

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting #30
February 11, 1981

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, February 11, 1981, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Roland Smith, president, presiding. Senators present were Anderson, Bacon, Biggers, Blaisdell, Cepica, Clements, Cochran, Collins, Conover, Dale, Dixon, Filgo, Gilbert, Gipson, Harris, Higdon, Hill, Horridge, Jebson, Keho, Kellogg, Lee, McDonald, McGuire, McPherson, Malloy, Masten, Mogan, Moreland, Nelson, Newcomb, Owens, Rude, Schoen, Sellmeyer, M. Smith, Stewart, Tan, Troub, Volz, Williams, Wilson, and Wood. Kimmel was absent because of illness, Freeman, Kunhardt and Sanders because of university business. Denham, Morris and Shine were also absent.

The guests were Jerry D. Ramsey, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs; Robert H. Ewalt, Vice President for Student Affairs; Ernest B. Fish, Chairman of the Grievance Panel; Preston Lewis, University News & Publications; Ruthanne Brockway, Avalanche Journal; and Bruce Kemp, Internal Vice President, Student Association.

SUMMARY OF BUSINESS CONDUCTED:

The Faculty Senate:

1. Heard Robert Ewalt report on the Student/Faculty Academic Information Center,
2. Heard Ernest Fish, Chairman of the Grievance Panel, detail that Panel's activities,
3. Heard a report on the action taken during the general faculty meeting regarding the revision of TTU Tenure Policy, Part IV, Section 8,
4. Heard reports from the Nominations Committee, Faculty Status & Welfare Committee, Committee on Committees, Faculty Senate Study Committee B, Undergraduate Programs Committee, Faculty Senate Study Committee C, and Faculty Senate Study Committee A,
5. Heard a brief report on the meeting between President Cavazos and Faculty Senate President Smith regarding the four special committees, and,
6. Elected two members to the Special Hearing Panel of the Tenure and Privilege Committee.

Smith called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. and introduced the Senate's visitors.

I. MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 14, 1981 MEETING

The minutes of the January 14, 1981 meeting were approved as distributed.

II. REPORT ON THE STUDENT/FACULTY ACADEMIC INFORMATION CENTER

Robert Ewalt reported the activities and recommendations of the task force developed to access the current state of the information systems available for student/faculty academic information. The task force evaluated the current system, determined requirements for a comprehensive system, and made specific recommendations regarding particular alternatives that might be considered. Generally, the task force found the existing information system outmoded, decentralized, often quite inaccurate, expensive to maintain, and unamenable to interfacing. In the opinion of the task force, a new

Minutes

Faculty Senate Meeting #30

February 11, 1981

Page 2.

Report on the Student/Faculty Academic Information Center continued.....

system must include a faster response time, a greater degree of accuracy, higher accessibility and reliability, and capacity for handling add/drop and pre-registration. Using the add/drop process as an example, Ewalt noted that the new system would cut the number of steps from twelve to six and would provide easy monitoring of registration, suspension and probation information, class assignments, and advising procedures.

The task force has recommended the purchasing of a system with the vendor developing a system appropriate for the campus. The system should be in operation within eighteen months. On January 31, 1981, the Board of Regents approved plans for developing and implementing the system. Fall 1982 registration for Spring 1983 classes should be possible. A project director and an advisory team will probably be appointed soon, though there are many details yet to be worked out and questions to answer. Ewalt added that the system will upgrade existing equipment considerably and that the costs will be amortized over a ten year period. Ewalt responded to several questions from Smith and Harris concerning the pre-registration procedures.

III. FACULTY GRIEVANCE PANEL

Ernest Fish, Chairperson of the Faculty Grievance Panel, updated the activities of the Panel by invitation of the Senate. Fish summarized the history of the Panel, the nature of its membership, and its charge. He explained that one grievance had been satisfactorily resolved and that no other cases were pending. He noted that the procedures for filing a grievance may intimidate faculty, explaining that though three inquiries had been made, no subsequent grievances were filed. Fish pointed out that the Grievance Panel functions only at the request of the President and that the Grievance Panel recommends a course of action which he may or may not take. Basically the procedure involves filing a grievance with the President within thirty days of the act or omission forming the basis of the grievance or within thirty days of the date on which the aggrieved faculty member becomes aware of the problem. The grievance then proceeds from department chairperson to dean to academic vice-president to the president if it remains unresolved.

