

**MINUTES #148, FACULTY SENATE  
JANUARY 19, 1994**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, January 19, 1994, at 3:15 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Sue Couch, president, presiding. Senators present were Barr, Bradley, Burnett, Cardenas-Garcia, Ceniza, Cravens, Curzer, Davis, Dragga, Dunham, Dunn, Dvoracek, Endsley, Haigler, Heintz, Hensley, Hopkins, Huffman, Jonish, Khan Marlett, J. Mason, Miller, R. Morrow, Oberhelman, Payne, Schoenecke, Shroyer, Sorenson, Strawderman, Troub, Urban, Westfall, Zanglein and Zartman. Senators Roy and Wagner were absent with prior notification. Senator Kiecker is on leave from the University. Senators T. Morrow and Perl were absent because of University business. Senators Aranha Gregory, Higdon, D. Mason, and Pearson were absent.

President Couch called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. and recognized the following guests: Virginia Sowell, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs; Michael D. Shonrock, Dean of Students; Jeannine McHaney, Associate Athletic Director; Robert M. Sweazy, Vice Provost for Research; Alice Kolb, Office of Development; Jay House, Student Senate President; Steve Kauffman, News and Publications, Mary Ann Higdon, Library; and members of the news media.

Steve Frazee, Agricultural Education and Mechanization, served as Parliamentarian.

**I. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the December 8, 1993 meeting were approved as distributed.

**II. REMARKS OF ROBERT SWEAZY, VICE PROVOST FOR RESEARCH**

In response to the Senate's request, Vice Provost Sweazy was present to answer questions on the decline in awards received by TTU faculty under the Advanced Research Program (ARP) and the Advanced Technology Program (ATP).

Vice Provost Sweazy noted that ARP was established in 1985 and ATP was added in 1987. \$20 million funding per biennium is available to public institutions through ARP and \$40 million per biennium is available to public and private universities through ATP.

Sweazy noted that grants submitted by TTU faculty have decreased since the establishment of the programs.

**Proposals Submitted by TTU Faculty**

|     | 1987 | 1989 | 1991 | 1993 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| ARP | 153  | 104  | 139  | 105  |
| ATP | 129  | 113  | 110  | 86   |

The success rate is about 10% for TTU faculty:

**Awards Received by TTU Faculty**

|     | 1987         | 1989        | 1991       | 1993         |
|-----|--------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| ARP | 8(\$874,000) | 13(\$1.57m) | 15(\$1.5m) | 8(\$854,000) |
| ATP | 12(\$2.18m)  | 13(\$1.08m) | 9(\$1.33m) | 12(\$1.104m) |

The large decrease in ATP awards in 1989 resulted from state-imposed industry matching funding requirements. Sweazy noted that TTU has not been able to easily locate matching funding.

**Percentage of Awards Granted to TTU Faculty**

|     | 1987  | 1989  | 1991  | 1993  |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| ARP | 5.56% | 7.14% | 8.88% | 5.16% |
| ATP | 5.80% | 5.04% | 4.05% | 6.63% |

**Percentage of Funding Granted to TTU Faculty**

|     | 1987  | 1989  | 1991  | 1993  |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| ARP | 4.39% | 7.56% | 7.56% | 4.31% |
| ATP | 5.47% | 2.66% | 3.37% | 3.32% |

The decline is attributable, in part, to poor judgments made by the evaluators. Applicants consistently have complained that their proposals have not received fair and adequate review. Vice Provost Sweazy has raised these concerns with the Coordinating Board.

Currently, proposals are evenly distributed among the panel members for review. (Each member reviews only a portion of the proposals submitted.) The panel meets in Austin, where each reviewer verbally reports on the proposals he has reviewed. The panel then votes to accept or reject the proposal. If the proposal is accepted, the panel assigns a funding category (fund; fund if available money; don't fund).

Sweazy said the system can be improved by:

- 1) mailing proposals to all (or more) panel members;
- 2) separating ARP and ATP and consider proposals in alternate years;
- 3) employing local screening (although this is not favored);
- 4) submitting pre-proposals (this is also undesirable); and
- 5) allowing UT and A&M to compete for 70% of the funding, and allowing rest of institutions to compete for the remainder. (Under law, UT and A&M can receive no more than 70\$)

Sweazy requested faculty suggestions. Senator Weber suggested anonymous proposals. Senator Haigler spoke against the 5th recommendation, stating that it may reflect negatively on TTU. Senator Dunn requested better assistance from Research Services with respect

to formatting and reclassifying proposals into categories where the applicant has the best chance of success. Senator Haigler also suggested assistance to improve the lucidity of faculty writing.

