

MINUTES

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council met Wednesday, October 12, 1977, in the Board Room of the Administration Building with Chairperson Clarence Bell presiding. Members present were Professors Burford, Collins, Eissinger, Elbow, Keho, Kimmel, McGowan, Nelson, Pearson, Smith, Strauss, Tereshkovich and Vines. Ch. Bell greeted Dale Davis, a recently elected member of the Faculty Council Executive Committee and observed another recently elected member was absent, recuperating from surgery. Committee members Brittin and Manley notified the chairperson earlier they would be out of town on University business and unable to attend. Guests present were: Jerry D. Ramsey, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; Jeanie Field, Kim Ham, Kathy Hennington, and John Morrow representing the Student Association; Janet Warren, University Daily reporter; and Mr. Richard Klocko, Director of Personnel Relations.

Ch. Bell called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. and welcomed the guests.

I. MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1977 MEETING

Professor Smith moved the addition on page 2, item 6, as number one in items considered in the Academic Council meetings the following statement from the May 10, 1977 minutes:

"Salary rates for chairpersons were also discussed. It was agreed that a policy statement should be developed, in which size and complexity of department should be considered when release time and salary supplements are developed. Released time and the designation of a portion of the salary to be paid for administrative duties are to be considered and recommended to the Academic Affairs Office by each Dean. It was agreed that these conditions should be established and printed on the appointment form as new chairpersons are appointed."

Professor Tereshkovich seconded and the motion carried to approve the minutes as amended.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Elections results - John Hunter, Range & Wildlife Management, elected as an at-large representative for a term expiring in 1980. Dale Davis, English, elected as an at-large representative for a term expiring in 1979.
- b. Review of the Academic Council Minutes (which are on file in the Faculty Council office for anyone to review at any time) of meetings on September 13th and September 27th.

From the minutes of the September 13th meeting Ch. Bell read:

- (1) "The draft of the Role and Scope document was discussed and suggestions were made by Deans. The draft document will be discussed with the Coordinating Board staff and revised for submission by October 1, 1977."

Ch. Bell asked Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Jerry D. Ramsey, for an update on this statement.

Professor Ramsey explained that this was basically a request from the Coordinating Board to each of the universities and institutions to submit a role and scope document. A copy drafted some time ago was held without being submitted to the Coordinating Board and in later discussions with that board a request was made for this document. It is basically a statement of overall goals and purposes which are copied out of the catalog and other existing documents. Each of the Deans was asked to give a five year projection of what he felt the role and mission and purpose of his College would be. Material gathered from the Deans was taken to the Coordinating Board in draft form.

Ch. Bell suggested that perhaps the Vice President for Academic Affairs would make this document available to the faculty by placing a copy in the Library. Professor Ramsey agreed that when the final copy of the document is filed with the Coordinating Board it would be public information, but at this time it is in a "pre-publication" status.

- (2) Announcement was made of a \$500.00 Shell Award. Deans were asked to nominate by October 15, 1977, faculty who desire to attend short courses or other development meetings for which regular budget funds would not normally be available. Committee assistance will be sought to select the recipient for the Shell Award this year.
- (3) Another item from the same meeting: College procedures for faculty review were discussed and Deans were asked to start discussions of tenure and promotion activities for the year. Dr. Hardwick noted that evidence must be furnished regarding teaching for promotion from assistant to associate professor and that credentials must be carefully reviewed for those requesting promotion to full professor. There was agreement that this topic should be discussed more fully at the next Academic Council meeting.

From the minutes of the September 27th Academic Council meeting: College procedures for faculty review were discussed at some length, centering primarily upon the review of tenure. There was agreement that there should be:

- (1) Course evaluation instruments used by each faculty member on probationary appointment. The indication was that the faculty needed to develop instruments with which they feel comfortable and which are suited to their particular teaching methods.
- (2) Peer review, including observation, is needed for those faculty who will be considered for tenure.
- (3) The use of letters of recommendation from individuals not associated with Texas Tech, e.g. colleagues on other campuses, regarding promotion to full professor are optional at the Dean's discretion. Preparation for considering those who come up for tenure or promotion this year should be started in the near future. Arrangements for course evaluation and peer evaluation should be made since the formal process will begin about November 1st. While college schedules may vary, promotion and tenure materials should be sent to the Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research by December 15, 1977. This will allow those proposed for tenure to be considered by the Board of Regents at its February meeting. There was discussion on the need for communication with faculty who would be considered for tenure and promotion this year. Some Deans will be meeting with persons up for tenure to advise them of the process. It was agreed that the Chairperson should advise those faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion so they might know of their status during the process. The Council deferred for a further discussion the question of whether tenure and promotion ballots should have comments from individual faculty members.

