



Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

November 7, 1980

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Roland E. Smith, President

SUBJECT: Agenda for meeting #27, November 12, 1980

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, November 12, 1980 at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

I. Minutes of the October 8, 1980 meeting

II. Visitor: State Senator E. L. Short

III. Report of Faculty Status and Welfare Committee -- Larkin

IV. Research Merit Salary -- R. Smith

V. Other Business

VI. Announcements

A. Excerpts from the minutes of the October 14, 1980 meeting of the Academic Council

B. Correspondence

AGENDA ITEM III.

Page 1.

Minutes of Faculty Status and Welfare Committee meeting, October 23, 1980
Present: Collins, Kimmel, Larkin, McPherson, Nelson, Tereshkovich, committee members, and Rodric Schoen of the University Tenure and Privilege Committee.

The meeting was called to order by Panze Kimmel, chairperson pro tem, who presented as the first order of business the selection of a permanent chairperson. Muriel A. Larkin was selected as chairperson, and assumed the chair.

The letter from Roland Smith, President, Faculty Senate, having been read, the Chair recognized Schoen, who presented a proposed revision of the University tenure policy. Following discussion, Kimmel moved and Tereshkovich seconded that the Committee recommend the proposal, with minor modifications, to the Faculty Senate as a substantial and desirable amendment to the University policy. The motion was carried unanimously. The proposed revision, as recommended, is attached hereto, together with comments by the University Tenure and Privilege Committee thereon, as Attachment A.

The Committee next considered the request of President Smith that the Committee spell out in detail the procedures to be followed in implementing the proposed change to University tenure policy. Following substantial discussion, Collins moved and Nelson seconded the following:

- a. That the Faculty Senate as a body consider and approve the proposed revision of University policy, and forward copies of its action thereon to the University administration and faculty for information.
- b. That the Faculty Senate thereafter call a full faculty meeting at which the full faculty will have an opportunity to consider and act upon the proposed revision.
- c. That the Faculty Senate thereafter officially submit the action of the full faculty to the President of the University for his presentation to the Board of Regents.

Following further discussion, the motion was carried unanimously.

The Committee next considered the previously proposed "Contingency Plan for Faculty Reduction." Following discussion, definitive consideration of this proposal was deferred until members of the Committee should have a greater opportunity to study and evaluate it.

There being no further business, the Committee adjourned.

PROPOSED REVISION OF TTU TENURE POLICY, PART IV, SECTION 8

1 8. If a probationary faculty member believes that a decision to
2 deny reappointment

3 (a) was made for reasons violating academic freedom;

4 (b) was made without adequate consideration of professional
5 performance;

6 (c) was made after significant noncompliance with prescribed
7 procedures;

8 (d) was based upon factors lacking a substantial relationship to
9 professional fitness or performance; or

10 (e) was based upon a criterion not listed among the prescribed
11 evaluative criteria for reappointment or admission to tenure,
12 the faculty member may present these allegations, which shall include the
13 specific grounds supporting them, in writing to the chairperson of the
14 University Standing Committee on Tenure and Privilege. The elected members
15 of the Committee shall give preliminary consideration to the faculty
16 member's complaint. If the Committee concludes that there is probable
17 cause for the complaint, the matter shall be heard in accordance with the
18 procedures outlined in Section VI, except that the faculty member shall
19 be responsible for stating the grounds upon which the allegations are
20 based and shall bear the burden of proof.

21 In no case shall the Committee find probable cause if nonreappointment
22 was for reasons of bona fide financial exigency or in consequence of a
23 duly considered and authorized deletion of an academic program or part
24 thereof.

Comments

The University Tenure and Privilege Committee (hereinafter "the Committee") is established by the Board of Regents in the TTU Tenure Policy. The Committee has two important functions: (1) to make recommendations pertaining to the tenure policy, and (2) to decide if there is "probable cause" that a complaining probationary faculty member has been denied reappointment for reasons violating academic freedom.

