

**Texas Tech University Faculty Senate**  
**Minutes #320, January 16, 2013**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, January 16, 2013 in the Senate Room of the Student Union Building, with **Faculty Senate President Daniel Nathan** presiding.

Senators in attendance were: Adams, Agnello, Ballou, Barenberg, Batra, Bayne, Backer, Blum, Boal, Borshuk, Bradatan, Brown, Buchheit, Collier, Coward, Davis, Decker, Dolter, Drager, Gaines, Gilliam, Held, Juan, Kucera, Kvashny, Lastrapes, Lauderdale, Loewy, Marks, Meek, Monroe, Pongratz, Rice, Ross, Shi, Smith, Stodden, Surles, Swingen, Syma, Chris Taylor, Colette Taylor, Valle, Wang, Weinberg, Whitfield, Wilde, Wong and Wood. Senators excused were: Caswell, Brashears, Cochran, Cole, Di Poppa, Duffy, Lee, Levario, Mills, Mondt, Nathan, Perl, Ramkumer, Todd and Watson.

- I. **Call to order** – Dr. Daniel Nathan, Faculty Senate President at 3:18 pm.
- II. **Recognition of guests.**
- III. **Approval of minutes**, Meeting #319, December 12, 2012. Minutes approved with corrections.

President Nathan read a note from Jan Tillery-Bailey and Guy Bailey thanking us for the resolution we passed.

- IV. **Speakers:** Larry Phillippe-Managing Director, Student Disability Services on ADA Compliance.

Larry Phillippe wanted to give an update of where we are with online accessibility. A handout was provided.

Howe: Two things, one you've looked at the video and the audio here, but used to be, those of us who did really plain vanilla text sites were generally okay but the java and one or two fancy things. Is that still true?

Phillippe: It can be. One of the things I will tell you as we move to implementing Blackboard 9, which will take care of a lot of those problems. That particular learning system has been certified by National Federation for the Blind, who started most of the lawsuits, as being fully compliant. Sort of the gold standard for meeting compliance and accessibility. That would address a lot of issues. A lot of learning systems use different languages and really messed up some screen readers. That would help us with the screen reader.

Howe: If we are doing distance education, how does this apply? Do we need to be captioned as we talk on the screen?

Phillippe: It can be. If you have a hearing impaired student we will work with you because we may have to have an interpreter either on this end or that end. That is something that our office will help you set up. When it comes to live or hybrid courses, if there is a deaf student in there we do have to find a way to get that information to them. Mostly what we are using now is what we call remote cart or closed captioning which is done in real time. We do that through a remote service. It is accessible and it makes the content immediately accessible to that student.

Lastrapes: Talking about ADA compliance, I'm actually a visually impaired faculty member. This is not quite related to what you are talking about, but I notice a lot of little things around campus, getting around campus. How does Texas Tech fit in with

compliance with curb cuts and the sidewalk on the south side of campus and traffic signals?

Phillippe: All of our buildings are accessible except for one and we are working on that with elevator issues. Most of our sidewalks and things are compliant that we are aware of. Now that is facilities, my office does not do facilities. We do follow-up with complaints from students that are having issues getting in and out of buildings or to buildings. We also alert them if there is construction going on or a route they are used to taking being no longer accessible. As far as I know we are far ahead on that game because usually when a student brings up an issue it is addressed fairly quickly and taken care of.

**Speaker: Provost Bob Smith-Tenure & Promotion Process**

Smith: I volunteered to come and share with you sort of a survey or overview of what we have been doing in Promotion and Tenure this year. Which is important particularly this year because as you all know, you helped us over a four year period putting a new version of 32.01 in place. I thought it was timely to give you an update on how that is working and how people are accepting it across the campus. First of all let me share with you some ideas on processes, observations and conclusions. We handed out a second sheet today because there was one mistake in the earlier version so I think we've got it all corrected. Just in terms of process and key dates. I think all of you should know that our faculty typically work on their portfolios maybe in the spring or summer before they come up for consideration for promotion to tenure. It goes through a departmental and college review typically from September to late November, then comes over to the Provosts Office for consideration by the Provost and President in December and January. Then we work very hard to make sure that we are done so that the first Board of Regents meeting in the spring will be one where we will consider the final recommendations. We are on track for doing that. In fact this afternoon I sent over all the finally signed recommendations from the department chairs and faculty representatives up through the Provost. So that is in the President's Office this afternoon. In essence, our reviews are of course directed by OP 32.01 but because we just put that into place (we meaning the Board of Regents who approved it on May 18<sup>th</sup> of last year) we gave faculty the option to be reviewed under the new policy or the policy currently in effect, under the policy that was currently in effect when they were hired or in the case of folks coming up from Associate to Full Professor under the policy in their last appointment or last promotion. That was functional this year. In terms of the Provost Office review I would like for everyone to know that what I asked my colleagues to do, and that includes: Senior Vice Provost, Rob Stewart; Vice President for Research and that includes in this case interim, Michael San Francisco; the Graduate Dean or interim, Dom Casadante; Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Juan Munoz; and our Vice Provost for Extended Education, Peggy Miller. They generally all read the dossiers that you send over and these all by the way are in electronic format now. For many years when I did this at other universities, during Christmas time it was moving boxes back and forth from the office to the home. We no longer have to do that. Even when I was able to go on a short vacation, over the Christmas holidays, I had all my files with me and somewhat to my wife's chagrin I was working 6-10 hours a day reading over the materials. We learn a lot. All of us do that and typically it is a 50-75 hour job. Then I met initially with that group to get sort of overview feelings or senses of what their judgments were. Then we meet individually with the deans. In some cases if there is some concern expressed between a dean and department chair we invite those department chairs into those meetings as well. Then I finally meet, which I did yesterday, with that Vice Provosts group about their final recommendations. All those decisions were made in the last two days and all that goes up to the President. The President makes his/her recommendations and those recommendations are then presented through the Chancellor to the Board of Regents and that is what will happen on March 1<sup>st</sup>. This year we had 68 cases. 40 for tenure and promotion, 5 just for tenure. By the way, for those who may not be familiar with that kind of occurrence, many times we will hire people who come in with significant experience at

