library

was ranked 80<sup>th</sup> among 102 ARL libraries and is now ranked at 57. This is a significant change in the last seven years, and is the result of tremendous effort. Tech is now the third largest state library and has recently been able to hire some excellent new employees. For the first time in many years the library is nearly fully staffed. The strengths of the library are evident in graduating student surveys conducted and in Servqual surveys. However, the libraries also face some strains. One of these is a cultural change and has to do with the way libraries conduct their business. Many books and journals are still purchased from vendors via traditional means. Increasingly, negotiating contracts for electronic products is becoming a lengthy and difficult process because the area of digital rights and copyright management has suffered from fogginess over the last 20 years. TTU Libraries now has a full-time person who negotiates with vendors and this is a significant change not only for our libraries but for major university libraries around the country. Teaching faculty have been insulated from the effects of these negotiations but could play a larger role in their professional organizations regarding how these negotiations take place. Professional organizations to which faculty belong have editorial boards and business entities who are responsible for purveying the research and publications of that organization. Many of these organizations have created discriminatory pricing models for libraries that permit a wide discrepancy between individual and institutional subscriptions. An individual may pay one price but the library may have to pay ten times or 100 times the price for the same journal. A related issue has to do with the very nature of scholarly communication not just in this country but internationally. Frequently research is done with federal dollars or tax-based dollars producing a result. The research is then written in reports that are sent to commercial vendors. There has been consolidation among publishers so that 60 percent of publications in the sciences are published by one vendor. The vendor holds a lock down on many scientific publications. Research conducted at universities that is supported by tax dollars is converted into products by vendors and then sold back to public libraries who then pay for it again at an increased rate, many titles costing in excess of \$10,000 per year. Many libraries operate on a tight budget without a lot of spare revenue. Even though the library has a large budget, most of the money is tied up in orders, subscriptions, and vendor contracts. If fiscal problems arise, such as an inflationary spike, libraries find it difficult to react because of pre-existing contractual obligations that limit their flexibility. Fortunately, with the new financial model the library is using, funding the library with student use fees, as the university grows so will the budget of the library. Unfortunately, since 1986 the inflation rate for serials is close to 300 percent. With an annual inflation rate of 10 percent it means that the library's budget will rapidly be exhausted. Every 8 to 10 years the library would need a 100 percent increase to break even. The other threat is that the university will cease to grow, the library's budget will be flat, and inflation will erode the budget. How is it that a vendor like Elsevier was able to garner 60 percent of science journals in the U.S.? They were able to do it because we let them. In the late sixties, university presses across the country were offloading their academic journals because it was too expensive to keep publishing them. Vendors bought them who are interested solely in business and that is where the discriminatory model was developed. This has created a situation that it is a unique resource and that if you want the information there is only one place to go. This sounds like a monopoly and in fact it is an international monopoly. There are solutions on the horizon to break the lock

grip of scholarly communication. MIT has created D-Space in which the entire university has gotten together, led by the distinguished faculty, and decided that rather than perpetuate the monopolistic practices of some vendors they would publish their intellectual content in peer reviewed fashion in an online environment and make it available to the world at large. Usage in these online journals has increased 89 percent over what was happening with print. You can manipulate data online in ways that you could never do with paper. This has occurred largely in the sciences. Arts and Humanities have been left at the gate. There is a squeeze play going on with libraries. Demand for books and journals is not diminishing, yet demand for electronic access is increasing sharply, so we have a dilemma. We cannot offload one medium to obtain another, so the cost of everything is rising. It is as much the faculty's problem as the library's because it affects all of scholarly communication. Dean Dyal said that he is optimistic about the future. He recently attended a meeting of the American Physical Society and was impressed. They make their publications available to all at a reasonable rate. Everything is digitized from 1898 to the present and is available for one fee. This is in contrast to many vendors that require libraries to negotiate the number of simultaneous users and define what is a user geographically. This has serious implications for the kind of services we can export to off-site campus locations. Distance education can be severely affected by those kinds of contracts. The community wants access even though they are not affiliated with Tech but they cannot have it because of contractual restrictions. Contracts have replaced copyright as what governs information. This had been done deliberately by a group of lawyers and business people. As long as you are a member of the university you are alright, but once you are no longer affiliated you no longer have access. The control of information by vendors is ominous. It is not just a financial monopoly but also an issue of control, of who has access to the research that was done with public money, paid for with public money and then sold to libraries with public money and is suddenly no longer public but proprietary. Dyal then asked for questions from the audience.