### **III. REPORTS FROM UNIVERSITY COUNCILS**

Provost's Council-Sue Couch (Report available in Faculty Senate office.) President Sue Couch reported on the Provost's Council meetings held on December 13 and January 10. In December, the Provost requested the Deans to prepare reports for a one and one-half and two and one-half percent reduction. The reduction is due to the failure of the legislature to fund the three percent salary increase and also is a result of the 130 hour cap on doctoral hours. At the January meeting, the Council discussed perceived poor faculty attendance at commencement and changes to the sick leave pool policy. A summary of changes to the sick leave pool policy is available at the Faculty Senate Office.

### **IV. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

Faculty Performance Study Committee - Jayne Zanglein (Minutes of the meeting available at the Faculty Senate Office). Senator Zanglein reported that the Faculty Performance Study Committee met on December 1 and January 12. The Committee has established meeting schedules, exchanged information on faculty performance and TTU college/department performance standards, and discussed the broad parameters of the Committee.

Three subcommittees have been established: Teaching, Research, Service and Administration. The Committee plans to look at various productivity and performance measures and devise a procedure which would involve the Faculty Senate in performance decisions. The Committee plans to define faculty workload, define a way to measure pre-tenure and post-tenure workload, and define a way to measure quality. The Committee also will suggest ways to convince the public that faculty work is important.

President Couch noted that Senator Jonish will attend a conference on faculty performance and productivity at the University's expense. Provost Haragan and John Burns will also attend.

Academic Programs Committee-Howard Curzer (Report distributed and on file in Faculty Senate Office) Senator Curzer moved that the Faculty Senate support the decision to develop a computerized degree audit system and that TTU cease to require an advisor's signature on registration cards for Juniors and Seniors once this system is in place. The motion was seconded.

President Couch noted that the motion will not change the availability of advisors for students who need advisement. Senator Dunn stated that the advisor's signature ensures that a student has met the prerequisites.

Senator Weber suggested that the motion be tabled so that the General Counsel can look into the University's potential liability when a student signs up for a class that they wrongly believe can be substituted for a required class. Senator Huffman commented that the liability issue is not a big factor because students don't want to take extra courses and so they will make sure they are taking the right course. The motion passed.

Senator Curzer moved that changes be made to the grade of "I" (incomplete): The grade of "I" may be given when a student's work is satisfactory in quality but, due to reasons beyond his or her control, has not been completed. It is not given in lieu of an "F" or other grades. The instructor assigning the grade will stipulate, in writing, at the time the grade is given the conditions under which the "I" may be removed. If these conditions are not met within one year then the student receives an "F" unless the instructor (or academic dean in the case where the instructor is no longer with the University) extends the make-up period by restating the conditions under which the "I" may be removed. At the time of graduation an "I" is replaced by an "F". The original "I" will be replaced by an "R" when a grade is assigned for the second registration for the course. The motion was seconded and passed.

Senator Strawderman made the following motion: The Committee recommends the Faculty Senate support the honors program and accept the following:

- A** - courses for which a student contracts with the instructor and completes the agreed-upon expectations may be designated honors credit for that student
- B** - the honors program may monitor contracted courses to evaluate their suitability for honors credit
- C** - the honors thesis may be completed by registering for an independent study. The thesis will be in addition to the base 24 hours of honors credit for six hours credit and the designation of "highest honors" on the transcript.

The motion was seconded.

Senator Burnett said it is unfortunate that the University is not willing or able to commit to a legitimate honors program. Senator Haigler responded that very few universities can afford to develop departmental honors programs. Virginia Sowell, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, stated that Provost Haragan is very supportive of the honors program. She also noted that TTU has not been approved for a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. Senator Strawderman's motion passed unanimously.

Committee on Committees - Senator Jonish, Chair presented three nominees for election to the Nominations Committee: Candace Haigler, Lloyd Urban and Richard Zartman. Senator Troub moved to elect the three by acclamation. The motion carried.

