



## Texas Tech University

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

February 5, 1986

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Margaret E. "Peg" Wilson, President

SUBJECT: Agenda for Meeting #76, February 12, 1986

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, February 12, 1986 at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

- I. Introduction of guests
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the January 22, 1986 meeting
- III. Report of the Vice President of the Faculty Senate
  - A. CONGO meeting (see attachment)
  - B. Academic Council meeting
- IV. Report of Standing Committee
  - Academic Programs Committee - Carlile
- V. Report of Ad Hoc Committees
  - A. Nominating Committee - Strauss (see attachment)
  - B. Financial Exigency Committee - Aycock
- VI. Old Business
  - A. Tenure Study Committee interim report - Bolen
  - B. Computer Update - Haragan
  - C. Select Committee - Wilson
    - Date: February 13
    - Time: 3:00 p.m.
    - Place: Conference Room 2B, 152 Health Sciences Center
- VII. New Business
  - Student Senate Resolution (see attachment)
- VIII. Old Business
- IX. Adjournment

Report on January 31-February 1, 1986, meeting of COFGO.

The meeting opened with reports from the representatives of the various institutions. (Quite a few were not represented, including UT-Austin and Texas A&M.) It is clear that quite a few institutions are still behind us in some aspects of faculty relations with administration. Some are still struggling to gain even formal input into search committees for administrators, planning for financial exigency, etc. Our problems with the tenure policy, etc., should not blind us to the fact that at quite a few institutions in the state the faculty senate or equivalent organization has even less recognition and formal status than ours does.

Don Brown, Assistant to the Commissioner of Higher Education, spoke to "Immediate Issues Facing Texas Higher Education." He argued that concerns for the near future will focus on quality, access, costs, and the contribution of higher education to the economic health of the state. For the most part, his statement was not very specific, and the implications were unclear. He said he had no reading as the commitments of the Select Committee, except for its wish to reduce administrative costs. He is sure consideration will be given to the development of a tiered system, such as that in California (University of California system, California State University system, and community colleges), and he says Ashworth probably favors this but is not pushing hard for it so far. He says Temple is stressing his effort to keep his roles as Chairman of the Co-ordinating Board and as Chairman of the Select Committee quite separate and emphasizes that the Co-ordinating Board is one of the institutions to be reviewed.

Larry Yawn and Bob Yude appeared to represent the Governor (who was scheduled to be present but had to cancel to attend the memorial service in Houston). Yawn heads the education section of the staff, and Yude is specifically responsible for higher education. Yawn believes, based on his experience with the Select Committee on Public Education, that the Select Committee on Higher Education will lead to some real changes of importance and some improvements. He urges COFGO and other representatives of faculties to have as much input into the Select Committee as possible. This was generally a cheer-leading presentation, however, with little focus on specifics and a warning that anything specific he said could always be changed by the Governor tomorrow.

There was then a discussion of Co-ordinating Board internships. The Board will be happy to have interns but has no funding for them. A motion was adopted to have COFGO fund two one-week internships at \$200 each during the first half of the summer. Those interested should explore the possibility of institutional support to cover expenses beyond the \$200. Applications will be due soon. All that is needed will be a vita and a short statement of the applicant's involvement in faculty governance.

Elections for COFGO officers were conducted. There was no opposition to the nominating committee selections: President-Elect, Hebe Mace (Stephen F. Austin); Regional Representatives for West Texas, Spencer Thompson (UT-Permian Basin); Northeast Texas, Mike Wiebe (Texas Woman's University); South Central Texas, Henrietta Avant (Southwest Texas State University).

There was a discussion of sick leave policy. In the light of the Attorney-General's opinion, virtually no one seems to think there is prospect of achieving a favorable result through further legal action. A legislative change is the favored approach. An acceptable bill may be introduced by Wilhelmina Delco, but this will be feasible only if faculty representatives, the legislature, and the state auditor can agree on specifics. The best approach may be to model the bill on an acceptable policy in another state, such as Oklahoma. The auditor is reported to be quite willing to go along with any policy that is sufficiently clear and that provides for sufficiently accurate and detailed record-keeping so his staff can readily ascertain whether the conditions have been met by anyone collecting payments under accumulated sick leave at the time of retirement.

There was also a discussion of the potential damage to the tax status of the optional retirement program. As the tax reform bill now stands, it would eliminate tax sheltering under such programs unless they are available to all employees (including staff). There would also be a maximum limit in dollar rather than percentage terms on the total amount to be sheltered in a combination of retirement programs, deferred compensation, supplemental annuities, and IRAs. This would sharply limit the options presently available to all but junior faculty members. We are urged to communicate with Lloyd Bentsen re this, as he is on the Senate Finance Committee.

On Saturday morning there was a presentation by Dr. Earl Lewis of Trinity University, who is the only member of the Select Committee who is currently a university faculty member. Much of his statement was very good but might have been better aimed at his fellow Select Committee members than at faculty representatives who were already familiar with and in agreement with most of what he said. He did stress the need to emphasize the value added through higher education, and not just in economic terms. One very good point he made was the need to hold administrators accountable for providing appropriate "ecologies for academic excellence." The agenda for the Select Committee, from his perspective, will be access, quality (including extensive remedial education, to prevent the drives for access and for quality from conflicting), resources, and governance.

