

Minutes

Faculty Senate Meeting # 23

April 9, 1980

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 9, 1980, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Gary Elbow, president, presiding. Senators present were Adamcik, Anderson, Aycock, Bell, Blackburn, Blaisdell, Brittin, Collins, Dale, Dixon, Eissinger, Filgo, Ford, Gipson, Gundersen, Harris, Higdon, Hunter, Kellogg, Kimmel, Lee, L. Luchsinger, V. Luchsinger, McDonald, McGowan, McGuire, McLaughlin, McPherson, Masten, Oberhelman, Pearson, Rylander, Sanders, Sasser, Schoen, M. Smith, R. Smith, Sowell, Stewart, Stoune, Troub, Volz, Wagner, Walkup, and Williams. Gillis and Morris were absent because of other university business. Allen, Finn and White were absent and Shine is on Faculty Development Leave.

Guests included Len Ainsworth, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; Arnold Gully, Associate Vice President, Office of Research Services; Robert Siedel, Parliamentarian; Donna Rand, University Daily; Ruthanne Brockway, Avalanche Journal; and Jim Brink, Library Committee.

SUMMARY OF BUSINESS TRANSACTED

The Faculty Senate

1. Adopted a resolution introduced by Tom McLaughlin concerning "The Gully Report"
2. Reviewed a proposal for Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate and moved to adopt the proposal, but requested that the ad hoc Committee to Study the Need for Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate revise the charge of the Nominations Committee
3. Moved that the newly created Faculty Status & Welfare Committee decide how to disburse the money in the Faculty Development Fund
4. Voted not to adopt the resolution reiterating the Senate's concern for the establishment of a university media center
5. Heard a report from the Chairperson of the Library Committee; moved that the Faculty Senate request that the Library Committee interview the major administrative personnel and the divisional heads and coordinators of the Library during the 1980-81 academic year; and thanked Jim Brink, Chairperson of the Library Committee, for his report
6. Heard an interim report from the ad hoc Committee on Academic Freedom.

Elbow called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and said that he would limit debate on each agenda item to ten minutes and that this time limit could be extended by majority vote of the Senate. He then welcomed the guests present.

I. MINUTES OF THE MARCH 12, 1980 MEETING

Schoen moved the approval of the Faculty Senate minutes of March 12, 1980. The motion carried.

II. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - Dixon

Dixon moved the approval of the slate of nominees for membership on the Protection of Human Subjects Committee, Radiation & Laser Safety Committee, Biosafety Committee, and Warm Blooded Animals Committee. The motion carried.

Dixon then moved the election of the persons named to serve on three ad hoc committees: the ad hoc committee to Select Faculty to Attend Out-of-Town Football Games, Robert Albin, Lotus Blackwell, Valerie Chamberlain, Richard Dudek, John Gilliam, Marilyn Phelan, and Gerald Skogg; the ad hoc Institutional Resource Allocation Data Base Committee, Stephen Thomas, Nelson Dometrius, and Raymond Smead; the ad hoc Committee to Investigate Texas Tech University's Compliance with Southwest Conference Rules, William Conroy, J. William Davis, (retired Tech professor), Owen Caskey, James Eissinger, Mary Owens, and Peggy Williams as a reserve member. Dixon's motion to elect the above-named persons to the ad hoc committees carried.

III. A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE "GULLY REPORT" - McLaughlin

McLaughlin moved to amend the title of the resolution to "A Resolution." The amendment carried. He then moved the adoption of the following resolution.

WHEREAS, it seems virtually indisputable that high-quality research is crucial to a bright future for Texas Tech; and

WHEREAS, we are clearly beginning to generate such work in substantial quantity under existing administrative structures; and

WHEREAS, the existing Deans' Committees that currently review recommendations for tenure and promotion are presumed to pass judgment on records of research; and

WHEREAS, it is obviously difficult for an individual not expert in a given field to judge the research potential of a prospective faculty member in the field; and

WHEREAS, it is very much a matter of dispute whether every high aim of the university requires a separate layer of middle management to bring about its realization;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Texas Tech University supports, endorses, and commends to the Academic Council and to the administration as a whole each of the following two statements:

- I. The university needs and desires ever-better research, which is mainly to say, ever-better faculty and opportunities commensurate to the abilities of the faculty.
- II. The university does not necessarily need, and should not necessarily establish, a new layer of administration, "for research," to be interposed between a Dean and his/her college.

