

**Texas Tech University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes #218**

October 10, 2001

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, October 10, 2001 in the Senate Room in the University Center with President Giaccardo presiding. Senators present were Elam, Kvashny, Buelinckx, Byerly, Marks, Dolter, Donahue, Harter, James, Kuriyama, Lee, Lewis, Lucas, Meek, Reed, Reeves, Roberts, Schaller, Howe, Weinberg, Yang, Dukes, Johnson, Murray, Lakhani, Mann, Norville, Reeder, Blum, Russ, Shriver, Marshall, Quinn, Bradley, Carr, Curry, Hsiang, Marbley, Steinhart, Willis-Aarnio and Parliamentarian Gary Elbow. Excused Senators were Lewis, Stinespring, Williams, Thomas, Zhang, Phelan, Cooper and Hoo. Unexcused Senators were Hein

I. Call to Order was announced by President Marc Giaccardo at 3:19 p.m.

President Giaccardo reminded senators that they must sign in on the sheets provided at the front door. He also recognized Senators Marks and Howe who were recently elected to the senate. Finally, he thanked and welcomed faculty guests and asked each of them to introduce themselves and their department.

II. Recognition of Guests: Provost John Burns; Vice Provost Jim Brink; Assistant Provost Liz Hall; Gill Reeves, Chair of Heath, Exercise and Sports Science; President David Schmidly; and Interim Chancellor David Smith.

III. Approval of Minutes for meeting #217, September 12, 2001, were approved as distributed.

IV. Invited Guests

President David Schmidly was introduced and stated that the number one goal of the strategic plan is to increase access and diversity throughout the university. We need to get more talented students, who better represent the diversity in the state of Texas, we need to retain them and get them employed after graduation.

We can still do better, but we are making progress. This years fall enrollment was an all-time high of 25,573; the previous record high was in 1990 of 25,363. We also have had a 7.4% increase in graduate enrollment and 25% of the total enrollment increase is due to increases in graduate students. Which is keeping with our goal of growing our research and graduate programs. We had 1,936 or 9.3% transfer students. We also had 3,921 incoming freshmen, which is a decrease of 1% from the previous year, but we had over 12,000 freshman applications and we were much more selective in who we accepted. The average SAT score for incoming freshmen was 11,012, which is also an all time high for Tech the previous high was 10,095 set in 1999. Our freshmen retention rate is also at a record high of 81% and our 6-year graduation rate, for the first time in Texas Tech history, is above 50% at 52%.

Our student athletes are also doing very well. Four percent of our student athletes had a perfect 4-point GPA; 37% had a GPA of 3.0-3.9; another 30% had a GPA from 2.5-.2.99; 21% had a GPA from 2.0-2.4 and only 9% had a GPA below 2.0. The average GPA of 2.88 compared to 2.83 for the entire student body.

We started Red Raider Camp this summer and over 10% of the freshman class attended that camp. So there is a lot of enthusiasm for being Red Raiders among the student body. We did well also in our minority enrollment. Among transfer students, African-American enrollment increased 89% from 28 to 53 students. Percentage increase looks good, but we need to work on the actual number. Among transfer students, Hispanic students increased from 233 to 256 about a 10% increase. Very encouraging was among graduate students, African-American students increased by 31% from 65 to 85, and Hispanic

students 248 to 271 about a 9% increase. Percentage wise these are good figures, but we still need to work harder to increase our minority enrollment.

The Provost's Office has worked hard to increase out minority faculty hirings. Of the 76 new faculty, 19 or 26% of those were minorities, which, once again, was an all time high for Tech. Access and diversity is our number one goal and we have made a lot of dramatic improvement over the past year. This strategic plan, in which we lay out a set of goals for this institution, a set of goals that is appropriate for our institution and higher education, that meets the needs and expectations of this state and we measure, benchmark and create ways to show that we are accountable for achieving those goals, is one of the most important things that we can do for the future of Texas Tech.

