

MINUTES

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council met Wednesday, January 19, 1977 in the Board Room with Chairman Collins presiding. Members present were: Burford, Stewart, C. Bell, R. Bell, Cummins, Davis, Keho, Kelly, Kimmel, McPherson, Mogan, Nelson, Smith, Strauss, Tereshkovich, Terrell, Vines and Wilson. Kim Cobb, of the University Daily; Vice President for Academic Affairs, Charles Hardwick; Len Ainsworth, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; Bill Parsley, Director, Office of Public Affairs; Neale Pearson, Associate Professor, Political Science; Fred Wehmeyer, Associate Vice President for Administrative Services; and Mr. R. Klocko were present as guests.

Ch. Collins called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m., and recognized the guests.

I. MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 8, 1976 MEETING

Ch. Collins called attention to an error on Page 5, Section VI. (Other Business), Item # 1 which should read: "Ch. Collins read a letter from Harley Oberhelman, Chairman of the Grievance Committee, stating that he will be off campus during the Spring Semester. The committee has an elected vice chairman, Dr. Donald Ashdown, who will act as chairman during this time."

Prof. Wilson moved that the minutes be accepted as corrected. C. Bell seconded and the motion carried.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

- a. Ch. Collins noted that three committee members failed to receive their copy of the agenda and promised to try to see that the error was not repeated.
- b. Letters written as instructed by the Executive Committee
 1. A letter was written to the Academic Status Committee relieving them of this committee's previous request to consider certain aspects of tenure and promotion and related matters, pending the development of recommendations by the Academic Vice President's Office with the assistance of the Tenure and Privilege Committee.
 2. Ch. Collins wrote a letter to Dr. Hardwick commending him and the Tenure and Privilege Committee for pursuing the tenure and promotion issues and reminding them that the Executive Committee would like to review the product before it is implemented.
 3. A letter was written to Mr. Wehmeyer with regard to: lights on Flint Avenue; guard rails around various buildings; and bypass lanes next to entry stations.

Mr. Wehmeyer reported that: guard rails have been or will be installed at several points; bypass lanes have been provided at some entry stations, but others are needed; student input is being sought on Flint Avenue lighting; and Loop crosswalks will be marked off shortly.

4. In a letter to Mr. Peterson of the Registrar's Office the chairman requested that a copy of the final computer printout of grades be sent to the instructors. Mr. Peterson has replied that this procedure has already been implemented. Prof. Burford confirmed that these printouts had already been received in his department.

5. A letter to Dr. Mackey notified him of a couple of committee appointments which were recommended by this committee at the last meeting.

c. Academic Council Minutes

There have been two Academic Council meetings since this committee met last. One meeting on December 14, 1976, the other on January 11, 1977. The main item of discussion at these meetings has been the proposed action of the Legislative Budget Board with regard to university budgets.

Ch. Collins asked Dr. Hardwick the meaning of paragraph 3 of the minutes of the December 14th meeting which reads: "Dr. Hardwick initiated a brief discussion of advisement, indicating that academic, career, and personal counseling are all elements to be considered in developing more effective advisement and guidance systems in the University. A committee has been appointed to develop a study of current advisement, to determine where we are from the point of view as a university as a whole. This committee, consisting of assistant and associate deans, will be asked to consider the status of advisement as it pertains to various elements of the campus." Ch. Collins asked Dr. Hardwick if the brief was an outgrowth of, or related to past discussion in this committee.

Dr. Hardwick replied that it was related to some extent, and that it was also responsive to concerns that were expressed in the consideration of admission requirements. One of the things which came up in discussing possible admission requirements was the need for better counseling and advising to students who are enrolled on a provisional basis. The pass/fail policy is also a part of it. These are just a few of the things involved in the efforts to evaluate the whole advising program. The committee concerned with advisement has met and initiated their study and the Executive Committee will be kept informed.