## **V. OLD BUSINESS**

### Remarks of Michael Shonrock, Dean of Students, on High Riders

Dean of Students, Michael Shonrock informed the Senators that the investigation of the High Riders incident is on-going. The High Riders Constitution includes a "Christian values" clause. Preliminary research has indicated that such clauses are not unlawful. He noted that the High Riders receives funding from the Student Fees Council for Women's Athletic funding.

Senator Miller stated that this is a matter of religious, gender, and pregnancy discrimination. Shonrock agreed to investigate these legal issues further.

Senator Dunn stated that the High Riders Constitution does not limit membership based on gender.

Senator Curzer asked if the Dean of Students Office intends to require all organization that receive state funding to remove Christian morals clauses. Shonrock will look into this.

Student Senate President Jay House stated that the High Riders do not receive any funds from Student Association fees.

Senator Cravens suggested that the problem might be resolved by the use of "high moral standards."

Senator Dunn read the relevant provisions of the High Riders Constitution:

"High Riders shall be dedicated to the principles of service and leadership to the University and the student body. High Riders was founded to uphold the traditional Christian standards of honesty, integrity, and servitude in the promotion of spirit at Texas Tech University."

Under qualifications for membership: "A student with a positive attitude, high moral standards, and a sense of responsibility..." He has spoken with advisors to the High Riders who have consulted with attorneys to determine the legality of the constitution provision. The High Riders want to comply with the law.

Senator Haigler said that if the language "high moral standards" were substituted, the standard would be too vague, creating more problems. Dean Shonrock expressed his desire to work with the Faculty Senate on this issue and will keep the Senate advised as to the status of the High Riders case.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

## Recommendation to Delete Technology from General Education Requirements

Howard Curzer-(Motion distributed and on file in the Faculty Senate Office; Senator Endsley's argument against Elimination of Technology Requirement also distributed and on file in Senate Office).

Senator Curzer emphasized the importance of reducing the General Education requirements to give students more flexibility to take electives. In an effort to give students more flexibility, Senator Curzer recommended that the technology requirement be eliminated because 1) Technology requirements are rare among universities, 2) the Coordinating Board does not include a technology requirement in its General Education requirements, 3) technology courses are not absolutely central to every college student's education, 4) the technology requirement is incoherent, 5) a multicultural course requirement is more important than courses that deal with technology and society, 6) students do not need a course to teach them to operate technical things -- they are already exposed to technology in their daily life, 7) the technology courses, with the exception of computer courses, do not teach basic skills necessary to excel in college, and 8) many of the technology courses (like "small gasoline engines and tractor maintenance") teach narrow mechanical skills.

Senator Endsley responded that the purpose of the General Education requirements is to expose students to a wide variety of areas, including technology, so that they are aware of other areas of study and can gain an understanding of the basic approaches. Technology courses are not simple "how to" courses, but are courses designed to provide a deeper level of understanding regarding technology. Courses that address the relationship between technology and society are valuable, especially in making business and personal design and purchasing decisions. Technology courses such as computer courses help alleviate "computer anxiety." The General Education requirement is actually a "Technology and Applied Science" requirement which is why courses like "Care and Management of Companion Animals" meet the "Technology" requirement. If the problem is whether the courses satisfy the objectives of the Technology and Applied Science requirement, then the solution is to change the criteria for selecting courses that meet the requirements, not eliminate the requirement.

Senator Heintz made a motion to send the Faculty Senate's concerns to the General Education Committee and ask for a timely response. The motion was seconded.

Senator Weber described this and other proposals concerning the reduction of the General Education requirements as a "witch hunt." Senator Barr moved the previous question. The motion was seconded. The motion on whether the Senate should vote on Heintz's motion passed. The motion to refer the Senate's concerns to the General Education Committee passed.

Senator Weber asked that the Senate representative advise the General Education Committee of all. the Senate's on-going concerns, not just with respect to the Technology requirement. President Couch suggested that Robert Marlett, the Faculty Senate's representative, be directed to advise the General Education Committee of these concerns.

Jeannine McHaney-President: Couch welcomed Jeannine McHaney, Associate Athletic Director and liaison to the Faculty Senate.

#### **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jayne Zanglein

Secretary 1993-94