



Texas Tech University

LUBBOCK, TEXAS 79409 / (806) 742-3656

The Faculty Senate

December 6, 1978

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Margaret Wilson, President

SUBJECT: Agenda for Meeting #10, December 13, 1978

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, December 13, 1978, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

- I. Minutes of the November 8, 1978 Senate meeting
- II. Board of Regents appointments - Dr. Elizabeth Sasser
- III. Report of the ad hoc Committee to Study Faculty Employment Contracts -
Dr. Ruth Wright
- IV. Report of the ad hoc Committee to Recommend Procedures to Replace Senators
Temporarily Absent from Campus - Dr. Elizabeth Sasser
- V. Resolution on University Calendar - Dr. Gary Elbow
- VI. Student Senate Resolutions
- VII. Resolution on Retirement Status Report
- VIII. Report of the ad hoc Committee on Academic Excellence Fund - Dr. David Cummins
- IX. Announcements
 - A. Grievance Panel Procedures
 - B. Academic Council Minutes
 - C. Interim Report from ad hoc Committee on Equus
 - D. Appointment to Library Committee
 - E. TTU and Senate Standing Committee Minutes
 - F. Faculty Development Committee Election
 - G. Status Report on Invocations Motion
 - H. University of Florida Alumni Report on Faculty Salaries
 - I. Letters from Senate Office
 - J. Interim Report from Admissions and Registration Committee
 - K. Interim Report from ad hoc Committee on Retirement Investigation
 - L. Agenda Committee meeting with Helen Brittin
 - M. Agendas and Minutes to Regents
 - N. Dates of Board of Regents Meetings
 - O. Letter to Regent Formby from Marilyn Phelan
- X. Other Business

November 21, 1978

The ad hoc Committee to Study Faculty Contracts, consisting of William Cain, Jacquelin Collins, Rodric Schoen, Ruth Voltz, and Ruth Wright, met on October 26, November 6, and November 15. It herewith submits its report.

Respectfully,

Ruth Wright

Ruth Wright
Chairperson

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY FACULTY CONTRACTS

The effect of the two bills "relating to employment contracts for faculty members at institutions of higher education; adding Subchapter I to Chapter 51, Texas Education Code, as amended," is to abolish tenure. Although there is no existing law that provides for tenure in Texas public colleges and universities, a system of tenure has been established by many governing boards and is in keeping with the tradition and practice of the best public and private colleges and universities across the country.

Under the terms of these bills faculty members at Texas institutions of higher education will be placed under a contract of limited duration. While under contract any faculty member may be removed by the governing board of his or her institution, after notification and hearing, for failure to develop professionally, incompetent performance, neglect of duties, physical or mental incapacity, excessive use of drugs or alcohol, felony conviction, or necessary reduction in personnel. Upon expiration of his or her contract any faculty member may be denied reappointment by the governing board without hearing and for any reason or no reason at all.

One of the proposed bills would abrogate tenure retroactively. Retroactive abrogation of tenure already acquired by contract probably violates the United States Constitution. In Indiana ex rel. Anderson v. Brand, 303 U. S. 95 (1938), the Supreme Court held that a legislative abrogation of contractual tenure already acquired by the employee violated the constitutional prohibition that no state shall impair the obligation of a preexisting contract, U. S. Constitution, Article I, Section 10. For those employees now holding tenure, exchanging tenure for a "renewable contract" is plainly not an equivalent exchange.

Historically, a crucial difference between probationary and tenure status is that the university must initiate proceedings to dismiss a tenured employee and must additionally bear the burden of proof in such proceedings that the tenured employee is not fit to be continued in employment. The proposed bills destroy this traditional safeguard for academic freedom, for there is no difference of substance between "probationary" and "renewed" employees. Although the bills provide a maximum term of years for renewable contracts, no minimum term of years is provided. Therefore, all employees, whether probationary or "renewed," could be employed on a one-year contract, year after year which would then subject the "renewed" employee to annual review, and more important, subject the "renewed" employee to termination at the end of each yearly contract.