The proposed revision relates to the Committee's "probable cause" function. Under the present text of the TTU Tenure Policy, Part IV, Section 8, a finding by the Committee of probable cause that a violation of academic freedom has occurred activates a Special Hearing Committee to hear the faculty member's complaint in an adversary proceeding wherein the faculty member is the petitioner and the University administration is the respondent. The findings and recommendations, if any, of the Special Hearing Committee are presented to the Board of Regents for action. (TTU Tenure Policy, Part VI, 1976-77 Faculty Handbook, pp. 47-48.)

The proposed revision substantially increases the specific grounds upon which the Committee might find probable cause that a violation has occurred. Authority to find probable cause should not be confused with the exercise of that authority. The Committee is neutral. It is neither advocate nor adversary of the faculty member or the University administration.

Expansion of the probable cause grounds beyond "academic freedom" is required by the persistent problems encountered in defining the precise meaning and scope of "academic freedom" and the need to provide specific additional safeguards for probationary faculty members who are denied tenure or reappointment. These proposed supplementary proscriptions--some procedural, some substantive--are consistent with the proper goals and administration of the tenure policy and consistent as well with a fair personnel policy.

Tenure should not be awarded to faculty members whose qualifications and professional performance are deficient. Awarding tenure to unqualified persons is contrary to the best interests of the faculty and the University and thereby endangers the tenure system itself. This proposed revision does not guarantee tenure or reappointment for unqualified persons. The revision merely requires that decisions to award or deny tenure, to reappoint or terminate, be made in accordance with prescribed procedures, be made after consideration of relevant factors, and be made for legitimate reasons.

The proposed revision also includes less significant changes to the present text of Part IV, Section 8. In accordance with past practice and custom, the revision specifically identifies the "faculty committee" as the University Standing Committee on Tenure and Privilege. The revision, again reflecting past practice and custom, states that the "probable cause" complaint shall be considered by the elected members of the Committee. Although the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs are ex officio members of the Committee, these officers in past years have not participated in the probable cause proceedings of the Committee.

The final paragraph of the proposed revision makes explicit what has always been implicit.

AGENDA ITEM IV.

GUIDELINES ON SPECIAL MERIT SALARY INCREASES BASED ON RESEARCH PERFORMANCE

Funds released by research appointments and other available University resources will be used to provide for one-time merit increases for approximately 100 faculty members, beginning on January 1, 1981. These merit awards are to be based on outstanding scholarly research and productivity; in rare instances, a faculty member who has a modest record of research but who has made clearly meritorious contributions to the University through outstanding teaching or in other ways appropriate to the institution's mission may be recommended.

Allocations have been made to each college, based 50% on professional head count and 50% on performance in sponsored research. Merit increases may range from \$1000 to \$1200 with an average of \$1100. These will be added to the 1980-81 base salary rate, but payment will be prorated for the year (thus, a faculty member appointed for nine months will be paid 5/9 of the increase this academic year).

Recommendations for recipients of awards should be made by the dean of each college, after consultation with appropriate departmental chairpersons or coordinators and the associate dean/coordinator for research. Administrative personnel (chairpersons, assistant and associate deans, etc.) may be eligible for the award on the basis of research performance. It is expected that only tenured personnel will participate in this particular merit program. Each recommendation should be accompanied by a supporting statement of approximately 100 words and will be reviewed in the offices of Research and Graduate Studies and Academic Affairs.

Certain departments have worked diligently in developing their sponsored research programs. In recognition of these efforts and as an encouragement to departmental initiative, some awards are strongly suggested for those departments qualifying on the basis of research performance. Except in unusual circumstances, faculty members in those departments should receive at least the number of awards indicated on the accompanying document (they may, of course, receive more than that number). Exceptions should be clearly explained.

While criteria for judging the quality and quantity of research accomplishment will appropriately vary from academic area to area, the following should be considered in evaluations:

1. Conduct of sponsored projects.
2. Publication in refereed journals and other media of recognized stature.
3. Development and submission of good grant/contract proposals.
4. Subjective judgment of peers and supervisor(s).
5. National reputation in research.
6. Supervision of outstanding theses/dissertations and development of student researchers.

