The Faculty senate met on Wednesday, September 8, 2004 in the Escondido Theatre in the Student Union building with President Gene Wilde presiding. Senators present were: Brooks, Doerfert, Johnson, Drager, Grass, Hart, Held, Hendrick, Howe, Jeter, Miller, Myles, Nathan, Rahnama, Schaller, Smucker, Toda, Troyansky, Wenthe, Hein, Jones, Mercer, Cedja, Duemer, Halsey, Olivarez, Jackson, Lakhani, Letchford, Masten, Sinzinger, Blum, Gustafson, Reifman, Soonpaa, Kreidler, Chamber, Reeves, Watts, Garner, Gelber, Meek, Wilson, Donahue, Ellis, Marbley, Morse, Smith, Spallholz and Tacon. Senators excused were Lucas, Perry, Carr, Sherif, Camp and Collins. Senators unexcused were: Kahera, Louden, D’Amico, Amor, Bard, Spurrier, Whitfield and Tombs. Guests to this meeting include Provost William Marcy and Vice Provosts Liz Hall, Jim Brink and UD reporter Erica Hoff.

I. Call to Order. President Gene Wilde called Meeting #244 to order at 3:16 September 8, 2004 in the Escondido Room of the Student Union Building.

II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance. President Wilde recognized Provost William Marcy and Vice Provost Liz Hall, Vice Provost Jim Brink and Erica Hoff of the University Daily.

III. Approval of Minutes. Motion to approve the minutes was made by Lewis Held, seconded by Phillip Johnson, and passed.

IV. Invited Guest: Provost Marcy

I thought I’d touch on a few things that are sort of in progress, things that have occurred since the spring semester and maybe give you a few ideas of where we are headed in the next legislative session. One of the big items, I think, was getting the semester started with the right faculty, so that we could in fact fulfill our promises to the students whose tuition increases are paying for this faculty. Between the end of the spring semester and September you don’t hire thirty or forty tenure track faculty in that time period. So, what we did was spend a lot of money on visiting faculty, people that were part-time faculty, and I think that helped us get the semester underway with a minimum amount of stress in terms of both students, and departments, etc. and we were working very closely with enrollment management, certainly Arts & Sciences carries a very large burden in regards to service courses, and we were constantly opening sessions. And, it seemed to me at least that we got things underway in pretty good fashion.

Now, we do believe that some of the visiting faculty that are here this fall may, as many faculty have in the past, turn out to be people that will want to include strongly in the search for permanent faculty to fill positions, and will be, I hope, by about the fifteenth of September will begin the process of allocating faculty lines to colleges to begin to address some of the needs that we are trying to address. We’ve got about 3.75 million that is earmarked for new tenure track faculty positions. We spent a big chunk of that that’s come in really since May when the students began paying increased tuition to hire the faculty that are here this fall, for the most part temporary or visiting faculty. So I think that’s procedure. We have roughly 850 thousand that we’re going to be allocating for instructional equipment. We hope this will improve the condition of some of our classrooms and provide some better technology in the classrooms. We also have roughly the same amount of money that we’re going to be investing in some additional advising...
support and student support. So those are things that are going to be very high priority items for the colleges, departments and office of the provost this fall.

Jim Brink can certainly amplify this, but I want to express my appreciation for all the people that have worked on the SAC’s [implementation 6:00], certainly Gary Elbow, Sue Couch, Peter Westfall, that’s the group. We had Jonathon Marks who did an internship in the provost’s office this summer working primarily on things relating to the quality enhancement plan and methods. I think that turned out quite well. I certainly enjoyed my conversations with Jonathon, and I think it changed both his perspectives and my perspectives of what we could accomplish with this addition. My expectations have never been higher with regard to the quality enhancement plan. As we speak, I guess the package has been submitted to SAC’s. It’s a rather impressive document especially as it is mostly how to get to the material not the material itself. So, it’s a major accomplishment to get this underway. There will be one or two areas which will be in partial compliance, some areas we really don’t have control over like fire, That’s not something that we have a lot of ability to influence, and we will be going through a financial audit as soon as Texas Tech’s books close; that closing process takes place between the 15th of September and usually the 1st of October. Of course, that was after our submission. So when that’s completed there will be someone who will come with the visiting team that will specifically address financial matters.

We’ve also just submitted the legislative appropriation request which is the beginning of the process leading up to the legislative session which will begin in January. And if anyone wants to come and review that LAR, it’s written in the arcane language of the legislative request, but it really reflects all the possibilities that we could be facing with the beginning of the fiscal year that starts in the fall of 2005. It really ranges from starting off with a five percent across the board budget cut for everything at Texas Tech with the first line item, or exceptional item as they call it, to be to restore that five percent. So that’s, I guess, one of those ways of managing expectations. If you tell people that you’re going to get less, and you give them what they already have then there’re going to feel like they came out of it OK. There are going to be a number of things that will happen in the legislature that we haven’t seen before. I went to an accountability meeting yesterday in Austin, met with some of the members of the governor’s staff about key measure of performance effectiveness of universities. And it was quite clear from that meeting that the governor’s office expects to tie funding to performance on those accountability measures. There are areas of excellence and diversity. Most of the targets that we were setting yesterday are targets that Texas Tech either meets or exceeds at this time period. My impression is that we are going to come out in very good shape.

