

**Texas Tech University Faculty Senate
Meeting # 304, March 2, 2011**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, March 2, 2011, in the Senate Room of the Student Union Building, with **Faculty Senate President Richard Meek** presiding.

Senators in attendance were: Farmer, Mills, Davis, Perl, Biglaiser, Borshuk, Cris Bradatan, Cox, Drager, Durband, Fallwell, Harter, Held, Lodhi, McFadden, Nathan, Rahnama, Rice, Stodden, Surlis, Bremer, Pasewark, Crews, Janisch, Bayne, Darwish, Helm, Matis, Wang, Costica Bradatan, Leslie, Blum, Collier, Fowler, Ross, Syma, Callender, Duffy, Santa, CM Smith, Tate, Ajlouni, Dodds, Kelleher, Kucera and Meek. Senators excused were: Kvashny, Louden, Boros, Mosher, Schmidt, Weinlich, Ritchey, Hendricks, Lakhani, Gilliam, Sharp, Chambers, Wood, Awal, Heinz, Spallholz and Whitfield.

I. Call to Order:

Richard Meek, Faculty Senate President, called the meeting to order at 3:18 PM.

II

II. Recognition of Guests:

Faculty Senate President Meek recognized our guests: newly elected Faculty Senators for next year Kim Boal from BA, Gad Perry(AAUP President) from Ag, and Sandy River (our Parliamentarian). From the Provost office , Provost Bob Smith, Vice Provosts Gary Elbow and Rob Stewart, Kay Rhodes, Vice Chancellor & System CIO, with Simone Barnhill, Managing Director of SPAR and Dr. Kathleen Harris, Associate VP for Research Services. In attendance also was Matt McGowan from the Avalanche-Journal and Arts & Science Dean, Lawrence Schovanec and Jeff Williams, Associate Dean of Finance.

III. Approval of Minutes:

Faculty Senate President Meek called for any corrections or changes to the minutes to meeting #303 held on February 16th. Corrections made to minutes from email. Minutes accepted as corrected.

IV. Speaker: Kay Rhodes, on Time Effort Certification. Update on new time-effort certification in the university. When we accept an award we are governed by several cost principals. Salaries paid on Federal projects, require an after the fact certification that the effort that the person provided is consistent with the amount of salary that was paid. Paid through a Sponsored Project, whether Federal, State or Private, must submit certification, either for themselves by someone who knows the work they are doing. Until we implemented Banner, we were doing a paper certification. We are currently doing an electronic certification using AFISM. We are now ready to implement something that will be better, and I think a bit easier to deal with.

About a year ago, we began evaluating software that would monitor time and effort process. It is a joint project with HSC implementing one solution for both institutions. We selected a solution from a company called Huron Consulting Services, called ECRT. This software gives us the ability to completely automate workflow and the approval process. A group of faculty previewed the system prior to the purchasing decision, to determine if this would be a good solution for them as well. Certification is done each calendar quarter. Simone will discuss some of the processes and things that are going to change. In the past, we have not had a foundation of data that we could build upon, such as we now have in Banner, and ECRT will provide this.

Another grant system that we are going to be looking at is the further automation of our pre-order to post-order processes, a committee will look at software sources for that process. A decision will be made for this in the future.

The ECRT system stands alone, and fits with data from our HR system. Data on how people are paid is the basis for certification. This will go live this summer.

Simone Barnhill- Sponsored Projects: we are responsible for the reporting systems in SPAR, and as such will administer the program as well as makes sure that faculty and staff comply with these requirements and are certified in a timely manner. It is getting harder and harder to manage this as the university continues to grow without a more robust system, and ECRT is going to doing a lot of things for us that our current system does not. One of the things it will help with is our monitoring. We will be able to identify a coordinator in each of the academic areas, typically the business manager in the departments. We have an advisory group that is testing the system, have input to the design, the look and feel of the system and how their reports are going to look. They have been a great asset during this part of the process. For many this is an added responsibility, but most are excited about the changes. About being a part of it from the beginning, and the hands-on training with the system vendor. Faculty will also be required to go through web-based training. Dr. Harris will go over why we need to do this in our research areas.

Senator Lance Drager: will there be an exam at the end of the web based training?

Kay Rhodes: Dr. Harris and I are both a fan of an exam at the end of the training, but we are still working out the details.

Senator Lance Drager: for example, in taking the EEO training, I discovered that the exam had been created by someone who was not in their right mind, in that the questions are really somewhat ambiguous, example being how many hours do you have to work before you are eligible for family leave? There is no reason in the world that somebody should have that in there. So let's not have any stupid questions in there.

Senator Wendy Ross: initially you stated this was being done for Federal grants, is this being done for compliance to State funding as well?

