



Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

October 2, 1979

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Gary S. Elbow, President
SUBJECT: Agenda for Meeting #17, October 10, 1979

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, October 10, 1979, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

- I. Minutes of the September 12, 1979 Senate meeting
- II. Remarks to the Senate by Dr. Lawrence L. Graves, Interim President of the University
- III. Comments on Senators' Responses to Questionnaire - Gary Elbow
- IV. Action on the Final Report of the ad hoc Van Committee - Gary Elbow
- V. Report of the Academic Affairs and Status Committee on Issues Related to Merit Pay Increases - Hong Lee
- VI. Report on Reallocation of Faculty Salary Monies - Jacq. Collins
- VII. Resolution Establishing a Select Committee to Develop Recommendations for Improving Faculty Salaries - Jacq. Collins
- VIII. Resolution ^{in response to a UD article reporting} on the Use of Radio Equipment Donated to Mass Communications - Richard McGowan & Michael Stoune
- IX. Selection of Alternate Members for Elective Committees - Gary Elbow
- X. Other Business *Paul Dixon C.O.C.*
- XI. Announcements
 - A. Minutes of Board of Regents Meeting of 8/3/79
 - B. Communication with Interim President Graves regarding a standard, published policy on perquisites of Emeritus faculty status
 - C. Communication with Vice President for Development and University Relations, Clyde Kelsey, regarding presentation to the Senate of University plans for a capital gifts campaign
 - D. Remarks on presidential selection
 - E. Correspondence

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Excerpts from minutes of Board of Regents 8/3/79
(The minutes of the Board of Regents are on file in the Senate Office.)

The Board of Regents:

1. adopted a revised policy for participation in men's post-season basketball tournaments
2. adopted a revised policy regarding participation in post-season football bowl games
3. altered the policy regarding travel by personnel of the Athletic Department to require approval by the Director of Athletics or his designee before such travel can be made
4. approved an honor code for the School of Law
5. authorized the President to retain architects to develop plans for the Music Building addition
6. authorized letting of bids for construction of dressing rooms in the Lubbock Coliseum (for use by women athletes)
7. approved letting of bids for completion of the basement of the Goddard Range & Wildlife building
8. authorized the President of the University to have contracts for concession vending services negotiated with Coca Cola Bottling Company and B & M Vending Company of Lubbock.. (August 26, 1979 to August 24, 1981)
9. approved awarding of two-year Cash Investment Depository Contracts to First National Bank of Lubbock, First National Bank of Midland, First National Bank of Dallas, First City National Bank of Houston, and State National Bank of El Paso
10. approved a compulsory Student Service Fee of \$3.60 per semester credit hour registered up to a maximum of \$43.00 for any regular semester or six week summer session
11. presented a resolution honoring Dr. Cecil Mackey upon his departure from TTU
12. elected Mr. Robert L. Pfluger to a second consecutive term as chairman of the Board of Regents and Mr. J. Frank Bucy as vice-chairman

September 26, 1979

Yesterday afternoon, I talked for more than an hour with Clyde Westbrook, Texas Tech Budget Officer, and Dan Williams, Vice President for Finance and Administration. They were most helpful. They could not have been more open and ready to provide information, nor more patient in explaining its meaning and in answering my questions regarding it.

They provided me with the following information regarding the amounts appropriated, budgeted and expending on faculty salaries:

Fiscal	Amount Appropriated	Amount Budgeted	Amount Expended	Remainder Reallocated
1975-76	\$18,743,926	\$18,802,163	\$18,432,962	\$310,964
1976-77	20,019,813	20,109,227	19,639,328	380,475
1977-78	20,863,044	21,091,176	20,428,422	434,622
1978-79	21,577,741	21,577,741	21,333,660*	244,081*
1979-80	22,608,896	22,708,896		

*These are not final figures. Changes may have occurred late in the fiscal year, which ended on August 31, and which may not yet be reflected in these totals.

