



# Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

May 1, 1980

TO: MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Gary S. Elbow, President

SUBJECT: Agenda for Meeting #24, May 7, 1980

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, May 7, 1980 at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

- I. Minutes of the April 9, 1980 meeting
- II. Report from the Committee on Committees:
  - a. Nominations for Faculty Senate Committees for 1980/81
  - b. Reports from University Councils and Committees
- III. Report from the Academic Affairs and Status Committee
- IV. Interim Report from the ad hoc Committee on Academic Freedom
- V. Final report from the ad hoc Committee to Study the Need for Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate
- VI. Reports from Standing Study Committees A and C
- VII. Other Business
- VIII. Announcements
  - A. Excerpts from the Board of Regents minutes, March 28, 1980
  - B. Excerpts from the Academic Council minutes, March 26, 1980
  - C. Correspondence

## Announcements

### A. Excerpts from the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting of March 28, 1980 (Minutes are on file in the Faculty Senate Office)

1. The Board approved the awarding of two honorary degrees from Texas Tech University and one from the Health Sciences Center.
2. The Board approved a request to the legislature for renewed funding for the Junction Center for 1981-82. The proposed request will be for \$150,000 in operating funds and \$75,000 for renovation of the facilities. This request is down \$100,000 from the budget which was vetoed last year by Governor Clements.
3. The Board established a quasi-endowment from Student Use Fee reserves to provide funding for the purchase of instructional equipment. The endowment is eventually expected to reach \$1,000,000.
4. The Board awarded a contract in the amount of \$184,000 to Gailey Construction Company for addition to and renovation of the Jones Stadium offices.
5. The Board approved proceeding with contract documents and receipt of bids on Jones Stadium structural renovation estimated at \$95,000.
6. The Board authorized proceeding with contract documents for the University Center Kitchen renovation.
7. The Board authorized planning working drawings and construction for renovation of the Industrial Engineering Building to house Petroleum Engineering in the amount of \$90,000.
8. The Board discussed but did not take action on the status of the Municipal Coliseum.

### B. Excerpts from the minutes of the Academic Council meeting of March 26, 1980 (Minutes are on file in the Faculty Senate Office)

1. A teleconference was presented which related to the developing national university consortium for telecommunications in teaching. Dr. Mezack explained that the 1980-81 year will be a pilot project for the Maryland based consortium. Texas Tech will have opportunity to preview films and related print materials for a variety of courses which may become available through the consortium. The effort is based on the open-university concept from England modified to American curricula and television assisted courses. Some course material should be available for preview in summer 1980.
2. Dr. Ramsey announced a follow-up assessment of job opportunities for May graduates being conducted by the Coordinating Board. Deans will be asked to supply names and addresses of May graduates for the survey.
3. Deans were asked to consider whether one or more "new" chairpersons should be involved in a summer departmental leadership workshop to be conducted with the assistance of the American Council on Education in Kerrville, July 13-18. Deans should nominate potential participants to Dr. Hardwick's office.

4. Deans were asked to return suggestions for Faculty Handbook revisions or corrections.

C. Correspondence

1. Robert Sweazy, Athletic Council, concerning Senate action and the Athletic Council
2. President Cavazos with regard to concerns of the faculty of Texas Tech
3. President Cavazos enclosing tabulations of the results of a questionnaire sent to the faculty in September 1979 (concerning salaries)
4. Knox Jones, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies with Senate approved nominations for university committees and councils
5. Charles Hardwick, Vice President for Academic Affairs, forwarding the resolution regarding the report "Research in the Mission of the University" which the Senate approved at its April meeting
6. Charles Hardwick, Vice President for Academic Affairs, requesting information on the average salary increase for faculty and the standard deviation of the salary increases as requested by the Senate at its April meeting
7. James E. Brink, Chairperson, Library Committee, thanking him for his report to the Faculty Senate on the activities of the Library Committee

April 25, 1980

Final Report of the ad hoc Committee to Study the Need for Standing  
Committees of the Faculty Senate

The committee met on April 17, 1980, and formulated the following recommendations:

I. Revised Charge to the Faculty Senate Nominations Committee.

Each year at its January meeting, the Committee on Committees shall nominate and the Faculty Senate elect three members, in their last year of service, each from a different college or school of the university to serve as a committee for the purpose of nominating candidates for the Senate offices for the succeeding year. There shall be no less than two nominees for each position. Nominees' names will be presented to the Senate at its February meeting, at which time any nominations from the floor must be made. Elections will be held at the March meeting.

