

MINUTES FACULTY SENATE MEETING #64

November 14, 1984

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTIONS TAKEN:

1. Minutes of October 2, 1984 and October 10, 1984 meetings were approved.
2. Revision in the Employee's Affidavit was approved. Employees may delete the word "swear" and the concluding statement, "So help me God.", if that is their choice.
3. Faculty Senate Tenure and Privilege Committee was established.
4. Committee on Committees submitted a slate of nominees to fill vacancies on various University committees.
5. Revisions of certain committees by the Administration have not been detrimental to faculty involvement.
6. A motion to request the President of TTU to initiate studies leading to the development of a comprehensive system for evaluation, on a regular basis, of the performance of administrators was defeated. "This motion presumes we have confidence in the President, and we have voted that we have no confidence in him."
7. After study and deliberation, Committee C concluded that service on University Committees should be an individual decision.
8. Two amendments were proposed to the Grievance Policy to give faculty and the University legal counsel.
9. Faculty Senate officers will meet with Dr. Cavazos sometime after December 10, 1984.
10. Thirty-five packets of material concerning tenure and other matters were sent out to Faculty Governance organizations in the state.
11. Several Senates of other universities passed resolutions on behalf of TTU (see attachment A).
12. Letters of exchange between Olson of Sam Houston State University and Cavazos of TTU (see attachment B).
13. Reply to Pevehouse's statement (see attachment C).
14. Reply to items (1) through (7) in Special Edition of Insight (see attachment D).
15. Reply to item e in Special Edition of Insight (see attachment E).
16. Community Relations and Progress and Status Committees were established.
17. A request was made for Faculty response to the Board of Regents' statement in Special Edition of Insight.
18. Motion to participate in implementation of new tenure policy was tabled.

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, November 14, 1984, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Evelyn Davis, President, presiding. Senators present were Adamcik, Blair, Bloomer, Burnett, Collins, Coulter, Cravens, Curry, K. Davis, Dixon, Dvoracek, Eissinger, Ford, Gettel, Gipson, Gott, Higdon, Keho, Lee, McKown, Mayer-Oakes, Newcomb, Oberhelman, Owens, Richardson, Rude, Sasser, Shine, Sparkman, Steele, Stockton, Strauss, Sullivan, Teske, Thornhill, Welton, Whitsitt, Wicker, Wilson, and Wright. Senators Anderson, Carlile, Freeman, and Havens were absent because of University business. Senator Khan was absent because of illness. Senators Ayoub Goss, Mehta, Vallabhan and Williams were also absent.

Vernon McGuire, Associate Professor, Speech Communications, served as Parliamentarian.

Guests included John R. Darling, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research; Preston Lewis, University News and Publications; Paul Cline, Avalanche Journal; Laura Tetreault, University Daily; David Barnett and Allison Bennett, Student Association; & various other representatives of the news media, including Barbara Williams, Channel 28.

I. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 1984 SPECIAL MEETING, AND THE OCTOBER 10, 1984 REGULAR MEETING

Senator Margaret Wilson moved the minutes of both meetings be approved as distributed. Hearing no opposition to the motion, Evelyn Davis, President, declared the minutes approved.

II. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Faculty Status & Welfare Committee

Wilson, Chair, read the following statement (taken from a memo from Dr. C. Len Ainsworth to Mr. Wendell Tucker, Director of Personnel) which is in response to an earlier request from the Faculty Status & Welfare Committee.

In accord with a request from the Faculty Senate this is to ask that the following addition be made as a paragraph after the Oath of Office contained in the Employee's Affidavit.

(Employees may execute the oath by deleting the word "swear" and the concluding statement, "So help me God.", if that is their choice.)

It is requested that this addition be included following the text of the oath at the next printing of the affidavit forms. Until that can be accomplished it is suggested that an addendum, of the above statement, be attached to existing copies or that the sentence be included on those existing copies by means of a rubber stamp, prior to this being provided to new employees. Please advise me as to how this should be handled for the current supply of forms.

Attached for your information is the report of the senate committee upon which its resolution and this request is made.

Wilson then continued with that committee's report by referring to the following report and moved its adoption:

The Faculty Status and Welfare Committee met 1 November 1984 at 4:00 p.m. in the Senate Conference Room.

The Committee discussed the feasibility of establishing a Faculty Senate Tenure

and Privilege Committee. It was recognized that the proposed committee would not have the same function as the defunct University Tenure and Privilege Committee but it was a consensus that our faculty colleagues need a support and investigatory group on matters of academic freedom and due process.