A Resolution Concerning the "Gully Report" continued.....

Gully spoke briefly, saying that the future of the university depends upon research progress and that the "research climate" on this campus is not what it should be. He said that the university must do something to make it more attractive for faculty to engage in research.

Stewart moved that item I. be amended by the addition of "and opportunities commensurate to the abilities of the faculty." Stewart's amendment carried.

Discussion of the resolution exceeded the ten minute time limit and Bell moved that the time for debate of the issue be extended. The motion to extend debate failed.

The resolution, as amended, was adopted.

IV. PROPOSAL FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Elbow referred to the Proposed Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate which was circulated with the agenda and explained that the first three committees listed--the Elections Committee, the Committee on Committees, and the Standing Study Committees A, B, & C--would be retained in their present form and that this proposal would create five new committees. The proposed new committees are the Nominations Committee, the Undergraduate Programs Committee, the Graduate Programs Committee, the Budget Study Committee, and the Faculty Status & Welfare Committee. The later would replace the Academic Affairs and Status Committee which is now a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. (see appendix)

R. Smith moved that the Senate consider this agenda item as a package. Several senators asked questions concerning the various proposed committees. Debate exceeded the ten minute limit and Stewart moved to extend the time for discussion. Stewart's motion carried.

Gundersen moved to amend the charge of the Nominations Committee to allow for a longer lapse of time between nominations and the election of Senate Officers. R. Smith moved (as a substitute for Gundersen's amendment) that the charge of the Nominations Committee be referred back to the ad hoc Committee to Study the Need for Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate for revision so that it might reflect Gundersen's proposed amendment. Smith's motion carried.

The motion to adopt the remainder of the proposal carried.

V. PROPOSAL FOR AN AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS - Elbow

Elbow introduced the agenda item and called for a motion for its adoption. Oberhelman moved the adoption of the following proposal:

Proposal for an ad hoc Committee on Faculty Development Funds continued.....

ad hoc Committee on Faculty Development Funds

Charge: To develop permanent guidelines and structure for the disbursement of funds placed in the Faculty Development Fund of the University.

Membership: Five current members of the Faculty Senate.

Elbow explained that this ad hoc committee would determine how the \$1500 given to the faculty by the Ex-Students Association is to be used. Schoen spoke against the establishment of such a committee and suggested that the Faculty Senate Officers should make the decision of how this fund would be disbursed.

Kimmel offered a substitute motion which would refer the decision of disbursement of these funds to the Faculty Status & Welfare Committee. Kimmel's motion carried.

VI. RESOLUTION REITERATING THE SENATE'S CONCERN FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNIVERSITY MEDIA CENTER - Pearson

WHEREAS: the selection of a director for the proposed university media center was deferred,

WHEREAS: \$300,000 has been allocated for instructional equipment for 1980-81, and \$250,000 was allocated for 1979-80,

WHEREAS: the Board of Regents at its meeting of March 28, 1980, established a quasi-endowment to support the purchase of instructional equipment for the university, and

WHEREAS: the Faculty Senate at its meeting of April 4, 1979, passed a resolution endorsing and urging the expeditious establishment of a university media center,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate convey to the President of Texas Tech University its concern for the establishment of a university media center at the earliest possible date and reiterate the statements made in its earlier resolution.

After discussion the motion to adopt the resolution failed by a vote of seventeen for and nineteen against,

VII. REPORT FROM THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE - Jim Brink

At the request of the Senate, James Brink, Chairperson of the Library Committee, appeared before the Senate to explain something about the work of that committee. He reported on the Library Committee's responsibilities and procedures, its recent operations and new projects, and some of its chronic problems. Brink was particularly concerned about the Library Committee's inability to have an impact upon large projects. Too often, he said, the committee is presented with plans in the final stages and is asked to do nothing more than simply approve them.

Report from the Library Committee continued.....

Brink said the committee tends to communicate with the director of the Library only and perhaps communication on a broader basis with Library personnel might bring about a better understanding of the functions and problems of the Library.

