

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
November 11, 2015, #345**

**Senators present were:** Cox, Farmer, Sharma, Buelinckx, Zugay, Adams, Brittan, Canas, Cargile Cook, Carter, Held, Kaye, McCheney, Milam, Nokken, Qualin, Wilde, Arnett, Dass, Fleischman, Ritchey, Crews, Richman, Siwatu, Bayne, Dallas, Ghebrab, Morse, Nejat, Zuo, Williams, Gillam, Kalenkoski, Parkinson, Whiting, Yuan, Metze, Cassidy, Heinz, Litsey, Weiner, Gring, Donahue, McKoin and Orflia. Senators absent were: Calkins, Grair, Hom, Mayer, Morgan, Morales, Nite, Rahamamoghadam, Ramkumar, Skidmore, Surluiga, Soliman, McGinley, Henry, Hidalgo, Keene, Ortiz, Ankrum, Brookes and Wascoe-Hays.

**Guests were:** TTU Vice President for Research Robert V. Duncan. Pat DeLucia Associate Vice President for Research, Faculty Affairs, Provost Lawrence Schovanec, Senior Vice-Provost Rob Stewart, Ombudsperson Jean Scott, Gary Elbow; Parliamentarian, Richard Meek, recording meetings, IRB Rep Andy King, Staff Senate Rep Cassandra Rodriguez, Professors W. J. Conover and Lee Duemer, Breann Robinson from the HUB, Linda Rodriguez (proxy for Liz Paulk, incoming Staff Senate President)

**I. Call to Order at 3:19pm** by Michael Farmer, President

**II. Introduction of Guests**

**III. Approval of minutes, Meeting #344, October 14, 2015 3:23**

Approved with corrections (Faculty Senate Approval of Programs, capitalization (Kalenkowski); Qualin shows as absent but was present)

Motion to approve: Senator Carter

Motion seconded: Senator Kaye

**IV. Special Announcement:** No Faculty Senate Meeting in December

**V. Speaker: Robert V. Duncan, Vice President for Research 3:26**

-Pat DeLucia working to determine needs of faculty to expand research mission of TTU

-Conducted an IRB-approved survey, because approved by IRB will be publishable and will lead to longitudinal studies to see how people's ability to do research is improving

-Survey showed three things:

1. The number one problem to submitting more proposals was balancing time for teaching, research, and service
2. Infrastructure and student support needed improvement
3. Financial support to start or continue research needed improvement

Comment: need more funding for grad students -- best way is to get outside funding

Comment: External funding leads to faculty recognition by the rest of the academic world

-Further analysis of data:

Much data needs to be analyzed further

Need to identify steps to improve process with external funding

Need to follow up with faculty and staff

-Strategies to increase TTU's national prominence in research

1. Promote faculty success through faculty support

Ease pre- and post-award burden

Working on hiring grant proposal writers/facilitators

Examining faculty workload issues

Provide ability to collaborate with other institutions/entities

President's collaborative research initiative

Collaboration with Health Science Center

Catalyst Program for Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences

- Early investigator faculty proposal development workshops
- Funds for travel to bolster research/proposal success
- Proposal review program
  - TTU will pay someone else to critically evaluate your proposal if it is prepared far in advance of the deadline for submission
- Targeted external faculty awards program -- faculty recognized for accomplishments nation wide
- Faculty research club
- 2. Improve research infrastructure
  - We have grown 40% in sponsored research project awards in 2 years**
  - Working on better utilizing TTU buildings so people can carry out their research
  - Spaces being renovated and remodeled, new buildings being constructed
  - Over 70 million in instrumentation, working to provide shared core facilities
- 3. Expand economic prosperity and innovation
  - With UT Austin, Texas A&M, Rice, we are 4th Univ. responsible for SW node of NSF Icore Entrepreneurial cluster -- three directors who report to Robert V. Duncan
  - Lubbock Angel Network and other investors (invest private equity)
  - Music, Engineering, Business -entrepreneurial classes being taught across the curriculum
  - Innovation Hub at Research Park -- working on major industrial research opportunities
  - Chromatin
  - Bayer Crop Science
  - Accelerator -- to help faculty get further along when they have ideas
  - Working to double size of entrepreneurialism "boot camp" for student
  - Multiple student organizations have formed
  - Proposals are up 19% over last 2 years
  - Total research expenditures declined -- must get out numbers up

**Discussion:**

Held: What about the "hunt" for National Academy members and Nobel laureates?