Hebe Mace reported on proposals for "rising junior" standardized examinations. She argued that the current state of the art does not permit the teaching of basic skills apart from disciplinary content. Students today do not come to college ready for specialized work (and this does not apply only to those from ethnic minorities). The effort to throw such students into specialized courses leads merely to increasing failure and frustration levels. Furthermore, the measurement of skill levels tells nothing about the ability to apply the skills learned. In the field after field where standardized tests suggest improvement is taking place, more and more students are actually performing less and less well. The moral: standardized testing inevitably leads to teaching the test; students learn to do well on the test but little more. Anyway, all that can really be tested is literacy and elementary mathematical skills, and surely that is not all that we want at the college level. However, that is all that students will learn when they realize that is what will determine whether they will continue with their education.

The fall meeting will be in early October, in conjunction with the state TACT meeting.

There was discussion of whether or not to hold a press conference or otherwise go public with the joint statement prepared by COFGO, AAUP, TACT, TUF, TFA, etc. concerning positions to be taken in presentations to the Select Committee. The decision was in favor of making no public statement but to use the letter only as a statement of positions that representatives of those organizations will not contradict in their dealings with the Select Committee.

A letter to the Select Committee will be drafted by the President and others willing to help him do so. This will focus on broad principles and will emphasize concerns of faculty governance, which is, after all, the reason for the organization's existence. Personal appearances before the Select Committee should, as far as possible, go along the same lines.

Murray C. Havens

February 5, 1986

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Nominating Committee

Marvin Dvoracek  
Monty Strauss, Chair  
Henry Wright

SUBJECT: Nomination of Senators to serve as officers for 1986-87.

The Nominating Committee presents the following slate of nominees for election as officers:

President

Kenneth Davis, College of Arts & Sciences  
Gerald Skoog, College of Education

Vice President

Milton Smith, College of Engineering  
Bill Hartwell, College of Arts & Sciences

Secretary

Evans Curry, College of Arts & Sciences  
David Koeppe, College of Agriculture

Stating the sentiment of the Senate concerning  
a student/faculty liason to the Texas Tech  
Faculty/Student Senates

WHEREAS:

BOTH THE STUDENT SENATE AND THE FACULTY  
SENATE HAVE RELATIVELY THE SAME GOALS AND  
ASPIRATIONS TO IMPROVE THE AFFAIRS AND  
ACTIVITIES OF TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY AND,

WHEREAS:

INCREASED COMMUNICATION BETWEEN  
THESE TO VITAL BODIES WOULD BENEFIT BOTH,  
THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY

RESOLVED:

THAT A FACULTY SENATOR SERVE ON THE STUDENT  
SENATE AND A SENATE COMMITTEE AS AN EX-  
OFFICIO MEMBER WITH VOICE PRIVELEGES BUT NO  
VOTE, AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED:

THAT A STUDENT SENATOR SERVE ON THE FACULTY  
SENATE AND A FACULTY COMMITTEE AS AN EX-  
OFFICIO MEMBER WITH VOICE PRIVELEGES BUT NO  
VOTE, AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED:

THAT THE AUTHOR OF THIS RESOLUTION APPEAR  
BEFORE THE FACULTY SENATE ON FEBRUARY 12,  
1986 TO PRESENT THE RESOLUTION TO THE  
FACULTY SENATE FOR THEIR APPROVAL AND BE IT  
FUTHER

RESOLVED:

THAT THIS ACTION BE IMPLEMENTED ON A TRIAL  
BASIS FOR ONE YEAR, AT WHICH TIME BOTH THE  
FACULTY SENATE AND STUDENT SENATE CAN  
EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM  
AND BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED:

THAT THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENT SENATE  
APPOINT THE STUDENT SENATOR TO REPRESENT THE  
VOICE OF THE STUDENT SENATE

Stating the sentiment of the Senate concerning  
a student/faculty liason to the Texas Tech  
Faculty/Student Senates

- WHEREAS: BOTH THE STUDENT SENATE AND THE FACULTY SENATE HAVE RELATIVELY THE SAME GOALS AND ASPIRATIONS TO IMPROVE THE AFFAIRS AND ACTIVITIES OF TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY AND,
- WHEREAS: INCREASED COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THESE TWO VITAL BODIES WOULD BENEFIT BOTH, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY
- RESOLVED: THAT A FACULTY SENATOR SERVE ON THE STUDENT SENATE AND A SENATE COMMITTEE AS AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER WITH VOICE PRIVILEGES BUT NO VOTE, AND BE IT FURTHER
- RESOLVED: THAT A STUDENT SENATOR SERVE ON THE FACULTY SENATE AND A FACULTY COMMITTEE AS AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER WITH VOICE PRIVILEGES BUT NO VOTE, AND BE IT FURTHER
- RESOLVED: THAT THE AUTHOR OF THIS RESOLUTION APPEAR BEFORE THE FACULTY SENATE ON FEBRUARY 12, 1986 TO PRESENT THE RESOLUTION TO THE FACULTY SENATE FOR THEIR APPROVAL AND BE IT FURTHER
- RESOLVED: THAT THIS ACTION BE IMPLEMENTED ON A TRIAL BASIS FOR ONE YEAR, AT WHICH TIME BOTH THE FACULTY SENATE AND STUDENT SENATE CAN EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM AND BE IT FURTHER
- RESOLVED: THAT THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENT SENATE APPOINT THE STUDENT SENATOR TO REPRESENT THE VOICE OF THE STUDENT SENATE