**Senator Held** said that there is a similar problem in the pharmaceutical industry. It is not unique to the library situation. We are a society in which business is promoted actively by our government, so it is not possible to undermine the roots of the problem. Dean Dyal said that there is a growing national movement to create alternative means of publication. Promotion and tenure reviews have to be consonant with what you develop. What happens if you publish online? The editorial costs stay the same; the only cost that is reduced is the cost of paper. Publishing online is not free, but you can save a lot of money. The access issue is just as important. An open access initiative is spreading in certain scientific societies where they in fact demand that everyone has access to this information. When authors publish a book they sign away all their rights, including electronic rights. This is another instance of research being controlled by vendors. Scholars have begun to ask, if this is research generated with public money, why should not the public be allowed to access it? **Senator Held** asked, what was the consequence of the all browbeating that libraries have been doing over serials inflation? What ideas have been put on the table to solve that short-term problem? Dyal said that there has been a change in the way the library is funded. Over the last 10 years the serials budget was taken out of the book budget, which tended to have a negative effect on humanities

fields like History and English. With the new funding system, the library budget expands as a result of increasing Higher Education Assistance Fund money and growth in the number of courses taught. However, there is a limit to how much the library can increase library use fees, and Dyal expressed concern that this may not be a sustainable financial model over a period of years. If state support of higher education wavers, it may have profound economic implications for the state. The university has an important economic impact on the community and there may be broader social implications as well because it affects the children of Texas and the skills that they will be equipped with to meet the future.

**Senator Gray** asked if there was a possibility that money going into electronic resources will be wasted 30 years from now. Dyal said that the issue is technological. Nobody wants to spend a lot of time reading online. Most users will print out lengthy documents rather than read them on the computer. The problem is how does one maintain a foothold in both paper and electronic sources?

**Senator Watts** asked if library use fees can be used any way the library wants. Dyal said that there are no restrictions. There are restriction on HEAF money, which can only be used for materials and not salaries. Senator Watts then asked how the libraries allocate their use fees. Dyal said that most HEAF money goes into acquisitions. The rest of the budget comes from library use fees for which there are no restrictions. **Senator Spallholz** asked if there was any collusion to not duplicate journal holdings throughout the state. Dean Dyal said that the libraries belong to numerous consortia for that very reason. Absent in the organization is good use data. Who uses journal X and why? Sometimes there is not a clear correlation between what a person teaches and the journals that the person is using. For example, there is a math professor who wants to use jazz journals rather than math. How are the libraries resource being used and are we spending our money in the wisest possible way? The libraries are currently in the process of gathering more data on usage so that use can be tracked more closely.

**Senator Held** requested that if there are further cancellations in serials subscriptions, that the Dean dovetail the decision-making process with the faculty at a grassroots level as early as possible, so that the faculty feel that they are participants and not shut out, which has been a problem in the past. The Dean pledged that he would do that and ensure that the faculty are some of the decision makers. One of the reasons the library wants to gather data is to review-not necessarily cut-but to review what is occurring with serials. If a journal is being used, we need it. If a journal is being requested frequently through interlibrary loan, why do we not own it? Once a certain number of interlibrary loan requests are exceeded, the library has to pay the publisher, so we might as well subscribe.

**Senator Marks** asked the Dean what stand he thought the faculty should take on some of the larger issues concerning the crisis in scholarly communication. The Dean suggested that there should be a larger dialogue on campus regarding these issues. Faculty are so preoccupied with teaching and research that these issues are not foremost in mind. The faculty could hold a forum to discuss alternative models of scholarly communication. Experts from the scholarly community could be invited to talk about what is possible,

what options exist, and what is currently being done. This could be done relatively inexpensively and might go a long way toward improving the quality of discourse about these issues. **Senator Dunham** mentioned that the faculty had received an email saying that there was a moratorium on library acquisitions and asked if that was still in place. The Dean said that it was no longer in effect.

