



Texas Tech University

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

April 30, 1987

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Gerald Skoog, President *GS*
RE: Agenda for meeting #89, May 6, 1987
3:30 p.m., Senate Room, University Center

AGENDA

- I. Recognition of new Faculty Senators and other guests
- II. Approval of the minutes of the April 8, 1987 meeting
- III. Report by William Hartwell, Vice President of the Faculty Senate, on the recent Academic Council meeting
- IV. Comments by and discussion with Don Haragan, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research
- V. Recommendations of the Faculty Senate Academic Programs Committee in regard to student admissions and retentions (see attachment)
- VI. Report of the Academic Programs Committee in regard to the Select Committee of Higher Education recommendations concerning teacher education (see attachment)
- VII. Report of other Senate committees
- VIII. Faculty Senate liaison to Student Senate - Sydney Cravens
- IX. University Library policies and procedures - Jim Brink
- X. Other Business
- XI. Closing report from Faculty Senate President
- XII. Adjournment

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 33% of their class upon graduation. No minimum SAT or ACT scores.
2. Students in the second 33% 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 34% 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 or equivalent	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 person with a deficiency will automatically be admitted on a conditional basis.

CONDITIONAL ADMISSION

1. Students in the second 33% 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 34% 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. This requirement could be met at another accredited institution of higher education.
 - 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 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, at least one should satisfy state or University basic requirements.

April 23, 1987

Election Results

Faculty Senate - representing Agricultural Sciences

Ernest Fish, Park Administration & Landscape Architecture
Robert A. Long, Animal Science

Faculty Senate - representing Architecture

No representatives elected in 1987

Faculty Senate - representing Arts & Sciences

Nelson Dometrius, Political Science
Robert A. Hayes, History
John M. Howe, History
Sue Tolleson Rinehart

Faculty Senate - representing Business Administration

M. Herschel Mann, Accounting

Faculty Senate - representing Education

No representatives elected in 1987

Faculty Senate - representing Engineering

John P. Craig, Electrical Engineering
Thomas F. Trost, Electrical Engineering

Faculty Senate - representing Home Economics

No representatives elected in 1987

Faculty Senate - representing School of Law

John Murray

Faculty Senate - representatives elected At-Large

Alwyn Barr, History
John H. Burnett, Political Science
Ruth M. Rogers, HPER

The Academic Programs Committee was charged with recommending a position concerning the Select Committee on Higher Education recommendation concerning teacher education. The legislation presently would require students to have majors in the field(s) they will teach, would eliminate the undergraduate education degree, and would limit undergraduate education courses to 18 hours.

The members of the Committee polled teacher education advisors in the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts & Sciences, Education, and Home Economics. Thirteen responses were received from A&S, 5 from Education, 2 from Home Economics, and 2 from Agriculture.

Results indicated that 9 A&S departments favored the proposal, 3 were opposed, and 1 was undecided due to lack of information. All responses from the other three colleges were negative. The 9-12-1 total was not considered to be a mandate in any direction. For this reason the Committee agreed to present the pros and cons to the Faculty Senate and, if approved, to President Cavazos in order that the Administration can present both sides of the problem to the legislators.

PROS

1. More courses would be taken in the major rather than in education.
2. Students would have a better background in the teaching field.
3. Broad field in science would probably be eliminated "and it should be."
4. A&S departments would have to acknowledge their roles in teacher education by curriculum changes and advising.
5. Public schools would have to upgrade their curricula "and about time too."

CONS

1. Students would have to take more courses.
2. A 5 to 6 year program would probably be necessary, especially since the majority of departments reported that most of their students are certified in two teaching fields.
3. Some certification programs presently do not prepare students to meet public school needs; the new proposal could make this worse.
4. Extra hours needed may dissuade students from entering the teaching profession.
5. Some "second" teaching fields would probably be eliminated as a result of this action.
6. Broadfield certification would be difficult if not impossible in areas where more than two fields are represented and in some cases with only two.
7. The 1984 Standards have not had a chance to work and should be given more time before changes are made.
8. Advanced subject matter in a teaching field is possibly beyond the scope of public school curricula and such knowledge does not necessarily make a better teacher.

9. Advisors in teacher education departments would have to advise the students in teacher preparation.
10. Courses in teacher preparation would have to be added in subject matter fields.
11. Small schools need teachers prepared in broad fields in agriculture, social science, science, and other areas; these broad fields may be eliminated.