



Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate
3-G Holden Hall
Lubbock, Texas 79409 / (806) 742-3656

January 15, 1986

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Margaret E. "Peg" Wilson, President
RE: Agenda for meeting #75, January 22, 1986

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, January 22, 1986 at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

- I. Introduction of guests and new senators
- II. Approval of the minutes of the December 11, 1985 meeting
- III. Report of the Vice President for Student Affairs - Ewalt
- IV. Report of Standing Committee:
Committee on Committees - Minifie
- V. Report of Ad Hoc Committee:
Financial Exigency Committee - Aycock
- VI. Old Business
 - A. Interim report of Tenure Study Committee at February meeting
 - B. Meetings of Faculty Senate and faculty with VPAAR candidates - Wilson
- VII. New Business
 - A. SHEAF (Proposition 2) funds distribution - Ainsworth
 - B. 1986-87 budget - Ainsworth
 - C. COFGO meeting - Wilson (see attachment)
 - D. Select Committee on Higher Education - February 13.
 - E. General Education curriculum - R. Smith (see resoluition)
 - F. Absences (see attachment)
- VIII. Other business
- IX. Adjournment

I. Instructional Concerns

- A. Teaching Excellence. Producing, recruiting and maintaining a competent and enthusiastic teaching faculty is the foremost element in developing and maintaining a superior institution of higher education. While improving the salary and compensation package is necessary to attract and hold excellent faculty members, a comprehensive program of faculty development and teaching support should be instituted at each university.
- B. General Education. The future of Texas depends upon well-educated citizens. Students should be assured a broad-based education rather than an exclusively specialized training program.

II. Faculty Concerns

- A. Faculty Compensation. Texas faculty and librarians are inadequately compensated compared to industry and federal government standards, or compared to universities in other states. There should be a permanent compensation benefit package available for Texas faculty and librarians independent of the fluctuations of legislative funding levels.
 - 1. Salaries are considerably below the real income level of the 1969-70 academic year. Every effort should be made to recover this loss in earning power and increase salaries to a level of the institutions in the 10 states nearest to Texas' population.
 - 2. Sick leave has been eliminated for faculty and librarians on less than 12-month contracts by action of the most recent Legislature. Faculty and librarians are typically employed on nine-month contracts. Therefore, Texas universities are unable to provide a sick leave plan for them. Previously accrued sick leave should be restored to faculty, and Texas should have a permanent plan rather than relying on the revenue bill.
 - 3. An adequate insurance program providing health, disability and life coverage for all employees at a basic minimum level should be a part of the benefits package paid for by the employer. Dependent coverage and optional coverages should be available for election at the employee's expense. At present, even though the state pays a portion of the employee's insurance costs, each university or system utilizes its own chosen carrier and may offer different coverages, some of which do not meet the state requirement for minimum coverage.
 - 4. Merit pay systems should continue and be improved to recognize and reward superior performance in all aspects of the faculty role--teaching, research, and public service. In addition, all faculty members should receive salary increases for satisfactory performance. Otherwise, these faculty members fall further behind in real income.
 - 5. Retirement. While the state provides a contribution toward a faculty member's retirement, it is far less than that allowed

by present law. Funding of the state's contribution should be increased to the maximum of 10% for both Teacher Retirement System plans and for Optional Retirement Plans, in order that that benefits be increased or individual contributions be reduced.

6. Faculty Development Leaves. Since 1969, Texas has allowed faculty development leaves. However, the funding of these leaves has not been available except from local funds. The state should fund faculty development leaves.
 7. Travel to professional meetings. Funding for travel should provide each faculty member the opportunity to attend at least one out-of-state professional meeting per year.
 8. Retired faculty. Former faculty who are retired under the TRS System should be protected against inflation and declining real income.
 9. Temporary and Part-Time Faculty. Dependence upon temporary and part-time faculty should be reduced, and these faculty should be hired, compensated and evaluated in a similar manner to full-time faculty.
 10. Longevity pay should be provided to faculty and librarians in the same manner as it is to administrators, staff and most 12-month employees.
 11. Educational plan. Faculty and their families should be given opportunities to attend any state-supported institution through incentives such as free tuition and no service fees.
 12. Overload and summer salaries should be paid at the same rate per course as nine-month contract rates, and not at a reduced rate.
- B. Tenure provides the foundation for academic freedom of thought and expression. All state universities should provide for and protect the tenure system and its well-established guidelines as developed by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).
- C. Women and minority faculty and librarians.
1. Public higher education in Texas should be more aggressive in promoting, as well as in encouraging and preparing women and minorities in instructional and administrative positions in Texas higher education.
 2. The principle of equal pay and equal opportunity should be honored for women and minorities in instructional and administrative positions in Texas higher education.
- D. Faculty Governance: Faculty should be integral and active participants in decision-making and policy formation at all levels of higher educational governance: local, system and state-wide.