**VI. Old Business.** President Reed introduced Gary Elbow, Faculty Senate Parliamentarian, who discussed the SACS review. We are currently in the process of undergoing a reaffirmation. Tech underwent reaccreditation ten years ago. SACS has decided that accreditation is continuing and so every ten years Tech reaffirms its accreditation, so we are not reaccredited in a technical sense. Two years ago, SACS passed a resolution to totally revise the process of reaffirmation. In 1994, Tech had a whole series of committees that worked long and hard to produce a lengthy reaccreditation self-study document that included approximately 465 “must” statements that said that the university has accomplished or is doing certain things. The new process involves 67 standards that the university has to meet. These fall into three categories: core requirements which are requirements the university absolutely has to do in order to be reaffirmed, and there are an additional 50 standards that we are supposed to meet. With these it is possible to be out of compliance as long as you indicate how you are going to come into compliance. There are eight federal mandates that we have to comply with for the Department of Education in order to qualify for things like the Student Loan Program. We have to create a report of certification compliance indicating that we are complying with these requirements and standards. There is a committee working on this and most Senators have received a notice that information is needed about your credentials so that we can put them into this report. Some Senators may be serving on the committee that is being chaired by Peter Westfall of the College of Business. Most of the report will be electronic and available on the Web. As it is developed, large parts of it will be accessible to members of the Senate and eventually it will be available to the people from SACS who will be conducting the review. It is a pro-forma situation and the input that we as faculty members will have into it will not be very great. The other report that we have to do is called the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Creating the QEP is one of the core requirements. This must be laid out by the time the committee appears on campus for reaffirmation in the spring of 2005. The QEP committee is chaired by Sue Couch of Human Sciences and is comprised of representatives from each of the colleges on campus. It is a much smaller committee than the aforementioned committee. Tech has made a conscious decision to use a “bottom up” rather than “top down” approach to its Quality Enhancement Plan. Faculty, staff, students, alumni and other stakeholders will be asked for input rather than having the administration decide. The Quality Enhancement Plan has to establish learning outcomes for our students. It has to be focused on outcomes that are measurable and fit in with the institutional culture and background. Sue and her committee have identified some possibilities. There is no preconceived idea about what the Quality Enhancement Plan should be. When you receive the questionnaire do not assume that it is just pro forma. We really do want your input and that of your colleagues. It will be a simple questionnaire that will give you some options that include some things that we have identified. If you do not like any of the options or you think you have identified something else put it down and indicate what it is. We want this to be an open process. We have created a Web site. If you go onto the

the Texas Tech home page (<http://www.ttu.edu>) you will notice a link in the lower left-hand corner that says "SACS Reaffirmation." If you click on it that will take you into the SACS Web site. The questionnaire will be posted on the Web site and you will have a week or more to respond. The faculty should understand that this is not an election process and is not based on the maximum number of votes. It is advisory and there may be other factors that come into play that make the committee decide that the number one choice happens not to be the most appropriate choice. If that happens, we will provide explanations for it so that you understand why we chose what we did. Elbow asked the audience if they had any questions or if Vice-Provost Brink or Provost Marcy had any comments to add.

Vice Provost Brink suggested that Elbow give the Senate the timetable indicating when the reports are due. Elbow said the Certification of Compliance is due August 31, 2004. We are asking that the reports be submitted by this January so they can be reviewed and revised as necessary. The Quality Enhancement Plan has to be submitted by February 15 of 2005. **Senator Held** asked if there was anything in the echelons of criteria for core requirements that pertains to our increasing student/faculty ratios that would be cause for concern. Elbow said that there is a requirement that the university have adequate faculty to meet the needs of our programs. We have to certify that we have adequate faculty so if there are programs that do not have adequate faculty and we can demonstrate that then we have to come up with a way of complying. This generally involves coming up with a plan to get more faculty or have faculty teach more classes. It is complicated, but there is a way to do it. **Senator Held** asked, in a worst case scenario, can they decertify a program or take away accreditation? Elbow said that they can take away the accreditation of the university but not the accreditation of the program. Accredited programs are accredited by the professional accrediting organizations. SACS does not override professional accrediting organizations.

President Reed introduced Vice President Shriver, who provided an update on the status of OP 60.15. This is the smoking policy which the Senate discussed at the end of last year. A decision was made this summer on the policy by Interim President Haragan, so no further input from the Senate is needed. The two major issues that the Senate debated are: 1) should tobacco products be sold in the Student Union building? and 2) should smoking be allowed on the east concourse of the United Spirit Arena? Number 1 of the policy says that, in the interest of providing a smoke-free environment, smoking or use of smokeless tobacco is prohibited in all campus, academic, administrative, auxiliary, and athletic facilities, which then called for item number 4 to be deleted in total, which used to read, in the case of athletics, the prohibition applies to both indoor and outdoor facilities, however smoking is allowed on the east concourses only of the United Spirit Arena and under the stands in Jones Stadium, Dan Law Field, and the R.P. Bob Fuller Track. Because of item number 1, item number 4 has been struck in total so there is no smoking allowed on the east concourse of the United Spirit Arena. Item number 6 says sale of tobacco products will be limited to the Student Union building, which means that tobacco products will be allowed to be sold in the Student Union building. The key part that was eliminated were the words "convenience store," therefore according to item number 6, sale of tobacco products is allowed in the Student Union building and it is not

necessarily designated a single area where that is allowed. This opens up the possibility that numerous vending sites if they exist in that building could sell tobacco products. It is not specifically limited to a single store. It is not clear at this time whether products will be sold in one place, two places or more.