Kay Rhodes: Yes. Compliance is part of the goal. As an institution we want to demonstrate that we are good stewards of all funds, regardless of the funding source. We feel it is important that we treat these consistently. It is important that we are not charging salaries that don't reflect the work done. Certification has to be done with someone who has firsthand knowledge of the project, so it will be an honest view of the work being done. The new program is a more robust, complete program than has been previously used and should help us in monitoring in a way that has not been previously done, as well as being more user-friendly and more time efficient.

Senator David Stodden: is there some regulation that requires us to report quarterly or is this a university decision?

Kay Rhodes: We are not required to report quarterly, but we do report quarterly. It's an objective. We could report twice a year. As an institution, we can choose our objective. However, as a university we've found that we do a better job if we report quarterly. We've done it every six months, but find that it is more difficult to compile the reports and with less information. The time and effort reports do not leave the university. They are not a requirement by any agency, either Federal or State. However, we do have to have them on hand, for example, in case of an audit. We retain them for the required retention period, but we don't retain them for anybody outside of the university. Schools have had significant penalties for not meeting this requirement. We have had people who are automatically certifying without knowing what they are certifying. We've had an audit in the past that showed there were several people who had no idea what they were agreeing to, they were just signing. If federal auditors came in, they would want to see what our policies are, what our training is a process by which we communicate and educate. If we don't do that, then we are in trouble with them for not doing what is required and giving you the training to do it.

Speaker: Dr. Lawrence Schovanec, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences:

Faculty Senate President Meek: As part of our movement towards transparency, and understanding the processes of a strategic climate for the Budget Working group, etc., we invited Dr. Schovanec to give us an idea how RCM is impacting at least one of the colleges.

Dean Schovanec: wants to share the planning and implementation that have been doing in Arts and Sciences regarding RCM, the issues we are raising with the departments. This is not a lesson in the basics of RCM, as that has already been done here. We have made presentations to ten of the departments thus far. In the course of the presentation of data that we share with them, will try to show the issues raised with them. Last December, we had a Town Hall presentation in Arts and Sciences for all departments. Since then we've begun to make individual presentations within the departments. As we go to the departments, we present to them what their RCM budget would look like. In RCM, the revenue centers are at the level of the college. We have to compare that data to the department level.

Acknowledgement of Jeff Williams who is the former chair of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, who is the Associate Dean of Finance. His work has been critical in terms of preparing those departmental level RCM budgets and this whole discussion.

We intend to have a budget track blueprint workshop this Spring. We are also preparing the resource page for Chairs, some budget tools for them to use.

Why are we here making this presentation about budgets? Because most faculty, including chairs and deans, don't have a thorough knowledge of budgeting processes now. The faculty need to be informed, engaged in the process, the cost and revenues that are generated. We try to assure them that within the process of RCM, we can still protect the core missions of the departments and colleges. Find it to be very healthy for the departments.

What are some of the challenges for RCM and Arts and Sciences? For RCM, there are four types of revenue: restricted, unrestricted, auxiliary and HEAF. All we are talking about today is restricted and unrestricted. Restricted is primarily generated through contracts. Research funding is a form of restricted revenue. It is primarily concentrated in the sciences, technology and math. In A&S, there are five programs, five departments that account for 90% of our grant funding. There are two types of tuition, and that tuition is part of your unrestricted revenue. There is the State funding, which you are all familiar with, and then there is the designated, the local, funding. The formula funding matrix inures the sciences. The base rate for the last year was \$62.19 for a freshman in a course. For a Ph.D. in Science, it was 22 times that. The sciences are at an advantage as far as generating the funding in credit hours in the programs.

There are divisions within departments that have some academic problems. For example, we have a large Ph.D. program in Spanish, it's has more revenue than the bachelor's and master's programs. Yet we have to support all of those programs, they are essential to the core mission of that department. Just as the university is going to have to subvent or subsidize certain colleges, or colleges are going to have to subvent certain departments, then the departments are going to have to subvent certain programs.

There are disciplines and accreditation requirements that impose non-uniform constricts on delivery of instruction. There are accreditation issues that impose limits of 25 in a class. That affects the profitability of teaching some of those classes. A&S teaches 50-55% of student credit hours at Tech. Yes, our research activity is essential to the mission of the college. You have to balance these issues and still meet obligations. It is not the cash cow that people like to think. Designated tuition is a lot of our revenue.

Texas Tech can be the first university to institute RCM. It carries certain benefits that local money doesn't. We look at each department, their sources of funding, what they can do to improve their situation, and the challenges they face. We show every department their fiscal year planned budget, and then we show them what would their budget have been with RCM. Going from a discussion of resources to revenue they would generate opportunities they might have and solutions that are possible.

