

Minutes #188

April 8, 1998

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 8, 1998 in the Senate Room of the University Center with Edward V. George, president, presiding. Senators present were Baker, Boal, Boylan, Bremer, Burkett, Casadonte, Coombs, Couch, Crawford, Elbow, El-Hindi, Floyd, Fox, Giaccardo, Gomez, Herring, Hufford, Josephson, Khan, Liman, Meek, Miller, Olivarez, Peek, Perez, Ponticell, Reckner, Reed, River, Robert, Schaller, Stinespring, Stompler, D. Thompson, L. Thompson, Van Cleave and White. Senators Dornier, Meaney, Sarkar, and Stout were absent because of University business. Senators Corbett, Lan, Loudon, McComb, Oler and Tsai were absent.

I. President George called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and introduced the following guests: David J. Schmidly, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies/Dean Graduate School; John Burns, Provost;

James E. Brink, Vice Provost/Interim Vice President for Enrollment Management; Mary Hudspeth, News & Publications; Ginger Pope and

Daniel Kerr, University Daily; Leslie Clem, student from the College of Arts & Sciences; and members of the news media.

II. Approval of Minutes #187. The minutes from the meeting of

March 11, 1998, were approved.

III. Invited Guest:

Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School,

David Schmidly addressed the Senate concerning the needs of Texas Tech University in its progress toward the next stage of development as a research institution. He expressed confidence in the growing stature of Texas Tech as a research institution. Dr. Schmidly indicated Texas Tech's position currently in comparison with leading research institutions based on the characteristics known as the "Carnegie Classifications" which calculate federal funding and the number of Ph.D's granted each year. He also discussed the rankings of top research universities as established by the NSF which use expenditures for science and engineering as guidelines. The third category was the Graham/Diamond Study which attempts to rank institutions by federal funding, faculty publications, and faculty fellowships. Texas Tech is considered a Research II institution in the Carnegie classification; a Category 4 institution in the Graham/Diamond Study; and ranked #134 in the NSF listing. Dr. Schmidly noted that the overall trend at Texas Tech is definitely improving but there is a considerable way to go.

Dr. Schmidly discussed the quality of graduate programs and such quality having a direct link with research and the ultimate ranking of the institution. He added that undergraduate instruction quality exhibits almost the same link. The better the performance in research, the better the academic program. One factor which directly impacts this is the work load factor. It has been clearly demonstrated that the more the faculty teach, the less is the performance in research. Budgetary factors are also a consideration. The more spent per faculty/student, the better the quality of the undergraduate and graduate programs.

Dr. Schmidly acknowledged that Texas Tech must address the faculty work load issue and the problem of funding in order to become a Research I institution.

He then itemized several steps to attain the goal of a Research I institution which included: convincing the Texas legislature for increased federal funding for research; acquiring additional resources via the Capital Campaign; improving the faculty; changing the work load policy; and changing the expectations and rewards systems. By improving the faculty, Dr. Schmidly further clarified that he means more faculty as well as methods to improve faculty recognition. He observed that no faculty member at Texas Tech is currently a member of a national academy. The work load, too, must be more conducive to research activity.

If we can implement all these steps, Texas Tech will become a high-performing research institution and dramatically improve the academic reputation of the university. Texas Tech needs to become more entrepreneurial, to lead the way in technology in this part of the state. All of this, Dr. Schmidly concluded, will add value to the degrees the university confers.

Dr. Schmidly did add that Texas Tech will have an Honors College as part of these goals.

Senator Baker observed that the steps outlined represent a bold and progressive analysis of the situation and asked what can the Faculty Senate do to help. Dr. Schmidly replied that the Senate needs to buy into the idea that Texas Tech needs to become a Research I institution. A coalition of support needs to be built to become a better research institution for students.

Senator Elbow commented that under President Grover Murray some twenty-five years ago, the switch to emphasize research began and that while consistent improvements have been made in the intervening years, the faculty is stretched as far as we can go now. We need help. To this, Dr. Schmidly replied that we can make ourselves a better institution if we want it. We need faculty support to back Chancellor Montford.

IV. Senate Reports. Gloria Lyerla Travel Grant Review Board representative Senator Stomblor reported that the Board awarded travel grants to Professor Mary Trotter (English) and to Professor John Howe

(History). The program is celebrating its 10th anniversary.

Privatization Resolution was discussed by Senator Miller. President George pointed out that the issue is not on the agenda for the April meeting of the Board of Regents. He will turn the matter over to Study Committee "A" which is chaired by Senator Casadonte. Senator Elbow pointed out that the Regents will meet again in June and that the Senate needs to make a recommendation in time for that meeting.

