

General Faculty Meeting
Texas Tech University
February 13, 1981

Faculty Senate President Roland Smith called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. in the University Center Ballroom. Approximately 110 faculty members attended the meeting (defined in Robert's Rules of Order as a mass meeting) called for the purpose of considering a revision to the TTU Tenure Policy relating to Part IV, Section 8 of the University Tenure and Privilege Committee's "probable cause" function.

As the first order of business, Smith called for the nominations for and the election of a president and a secretary for the meeting. Roger Troub, Arts & Sciences, moved that the Faculty Senate President and Secretary serve as President and Secretary for the meeting. The motion carried without opposition.

Smith asked if there were announcements to be made before the main item on the agenda came up for consideration. Len Ainsworth, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, said that nominations for honorary degrees were being accepted, that the general commencement is scheduled for Friday, May 15, 1981, and that faculty are urged to attend. Nominations for a speaker for the commencement activities were still being received. Ainsworth said that the 5.1% (\$50 minimum) pay increase recently passed by the legislature and signed by the governor will be effective February 1.

James Brink, Arts & Sciences, moved that the faculty adopt the revision to the Tenure Policy, Part IV, Section 8, as circulated with the agenda of the meeting. Margaret Wilson, Arts & Sciences, seconded the motion. Smith then opened the floor for discussion of the question.

William A. Stewart, Chairperson of the Tenure and Privilege Committee, stated that the committee had unanimously endorsed the proposed policy change.

One faculty member questioned the procedure by which the revision would be implemented if the proposal passed. Smith explained that it would be taken to the President and then to the Board of Regents.

Ainsworth spoke against the policy revision, saying the revision may open to question every tenure decision made. He added that faculty members who are up for tenure are considered well by both their peers and administrators and that the rate of denied tenure is relatively low. He expressed concern regarding the judgment of one committee substituting for another committee and said that the revision would place an inordinate burden on the Tenure and Privilege Committee. Ben Newcomb, Arts & Sciences, speaking for the proposal, pointed out the desirability of amending the policy in total, rather than in a piecemeal manner. Rod Schoen, Law, said an allegation in itself does not mean probable cause will be found. Several faculty members objected to item "e" in the revision, and John Walkup, Engineering, said item "b" was too vague. Schoen responded to both objections, saying the document did not attempt to establish standards.

In the discussion that followed, Russell Seacat (Engineering), Len Ainsworth, and Dean Lawrence Graves (Arts & Sciences) spoke against the proposal, while William Stewart, Henry Maxwell (Arts & Sciences), Rod Schoen, Ben Newcomb, Jacq. Collins (Arts & Sciences), and Briggs Twyman (Arts & Sciences) clarified and defended the proposal. Seacat objected that "academic freedom" and "adequate cause" were difficult terms to define.

Ainsworth said the revision might substitute the judgment of one committee for another, and Graves voiced reservations about the unnecessary and burdensome procedures. Speaking as a former member of the Tenure and Privilege Committee, Maxwell said events in the past have led to more specific procedures. Schoen added that the Tenure and Privilege Committee had functioned as a reasonable body acting on a case by case basis. Wilson, agreeing in part with Graves, said the proposal would necessitate the various colleges spelling out their procedures.

Mayer-Oakes (Arts & Sciences), asked if the proposal included faculty other than those being considered for tenure and expressed concern over lines 22-24 of the proposal, saying they would intrude a new concept into the tenure policy. Newcomb said the proposal had nothing to do with tenured faculty and existing programs but applied to tenure-track faculty only. A brief discussion of financial exigency between Mayer-Oakes, Smith, and Maxwell followed.

Collins spoke briefly in favor of the policy revision, noting that it clarified several existing ambiguous points. Ainsworth spoke against item "b" and foresaw problems opening out from the proposal. Twyman pointed out that the revision would enact some of the interpretative comments from the 1970 AAUP statement on tenure.

Neale Pearson, Arts & Sciences moved to close debate. Pearson's motion passed.

The members of the voting faculty present adopted the revision by a vote of 64 to 42.

Part IV, Section 8 was amended to read:

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

Proposed Revision of TTU Tenure Policy, Part IV, Section 8 continued.....

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.

Smith declared the meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

David Leon Higdon

David Leon Higdon
Secretary
2/26/81