Faculty Senate Minutes
#323 April 10, 2013

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Dr. Daniel Nathan, Faculty Senate President

RE: Agenda for meeting #323, April 10, 2013
Meeting starts at 3:15 p.m. Senate Room 132 Student Union Building

I. Call to order – Dr. Daniel Nathan, Faculty Senate President called the meeting to order at 3:16 pm
Senators present were: Ballou, Brashears, Mills, Davis, Perl, Pongratz, Chris Taylor, Adams, Di Poppa, Drager, Juan, Held, Nathan, Shi, Smith, Surles, Swingen, Weinberg, Wilde, Boal, Agnello, Coward, Todd, Bayne, Blum, Gaine, Lauderdale, Cochran, Ross, Mondt, Monroe, Syma, Whitfield, Peaslee, Brown, Decker, Dolter, Lastrapes, Marks, Meek and Wood.

II. Recognition of guests: Guests were: Interim President Lawrence Schovanec, Catherine Parsoneault, Associate Vice Provost-SACS COC reaffirmation, Jennifer Hughes, Planning & Assessment, Bob Smith-Provost, Rob Stewart-Senior Vice Provost, Gary Elbow, Vice Provost, Christine Self and Vince Wilde from the Staff Senate, Senators Elect - Mark McGinley (Honors) and Jordan Berg (ME/WCOE), Michael Farmer-AAUP President, Brittany Hoover from the AJ with Pedro Mendez, Cooper ISD shadowing reporter. John Howe- FS Parliamentarian, James Hodgins-Internal Communications and Katherine Lindley from the Student Senate.

III. Approval of minutes, Meeting #322, March 20, 2013. Minutes approved as written.

IV. Speakers:

3:20pm to 3:30pm Interim President Dr. Lawrence Schovanec spoke about the Center for Measuring University Performance (CMUP) Data Comparison between TTU and AAU Institutions. The focus is on growth and enrollment. Dr. Schovanec also gave a brief report on last meeting with Board of Regents and went over the System Strategic Plan.

Held: Did you do a faculty salary comparison with AAU?

Dr. Schovanec: We would be very low. That is not a secret. That is something we really have to work on. Last year they gave two raises, 2% and 2%. We did issue a notice to the deans maybe two or three months ago to let us know if you have faculty you consider flight risks and we have issued quite a few responses to that and that is according to the Provosts office. Dr. Nellis will make a decision on raises. We have to see how the legislative session goes.

Mills: Regarding that new building over by the hospital, I’ve been involved in the building trade for over 25 years and I’ve done some renovation, basically you are talking 2 to 3 times the cost for new versus on campus construction.

Dr. Schovanec: No, what I said was, if you build on campus, because there are certain specs we have to meet, they have to be like 100 year buildings, it varies $500 roughly to $1000 per square foot. There is a bid process for those, a very extensive bidding process. There is a faculty committee that reviewed that. There they are talking about the shell space going up for 200. Much cheaper.
Mills: I buy that in part, but I think the benefits of building on campus (I wasn’t on the committee) but there are certainly some great advantages. You cannot walk over there; you have to take a bus. You said that the building would primarily be used by non-classroom activities, research or whatever, I still think having a more clustered campus, we have a lot of room here but we just keep going out that way. I don’t know there are a lot of benefits of being close to the core.

Dr. Schovanec: Right. And that is the concern. We had a meeting about a week ago on to go to BOR items and we got into an intense debate about what to do if the TRB would be approved. That would give us the capability of building on campus. Some said, well if this becomes common knowledge, no one is going to want to go over there. There might be opportunities for some faculty groups to interact with others you are not going to find on the core campus. But the points you are raising are absolutely legitimate and everybody has expressed those concerns. The cost is an issue on the core campus. There is a master plan that looks at this. There is actually less space to build here than you might first think in terms of infrastructure that is under the ground, parking accessibility. We are getting limited in where we can grow. There was even discussion that ultimately that would be kind of a place where you would have a student union building; would create a more campus like environment there. But that is down the road. Your concerns are well taken.

Drager: Something like that from a faculty perspective, not the students, would be much more practical if I could get in my car and drive over there if there’s some place to park. If you want to drive anywhere else on campus forget parking.

Dr. Schovanec: Michael San Francisco managed a meeting the other day that is has been emphasized that there must be really good bus service everywhere. The issue of getting on campus to do collaborative research is a problem. I met with a faculty member a few months ago she got a ticket for coming over from the law school to visit somebody where she was engaged in a joint project. We have to remove those obstacles. We gave her some kind of pass where she could go wherever she liked. I think that would be an option for any faculty member whose ability to engage is impeded by these issues.