III. REPORT ON RECENT ACTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD - DRS. HARDWICK, AINSWORTH, & PARSLEY

Dr. Hardwick introduced the report by recalling that in the last legislative appropriation there was a rider attached which indicated that no person could be paid out of faculty salary money unless they were teaching a minimum of 9 hours, or the equivalent thereof. At recent hearings of the Legislative Budget Board the recommendation was made to use a formula to

determine how much money could be taken from faculty salary budgets which would reflect the number of people teaching less than 9 hours. First data used resulted in a penalty to the new budget for this university of about four million dollars. Corrections have reduced this figure to about one million, plus.

Dr. Ainsworth used the overhead projector to illustrate the Budget Board recommendations and formula. He emphasized that many factors are taken into consideration in the formula by which the Board arrived at its figures. The university administration is looking over this data carefully before submitting it and feels that many areas may not be recorded or used correctly at this time. None of the current figures are final.

Dr. Parsley opened his discussion by saying that a negative attitude will accomplish nothing. He feels that the Board staff is knowledgeable and friendly to higher education. His office will be working on this for the next five months; trying to make the formula responsive to the real conditions of academic life. He feels that the Board action came about because the universities abused the privilege to determine academic equivalents. This measure is probably meant to get the attention of the administrators, forcing them to solve their own problems in the area of minimum teaching loads. He expressed confidence that something will be worked out so far as the money is concerned.

Among the questions raised by members of the Executive Committee were the following: Will institutional choices be limited, especially in research (C. Bell)? The final form is not likely to affect research (Parsley).

Will an unfriendly conference committee be able to undo all of the reasonable adjustments (Smith)? New rules prohibit the conference committee from taking independent action (Parsley).

What are our alternatives in the management of graduate programs (Burford)? These are being worked on (Ainsworth).

Is there any relationship between teaching loads and the differences in funding levels for different categories (R. Bell)? Appropriations are ultimately political decisions (Ainsworth).

Is there any possibility that salary fund reductions could be applied to individual professors (C. Bell)? No (Ainsworth).

Is the concern with teaching loads likely to increase the number of contingency contracts (Mogan)? There is that possibility (Ainsworth).

How does summer school affect teaching loads and costs (Keho)?
This is being reviewed (Ainsworth).

How do funds generated by research affect funding by the legislature (Burford)? They don't (Ainsworth).

Dr. Hardwick reported that he was drafting a statement to assist President Mackey in furnishing information and direction to the legislature. He also stated that he would be kept advised of the situation on at least a weekly basis and would be glad to hold briefing sessions with the Executive Committee.

IV. REPORT ON CAMPUS ENERGY CONSERVATION - MR. WEHMEYER

Mr Wehmeyer provided copies of a memorandum on energy conservation (20 December '76) and an annual breakdown of energy costs and requests for the years '75 - '79. He pointed out that the auxiliaries (residence halls, bookstore, University Center, athletics, and the new swimming pool) pay their utilities out of their own funds, and that these do not come out of the state appropriations.

He noted that Tech has requested \$326,500.00 as an emergency appropriation from the legislature. At this time the governor has deferred all emergency appropriation requests until the general appropriation is finalized. The opinion is that the funds will be forthcoming, but there is no guarantee, and it is likely to be the latter part of May before it is known whether this additional appropriation is approved.

It is his feeling that the answer to the problem is really not so simple as it might appear since few of the buildings were designed with an energy shortage in mind, or for economy. (They were dedigned for creature comfort").

After Mr. Wehmeyer's initial statements there was much discussion; many suggestions were offered and questions raised as to the best use of energy and ways to conserve it.

He reported that Tech will schedule summer classes as carefully as possible so that some buildings, or part of buildings can be closed during the summer and thus save on utilities. These decisions will affect everyone and may be an inconvenience to some, but something must be done. He indicated that concern for efficiency might cause the legislature to look more favorably on other requests.

He also emphasized the use of normal administrative channels in all matters relating to this issue; but indicated that he would continue to report to the Executive Committee when invited.