The Committee then deliberated on a charge and procedures for selection of members for the proposed committee. The following is the suggested format.

The Faculty Senate Tenure and Privilege Committee will be a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. It will be composed of five tenured members, drawn from the faculty at large, all of whom are Associate Professors or Professors. One member shall be elected Chairperson by the Committee.

CHARGE:

The Faculty Senate Tenure and Privilege Committee shall be available to assist the Faculty Senate, faculty, and administration by performing the following duties:

- (1) Receive complaints from any Texas Tech faculty member on alleged violations of academic freedom, academic due process, and tenure procedures;
- (2) Investigate and document such complaints; and
- (3) Take such action as is considered appropriate.

All information received by the Committee will be held in confidence and released only by, or by permission of, the complainant.

SELECTION OF MEMBERS:

Members shall be elected by the Faculty Senate upon nomination by its Committee on Committees.

TERMS OF MEMBERSHIP:

Terms will be two-year staggered terms, with two members going off in odd-numbered years and three going off in even numbered years.

Wilson's motion passed without discussion or opposition.

B. Committee on Committees

Welton, Chair, submitted a slate of nominees of persons to fill vacancies on various University Committees and moved the Senate approve the slate of nominees. The motion to approve passed without opposition. The slate of nominees will be forwarded to the appropriate administrative officials for appointment to committees.

Welton continued his report by saying that the Committee on Committees had been charged with analyzing the structure of University committees and noting any changes that have taken place. He referred to an attachment circulated with the agenda of the meeting and said it reflects changes that have occurred within the past year, most of which have resulted from administrative reorganization.

Academic Publications Committee is being replaced by Texas Tech Press Editorial Committee and the Minority Affairs Committee has been restructured. According to Dr. Robert Ewalt, Vice President for Student Affairs, changes in that committee are in response to recommendations from the committee itself, or prior committees. Nothing detrimental to faculty involvement on committees was found at this time. Welton said this is a preliminary report and the committee will continue to study the matter.

C. COMMITTEE B

Adamcik, Chair, referred to the committee report circulated with the agenda. The charge to the committee was to study the need for and rationale for evaluation of administrators. Adamcik summarized the report by saying the committee concluded that in principle the idea is good, however, it would be a major undertaking which probably nobody would pay attention to.

Consequently, the Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate not develop such a procedure itself but that it encourage the administration to do so and that the Senate offer its cooperation in securing input from the Faculty if it is asked to do so. Specifically, Adamcik said, the Committee proposes that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution:

Whereas, periodic performance evaluation is important and necessary for any organization, and

Whereas, performance evaluation is equally applicable to administrators as well as faculty, and

Whereas, the faculty of Texas Tech University support a total system of performance evaluation for faculty and administrators, and

Whereas, current procedures for the evaluation of administrators are sporadic at best, therefore be it

Resolved by the Faculty Senate of Texas Tech University that the President be requested to initiate studies leading to the development of a comprehensive system for evaluation, on a regular basis, of the performance of administrators, and be it further

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate expresses readiness to aid in providing faculty input to such a study.

Collins spoke in opposition to the motion saying that the faculty has given the President a vote of no confidence. This motion, he says, in a roundabout way presumes that the faculty has confidence in the President. To have any credibility at all, an evaluation of administrators must be done by the faculty, not the administration, Collins concluded.

After further discussion, Collins moved to table Committee B's resolution. Collins' motion to table failed.

Ford spoke in opposition to Committee B's resolution and after a very brief discussion, the resolution submitted by Adamcik on behalf of Committee B failed to pass.

D. Committee C

Burnett, Chair, said the committee was charged with examining the question of faculty honoring committee assignment. He referred to the following paragraph from the Texas Tech Board of Regents Manual.

.06.03

Faculty Responsibility

(4) University Service

A faculty member has a responsibility to participate in the various activities, programs, and functions related to the enhancement of the University, such as participating in the formulation of academic policies, service on University committees, and other assignments.

In light of this statement the committee concluded that it would not be appropriate for the committee to recommend action by the Senate, but rather that this should be a matter to be left to individuals as to how they would handle their committee assignments.

E. Committee D

Oberhelman, a member of the committee, gave that committee's report.

Re: Proposed Amendments to the Grievance Policy

Whereas: Information received from General Counsel, T.S.T.A. affirms that the Texas Tech University Grievance Policy paragraph B, page 77, Faculty Handbook is not in compliance with state law and

Whereas; The office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research has been made aware of this and has indicated a change in the policy.