Renovation Backlog: President George drew attention to Associate Vice President Thomas Newman's report on the renovation backlog which was itemized in the Announcements listing. The total cost of reconstruction and renovation needed but for which there are not funds is a little over \$19 million. Meantime, HEAF funds being set aside for new construction are curtailing the availability of funds to clean up the backlog.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS. RESOLUTIONS; Sexual Harassment Training presented by Study Committee "A" was discussed by Senator Hufford. The original phrasing was altered after consultation with the Dean of Students Office and the General Counsel. Senator Stompler observed that the resolution is too generic and should more specifically target Greek organizations. Senator Hufford noted that the General Counsel said it "was unwise to target specific groups." Senator Couch offered an amendment to the resolution to delete item #4 which addresses the "delivery method." After a short discussion, the Senate unanimously approved the amendment to delete #4. The resolution then read:

"(1) That all freshmen and transfer students admitted to Texas Tech University receive training in the legal, social, and ethical aspects of the sexual harassment and assault, discrimination, and drug abuse by the end of their first semester; (2) That this training be administered and supervised by a Texas Tech University agency such as the Office of the Dean of Students; (3) That the training be accomplished in such a way that delivery of the training is verifiable on an individual basis."

After a lengthy discussion, the resolution passed by a show of hands: 18 in favor; 14 against; 1 abstention.

Resolution Based on Item A4 of the Hensley Motion concerning notification from the Administration was discussed by Senator Casadonte, chair of Study Committee "A". The resolution reads: "The Faculty Senate welcomes its role in the shared governance of the University. As such, the Faculty Senate recommends that a calendar or list of proposed major development and operation events and milestones be prepared at least each academic year with updates incorporating significant changes and that the calendar or list be available in paper form and placed on the University webpage for perusal by the University at large. Subsequently, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate be apprised in a timely manner concerning major development and operations plans or modifications in existing plans by the administration." The resolution carried.

VI. New Business. Post Tenure Review Ad Hoc Committee. It has come to the attention of the Faculty Senate that O.P. 32.32 (which pertains to annual evaluations of tenured and

non-tenured faculty) must be separate from matters concerning the Post Tenure Review process in order to avoid what are perceived as ambiguities between the two processes. This was communicated in a letter from Provost Burns.

Senator Boal asked for clarification on the issue of where the revised O.P. 32.32 is in violation of the Texas State Bill 149. He also asked Provost Burns if we could get a second opinion from the State Attorney General's office.

President George observed that while the existence of ambiguities is rumored to have come from Texas Tech counsel Pat Campbell, no document exists with Campbell's signature on it. Pat Campbell's role is not entirely clear.

Vice Provost Brink urged that for clarity, return O.P. 32.32 back to its original reading and create a "stand alone document" which would concern Post Tenure Review procedures. He added that there are one or two minor points which need changing. The changes concern the issue of the consequences in the event of a negative evaluation. Vice Provost Brink alluded to two points in SB 149 which are not in the revised

O.P. 32.32.

President George replied by saying it is his belief that all the points are covered in "revised O.P. 32.32." He conceded that a separate document might be required for clarity but that such a separate document would not tamper with the substance of the revised O.P. 32.32.

Provost Burns added that the lack of communication with the Health Sciences Center led to some of the confusion. The policy must be voted upon during the May 6 meeting of the Senate in order to be presented to the Regents at their 15 June meeting. And the law goes into effect 1 September 1998. Provost Burns said that the existing language in Revised O.P. 32.32 could be used in the "stand alone" Post Tenure Review document but that a change needs to be put into the last line about negative evaluations. He further added that what constitutes "peer review" is our leeway. SB 149 does not address that.

At the suggestion of Parliamentarian Brian McGee, President George at this point in the discussion handed the chairman's gavel to Faculty Senate Vice President Olivarez in order to participate more fully in the discussion before the Senate.

Several senators expressed concern over the timing of the rewriting and again asked for a second opinion to clarify exactly what it is about Revised O.P. 32.32 that is not in compliance with SB 149.

Vice Provost Brink attempted to assure the Senate that no conspiracy was going on and conceded that it was a matter of poor timing.

When asked by President George if we could have assurance that the newly created "stand alone" document and the original O.P. 32.32 would go forward expeditiously and

that the Chancellor will get the documents to the Board, Provost Burns assured him that such would be the case.

Senator Boylan asked about the specifics if a faculty member receives a negative review. Will the committee address that or present only vague recommendations?

President George maintained that the committee will preserve the sequence of termination as it exists now with tenured faculty. If termination is a prospect, everyone will be referred to the existing policy.

A vote taken to preserve the spirit of the original proposal passed unanimously. A second vote in favor of the members of the Ad Hoc committee also passed unanimously. These include: Charlotte Dunham, Gary Elbow, Timothy Floyd, Edward George, and Gerald Skoog.

VII. Announcements: President George, having resumed the chairman's gavel, referred the senators to the list of announcements. Item #1 concerned the proposal for a Staff Senate which does not seem to be on the agenda for the Regents' meeting on 13 April. Item #2 concerned a dialogue group which met 9 March at Lubbock City hall with the theme of "Making Texas Tech University More Inclusive." Item #3 is an inquiry from a faculty member at the Health Sciences Center for information regarding main campus academic units which use numerical systems in grading faculty productivity for purposes such as salary increases and promotion.

President George also mentioned at a special social event will follow the 6 May meeting of the Faculty Senate and urged all senators to plan on staying a while after the regular meeting.

VIII. Adjournment. Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy B. Reed

Acting Secretary