When asked whether or not signatures on the ballots are still required, Professor Ramsey replied that at this time the process remains unchanged, although it does vary from college to college.

- c. Ch. Bell announced the appointment of Professor Panze B. Kimmel as the Executive Committee's representative to the Affirmative Action Committee.

- d. A letter of commendation has been written to the Artists and Speakers Committee of last year.
- e. Ch. Bell called attention to the Committee Directories which were available for each member of the Executive Committee. He added that, because of cost, they were not sent to all faculty this year. Deans, Department Chairpersons and a few other people received copies. However, copies are available to any faculty member wishing one in the office of the Assistant to the President (Clyde Morganti). Various means of getting the directory information to the faculty are being considered for future years, including publishing the information in the University Daily and the Campus Telephone Directory.

III. OPEN HEARING ON PROPOSED CHANGE TO POLICY PAPER 1 - DR. JACQUELIN COLLINS

As directed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, Ch. Bell appointed a representative, Dr. Jacquelin Collins, to attend the open hearing meeting of the ad hoc committee of the Coordinating Board on September 12, 1977.

Professor Collins reported that he attended the meeting along with fourteen other persons representing various teachers' organizations in the state, TACT, junior college representatives, and faculty groups such as the Executive Committee. All spoke in support of the original Position Paper and against the proposed revisions.

After a meeting of about three hours, the chairperson of the ad hoc committee of the Coordinating Board summarized the comments by saying that the support for the original Policy Paper 1 seemed unanimous. Professor Collins indicated that written comments had been received also, and that they were, perhaps, not unanimous.

The ad hoc committee will meet again and make a formal report to the Coordinating Board sometime in the future. At this point it seems that things remain simply suspended and what is going to happen in the future is anybody's guess. But certainly the people speaking at the hearing endorsed Policy Paper 1 and rejected the revisions.

IV. GRADE APPEALS PROCEDURE

Ch. Bell introduced this agenda item by calling attention to the fact that each Executive Committee member had had opportunity since the last meeting to study the grade appeals policy and procedures which came from the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and also, the recommendations of the Student Senate. He reminded the Executive Committee that its action will, of course, be recommendatory, but it would have influence on the final Grade Appeals Policy and Procedures.

In order to initiate discussion Professor Nelson moved that the Executive Committee recommend a grade appeals policy and procedures. Professor Pearson seconded. Ch. Bell called for discussion. The motion carried to recommend a grade appeals policy and procedures.

Professor Nelson's second motion was to recommend the policy statement provided by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and that this policy statement be placed before or in front of the procedures statement. Professor Smith seconded. At this point there was a lengthy discussion.

Professor Eissinger disagreed with the manner in which the statement was phrased and expressed the feeling that policy and procedures cannot be separated. Professors Keho, Strauss, Elbow and Burford entered into a general discussion. Definition of "capricious or arbitrary action by the instructor" in the policy statement was discussed.

Professor Smith moved to amend the motion on the floor by substituting the word "through" for the word "or" in item #1, the last sentence, making that sentence read: The only basis upon which the grade assigned by the instructor can be formally appealed is a serious, demonstrable influence upon the grade of prejudice toward the student on the part of the instructor through(or) a capricious or arbitrary action by the instructor. Professor Elbow seconded. Professors Ramsey and Eissinger spoke against Professor Smith's motion to amend the motion on the floor. Professor Vines felt that this committee should endorse and recommend the grade appeals policy and procedures as recommended. Professor Strauss agreed with Professor Ramsey's earlier statement in which he said that he felt the intent was to get comments and input from the Executive Committee as representing the faculty; to merge that with the comments obtained from the student government and to incorporate those into a final document to be effective as soon as possible. Professor Strauss expressed the opinion that this is not the Executive Committee's document and it is not up to this committee to change this point or that point; only endorse or recommend, or provide a separate document. Professor Smith's motion to amend the motion on the floor by substituting the word "through" for the word "or" failed. Ch. Bell directed discussion back to the original motion on the floor.

Professor Vines moved the previous question, which would end debate. Professor Smith seconded. Eleven votes for the motion, none opposed.

Ch. Bell called for a vote on the motion on the floor made by Professor Nelson to recommend the policy statement provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and that it be placed before the procedures statement. The motion passed, 12 - 0.

Professor Strauss moved that the Executive Committee endorse the proposed grade appeals procedure supplied by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, as modified by the statement from the Student Association. Professor Elbow seconded. Professor Pearson pointed out substantive differences between the procedures from the Vice President for Academic Affairs and those from the Student Association. One difference being the number of days in which a student is allowed to make an appeal.

