



## Texas Tech University

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

March 4, 1987

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate  
FROM: Gerald Skoog, President *RS*  
RE: Agenda for meeting #87, March 11, 1987  
3:30 p.m., Senate Room, University Center

### AGENDA

- I. Approval of the minutes of the February 11, 1987 meeting
- II. Report by William Hartwell, Vice President of the Faculty Senate, on the Academic Council meeting
- III. Comments by and discussion with Don Haragan, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research
- IV. Report of Nominating Committee
- V. Reconsideration of the recommendations of the Admissions and Retentions Committee (see attachment)

These recommendations were considered and tabled at the January 21 meeting. As requested by the Senate, Gene Medley, Director of Admissions and Records, will be present to provide information and answer questions.

- VI. Report of the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee regarding the operating policy on performance evaluations of faculty (see attachment)
- VII. Reports of other Senate Committees
- VIII. New Business
  - A. Resolution concerning Texas Tech Appreciation Dinner

The Faculty Senate of Texas Tech University thanks the individuals and sponsors who conceptualized, organized, and financed the Texas Tech Appreciation Dinner on February 26, 1987.

- IX. Adjournment

### Information

The February 11 resolution concerning the role and scope of Texas Tech University was sent to the individuals stipulated by the Senate. The response of Larry Temple, Chairman of the Select Committee on Higher Education, is attached. The only other response was from Gary L. Watkins, Representative from District 75, Odessa.

The report from the Athletic Department concerning the graduation rate of student athletes at Texas Tech University and other Southwestern Conference institutions should be available at the April Senate meeting.

## ADMISSIONS AND RETENTIONS REPORT

The Admissions and Retention Committee recommends that the following be adopted as conditions for admission to the undergraduate programs at Texas Tech University.

### UNCONDITIONAL ADMISSION

1. All students in the upper 25% of their class upon graduation. No minimum SAT or ACT scores.
2. Students in the second 25% of their high school class upon graduation and achieving scores of at least 900 on the SAT or 20 on the ACT.
3. Students in the lower 50% of their high school class and achieving scores of at least 1100 on the SAT or 24 on the ACT.

The following high school credits are expected to be completed before enrollment at Texas Tech:

English	4
Mathematics	3
Social Sciences	2 1/2
Laboratory Sciences	2
Electives	3 1/2

A deficiency in high school units will not normally affect admission to the university. However, any deficiency will be noted on the student transcript and must be removed during the first semesters of enrollment at Texas Tech.

### CONDITIONAL ADMISSION

1. Students in the second 25% of their high school class, but not achieving scores of at least 900 on the SAT or 20 on the ACT will be admitted on a conditional basis and will be permitted to enroll in the fall semester following graduation from high school.
2. Students in the lower 50% of their high school class, but not achieving scores of at least 1100 on the SAT or 24 on the ACT will be admitted on a conditional basis, but may only enter the university during the summer session following graduation from high school, or the subsequent spring semester.
  - a. Summer enrollment: Students must enroll for a minimum of six hours (two courses). These may be distributed over two summer sessions. One course must be in English or Mathematics; the second course must remove a high school deficiency, or satisfy a state or university basic requirement. If a grade of "C" or better is received in both courses, the student may then enroll in the fall semester. If not, the student may not enroll until the subsequent spring semester, and will be admitted under the rules that govern students on academic probation.
  - b. Spring enrollment: Students will enter under the conditions and rules that govern students on academic probation. Of the courses taken, at least one must be in Mathematics or English, the others should remove deficiencies and satisfy state or university basic requirements.

Memorandum to: ALL HOLDERS OF THE TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY OPERATING POLICY AND  
PROCEDURE MANUAL

Date:

Subject: Performance Evaluations, Faculty

#### PURPOSE

This operating policy establishes uniform guidelines and procedures for performance evaluations of members of the faculty.

#### REVIEW

This administrative operating policy will be reviewed by March 1 of each even numbered year by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research.

#### POLICY/PROCEDURE

##### 1. Background:

Texas Tech University administrators and faculty conduct periodic evaluations of faculty performance when making decisions concerning tenure and promotion, merit salary increases, research support, development leaves, and teaching and research awards. The evaluation of faculty at Texas Tech University is continuous. Students evaluate teaching, faculty members judge each other's work continuously as decisions on promotion and tenure are made, products of research and other creative activity are reviewed and critiqued, and award competitions are conducted. Moreover, evaluation of faculty members and the programs of departments and colleges occur during reviews conducted by accreditation agencies, the Graduate School, and other concerned groups and individuals.

##### 2. Criteria:

The responsibilities of the University dictate, to a major extent, the responsibilities of the individual faculty member. Therefore, faculty members are responsible for teaching, research and other creative activity, and service to the profession, University, and community. Performance in these three areas of responsibility will provide the basis for the evaluation of faculty members. In making individual evaluations, consideration should be given to standards expected of faculty members in similar positions in similar fields of study in institutions of higher education comparable to this University in terms of mission and status.

