

**Texas Tech University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Meeting # 245
October 13, 2004**

The Faculty senate met on Wednesday, October 13, 2004 in the Escondido Theatre in the Student Union building with President Gene Wilde presiding. Senators present were: Brooks, Doerfert, Johnson, Carr, D'Amico, Drager, Dunham, Grass, Hart, Held, Howe, Jeter, Miller, Myles, Nathan, Rahnama, Schaller, Smucker, Toda, Troyansky, Wenthe, Hein, Sherif, Cejda, Duemer, Olivarez, Collins, Lakhani, Letchford, Sinzinger, Amor, Blum, Reifman, Kreidler, Whitfield, Chamber, Reeves, Watts, Garner Santa, Gelber, Lucas, Meek, Wilson, Donahue, Ellis, Marbley, Morse, and Spallholz. Senators excused were Masten, Perry, Spurrier, Jackson, Camp and Soonpaa. Senators unexcused were: Kahera, Louden, Jones, Mercer, Halsey, Gustafson, Bixby, Smith, Tacon and Tombs. Guests to this meeting include Provost William Marcy and Vice Provosts Liz Hall, Jim Brink, an UD reporter, and FS Parliamentarian Nancy Reed.

I. Call to Order. President Gene Wilde called Meeting #245 to order at 3:16 October 13, 2004 in the Escondido Room of the Student Union Building.

II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance. President Wilde recognized guests included: Dr. William Marcy, Provost; Dr. Liz Hall, Vice-Provost; Dr. Jim Brink, Vice-Provost; Dr. John Whitmore, University President; reporters from the University Daily;

III. Approval of Minutes. Motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by **Senator Doerfert**, seconded by **Senator Troyansky**, and passed.

IV. Invited Guest: President Whitmore, 14th President of Texas Tech University.

Thank you for having me here. I wanted to review just a couple of things about the opening of this whole semester, and then spend some time talking about our legislative session which I consider to be probably the single most important agenda item for the university at large for the coming year.

First of all, our enrollment is basically even; it's down about a hundred and some which is less than half of one per cent of our total enrollment, but the SAT scores went up three points again this year. So one of our goals is to improve the quality of the institution including students that we have here and I believe that our people are continuing to do that. Probably the most important thing connected to the faculty is hiring new faculty and additional faculty and I think Provost Marcy talked about that when he was here last time. He has released forty-three new positions through the funding of those positions to the deans and the departments are beginning the searches. One of the challenges I have for you is participating in these searches. There is going to be a lot of it this year, probably over a hundred if we have our normal turnover of faculty positions plus forty-three new ones. So there is going to be a tremendous amount of faculty energy spent recruiting this number of new faculty members and searches are usually mostly made up of faculty. So, one of your exciting challenges, I think for the year, is to seek out and find excellent new faculty members. Some of these lines are at the endowed professor senior level, and then of course some are at the junior level and some in between. So I think we'll have a variety of opportunities to look at potential new faculty, and it's our goal to hire the very best people that come forward through our search process. We set aside some money for start-up funding for those particularly in sciences or engineering or certain fields of social science that need to have some support for laboratory start-up as part of their coming to the institution. So I think we're set hiring new faculty, and my sort of exciting challenge to you is let's go out there and get some great folks and bring them here, and we'll have them in place next fall.

The other thing that I really want to talk about is our legislative agenda. Most of you have been here a lot longer than I have and therefore know more in general about the legislative process. But, essentially the process is this: we are given some parameters in which we can ask for some additional resources if we can justify them to the state, to the legislature, to the governor's office. We have done that part of it which is to develop a budget request and then to develop a narrative for that request. Among other things a narrative talks about us wanting to participate in Closing the Gaps program, which is to increase the number of students in Texas that go to college that is those who are qualified. It talks about us wanting to become a stronger research and graduate institution as well as trying to improve the undergraduate education that we offer to so many students. And it talks about partnering with local community, with corporations, and legislators to try to leverage resources that we have to make ourselves stronger as an institution.