There are many different types of RCM around the country. At Tech, there are three types of centers. There is the Administrative Service Center (including the Provost, Administration, etc.), the Resource Centers (including the library), and the Revenue Centers (colleges). The budgets in RCM go down to the college level, and what they are doing is trying to produce those budgets at the departmental level. In A&S, they aim for a decentralized approach, allowing departments to make decisions on how they pursue those initiatives.

We should think of direct revenues as money that you generate by virtue of your activities. Tuition comes in formula funding, then there is also local tuition which is designated funding. Some feel that changes should be made to tuition where departments receive a larger percentage of the funding. The House and Senate bills are being reviewed for changes to this. The fees are different, in that money has to go back to the courses that generate those fees. There has been a lot of discussion about this. Some people feel that tuition should be split 75/25 across the board. However, in A&S that would be devastating. Especially since so much of our income comes from that lower space rate. Legislature is looking at bending that formula. It would be very difficult for all of us if we lose 25% of the core. The fees are not unrestricted revenue, but in the RCM model they are. That is purpose generated, and that money must go back to the courses that generate it. RCM has notion of participation, where you take 20% of your unrestricted revenues, and that goes into the subvention core. If you take away 20% of that money

away, then you have to turn over another million dollars to that department that generated that fee. F&A is coded in Banner as research dollars, but that is not how you spend the money. That diminishes the subvention core.

If you add them all up, the deficit is about \$80 million. Arts and Sciences have a profit of about \$1.4 million. You have to provide subvention in order to balance the budget. Now that we have eliminated other options, all subvention comes from the Administration.

As we go to the different departments, we give them a feel for how they are funding all these different categories. This is particularly important for the Humanities and Social Sciences, who gain less from research funding. Discussion continues as to how it has been set up thus far in Arts and Sciences, the breakdown of the revenue, where it comes from and where it can go, and how it is being shown to each department as a basis of comparison of what their budgets could look like using RCM, it would be some time before we could see profits from the change.

RCM suggested that departments review their CIP inventory, State's inventory. As enrollment grows and we deal with budgeting requirements, we will find it is more efficient. It will be helpful in determining how many students it takes to pay that instructor's salary, for example. It is encouraging academic planning that takes into effect the budgets and goals.

Senator Charles Crews: How do address outsourcing of services?

Dean Schovanec: That is happening right now. We are looking at outsourcing the Intensive English program. That program is important because of the opportunities it gives, especially to our graduate students. However, if you look at the cost of doing that, it was prohibitive. It also is not accredited. When you look at the accreditation cost, that department (Business dept.) has other issues that they need to spend the money on. It is a sensitive issue, as it was found to be a hundred million dollar program. The department made a commitment to increase the number of graduate students in this program, to maintain the graduate teaching assistantships. There was discussion with faculty and the chair, and they are now looking at outsourcing.

Senator Dorothy Chansky: As you explain it, within your multi-track college, different components of the college are valuable to the university in differing ways. But, in a university, that by virtue of its very name, privileges the sciences, and given the financial imperatives that we've had explained to us over the last year, what do faculty, scholars, researchers, artists, innovators in the Humanities have to look forward to as a means of being valued here, other than what seems to be largely seen as providing obligatory services to undergraduates?

Dean Schovanec: Well first let me say that the name "Texas Tech" is a misnomer. The largest college at this university is Arts and Sciences, but I don't believe that sciences have a privileged position. If you look at the scholarship in this university, I'll give you an example, the new Horn Professor in our college this year is from Literature. So, I don't think there is any devaluing the Humanities, but I recognize what you are saying. I've mentioned the challenges, but that doesn't mean that the Humanities should have the same expectations as the studying activities. There's different ways of honoring scholarship. I have never seen an institution where Arts and Sciences was the "cash cow" to the extent that it is here. When asked how we are doing that, I said, salaries are too low, some classes are too large, and there are too many adjuncts and graduate students. I would hope that we could address those issues.

Senator Glen Biglaiser: First, I want to thank you for bringing back department autonomy, for putting in chairs that are of our own discipline that has been very helpful. My question is, how are we going to get these higher salaries? My department is Political Science, we are underpaid, and we've lost one person already, who was offered a generous salary at another university, and there are others who are below salary and likely to leave. If the suggestions here are to try to come up with a way to cut cost, can't administrative service centers costs also be on the table?

Dean Schovanec: If you look at the RCM document that outlines the process for implementation, it calls for preliminary budgets to be distributed early in the Spring semester and then go to the administrative service centers and adjust their budgets. I know from personal experience, I don't think there is any attitude in the administrative service centers that they are immune. That is the good thing about the transparency of RCM, it puts this on the table. If I said I knew how we were going to address the salaries issue, I'd be very naïve, to be specific right now, other than to say we are aware of it, and that it is a problem across the university.

Senator Michael Farmer: I think it was great that you were mentioning ways to cross those courses to try to maintain interdisciplinary work. How do you do the mechanisms in that?