Fish responded to questions from Newcomb, Stewart, Smith, Gilbert, and Blaisdell concerning the Ad Hoc Academic Freedom Committee's report and recommendations to create a new committee, the Panel's position in the formal grievance process, the kinds of cases heard, and the number of grievances filed. Fish said the panel only recommends action, that cases usually involve course loads, salary, textbook selection, official university travel, and so on, and that a grievance involving questions of tenure falls outside the Panel's charge. Newcomb asked if Fish foresaw duplication with an academic freedom committee, and Fish responded that he did not. Questions concerning the thirty-day stipulation and the panel being convened only at the request of the President were raised by Bacon, Schoen, Rude, and Collins.

Collins moved that Smith refer the charge and procedures of the Faculty Grievance Panel to the proper Faculty Senate study committee for review and recommendations as to whether or not the charge of the committee as now written is adequate and to determine if the Grievance Panel serves the purpose for which it was established. Newcomb asked if this would affect consideration of the Ad Hoc Academic Freedom report. Cochran, Wilson, and Schoen spoke against the motion. The motion failed.

Faculty Grievance Panel continued.....

Harris said the Grievance Panel should at least receive copies of all grievance letters filed with the President. Newcomb stressed the need for publicizing the grievance procedure, and Smith, Wilson, and Collins suggested both the Faculty Handbook and Insight as vehicles for such publicity.

IV. THE FEBRUARY 3, 1981 GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

Smith reported briefly on the general faculty meeting called for the purpose of considering a revision of the TTU Tenure Policy. The faculty approved the revision of Part IV, Section 8 of the Tenure Policy by a vote of 64 to 42 during its February 3, 1981 meeting in the University Center Ballroom. Smith said he would communicate this information to the President, asking him to consider the matter and either to approve the action and present it to the Board of Regents or to express to the Senate his reasons for not approving it.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Nominations Committee - Jim McDonald, Chairperson, presented the committee's slate of candidates for the officers of the Faculty Senate for the 1981-82 academic year. These were: Clarke Cochran (Political Science) and Alice Denham (Education) for Secretary, Davis Clements (Engineering) and Panze Kimmel (Education) for Vice-President, and Larry Masten (Engineering) and Ben Newcomb (History) for President. McDonald said all persons had agreed to serve if elected. Smith asked for nominations from the floor. There were none. The slate of nominations stood approved. The election will occur during the March meeting of the Senate.

B. Faculty Status & Welfare - Jacq. Collins, a member of the committee, updated the Senate on the background of the financial exigency report circulated with the agenda of the meeting. Newcomb moved that the Senate defer action on the report until the March 11, 1981 meeting, thus giving the Senators additional time to consider this important issue. Newcomb's motion carried.

C. Committee on Committees - Larry Masten moved the approval of the appointments to the various committees as reported in the agenda. Masten's motion carried. Masten also noted that nomination forms for appointments to the various University Councils and Committees will be going out to the entire faculty soon, and he suggested that Senators urge their colleagues to complete these forms and return them to their representative on the Committee on Committees.

D. Faculty Status & Welfare Committee B - Vernon McGuire moved that the Senate accept the report of the committee as circulated and explained that Senate acceptance of the report implements no action on behalf of the body except that the Senate accepts the recommendation that it investigate further committees suggested by Study Committee B. There were questions and suggestions regarding the recommendations. Cochran asked if the funds could be added to the AMOCO awards; Collins indicated the need for a more specific report and recommendations; Nelson pointed out that the Faculty Status & Welfare Committee was already charged with distributing \$1,500 and added that a committee to handle such small awards was needed. The motion to accept the committee report failed. Newcomb's motion to recommit the report to the Committee for more specific recommendations carried.

Committee Reports continued.....

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Programs - Newcomb moved that the committee recommendations having to do with withdrawal and pass/fail dates be approved. Dixon spoke against the proposed action, saying it would place too many restrictions on the students. Newcomb said the changed date was suggested by students, and Clements noted that the change involved only a week. The report was approved. The recommendation read:

Revised "W" and Pass/Fail Policy

1. That the 30th class day (counting Mondays through Fridays) be fixed as the last date on which a student may
 - a. Drop any course with a grade of "W". Beyond this date there will be no individual drop of a course and a grade of record must be assigned as a grade for the full semester.*
 - b. Declare pass/fail, but may not reverse a prior pass/fail declaration.
2. The final date to withdraw from the University will be ten class days prior to the first day of the final examination period. Withdraw is defined as "action which the student initiates to eliminate his enrollment from all courses in the University for which he is registered." At the time of withdrawal, a grade of "W" (withdrawal passing) or "WF" (withdrawal failing) will be assigned based on the student's performance in class.
3. The office of academic affairs shall fix for summer session calendars, dates equivalent to the dates fixed for the long sessions.