We now have a strategic plan for every academic and non-academic area of the campus and we have created a draft plan for the entire institution that is available on our website. The strategic plans for all areas at Texas Tech are due on October 15. They will then be reviewed and then we will be holding a series of town hall meetings for people to comment on the strategic plan. This process should be completed by November and the plan will go to the Board of Regents for approval in December. We can expect this plan to take this institution into a dramatically positive direction over the next 5 years.

The plan calls for the establishment of a ledger system that is based on each area's critical success factors. That we will use, measure and report on annually to report our success. There will be some common measures in the ledger system, and there will be others that will be unique to the college and many academic and non-academic units that will have their own unique ledger attributes as well. I think that presenting ourselves in this performance-oriented way will position this university to achieve a lot of respect with regard to the leadership of the state of Texas. I met with Mr. Adams, chair of the governor's select commission on higher education, and I presented him with the draft of our strategic plan along with our performance system, our critical success factors and he said that it was some of the best things he had seen in higher education in Texas in the past 30 years.

We did not receive any directed money from the state for faculty salary increases this year. We had to find a way, institutionally, to come up with a 4% merit-based raise system. Consistently, since 1997 we have been somewhere between 3% and 6%. That is not good enough. We still lag behind other institutions in Texas. The interim-chancellor is doing a great job and is trying to get money to come back to the institution and we have agreed that that money will be put back into the faculty salary category. Particularly for younger, assistant professors that other institutions typically raid.

In order to get the money for faculty raises we had to reduce the non-academic operating budget. We did that by 4%, it was not easy, but I felt it was absolutely essential that we at least be doing the same as other major state universities in terms of faculty salary increases.

Finally, I want to discuss the athletic program reorganization plan. The plan is guided by the general philosophy that there is a need to reintegrate university athletics back within institutional academic structures. Part of the problem is that they sit out as appendages and are isolated from the rest of the academic infrastructure and that is not healthy for the long-term. We also need to streamline the administrative and reporting structure and also free up the athletic director to bring in more outside revenue. We are currently at the bottom of the Big 12 in terms of private fund raising for our athletic department. We have initiatives started in Dallas, Houston, Austin, and San Antonio to increase funding for athletics and we need to have the athletic director to be more involved in that.

We also want to improve financial management, fiduciary control and communications within the athletic department. We have met with the athletic department personnel and are continuing to meet with them over the next week. The president then reviewed the new organizational chart for the newly organized

athletic department. The reason for the new structure is to get the management of these activities more broadly integrated with the overall way that we manage and treat students in the university. We intend to announce this to the Board of Regents during the November meeting and implement it at the beginning of the year.

The president then opened the floor for questions.

Senator Donahue asked about the ledger system. How does it apply to each department? What changes does the president foresee occurring in departments as a result of the ledger system?

President Schmidly replied that 65% or more of Tech's money comes from the state and we need to become more self-sufficient as a university and each department must also become more self-sufficient. The manner in which units become more self-sufficient depends on the benchmarks of those units. There is no formula that will be used to measure performance. Everyone will be held accountable through an annual review.

Senator Lee asked about the student SAT averages and he complained that some of our students were not properly prepared for college. Where in the chain from high school to college does the fault lie?

President Schmidly admitted that this is a debate that takes place in the Texas Legislature and other levels. Provost Burns interjected and stated that the inclusion of math placement tests should help resolve some of this problem. The president mentioned that we need to look at this from a system standpoint from K thru 12 and all the way to Texas Tech. The College of Engineering has adopted Estacado High School and is working with them to improve student's math scores.

Senator Bradley asked whether Tech and UMC were considered as a two-tier system and if there were plans to integrate the two systems. President Schmidly stated that they are two common entities, but however warned that they should not be seen as two ships that pass in the night. They need to be seen as two parallel activities with interconnecting points. There will be some broad institutional ledger measures, but then you will move down into each college and critical success factors will vary at these levels. A draft of the ledger system is available for anyone who is interested in seeing it.