Duncan: There is a systematic effort in the state to identify people, to attract them to TTU -- please help us identify them and help us get them here

Held: Confirm something Dean of Arts and Sciences said: Univ. willing to pay \$10-20 million for Nat'l Academy member, as much as \$50 million for Nobel Laureate

Duncan: can't confirm those numbers, but money is available from the state

Schovanec: \$38 million biennium available from the state

Parkinson: Shared core space

Duncan: We know faculty have a need, University wants to help people access equipment; come to us if you see a need for a major piece of equipment, we will facilitate access

Parkinson: is there any space on campus available?

Duncan: yes, and we're identifying those things right now, because of faculty self-organization

Held: graduate students are the workhorses of research. Why is there not more support for graduate stipends to recruit students at a level like UT and A&M?

Duncan: I can't really answer that; but, there is money available. It would be valuable to apply for external support.

Held: but why aren't we spending more money to attract the best students?

Duncan: referred back to external/extramural support.

Farmer: across country, 43% of time goes to things other than research; at TTU, we score above that number.

Can we use that, as opposed to a negative number, as a rallying cry to get people organized?

Duncan: yes. That shows a strong charge to our office to relieve administrative burden for faculty. CFO Sloane

and I work closely to try to lessen the burden. Streamlining is important, community must push back.  
Richman: certain sector have maximized buyout of summer salary; can we identify those people, nurture them, enable them to buy out a class, and get them to mentor junior faculty?

Farmer: Noel Sloane is working on that

Duncan: we have been working on ways to incentivize, but it is department by department

## **V. Old Business 4:01**

-Feedback on 2-minute reports

-Big 12 Travel Fellowships: Senator Nokken was concerned with Big 12 Fellowships, received an email from Provost's office; work will continue with Provost's Office

Rob Stewart: we can do what other Big 12 Schools are doing in the future, would like faculty feedback

-Communicating Senate business (Cargile-Cook): reports sent to faculty by Deans, and now Michael Farmer has an email list of faculty and can send out.

-Purchasing (Sharma): no real solution; Farmer: did speak with John Huffaker, no real details

-Faculty Course Review (Program Review)

Farmer: clarified Kalenkoski's question from last month, making certain all knew there is no question about approving courses; education point: we don't want people from other disciplines reviewing our work; in fact, Academic Council comprised of people from different disciplines, so we are already living in that world. Who would we rather have doing it, our group of elected faculty, or the group of Associate Deans effectively? Need to democratize the Senate more. It is a concern whether the broader faculty trusts this respective body. Challenge: if we as a faculty are concerned that the Faculty Senate can't be trusted to approve Programs, there is very little else I can think of that would justify faculty governance on campus. If we're not at that trusted point, we need to get there. My concern is about incentive compatibility. Incentive structure for Faculty is different than that of Associate Deans. We can use expertise of Academic Council and of Faculty Senate, and keep the approval process here.

### **Discussion: 4:12**

Donahue: Where did the impetus for this start? Why on the table now? No groundswell from the Senate.

Farmer: Largely my initiative, and there are some irregularities that have happened. For example, no faculty vote for program approval recorded by Academic Council. (Other examples noted.)

Donahue: In my college, not a problem.

Farmer: Other examples given for need for Faculty Senate approval, rather than just Academic Council, in regard to incentives for faculty to review (protection of faculty materials, for example), in contrast to incentives for Academic Council to review (incentives are different/not as strong in regard to advocating for faculty as opposed to advocating for programs). Out of AAU institutions, all 69 that I have checked have Faculty approving programs. I believe faculty don't trust faculty to approve faculty work. I like the people on Academic Council, but I see problems I can't always report.