Jacq. Collins

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Faculty Senate create a SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE STATUS OF FACULTY SALARIES AND RELATED MATTERS. The charge of this committee is to examine the status of the faculty salaries at Texas Tech University for the purpose of preparing recommendations for presentation to the Senate. In order successfully to carry out its charge, the Committee may examine the status of course load distributions; departmental and college course listing; current University and Coordinating Board rules pertaining to cross-listings of courses, team teaching, and related matters; the distribution and productiveness of graduate and undergraduate courses and programs; and such additional matters directly or indirectly related to faculty salaries and their allocation. The Committee is to report/periodically on its activities and to prepare a final report stating its findings and recommendations for submission to the Senate. The Committee shall consist of 5 members, nominated by the Committee on Committees and approved by the Faculty Senate.

The Committee is expected to work in cooperation with the Academic Budget Council, the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, the Office of the Vice-President for Finance and Administration, and such other University offices and committees as may be appropriate.

Jacq. Collins will present the above resolution.

Correspondence

The following correspondence has been sent from the Faculty Senate Office since the September 12, 1979 Senate meeting:

1. To Dr. Lawrence L. Graves, Interim President
 - a) informing him of the resolution regarding the emeritus status for Orlo Childs endorsed by the Senate at its September 12, 1979 meeting
 - b) expressing the concern of the Senate with the lack of a standardized policy for the awarding of perquisites to emeritus faculty
 - c) confirming his commitment to meet with the Faculty Senate on October 10, 1979
2. Virginia Sowell, Academic Affairs & Status Committee, asking her to convene the committee to elect officers for the 1979-80 academic year and referring to that committee the matter of the evaluation of department chairpersons for their study and recommendations
3. Katherine Hutmacher, Robert Warren, Kent R. Keim, William Morrison, Arthur Stoecker and Adite Angirasa, new faculty members in the College of Agricultural Sciences, inviting them to attend the October 10, 1979 Faculty Senate meeting
4. David Northington, Chairperson, with copies to other members of the ad hoc Van Committee, acknowledging receipt of the final report of that committee and inviting them to attend the Senate meeting on October 10, 1979
5. Bruce Bartholomew, Chairperson, Executive Committee Faculty Council, Texas Tech University School of Medicine, enclosing a copy of the questionnaire prepared for distribution by the ad hoc Committee on Academic Freedom for his approval before sending it the members of the faculty in the School of Medicine
6. Clyde Kelsey, conveying the interest of the Senate in obtaining information relating to the status of the University's plans for a major capital gifts campaign

RESOLUTION

In response to the article in the University Daily "Tech Receives Audio Equipment" (9/28/79) raising the prospect of future Texas Tech University affiliation with National Public Radio (NPR), and

whereas Texas Tech University has the obligation and responsibility to improve the quality of life and expand the cultural and intellectual horizons of its students, and

whereas Texas Tech University has the obligation and responsibility to lead in providing cultural and educational services to the Lubbock community and the region at large, and

whereas the in-depth news, public affairs, Classical music, and other broadcasts presented by NPR could enrich the cultural and intellectual climate of the University and this region of West Texas, and

whereas many universities and communities in this State and in the Nation as a whole have taken advantage of the opportunities provided by NPR (e.g., KTEP, El Paso; KENW, Portales; KUNM, Albuquerque; KUT, Austin; KAMU, College Station; KETR, Commerce; and stations in Houston, Dallas, Beaumont, and Killeen),

We, the Faculty Senate, for the good of the students and faculty at Texas Tech University and the citizens of the greater Lubbock community, urge the University to establish an affiliation with National Public Radio.