1. An elected, representative Faculty Senate should constitute a significant element in the governance structure of each institution. Its representatives must participate in all decisions affecting the college or university.
 2. The proliferation and extension of system boards and administrations has made faculty participation in crucial decisions more difficult. This must be taken into consideration in evaluating the value, efficiency and effectiveness of these large systems as compared to governance decisions made at the campus level.
 3. State Boards and Commissions are in a position to make decisions affecting all facets of higher education. The Governor should be encouraged to appoint persons with higher education teaching experience to each Board or Commission whose mission includes making decisions affecting higher education, and specific methods for gaining broad faculty input on all issues should be instituted. Cooperation and relationships between faculty governance organizations on a system-wide and state-wide basis should be encouraged.
- E. Administrators. Qualified administrators are essential to the leadership, direction and operating efficiency of any organization. The committee should explore the following areas:
1. Proliferation of administrators
 2. An evaluation system for administrators that would include faculty and others in the process.
 3. A policy reducing administrative pay to faculty levels upon the return to teaching.
 4. A policy that compensation for persons dividing responsibilities between teaching and administration be budgeted and applied in a proportionate manner to each responsibility.

III. Student Concerns

- F. Tuition. New tuition increases should be reviewed as to their overall impact. Already it appears that there has been some adverse impact on minority students and non-residents, particularly foreign students. The value of a college education to these students, to the state of Texas, and to the foreign students' countries as compared to the value of the tuition increase received should be explored.
- G. Student service fees have increased more rapidly than tuition, and exceed the cost of tuition in many cases. The use of these fees should be explored and restricted to specific benefits of the student.
- H. Minority student enrollments at higher education institutions are declining nationally. Texas higher education should make more extensive efforts in affirmative action to ensure full opportunity for minority students in undergraduate and graduate programs.

IV. General Concerns

- A. HEAF Funds. Proposition 2, a Constitutional Amendment was passed, supposedly to provide for building and capital improvements for Non-Permanent University Fund (PUF) universities. Actions of the most recent Legislature have permitted and even encouraged universities to use these funds for operating expenses. The practice of using HEAF funds for operational expenses and other functions for which they were not intended should be discontinued, and the full funds should be utilized for major capital investments and enhancements.
- B. Research. While Texas needs to support adequately the large research institutions, it should also adequately fund research scholarship and artistic achievement at all universities.
- C. Program Review. While the need for program review has merit, the Select Committee should be reminded that the Coordinating Board has had a reasonably effective continuous program review in effect for more than ten years. In addition, the Coordinating Board in early 1985 requested that new mission statements be developed by each university. This mission statement has required universities to review their course inventory once again. While the elimination of duplication of programs may sound desirable, it must not be allowed to reduce availability of quality education for students in all regions of the state. While the concept of Centers of Excellence has been proposed, all present universities should be given the resources necessary to be centers of excellence.
- D. Libraries: Since libraries depend on a known, consistent level of funding appropriations in order to sustain orderly and continuous growth and development, they have been funded by formula with appropriations designated as non-transferable. The most recent State Legislature provided for the transferability of these funds. Appropriations for libraries should be returned to non-transferable, full-formula funding.
- E. Teacher Education: Faculty in academic and professional education departments should work together to assure sound educational programs. State regulations should assure, as a first priority, that general education, requirements and electives, constitute approximately half of the four year program. Institutions must be allowed the flexibility to develop innovative programs.

A RESOLUTION

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate request the university's General Education Committee to defer for at least two months the deadline for faculty input on the proposed general education curriculum.

SOME REASONS FOR THIS RESOLUTION

1. The Faculty Senate only recently transmitted the material to one of its committees for study. With the advent of final exams and the semester break, the committee has not had ample time to consider the matter thoroughly.
2. Many departments, also, presented the matter to their faculty for their reactions, and for the reasons cited above, they, too, have had inadequate time for the matter.
3. Subjects of great import should not be changed for light and transient causes. Neither should they be changed in haste.

MEMORANDUM

FROM
OFFICE OF
DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Attachment VII., F.

TO: Margaret E. Wilson, Chairperson, Faculty Senate DATE: December 16, 1985
FROM: Clyde Hendrick, Dean *Clyde*
SUBJECT: Class Attendance at Tech

During the Fall Semester, 1985, I team taught a class that included both graduate and undergraduate sections. In addition, I gave a couple of lectures to another undergraduate class, and several such lectures last year.

I continue to be startled by the high level of absences from class and tardiness by undergraduate students. Based on inquiries to my colleagues, lack of consistent attendance appears to be a general phenomenon and not unique to me.

I find the students at Tech very friendly, even docile. Thus, when they wander into class twenty minutes late or simply don't show up, I am inclined to believe that we have a cultural norm at work, rather than malevolent motivation.

Such sloppy attendance bothers me greatly. We have a high attrition rate at Tech, a terrible human waste in my judgment. I suspect that a casual attitude toward classes is one factor in a complex of issues related to attrition.

I suggest that you and your colleagues study the issue of class attendance in the hope that positive recommendations might be forthcoming. There are many devices that could be used to stimulate better attendance. Perhaps the most critical factor is faculty attitudes on the matter. In any event, the issue has considerable economic importance. If attrition could be cut substantially, the larger enrollments at junior and senior levels would enhance our formula funding considerably.

cc: Donald R. Haragan
Robert H. Ewalt