**Senator Held** asked if the change would affect the revenue that goes to SGA. Vice President Shriver replied that the policy does not say anything about it. Since the sales are going to be maintained in the Student Union building, SGA may get increased revenues since it is now sold in multiple places. Held then asked if it does not seem to be counterproductive if the intention of this whole oversight review was to limit the amount of smoking on campus, to essentially now give free reign to the proliferation of vending machines. Shriver said that he was wondering the same thing. Even though it does not directly address it, the OP does not eliminate the possibility that vending machines for cigarettes could be put in some places in the Student Union building, unless there is another OP that specifically says that those types of vending machines are prohibited from campus entirely. Shriver said he was not able to find an OP that addresses this. Parliamentarian Elbow said that there is another possibility that this raises and that is if Barnes and Noble starts to sell cigarettes, in which case the money does not come back to the students but goes to Barnes and Noble, so we may have opened Pandora's Box here.

President Reed made an additional comment regarding the SACS Reaffirmation process, noting that Senator Charlotte Dunham is the Faculty Senate representative to the Certification of Compliance Committee. Any related issues should be taken up with Senator Dunham.

President Reed asked if there was any other old business. **Senator Meek** asked if there was a report from Dr. Elbow's committee concerning OP 30.15? President Reed said that the Senate has not gotten a response back but would look into it. **Senator Kvashny** said that in December of last year he moved that the Senate Welfare Committee look into the subject of drastically reducing fees for faculty, staff and their families enrolled in courses at Texas Tech. It seems to have fallen through the cracks and he would like to see it move ahead. **Senator Troyansky** said that there was a report or a series of recommendations made by the Faculty Senate Welfare and Benefits Committee the year before last when Marc Giaccardo was President that was supposed to have gone to the President's office and no one can remember if there was a response from the President's office. President Reed said she would look into it. **Senator Marks** said that during the summer the Senate received a copy of a proposed free speech statement. One sentence in particular designates some areas where free speech can be practiced and says that any free speech activities proposed for any other area of campus can only take place with prior approval of the Office of Campus Life. **Senator Marks** said that he believed that he had detected some free speech occurring within the Senate and wanted to know if the Senate had prior permission. President Reed responded by saying that Senator Floyd, though not present in today's meeting, is from the Law School, and he indicated in a recent letter in the University Daily that it would be alright to have free speech any place on campus. **Senator Marks** said that this is not what was suggested by the policy. President Reed said that we will go with what our legal representative, Senator Floyd,

suggested. **Senator Marks** suggested that the faculty consider communicating with the Office of Campus Life that the sentence should be altered, and that it might be worth considering the whole question of whether free speech should be limited at a university. President Reed said that the Senate would look into that.

**VII. New Business.** President Reed asked Provost Marcy to provide the Senate with an update on the searches for the deans. The Dean of Engineering search committee has completed interviews with two candidates. One is Kirk Schulz, Chair of Chemical Engineering at Mississippi State and the other is Pamela Eibeck who is Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies at Northern Arizona University. There is a third candidate, Anjan Bose, who is Dean of Engineering and Architecture at Washington State and who specializes in power distribution engineering. He has been preoccupied during the last several weeks with the blackout that occurred in the Northeast, but they are hoping to interview him as early as this Friday. When that interview is complete they will make proposals to the President and the Board of Regents about negotiating with one of the candidates. The only other ongoing search is the Dean of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources. They are in the early stages of negotiating with a dean to chair that search.

**VIII. Announcements.** President Reed mentioned that a question has been brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate as to why the Senate is not meeting in the Student Union building. She said the answer is because they will not let us. They will not book the Senate Room. **Senator Held** said that the reason the Senate was told last year that the room was unavailable was because of the renovation, not because the room is unavailable for booking. He wanted to know if the situation had changed. Patty Gisch, Faculty Senate Office Coordinator, said that she had been in contact with Tom Shubert, Managing Director of the Student Union and they will not schedule us or anyone. **Senator Held** asked for further clarification on why they will not. President Reed said that she would obtain an answer from Shubert, which might require a personal visit. President Reed asked if there were any other announcements. President Reed reminded the Senate that University President Whitmore would attend the Senate meeting in October.

**IX. Adjournment.** President Reed adjourned the meeting at 4:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted  
Brian Quinn  
Secretary, Faculty Senate