Committee D recommends that the Faculty Senate vote to approve the underlined additions to the Faculty Grievance Policy, Operating Policy 32.05 as follows:

"b. ... The aggrieved or his or her representative will present.....

After ... The University may be represented by its General Counsel. The Grievance"

If any grievance should reach the hearing stage before publication or formal implementation of this charge, the grievant shall be notified of his or her right to representation.

Oberhelman concluded the committee report by saying that Committee D recommends that the Grievance Policy be changed as indicated in "b" above which would permit a person to have legal counsel when presenting their grievance and would also permit the University to have its general counsel present as well. Oberhelman moved acceptance of the recommendation. The motion passed without opposition.

F. Report by Faculty Senate President Evelyn Davis

Davis read a draft of a letter to Dr. Cavazos which was in response to his letter stating that he would meet with the Faculty Senate officers after he has met with all colleges (December 10). Davis agreed to do this but wanted the following statement included in the minutes: "From Faculty Senators viewpoint the meeting with the Faculty Senate officers in no way negates President Cavazos' responsibility to meet with the Faculty Senate."

Ford made a motion that the Senate adopt the following resolution: The Faculty Senate feels there are many issues for the officers of the Faculty Senate to discuss with the President and therefore, directs the officers of the Faculty Senate to meet with the President on these matters and report back to the Senate. Ford's motion passed without opposition.

Interaction with students - Sullivan reported that a noontime meeting with students, at which time a discussion of the tenure policy was to have taken place, has been canceled. The Student Association, in informing Sullivan of the cancellation, told Sullivan that Dr. Darling's office thought this discussion was not entirely advisable. Dr. Darling confirmed Sullivan's statement and commented that, in his opinion, the policy has been passed and to go back and debate the policy is dysfunctional at this time.

Davis mentioned that the Governor will be making a statement soon concerning tenure and the vote of no confidence in President Cavazos. All regents have talked to the Governor. The Governor has received a large number of letters concerning the new tenure policy at Texas Tech.

Thirty five packets of material concerning tenure and other matters were sent out to faculty governance organizations in the state. These faculty senates have the Tech tenure policy as an item on their agenda for discussion. Four senate organizations have reported back and in all cases their resolution (see attachment A) passed without opposition.

Davis also reported on an exchange of letters between James S. Olson, Chairperson of the Faculty Senate at Sam Houston State University, and Lauro F. Cavazos (see attachment B).

III. New Business

Senator Bloomer made the following motion:

IN RECOGNITION of the Faculty's obligations to the students of Texas Tech University, and the citizens of Texas,

BE IT RESOLVED that, despite the existence of an adversarial relationship between the Faculty and the administration resulting from actions by President Cavazos and the Board of Regents, the Faculty Senate recommends that members of the Texas Tech University faculty reaffirm their commitment to excellence in all aspects of teaching and research.

There was a lengthy discussion of the resolution and several senators expressed strong opposition to the motion. All faculty felt that they have always been responsible to their duties despite adversarial relationships with the administration. Some, however, thought that such a motion would reassure students and the local community. Bloomer withdrew the motion from the floor.

IV. Response to official statements by the Board of Regents on 18 October 1984 and to the subsequent Special Edition of Insight

- A. Newcomb and Wright drafted a reply to Pevehouse's statement directing the President not to meet with the Faculty Senate to restore confidence in the President. Newcomb discussed the reply and moved that the spirit of the reply be accepted and that the Faculty Senate officers be permitted to use this material at their discretion. The motion passed without opposition (see attachment C).
- B. Newcomb, Wright and Welton drafted a reply to items (1) through (7) of the special edition of Insight. Welton discussed the reply and moved that the spirit of the reply be accepted and that the Faculty Senate officers be permitted to use the material at their discretion. The motion passed without opposition (see attachment D).
- C. Wicker drafted a reply to item e. in the special edition of Insight (attachment E). He made a motion that the information be included in the minutes. The motion passed without opposition.

Wicker's reply prompted discussion by Dr. Darling. He said that the implication of percentages could be misleading because most funds received by Texas Tech are formula-generated. Adamcik asked Dr. Darling if he was saying that "it is irrelevant as to how hard the President works to get salary and M&O dollars, we will receive the same?" Dr. Darling said that could be a fair statement.

Sullivan said that in regards to student enrollment, we are doing more poorly than most universities. Ford said that he felt part of this is being caused

Agenda item IV., part C. continued.....

by approximately 200 TTU faculty seeking a year's leave of absence in the coming fiscal year. "Students do not like it and are leaving." Ford mentioned that he thinks the administration has grossly overlooked the impact of the vote of no confidence in the President.

