

MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #116

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, May 2, 1990 in the Senate room of the University Center with President Julia Whitsitt presiding. Senators present were Andrews, Barr, Beckner, Brink, Burnett, Couch, Dometrius, Ervin, Finn, Fish, Harp, Hall, Hartwell, Hayes, Hennessey, Hildebrand, Howe, Hurst, Kimmel, McClendon, Mann, Nathan, O'Callaghan, Owens, Pearson, Peters, Peterson, Piatt, Richardson, J. Smith, R. Smith, Strauss, Tock, Trost, Troyansky, Vann, Wagner, Westney, Williams, and Wilson. Senators Curry, Mehta, and Rinehart were absent on university business. Senators Hill, Lee, Long, Tallent and Thompson were absent.

I. Introduction of Guests

President Whitsitt called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. and recognized the following guests: Senators-elect Alfred Cismaru, Murray Coulter, Patrick Dunne, Gary Elbow, Clifford B. Fedler, Sunanda Mitra, Ben Newcomb, Michael Stoune, and Diane Wood. Other guests were Donald Haragan, Executive Vice President and Provost; Jerry Ramsey, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; Mary Ann Higdon, TTU Library; John McGlone, Chair of Academic Programs Committee; Denise Jackson, Interim Executive Director of Development; Steve Kauffman, News and Publications; Jim Barlow, Lubbock Avalanche Journal; and Nick Federspiel, Student Association.

Professor John Bliese served as Parliamentarian for the meeting.

II. Consideration of the minutes of the April 11, 1990 meeting.

The minutes were approved as mailed.

III. Reports from Faculty Senate Standing and Ad Hoc committees:

A. The Committee on Committees submitted the name of Ben Bates, Mass Communications, for the Protection of Human Subjects Committee. Motion accepted.

B. Professor John McGlone, Academic Programs Committee, submitted a report regarding non-native English speaking teaching assistants (Attachment) and moved that the recommendation be forwarded to the Provost's office. The policy originated in the office of Vice-President Sowell. The motion carried to endorse the policy.

C. 1. Senator Richardson, Faculty Status and Welfare Committee, moved acceptance of a proposed addition to the the Texas Tech University Affirmative Action Hiring Policy for tenured faculty positions (Attached). Senator Wilson observed that the University has been giving lip service to affirmative action during the 25 years that she has been on the faculty. The policy is adequate as written, but commitment is missing from the upper administration, middle administration, and the faculty, so it is possible to get around the stipulations. If we are serious about affirmative action we must throw some money at the problem. Senator Williams proposed a friendly amendment to insert "in the top group of candidates" in the last sentence of Item I. The amendment was

accepted by Senator Richardson. Motion passed.

2. Senator Richardson presented a report (Attachment) regarding a grade change by a dean that did not follow specified procedures. Senator Richardson moved acceptance of the report and asked that the report be referred to the dean involved. Motion passed.

D. Senator Fish, chairperson, Budget Study Committee, submitted the final report of the committee. President Whitsitt thanked the committee for the exceptional amount of work involved.

E. Senator Troyansky for Study Committee A submitted proposed guidelines for a policy for reorganization of academic units (Attachment) and moved their acceptance. The following changes were accepted as friendly amendments: change "or" to "and" between the two motions; change "mergers(s)" to "reorganization(s)"; "programs" to "academic unit", and "might utilize" to "will utilize" in line 10 of Motion B. The criterion for academic unit is that the chairperson reports directly to the dean. Motion passed.

IV. Reports on Councils

A. President Whitsitt submitted a written report on the Provost's Council. (Attachment)

B. Vice-President Peterson attached a report on COFGO to the agenda. The full report is in the Faculty Senate office.

C. The Operations Council has not met since the last Faculty Senate meeting

D. Senator Peters submitted a written report on the Research Council. (Attached)

E. Senator J. Smith's report from the Development Council was attached to the agenda. Senator Smith further reported that the candidates list for director has been narrowed.

F. President-Elect Brink had no report from Student Senate.

V. Old Business

The Academic Programs Committee responded to a draft report from the Task Force on Student Evaluation of Faculty. President Whitsitt then received a final draft from the Task Force. The Agenda Committee recommended that the final report from the Task Force be submitted to the Academic Programs Committee to determine whether or not their suggestions received adequate consideration during this academic year, then submit the entire document for a vote by the Faculty Senate at the beginning of the new academic year. Senator Andrews moved that we follow the Agenda Committee plan. Motion carried.

