



Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

May 8, 1981

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Roland E. Smith, President
SUBJECT: Agenda for meeting #33, May 13, 1981

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, May 13, 1981 at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

I. Minutes of the April 8, 1981 meeting

II. Old Business

Financial Exigency Regulations - Stewart
(see amended version enclosed)

III. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Institutional Resource Data Base - Dometrius

IV. Committee Reports

A. Budget Study Committee - Vince Luchsinger

B. Committee on Committees - Masten

C. Undergraduate Programs Committee - Newcomb

V. Assignment of Task to Committee C

VI. Election results

VII. Other Business

VIII. Announcements

A. Academic Council Minutes

B. Correspondence

PROPOSED FINANCIAL EXIGENCY REGULATION

(Amended from the original presented to the Senate in February by the Faculty Status & Welfare Committee. Suggested deletions are in brackets and new portions are underlined)

The following regulation sets out the procedures to be followed if the University should be afflicted by a decline in resources of sufficient magnitude to mandate [a change in the size of its operation] reductions in its operations.

1. The President of the University, on determining that there probably exists a condition of financial exigency, will initiate the creation of a five-member advisory committee: [two members] one member of the Faculty Senate chosen by the Faculty Senate; one member of the Standing Committee on Tenure and Privilege [Committee] chosen by that committee; one member of the Faculty Budget Study Committee chosen by that committee; one member of the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee chosen by that committee; and the Vice President for Finance and Administration.
2. This advisory committee will, after reviewing all relevant material and data, including current and proposed University budgets, give the President a written report on the financial status of the University, including its judgment as to whether the University is facing a condition of financial exigency. Copies of this report will be given to the Faculty Senate and the Academic Council.
3. The President, on the basis of the advisory committee's report, will make a report and an initiating recommendation to the Board of Regents.
4. The Board of Regents will, on the basis of the President's report and if it deems it necessary, declare that a financial emergency exists in the University.
5. At a called meeting of a University faculty and staff, the President will report the existence and the extent of the financial emergency. At this meeting the President will also report the reductions in administrative and support [staff and] functions (capital outlay, operations and staff), short of reductions in faculty, that have been or are proposed to be made. He will also charge the members of the University community to formulate, individually and in peer groups, proposals which might effect appropriate savings, and to submit those proposals to the advisory committee described in the next section.
6. The President of the University will effect the selection of a second advisory committee of [five] seven members: two members of the Faculty Senate chosen by the Senate; one member of the Standing Committee on Tenure and Privilege [Committee] chosen by that committee; one member of the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee chosen by that committee; one member of the Faculty Budget Study Committee chosen by that committee; the Associate Vice President for Administrative Services; and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. No member of the first advisory committee shall be a member of this second advisory committee.
7. The second advisory committee and the President of the University will draft a proposal for meeting the financial emergency, proposing reductions in or elimination of specific functions, programs or academic units of the University and specifying the budget and faculty (FTE) of each college and school for the next academic year.
8. The President will submit the plan to the Faculty Senate and to the Academic Council for their comments and advice.

9. The President will then present the plan to a [second] meeting of all University faculty and [listen and] give [serious] further consideration to the faculty's recommendations and advice.
10. The President will then present his final plan to the Board of Regents for its approval.
11. The Presidnet will then direct the deans and directors to work out detailed plans either to effect specific [reductions] changes already mandated or to work out the details of general [reductions] changes that might be required.
12. Deans and directors, following consultations with chairpersons of departments and area coordinators, will determine the [programs to be reduced or abolished] changes to be effected and [the faculty] positions to be eliminated in the units they administer.
13. [The faculty in each department or area will review that department or area and report to the deans the names of faculty members to be terminated or resigned.] Chairpersons and coordinators will develop their recommendations in consultation with the faculties of the respective units.
14. If the department or area review and [reporting of names] recommendation is not forthcoming after a reasonable period of time, the dean shall make recommendations on [the department's or area's] behalf of the department or area not reporting.
15. The deans will then convene [his] area and department chairpersons for their comments and advice on the proposed [terminations or assignments] changes.
16. The deans will then submit their plans to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
17. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will review the deans' plans and submit to the President a comprehensive plan.
18. After review and acceptance of the plan submitted, the President will order appropriate action.
19. Any termination notices given to faculty members will comply with the deadlines for termination written in the Tenure Policy.
20. Tenured faculty members should be terminated only in rare instances, either after all non-tenured faculty have been released or where the long-range needs of the program concerned demand that non-tenured faculty members be retained and then only after this has been substantiated by documentation.
21. Retraining and reassignment of tenured faculty members within the University will be done wherever possible, the cost of appropriate training being borne by the University.
22. If the administration issues notice to a particular tenured faculty member of an intention to reassign or terminate the appointment because of financial exigency, the faculty member will have the right to a full hearing before a committee of five faculty members selected on the same basis as the special hearing committee specified in Article VI of the Tenure Policy. Such hearing will observe all