V. Special Motions

- A. Newcomb moved that the Faculty Senate President appoint and charge a Faculty Senate ad hoc Campus and Community Relations Committee to keep the faculty and community informed about important University issues. Among its duties shall be providing speakers for and arranging speaking engagements with civic, professional, and trade organizations with interest in occurrences at Texas Tech. Jacquelin Collins agreed to chair this committee. The motion passed without opposition.
- B. Higdon moved that the President of the Faculty Senate appoint and charge a Faculty Senate ad hoc University Status and Progress Committee to monitor the status and progress of Texas Tech University. The motion passed without opposition.

VI. Discussion of Special Edition of Insight

Wilson brought up the matter of the Special Edition of Insight. She said that she was pleased to see the Board's statement in its entirety.

Shine moved that the Editorial Board of Insight be asked to publish a synopsis of faculty responses to the Special Edition of Insight. The motion passed without opposition.

VII. Motion by William Mayer-Oakes

Mayer-Oakes moved that the Faculty Senate charge its Tenure and Privilege Committee with the additional need to act on behalf of all TTU faculty to consider and evaluate the procedures established by the TTU administration for implementation of the tenure policy approved September 28, 1984 by the TTU Board of Regents. The committee actions required under this charge will be to react to and evaluate the proposed implementation ideas in order to recommend a "broad faculty viewpoint" which will be made available to those faculty who wish to consider it. Faculty members acting on the committee with regard to this charge will explicitly be considered as acting in the interest of all Faculty rather than in their own individual interests.

The motion was tabled to enable Faculty Senate members to think about the motion in detail.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Henry A. Wright
 Henry A. Wright, Secretary
 Faculty Senate
 11/20/84



University of Houston at Clear Lake City

2700 Bay Area Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77058

FACULTY SENATE

November 8, 1984

Dr. Evelyn Davis
President, Faculty Senate
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Dear Dr. Davis:

By a unanimous vote at its November 7, 1984 meeting, the Faculty Senate of the University of Houston-Clear Lake passed the following resolution:

Whereas the concept of tenure allows professors at respectable universities to discover and express new ideas and new knowledge without fear of loss of livelihood or harassment or retribution;

Whereas tenure is therefore fundamental to the preservation of the university as a center of learning;

Whereas the President and Board of Regents of Texas Tech University have adopted a new policy which negates the tenure system in favor of renewable term contracts, and whereas the undermining of the tenure system at Texas Tech University threatens the institution of tenure at all other centers of higher learning in the state;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Houston-Clear Lake condemns the actions of President Lauro Cavazos and the Board of Regents at Texas Tech University and strongly urges reinstatement of the tenure policy published in the March 1984 Faculty Handbook.

We wish you all success in your effort to restore an appropriate tenure policy and to re-create at Texas Tech an atmosphere allowing the academic enterprise to thrive.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Carol Snyder'.

Dr. Carol Snyder, Chair
Faculty Senate
University of Houston-Clear Lake

CS/jr

Comment: East Texas State University passed a similar resolution on November 6, 1984

The following letters or excerpts are from an exchange between Dr. James Olson of Sam Houston State University and Dr. Lauro F. Cavazos.

October 24, 1984

Dear Evelyn:

As you can see from the enclosed letter, I managed to raise the ire of Lauro Cavazos, a fact that does not disturb me in the least, although I hope I have not made things any more difficult for you. I have enclosed for you a copy of the letter I sent to the SHSU faculty on October 7, 1984, a copy of the Cavazos letter to me, and a copy of my response to him. I wish you all the luck.

James S. Olson, Chairperson
Sam Houston State University

October 7, 1984

TO: SHSU Faculty

At this weekend's meeting of the Conference of Faculty Governance Organizations and the Texas Association of College Teachers, a major item of discussion was the decision of the Board of Regents of Texas Tech University to abolish the tenure system. With no consultation with the university faculty, either through the Faculty Senate or faculty committees, the Board of Regents at Texas Tech University revoked tenure for all existing faculty and is extending to them five-year renewable term contracts. In the review process, faculty members can be terminated for "unsatisfactory performance and other reasons." Both COFGO and TACT passed resolutions condemning the destruction of tenure at Tech, and faculty members at Tech by a vote exceeding 80% condemned the action.....

James S. Olson, Chairperson
Sam Houston State University

October 19, 1984

Dear Mr. Olson:

I just received the attached copy of your October 7, 1984, letter to the faculty of Sam Houston State University, regarding tenure at Texas Tech University.