II. Concluding remarks: The Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee to Study the Need for Standing Committees observes a need for a critical and systematic examination of the university standing committee and council structure and operations. It urges the President of the university to undertake such an examination as early in his administration as is convenient.

Committee members: Wendell Aycock, Clarence Bell, Jacq. Collins, Paul Dixon, Gary Elbow, Hong Lee, Louise Luchsinger, Clyde Morganti, and Margaret Wilson

RECOMMENDATIONS OF FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE "A" REGARDING THE FACULTY  
ROLE OF ADVISING FRESHMEN WHO ARE ADMITTED PROVISIONALLY

THE PROBLEM: A significant proportion of entering freshmen are admitted as "provisional" (36% in Fall 1979). The success rate of provisional students has been much lower than that desired. There is a feeling among some of the faculty and administration that the level of advising, both quantity and quality, is not sufficient for the needs of these students.

THE COMMITTEE'S RESPONSE: A cursory check indicated to the members of Committee A that there is, indeed, a great amount of variation in the advising system, and in treatment (if any) of the provisional students.

We understand that at least one committee on campus has the provisional admission of freshmen under study at the present time. Our purpose was only to examine the advising of students admitted provisionally.

After a review of our experiences here, and on other campuses, Committee A engaged in a lengthy discussion with Dr. Rolf Gordhamer, Director of the University Counseling Center, about some of the options which we were considering.

We doubt that the needed counseling by individual departments, divisions and colleges can be accomplished with existing funding and personnel. In addition provisional students have often failed to take advantage of available counseling services. The students that do seek aid often do so only after they are in deep academic trouble and not enough time is available to remedy the situation.

RECOMMENDATION: We move that the Faculty Senate recommend to the Academic Vice President that consideration be given to requiring that all freshmen admitted provisionally be required to complete a credit-granting course of "Academic Development" which would be conducted by the University Counseling Center at, or prior to, the beginning of the students' first semester in the University. Such course would be in addition to those necessary for a degree.

## RECOMMENDATION OF FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE A REGARDING THE PASS-FAIL OPTION

THE PROBLEM: As presented to Committee A, too many students are declaring too many hours of work Pass-Fail, then changing back to a letter grade. There is no restriction on the number of hours a student may declare as P-F at the beginning of a semester. There is too much paper work involved in handling all of the P-F slips. Some students are playing games with P-F for the improvement of the GPA.

### SOME SUGGESTED CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Limit the number of hours which can be declared for P-F grading at the beginning of each semester.
2. Alter the deadlines for declaring P-F and for changing back to letter grade, in order that they do not coincide with the deadlines for withdrawal from courses.
3. Consider the original intent of Pass-Fail which was to encourage students to explore academic areas which they might otherwise avoid.

THE COMMITTEE'S RESPONSE: As we examined the information available, we found that the problem is probably not so much one of students declaring P-F then switching back, because a small proportion of courses once declared P-F are converted to letter grading at the request of the students. For Fall, 1979, the following figures are available:

Total Fall Grades	105,852
Total P-F Requested by Departments	1,569
Total P-F Requested by Students	7,700
Total P-F Grades Requested	9,269
Total Deletions of P-F	549
Total P-F Grades Awarded	8,720

Pass-Fail grades represent 8% of all grades.  
Pass-Fail grading deleted after initiation  
represent 7% of those courses requested by students.

