

Minutes, General Faculty Meeting
September 19, 1984

A general faculty meeting was called to order by President Evelyn Davis at 3:35 p.m. to discuss the proposed new tenure policy. Dr. Cavazos indicated in a letter to the Senate President that he would be unable to attend this faculty meeting because of long-standing prior commitments. Dr. Davis read Dr. Cavazos' letter to the general faculty. He said, "I do not support more delay to revise the tenure policy.... There has been considerable faculty input.... Substantial changes were made because of faculty and Academic Council recommendations.... The disposition of that agenda item (draft of tenure policy) now is a Board matter.... The current proposal is reasonable and a fair compromise of most of the views and concerns of the Board, the Administration, and the faculty. Additional temporizing would yeild very little and we should move on to other matters that also require attention."

Four speakers addressed the General Faculty. Dr. James Brink, representing the Tenure and Privilege Committee, addressed general matters about the September 5, 1984 Tenure Policy and then focused on Section X. He mentioned that currently our annual reviews are conducted by our chairpersons who know our professions. This proposed policy would send unfavorable annual reviews and 5-year reviews through John Darling's office. The concern here is that the central administration has reversed a number of departmental decisions. In other words, serious judgments are being made by administrators who do not take the counsel of the most knowledgeable people -- departmental peers. All parties should sit around a table together, face to face, until a final tenure policy is developed.

Dr. Benjamin Nevcomb, the second speaker, representing AAUP, mentioned that the AAUP has always been instrumental in upholding academic freedom and due process. He gave a history of past censureship at Texas Tech and how the TTU chapter and Dr. Murray were instrumental in getting censureship removed at Texas Tech in 1967. This tenure draft is vague, sloppy, carelessly written, ...and hostile to the faculty. Performance reviews are acceptable to the faculty if done properly, not as written in this policy. Quotas should not be in a tenure policy. However, there is a remote chance of excessively high tenure, and this could be handled in tenure document if statements to that effect were carefully delineated and faculty consultation was involved for emergencies. Thus what is needed for this draft is "major surgery which probably the patient should not survive." If we adopt this policy, our competitors will out-distance us. The September 5, 1984 draft must be withdrawn.

Richard L. "Chip" Peterson, Chairman of the Dean's Faculty Advisory Committee, gave a summary of activities of the Dean's Faculty Advisory Committee during the summer. They conducted a faculty survey to get input from the faculty. This material was used by the Deans in early drafts, but all along the way important faculty concerns were removed from the document by the University President, legal counsel, and possibly the Regents. It was a frustrating experience because "we worked hard to please the faculty and meet the Board of Regents' wishes." Somehow administrative power came through as an over-riding theme and phrases such as "due process" and "in consultation with faculty" were deleted. Many undesirable and broadly encompassing statements were retained. The committee voted 8 to 1 to not accept the September 5, 1984, draft of the tenure policy. (A full report of Dr. Peterson's report is available upon request from the Faculty Senate.)

Henry A. Wright, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, presented 10 Reasonable Requests for changes in the September 5, 1984 tenure policy draft. Topics included (1) academic freedom and due process for all faculty comparable to rights in the Medical School tenure policy, (2) the awarding of tenure based on individual

merit, (3) definition of non-tenure track appointments; they should not be substituted for professional appointments, (4) deletion of the phrase "but shall not be limited to," (5) comprehensive reviews should be limited to faculty with poor or unsatisfactory performances on a series of annual reviews, (6) reduction in faculty due to program phase-outs must involve faculty consultation, which has been assured the Medical School Faculty in part XI on page 14 of their tenure policy, (7) Prior comparable service should count toward maximum probationary periods, (8) the word "younger" should be deleted in the 4th par. of the Foreword (9) "high" should be replaced with "satisfactory" in section I, and (10) miscellaneous comments concerning many vague and sweeping broad statements that give the administration excessive discretionary power were mentioned. Because of haste in preparation of the document and the typically short time made available for comments did not allow sufficient time to develop wording and principles upon which all parties could agree.