One can only wonder what prompted you to write such a letter, containing gross errors, without checking the facts. Enclosed is a copy of the tenure policy at Texas Tech University which I suggest you read carefully so that you can correct your letter and, hopefully, stem the damage and confusion that you set in motion October 7 plus anything else that may have resulted at your October 18 Faculty Senate meeting. Also enclosed is a statement by our Board of Regents, October 18, 1984, which should be educational.

Our Board of Regents, and I would appreciate a note explaining what has been done, or is proposed, to correct the misinformation for which you are responsible.

Lauro F. Cavazos, Ph.D.
President

xc: Dr. Elliott T. Bowers, President, Sam Houston State University
The Honorable Mark White, Governor
Members of the Board of Regents, Texas Tech University

Letters or excerpts from exchange between Dr. James Olson and Dr. Lauro Cavazos continued....

October 22, 1984

Dear Dr. Cavazos:

I have received your letter of October 19, 1984, and would like to respond to your concerns. At the October 5, 1984, meeting of the Council of Faculty Governance Organizations and the Texas Association of College Teachers, a team of Texas Tech faculty members testified about the changes in your tenure system. To put it mildly, they were outraged, claiming that the faculty had not been seriously consulted, evidenced by repeated and overwhelming votes against the new policy. In their opinion, the process of faculty input and influence had not taken place, and that before any changes in tenure occur, the broad support of the vast majority of the faculty must be secured. They claimed that had not taken place at Texas Tech University. I agree with their philosophy about the need for faculty consensus. Any other approach tends to destroy the atmosphere of collegiality and security so essential to the creative work of great universities. My letter to the Sam Houston State University faculty was based on the information your faculty members provided to the assembled delegates of COFGO and TACT.

Early last week, I received a copy of the new Tech tenure policy and I postponed the October 18th meeting of our Faculty Senate. I have carefully read that document (which is identical to the one you sent) in preparation for our Faculty Senate meeting in November. It has also come to my attention that the Faculty Senate of Texas Tech is preparing, and will soon distribute, a packet of materials about the entire controversy to all institutions of higher learning in the state. I will also read that material very carefully. With both your documents and those of the Texas Tech faculty senate, I will make a presentation to our Faculty Senate and solicitate their opinion through debate of the issue.

If it becomes apparent that I have been guilty of "gross errors" in the first letter to the S.H.S.U. faculty, I will gladly acknowledge those errors to our faculty, as well as to you and your Board of Regents. If, on the other hand, I feel that those remarks were essentially accurate and that your new policy effectively destroys the meaning of tenure, I will continue to offer whatever criticism I can and to urge academic administrators at Sam Houston State University to remain faithful to the excellent tenure policy now in place here.....

James S. Olson, Ph. D.
Chairperson

cc: Dr. Elliott T. Bowers, President, Sam Houston State University
The Honorable Mark White, Governor

Attachment C (Prepared by Senators Newcomb and Wright)

Draft reply to statement of Board chairman B. J. Pevehouse, which directed the President not to meet with the Faculty Senate on restoring confidence.

The Faculty Senate is shocked that the Board of Regents on October 18, 1984, directed Dr. Cavazos not to talk to the Faculty Senate. We noted that Dr. Cavazos had expressed in previous statements his reluctance to meet with the Senate; however, we honestly hoped that he would change his mind and that the regents would encourage a dialogue with the Faculty Senate.

This statement indicates that neither the regents nor Dr. Cavazos is at all interested in faculty opinion or sentiment, and that both have repudiated all principles of faculty governance in practice at reputable universities. In our view the Constitution of the Faculty Senate is as much a contract, between regents and faculty, as is any other contract the regents may in the course of business enter into. It can be amended only by joint faculty-president-regent concurrence, not by a unilateral statement by the regents. To direct Dr. Cavazos not to meet with the Senate is a breach of contract.

The Board's statement is a blatant attempt to retaliate against the Faculty Senate for doing its constitutionally-designated task of representing the faculty. Senate actions have been completely consonant with the overwhelming faculty vote of no confidence. When the regents and Dr. Cavazos are prepared to come to grips with the reality of overwhelming lack of faculty confidence in Dr. Cavazos as President of Texas Tech University, the Faculty Senate stands ready to assist in restoring the collegiality necessary for the growth and enhancement of Texas Tech University.