The "peer review" provided in the bills is wholly advisory; it is not binding on the governing board. The decision to terminate or continue employment at the end of each contract period is in the sole and unreviewable discretion of the governing board. Hence abrogation of tenure by these bills effectively relieves the employing institution of any burden to establish a legitimate reason for terminating either a probationary or "renewed" employee upon expiration of the contract.

Academic freedom will cease to exist, for no employee can be expected to confront or assert controversial or unorthodox positions when employment may be terminated in the unreviewable and unexplained judgment of the governing board upon expiration of the employee's yearly contract. Conversely, those employees whose performance is safe and orthodox will, in practice, enjoy what amounts to tenure -- at least as long as their views do not offend the governing board of "bother" the board, administrators, alumni, citizens, or legislators.

Tenure is not a guarantee of lifetime employment. Tenured employees may -- and should -- be dismissed when their professional performance is deficient. If the reason for these bills is the belief that many tenured employees throughout the state are "dead wood" or not otherwise deserving of continued employment, tenure itself is not to blame. If there is an accumulation of tenured "deadwood," the fault for such a situation must be placed where it belongs -- upon the governing boards and administrators who fail or refuse to exercise their responsibilities to remove unfit tenured employees through established

procedures. Abrogation of tenure seems a drastic remedy for a situation caused by the default of governing boards and administrators.

One of the particular merits of the tenure system is that it requires a formal and very searching evaluation of a faculty member at the time when he or she does acquire tenure. It is a characteristic of systems without tenure that marginal faculty members are continued from year to year. A tenure system is the guarantee that weak and marginal faculty will be weeded out early in their employment rather than being continued indefinitely.

Abrogation of tenure throughout the state will, of course, place Texas public institutions of higher education at a serious competitive disadvantage in attracting and retaining highly qualified employees. Even assuming that salaries are comparable, why would a person accept a no-tenure scheme, with its manifest opportunities for abuse, when a sister institution offers comparable compensation with tenure?

Employees in certain disciplines often forsake the more lucrative rewards of non-academic employment. It seems unlikely that highly qualified persons will forsake private employment for the lesser economic rewards of academic employment without tenure.

Finally, statewide abrogation of tenure will surely precipitate extensive self-protective efforts by present employees to organize themselves into a unitary bargaining position. The unique relationship presently existing between faculty, administrators, and governing boards will vanish, to be replaced by a formalized "labor-management" relationship like that already existing in the private sector.

The foregoing comments on the bills are wholly negative. Without some explanation of the reason(s) for proposing these bills, nothing positive can be said in their defense. Because the bills totally abrogate tenure and offer no equivalent protection for academic freedom, nor equivalent incentive for highly qualified persons to choose academic employment over non-academic employment, the only apparent purpose of the bills is to do exactly what they do -- totally abrogate tenure. Why tenure should be totally abrogated is not explained in the bills and is thus a matter of speculation.

If removal of "tenured deadwood" is the object of the bills, procedures already exist for removing tenured employees whose performance is deficient. The bills are unnecessary and impose disproportionate harm upon higher education to achieve a less important objective that can be achieved readily through present procedures.

If the bills reflect concern that there are, or will be, "too many" tenured employees, certainly total abrogation of tenure is not required to achieve an appropriate balance between tenured and non-tenured employees. Similarly, if the bills reflect concern that tenure forecloses opportunities for younger employees and thus inhibits the infusion of "new blood and ideas," again total abrogation of tenure is not required to achieve an appropriate academic balance between "new ideas" and "mature experience."

If the bills are proposed merely to simplify the procedure for dismissing any employee by relieving the employing institution of any "unpleasant" burden to justify the dismissal, the obvious dangers to academic freedom must surely outweigh the "benefits" of summary dismissals. If the bills are proposed merely to simplify the dismissal of "academic troublemakers" by concealing vindictive or retaliatory dismissals, or are designed to force all employees into a safe and orthodox pattern of behavior and scholarship, then such reasons are palpably indefensible.