FINAL REPORT OF THE AD HOC VAN COMMITTEE

submitted to the

FACULTY SENATE, TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

CHARGE: To investigate the use of University vans by the athletic departments and by academic departments and return with a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

Members: David Northington (Chairperson)
Charles Burford
Claud Davidson
Oscar Francke
Richard Zartman

REPORT

To fulfill our charge, we decided that we would need to investigate an involved series of related topics bearing on motor vehicle usage in general at Texas Tech University. The problem which produced the need for this committee and thus its charge is partially one of scheduling advantage. The Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Departments (hereafter referred to as the athletic departments) were able to reserve vehicles much farther in advance than were most academic departments because they usually knew their game-meet schedules by the end of the preceeding summer and were able, therefore, to file their rental requests for the entire year in early September. This occurred during the past academic year (1978-79), resulting in a pattern of usage greatly favoring the athletic departments. Appendix 1 summarizes information compiled by Dr. Elbow prior to the establishment of this committee. Our Appendix 2 summarizes similar data for the entire year and presents additional information regarding overbooking and number of requests turned down.

It is apparent from these data that vehicles purchased with appropriated funds (the athletic departments are not otherwise supported with any appropriated funds) are not as available to the academic departments as they are to the athletic departments. Total numbers of faculty and students in academic departments versus numbers of coaches and student-athletes would only further point out this discrepancy.

The possibilities for immediately solving this problem range from purchasing enough vans so that everyone is able to rent them whenever needed to not allowing the athletic departments to have access to motor pool vehicles at all. This committee did not feel that any such solutions were either feasible or fair. Our concern is to present recommendations that are financially feasible and yet allow use by both academic and athletic departments with academic departments having as good or better access to vehicles in the future as they would now if athletic departments had no current access.

To that end, we investigated the following: (1) why are only vans and carry-alls (or pickups) purchased for rental through the motor pool (officially the "Vehicle Rental Office"), (2) vehicles inventoried in academic departments, (3) purchase and operation costs for different kinds of vehicles, (4) dual use of selected vehicles, (5) vehicle rental office staff situations relative to priority of usage, university subsidy, etc. Our findings are presented below, followed by our recommendations.

1. Past interpretation of Section 17 of the State Travel Regulations has resulted in the purchase of only "panel, pickup and delivery trucks" for motor pool rental. It is our

opinion that "buses, sedans and station wagons regularly used for the mass transportation of numbers of people and essential to the efficient management of the operating agency of the state" is a statement that would allow Texas Tech (or any state institution of higher education, not otherwise listed in sec. 17 as an agency "authorized the use of appropriated funds for the purchase ... of passenger cars..." to purchase buses and smaller passenger cars as long as they were used appropriately. The intent of section 17 is obviously aimed at not allowing us to have "company cars" for individual use in Universities. With a broader interpretation of these regulations by the appropriate administrative officers we feel that future motor pool purchases should include both buses and smaller passenger cars. Details will be presented in the Recommendations section of this report. Section 17 of the State Travel Regulations is here presented:

Section 17. PASSENGER AND OTHER VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT (EXCLUDING AIRCRAFT).

a. Only the following agencies are authorized the use of appropriated funds for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of passenger cars and other vehicles designed for passenger transportation (excluding aircraft): Texas Youth Council, Adjutant General's Department, Department of Agriculture, Attorney General, Board of Control, Department of Corrections, Highway Department, Historical Commission, General Land Office, Parks and Wildlife Department, Railroad Commission, Department of Public Safety, Water Development Board, Water Quality Board, and Water Rights Commission.

For the purposes of the above limitation, the following vehicular equipment shall not be construed to be passenger cars and other vehicles designed for passenger transportation and may be purchased, operated, and maintained by an agency through appropriated funds: panel, pickup and delivery trucks and trucks required for the conveyance of special equipment; motorcycle delivery units; dual control automobiles used exclusively for driver training; passenger cars equipped with two-way radios, motorcycles, jeeps, and boats needed and used for fire prevention, fire fighting and other activities for safeguarding public safety, public property, or for criminal law enforcement; ambulances or other passenger vehicles specifically equipped and regularly used for ambulance service; buses, sedans and station wagons regularly used for the mass transportation of numbers of people and essential to the efficient management of the operating agency of the state.

b. Passenger cars which have a wheelbase longer than 119 inches may be purchased only when the purchases would result in a lower unit cost.

