

MINUTES #139, FACULTY SENATE  
January 20, 1993

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, January 20, 1993, at 3:15 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Benjamin H. Newcomb, President presiding. Senators present were Aranha, Bliese, Bradley, Burnett, Cismaru, Couch, Coulter, Curzer, Dunn, Dunne, Elbow, Fedler, Goebel, Haigler, Hensley, Higdon, Hopkins, Huffman, Kiecker, D. Mason, J. Mason, Miller, Mitra, Morrow, Payne, Shroyer, Strawderman, Trost, Troub, Urban, Wagner, Weber, and Zartman. Senators Benson, Green, Meek, Perl, Roy and Stoune were absent because of University business. Senators Daghistany, Jonish, and Zanglein were absent with notification. Senators Davis, Dragga, Dvoracek, Freeman, Henry, and Reynolds were absent.

I. INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

President Newcomb called the meeting to order at 3:20 and welcomed the following guests: Virginia Sowell, Associate Vice President; Jacquelin Collins, Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences; Denise Jackson, Office of Development; Steve Kauffman, News and Publications; Mary Ann Higdon, Library; Daniel O. Nathan, Philosophy; and Julie Hemby, Avalanche Journal.

Professor Clarke E. Cochran, Political Science, served as Parliamentarian.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

The minutes of 9 December 1992 were approved.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Dean Jacq Collins (Arts & Sciences) presented an Academic Council proposal to change university policy on the W date. The purpose of the new policy was to eliminate rigidity and the complicated procedures required to accommodate students needing to withdraw from classes.

The new policy reads as follows:

a. Students may on their own initiative drop courses and receive grades of W through the 30th class day of a long semester or the 12th day of a summer term.

b. Students may, with the approval of the course instructor, drop courses from the 31st day of a long semester or the 13th day of a summer term through the last day on which a student may withdraw from the University ("no later than ten class days before the first day of the final examination period"). They will receive grades of W or WF as determined by the course instructors.

c. After the last day to withdraw from the university and only in rare and compelling circumstances of a non-academic nature, the student's academic dean may, on a student's request and after consultation with the instructor(s), drop that student from classes with a grade of W or WF.

Discussion of the policy focused on the need for procedures to guarantee that the faculty involved were notified and had actually approved of the student's dropping a course. It was suggested that other Texas schools with similar policies had mechanisms of faculty notification that could be studied and adopted. The motion to approve this policy and recommend it to the administration passed with some dissent.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Newcomb announced that the Coordinating Board will consider the adoption of college prep courses as requirements for admission to the

university. This issue is already being considered by Senate Study Committee C.

V. Provost Haragan had been invited to comment on a number of Senate recommendations, but due to the meeting of the Coordinating Board he was unable to attend. President Newcomb directed senators to Provost Haragan's letter of 7 January 1993 concerning grade replacement. The policy Haragan recommended does not reflect the senate's proposal; it eliminates the Senate's 12-hour limit on grade replacement.

#### VI. REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

Provost Council--Benjamin Newcomb (report distributed to Senators and on file in Senate office)

The Provost's Council meeting of 14 December 1992 adopted a mission statement for TTU/TTUHSC. No action was taken on the freshman seminar, multicultural courses, or the generic course evaluation, although each was discussed.

Academic Council--Candace Haigler (report distributed to Senators and on file in Senate office)

The main proposal coming out of the Academic Council involved the W date discussed above. Senators questioned how this new policy dovetailed with proposals on grade replacement and academic bankruptcy. Senator Haigler noted that a committee of the Academic Council was considering this issue. It was also suggested that some method, possibly the revision of the faculty handbook, would need to be adopted to notify faculty of these changes.

Research Council -- Fred P. Wagner, Jr. (report distributed to Senators and on file in the Senate office).

Senator Wagner reported that the Research Council wanted information from the faculty on what established research areas at TTU had potential for becoming "areas of excellence" and what new or young research areas might be nurtured to become "areas of excellence." Those with information on this should contact Senator Wagner (2-3538).

#### VII. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Committees--Pat Dunne

The Committee on Committees presented a list of candidates available for the nominating committee. Senators Benson, Elbow and Goebel were elected as the nominating committee.

Study Committee B--Robert Weber (report distributed to Senators and on file in Senate office)

Study Committee B considered adoption of the AAUP Statement on Intercollegiate Athletics. The committee recommended that the Senate reject the AAUP statement. It concluded that "the athletic program at Texas Tech has not abused the athletes or ignored the academic component" and recommended a number of specific changes that it deemed achievable concerning travel, practice schedules, and the role, selection and privileges of members of the Athletic Council.