Senator Kvashny asked who is in charge of athletic scholarships? The president stated that it is the athletic director's responsibility. We had a deficit budget in athletics last year. That forced us to tier the sports. We kept the revenue sports at a higher level than we were able to keep the Olympic sports. That is something that we do not want to do in the long-term and that is why fund raising is so important. The Athletic Council gets reports on what sports get what scholarships.

Senator Schaller asked if the president was going to get involved in tenure decisions. The president explained that he excluded himself from getting involved in the departmental level in departments where he has a faculty appointment because he does not feel that he should vote twice. For example, he has a faculty appointment in the Department of Biological Sciences, Range, Wildlife, and Fisheries and Museum Sciences, so he does not vote when people come up for tenure in those areas. He votes after the deans and provost review it. He believes that it is his responsibility to review the document before he puts his signature on it.

Senator Bradley asked with regard to access and diversity of faculty if we conducted exit interviews for faculty. The provost interjected and stated that it is required by law that we conduct exit interviews with all faculty. The president reminded everyone that Manuel Espinosa is working on faculty recruiting, and minority faculty and student retention issues. We have high faculty turnover at Texas Tech and it costs us a lot of money and we need to resolve it by finding out more about why faculty leave.

Senator Lucas asked in reference to the faculty retention rate if we knew what the faculty turnover rate was. Assistant Provost Hall interjected and stated that we hired 76 faculty members last year, however, it is actually a difficult number to calculate because we sometimes have positions that go unfilled and then are filled in another semester. Assistant Provost Hall stated that the coordinating board reported a 7% turnover rate, while the Provost stated that he believed it was closer to 10%. The president stated that all faculty do not leave just because of salary issues. They may leave for a variety of reasons such as family, geography, or to be located closer to home or a child. The fact is that we need to know why our faculty are leaving and the turnover rate should always be below 10%.

Senator Steinhart asked with regard to recruiting faculty and lobbying for faculty salary increases if departments will be penalized if they do not perform. The president reassured that departments would be measured against themselves and there would be no punitive arrangement. He wants to measure departments against their own improvement from year to year. Budgets and resources need to change because enrollments change. So we have to be able to move resources around. There is no hard and fast formula and there is no punitive system. It is necessary at some point in time to rearrange resources based on enrollment and what performance is about. The Hopwood situation is a very difficult one. At the University of Georgia they had a system of assigning additional points to minority students who applied and that has been thrown out by the courts. There is another situation in Michigan that is now in the courts and if that one is thrown out it looks like Hopwood will be the universal thing that we need to deal with. So we are all concerned about Hopwood, but I have to live with it, but my position is that we will not use it as an excuse for Texas Tech not performing well in recruiting and creating a wonderful place for all Texans to go to school. We can make no excuses; we need to reach out to all Texans. We need more scholarship money for all of our students of all races. I am proud of what we did this year, but I am absolutely convinced that we can do better.

Senator Marbley asked exactly what does the president plan to offer to attract students of color. The president responded that a nurturing environment where students can learn and feel appreciated, and some of the things we need to do is improve some of the ways we relate to a broader segment of the population than we have in the past. We are trying to do a lot of things to improve the cultural environment. The most important thing would be to diversify the faculty and the administrative leadership of the institution. So when students come on to campus and they see the faculty that teach them, the staff that support them, and the people who administer the institution are more reflective of the total community of Texas than they would feel more comfortable to come to school here. Senator Marbley asked also how does the university plan to measure diversity at the department level? The president stated that the proof is in the pudding. What percentage of your administrative appointments were diverse appointments? What percentage of your faculty are minorities? What percentage of your student body is diverse? All of these things tie into whether people are coming here and going to school, and are they graduating? I think you have to count things. If students of color are not satisfied, they will not stay and it will be reflected in a low graduation and retention rate. I can get up and make speeches, and recite numbers for you, but that will not achieve what we are talking about if we do not get everyone in this room committed to it. It is my job to philosophically lead that discourse and encourage that as an institutional value of Texas Tech University. I will work hard to achieve success, but we cannot do it alone.