It is imperative that each award go to a recipient whose record of accomplishment clearly is worthy of recognition. To do otherwise undermines the objectives of this special incentives program.

Recommendations are due no later than November 15 in the Office of Academic Affairs. Changes of status should not be initiated until the review process has been completed.

A. Selected items from minutes of Academic Council Meetings

October 14, 1980

1. There was brief discussion of the interdisciplinary research task forces. Professors Hagler, Hopkins, and Lefkowitz, head the teams concerned with energy, food, and health, respectively. Deans were encouraged to invite the task force leaders to meet with faculties in the respective colleges to describe the work activities and to provide opportunity for additional input.
2. Attention was called to a management-by-objective procedure being used in the College of Agricultural Sciences. The need to develop and use objectives as a management tool was discussed. Attention was also drawn to an earlier presentation by Dean Anderson as an effort being used to meet a management-by-objectives approach. The value of setting objectives was also noted as providing a tool for improved communications.
3. A plan for special merit increases based primarily on research performance was discussed. The intent of the proposal was to provide increases, within funds released by research appointments and other available resources, to highly productive faculty. In order for the increases to be of significance, a nine months base rate improvement of from \$1000-\$1200 is to be made available for recognition of 100 faculty. The basis of allocations to colleges was 50% on professional staff numbers and 50% on sponsored research levels. There was considerable discussion regarding the program. Comments were wide ranging but noted the need to include a factor for non-funded research, that there was concern for inadequacy of funds available, that the additions may be "too little and too late" to have the desired effect of faculty retention, that priorities should be established for a broader return of indirect costs from research, and that incentive programs should be developed and implemented at the time the annual budget is made. After discussion and clarification of procedures, the program was recommended by the Council.
4. Council members expressed frustration with the problems of providing adequate faculty salaries. They expressed a need for early involvement in budget planning and for involving the President in developing understanding of budget needs.

B. Correspondence

The following correspondence has been sent from the Senate Office since that which was reported at the last Senate meeting.

1. Rod Schoen, acknowledging receipt of his committee's proposed changes in the university's tenure policy.

Correspondence continued

2. Fred Wehmeyer, requesting parking for persons attending Senate meetings.
3. Lauro F. Cavazos, President, concerning the implementation of a recommendation made by the Grievance Committee last spring.
4. Michael C. White, accepting his resignation from the Faculty Senate.
5. Frank K. Fair, Vice Chairman, Faculty Council, Sam Houston State University, in answer to his request for a copy of the Constitution and Bylaws of Texas Tech University's Faculty Senate.
6. Lauro F. Cavazos, President, concerning the possibility of financial aid for the library during the current fiscal year.
7. Ralph L. Sellmeyer, Mass Communications, outlining procedure by which faculty to attend out-of-town football games are selected.
8. Len Ainsworth, requesting specific pieces of information about the use of the pass/fail system on campus.
9. Robert Ewalt, about the late date on which faculty members received class rolls.
10. Lauro F. Cavazos, President, forwarding the resolution regarding certain university committee appointments which the Senate approved at the October meeting.
11. Ernest B. Fish, Park Administration and Landscape Architecture, asking him to convene the Faculty Senate Committee on Elections.
12. Panze B. Kimmel, Education, asking her to convene the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee.
13. Lauro F. Cavazos, President, asking that the Senate have a voice in the selection of persons to serve on the screening/advisory committees being formed for the selection of persons to fill vacancies in the administration.
14. Murray Coulter, Chairperson, Library Committee, asking that committee's help in a solution to the problem of inadequate janitorial service in the library over the weekends.
15. Clarence A. Bell, accepting his resignation from the Faculty Senate.
16. John Queen, concerning grievance.
17. Lauro F. Cavazos, President, thanking him for his action regarding the current financial situation of the library.
18. Len Ainsworth, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, regarding transferring of funds to the library.
19. James R. McDonald, requesting that he convene Special Study Committee C.