Henry A. Wright made the following motion: "I move that the Board's Ad Hoc Committee, Academic Council, Faculty Advisory Committee Representatives, and the University President meet in one room and write a final draft of our September 5, 1984, Tenure Policy with a free exchange of ideas and concerns."

James Brink made a friendly amendment to add the word "together" after the word "meet" in Wright's motion. Wright accepted the amendment.

Benjamin Newcomb moved to amend Wright's motion to say that "the final draft of the tenure policy will be presented to the Faculty Senate and general faculty for their ratification by ballot." The amendment passed.

Kathleen Hennessey moved to amend Wright's motion "to define very clearly academic freedom, due process, unprofessional conduct, moral turpitude, academic incompetence, and all other terms of substance in our tenure policy." She was informed that this amendment should be brought up as a separate motion. Ms. Hennessey insisted that it be an amendment. The amendment failed.

Richard Quade moved that "the results of this motion be channeled to the Academic Council, Academic Vice President, President and Board of Regents by John Darling," which Dr. Darling agreed to do. The motion passed.

Joe Adamcik moved to strike out "September 5, 1984" from Wright's motion. The motion carried.

Wright's final motion read as follows:

"I move that the Board's Ad Hoc Committee, Academic Council, Faculty Advisory Committee Representatives, and the University President meet together in one room and write a final draft of our Tenure Policy with a free exchange of ideas and concerns. The final draft of the tenure policy will be presented to the Faculty Senate and general faculty for their ratification by ballot." The motion carried.

James Mertes moved that "a precise set of procedures be adopted before a new tenure policy is adopted. There should be open faculty meetings, a chance for faculty to speak on the policy, and a chance for substitute wording in the document to be proposed. A legislative process should be followed." The motion carried.

In response to a question from Clarke Cochran, Evelyn Davis assured him that the faculty ballot outcome on Friday, September 21, will be forwarded to the Regents.

Neale Pearson introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Whereas the faculty of Texas Tech University was asked in June 1984 to respond to a questionnaire of a Faculty Advisory Committee to the Deans to determine the attitudes and concerns of the faculty over tenure, and

Whereas it is important that the results of the survey be made known to the faculty and the public in the formulation of university tenure policy, and

Whereas it is important in a democratic society for public attitudes to be taken into consideration if policy is to be successful,

Be it resolved that the President of the Faculty Senate request that Dr. Darling make available the results of the votes for each college collected by the Deans after submission to the chairs and faculty, with that information being made available to the Faculty Senate and the general public.

Pearson's motion to adopt the above resolution passed.

Gary Elbow moved that "this faculty endorse a moratorium of one year on any new tenure policy or any amendment to the present policy." The motion passed.

Benjamin Newcomb moved that "the general faculty meeting adjourn until September 28, 1984, at 3:30 p.m. at which time we will await the outcome of the Board of Regents vote on tenure." The motion carried.

President Davis adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Henry A. Wright

Henry A. Wright, Secretary

The results of the 21 September 1984 mail ballot of the 814 voting faculty conducted by the Faculty Senate on the 5 September 1984 draft tenure policy are:

53 I approve the proposed tenure policy

524 I disapprove the proposed tenure policy

19 I wish to abstain from voting on the proposed tenure policy

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE
ON
UNIVERSITY TENURE POLICY

Dear Fellow Faculty Member:

As you know the Regents are considering revisions in Texas Tech's Tenure policy. The Regent's Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure policy has asked the University's Academic Council for input on the major goals and issues associated with a tenure policy. The Academic Council, in turn has created an "Advisory Committee on Tenure Policy," with faculty representatives elected or appointed from every college on campus. As faculty representatives on that committee our job is to provide faculty input. Before formulating our own views, we have elected to survey the faculty to determine the faculty view of the goals and major issues associated with Texas Tech's tenure policy.

In order to reflect faculty views as closely as possible, we need your response to the attached questionnaire. Please complete the questionnaire as quickly as possible and return it to your departmental secretary or to college representative in person or by campus mail (in large envelopes) by noon Tuesday, July 3. We need your views if this survey is to be representative of faculty sentiment.