VI. New Business

The Faculty Senate has received from the Coordinating Board "A Master Plan for Texas Higher Education." The Coordinating Board has requested comments from Faculty Senates of Texas universities. Faculty Senate members are invited to read the report and leave their comments. President Whitsitt and President-Elect Brink will write the response.

VII. Remarks by Executive Vice President and Provost Donald Haragan

A. The budget has been put to rest.

B. The Faculty Senate is asked to contribute ideas regarding health insurance, since the decision must be made soon.

C. The enrollment tally from Admissions reveals that admissions are down by 7%; applications are up 5% from last year. Changes, primarily in the freshman class, are attributed to the new standards. Transfer applicants are up 25% from both two and four year schools. 832 students received probationary status this summer, 309 last summer. Of the 832 probationary students, 180 chose to enter this summer. Of the freshmen who have been accepted this year 87% were in the top half of their high school graduating class; 51% of those accepted were in the top quarter of their graduating class. Our best guess is that enrollment will be 300 to 400 less than in the fall semester, 1989.

D. Provost Haragan expressed thanks to President Whitsitt and the Faculty Senate for a good year.

VIII. Remarks by outgoing Senate President Whitsitt

A. Ms. Grace Frazier has been a mainstay for the committee chairs and council representatives as well as the president. Parliamentarian John Bliese has endured the meetings with patience and good humor. The Senate Vice-President and Secretary, Pete Peterson and Betty Wagner, provided advice and counsel and shared tasks.

B. Thanks go to President Lawless, Provost Haragan, and other members of the University administration. They have been cooperative and candid. Although we have not always agreed, we have been able to discuss our differences in an atmosphere of mutual respect. This respect has been earned by the Faculty Senate as a whole. We have advised the administration and brought the archivists and librarians more fully into the life of the institution.

C. We have undertaken a significant study of teaching. The only issue on which we have not taken a stand is bronze statuary.

IX. Remarks by Senate President Brink

A. President Brink expressed thanks to his fellow Senators, the outgoing officers, and to the administration.

B. Areas to be addressed next year include

1. Group health insurance coverage
2. Faculty salaries
3. Begin the process of understanding how administrative salaries are determined.

C. We will take an active role in revision of University Grievance Policy.

D. We will consider the topic of faculty-staff family leave and child care.

E. We are concerned about parking. Rumors abound about the fate of parking arrangements. We are alerted.

F. We will continue to monitor policies relating to increased admission standards and cooperate in efforts to retain academically able students. We will monitor the initiation of the core curriculum. The Senate will attend to the final definition of writing intensive courses and the procedures for initiating them. Texas Tech must pay more than lip service to foreign study by supporting students and faculty who wish to study and teach abroad. The Faculty Senate will work to ensure that Texas Tech doesn't reorder our resources in the desire to increase our research profile, thereby jeopardizing the lifeblood of our university and making the name, Texas Tech, really appropriate.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Betty Wagner
Secretary 1989-90

Additional attachments referred to in these minutes are being mailed in a concurrent mailing.

**Report by Academic Programs Committee on
Non-native English Speaking Teaching Assistants
and Faculty Policy**

To Faculty Senate

May 2, 1990

The latest policy is in draft form. We find the proposed policy generally acceptable. The goal of having all teachers easily understood is worthy of attention.

Two refinements may make the policy more acceptable to faculty. First, item 5 (which refers to graduate students) should include a statement similar to that in item 4 that states that the department chair should evaluate (and certify) English proficiency. We suggest a statement be added to item 5 like: Following certification, department chairs will be responsible for completing an oral proficiency evaluation.

The second item refers to items 4, 5 and 6 in the draft policy. We suggest a departmental advisory committee be used to assist the department chairs with certification.

DRAFT

Policy

Non-native English Speaking Teaching Assistants and Faculty

1. House Bill 638, passed 5-28-89, requires that each institution of higher education establish a program or a short course to assist certain non-native English speaking faculty members to become proficient in the use of the English language. The term "faculty member" means a person who teaches a course offered for academic credit by an institution of higher education, including teaching assistants, instructors, lab assistants, research assistants, lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors.
2. The purpose of this policy is to assist faculty members whose primary language is not English to become proficient in the use of English, and to ensure that courses offered for credit at Texas Tech University are taught in the English language, and that all faculty members are proficient in the use of the English language. A faculty member may conduct foreign language courses designed to be taught in a foreign language or may provide individual assistance during course instruction to a non-English speaking student in the native language of the student.
3. The cost of any English proficiency development necessary will be paid by the faculty member lacking proficiency in English.
4. In order to comply with federal regulations for equitable treatment of all residents of the United States, all faculty interviews shall include an oral proficiency evaluation which includes information on pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, grammar, intonation, and general comprehensibility of the faculty member being interviewed. The chairman of the department in which the potential faculty member is being interviewed will be responsible for completing the oral proficiency evaluation and including it in the application materials.