Kalenkowski: problem is the mistrust of this body.

Farmer: we could have Horn Professors approve programs; we've had problems in not trusting Faculty Senate to approve OPs; 10 years ago, Faculty Senate did not approve, now we do.

Kalenkowski: we need to convince people that the Faculty Senate is an appropriate place for Program approval.

Farmer: where, really, should it be? It should be in the Senate, but we don't yet trust the Senate to do it. We have to be credible. This is why we are not pushing forward with this right away.

Dallas: we keep talking about trust, but it may be a matter of workload; the amount of work it would take for individuals on the Faculty Senate to understand the programs thoroughly enough to make decisions about them would be a burden.

Farmer: one concern is workload burden, we hear that our score of post-award administrative burden is over 50% (high compared to the rest of the county, at 43%). Propose that one of the reasons our burden is so high is that our voice is so silent, and that if we had a stronger voice, we might be where our competitors and our aspirants are. At some point, we may have to invest in that time.

Held: echo Senator Donahue's concern. This seems to be a concern of our President.

Farmer: nothing has been moved upon formally, I am putting a committee together to investigate the issue.

Held: concerns over heavy burden to approve programs, concerns over the time it may take to approve programs. Disagree that the Faculty Senate should be approving programs.

Farmer: Do we want to study the possibility of moving this over to the Senate over time? If we really don't pursue it, I want us to understand why. It is difficult for me to understand faculty not approving programs.

Held: can this be moved into Academic Committee for investigation?

Farmer: yes. We have collected comment on this, and it will be moved into committee. They will decide how to pursue. We will not move forward without votes.

**-Update on Fair Use (Rob Cox) 4:25**

Statement sent out with Agenda material

Suggesting insertion in OP 74.04 (Intellectual Property)

Next step: identify OP language, get comment on this language.

Languages mirrors closely language in OP already

Farmer: if we as a body feel comfortable with the language, we need to figure out where we need to include the language

Work for Hire: "uncommon" and "disclosed" (to College Deans at least) are the two principles we're looking at. Farmer: if there are funds involved that make it Work for Hire, the faculty member should be paid.

**-TCFS (Michael Farmer)**

Will give a full report in January

**-COBA Report (Provost Schovanec) 4:30**

Gave details surrounding Dean Nail's resignation

He will receive a teaching release for Spring 2016, will remain as tenured professor

Thanked the Committee for their thorough work

Unresolved issue: the grades

What to do with these four students? Not every student whose grade was changed needed the change to graduate; but what to do about the one/two who did need the grade change, and what to do about the other students in the class who were not given an opportunity to raise their grades? The issue is, what do we need to do to make this right? The committee proffered no recommendations in regard to the students. We need to make a decision in a timely manner, and we'll work on it (with advice from others).

**Discussion: 4:35**

Fleischman: what impact has this had on a very esteemed Horn Professor, who has been teaching here for 37 years?

Schovanec: I would ask that you look at the action, and the statement we have made about the action. We have to protect the central role of faculty in these matters.

Arnett: time period for an interim dean hire?

Schovanec: meeting called to answer questions, emphasize need for cooperation, will speak to interim

candidates next week. Dean Nail will serve until the end of the year to prevent disruption.

Held: Dr. Conover is here to speak. (very brief thanks for support from Senator Held)

Adams: Asked by three different people, Dean Nail issued his own statement which condemned the committee, saying they did not act in good faith. Will there be a response?

Schovanec: I have not yet had a chance to meet with anyone in regard to that. (Doesn't necessarily believe that rebutting a statement will help the situation.)

Richman: several faculty members have asked why we would pay him for a sabbatical and keep him on the faculty as full professor rather than terminate his position?

Schovanec: we investigated fully, and used a statute as the basis for compensation.

Richman: there are faculty who are questioning the decision not to terminate his tenure.

Schovanec: I never considered this an option. I recognize your point, and acknowledge that there are differing opinions about the issue.

Held: do you have any concerns about SACs accreditation for the Rawls College of Business or TTU?