I'll just review quickly. Some of you may have been at the town hall meeting and heard some of this, so I'll do it fairly quickly and then I'll answer any questions. The first part of our budget request had to be to claim back five percent of our budget that we currently have. In other words, the state said the parameters for your budget request first of all, is to start with a request for ninety-five per cent of the budget you now have. So that is how we had to start our budget. So our first claim is to get that five per cent back and here's what it means for us, and it's spelled out in the narrative. In general it means that there are about three thousand five hundred students that will go unfunded, current students that will go unfunded based on the current funding formula that we use for funding the institution. And then we say that won't do because our plan is in fact carefully and slowly with the addition of new resources and faculty to put ourselves in a position to begin to grow again. So we claim that we need that five per cent back, and then we get into the other budget request that we have. The first one is that the formula for which we are funded, the more robustly sort of raise, that is last biennium the formula went down from fifty-six dollars and twenty five cents per credit hour to fifty-one dollars and twenty-five cents. And we're stating that we need at least get it back up to the fifty-six dollars twenty-five cent category, which would bring new resources right there. And then, apply all that formula to our

growth that happened over the last couple of years that really was not reflected in last year's budget. So that's our first major request after we argue to get our five per cent back. And that's the place where we would get money for some additional faculty beyond the forty-three that we have. That's the place we would capture some dollars that we could use for continuing our desire to give appropriate raises for faculty and staff. That's the place where we would get some additional dollars for program support as well. And so that's a very critical, and probably the most critical single feature to our budget request is funding the formula at a higher level and also then applying that to our full complement of students. From there we do have some request for tuition revenue bonds (TRB) which will build us some new buildings. Our priorities at this time are to build a new business building and then take the old business building and totally renovate it for really upscale classrooms that could be used by all units in the university. These would be state of the art classrooms, high-tech classrooms, whatever you want to call them, with the resources in that building to service all that equipment in the classrooms and keep it in top shape for faculty to be using and not having to worry about whether this or that part of the technology wasn't working appropriately at the time. So it's new business building for twenty-five million dollars, twenty-five million dollar renovation of the old business building for uses on a broad range of faculty needs including classrooms, and then a much smaller piece of six million dollars to match a six million dollar private gift that was recently announced to build an addition to the Law School which would include a high-tech court room, and some new offices and seminar rooms for the Law School. So there are tuition revenue bond or TRB request.

Also, as many of you know, that HEAF money is some of our most valuable resources. It is used to build a lot of buildings that we build. It is used to buy books and supplies and digital information. [16.00], it's used for equipment in many different cases, and so this is very important funding. That HEAF funding gets recycled every ten years, or re-evaluated every ten years, and so it is a major cushion for us, and I think appropriately by almost every other university in the state, all those who do not have the PUF funds for support in their institutions, that we would want to see a big jump in HEAF funding. And then there is a formula that would distribute it back to us. So that was another one of the things we are reaching for. Excellence money, or research development money, as it's variously called, was not placed in this last year's biennium budget. It was taken out in the last minute. We have now, as it has been announced, gotten, we think, most of our fair share of that money back for this year. We lost it last year and didn't get it, and that won't be restored. But, for this current budget, we now have 1.5 million dollars of that money coming back to us with the possible 1.5 million dollars additionally coming back. That money can only be used to stimulate research at the institution and that's what it will be used for. Again, 1.5 million is already in hand or on its way and I figure that about half way through the fiscal year we'll hear whether we get the other 1.5 million. We're counting on it, but that second part is not guaranteed at this point. But, part of our legislative request will be to continue those funds on into the future not just in this year's budget, and to ask that they be increased to support our desire to grow our research infrastructure at Texas Tech University.

So those are the major features of our sort of across the board major items of budget request to the state based on their sort of guidelines about the kinds of things that we can ask for. There's also something then in our budget called special items and these are sort of individual niches of the university that have come to be funded by the state outside of the formula, outside of TRB's. Every institution in Texas has a set of these and ours have sort of developed out of the historical past. I don't have a full list of ours here, but we're asking for some additional dollars in areas where we think that political will and the possible political support is there that generate the special extra items for special things. Additional funding for water resource research, which we do a lot of now, the university needs would be interdisciplinary resources that help fund some faculty positions as well as support the activities of a kind of water research umbrella organization within the institution. We've asked for some funding in the energy and environment area, a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Our hill country where we offer courses in three different locations is beginning to produce graduates this past year for the first time. There's an interest in expanding that and there is some political support for that from people who represent that part of the state. So we are going to be seeing if we can get some additional resources there. I think we have about five hundred thousand in a special line item for that and we are asking to double that if possible for the coming years. There's also an initiative in Ag production which is an area of high interest and former support by the special initiatives for Texas Tech, and a small amount, hundred thousand dollar additional request, to expand the small business development center which is a center that goes out around rural communities in West Texas and tries to generate business opportunities for these communities some of which are described. Our attempt is to find new and creative ways to have the people train people in those communities to think about developing in some cases very small businesses that might be successful in the new environment.

