Minutes
Meeting #15, May 9, 1979
Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, May 9, 1979 at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Margaret Wilson, President, presiding. Senators present were: Adamcik, Allen, Aycock, Brittin, Chamberlain, Christian, Dale, Davis, Dixon, Elbow, Eissinger, George, Higdon, Hunter, Jebsen, Keho, Kellogg, Lee, L. Luchsinger, V. Luchsinger, McGlynn, McGowan, McPherson, Mehaffie, Nelson, Newcomb, Oberhelman, Owens, Pearson, Reichert, Roberts, Sanders, Sasser, Shine, Sowell, Stoune, Tereshkovich, Troub, Wagner, Walkup, Williams, and Wright. Absent because of other University business or pressing personal matters: McLaughlin, Mogan and Smith. Absent: Alexander, Cummins, Gillas, McDonald, Michael, Morris, Rylander, Vines, and Wade.

Guests included Charles S. Hardwick, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Jane Brandenberger, Director, University News & Publications and Senators-elect Blaisdell, Collins, Gipson, Goodwin, Kimmel, Masten, R. Smith and Stewart.

SUMMARY OF BUSINESS TRANSACTED

The Faculty Senate:

- 1. Adopted by majority vote each of the four final changes in the Grievance Panel Procedures recommended by President Mackey, thus finalizing the Senate's approval of the Faculty Grievance Panel Procedures.
- 2. Heard a report on the status of the University newsletter, approved the concept of having an editorial advisory board for the newsletter, and nominated two faculty members to serve on that board.
- 3. Heard reports from members of the Committee on Committees on the various activities of University committees and councils for the 1978-79 academic year.
- 4. Voted to send to the University administration a resolution requesting that 50% of all funds appropriated by the legislature for faculty salary increases be given out in across the board raises, with the remainder designated for merit increases.

The meeting was called to order by President Wilson at 3:35 p.m. Guests were recognized and the newly elected senators who were present were asked to introduce themselves.

I. MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4 & APRIL 11, 1979 MEETINGS

Hearing no corrections, Wilson declared the minutes of the April 4, 1979 meeting approved as distributed. Senator Duane Christian asked that his name be removed from the list of senators absent from the April 11, 1979 meeting and placed on the list of those senators absent because of other University business or pressing personal matters. Wilson then declared the minutes of the April 11, 1979 meeting approved as distributed with the one correction.

Page 2.
Minutes
Meeting #15, May 9, 1979
Faculty Senate

II. FINAL DRAFT OF GRIEVANCE PANEL PROCEDURES

President Mackey's response to the Senate's suggestions for amending the second draft version of the Grievance Panel Procedures was brought to the floor. A response had been prepared to each of the Senate recommendations for change and Newcomb requested that each of the four items be considered separately.

Hunter moved approval of Section III, E, which, while extensively rewritten from the Senate form still reflects the intent of the Senate to clarify the status of a grievant who seeks redress outside of the University procedures. The revised Section III, E, passed without opposition on a voice vote. That section now reads: "Presentation of the grievance in accordance with the steps in this section is a condition precedent to the right of a faculty member to a hearing before the panel. Further, if the grievant pursues the grievance before any other body, board, commission or agency, then the University at its discretion may elect not to proceed with further processing of the grievance under the procedure.

If, after completion of proceedings before such other body, board, commission or agency, and a final decision in the matter, the grievant wishes to reopen consideration of his or her grievance through the university procedure, the grievant may file with the University President a request for reconsideration asking to have the case reopened. The written request for reconsideration must be received at the Office of the President within 30 days of the final action of decision by the body, board, commission or agency, and must state the basis for requesting that the case be reopened.

The University President, within 30 days of receipt of the request for reconsideration, will forward the request to the grievance panel for its review and recommendations. The panel will reduce its recommendations to writing and furnish it to the University President within 60 days of its receipt of the request for reconsideration. Recommendations to the University President are advisory.

Normally the university would not be expected to reopen issues that had decision before another body, board, commission or agency absent unusual or extenuating circumstances. Matters that have not been the subject of final action or decision, that may be ancillary to the principal issues before the body, board, commission and that are more normally considered within the university are more likely appropriate as a basis for further consideration within the university grievance process."