If deemed necessary by the chairman of the department for which the faculty member is being interviewed, additional assessment procedures already developed by the English as a Second Language

Program, may be utilized to further assess the English proficiency of non-native English speaking faculty.

If results of the evaluation indicate that additional language instruction is necessary, faculty will be required to register in an existing language instruction course in the English as a Second Language Program and pay the required fees.

5. Since potential graduate students who will be teaching assistants or research assistants are not required to have an interview before being admitted to Graduate School, the procedure that is presently in place for evaluating all prospective non-native speaking teaching assistants will be required. This consists of a three week intensive workshop in August prior to the beginning of the fall semester. During this workshop, students undergo extensive evaluation in a variety of academic contexts commensurate with classroom communication requirements. Students are certified for the classroom or laboratory, upon successful completion of the workshop. Students who do not successfully complete the workshop are not given classroom teaching assignments until they have successfully attained the level of communication in English required.
6. All presently employed non-native English speaking faculty of all ranks will be required to be certified as competent in the English language by the department chair.

AGENDA ITEM III., C. (1)

Proposed Addition To The
Texas Tech University Affirmative Action Hiring
Policy For Tenure Faculty Positions

1. A college which has a tenure track faculty position available must first make a legitimate offer to a qualified minority or female from among the top group of candidates. The hiring unit must recognize that among the most important factors in identifying these candidates is the greater breadth a candidate brings to the unit by the possession of an underrepresented gender or ethnic background. This requirement will apply so long as that college has an underrepresentation as determined by the University's Affirmative Action Plan.

Academic units and colleges share the responsibility to define the academic qualifications for each faculty position to be filled.

A college may be excused from the requirement of this section if and when it establishes, in writing, to the satisfaction of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University, that there are no minority or female candidates in the top group of applicants for the position in question.

2. For faculty who accept positions under stipulations of Section 1, relocation assistance will be provided from a special fund established for this purpose.
3. Additional faculty funding will be provided to academic units that are successful in hiring and retaining qualified minority or female tenure track faculty.

Draft proposal of a joint meeting of the Affirmative Action Committee and the Faculty Senate Faculty Status and Welfare Committee, April 27, 1990.

AGENDA ITEM III., E.

Report to Faculty Senate by Study Committee A. (4-24-90)
Prepared by David Troyansky, with other members of the committee, Sue Couch, John Burnett, Terry Ervin, Don Finn, Thomas Trost, and Peggy Williams.

To: All Members of the Faculty Senate:

The committee met on April 2, 1990 to consider the issue of the reorganization of departments. A member of the faculty had addressed a letter to Senate President Whitsitt concerning a particular reorganization proposed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. As this particular issue has seemingly been resolved--at least in the short run--we turned to the general issue of faculty input in administrative reorganization of departments and other academic units. While we thought that a full-fledged policy for administrative reorganization might be excessive at this time, we did express some consensus on basic guidelines for such a policy. However, we were not in complete agreement over the concluding recommendation and, therefore, provide the Senate two alternative motions.

It was agreed that administrators should communicate promptly to the faculty concerned any ideas they are entertaining of reorganizing academic units. Administrators should indicate clearly and openly their reasons for a proposed reorganization and seek continued faculty input throughout the process. Individual committee members were able to recall reorganizations that had been happily consummated and that had been undertaken for legitimate reasons, including the more effective running of the university, reaction to the evolving academic landscape in the world, and perhaps even financial considerations. However, the committee was aware that while reorganizations might be construed as unions of equals or of two parties that might both benefit, they were often devices for eliminating departments, programs, or individual faculty deemed "unnecessary."

Such a judgement cannot fairly be reached without full consultation with the faculty. Administrators may need to be reminded that a university is a community of scholars

rather than a community of administrators and that the reorganization of academic units is not a purely administrative function. The structure of the university is essential to its ability to fulfill its mission, for the structure of knowledge is as important as its content. The coherence of departments and programs should be the primary concern. The best judges of that coherence will be members of those departments and programs, but the faculty in general and the Senate as its representative will also have a vision of the university and ought to have a role to play.