another institution but the faculty's belief is that they want them to be in place for a while before the tenure decision is made. So we will sometimes hire people as Associate Professors without tenure. That is where the 5 cases came in that particular instance. Then we had 23 for promotion. Out of the 40 tenure and promotion cases, 15 or 38% chose the policy currently in effect. 5 of the 5, so 100% of the tenure only cases, chose the policy currently in effect. So it was a total of about 40% of those who had a choice say: we like the new procedures, we like the new criteria, we like the idea of teaching, research and service. I frankly was surprised at that. President Nathan said he thought maybe that would be the case anyway but I was a little surprised about it quite frankly and I was very pleased because I think it validates what we've been doing and worked so hard to build into that policy. I am pleased that people appreciate that. So that's one observation.

Another observation is that sometimes we have some problem cases that get into the press, rather contentious issues. We frankly had very little of that this year and I attribute that partly due to the fact that we are doing a better job with the third year review. As you know, that is now codified in the new policy 32.01. It is absolutely mandated that it come forward. I think that we are doing a better job overall. I would also say that Promotion and Tenure reviews and that whole process gives us a number of other opportunities. Sometimes we will read into the files whether there are possible compliance issues, possible disclosure issues. We raise those with the dean. Sometimes a particular faculty person might have had a previous difficulty; we have a chance to review whether that's all been adjudicated and all resolved before the promotion and/or tenure decision.

In conclusion, I think that the Promotion & Tenure Process is working successfully and smoothly. I think we need continued vigilance on the third year reviews to make sure that all the colleges follow through on that. As we move along the policy currently in effect will affect for the first time that new class of faculty coming along. Some colleges need to do a better job on peer review of teaching. We are generally doing a good job with that but we need to beef that up a bit. I think that faculty members need to be reflective thoughtful and cognizant of conflict of interest and commitment issues that we are going to be coming forward with some new policy in that area. Of course the Faculty Senate will be working with us on that so that is just one final conclusion.

Pongratz: In future tenure cases, will they also have the option to choose between an older procedure and the new one?

Smith: Yes

Howe: You mentioned that this is a process that is getting better, and it always has been pretty good. In those rare occasions when we have money for salary raises it is generally marked as merit pay. Of course it is always very hard to evaluate merit, but one way in which we do it is, these people who are worthy of promotion and worthy of tenure have been really well screened by the academic community. Is there a way that as we improve the process we might come up with bigger promotion bumps for some of these people because if we are doing merit pay this is our best demonstration of meritoriousness.

Smith: I think it is a very good point. Currently I think it is like five and six thousand dollars, we can clarify that and get back to you all. (Inaudible speaking from the audience) Is it three and five? Thank you for that correction. I think it is meritorious thinking about increases.

Nathan: The numbers you indicate here are the numbers of cases. Can you describe the number of cases that were successful and not successful at this stage? I know it is not final.

Smith: At this stage we have one case where it was a recommendation from the Dean that we honored where there was a positive from the department and up through the ranks up until the dean. We honored that in terms of the Provosts Office. There was one other case for promotion to full where there had been a lot of negative votes all along the line.

Nathan: So let me get clarification. One case in which the vote was positive to the dean and the dean was negative and you upheld the dean's view. And another case in which...

Smith: It was negative all along. Actually there is one very unusual case, and I hate to mention it because it is so unique, but there is one other case where there was tenure and promotion but we awarded tenure and not promotion.

Nathan: Is 3 out of 68 typical?

Smith: Generally I think in terms of 5-10%. That's a fairly strong number generally.

Nathan: Quite a number drop out earlier in the process.

Smith: Yes. Because of the third year review we are seeing that dropout rate earlier on. In one of the colleges it was two out of a total of ten.

Held: You told us at the last Senate meeting that there were 143 new and replacement positions advertised and that you would get back to us on how many of those were new verses replacement.

Smith: Generally the replacements are in the order of between 45 and 50.