Proposed Financial Exigency Regulation

Page 3

essentials of an on-the-record adjudicative hearing. The issues in this hearing may include:

- a. The existence and extent of the condition of financial exigency. The burden will rest on the administration to prove the existence and extent of the condition. The findings of the committee in a previous proceeding involving the same issue may be introduced.
 - b. The validity of the educational judgments and the criteria for identification for termination or reassignment; but the recommendations of a faculty body on these matters will be considered presumptively valid.
 - c. Whether the criteria are being properly applied in the individual case.
23. If an appointment is terminated as a result of procedures instituted because of the need for faculty reduction resulting from financial exigency, the position of the released faculty member will, within a period of three academic years after the termination becomes effective, be filled by another person only after the released faculty member has been offered reappointment to it.

REPORT OF THE BUDGET STUDY COMMITTEE

The Budget Study Committee met over the year to study the financial situation of the library. Our findings boil down to:

1. The library budget has had modest increases.
2. Inflation is seriously eroding the purchasing power of the library, especially in the accession of materials.
3. Line items in the library have supported the Law School library for a number of years. This was originally done in the founding years of the Law School, and those items persist. It was claimed that those funds of about \$200,000 might someday be recovered for the main library, but seemed implanted for the present.
4. The Southwest collection is supported by the library, but no alternative source of support exists at the present to replace that aid from library budget.
5. The library is committed to a process of computerized cataloging. While we were skeptical, this plan appears to be financed by a no-interest loan from the administration to be amortized by library savings from the shutdown of support for the manual card catalog. This plan will give TTU a first-rate capability for cataloging and search, if all goes as planned (an assumption which often goes awry in computerization processes).
6. The library has already been assisted by special funding supplements by the administration.
7. The library personnel were most helpful and cooperative in our deliberations.
8. In summary, we find no suggestions which would enhance the library funding at present, except to look into 3 & 4 above.

In addition, our committee looked into the proposal for early retirement of qualified faculty who would be able to teach part-time and effectively retain the same total income from retirement and part-time teaching. This was thought to be able to free faculty teaching moneys for raises and new hires. Needless to say, we found that policies existed which appeared to negate the possibility of such a step.

V. P. Luchsinger, (s)

Chairperson

April 30, 1981

REPORT OF THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS COMMITTEE: On the Pass/Fail System.

The committee was charged by the Senate on May 7, 1980 to "make further examination and a specific recommendation on the Pass/Fail grading system," and to "consider reducing the options available under the Pass/Fail program." It began its work after the Academic Affairs office provided data on pass/fail grading, and this was tabulated by course. The committee met on January 26, February 2, March 30, and April 13. It reported earlier to the Senate on a related matter. The committee considered the data from Academic Affairs and the report of the 1976 ad hoc committee on pass/fail grading. It polled the faculty.

It recommends that the current pass/fail policy be supplemented by the following further restrictions. These should be added to the Catalog in the section on Academic Regulations, subsection on Pass/Fail Option.

- Students may not take either English 131 or English 132 pass/fail.
- Students may take no more than three hours of required American history pass/fail.
- Students may take no more than three hours of required political science pass/fail.
- Students shall consult with their academic advisors before declaring pass/fail, and obtain signed approval from advisors on the declaration form.