Discussion then moved to Section IV, D, in which the only change from the Senate recommendation was a minor clarification in wording. Adamcik's motion to accept the revision of this section was passed without opposition on a voice vote. Section IV, D, as approved by the Senate, now reads: "The grievant will represent himself or herself and present his or her own case, although he or she may be advised by a counselor present at the hearing. The grievant has the right to present evidence, including oral testimony, and has the right to cross-examine witnesses other than his or her own. Neither the University nor administrative officials of the University will be represented by counsel in proceedings before the panel, nor will any witness appearing before the panel be represented by counsel."

Roberts moved adoption of Section IV, E, which contained an addition by President Mackey defining in broad terms the type of evidence which would be considered by the Grievance Panel in its deliberations. The motion to adopt the President's wording passed by a wote of 25 in favor to three opposed. That section will appear as follows in the final draft of the Procedures: "Evidence will be considered which relates to the grievance and which is of the type relied on by faculty members in the conduct of their professional affairs."

Page 3.
Minutes
Meeting #15, May 9, 1979
Faculty Senate

President Mackey rejected the Senate's request that Section IV, I, be phrased to require a detailed response from the President in the event that a Grievance Panel recommendation is not followed. President Mackey feels that the existing requirement for a response in writing is sufficient guarantee that the University President will address himself to the Panel's recommendations. He is willing, however, to reconsider this item at a later date if problems do develop. Adamcik moved acceptance of President Mackey's recommendation that Section IV, I, be left as it was in the original wording of the Second Draft. The motion passed by a vote of 23 to 14.

Wilson noted that President Mackey will probably place the Grievance Panel Procedure into operation in the near future, at which time the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee will cease to exist.

III. NEWSLETTER

Wilson reported on her April 12, 1979 meeting with University News and Publications personnel. The possible content of a newsletter was a focus of discussion at the meeting, with Wilson indicating the faculty's interest in seeing announcements of forthcoming events, items of information from the University administration on budget, legislation which might affect the University or its employees, and policies under consideration, and/or other items of general interest to faculty and staff. University News and Publications personnel suggested the appointment of an editorial board which would be composed of four members, two appointed by the Faculty Senate, and two by the administration. President Mackey favors the creation of such a board and agreed to appoint administrative representatives if the Senate approved of the plan. All parties agreed that it would be desirable to have the first issue of the newletter come out in September 1979, probably to be followed by others at monthly intervals.

Jebsen moved Senate approval of the concept of an editorial board to act in an advisory capacity to the University News and Publications Office on the University newsletter. The motion carried on a voice vote.

The chairperson of the Committee on Committees submitted the names of George Tereshkovich and Otto Nelson as nominees to represent the faculty on the editorial board. The motion by Brittin to approve the nomination passed without opposition.

IV. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - Brittin

Each member of the Committee on Committees is assigned as liaison to certain University Committees and Councils. As is customary at the May meeting, each liaison person reported on the activities of the Committees and Councils for which he was responsible. These reports are on file in the Faculty Senate Office where they will be made available to faculty member, on request. Neither reports nor minutes were received from the follow-Admissions and Registration Committee, Affirmative Action Committee, ing committees: Artists and Speakers Committee, Biohazards Committee, Code of Student Affairs Committee, Faculty Development Committee, Minority Affairs Committee, Parking Violations Appeals Committee, Protection of Human Subjects Committee, Special Hearing Panel for Tenure & Privilege, Student Financial Aids/Scholarship Committee, and Student Service Fee Allocation Committee. Vines was not present to report on the committees for which he is responsible: Warm-Blooded Animal Committee, Academic Affairs and Status Hommittee, Academic Budget Council, and the Grievance Committee. Wilson noted that the University President no longer requires a final report from University committees and chuncils and that it is, therefore, difficult for the Committee on Committees to obtain such reports. Pearson requested clarification of the operation of the "480 Station Alert System" reported on by the Campus Secuity and Emergency Committee. Wilson responded that 480 telephones in campus buildings are programmed to ring and transmit a taped message in the event of an emergency. The problem seems to lie in dissemination of information on what should be the