Jeff Williams: We had three courses, basically introductory linguistics offered in three departments, and that is a huge, repetitive thing. We worked with three department chairs and the faculty that teach those courses, rotated the teaching of that course, increased the class size, and that gives us something that we can count towards all those different programs. Rather than having three people offer the same thing over and over again, this will work towards different degrees. Not everything is going to work that way, but we have to look. We don't have much fat to cut, so we have to look and make sure we are covering every curriculum as officially and accurately as we can.

Senator Michael Farmer: I am sorry my question was not clear, I was more concerned with drawing courses across departments. It's not taught in three places, where is it taught?

Dean Schovanec: Discussion of ways to do it. The prefixes would stay the same, so how does it cross? Money from each department goes to that department, regardless of where it is taught.

Senator Donell Callender: who is looking out for the students, in RCM? You're talking about making classes larger, and we're down in faculty numbers, so who is looking out for the students?

Dean Schovanec: Related a discussion in a Marketing class, where a student raised that question. He had a friend who was in Calculus, and there are over 200 people in the course. I questioned if he was mistaken, was it possible that it was 100, that it was once taught in classes of 40, then 100. So I asked the Math department, and the largest class they teach is 250 students. This is a real problem. With fewer faculty and more students, with budget issues to meet the, we will see this problem. This problem has developed over time. Maybe with a more rational budget, we will be able to find a better solution, and be able to do more hiring, with a cautious approach to filling vacancies.

Dean Schovanec: Regarding Senator Chansky's concern about overemphasis on the sciences, what we've tried to articulate publicly is that under ten year our Strategic Plan, we would like to see Tech become competitive with AAU (Association of American Universities). That puts us in the company of the University of Michigan, which has a great Classics department, Indiana which has a great Music program and, the University of Texas that has a great Latin American Studies program. So if we are going to grow and develop, it can't just be in the sciences. We won't be competitive in that arena. And I'm also pleased to share with you that the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is thinking in these terms as well, in terms of the criteria for national research universities. They want to know how you measure up to AAU institutions.

So I think we are moving. I am very conscious of salary and benefits to faculty, but I think what we have to do is think in the long term. We're in a recessionary period now. That is not going to be forever. When you create opportunities for entrepreneurial activities, and creative thinking, in our institutions, much as people think in the corporate sector, you have opportunities to gain in revenue. I have every faith that we have so much creativity in this faculty and among our staff, and even our students, that we will grow and develop in the future.

OLD BUSINESS:

Senator Carrie Syma: Report on the Administrative Evaluation Survey:

Emails will go out to the Faculty Senate. Results were delayed due to move to the east basement.

Report on the Texas Council for Faculty Senate, Dr. Michael Farmer:

The group is a lot more active, likely because of the budget crisis. One of the themes that we came up was making ourselves useful to administration as a demonstration of shared governance during the crisis. We have reports from TACT (Texas Association of College Teachers). They offer insurance to faculty, and are our lobbyists. All gave us really harsh realities in terms of what is happening. Given the formulas in place are there, Texas Tech looks reasonably good in relative terms to what some other colleges are facing. Some are facing severe shortages, including losing as much as 50% of their grant funding. They are looking for means to rescue schools specializing in those students. There are lots of concerns. The mentoring process that Higher Education does is a fair portion of that activity.

Two issues: Farmer has been asked to address in a drafted discussion how not to micromanage faculty in the universities. There will be some budget retention, but let us manage it.

The concern for firearms carried on campus. That is going to pass, Response from the administrative level was that there are some unfunded mandates in place, they are not aware of, and college security officers had posted a response to the assembly saying they did not feel ready or trained to deal with it. The debate at this time is how to minimize the cost that for the universities. However, it will pass.

Faculty Senate President Richard Meek: There was general talk about faculty workloads, and shared government. At the final meeting of the general session, there were two motions passed. One was that the coordinating board of the legislature should not consider the mandates running on the backs of teachers, at least not increasing teaching loads. The motion was passed by the Council. The second motion had to do with the guns on campus issue, reaffirming the resolution that they had made the prior year, that of guns on campus.

NEW BUSINESS:

Senator Lance Drager: What the real cost of Athletics for the university? Are they paying utilities for the lights on in the stadium for practice, etc? RCM will be useful to show the scope of that funding.

Senator Daniel Nathan: I've heard that the Staff Senate passed a resolution that condemned the raise that was given to the football coach, and had asked the Faculty Senate to consider the same. The issue has not been raised in the Faculty Senate at this time.

Other announcements:

Announced from the Officer Nomination Committee: slate of nominees: from Human Sciences - Deborah Fowler for Secretary; from Mass Communications - Sam Bradley for Vice President, and from Philosophy – Daniel Nathan for President.

Meeting Adjourned.

Faculty Senate Secretary
Michael Farmer