If the reason for the bills is to destroy the atmosphere of free inquiry prevailing in state institutions of higher education, passage of these bills will surely do that.

Report from ad hoc Committee to Recommend Procedures for Replacing Senators
Who Are Temporarily Absent from Duties

The Constitution of the Faculty Senate of Texas Tech University provides the procedure for filling a Senatorial vacancy. The Constitution does not define the term "vacancy, nor does the Constitution recognize a "temporary" vacancy. In order to define what is meant by a vacancy, the following Amendment to the By-Laws is offered in motion form.

MOTION: The Senate shall declare three absences during a Senator's term of office, without reasonable cause, constitutes a vacancy. The responsibility of reporting cause lies with the Senator.

Reasonable cause may be defined as absence due to other University duties or business, illness, absence from the campus during the summer, pressing personal matters.

The President of the Senate shall have the authority to rule on the validity of the cause of absence. The Senator affected may appeal the ruling to the Senate, which may overrule the President by a simple majority.

If a Senator is absent for five consecutive months with reasonable cause, the seat shall nevertheless be declared vacant.

RESOLUTION

Whereas great inconvenience is caused to students, faculty, and classified employees of the University as well as to parents and other relatives of students by scheduling the fall semester to end on the Friday before Christmas, December 22, 1978, and

Whereas certain final examinations scheduled for Friday, December 22, 1978 will not be concluded until after the 5 p.m. closing time of the Office of the Registrar, and

Whereas the final date for grades to be reported to the Office of the Registrar is Wednesday, December 27, 1978, and

Whereas the University has official vacation scheduled for the period from December 23, 1978 through January 1, 1979, and

Whereas the above schedule will make it impossible for faculty with late examinations to turn in grades by the deadline date without the necessity for altering their travel plans,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Texas Tech University inform the proper administrative officers of the University of the great inconvenience created by this year's schedule, and

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate of Texas Tech University request that special care be taken by these administrative officers to avoid the scheduling of final examinations so close to the Christmas holidays in the future.

--Dr. Gary S. Elbow

The Council of The College of Arts and Sciences

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

P.O. BOX 4664

LUBBOCK, TEXAS 79409

In the interest of upgrading the academic standing of Texas Tech University and in the interest of eliminating any confusion that might exist with the type of diploma that is currently being presented at the University; We, the members of the Council of the College of Arts and Sciences, have met and voted unanimously to support Resolution 14:3 and Resolution 14:5 of the Student Senate of Texas Tech University, which reads as follows:

Senate Resolution 14:3 By: Eli, Lassetter

(Stating the sentiment of the Senate concerning scholastic graduation honors which are placed on certain diplomas)

Whereas, Texas Tech is presently designating those graduates with high grade point averages by placing "With Honors" or "With High Honors" on their diplomas, and

Whereas, According to the present Texas Tech catalog any student who completes 30 hours of honors courses and graduates with a 3.0 grade-point average will have "In Honors Studies" placed upon his/her diplomas, thereby creating some confusion as to the scholastic level of the graduate, and

Whereas, Texas Tech University and the Student Senate are seeking to improve the academic standing of this University, and

Whereas, Most major academic universities use a system of designating those graduates with high grade-point averages by the use of "summa cum laude", "magna cum laude", or "cum laude", now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Student Senate of Texas Tech University that the Vice-President for Academic Affairs should initiate a system of honors designating a system as follows:

"Summa Cum Laude" to signify graduation with high honors, the overall grade-point average being 3.9-4.0.

"Magna Cum Laude" to signify graduation with high honors, the overall grade-point average being 3.7-3.89.

