

**Texas Tech University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Minutes #224  
April 10, 2002**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 10, 2002 in the Senate Room in the University Center with Vice President David Weinberg presiding. Senators present were Kvashny, Byerly, Dolter, Donahue, Howe, James, Marks, Reed, Reeves, Roberts, Schaller, Stinespring, Weinberg, Dukes, Hein, Johnson, Lakhani, Mann, Norville, Blum, Russ, Shriver, Phelan, Quinn, Bradley, Carr, Curry, Marbley, Steinhart and Willis-Aarnio. Senators excused Giaccardo, Lewis, Lucas, Thomas, Murray, Marshall and Cooper. Senators unexcused Blanton, Elam, Buelinckx, Harter, Iber, Kuriyama, Lee, Meek, Williams, Yang, Reeder, Zhang, Hoo and Hsiang.

I. Call to Order: at 3:20 p.m.

II. Recognition of Guests: Vice Provost Jim Brink; Assistant Provost Liz Hall; Vickie Hampton from Human Sciences; and Gary Elbow the Faculty Senate Parliamentarian.

III. The minutes for Meeting #223 were passed unanimously.

IV. Old Business:

The Grievance Policy Ad Hoc Committee membership was announced as: Lewis Held, Gary Elbow, and Senator Dolter. Senator Howe asked if this committee would be held over until the fall. In response, Gary Elbow said that he thinks they should be able to have a report by next month. Senator Dolter said they have a meeting on April 17<sup>th</sup>.

Senator Steinhart asked if Linda Gilbert was invited to this meeting and he was informed that she was not.

V. New Businesses:

Senator Nancy Reed reported on the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee's findings. The findings were distributed in handouts available at the entrance to The Senate Room. Senator Reed then explained the details of the handouts to The Faculty Senate. Vice Provost Brink asked if this information would be put online on the Faculty Senate website. Patty Pledger stated that they would be put online. Senator Reed reviewed the handout regarding comparisons to Big 12 and other Texas Schools and identified six key indicators that contained significant discrepancies. She asked that The Faculty Senate review these categories at the next meeting and suggested that The Senate make a recommendation that these issues be considered by the administration in order to make them competitive with the other institutions.

Vickie Hampton explained that her graduate students created the report, and it is currently being double-checked for 100% accuracy. Senator Howe brought up that athletic ticket discounts are not consistent with the information they had earlier been given regarding IRS benefits. Senator Reed added that further comments could be made through the Senate's office and a recommendation would be made in May. Senator Lakhani asked how are we going to combine all of these? Is there going to be a formula? Vickie Hampton replied they can do that, but it's difficult because some things are more important than others. Then, Senator Donahue added that the committee tried to narrow it down by focusing on the six areas. Senator Howe inquired where can they direct inquiries? Vickie Hampton provided her e-mail address and encouraged The Senate to contact her at [vhampton@hs.ttu.edu](mailto:vhampton@hs.ttu.edu). Vice President Weinberg extended thanks to Senator Reed and Vickie Hampton for their report and comments and explanations.

Senator Jim Carr then took the floor to discuss an interim report on student evaluations. Senator Carr suggested that we could review a website at [www.irs.ttu.edu](http://www.irs.ttu.edu) in the "warehouse section" to obtain information regarding student's faculty reviews. He informed The Senate that an E-raider account is needed to access it. The website was created at the request of students. The committee looked at the lack of statistical information provided on the site. They were also concerned that access is too easy. The committee met with Gary Wiggins about redesigning the website, and he was accommodating, but he does have limited resources. Senator Carr asked that The Faculty Senate discuss and create one, large recommendation so we do not keep going back to Gary Wiggins with minor adjustments. Senator Carr also stated that he had spoken to the president of the student senate regarding their recommendations for the website. Senator Hein asked whether the site lists the number of respondents or just a mean score? Senator Carr stated that there had been a recommendation to list the number of respondents relative to the number in the class. He also stated that they might correlate the responses with the student's grade. Senator Howe stated that the problem is that the number of students varies, but they can use the twelfth-day drop numbers as the figure for the class enrollment. Senator Schaller brought up the point that only the two global questions were supposed to be used and not all of them. Senator Carr stated that that was his understanding as well, but another more advanced website might be created in the future with additional information. Senator Carr concluded that no recommendation is being made at this time until they can come up with specific recommendations to Gary Wiggins.

Senator Marks discussed the issue of service learning. The charge of the committee was to contact Andrew Shoppe to help define and investigate service learning at Texas Tech University and all recommendations and findings should be reported by the Senate's April meeting. He made a recommendation to have service learning sent to another committee for further study. However, it was discovered that The Office of Campus Life had already created a definition for service learning at Texas Tech. He also recommended that the function of the service learning coordinator be moved from The Office of Campus Life to Academic Affairs.

Senator Marks then read a statement concerning actions The Faculty Senate might take regarding the service learning issue. He stated that The Faculty Senate might request that the administration clarify the definition, meaning, application and intentions of The University's Strategic Plan, Objective 3.3 to improve understanding by faculty, students and the community. Senator Marks then stated that Andrew Shoppe was leaving to pursue graduate work at Notre Dame University and he thanked him for his efforts regarding service learning at Texas Tech. He then opened the floor for questions.

Senator Stinespring stated that an art education proposal for service learning had been created and they are already doing it. However, it makes him uneasy. Senator Norville asked if someone could explain the difference between service learning and community service. Vice President Weinberg asked if anyone could give an example of each. Senator Marks read definitions of both. Community service deals more with activities that are performed in the community that provides a benefit, while service learning is a teaching method that involves students in meaningful community service that is incorporated into a course and is tied to specific learning objectives.

Senator Stinespring then added that field-based activities are part of the problem in the definition. Senator Marks then discussed the deference between internship and service learning. Senator Dolter stated that Music Theater and Children's Operas in LISD are an example. Does this fit the definition of service learning? Vice President Weinberg added that is does not seem right if you cannot consider service learning to be something you are already doing now. A lengthy discussion on service learning ensued with comments from Senators Shriver, Schaller, Stinespring, Marks, Howe, Hein, Weinberg, and Donahue

Senator Marks then stated that Committee A wished to present the following recommendations to The Faculty Senate: 1) As the working definition of service learning stress its pedagogical aspects, the function of the service learning coordinator shall be removed from the Office of Campus Life and moved to the Office of Academic Affairs which is under the Offices of The Provost 2) The determination of our actual community needs should reside in the Office of Academic Affairs, and 3) The Senate should remand the issue of service learning back to Committee A or to another committee for further study. The recommendations of Committee A were voted upon and approved by The Faculty Senate. However, a vote on other service-learning related issues could not be taken because a quorum no longer existed. A discussion on the topic will take place at future meetings.

Senator Steinhart asked that the Vice President for Fiscal Affairs be invited to The Faculty Senate's next meeting.

#### VI. Announcements:

The first Provost candidate meeting was last week, and Patty Pledger did an outstanding job of coordinating an informal luncheon with the candidate. Vice President Weinberg asked if there were any comments regarding Daniel Acosta? There were none. The second candidate meeting was held yesterday and again Vice President Weinberg asked for comments on William Marcy, and there were none.

Vice President Weinberg also announced that the NEA/TEA conference was on March 1<sup>st</sup> through 3<sup>rd</sup> in Austin. Information regarding the sessions is available in the Senate office.

#### VII. Adjournment at 4:31 pm.

Respectfully submitted  
Shane C. Blum  
Secretary, Faculty Senate