The Higher Education Coordinating Board has sort of organized all the twenty-six state four year institutions into groups. The first group is a research group that consists only of UT and A&M; and then there is the emerging research university group of which Texas Tech is with seven other universities. I think Texas Tech clearly is at the very top of that list in terms of all performance measures. And then there are doctoral universities, then master universities. So, the governor’s office said that they are going to push the legislature very hard to put a significant part of the funding for higher education into this accountability or performance based process. I think that if Texas Tech is measured on the basis of those accountability measures Texas Tech will in fact succeed in getting more than its fair share of those funds. So, in spite of the fact that the ground rules are laid out in the governor’s office do not seem particularly favorable for higher education I think Texas Tech is well positioned against the universities that are grouped with us. In fact, in listening to the various other universities present their position on setting targets for performance, in almost every case, if they had asked me to set a target, I would have set it higher than where they did. These are mostly urban universities that have a lot of part-time students; for the most
part they are not residential campuses. One of the more interesting targets was to set the graduation rate not at four, or five or six years as it is currently measured, but to set it at ten years. And, of course, the people in the governor’s office would be very opposed to that. They believe the legislature would cut our throats if we set a ten year graduation objective for our students, and they were quite willing to sharpen the knife if that were to occur. So, the actual target is going to be a five year graduation rate which fits well for universities that have a lot of five year programs: architecture, accounting, finance, engineering programs.

The budget situation this year I think we are in good shape. We certainly have been able to set aside some finding for start-up. We’ve allocated some of that start-up to help programs and attract some really top faculty with matching money which the vice-president for research will manage. The provost office manages the start-up funds. The president announced some reorganization as you heard at the faculty meeting. The provost now acts as provost and senior vice-president for academic affairs. The vice-president for finance or fiscal affairs administration is the other senior vice-president, and in effect those two individuals are really charged with most of the day to day operation of the university. The president wants to spend more time on policy issues and interfacing the legislature. Certainly this next year he is going to be in Austin testifying a lot, raising money, doing the things only the president can do. The big change that I’ve seen is I get more paper coming into my office than I did just a few weeks ago.

I’d be happy to answer questions on anything that’s of interest to you, or elaborate on anything I’ve touched on a few minutes ago.

Senator Lance Drager: Where are we on teaching loads for visiting faculty? Provost Marcy: ….visiting faculty are usually not expected to carry a heavy research load,…..[14:55]

Senator Chance Brooks: Last week in the AJ was an article mentioning “excellence funds” coming back, and where were they going?....Provost Marcy: .As of this point in time, that is sitting in the governor’s office. The estimates are that if we get it back it ill be somewhere between about 2.8 million and 3.3 million dollars per year. However, at this point the governor has indicated that he would only fund for the rest of this year.........these finds are not for tenure track positions. [16:41]

Senator Andrew Jackson: When will there be announced space requests for Experimental Science? Provost Marcy: I don’t know the answer to that….[20:18]

Senator Lewis Held: Has there been a committee appointed to replace Dr. Sweazy, and will it be a national search? Provost Marcy: It will be a national search. The president has the list.............[20:46]

Senator Lewis Held: I know we had some outside consultants come in and evaluate the university academically and make recommendations. Are those recommendations available? Provost Marcy: We have not actually received that report........ [21:17]

Senator Alan Reifman: In regard to September 15 when the process of allocating the forty new faculty positions ..........how specified will the positions be? Provost Marcy: ........ Relying on Deans for insight and to make final allocations as is most effective in their area..... [21:44]

Senator Chris Letchford: What is the procedure for allocating the 850 thousand dollars for facility upgrades? Provost Marcy: ....I’ll be combining the 850 thousand with the 2.8 million of Heath money and allocating it very much the way I would be Heath money. [25:56]
FS VP Elizabeth Watts: Regarding passing periods between classes, what do you think is the solution?…… Provost Marcy: The solution will come in October when we get access to another thousand parking spots and we should be pretty much back to where we were a year ago………Vice Provost Brink indicated that it is being discussed in the Academic Council…….

V. Old Business:

President Wilde: Suggested changes to Op 3.15. Evaluations of Administrators. None of the spring recommendations were approved. Changes were viewed as “one size fits all” and probably inappropriate to have administrators be evaluated exactly the same way given the differences in their responsibilities. Provost Marcy indicated he would be willing to meet with a committee and continue working on this……Senator John Howe expressed concern that the issue might be not so much how they are evaluated but by whom…….President Wilde referred the issue to Committee A….[29:24]

President Wilde: There is no action regarding committee reports but wished to serve notice that he would like more regular reporting from committees to the membership so that we might know that progress is being made. [37:45]

Regarding possible revision to Equal Opportunity Employment involving sexual orientation: Motion by Clifton Ellis, seconded by Danny Nathan: Moves that the Senate ask the Senate President Wilde to write President Whitmore asking why sexual orientation is not included in the update of August 11th.  Motion carried. [38:10]

VI. New Business:

President Wilde announced that left over funds were used to hire a student to update the Senate web page. The plan is begin tracking down a number of reports from previous senate meetings, to post them in electronic form on the web site. [42:05]

There is also a link on the Provost’s web site to Academic Integrity Task Force. Vice Provost Brink announced that the task force was appointed by the Provost at the request of students concerned with cheating and plagiarism. SAC’s also addressed the issue in their report. Senator Julian Spallholz expressed concern regarding shutting down copies of tests floating around campus. Related discussion ensued for 16 minutes. [ 43:08]

VII. Announcements: [59:13]

Please turn in course schedules to Patty Gisch to facilitate scheduling meetings of committees.

We have one liaison between the Faculty Senate and the university-wide groups one with the University Center Board that is vacant. If you are interested please let me or Patty know.

Lewis Held announced that he has been reappointed liaison with the student center and that their major concern is the issue of parking and the resulting congestion.

VIII. Adjournment: Meeting declared adjourned at 4:16 p.m.