"Cum Laude" to signify graduation with honors, the overall grade-point average being 3.5-3.69, and be it also,

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Dr. Cecil Mackey, President of Texas Tech University; Dr. Charles Hardwick, Vice-President for

Academic Affairs; Mr. Robert Pfluger, Chairman of the Texas Tech Board of Regents; Deans of the Various Colleges within the University; and Margaret Wilson, President of the Texas Tech Faculty Senate.

Senate Resolution 14:5 By: Eli, Lassetter

(Stating the sentiment of the Senate concerning departmental graduation distinction)

Whereas, The type of diploma that is currently being presented at Texas Tech University carries only the name of the College within the University from which the student is graduating, and

Whereas, there is no distinction as to the department in which the graduate has earned his degree, and

Whereas, This lack of distinction in no way designates the graduate's particular interest or area of expertise, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Student Senate of Texas Tech University that the Registrar of Texas Tech University be instructed to take the necessary actions to include the specific area of study of the graduate on all diplomas, and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Dr. Cecil Mackey, President of Texas Tech University; Dr. Charles Hardwick, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Mr. Robert Pfluger, Chairman of the Texas Tech Board of Regents; Mr. Don Wickard, Registrar; Dr. Margaret Wilson, President of the Faculty Senate; and the Deans of the Colleges within the University.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: William F. Bennett
Lawrence L. Graves
Carl H. Stem
Robert H. Anderson
John R. Bradford
Donald S. Longworth
Frank Elliott
J. Knox Jones, Jr.

FROM: Charles S. Hardwick *CSH*

SUBJECT: Peer Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

Beginning with the 1978 Fall Semester, peer evaluations will be required for all probationary faculty. Peer evaluations are to be conducted annually.

For probationary faculty being considered for tenure next year, evaluations should be conducted early in the semester and made available to departmental and college tenure and promotion committees.

Departments should be allowed flexibility in developing procedures for conducting the evaluations but the procedures should include at least the following:

1. Appointment of two or three senior faculty to conduct the evaluation.
2. Conference with probationary faculty member to explain procedures to be followed.
3. Review with faculty member course objectives; outlines, texts, teaching methods, and other materials.
4. Periodic classroom visits to observe presentation of materials and interaction with students.
5. A summary evaluation report to the chairperson.
6. Review of the report by the chairperson with the probationary faculty member.

The information gained in the evaluation should be used by the chairperson, along with the annual faculty report and course evaluations, in the annual review of a probationary faculty member's progress toward tenure. It should also be made available to tenure and promotion committees, both at the departmental and college levels when a probationary faculty member is being considered for tenure.

:sj

✓ c: Margaret Wilson

LIAISON WITH COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

(1) George Tereshkovich (2-2837) Agriculture Representative	(5) Helen Brittin (2-3047) Home Economics Representative
(2) Roger Troub (2-2201) Arts & Sciences Representative	(6) Jim Eissinger (2-3894) School of Law Representative
(3) Herschel Mann (2-2037) Business Administration Representative	(7) Darrell Vines (2-3536) Engineering Representative
(4) Paul Dixon (2-2374) College of Education Representative	
ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS POLICY COMMITTEE	(1)
ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE	(1)
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE	(1)
ARTISTS & SPEAKERS COMMITTEE	(1)
BENEFITS & RETIREMENT COMMITTEE	(2)
BIOHAZARDS COMMITTEE	(2)
BOOKSTORE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	(2)
CAMPUS SECURITY & EMERGENCY COMMITTEE	(2)
CODE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE	(3)
CONVOCATIONS COMMITTEE	(3)
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	(3)
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE	(2)
LIBRARY COMMITTEE	(3)
MINORITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE	(4)
PARKING VIOLATION APPEALS COMMITTEE	(4)
PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE	(4)
RADIATION & LASER SAFETY COMMITTEE	(4)
RED RAIDER COMMITTEE	(5)
SPECIAL HEARING PANEL for TENURE & PRIVILEGE	(5)
STUDENT FINANCIAL AIDS/SCHOLARSHIP COMM.	(5)
STUDENT PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE	(5)
STUDENT SERVICE FEE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE	(6)
TENURE & PRIVILEGE COMMITTEE	(6)
UNIVERSITY DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE	(6)
UNIVERSITY DISCIPLINE APPEALS COMMITTEE	(6)
WARM-BLOODED ANIMAL COMMITTEE	(7)
*ACADEMIC AFFAIRS & STATUS (FS)	(7)
ACADEMIC BUDGET COUNCIL	(7)
*GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE (FS)	(7)