Schovanec: there are two standards relevant to this. One says that you have in place a system for handling student complaints (OP34.03) -- it wasn't used. That was the basis of recommendation to Professor Conover to file an appeal. The second (noted in report) was also upheld. Both are noted in the report. I can't speak for SACs but I believe Texas Tech has taken the high ground on this.

Held: Thank you for that.

-Update on Graduate Council Liaison (Morse) **4:44**

1. Looking at revising policy of the requirement of having a graduate Dean representative on PhD committees assigned by the Graduate School; rather, proposal: we are looking at having the student and/or chair of the committee select that person and invite them on the day of dissertation, to be noted; person would not be a voting member of the committee (no vested interest in process of dissertation itself). This is an attempt to reduce backlog at the graduate school level so they can focus on other things.
2. Talk of, should we allow a grade to be assigned to dissertation/thesis work each semester instead of just at completion; leaning toward leaving it the way it is.

*Discussion:*

Donahue: right now we assign them CR. What if a very productive student doesn't do a lot of work during a semester? Would I have to assign that student an F?

Morse: that would be the idea, that is the argument to change the procedure; however, there were many arguments against changing the procedure.

Donahue: afraid we would lose students. There are students who will not make progress during one semester (e.g. when they adjunct someplace for a semester), but they will come back and complete.

Morse: will take that forward to the Council.

Wilde: generally opposed to it, and also do not want to have to write performance criteria each semester and evaluating to head off potential grade appeals. This would lead to a lot of extra work.

Morse: the trend is to move that way anyway, simply to have more formal evaluation.

Langford: understand opposition, but sees this as a good tool to motivate students to complete. Isn't it up to faculty discretion right now? I would like to have this option.

Morse: right now, they will go back and change it back to CR, until completion.

Langford: would like to be able to assign F for the purposes of putting them on probation with the graduate school, if necessary.

Morse: indicated understanding.

Morse: exploring idea that students who come in as PhD student but don't have Masters degree in that field, may *de facto* complete Masters degree on the way to completing PhD. Proposed that they would be able to do this as a recruiting tool in addition to just coming in as straight PhD person and skipping the

Masters. Criteria may also be set (extra exam, for example).

Farmer: this already happens in several departments.

Morse: feedback? Anything to take back to Grad Council?

Held: call for a vote, these are substantive changes that need to be discussed and voted upon.

Morse: my role has always been as liaison ...

Farmer: need for more discussion? Do we have a quorum? No ...

Donahue: Are you saying that academic policies that come from the graduate school should be brought before Faculty Senate?

Held: yes

(fast exchange of comments between Donahue, Farmer, Held)

Morse: I have a vote for Faculty Senate on the Grad Council. Held would like to formalize the process.

Farmer: we just established liaisons last year. It would take time to change/formalize the process and take a vote without breaking our rules.

Morse:( reassuring Senator Held) these are exploratory, not things that are being changed.

## **VI. New Business 4:55**

### **Open Forum: 2 minute open topic from the floor**

#### **-MBA Program**

Held: explain what happened to the MBA program. The Dean unilaterally changed the MBA program to the STEM MBA program; if this can happen, there is not shared governance

Farmer: yes, the Dean approved, then the Academic Council approved. The faculty needs to investigate. We need to see faculty governance strengthened at the local level. What can we do to facilitate better Unit development, at the College level?

Crews: in the OPs is there a requirement about involving Faculty counsel to make those types of decisions?

Farmer: the only OP that requires Faculty involvement/governance is for Tenure and Promotion.

Stewart: Arts and Sciences has structure in the form of an Academic Programs Committee. Respective Associate Deans and Academic Council make the decisions.

Farmer: back to faculty governance, a need to

Held: rectified by the next Dean? It is important for the next Dean to know that we have a model of shared governance (or an aspiration to it), and that the faculty must be consulted before making these types of decisions.

### **Announcement (Scott): 5:02**

Please look for a survey on bullying, being sponsored by the Bullying Prevention Committee.

## **VII. Adjournment: 5:03**

Motion to adjourn: Senator Kaye

Motion seconded: Senator Fleischman