Held: The question was, how many of them actually are new and replacement not in general. But this year, how many of them new and how many of them are replacement? That was the question.

Smith: My understanding that the number is 45 this year and I will check on that.

Nathan: That are new or replacement?

Smith: That are replacement and that the others are new. I thought I mentioned that it was something in the order of 100. I do not have the exact number.

Held: Well it is my understanding that...

Smith: I'm sorry I forgot it and I will get you that number.

Ross: You had said that some colleges [audio was difficult to understand, approximately 24:53 on recording] only after promotion and tenure or are you talking about after 3<sup>rd</sup> year review?

Smith: Actually I think it is, if I remember correctly, policy is that it is mandated for all faculty.

Ross: Ok

Smith: So we have talked to the deans in that. If we are falling down on that I think that it is useful for a faculty member to remind the chair that that needs to be done. Hopefully

that will come forward. Actually only two or three colleges now that are not doing that as well as we would like to see.

Ross: What do you mean as well? Are you talking about tenure or are you talking about promotion?

Smith: No, no my suggestion would be to bring it up at the next faculty meeting. What are we doing if it is not apparent in your particular unit, what are we doing about peer review of teaching? Bring it up with your chair.

Ross: Ok

Nathan: Only tangentially related [audio was difficult to understand, approximately 25:48 on recording] I What is the percentage of course that are taught by tenured and tenure faculty versus as opposed to instructor or assistant?

Smith: I do not have the percentage but I can tell you this, that we have about 1220 total faculty, we've published that number. Out of that tenure/tenure track is 1003 or was going into this year. Starting out you have over 80% are tenure/tenured track faculty. Now we also know that of the difference between 1003 and 1220 many of those folks are not full time. So if we did a strict calculation of what's the percentage of courses that are taught by non-tenure and tenure track faculty it frankly works out to be about 8%. We did that calculation about a year and a half ago and as opposed to some of our sister institutions in the state of Texas that are up as high as 40%. We are relatively low.

Nathan: Do you happen to know what UT or A&M are?

Smith: I don't have those numbers but I have been told that Houston is up around 40%. I don't know UT and A&M and I shouldn't venture a guess.

Held: Can you give us some estimate of what the merit pay might be for the coming year, whether there's any at all?

Smith: The President is working on this almost daily. We had a conversation this morning which I think President Nathan can reflect upon. We are working very hard to make sure that the revenue is going to be there to provide some kind of reasonable raise. We are very cognizant of the fact that Texas Tech is low relative to our peers. We are working diligently to find additional funds. I can't tell you the percentage and it probably would be speculation on my part. A lot will depend on what the legislature does and then how tuition revenues will work out in the next several months.

Nathan: I know I've heard talk about the 143 faculty positions here. But those are searches going on and not all searches are successful. A sizeable percentage are not successful. Can you talk about that briefly?

Smith: We learned this morning that we have now hired already 68 faculty for next year. When you think that typically we have been hiring in the order of 40-50 faculty a year, here we are not even in the high season yet and we've got 68 signed on. That's a pretty significant number I think. So we are well on our way to 143.

Nathan: So the reference to 40% of our searches are unsuccessful [audio was difficult to understand, approximately 29:24 on recording]

Smith: I frankly think we are going to do much better this year. Well you know the Philosophy hire, I'm told that you have 70 or 80, no no, 216 applicants for an Assistant Professorship. Clearly there are people out there wanting to be employed.

Nathan: We've never had a problem.

**V. Old Business:** University Councils/Committees & Liaison Reports:

President Nathan read a note from President Schovanec regarding the resolution of Faculty Senators being appointed to Presidential searches. He also mentioned that he and Patty have sent notes about volunteers for search committees.

Gilliam: Student Government Association Liaison Report:

The Student Senate passed a resolution at the end of last semester supporting a tuition freeze. The President of the SGA (keep in mind that this officer position is different than the student senate president) is in opposition to the tuition freeze and indicates he plans to better educate the senate at the upcoming meeting on January 29th of the potential ramifications of a tuition freeze. Senator Mitzi Lauderdale will continue to communicate with the SGA President and will be attending meetings of the student senate as our liaison. So if you have any questions, thoughts, or concerns please feel free to contact her.

There was some discussion on OP 70.11 which is concerned with Administrative Appointments. One other clarification, OP 32.09 has passed. OP 32.17 is still pending.

**VI. New Business:**

Senator Agnello raised a question about the number that constitutes the cut off point for small classes for graduate and undergraduate classes. Discussion followed on this topic.

President Nathan spoke about Senator and Vice President Sam Bradley being unable to for professional and personal reasons to continue to serve on the Senate. This means that we have a vacancy at the Vice President level and will have to call for an election. This will be turned over to the nominations committee.

**VII. Announcements:**

Senator Wong brought flyers for the Difficult Dialogue workshops. She encouraged Senators to sign up for these workshops.

President Nathan asked Senator Wong to send to Patty for distribution to the Senate an article about Guy Bailey that dispels some of the rumors about his recent resignation.

**VIII. Adjournment:** Adjourned at 4:01 pm