Page 5.
Minutes
Meeting #15, May 9, 1979
Faculty Senate

V. Resolution on Merit Raises continued.....

Shine requested that Faculty Senate officers provide for the first Senate meeting in the fall semester the following data on allocation of budget funds: 1) What dollar amount of increased faculty salary funding for 1979-80 went to each of the colleges of the University, and 2) what percentage of the total allotment for salary increases that represents.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Wilson reviewd briefly the minutes of the April 24, 1979 meeting of the Academic Council. One item concerned the recent approval and distribution of a policy manual for the Board of Regents. Deans were reminded that the previous policies had been recinded and were asked to review the policies to see if changes or corrections are indicated and to make suggestions regarding any needed additions.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Wilson said word had been received from Austin that there is a good chance that one of the Gaston bills may get on the floor of the House. (Gaston bills, 145/1337, seek to do away with tenure and substitute either a 5 or 7 year contract.) Senators and other concerned faculty should write Representative Wilhelmina Delco, Chairperson of the Committee on Higher Education, expressing their opposition to the passage of the Gaston bills.

Adamcik moved that attachment #1 and attachment #2 be distributed to all members of the University faculty along with the minutes of the May 9, 1979 meeting. The motion carried.

Wilson expressed appreciation to members of the Senate for their cooperation during her year as president of the Faculty Senate. She stated her belief that the Faculty Senate has an impressive list of accomplishments with which to close its first year and that it is and will continue to be a constructive voice for change in the University. Wilson continued her remarks saying that she has only one regret at the end of the year, that two councils, the Academic Budget Council and the Athletic Council, have not functioned as they should have during the year. She indicated her hope that these councils will begin to function more effectively in the near future. Wilson then recognized senators whose terms are expiring: Alexander, Chamberlain, Christian, Cummins, Davis, Jepsen, Keho, Michael, Mogan, Nelson, Newcomb, Owens, Reichert, Tereshkovich, Vines, Wade and Wright. She also voiced appreciation to Dr. Charles Hardwick, Dr. Vernon McGuire, the Committee on Committees, and to the Faculty Senate Office Secretary and to Vice President Otto Nelson and Secretary, Gary Elbow. Elbow, incoming President of the Faculty Senate, requested that Senators seek to learn the wants, desires, and complaints of their constituents so that the senate might better serve the faculty of Texas Tech.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary S. Elbow, Secretary

Faculty Senate

Page 4. Minutes Meeting #15, May 9, 1979 Faculty Senate

Report From the Committee on Committees continued.....

response of a University employee who canswers one of these calls. Wilson properted one instance in which a faculty member received a 480 system call on a tornado alert, hung up the phone, and returned to his classrooom to continue the class which was in session. It was suggested that guidelines might be in order.

V. RESOLUTION ON MERIT RAISES - Pearson

Pearson moved the Senate's endorsement of the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the minutes of the Academic Council for March 13, 1979, indicate that legislative salary appropriations will be increased by approximately 5%; and

WHEREAS there is also a quotation in those Academic Council Minutes that "there will be no uniform cost-of-living or mandated increases for faculty personnel;" and

WHEREAS there were many discrepancies within and between the departments and colleges of this university in the allocation of pay raises in the past two years; and

WHEREAS it is desirable to have a merit system for salary increases, but since the impact of inflation has been so severe in recent years that much improvement is needed to return to 1969 salary levels, and

WHEREAS so little legislative funding is available, in order to achieve something for the faculty from a humanitarian or equity viewpoint,

Be it resolved that this Faculty Senate goes on record as favoring a system of allocating 1/2 of the monies appropriated for salary increases to be granted in across-the-board increases by college to be divided in equal amounts on the basis of FTE's in that college and 1/2 of the monies appropriated to be granted on the basis of merit programs in which the faculty participate in formulating.

Hardwick explained the process by which estimates of funding available for faculty salary increases by college are determined in an attempt to clarify some of the confusion regarding apparent discrepancies. He noted that funding for faculty salary increases is likely to be low and that the University administration anticipates an across the board cut in the legislative appropriation for all line items except salaries.

There followed considerable discussion of the resolution. The general thrust of the debate was that, while faculty do not oppose the concept of merit salary increases, there is much concern for the process by which such funds are allocated and there was also a strong sense that the need for a cost of living adjustment for faculty would be underscored by passage of the Pearson resolution. George's motion to suspend debate carried and the motion to forward the Pearson resolution to the University Administration passed by a vote of 25 for to 10 opposed.