McGowan moved that the Faculty Senate request that the University Library Committee interview the major administrative personnel and the divisional heads and coordinators of the Tech Library during the 1980-81 academic year, and that the committee include its principal findings in its final report for that year. He moved, further, that the Faculty Senate recommend that the Library Committee inquire primarily about the Library's systems and services, but that the committee not exclude other matters if preliminary findings would suggest a broader inquiry. The motion carried.

VIII. INTERIM REPORT FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM - Stewart

Stewart said that results of the questionnaire sent out earlier by the committee was still being tabulated and that recommendations concluded from those tabulations would be circulated with the agenda of the next meeting.

IX. REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE STANDING STUDY COMMITTEE "A" - R. Smith

Smith said that he had no report at this time and that he would report the committee's recommendations at the May meeting.

X. REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE "B" - Sanders

Sanders said that the initial report of this committee included three recommendations concerning the academic calendar which have already been implemented and no Senate action is needed on this agenda item.


XI. OTHER BUSINESS

Bell moved that the Vice President for Academic Affairs be requested to furnish the following information to the Senators at the next meeting:

- 1) What is the average salary increase for continuing faculty this year (overall)?
- 2) What is the standard deviation of that figure?

The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.


Wendell Aycock, Secretary
Faculty Senate

Appendix

PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

I. Elections Committee*

II. Committee on Committees*

III. Standing Study Committees A, B, & C*

IV. Nominations Committee

Charge: At the February 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. There shall be no less than two nominees for each position. This procedure does not preclude nominations from the floor.

V. Undergraduate Programs

Charge: To evaluate and recommend to the Senate action involving undergraduate programs. This will include but not be restricted to matters such as undergraduate program additions and deletions, undergraduate degree requirements, and academic standards.

Operating Procedures: The committee shall develop its own operating procedures, subject to the approval of the Faculty Senate. Faculty members will serve one year terms corresponding with the terms of Faculty Senators and may be reappointed.

Structure: The committee shall be composed of six (6) faculty members, at least four of whom, including the chair, must be members of the Faculty Senate, representing each college of the university with undergraduate degree programs.

VI. Graduate Programs

Charge: To evaluate and recommend to the Senate action involving graduate programs. This will include but not be restricted to matters such as graduate program additions and deletions, graduate degree requirements, academic standards, and standards for admission to the graduate faculty of the university.

Operating Procedures: The committee shall develop its own operating procedures, subject to the approval of the Faculty Senate. Faculty members will serve one year terms corresponding with the terms of Faculty Senators and may be reappointed.

Structure: The committee shall be composed of seven (7) graduate faculty members, at least four (4) of whom, including the chair, must be members of the Faculty Senate, representing each college of the university and the School of Law.

VII. Budget Study Committee

Charge: To study and report to the Senate on matters related to the budget of the university. This committee is not charged with making recommendations relating directly to budget allocations during the time the budget is being formulated. It is instructed to initiate investigations and report to the Senate on any inconsistencies, mis-allocations, re-allocations, oversights, or other budgetary items which it believes will be of interest or concern to the faculty of the university, in order that the Senate may make timely recommendations to the administration regarding the budgeting process.

Operating Procedures: The committee shall develop its own operating procedures, subject to the approval of the Faculty Senate. Faculty members will serve one year terms corresponding with the terms of Faculty Senators and may be reappointed.

Structure: The committee shall be composed of seven (7) faculty members, at least four (4) of whom, including the chair, must be members of the Faculty Senate.

VIII. Faculty Status and Welfare Committee

Charge: To investigate and recommend to the Senate on matters relating to the status and welfare of the faculty, including but not restricted to salaries, fringe benefits, working conditions, teaching loads, standards for promotion, tenure, and merit pay, and evaluation of deans, departmental chairpersons, and other administrative personnel.

Operating Procedures: The committee shall develop its own operating procedures, subject to approval of the Faculty Senate. Faculty members will serve one year terms corresponding with the terms of Faculty Senators and may be reappointed.

Structure: The committee shall be composed of seven (7) faculty members, at least four (4) of whom, including the chair, must be members of the Faculty Senate.

*Existing committees of the Faculty Senate which will be retained in their present form.

The committee structure proposed above will replace the existing standing committee structure of the Faculty Senate, thus eliminating the Academic Affairs and Status Committee. If approved, the new committees will begin their work with the new term of the Faculty Senate, May 12, 1980.