Senator Schaller stated that in a breakdown of the faculty that he saw in a report that the number of female professors had decreased. Why? The president did not know why, but he assured the senator that women did count as a diverse group.

Senator Howe asked with regard to the reintegration of athletics that fans should also be mainstreamed into what is going on at the university. The president agreed and stated that the pride and pageantry committee was trying to create more non-athletic events that would correspond with athletic events. I

want to see our students with their families on campus and feeling good about our university and then the culmination of that is going to the football game.

Senator Lee asked if we still had International Week events and dinners and he was informed that we still did and that the city and community must also get involved in developing a cultural diverse environment.

Senator Donahue asked about the North Overton Performing Arts Center. The president indicated that it was still on the books for construction however they had no money for it now and they were looking for a donor and an exact site.

Senator Lucas mentioned that he had heard that the arts center plans were removed from the planning committees agenda. The president explained that the plans had not been removed, but currently no planning is taking place since there is no money. We are still looking for a donor.

Senator Willis-Aarnio asked why she has not seen television monitors around campus. The president explained that there were monitors all over campus but they were not in every building. They are in all of the high-traffic areas. If we need to get more, we will try to as soon as we get the resources.

Lewis Held asked what was going on at the Reese BSL-4 Lab? What security measures are there? The president assured him that studies at the labs were on hold prior to September 11, however, if they were to begin again, the labs would have to be 1000% secure in order to get approval from the government to build such a facility. He also reassured that the research at Reese is not involved in Bio-terrorist agents.

A faculty guest who had attended one of the president's bi-monthly meetings with students stated that he felt that the meetings needed to be better organized and the president agreed that it needed to be a more relaxed atmosphere and that they were looking into moving the meeting to another location.

At that point the president thanked everyone and Interim Chancellor Smith took the podium.

The interim chancellor believes that his role is to support the other two presidents, of which he is one. He feels that the system is there as a service organization in order to fulfill our mission of academics, research, and service, and as interim chancellor that is his priority. He has to date, changed the way that the chancellor's office is structured and he firmly believes that communication is the key. He will not make decisions that impact the financial liability or the strategic decisions that the presidents make, we need to do that in a collaborative fashion and we have created a committee to do that.

His priorities are looking at the chancellor's office and looking at economics and efficiencies. Some of the cuts will create substantial budget reductions and these resources will be diverted back to the university. The announcement will come in the next week or two. We will be moving some of the operations that are currently in the system back to the university with the funds. There are some difficult personnel decisions that need to be made as well.

We are also working on increasing endowments in the areas of scholarship, graduate student stipends and fellowships, and faculty support. This is also the interim period for the legislature. The Legislative Appropriation Request (LAR) is due in late June early August and it will be this team that puts together those priorities. It will be a difficult session because the legislature has forward funded the next session to the tune of between 4 and 5 billion dollars of the state budget of 75-76 billion. So that means we will be going in with a deficit. We are hopeful that because of the economy that Texas will not be hit as hard. The number one area for opportunity in this session will be formula funding and enrollment, enrollment, enrollment! Both universities need to pay attention to this. Faculty salaries are another issue of importance. We need to prioritize during this next legislative session.

We are also developing a team to fundraise for the Montford Legacy for students to enhance scholarships, stipends and fellowships. We need to build endowments in order to keep increasing our student enrollment, especially for diverse students.

We are also looking at the Chief Information Offices Report, which has indicated that Tech has huge Information Technology requirements and we need a lot of money to support increases in IT. It will be a major investment in the order of what we are doing with facilities. He plans to bring this plan to the Board of Regents.

The final thing is just honesty. This is always a time for anxiety. But, I am committed to work with you and do believe that we can continue to achieve and be the university of choice for Texas.

The interim chancellor then opened the floor for questions.