STUDENT-FACULTY RATIOS Texas Public Senior Colleges and Universities Fiscal Years 1973-1977

						of the 4	INSTITUTIONS
	Institution	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77 Anenav	1/2 1/4
7						SALARY	
			25.0	27. (25. 6	26 :4	
	Angelo State University	24.1	25.0	23.6	25.6 17.5	15.9	
	East Texas State University	16.4	16.2	16.1		12.1	
	East Texas State University Center at Texarkana	11.9	18.0	15.0	12.0	20.3	
	Lamar University	22.9	22.3	23.2	22.8		
	Lamar University at Orange	23.0	18.7	29.6	32.8	19.0	
	Lamar University at Port Arthur				24.6	25.7	
	Midwestern State University	18.0	17.8	19.0	20.9	20.4	-
	North Texas State University	16.7	15.3	15.7	15.3	15.2-5	
	Pan American University	23.4	21.6	20.7	23.0	22.3	
	Pan American University at Brownsville		11.9	12.2	11.7	16.7	
	Sam Houston State University	25.3	24.5	23.7	22.4	23.1	
	Southwest Texas State University	25.1	23.0	22.9	22.4	22.3	
	Stephen F. Austin State University	22.3	21.2	23.7	22.9	21.6	
	Sul Ross State University	15.9	16.6	17.2	17.8	14. 1	
	Uvalde Extension Center		13.3	12.6	11.8	9.2.	
	Texas A & M University System						
	Prairie View A & M University	18.1	18.8	19.5	18.0	16.2	
	Tarleton State University	21.4	20.8	20.2	20.1	19.8	
	Texas A & M University	15.3	15.5	16.8	16.8	16.1 3	
	Texas Eastern University		12.5	14.3	10.9	10,3,.	
	Texas Southern University	22.1	20.7	19.9	20.2	23.9	•
	Texas Tech University	19.1	18.3	18.7	18.1	18.1— 1	
	Texas Woman's University	15.9	14.2	13.9	13.8	14.2	
	The University of Texas System	13.3	14.2	10.0			•
	The University of Texas at Arlington	22.0	20.7	20.4	19.5	18.8·	
	The University of Texas at Austin	18.1	16.8	17.0	16.9	15.8 — 4	
	The University of Texas at Dallas	2.31/	3.71/	4.71/	6.8	9.5	
			18.9	20.6	24.3	24.3	
	The University of Texas at El Paso	18.8				9.3.	
	The University of Texas of the Permian Basin		$\frac{10.9}{6.8}$	$\frac{10.3}{7.6}$ 1/	$\frac{9.6}{13.6} \frac{1}{1}$	17.3	
	The University of Texas at San Antonio		0.0-	7.0-	13.0-	17.3	
	University of Houston System	17 7	16.0	20.0	17.0	17.7-2	
	University of Houston Central Campus	17.7	16.8	20.0 7.5 <u>2</u> /	17.9	11.2	
	University of Houston at Clear Lake City				9.9		
	University of Houston Downtown College				26.4	19.2:	
	University of Houston Center at Victoria		5.5	9.3	6.9	7.5	
	University System of South Texas						
	Corpus Christi State University		13.2	12.9	13.8	12.0	
	Laredo State University	14.3	12.6	12.7	12.4	13.1	
	Texas A & I University	19.4	18.4	19.1	21.8	19.7	
	West Texas State University	17.8	18.1	19.3	19.4	$\frac{18:4}{}$,	
	All Institutions Combined	19.0	17.9	18.5	18.2	17.7	

NOTE: The above data were computed. Each ratio represents fall semester full-time student equivalents divided by the number of full-time faculty equivalents budgeted for nine months as reported by the institutions. For purposes of these computations institutional fall semester totals of student credit hours divided by fifteen were used as the measure of full-time student equivalents.

^{1/} Not in full operation

^{2/} First full year of operation

other hands

1978-79 Base Period Semester Credit Hours as % of Hours by Institution

	U.G.	Masters	Dr.	Prof.
University of Texas at Austin	83.4	8.5	4.2	3 8
Texas A & M	87.5	6.3	3.8	2 3
University of Houston	79.5	10.6	3.2	6 6
North Texas State University	82.7	11.6	5.6	
Texas Tech University	90.0	5.2	2.3	2.4

Drawn from Coordinating Board, Semester Credit Hours Report, 1978-79.