These recommendations are largely based on the faculty poll. 305 faculty members replied to the 950 questionnaires mailed out. A majority (161) voted to retain the present maximum of 13 hours. A plurality voted for the present maximum of 9 hours for general degree requirements; a slight majority (155-146) favored some reduction here. Respondents from three colleges were heavily in favor of continuing the maximum as it is. The finding of the 1976 ad hoc committee that to prohibit taking general degree requirements pass/fail would be unfair to students in some programs seems to have considerable support. The committee thus turned to the recommendation of prohibiting certain basic courses from being taken pass/fail. 103 respondents wished to prohibit all general degree requirements from being taken pass/fail, and an additional 121 wished to apply this to English 131-132. The committee concurred with this landslide. While 75 respondents wished to apply a like restriction to American history, and 71 to political science, the committee took into account that three colleges opposed such a restriction, and that students from some programs would then have perhaps no opportunity to take courses pass/fail. Thus the partial restriction appeared a good compromise. 198 respondents favored advisors' approval for taking a course pass/fail.

The committee also recommends that the above restrictions, if they can be considered in time by the administration, be applicable to new students entering the university in Fall 1981.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Newcomb, Chair
Marvin Cepica
Davis Clements
W. J. Conover
Martha Logan
Duane Christian
Mary Owens

Agenda item VIII.

B. Correspondence continued.....

4. Lauro F. Cavazos, President TTU, thanking him for seeing the delegation from the Senate regarding the matter of the jurisdiction of the Tenure and Privilege Committee and conveying to him the figures comparing the number of faculty members who voted in the 1980 election for representatives on the Faculty Senate and on the Tenure and Privilege Committee with the number of persons voting in the state elections.
5. Professor James R. McDonald, Chairperson, Faculty Senate Standing Study Committee C, asking that committee to examine the feasibility of retaining legal counsel by the faculty.
6. Lauro F. Cavazos, President TTU, informing him of the elections which are underway to fill the vacancies on the Tenure and Privilege Committee.
7. Lauro F. Cavazos, President TTU, concerning the resolution adopted by the Senate at the April meeting which states ..."that it is the opinion of the Faculty Senate that the President's failure to refer the matter of a finding of probable cause by the former Tenure and Privilege Committee to a special hearing panel is in violation of the University tenure policy."

Agenda item VIII.

A. Selected items from minutes of the Academic Council meeting on April 14, 1981

1. A discussion of possible new programs, actions or activities, which would promote minority faculty recruitment was held. This information will be incorporated into the University's report to the Governor's Special Committee relating to Equal Higher Educational Opportunity Planning.
2. Deans were encouraged to remind search committees within their colleges to follow the checklist, which is part of the affirmative action plan, and to maintain faculty employment records specified in these documents.
3. There was general agreement that encouragement of provisional students to enroll during the summer would be a good idea. Conroy will develop a letter for use at summer orientation conferences this summer.
4. President Cavazos provided a report on the legislative status of next year's budget. Since the final budget may not be available until June, it will be necessary to initiate the budget planning process with the use of approximate figures.
5. Merit salary increase guidelines for eligible non-faculty employees were distributed. Personnel transaction forms resulting from these adjustments should be returned to the Office of Academic Affairs no later than April 22, 1981.
6. Plans for updating the Five Year Data Processing Plan were presented to the deans. Departmental and college responses to a survey instrument, which will be distributed shortly, will be used as a basis for this plan update.

B. Correspondence

The following letters have been sent from the Senate Office since those which were reported at the last meeting.

1. Senators E. L. Short and W. E. "Pete" Snelson in support of the proposed 27.4% pay raise for Texas faculty members in the first year of the next biennium, and at least 12.6% in the second year.
2. Professors Ben Newcomb, Rod Schoen and Gary Elbow thanking them for their work on the Special Senate Committee to Conference with President Cavazos Regarding The Tenure and Privilege Committee.
3. C. Len Ainsworth, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, recommending that he consult with the Committee on Committees of the Faculty Senate before making appointments to a committee to deal with the general review of the tenure policy. (Copy to President Cayazos)