So that is the total of our request, or at least all the major features of it, this will be what we will be talking to the legislature about starting in January. But, prior to that I have already been to Austin and testified basically to the budget board and the governor's office about these requests. It was a non-contentious sort of discussion about these requests, and now we will go into a series of meetings before the legislative session talking to the different legislative financial hearing boards about the requests that we made. So, I would be very happy to answer any questions that you have, and by the way, I talked to the Faculty Senate President and we are intending to have some faculty go with us to Austin at the appropriate times and talk directly to key legislators about the initiatives that we are proposing and how they will help us advance the institution and make a difference in keeping the top quality faculty that we have here, etc. So there will be a role for Faculty Senate leadership and faculty. We also feel there will be a role for staff and students that we intend to organize. I talked to Chancellor Smith about this yesterday, and he supported it. The oversight of all of the legislative, the organization of all our legislative efforts, really takes place at the Chancellor's level where they have three or four personnel who essentially are lobbyists, or people who understand how Austin works, who we need to see and have set up those meetings for us. We have a very very good story to tell, and I've testified in Austin I think four or five times now since I've come, and it's not been contentious. I think there is an interest in higher education by key people who serve on these higher education budget committees. The problem is that resources are limited, there is lots of demand. So I don't want to bring out any false hopes that we're going to easily get all this stuff that we're asking for. But, I think we will be taken seriously and it is our goal to get as much of these resources back into the institution that we can.

With that I'll stop and answer questions about this or any other thing that you might consider.

Senator Gelber: I applaud the plan for building a new business administration building and renovating the old one. But, I'm still wondering how much of a priority classroom space is. I guess I'm really wondering how many departments still have adequate classroom space? In theater and dance we don't have a single classroom in our building. **Whitmore:** ...faculty offices also provided by dividing large classroom ...trade-off — some classes may move elsewhere.....it is cost effective to keep hi-tech classrooms close together...[24.09]

Senator Kreidler: Weeks dorm is non-functional, and has been for the last ten or fifteen years. Is there any thought to retrofitting that structure for possible office space? **Whitmore:**...asbestos abatement would cost about eight million dollars as would demolition....analysis indicates it is cheaper to build a new building.... [28.01]

Senator Lucas: There are three things I wish you would speak about. They are: 1. three million dollars has been given to the athletic department at least this year and perhaps previous several years, they came from academic monies; 2. At the end of the year when we were told that the athletic department zero balanced their accounts that the policy has been that if they had extra monies that were in the profit, that they just divided that up amongst maybe coaches, athletic directors, whoever they so chose so the books would reflect the zero balance, it did not go back in the coffers; 3. in the spring of 2003 we were asked to possibly prepare in our departments a straight across the board twelve per cent possible cut across the university academics, but that year there was no cut in the athletic department in that they did receive the two million dollar in that year and they didn't have to go through that budget cut. I want to know if you've heard any of this and if to the best of your knowledge any of this is true and can be substantiated? [29.31]

Senator Howe: I was on the committee when we hired our current athletic director and had chance to ask several questions regarding zero base budgeting.....special oversight on windfalls would help tighten the budget a little bit....**Whitmore:** We actually have established since I've been here a budget oversight committee for the athletic programwe basically have a monthly meeting with the athletic people..... [41.01]

Senator Dunham: ...compliance with Title IX has declined the last few years in terms of women's participation and coach's salaries [40.20] **Whitmore:**asked the Provost to appoint a gender equity committee.....athletic department has asked for an outside evaluation every three years regarding title IX and gender equity and issue a progress report.....

Senator Nathan: ...questioned which committee report on gender equity was addressed. It was noted that the Provost has appointed a new committee chaired by Senator Charlotte Dunham.... [47.33]

Senator Grass:has there been any thought given to remediation in the use of Excellence Funds for those who lost out on their promised startup packages because the excellence money went away?..... [51.21] **Whitmore:**this is the first time this issue was raised with me and I'll look into it.....we are setting aside \$150, 000 to support humanities research....it is important to support non-sponsored research....