Professor Ramsey agreed that there is a question here as to how much time a student should have in which to file a grade appeal. He felt that his office is certainly open to suggestions on this matter.

Professors Strauss, Pearson, Keho, Elbow, Smith, and Nelson engaged in discussion of various points at which they felt problems might arise and ways of solving them.

Professor Vines moved the previous question. Professor Nelson seconded. The vote was 11 - 2.

Ch. Bell called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion passed. The Executive Committee endorsed the proposed grade appeals policy and procedures statement as supplied by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, as modified by the statement from the Student Association.

Professor Pearson moved that the Executive Committee support the recommendation that an appeal to be filed in the office of the Dean be made within 30 days rather than 60 days of the next long semester so that action might be taken expeditiously

and the question be resolved within one semester. Professor Kimmel seconded. Discussion followed. Professor Strauss spoke in opposition to the motion. He felt that the best way to get grade appeals settled is through negotiation between the student and the instructor and among the student, the instructor and the chairperson if necessary. The shortened time would leave little time for such negotiations and he foresaw many more formal appeals as a result. He felt that informal procedures should be maximized.

Professor Vines suggested that a short recess should be called to allow time for drafting changes in the Grade Appeals Policy and Procedures.

Ch. Bell agreed and declared a 10 minute recess, until 5:05. p.m.

The chairperson reconvened the meeting at 5:05 p.m. and noted that there was a motion on the floor which should be acted upon. Professor Pearson stated again his reasons for making such a motion. Ch. Bell called for a vote on the motion. It failed: five votes for, six against.

Professor Nelson moved that this body recommend that the faculty members of all grade appeals committees be selected by a faculty body, preferably the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council or its successor, in a manner that it will decide. This would apply to all faculty members except the chairperson who would be named by the Dean. Professor Kimmel seconded. There was very little discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Professor Nelson moved further to recommend that the faculty and student representation to all such bodies be equal in number, excluding the chairperson to be appointed by the Dean. Professor Collins seconded. The motion passed after a short discussion.

To provide emphasis on the point, Professor Pearson moved that in the case of a graduate student, grade appeals be considered by the undergraduate college in which the graduate student is currently studying and not by the Graduate Dean. Professor Smith seconded. There was no discussion. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Professor Eissinger moved to recommend that the grade appeals committees could be selected on an ad hoc basis in a college or school. Professor Keho seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote.

V. REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER A FACULTY SENATE - DR. CLARENCE A. BELL

Ch. Bell discussed the open hearings held on campus in September and reported that attendance was not outstanding. A few suggestions and points were brought up by individuals outside the open hearings and these were also considered by the committee.

Ch. Bell submitted the report of the ad hoc committee to consider a faculty senate. The report included a slightly revised draft of the previous Constitution of the Faculty Senate and the recommendation that the Faculty Council be replaced by the Faculty Senate, as defined by the Constitution, and that the matter be placed on the agenda of the Faculty Council meeting called for November 1, 1977.

Professor Kimmel moved that this report be accepted, except that Article VIII be changed in line #2 so that the word "faculty" is replaced by "membership of the Faculty Council." Professor Keho seconded. Discussion was brief and the motion was approved by unanimous vote.

The revised version of Article VIII reads: "The Constitution of the Faculty Senate shall become effective when adopted by a majority of the membership of the Faculty Council then present and voting at a called meeting of the Faculty Council and after ratification by the President of the University and approval by the Board of Regents. Upon the Constitution's becoming effective, the Faculty Senate and its Constitution shall substitute nunc pro tunc for the Faculty Council and its Charter."

Professor Strauss moved to commend the committee that had worked so many years to finally produce a workable document, and to do this by acclamation. Professor Kehoe seconded. The motion passed with unanimous approval. Ch. Bell will write a letter of commendation to the members of this committee.

IV. REPORT FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE TENURE POLICY - DR. JACQUELIN COLLINS

Professor Collins stated that this committee has been meeting almost weekly, on Thursday afternoons, to review the Tenure Policy in some detail. No report on substance is appropriate at this time, but on procedure, one thing is noteworthy. A report will be prepared and given to the President, to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, and to the Tenure and Privilege Committee for comments. Comments will be received, considered, and a final report then will be given to the President. The President, if he then approves it, will forward the recommendations to the Executive Committee or its successor to be given to the faculty for its approval. The faculty must approve any changes made before it is returned to the President to be submitted to the Board of Regents for final action.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

The chairperson called for other business to be considered at this time. There was none. The motion was made to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Roland Smith, Secretary
Executive Committee
Faculty Council

10/28/77

/gf