Lewis Held asked about anti-terrorism measures and curb-in and curb-out? The interim chancellor stated that a committee was looking into bio-terrorism issues and academically they were looking into the long-term effects of current events. What should we be doing academically? Symposiums, course offerings, degree programs? We have expertise in two critical areas, what we breath and what we eat. If you were going to hit a mass amount of people those are the two vectors that you would use. Curb-in is very important and I have asked the committee to address that issue. We will be using external and internal people in this process.

Parliamentarian Gary Elbow asked what the job description of the chancellor was. The interim chancellor explained that he had not really seen it. We are trying to take a look at that. At one point there was a draft of a chancellor's job description that included athletics. Under the NCAA that has to be under the academic officer which is the president of the university. So there are things like that that need to be corrected. Tenure is another area that should be under the presidents, not the chancellor's office. The changes that he is making are looking at efficiencies and economies. He is not making fundamental changes just changes to telecommunications and some of the support services. I am trying to see if we need the size of the budget and the number of personnel that we currently have given the changes that occurred and if we have vacancies, do we need to fill them.

The interim chancellor thanked everyone and concluded his remarks.

V. Old Business

The Budget Study Committee chaired by Uzi Mann presented their findings of the post tenure review process. Lewis Held presented the findings that were distributed along with the agenda proceedings. The committee suggested that 4 additional passages be added to OP 32.05, 32.31 and 32.32.

A suggestion was made that the passages be separated and voted on individually. Senator Howe moved to separate the passages; Senator Lucas seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

The first passage that was voted on was Passage 1 which is to be inserted into O.P. 32.05, Section 4d and reads, If the President's decision is different from that recommended by the Grievance Committee, then the written reasons for such difference will be provided to the grievant and the Committee.

Since the recommendations came as a motion from the Budget Committee, no other motion was necessary. There was no discussion and Passage 1 was passed unanimously.

Lewis Held then presented Passage 2 and the floor was opened for discussion on the passage. Senator Howe objected to the lot system described in the changes because it would still create a three-person

committee that was lopsided toward one party. Senator Lee agreed and likened it to flipping a coin. Senator Lucas felt that having an odd number of people in the committee might cause problems and he expressed his concern that “incompetent” is a strong word. Senator Meeks asked if two experts could be used to pick a third. Parliamentarian Elbow said that he thought it was difficult to get off campus people to vote for tenure. The issue of whether this was a vote or a review was brought up and it was explained that it was a review by the three committee members, and was not a vote of the three members.

Senator Reeves asked if the third person on the committee could be chosen from a pool of candidates. Senator Marks explained that the experts on the committee are simply providing their opinion and are not actually voting so a committee of two or four could work. Assistant Provost Hall indicated that it depended on the comments whether or not they were truly helpful. Some simply say competent or incompetent and they are not helpful to the Provost in making a decision.

Senator Howe then said that after rereading the policy it does not necessarily require three members and you could have a committee that either has two or three members. Senator Duke asked about the voting process again and said that if it were an even number of committee members that a tie should go to the faculty member. Committee chairperson Uzi Mann suggested that Passage 2 go back to committee for a further re-write. All were in favor of sending Passage 2 back to committee for a rewrite.

A discussion then took place regarding Passage 3 which is to be inserted into O.P. 3231, Section 3 and reads, Vice-president Weinberg wanted to add as a friendly amendment the words “respond to” instead of “appeal” and the words, “in person with additional material if so desired” after the word, “Provost”. Lewis Held asked if there were any objection to the friendly amendment and Parliamentarian Elbow stated he objected because you have the word appeal up above in the passage and then wanted to remove it from the passage. Vice-President Weinberg stated that at this point in the process the word appeal was not appropriate since it was not technically an appeal since the process was still underway. Parliamentarian Elbow was informed that there was an appeal system later on in the process.