Daniel Nathan, vice-president of the TTU chapter of the AAUP presented a response to the committee's report. Professor Nathan questioned the

committee's conclusions regarding the admission and exploitation of athletes. He pointed out that the majority of TTU's 91/92 scholarship athletes did not qualify for regular admission, that the situation was worst among football players, and that TTU's 6-year graduation rate for football players was the lowest in the Southwest Conference and one of the worst in the nation among Division I-A schools. This was particularly true for minority athletes. Of the 18 African Americans admitted to TTU with football or basketball scholarships in 1985/86, only one graduated in six years. Nathan also questioned the committee's conclusions regarding the funding of athletics and its evaluation of elected faculty supervision of athletics as "commendable" but unachievable. He asked the Senate to reject the recommendation of Study Committee B and adopt the AAUP statement.

Rising to respond to the AAUP, Senator Goebel stated that he had written much of Study committee B's report with input from other committee members. He felt that while the AAUP statement has some good elements and had led to some of the committee's recommendations, it was not "worthy of acceptance" in total. It did not reflect the situation at TTU and was unrealistic and inappropriate for Division I schools. Goebel stated that the committee report had examined many issues; it had not examined others, such as graduation rates, and had relied on information provided by the Athletic Department and the administration. At one point Senator Weber held up the thick NCAA report on TTU athletics that the committee had utilized and invited others to "wade through" it if they wished. He also asserted that the AAUP proposal was unrealistic and that the committee was concerned with what was going on at TTU itself. Senator Hensley questioned the idea of imposing any more restrictive change unless change had been demanded by the students or those in the athletic department.

Study Committee B's decision not to recommend that the Athletic Council be elected provoked comment. Senator Goebel stated that President Lawless had already rejected any change in the composition of the Athletic Council. Since this goal was unattainable, the committee recommended more limited change in the method by which the Senate would elect the nominees it sent to the president. Senator Elbow expressed concern with the attitude that the faculty should not request something because it might be rejected. He noted that the Senate had just gone over the W/WF policy for the third time; while the Senate's original proposal had not been accepted, the new administration policy was closer to the faculty's position than it had been before. The faculty should ask for what it felt was proper and right and then negotiate. Senator Dunne argued that many of Study Committee B's proposals were good; even if the committee had not called for everything that might be desired, its proposals were a step forward. Weber pointed out that some of its recommendations would not be favored by the Athletic Department.

Throughout the discussion, senators requested that the committee resolve or explain contradictory statements made in its report. Concerns were raised about actual graduation rates; about which figures were correct, those in the report or those in the AAUP document, and about what figures and sources of information should be used; about the report's conclusions both that the athletic budget was separate from the university's general operating funds and also that the Athletic Department received funds from institutional appropriations, student activity fees, and bookstore revenues; and about who actually controlled the athletic budget. It was pointed out that although the monies going to Athletics from sources such as the bookstore might make up only a small part of the Athletic Department budget, such monies would make a significant contribution to protecting the library's journal subscriptions. In the context of cutbacks, the funding of athletics and academics needed serious consideration.

The motion to accept the recommendations of Study Committee B failed by a vote of 13 yes, 18 no. The Senate adopted a motion that senators be allowed two weeks in which to address their questions to the study committee in writing and that the committee issue a new report.

It was moved and seconded that the Senate adopt the AAUP guidelines. Senator Troub stated that the AAUP statement seemed to be "innocuous." It was a request that the Senate support a national policy to give faculty more input over athletics; its remedies for exploitation were mild limits to allow athletes time to study and to integrate themselves in student life. He suggested that the Senate endorse the AAUP statement, which was separate from the issue of which things TTU did well and which it did not. The motion to adopt the AAUP statement failed.

Faculty Status and Welfare Committee--Gary Elbow (report distributed to Senators and on file in Senate office)

The Faculty Status and Welfare Committee examined a complaint on summer school appointments. The committee found no need for action; the issue was a college matter. Senator Elbow stated that a grievance policy existed that could handle complaints of this sort. The grievance committee reports to the administration not the faculty. The report was accepted by the Senate.

#### VIII. OLD BUSINESS

No old business was raised.

#### IX. OTHER BUSINESS

President Newcomb noted that the Avalanche Journal had mentioned regent selection; he asked if the Senate wanted to take any action on this matter. Senator Elbow suggested that given the situation on campus, it was important to have minority representation on the board of regents. He suggested that the Senate write to the governor and urge her to find qualified minority members for the regents. President Newcomb stated that he would do this.

#### X. ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*M. Catherine Miller*

M. Catherine Miller  
Secretary 1992-93