While a number of students may be "playing games" by declaring a number of courses P-F then changing back to a letter grade, and while the number who do this may increase in the future, it appears that the major traffic in Pass-Fail paperwork occurs only at the first deadline and not at the second deadline late in the semester.

However, while the proportion of grades taken P-F is relatively small, it does appear that there are problems on matters about which the committee had no data (e.g., the courses most frequently taken P-F, and the number of hours of P-F taken by individual students). We have requested that the Office of Academic Affairs obtain such information for the committee, but it is not yet available. Some of the problems associated with the use of Pass-Fail appear to be

1. DISTRIBUTION. There are nearly ten thousand slips of paper to be handled and records to be altered, and most of them are probably handled by the College of Arts & Sciences. These courses are undoubtedly not distributed evenly across

the campus, but are in courses required by the university and colleges -- a small number of specific courses.

2. INTENT. It appears somewhat incongruous to require certain courses, then allow students to "get by" in them with the minimum amount of effort and with unsatisfactory performance in those courses.

RECOMMENDATION:

We move that, once the requested data are provided by the Office of Academic Affairs, our report and those data be transmitted to the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Programs Committee for further examination and a specific recommendation on the Pass-Fail grading system. Furthermore, we suggest that they consider reducing the options available under the P-F program.

INTERIM REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE BY THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM  
RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Faculty Handbook Copy

- A. Academic Freedom Definition (see p. 26). Delete the second paragraph and include the following:

Academic freedom presumes a special intellectual climate wherein the exercise of constitutional freedoms is enhanced in order to assure that truth may be pursued in all of its nuances and subjected to the most rigorous tests. Academic freedom applies to both the academic and non-academic performance of researchers, educators and students.

Among the organizational and procedural provisions which are intended to be supportive of academic freedom are:

- a. the tenure system;
  - b. the Standing Committee on Academic Freedom, Privilege, and Tenure;
  - c. the Faculty Senate;
  - d. the Faculty Grievance Panel; and
3. various administrative policies.

The Operating Systems and Procedures Manual contains detailed and updated expressions of these provisions.

B. Tenure Policy References

1. Introductory Statements (see p. 45). Delete paragraphs A, B, and C. [Board of Regents Policy 01-01-15.01 uses the term "faculty member", but the whole issue is better covered by the statements on "Faculty Responsibility" on pp. 34 and 35 making these paragraphs contradictory and redundant.]

2. Purposes of Tenure (see pp. 45-6). In purpose (4) after "and full", add "expression and"; after "citizens", change "in the community" to "of academic and non-academic communities".

3. Admission to Tenure (see p. 47). Change to "The Standing Committee on Academic Freedom, Privilege, and Tenure". Add the following paragraph: Committee responsibilities include the development and transmittal of recommendations pertaining to academic freedom, privilege, and tenure.

- C. Visiting Speaker Policy (see p. 51). In the second paragraph delete all after the second sentence (beginning with "It is the policy of this Board") and substitute the following: Access to speak within the physical confines of Texas Tech University shall not be denied on the basis of content or fear of violence or disruption unless it can be said with assurance, based on prior recent acts of the speaker, that the speaker will engage in activity directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action, and likely to produce such action.



## II. Faculty Grievance Panel

(see Operating System and Procedures Manual, Document B-9.1.3.8--subject to inclusion in the forthcoming edition of the Faculty Handbook).

I. Purpose--bracketed exceptions. Change to: except those grievances more properly related to the purview of the Standing Committee on Academic Freedom, Privilege, and Tenure.

---

### It Will Be Moved:

1. That the Senate adopt these recommendations as its own;
2. That these recommendations be transmitted to the Tenure and Privilege Committee with a request for a concurrent resolution; and
3. That these recommendations be transmitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a request for appropriate representations to the President of the University and to the Board of Regents, and for subsequent instructions which will cause these recommendations to be incorporated into relevant documents (The Policies of the Board of Regents, The Faculty Handbook, and The Operating Systems and Procedures Manual).

Charles Dale  
Robert P. Davidow  
Roger C. Schaefer  
William A. Stewart, Chairperson