V. REQUESTED REPORTS - DR. HARDWICK

1. Home Offices for Faculty - There is little hope that a declaration from any part of the administration that a home office is needed in line of duty would be of any help. The tax law as it was amended with regard to the business use of a home office leaves little doubt that Tech faculty would fail to qualify for a tax reduction.
2. Authority to Change a Grade - The answer to this question can be found on page 56 of the catalog, which reads in part...."and a grade, once given, may not be changed without the approval of the student's dean."

He also reported that he has met with the ad hoc Student Grade Appeals Committee. They in turn met with the Academic Affairs Committee who decided that they do not want to hear appeals or recommend policy. The ad hoc committee has been asked to draft a policy and procedures which may be followed in dealing with grade appeals. When the ad hoc committee makes its recommendation, Dr. Hardwick will bring it to this committee or to the Academic Affairs Committee as a recommendation for study.

Deans hear appeals under existing arrangements but it seems that there is a need for a formal policy so that the student knows what the procedure is for making grade appeals.

3. Status of the Investigation of Computerized Preregistration - The chairman of the committee appointed to make the study says they are about ready to report. They have been meeting regularly, have studied carefully our current registration procedures and are looking at the whole process in depth from the point of view of our computer capabilities. They have made detailed studies of systems used in other institutions.

He also reported that the change to the recent two day registration schedule was not done to accommodate the athletic schedule. It was done at the request of the faculty who felt that registration time could be shortened. Reports are that the faculty was pleased with the recent use of the two day system of registration. He noted that fewer exceptions were made for allowing early registration in the Spring registration. A question was raised concerning the preferential treatment of some student groups and whether or not there was adequate reciprocity in favor of faculty interests.

VI. REPORT ON PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN FACULTY COUNCIL CHARTER REVISION - C. BELL

The purpose of this report is to make the committee aware of what the ad hoc committee is doing, to tell the committee about the tentative time schedule the ad hoc committee has discussed and will try to follow, and to review the procedures by which this action will be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee. The ad hoc committee will recommend the replacement of the Faculty Council and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council by a Faculty Senate. It has prepared a preliminary document for the Constitution of the Faculty Senate and has arranged to meet with President Mackey and Vice President Hardwick in the near future for their input into this document.

The committee plans to submit a preliminary report to the February meeting of the Executive Council. At that time the Executive Committee can accept the report or ask for further consideration by the committee and future resubmission. If the report is accepted, an open hearing should be scheduled, hopefully in late February or early March. The ad hoc committee would then take the recommendations from the open hearing and incorporate them or not, as it sees fit, and submit to the Executive Committee a final report. It will be recommended that the matter be placed before the Faculty Council at its Spring meeting. If the Executive Committee does not accept the final report, it may resubmit it to the ad hoc committee with specific recommendations concerning modifications. The ad hoc committee will then submit an amended final report, which in this case would mean placing it before the Faculty Council. The Executive Committee may recommend to the Faculty Council that they not accept the report. If the Faculty Council accepts the report, thus replacing the Executive Committee and the Faculty Council by a Faculty Senate, it will be sent to the administration and to the Board of Regents and, if and when they approve it, it will become effective.

The ad hoc committee does not consider that the dissolution of this body and the establishment of a new body is a revision to the Charter. As a consequence, it does not believe that the protracted amendment procedures, which are currently stipulated, must be followed in making the proposed change.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Ch. Collins expressed his resolve that draft documents of the proposed changes must be available for distribution on Thursday prior to the February meeting of the Executive Committee in order to qualify for consideration on the agenda.
2. Prof. McPherson, Chairwoman of the Faculty Development Leave Committee, reported that the administration has informed her that two faculty development leaves have been approved for next year.

January 19, 1977
Meeting # 81

3. Prof. Strauss, of the University Benefits Committee, reported that the faculty will receive a memo shortly informing them that they have one benefit they were unaware of: the University carries liability insurance which covers the faculty when carrying out professional duties.

Prof. Strauss made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Prof. McPherson seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William A. Stewart, Secretary
Executive Committee
Faculty Council

1/28/77

/gf