Senator Lucas: ...are there other ideas for the retention of faculty other than dividing up state monies for merit raises.. [55.40]

Whitmore:some investment in research would definitely help.....if the Senate has ideas for using funds I am open for suggestions.....others have suggested we also need more faculty as much as a raise...

Senator Held: There was a recent court ruling on free speech areas. Is that the final word, or is that being appealed? [58.55]

Whitmore: it is a complicated ruling....general reaction is to use it as a guide....no final decision at this time...

Senator Lucas:is there someone in the university fighting for our benefits? [01:01:42] **Whitmore:** ...what would be useful is to get one of the experts in our whole benefits healthcare system to come talk to us.....

V. Old Business [01:08:45]

The committee for OP 30.15 has met with not much progress made.

Regarding OP 40.01, affirmative action, it was brought up in a meeting with the president....agreed to a wording to mimic University of Texas' statement.....its now in the chancellor's office with attorneys...

Academic integrity task force...not very close to a report....but next week will present preliminary results to the associate deans.....some concern expressed regarding the eight points outlined for addressing student dishonesty in the student bulletin on integrity and academic dishonesty..... [01:11:00]

Senator Garner Santa:responding to President Whitmore's request for ideas for the budget committee.....to pursue faculty tuition waivers....**Wilde:**may look at it as a faculty retention issue.. [01:14:05]

VI. New Business [01:15:23]

President Wilde: The committee on quality enhancement headed by Sue Couch requests faculty input on draft.....those interested email Sue Couch..... this is part of the SACS accreditation involving improvement over a five year period.....the focus is on campus ethics.....the major focus of the campus visit by outside reviewers. A motion to assign this to an ad hoc committee was made by **Senator Drager**, seconded by **Senator Wilson**. Motion passed and those interested ask to contact Faculty Senate Office Coordinator, Patty Gisch.

President Wilde: suggested modifying the tenure probationary period to give permission for consideration of non- consecutive years...[01:20:43] **Provost Marcy:** mentioned that the Provost does regularly extend probation period upon request.....recommends that rather than open the tenure policy we review wording and go through the regular recommendation process to amend the wording...

Proposed wording to be added to OP 32.01 was distributed:

1.b Upon request, a faculty member will be evaluated for promotion and tenure in any year in which timing requirements are met. If unusual circumstances justify a suspension of the tenure probationary period to cause the years included not to be sequential, a request may be made to the SVPP, through the appropriate department/division administrator and dean. Faculty members, including ranks not accruing tenure, should have their professional records submitted for review by the basic academic unit on an annual basis.

Senator Dunham: ...there is confusion about the university attorney and the degree to which he will represent faculty...
Provost Marcy: in your capacity as a state employee the state of Texas Attorney Generals office indemnifies the faculty member.....suggested we request Victor Melinger to address the Senate.... [01:24:59]

Motion made by Senator Drager, seconded by Senator Ellis, to suspend the rules to consider resolution. Motion passed.

Whereas enrollment at Texas Tech University has increased by 15% in the past five years without any commensurate increase in State funding for necessary faculty, staff, or facilities to support that increase, and

Whereas an increase in faculty, staff, and facilities is required to maintain current academic, research, and engagement activities, and

Whereas the ability of Texas Tech University to progress towards becoming a flagship university is compromised by current State funding levels,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Texas Tech Faculty Senate, meeting on this 13th day of October, 2004, does support the University's Legislative Appropriation Request for the upcoming biennium. In particular we support the University's request for (1) full (100%) funding of its current budget, rather than the 95% baseline proposed by the State; (2) an increase in the funding rate for formula funding, and (3) an increase in /HEAF funds to support maintenance and improvement of campus academic facilities.

Resolution passed unanimously.

VII. Announcements

Sam Segran, Assistant Vice President for Information Technology asked us to nominate a member of the Senate for service on his Information Technology Services Advisory Board. Senator Smith, from Agriculture was appointed to serve in that capacity. [01:31:43]

Vice President Watts has been asked to serve on the Vice President for Research search committee. Please direct any thoughts or comments on that to her. [01:32:15]

Gill Reeve, Director of Strategic Planning, has asked to come and speak briefly to the Senate.

VIII. Adjournment: Meeting was declared adjourned at 4:52 p.m.