2. Although the committee was under the impression that for several years now academic departments were not allowed to purchase and inventory any vehicles, we find that there are ways around this and that past purchases have left many departments "well endowed" with vehicles. Appendix 3 summarizes the late model vehicles by department and whether or not these vehicles might be available for rent by other academic departments. Our recommendations regarding departmental vehicles is available in that section.

3. Purchase and operation costs. The purchase of a new carry-all is \$7,000-7,500 while a van costs \$8-9,000. These vehicles carry 9 or 12 passengers depending on how they are set up. The purchase price of a new school bus is somewhere in the \$15-20,000 range. Such a bus can be airconditioned and can hold over 30 adults with room for luggage and equipment. Thus, a bus costs approximately twice as much as a van or carry-all, but will carry as many passengers as three such vehicles. Vans and carry-alls get 10-12 mi./gal. while a bus gets approximately 5-7mi./gal. Buses, therefore, would on

the same or less to operate as two vans, and much less than the three that would be necessary to equal the carrying capacity of one bus.

Compact sedans and wagons would cost approximately \$5000 to purchase and should get 18-25 mil./gal. depending on the vehicle in question. For trips where only 1-4 people are going (meetings, etc.) and little or no "equipment" is needed, such vehicles would be almost twice as efficient as the use of vans by 1-4 people; an event which has been common in the past.

4. Currently, one van is being used evenings only as a shuttle for female students to and from dorms and parking lots. In addition, a number of 11 ft. wide reserved lot parking places are currently being issued to disabled students to provide better access to campus buildings. Many of these spaces could be converted to regular (8 ft. wide) reserved spaces if a daytime shuttle van equipped with a lift could provide access from commuter lots. This change would result in increased revenue from more total reserved lot spaces, better general access for disabled students and a daytime use for a van which is currently utilized evenings only.

5. Currently a Clerical Specialist II is in charge of the motor pool at a salary in the ballpark of \$650/mo. Originally, there was a transportation manager (2 years ago) paid \$1100/mo. + and a Secretary I as his assistant. At that time the Transportation Manager reported directly to Mr. Wehmeyer. The Clerical Specialist now responsible for all the duties originally handled by two people reports to Mr. Jim Ward (Garage Foreman) who reports to John Millar (Administrative Supervisor, Bldg. Maintenance & Utilities) who reports to Mr. Buckberry (Director, Bldg. Maintenance & Utilities) who reports to Mr. Wehmeyer. The University has already lost the first Clerical Specialist II who had to handle the job alone because of the workload and salary (personal communication).

6. Philosophical considerations dealing with priorities, subsidy, restriction etc. will all be included in the Recommendations section of this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, we are recommending that the University purchase more vehicles! For an institution our size to have only eight or so vehicles available for rental is incredibly inadequate. This is especially true in comparison with other universities (Arizona, Arizona State, Utah State, New Mexico, New Mexico State, West Texas State, etc.) and in light of the total number of vehicles (289) inventoried at Texas Tech last year (probably 1½-2 yrs. out of date by now) as shown in Appendix 4. In addition to not having nearly enough vehicles, because of past interpretations of Section 17 of the State Travel Regulations, the vehicles we have purchased for rental are restrictive and inefficient.

1. Therefore, we feel that two buses (school) should be purchased and set up to seat 30+ adults with facilities for luggage and equipment. Because of their scheduling advantage, the athletic departments would be able to reserve these buses any time they needed to transport enough people and gear to normally require at least two vans. When not being used by the athletic departments, academic departments would be able to rent these buses for class field trips etc. Whether the University purchases these with appropriated funds or whether the athletic departments purchase them, they should be inventoried in the motor pool and controlled by that office.