FS indicates that this is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. These two committees are responsible to the Senate, and are bound by the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Their reports and recommendations are directed to and through the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. It became evident very quickly that there are a number of Senators who have questions on the draft of the Grievance Panel procedures. President Mackey has a long standing commitment for December 13 which will prevent him from attending that meeting. After talking to members of the Senate, the Executive Committee, and President Mackey it seemed that the best procedure to follow would be:

1. Each Senator who disagrees with some part(s) of the draft will write (preferably type) as precisely and concisely as possible what he/she finds to be untenable. Please refer to Roman numeral and section letter in order that I will know exactly to which part of the draft you are referring.
2. Mail your list to Grace or bring it to the December meeting (deadline!).
3. I will compile a list of all suggestions, giving quantitative data as well as points of disagreement.
4. The final list will be sent to President Mackey and to each Senator.
5. President Mackey will meet with the Senate at the January 17 meeting.

I believe that this procedure will save a tremendous amount of time at the meeting and hope you approve of it.

NOTE: Under I. on the last page, last word of next to the last sentence, change "decision" to "recommendation."

B. Academic Council Minutes are on file in the Faculty Senate Office for anyone who wishes to read them in detail.

October 24, 1978

1. Interdepartmental transfers (of funds) was discussed with Deans expressing a need to get feedback in time to approve or disapprove expenditures prior to shifts of money from budgets under the deans' control.
2. Discussion of policies regarding use of lapsed funds resulted in a request that Kenneth Thompson visit with the group at a future meeting. Topics suggested for his visit included expenditures in faculty salaries, maintenance and operation, personnel, line item budgets, and planning for computer services. Council members agreed that end-of-year determination of balances is difficult to strike in time to appropriately use funds for needed purchases.
3. Dr. Hardwick reviewed the Coordinating Board document, "Texas Higher Education in Transition," and discussed the recent Coordinating Board meeting. He reported that the Bachelor's degree in Landscape Architecture and the Master's degree in Biological Sciences were withdrawn but may be resubmitted at a later date. He also reported that "the University is committed to eliminate a program which requires comparable resources as that anticipated for Atmospheric Sciences in order to implement the program approved for a Master's Degree in Atmospheric Science." Concerning prioritizing of programs, President Mackey has suggested that Dr. Hardwick and Dr. Jones meet with the various college faculties to discuss issues regarding priority assessments and deans were asked to develop schedules which would be convenient to most of their faculty.
4. Dr. Jones proposed a new schedule of stipends for teaching assistants, \$3,200 - \$4,500, and part-time instructors, \$3,400 - \$4,500, for one-half time for 9 months. The proposal was approved.

Academic Council Minutes continued.....

5. Dr. Ainsworth discussed the need to utilize procedures for program and budget approval through Continuing Education for those activities which are not a part of the regular academic programs. These budgets need to be developed early, include appropriate fees, and obtain required approvals well in advance of a proposed activity. "New state regulations require cooperation through Continuing Education in order to establish any off-campus, out of area activities. These activities must be reported to the appropriate regional coordinating councils before activities are offered. Questions regarding which activities should be cleared through the Coordinating Board's council should be directed to Continuing Education."
6. Outside employment forms for faculty who expect to be engaged in consulting or other external activities during the year will be distributed by the deans.
7. Discussion of salary incentives centered on some type of awards program to reward young tenured associate professors which would encourage them in their work and encourage them to stay at Tech. The Academic Council suggested that Dr. Hardwick and Dr. Jones develop plans and guidelines.
8. Dr. Hardwick noted a lack of documentation for teaching awards and suggested that a listing of awards could be made available to deans and chairpersons with criteria clearly established for each award. Documentation could be provided then as it pertained to a specific award.
9. Dean Elliott announced that Attorney General Bell will be a visiting lecturer in the Law School on December 1 and the Academic Council will be invited to a session with him.
10. Deans received information from Freshman Orientation Evaluation and were asked to review the comments of parents and freshmen concerning these activities.