Motion A:

Therefore, we recommend that whenever an administrator proposes the reorganization of departments or other academic units the Faculty Senate be notified in order that it may play its natural role. An ad hoc or standing committee of the Senate should be appointed to discuss all proposed reorganizations and make recommendations to the administration long before reorganization of academic units is undertaken.

and

Motion B:

Therefore, we recommend that all parties within a college or academic unit who are involved with a potential reorganization have sufficient opportunity to support or oppose said reorganization and that the decision to reorganize be made with agreement of a majority of each faculty unit. An exception to this policy might be appropriate in cases of fiscal necessity as determined by the Provost or Dean. It is further recommended that when a reorganization is voted down by a majority of faculty in an affected department, and an amicable agreement cannot be reached, an appeal process be initiated. That process will utilize the Faculty Senate. An ad hoc or standing committee of the Senate shall be appointed to discuss the proposed reorganization and make recommendations to the administration before reorganization of academic units is undertaken.

AGENDA ITEM IV., A.

Report on Provost's Council
by Julia Whitsitt

The Provost's Council met Monday, April 30, 1990. In addition to some routine business and consideration of specific line-item budget requests, the following items came before the Council:

1. President Lawless asked for discussion of the pros and cons of allocating salary appropriations in one of two ways: on the basis of "parity" among colleges, or with "flexibility" for deans to (for instance) use the money budgeted for a position that becomes vacant to provide raises for continuing faculty. The crux of the problem, which remained unresolved, is that "flexibility" can mean higher raises for some faculty, but also can make the size of the raise dependent on the college or unit's faculty turnover rather than on the merit of the individual faculty member, the department, or the unit. President Lawless pledged open discussion of how much parity and flexibility to mandate, and to involve faculty in decision-making about these allocations.

2. Texas Tech needs to draft a new policy on allegations of misconduct in research to be in compliance with federal granting agencies' requirements. A draft proposal has been prepared by the Vice Provost for Research, who welcomes comments on it. A copy of the draft is available for your perusal in the Faculty Senate office. When a first round of revision is complete, the draft will go to the Senate for comment.

3. The possibility of granting emeritus status to non-faculty, and/or of making only full professors eligible for emeritus status was discussed briefly. Comments from faculty to the Provost are welcome.

4. The recommendations of Senate Committee B on the ethics of textbook adoption will become University policy.

AGENDA ITEM IV., D.

2 May 1990

To: Faculty Senate
From: Randall Peters
Subject: Research Council Meeting, 25 April

I. Indirect Cost Rates:

A survey of the top 135 research universities yielded the following-- Mean = 51.7%, median = 49%, standard deviation = 9.6%, compared to TTU's 41%.

An administrative charge of 8% is being considered for those agencies that do not allow indirect cost reimbursements.

II. Committee Reports:

A. Increasing Faculty Involvement in Funded Research--
Discussions focused on awards to faculty members.
(It should be noted that the committee had earlier stated that increased involvement, whether funded or unfunded, was important.)

B. Research Philosophy--
The working document which was discussed at the last senate meeting, has been allowed to stand without substantive change.

III. Future Meetings

The next Research Council meeting will be devoted to discussions of the three remaining reports:

- (i) Graduate student involvement
- (ii) Research environment and infrastructure
- (iii) Unfunded Research

FACULTY STATUS AND WELFARE COMMITTEE

May 2, 1990

John Howe, Panze B. Kimmel, Daniel Nathan, C. Reed
Richardson (Chair), Mary Tallent, W. Penny Vann and Margaret
E. Wilson

Responding to a charge from the Faculty Senate President concerning a recent situation involving grading practices, this committee listened to the faculty member and administrator involved and discussed the matter with each, and submit the following:

Unfortunate grade distribution is not prima facie evidence of unfair grading. If there is a question about grading, a thorough discussion with the instructor in question is the appropriate first step.

We note the following excerpt from the Texas Tech University Undergraduate Catalog, 1989-90, p. 68, involving grading practices:

"The instructor of record determines all grades for a course. The method of determining a grade will be included in the course syllabus that is to be presented to the students at the beginning of the semester."

In cases where the administrator has questions about the grading practices in a particular course, it would be advisable to make changes through the normal Grade Appeals Process. Deans should only intervene in a class grading process under extraordinary circumstances and only through consultations with the affected faculty member and the department chairperson. Problems should normally be handled by the instructor and chairperson involved. It is difficult to imagine circumstances where encouraging students by letter to appeal grades would be appropriate. In no case should a dean communicate directly with instructor's students without sending copies to the intervening authorities (i.e., the chairperson, the instructor and any other as appropriate). For deans to change grades directly in a routine manner would create an alternative grade appeals system to the detriment of faculty and administrators.