Attachment D (Prepared by Senators Newcomb, Wright and Welton)

The Faculty Senate regrets that the Board of Regents' statement issued on October 18, 1984, focused almost solely on the tenure policy and failed to address the more fundamental issues and concerns related to the vote of no confidence in President Cavazos. The President's unwillingness to follow procedures established by the University Tenure Policy in 1981, his mishandling of the Crosbyton Research Project, his failure to recognize the faculty's traditional role in university governance, and his apparent inability to resolve communication problems with the faculty were not addressed. However, inasmuch as the Board of Regents' statement was directed to the tenure issue, this response will also be restricted to that issue.

Portions of the Regents' statement are misleading or contain misinterpretations or misstatements of fact, as follows:

1) The "conclusion" that many faculty were misinformed about the policy is not true. Despite the crisis atmosphere and the short period of time within which faculty members were permitted to review the proposed policy, the document itself was clear. Only obvious defects, not misinformation, could have led more than 88 percent of the faculty to vote against the proposed policy. To intimate that such a large proportion of faculty voted in ignorance is an insult.

2) The contention that there was extensive faculty involvement during the policy's development is misleading. It is true that the tenure issue has occupied the university community for three years. However, from June 1982, through April 1984--a period of 22 months--the tenure policy was in limbo. During that period there was no faculty involvement or consultation whatsoever.

When the administration's tenure policy was distributed to the faculty in April 1984, less than one month prior to its proposed implementation, the faculty's official representative, the Faculty Senate, was deliberately excluded; individual Regents were quoted in the press as saying that the Faculty Senate was "not in our process." No formal hearings were conducted on either the April 1984 or the September 1984 drafts of the proposed policy.

The Faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure that met throughout the summer of 1984 was created on the initiative and at the insistence of the academic deans, not the President. In subsequent balloting on the final draft, also conducted on the initiative of the academic deans, the faculty voted overwhelmingly against the proposed policy. In public statements to both the Faculty Senate and the general faculty, the Faculty Advisory Committee repudiated the final draft of the proposed policy and expressed grave doubts about the manner in which the development process had occurred.

3) The contention that the new policy "violates no laws" cannot be taken as a statement of fact. Upon advice of legal counsel, the inclusion of five-year reviews appears to violate the principles of contract law. It remains for the courts to decide, as they almost certainly will be called upon to do, whether any laws have been violated. In addition, however, the new policy is in many instances directly contrary to the guidelines published by the Coordinating Board of the State of Texas.

(4) The Regents' assertions regarding substantive provisions of the policy are inconsistent with the overwhelming faculty vote against it. It is apparent that the faculty believes the policy neither protects their rights nor benefits the University.

It is regrettable that the Board of Regents and the Faculty agreed on issues and goals but ended up with a policy that has left the two groups deeply divided. Had a face-to-face conference with Dr. Cavazos, the academic deans, and faculty representatives occurred, the objectives of both parties could have been realized. Unfortunately, virtually no direct communication between the faculty, regents and the Presidents was permitted to take place.

The inescapable conclusion is that the President and the Board of Regents have lost their way in our common quest for excellence. To continue to exclude the Faculty from a meaningful role in university governance will drive able faculty away, impede future faculty recruitment, discourage promising graduate and undergraduate students from attending TTU, diminish the quality of instruction, and ultimately do grievous harm to students and the University itself.

Attachment E (Prepared by Senator Wicker)

In its October 18 statement, the Board of Regents claimed that President Cavazos has done an outstanding job as President as evidenced by many significant accomplishments, including:

"Dr. Cavazos has worked hard in ... being an ardent spokesman for faculty salaries and increased research support, providing funds for classroom and laboratory equipment...."

The Chronicle of Higher Education recently reported figures on state appropriations for higher education. Based on state appropriations through 1984-85, the percentage increases over the last two years (almost all of which is for faculty salaries and M & O) were:

University of Texas (Austin)	+22%
Texas A & M	+21%
Univ. of Houston	+20%
Texas Tech Univ.	+ 9%

Other examples include: Texas Women's Univ. +13%; North Texas State Univ. +18%; Lamar Univ. +19%; Pan American Univ. +12%.

The state community colleges in Texas averaged +23%. Indeed, only three of the fourteen colleges or universities in Texas fared worse than Texas Tech: East Texas State Univ. (+5%), Texas Southern Univ. (+8%) and West Texas State Univ. (+8%). In fact, the legislature appropriated no more of a percentage increase for Texas Tech than for aid to students of private colleges (+9%).

The average increase for higher education funds appropriated by the legislature for all recipients averaged +16%.