November 28, 1978

1. Dr. Ramsey reported on the academic information system update and indicated that materials for the Coordinating Board for Fall 1978 would not be available from the computer in hard copy form until about 10 January 1979.
 2. Copies of the faculty workload report for Fall 1979 were distributed and Deans were asked to check for errors. Designation of TAs and PTIs must be made on the report. Corrected report will be provided to the Board of Regents and become a part of the reporting system to the Coordinating Board.
 3. Deans were asked to suggest issues in addition to priority assessment which should be considered during 1978-79.
 4. Brief discussion was held on the development of an academic advisory computer committee with suggestions made to Dr. Ramsey for membership on that committee.
 5. Deans will meet on December 5 with Student Affairs for a program in response to deans' presentation to that group last spring.
- C. Chairperson Howze of the ad hoc Committee on Equus reports that the committee has interviewed everyone they originally intended to talk with except a Regent. They have studied the AAUP report and have started writing their report. It is their intention to give the final report to the Senate in time for discussion at the January meeting.
- D. Thomas A. Musiak, Park Administration and Landscape Architecture, has been asked by Dr. Hardwick to fill the unexpired term, ending in 1981, of Charles A. Johnson on the Library Committee.

E. Standing Committees

Academic Affairs and Status Committee

L. B. Blackwell was elected chairperson; Virginia Sowell was elected secretary. Under discussion are the following topics: suggestions for changes in procedures to acquire promotion and tenure; increasing teaching effectiveness; hiring practices; and teaching load.

Library Committee

The report on the rare-book collection was presented. Four recommendations were approved: (1) The Turner Report is unsatisfactory "because of its failure to address adequately and specifically the major issue for which the Consultant was brought here, namely the proper housing of the rare-book collection;" (2) The Director of Library Services should take steps to implement 14 points of the Turner Report; (3) Three members of the Library Committee should meet with Dr. Hardwick to discuss the Turner Report and re-emphasize concern for proper housing of the rare-book collection; (4) The Director of Library Services should respond in writing setting out how implementation of the 14 points can be effected and on what time scale.

The sub-committee on the Core Collection remains uncertain of the philosophy and guidelines for the Core Collection and will continue its discussions with librarians.

The committee is continuing its enquiries concerning copying services, and library privileges available to emeritus faculty.

The Circulation Librarian enquired as to what should be done about faculty who refuse to return overdue books. The Committee noted that it had made a recommendation in 1976 that check out privileges be withdrawn for these faculty and did not feel inclined to consider the matter again.

Academic Budget Council

Dr. Magne Kristiansen, Electrical Engineering, was elected chairperson and Dr. Dwane Miller, Plant & Soil Science, was elected secretary. The committee discussed its charge and Kristiansen indicated he would discuss the Council's purpose with Dr. Hardwick. Minutes of each meeting will be sent to the Faculty Senate. Council members were asked to respond to material handed out by Dr. Hardwick on departmental profiles and Louise Luchsinger was asked to respond on statistical profiles as soon as possible. Faculty opinion will be solicited periodically. Input from the Faculty Senate as to the function of the Council and how the Council might serve the Senate will be discussed at the next meeting. Kristiansen will discuss this with Hardwick prior to the next meeting and will also discuss what documents relative to university budgetary procedure the Council should have on file for reference.