Yours truly,

Faculty Advisory Committee on
University Tenure Policy

Evelyn Davis, Faculty Senate
James Eissinger, Law School
Judith Fischer, Home Economics
Marion Hagler, Engineering
Roland Smith, Arts & Sciences

David Welton, Education
Margaret Wilson, Arts & Sciences
Henry Wright, Agriculture
Richard Peterson, Business, Chairman

RLP/amr

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE
ON
UNIVERSITY TENURE POLICY

Please record your views on the following statements on the attached computer sheet. (Use No. 2 pencil so your vote will register). Indicate whether you (A) strongly agree, (B) agree, (C) neither agree nor disagree, (D) disagree, or (E) strongly disagree. Return the answer sheet and any additional comments you wish to make to your departmental secretary or college representative by noon, Tuesday, July 3. Please don't fold the answer sheet.

STATEMENTS

For statements 1-8:

A tenure system is necessary in order to:

1. Ensure that academic freedom will exist, so professors can challenge basic assumptions and develop new ways of looking at their discipline in their research and classrooms.
2. Guarantee job security to established faculty regardless of performance.
3. Ensure that Texas Tech will be able to attract and retain high quality faculty.
4. Ensure that Texas Tech faculty members receive due process.
5. Provide a stable base of competent faculty with potential for continuing achievement in research, teaching, and service.
6. Provide a method and time schedule that will force hard decisions to be made in the case of marginally qualified faculty.
7. Protect faculty against the arbitrary exercise of administrative power, and preserve the status of faculty as independent professionals.
8. Provide a supportive long-term environment for teaching, research, and service.

For statements 9-12

A tenure "quota" system would:

9. Harm the university.
10. Make it difficult to recruit.
11. Allow administrators to exercise power arbitrarily.
12. Make it difficult to protect merit if quotas were full.
13. Tenure should not be tampered with to solve a faculty productivity problem.
14. The existing tenure system harms the university because it reduces faculty turnover, protects non-productive people, and limits the ability to bring in fresh new people and ideas.
15. Tenured faculty whose performance reviews remain unsatisfactory should be terminated by some fair and reasonable procedure.
16. The university's mission has changed with time. Therefore, it would be unfair to dismiss tenured faculty if they are performing competently.

For questions 17-20

Performance reviews of tenured faculty should be used to:

17. Adjust salaries.
18. Revise tenure status.
19. Allocate resources other than salary monies.
20. Be conducted every (A) year (B) two years (C) three years (D) five years (E) not at all.

For questions 21-26

Renewable contracts should ordinarily:

21. Be used instead of tenure for all professorial ranks.
22. Be granted instead of tenure to people engaged primarily or solely in contract research.
23. Be granted instead of tenure to people engaged primarily or solely in administrative work.
24. Be granted instead of tenure to people with terminal degrees engaged primarily as instructors for basic courses (such as Freshman English, Basic Math, or other courses that are frequently taught by TA's or adjunct faculty).
25. Be granted instead of tenure to people without terminal degrees engaged primarily as instructors for basic courses (such as Freshman English, Basic Math, or other courses that are frequently taught by TA's or adjunct faculty).
26. Have a usual term of (A) one year (B) three years (C) five years (D) over five years (E) there shouldn't be such a thing.
27. New faculty whose primary function is teaching, research, and service should ordinarily be hired on tenure track contract.
28. In my area, tenure track contracts are necessary to recruit the most highly qualified faculty.
29. It should be possible to promote assistant professors after a few years in grade without tenuring them.
30. The maximum tenure probation period for associate and full professors should be extended to six years.
31. The University should provide sufficient resources and release time for programs designed to update faculty skills and productivity.
32. A renewable contract system for professorial faculty would reduce faculty quality by making it easy to retain people who failed to meet tenure standards.
33. A system that had renewable contracts for some and tenure for others would lead to discrimination through greater clustering of disadvantaged groups in the renewable contract, rather than tenure, slots.