##### 3. Procedures:

Standardized procedures will be followed by each college or school. These procedures include:

a. Each faculty member shall provide, according to a uniform format, a written record of his/her achievements for the year immediately past. This information shall provide the principal data base for the evaluations. This annual report will be provided to the department chairperson/area coordinator by January 20.

b. The administrator responsible for evaluating a faculty member shall provide written evaluations of the faculty member's performance for the preceding year. In addition, the chairperson/coordinator will consider performance for the three previous years. This annual evaluation will be provided to the dean and the faculty member by March 1 with any unsatisfactory evaluation so noted.

c. Each faculty member will conduct student evaluations of teaching at least once each year. These will be considered by the chairperson/coordinator in the annual evaluation. Student evaluations will be retained in the department office for at least three years.

d. Each year the dean, in consultation with the chairperson/coordinator of each department/area, shall review each faculty member's evaluation. The dean will either approve the chairperson's/coordinator's evaluation or provide his/her own. In those cases where the dean and the chairperson/coordinator agree that the faculty member is not performing in an acceptable manner, then the procedures outlined in section 5 shall be followed.

e. Discipline-specific evaluation procedures such as goal setting, peer evaluations of teaching, or comparisons with mission and goals statements of the academic unit may be developed.

#### 4. Recognition:

Performance evaluations will provide data for use in the recognition of faculty for merit salary increases, salary bonuses, research support, academic awards, development leaves and teaching and research awards.

#### 5. Development Procedures:

Follow-up development procedures will also be standardized, although specific activities designed to improve performance may vary according to the individuals involved. These procedures are as follows:

a. Any faculty member whose performance is deemed unsatisfactory, as agreed upon by the dean and chairperson/coordinator, will be informed in writing of his or her deficiencies in teaching, creative activity or research, or service. A written program of development, not to exceed two years, will be established in consultation with the chairperson and the faculty member. Each academic unit may develop additional procedures for involving other faculty in the formulation of a written program of development.

b. The faculty member and the chairperson/coordinator will continue to provide annual reports summarizing progress toward development objectives. For the individual on a development program the dean and the chairperson/coordinator will provide an evaluation report each year to the individual.

c. For any case in which the dean and the chairperson/coordinator deem that there has been a failure to improve performance to acceptable standards within the allotted time period, they will refer the matter to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research (VPAAR).

## 6.. Referral Decisions:

Consideration by the VPAAR may result in one of the following decisions:

- a. The VPAAR may determine that satisfactory progress has been made and take no further action.
- b. The VPAAR may determine that because of extenuating circumstances the development program should be extended for an additional year.
- c. The VPAAR may refer the case to the President for further action.

## 7. Communication:

Prompt and full communication is essential. The following actions should occur:

- a. The written evaluations completed by the chairperson/coordinator and dean shall be given to the individual faculty members.
- b. Any faculty member whose performance is deemed unsatisfactory by the dean and the chairperson/coordinator must be provided a meeting with the dean and the chairperson/coordinator involved in the evaluation. This conference will take place prior to any further action.
- c. Unsatisfactory evaluations may be appealed to the next higher administrative level and must be initiated within thirty working days of the receipt of the evaluation specified in section 7a of this policy.
- d. The VPAAR must provide a written decision on any referral or appeal within thirty working days of receipt.
- e. Administrative determinations made on the basis of this policy are subject to faculty grievance procedures and to tenure policy.

## 8. Changes:

Any changes of procedure or criteria shall be developed to allow reasonable implementation dates. Proposed changes will be made only after faculty of the affected unit(s) have had time and opportunity to make recommendations or respond to proposals. Departmental or area changes must be reviewed and approved by the dean and VPAAR prior to implementation.

## 9. Implementation:

Annual Faculty reports will be submitted to chairpersons or area coordinators by January 20 each year, beginning in 1988.

## RESPONSIBILITIES

<u>Position</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Month</u>	<u>Day</u>
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs	REVIEW	April (ENY)	1

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Vice President for Academic Affairs  
and Research

Annual Faculty Report, (Date)  
Faculty Member's Statement

Faculty Member

Department/Area

Due to Chairperson or Coordinator by \_\_\_\_\_.

Indicate your major contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service to the University, profession and community for the past calendar year. Add other information which you judge to be pertinent.

Use other side of page or add attachments as needed.

Teaching:

Research/Creative Activity:

Service:



## SELECT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

February 19, 1987

Larry Temple  
CHAIRMAN

Mark White  
GOVERNOR  
William P. Hobby  
LT. GOVERNOR  
Gib Lewis  
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE  
Ray Farabee  
STATE SENATOR  
Grant Jones  
STATE SENATOR  
Carl Parker  
STATE SENATOR  
Wilhelmina Delco  
STATE REPRESENTATIVE  
Al Luna  
STATE REPRESENTATIVE  
Jim Rudd  
STATE REPRESENTATIVE

Glenn Biggs  
Bill Blakemore  
Judge Reynaldo Garza  
Dr. Norman Hackerman  
Admiral Bobby Ray Inman  
Deborah Kastrin  
Dr. Earl Lewis  
Wales Madden, Jr.  
Joe McCormick  
George Mitchell  
Peter O'Donnell, Jr.  
Bill Parsley  
Arthur Temple

Victor L. Arnold  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dr. Gerald Skoog  
The Faculty Senate  
3-G Holden Hall  
Texas Tech University  
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Dear Dr. Skoog:

I received your February 17 letter setting out the resolution adopted by the Faculty Senate of Texas Tech University on February 11.

The role and scope the Select Committee adopted for Texas Tech many weeks ago identifies it as the comprehensive graduate research university that it is. The research facet of the role and scope specifically refers to Tech as an emerging national research university.

The report of the Select Committee -- with that role and scope for Texas Tech -- has been finalized and is presently being printed. So there will be no change.

I hope this responds to your concern.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Larry Temple".  
Larry Temple



The Nominations Committee proposes the following  
nominees for Senate offices, 1987-1988:

President

Georgette Gettel  
Carlton Whitehead

Vice President

Thomas McLaughlin  
Elizabeth Sasser

Secretary

Michael Stoune  
Robert Wood