In addition, we recommend the purchase of "several" compact cars and station wagons

for use when four or fewer people are involved without significant equipment transport needs. Their original purchase price and cost of operation should readily justify their immediate incorporation into the motor pool inventory. With the addition of two buses and these gas efficient small passenger vehicles, the motor pool would be able to serve more efficiently the needs of the athletic and academic departments because one bus can do the job of three vans and 1 small car can much less expensively fill the needs for many who in the past have had to use vans or carry-alls when their size and space were not needed. The result should be much greater access to the vans and carry-alls for those needing the capacities of such vehicles.

Finally, in the past, the motor pool has at least one 4x4 carry-all (four wheel drive) and three carry-alls with standard transmissions, geared low with positraction for use on unpaved and rough dirt roads. Presently, only carry-alls with automatic transmissions are available and these are totally inadequate for travel into certain areas. We recommend the purchase of an adequate number of vehicles to satisfy the needs of those requiring "off-road" field vehicles.

2. We recommend that departments either not be allowed to purchase and inventory vehicles or certainly that they be housed and maintained by the motor pool and generally accessible by other departments when not reserved and being used by the home department. Some reservations and priority schedule would be necessary to fairly handle such a system but we see an inequity when some departments have as many or more vehicles than they do faculty and still have access to motor pool vehicles (which are airconditioned and often better maintained). For departments such as these to have their own vehicles standing idle while they use motor pool vehicles is inefficient and puts an unfair burden on those departments having no vehicles and no access to the motor pool's because they are tied up for long periods of time (all summer in some instances).

3. We recommend the conversion of one van with a lift to shuttle disabled students during the day and serve as the security shuttle for female students at night. Some gain in reserved parking spaces (and money) can be made while providing better service for disabled students. The conversion from daytime to night shuttle would take only some 10-15 minutes of seat installation. Ms. Trudy Putteet in the Student Life Office has all the necessary information relative to a disabled shuttle system. Such a vehicle could also provide academic access to a disabled student who otherwise might not be able to participate in class field trips.

4. We recommend that the person in charge of the Vehicle Rental Office be higher than a Clerical Specialist II and paid appropriately. We also recommend that this person report directly to Mr. Wehmeyer. The administration of a motor pool that is adequate for a University of this size is no small task and the person in charge of the office should be provided at least part time assistance. Otherwise, we feel that the size and responsibilities of the job will produce a frequent turn-over of personnel which is counter-productive to the continuity and proper administration of such a facility.

5. The University should continue to charge the athletic departments a replacement plus rate while charging less for academic departments. As it does by providing buildings, laboratory equipment etc. for classroom oriented courses, the University should provide equivalent support for field-oriented courses by having adequate number of vehicles available at a less than replacement rental rate, thus subsidizing such courses by assuming a portion of the maintenance and replacement costs of the vehicles.

Rental policies should not change to restrict distances traveled. Many trips are valuable because of the area to which the student or faculty is able to travel; distance restrictions would significantly decrease the value of a motor pool, not enhance it.

A policy for vehicle retirement should be established on a cost-of-maintenance basis, not on a mileage basis. Retirement of some vehicles might be desirable after 60,000 or so miles, while others are still safe and cost efficient at 160,000 miles.

A usage priority should be established that considers usage by the Electrical Shop, Purchasing Office, Housing Office, Admissions Office, Tech Press, Residence Housing Association and similar groups at a very low priority (non reservable). All of the above offices, etc. were on the ledger this past spring as users of motor pool vehicles and are presumed to have reserved the vehicle in advance.

6. The actual implementation of many of the above recommendations is contingent upon the availability of vehicles. The acquisition of a significant number of additional vehicles is central to the solution of many of the problems that we have discovered to exist in the Vehicle Rental Office. As we have pointed out, we feel that to be a major University in the true sense, subsidy of off campus activities is as real a responsibility as the building of classrooms and the purchase and maintenance of items in and for classrooms and laboratory courses. We strongly encourage the University to assume this responsibility by equipping, staffing and maintaining a motor pool (Vehicle Rental Office) adequate to service the needs of the departments and individuals of this Institution. We also encourage the University to do so in a realistic but prompt manner.