Graduate Student: I am a graduate student so I do research and am a Research Assistant. If you do open up that building over there will you allow student parking? Right now graduate students are not allowed to park on campus, we can park after 4:30pm but obviously research is not always going on at 4:30. Would you help SGA fund bussing services? They are the ones who help provide the money to get bussing for students now.

Dr. Schovanec: First of all you said would we allow graduate parking? I would like to say absolutely but I will make a note of that. Michael is coordinating that and we are doing a search right now for a permanent VPR. The second issue was?

Graduate Student: If you do have bussing over there, I am on SGA, and SGA kind of approves the bussing now. It is hard enough to have the money to go to any off campus location, so will you work with them on a budget to allow a bus to get out there?

Dr. Schovanec: Yes

3:35pm to 3:45pm Catherine Parsoneault, Associate Vice Provost, and Jennifer Hughes, Director of Office of Planning and Assessment, spoke about SACS Reaffirmation at Texas Tech most information may be found at http://www.depts.ttu.edu/opa/2015Reaffirmation.php

V. Old Business: University Councils/Committees & Liaison Reports: None

VI. New Business: 2013-2014 Faculty Senate Officer Elections- Nomination Committee-Alan Barenberg, Fanni Coward and Wendy Ross
Candidates for President: Aliza Wong and Arnold Loewy
Vice President: Richard Meek and Mary Francis Agnello
Secretary: Gretchen Adams

President: Aliza Wong
Vice President: Mary Francis Agnello
Secretary: Gretchen Adams

Summer Work Policy Resolution-resolution attached Submitted by Senator Agnello on behalf of faculty in the College of Education and other faculty

**Summer Work Policy Resolution-**

Whereas Texas Tech graduate students are required to enroll and pay tuition for continuing dissertation or thesis hours (OP 64.02) during Summer Sessions; or independent study classes;

Whereas one of the university's initiatives is to award more graduate degrees;

Whereas there is currently inconsistency across colleges in remunerating tenure-track faculty for teaching obligations to graduate students during the Summer Sessions, since OP 32.18 Academic Work Load Calculations addresses only Fall and Spring contracted period;

Whereas such uncompensated faculty work responds to graduate student instructional needs, including doctoral qualifying exams, research proposal defenses, and dissertation defenses, in addition to masters comprehensive exams, thesis supervision, and defense; as well as independent study courses;

Therefore, be it resolved that Texas Tech University, with collaboration from Faculty Senate, develop a salary/ remuneration policy to be operational Summer 2014 for faculty who perform these graduate teaching requirements during the Summer Sessions.

Nathan: Coincidentally, Senior Vice Provost Stewart has informed us that the Vice Provosts office is considering that issue right now as well. So it is a timely thing for us to take up. My inclination is to assign it to a Budget Study Committee and have them report to the Senate for a recommendation in May. But I am open to whatever is the vote of the Senate. Does that seem acceptable, like a good idea rather than acting on it now?

Howe: It’s a substantive matter so it should be publicized for a month. Constituents have to have time

Nathan: Senator Perl I would like to assign this to the Study committee and hopefully get a report out before the May meeting. We will put it on the agenda for the May meeting.

**Study Committee C-studying the Proposal to Revise Titles for Teaching Assistants** this is being initiated out of the Provosts Office. Dr. Stewart spoke about this proposal.

President Nathan assigned this to Study Committee C. Senator Lourdes Juan was asked to convene this committee to address the proposal.

**Revisiting of Previous Senate Resolutions on:**

**Child Care** Graduate Senator on the Student Senate, Katherine Lindley spoke about child care on campus. She stated that she knows this is an issue and hopes that the Faculty Senate will consider passing a resolution.

Some discussion followed on this issue.
President Nathan would like an ad-hoc committee for the Faculty Senate to make a recommendation at the May meeting regarding this issue. Senator Blum will put together an ad-hoc committee.

**Ombudsman** – table until next meeting. Senator Monroe made the motion to table. Senator Dolter seconded. No opposition so it is tabled.

VII. Announcements:

   Nathan: Faculty Status and Welfare Committee would like to have a brief meeting after Faculty Senate.

   There is a new OP on the horizon having to do with Conflict of Interest and that will probably be presented to you in some form in May.

VIII. Adjournment at 4:53 pm.