- F. The Election Committee certified Dr. Brian L. Blakeley to represent the College of Arts & Sciences on the Faculty Development Committee. Dr. Blakeley will serve the term ending in 1979, left vacant by the resignation of Dr. Thomas McLaughlin, who will be on leave of absence for the spring semester.
- G. Dr. Mackey is away from the campus but had Sharon Nelson call and say that he would discuss the Invocations motion with us at the January meeting if we so desire. As some of you know the President has declined to forward our request to the Attorney General.

- H. Bill Dean has sent me a copy of an article from the Fall issue of a University of Florida Alumni publication. One paragraph of it reads: "Comparisons of University of Florida salaries with 16 other leading southern state universities (those with more than 700 faculty members) show equally shameful results. Tied for third from the bottom in median salaries for all ranks, Florida salaries averaging \$17,000 were 10 per cent lower than the median of \$18,850 for the southern universities. Only at Auburn and Texas Tech do full professors earn less than at Florida, and that by only \$500. University of Texas professors are paid \$3,400 more and Alabama professors \$600 more." The article has been sent to the Academic Budget Council.
- I. The following letters have been sent from the Senate Office since the last meeting:
1. Members of the Faculty Senate and the Grievance Committee re draft of Grievance Procedures;
 2. Members of the ad hoc Committee to Study Faculty Employment Contracts re charge of the committee;
 3. Dr. Mackey, Dr. Jones, Dr. Ewalt, Dr. Barnett, Mr. Thompson, and Dr. Hardwick re Senate motion concerning replacement of faculty members on University councils and committees and listing councils/committees for which each is responsible and listing names of faculty already approved by the Senate in the spring and at the November meeting;
(NOTE: Dr. Mackey responded by letter saying that our idea of filling vacancies is acceptable.)
 4. Dr. Mackey re resolution on carillon;
 5. Dr. Mackey re resolution on retirement age;
 6. Dr. Mackey re motion to request an opinion from the Attorney General concerning our policy on invocations;
 7. Helen Brittin re appointment to Library Committee, alternates on University Discipline and University Discipline Appeals Committees, and change of Admissions and Registration Committee from Hardwick to Ewalt;
 8. Dr. Mackey re election of Dr. Brian Blakeley, by Arts & Sciences faculty, to serve on Faculty Development Committee;
 9. Brian Blakeley re election to Faculty Development Committee;
 10. Robert Rooker re Faculty Development Committee election;
 11. Magne Kristiansen re Academic Budget Council;
- J. Dr. Ewalt called to report that Admission and Registration Committee was discussing the 7th Summer Conference. A report from that committee will be forthcoming soon (hopefully).
- K. Bruce Kramer reports that the ad hoc Committee on Retirement Investigation has sent out 20 questionnaires; 4 have been returned. It is his belief that the committee will be ready to make a final report at the January meeting.
- L. As requested by the Senate at the November meeting, the Agenda Committee met with Helen Brittin, Chairperson of the Committee on Committees. It was decided that liaison persons would contact committee chairperson who have not sent minutes and remind them that minutes are to be sent to the Senate office. Further, the minutes will continue to be capsulized in the announcements. Finally, minutes, as they are

received, are on file in the Senate office and available to any Senator who wishes to read them.

- M. In response to a comment made by Mr. Bucy at the last meeting of the Board of Regents, copies of the agenda and minutes from the last three Senate meetings and all subsequent meetings will be sent to each Regent.
- N. Gary Elbow represented the Faculty Senate at the 1 December 1978 Board of Regents meeting. It is his belief that all Senators would benefit from attending a Board meeting. At his request I am including the dates of the remaining meetings for this year: February 2, March 30, May 11, and August 3. We receive the agenda usually two days prior to the meeting. If any Senator wishes to call Grace, she can tell you the approximate times the Regents will come out of Executive Session and start consideration of TTU agenda items. I, too, would urge each of you to try to attend one meeting.
- O. President Mackey has sent a copy of the letter, re legality of invocations policy, written by Dr. Marilyn Phelan to Regent Formby. The letter is on file in the Senate Office and can be read by any interested person.