Assistant Provost Hall asked if there were any issue of the faculty peer review committee if the Provost overturns the recommendation of that committee based on information that the committee has not seen? Would the committee look at the overturn of their decision as arbitrary, capricious, or anti-faculty simply because the Provost has access to materials that the original committee does not have access to? Senator Mann stated that the committee makes a recommendation and the final decision comes from the Provost.

President Giaccardo asked about the additional materials that the AAUP wanted included into the passage. Vice-President Weinstein stated that another issue discussed additional material and was included into this discussion. Parliamentarian Elbow again stated that an appeal process was still necessary in the passage. Senator Lee asked about the criteria that were used to measure incompetence and Lewis Held stated that other university literature went into great detail to define these terms and it was not a part of this policy.

Senator Lucas called a question to accept the passage with a friendly amendment with the addition of the words, “in person.” Senator Marx wanted clarification of what was actually being appealed, the dean’s decision or the Provost’s decision, and he was informed that it was the dean’s decision. All were in favor of calling the question to vote on Passage 3 which is to be inserted in O.P. 32.31, Section 3 and reads, The faculty member may appeal to the dean’s decision to the Provost, in person, before the Provost renders his/her decision. All were in favor of approving the passage.

Lewis Held then presented Passage 4 and Senator Howe again felt that it contained the same issues as Passage 2, so he motioned to have the passage also sent back to committee. Senator Lee seconded the motion. Assistant Provost Hall asked if the committee could better define where the committee members

come from, if they are outside reviewers or members of the faculty. It was stated that this was a vote as opposed to the recommendations made in Passage 2. The question was called to send Passage 4 back to committee and the question passed. Provost Burns wanted to make sure that since he is going back to the faculty that we make sure that we get it right.

Assistant Provost Hall asked where the faculty survey regarding how faculty members viewed post-tenure review since the faculty senate participated in gathering that material and sending it to the appropriate surveying body. President Giaccardo mentioned that Frank Fair conducted it and there was a delay in reporting the information, but he is going to visit campus and present the information.

There was no other old business

VI. New Business

Senator Reed introduced the following Faculty Senate resolution: **Whereas all members of the Texas Tech Faculty Senate have experienced the suffering and anguish of our country resulting from the recent terrorist attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C.; Whereas it is important for all faculty, students and staff of Texas Tech University to engage in sober reflection and mutual support as we develop our individual and collective responses to the tragedy; Whereas all members of the University Community are deserving of respect and consideration regardless of their religion, ethnic background or national origin: Be it resolved: (1) That all faculty shall ensure the civil rights, liberties, personal safety, and protection of property of all citizens and international guests in this time of crisis; (2) That all faculty will assist each other and our students in ensuring that no acts of disrespect or hostility are directed at other faculty, students or staff as we seek understanding and solutions in the weeks and months ahead; (3) That as our government seeks to retaliate against the perpetrators of terrorism, all faculty shall be committed to ensuring in our University Community the fundamental values of a free, open and tolerant society governed by law with justice for all people.**

President Giaccardo opened the floor for a discussion on the resolution. Senator Lucas made a motion to accept the resolution, Senator Russ seconded the motion and the motion was passed.

VI. Announcements:

President Giaccardo announced that an open meeting to discuss the chancellor's search was being held and it was very successful. However, there were some issues regarding changes made to how the chancellor would be chosen. The 1998 procedures stated that there was a formal role for faculty, however, the new procedures written this May made no mention of a formal role of anyone. The Faculty Senate will continue to insist that faculty have a formal role in this procedure. The new policy states that every chancellor search will be treated as a special case and the procedures may change radically.

There was also a meeting for the new Provost search committee. At that meeting Provost Burns indicated that the next Provost must make some hard choices regarding the allocation of budgets and the new ledger system.

There is a new Faculty Senate web page and we would like your comments regarding its content. Max Hinorosa will speak to the senate next month along with Russell Crosby from the Staff Senate.

VII Adjournment at 5:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted

Shane C. Blum

Secretary, Faculty Senate