34. A renewable contract system would make it difficult for faculty to undertake major long-term research projects.
35. In calculating tenure percentages in a department, each department should receive credit for all the faculty positions it generates.
36. Texas Tech's tenured faculty has varied from 53 to 57 percent over the last ten years. This percentage is too high.
37. Texas Tech's governance should be collaborative with reciprocal input on policies among the regents, administration, faculty and students.
38. Faculty should be asked to ratify any new tenure policy.
39. A supportive environment helps retain highly productive faculty.
40. Monetary incentives help retain highly productive faculty.
41. What percentage of tenured faculty at Texas Tech is non-productive?
(A) less than 10% (B) 10-19% (C) 20-29% (D) 30-39% (E) 40% or more
42. A university that seeks to be innovative about tenure should seek input from its faculty.
43. If a tenure quota policy were adopted I would leave this institution within the next few years.
44. If a renewable contract policy were adopted for professorial staff I would leave this institution within the next few years.
45. If no change is made in the tenure policy in the faculty handbook, I would leave this institution within the next few years.
46. If a tenure quota policy were adopted I would seriously consider joining a faculty union.
47. If a renewable contract policy were adopted I would seriously consider joining a faculty union.

48. Rank: Instructor A Assistant Prof B Associate Prof C Professor D Other E
49. Age: Under 30 A 30 - 45 B 46 - 55 C over 55 D
50. Tenure Status: Tenured A Non-tenured B
51. & 52. College: Agriculture 51-A(1) Arts & Sciences 51-B(2) Business 51-C(3)
- Education 51-D(4) Engineering 51-E(5) Home Economics 52-A(6) Law 52-B(7)

Respondent name is optional on the answer sheet. Please record your answers with No. 2 pencil on the attached computer sheet. Do not fold the sheet. Return the sheet and any comments you may have on a separate sheet to your departmental secretary or college representative by noon, July 3. Also, on the front of the computer sheet under "section" please record the number of your college (shown in parentheses in question 51) in the right hand column and, if you are tenured, put a 1 in the middle column, if untenured, record a 2 in the middle column.

TABLE 1A: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON
FACULTY TENURE QUESTIONNAIRE

Question Number	Answer (# Responding)					N.A.
	A	B	C	D	E	
1	314	70	9	11	0	
2	7	22	36	81	258	
3	317	65	14	5	3	
4	226	122	41	13	1	1
5	259	123	15	6	1	
6	151	153	62	26	12	
7	280	94	15	14	0	1
8	257	115	22	7	2	1
9	272	80	30	15	6	1
10	300	74	20	11	8	1
11	187	106	73	28	9	1
12	230	108	39	21	6	
13	160	126	57	45	12	4
14	20	56	60	150	114	4
15	170	137	58	22	17	
16	161	156	57	13	11	6
17	200	162	21	14	7	
18	34	88	80	96	104	2
19	110	169	80	27	15	3
20	112	60	99	107	22	4
21	2	11	16	65	310	
22	66	148	81	54	52	3
23	141	133	63	44	20	3
24	73	109	63	76	79	4
25	127	160	44	33	37	3
26	70	187	64	12	61	10
27	300	81	11	10	1	1
28	330	43	11	11	8	1
29	92	130	61	60	59	2
30	66	93	120	82	38	5
31	263	120	15	5	0	1
32	137	110	78	56	19	4
33	116	102	99	59	23	5
34	191	123	43	38	7	2
35	165	120	84	15	8	12
36	6	14	53	128	201	2
37	268	104	19	6	5	2
38	333	54	10	5	2	
39	363	39	2	0	0	
40	295	97	6	4	1	1
41	146	115	53	25	20	45
42	325	66	10	2	1	
43	106	66	140	51	36	5
44	119	70	115	55	41	4
45	11	7	119	140	120	7
46	110	95	73	46	77	3
47	123	79	76	47	76	3
48	29	143	138	85	7	2
49	23	212	109	54	3	3
50	278	123	1	0	0	2
51	43	174	44	26	65	52
52	22	20				362

(Usually) A = strongly agree, B = agree, C = neither agree nor disagree, D = disagree, E = strongly disagree, and N.A. = not ascertainable