*At present, there are two deadlines for withdrawal from an individual course. In the Fall 1980 semester, the last date to drop with an "automatic" grade of W was Tuesday, September 30. The last date to drop a course was Friday, November 14.

As directed by the Senate on May 7, 1980, the Committee continues to its study of the pass/fail system.

F. Faculty Senate Study Committee C - McDonald reported the charge, the questions, and the recommendations of Committee C. Specifically the committee was to determine what input faculty members currently have in the evaluation of chairpersons, deans, and vice presidents. He reported some input for chairpersons particularly with the use of a standard form in three colleges but no formal procedures for the evaluations of deans and vice presidents. McDonald then explained the committee's three recommendations as circulated in the report and moved adoption of the report. Horridge asked why assistant and associate deans were omitted from the study; McDonald said these positions were not included in the original charge. A brief discussion concerning the confidentiality of evaluations and the eventual disposal of evaluations followed. Lee pointed out that the Academic Affairs and Status Committee did the same work last year, and the Faculty Senate approved its report, sending it at the time to the President for action. Cochran called attention to recent Academic Council action, as reported in the meeting agenda. Mogan reminded

Committee Reports (Faculty Senate Study Committee C.) continued.....

the Senate of recent AAUP statements concerning the evaluation of administrators, and Harris and Gilbert asked if there were indications such procedures would be effective with chairpersons. McDonald said decisions would be left to the deans. Dixon stressed the positive uses of evaluation. Attention was called to the yearly evaluation in the College of Business Administration, and Ramsey noted that a formal evaluation procedure was under development.

The report was approved. Its recommendations read:

1. Department chairpersons should be evaluated with faculty input every three years. A written questionnaire of a general nature similar to the one now used by Arts & Sciences, Engineering, and Agriculture should be used. The deans should guarantee confidentiality of the comments by destroying them after a summary has been prepared.
2. Deans should be evaluated on a regular basis, perhaps every four years. The Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs should develop an instrument to be compiled jointly by department chairpersons and faculty or faculty representatives of the college.
3. In the evaluation of the vice presidents, the President of the University should be urged to seek input from the Faculty Senate. A formal procedure for faculty input does not seem practical.

VI. REPORTING CONCERNING THE FOUR SPECIAL COMMITTEES

As instructed by the Senate, Smith arranged a meeting with President Cavazos to talk with him about the four university committees that were made into "special" committees early in the year. These were the Biosafety, Protection of Human Subjects, Radiation and Laser Safety, and Warm-Blooded Animals Committees. Smith felt that Cavazos responded favorably when he heard the Senate's point of view concerning these committees, but the President was non-committal. He indicated that he would look into the situation and that the matter was not closed. He may reconsider the issue.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Smith read a letter from the Tenure and Privilege Committee calling for the Special Hearing Panel to be activated. Smith explained that the Senate was to elect two members from the Panel's ten members. The President selects two members, and these four elect a fifth member. After discussion concerning balloting and tabulating, the Senate voted by secret ballot, having selected Smith and Stewart to count the ballots.

Williams moved approval of the resolution of Study Committee A., distributed at the meeting. The motion carried. Smith said the resolution would be forwarded to the IRS, area congressmen, and Texas senators. The resolution reads:

Other Business continued

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the so-called Thor decision of the U. S. Supreme Court shall be applied to the inventories of businesses, and

Whereas, the application of the ruling to book publishers is almost certain to have a most serious impact on the retention of books by publishers, and


Whereas, book publishers are likely to destroy unsold copies of books, particularly connected with teaching and research, rather than keep those copies as part of their inventory, and

Whereas, book publishers may make decisions on the publishing of new books based not upon the merit of the books but on their probable inventory status.

Be it resolved, That the Senate of Texas Tech University calls urgently for a modification or change in the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service in such a way as to avoid the consequences which now face the public and the teaching profession, namely the probable wholesale destruction of book inventories, and the probable decrease in the publication of worthy scholarly books.

Collins announced that President Cavazos would discuss faculty salaries and raises at the February 24, 1981 AAUP meeting and invited all senators to attend.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45


David Leon Higdon, Secretary
Faculty Senate
3/2/81