

Minutes  
Faculty Senate  
Meeting # 39  
February 10, 1982

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, February 10, 1982, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Benjamin H. Newcomb, President, presiding. Senators present were Anderson, Bacon, Benson, Berlin, Biggers, Brink, Burkhardt, Cepica, Clements, Cochran, Cummings, Elbow, Filgo, Freeman, Gilbert, Gipson, Graves, Harris, Hickerson, Hill, Horridge, Keho, Malloy, Masten, Maynard, Moreland, Nelson, Owens, Pearson, Rude, Schoen, Smith, Sowell, Tan, Urban, Volz, Williams, Wilson and Zyla. Senators Conover, Kimmel, Kunhardt, Mogan and Stewart were absent because of university business. Senators Blaisdell, Chonko, Denham, and Hudson were absent.

Guests included Dr. John R. Darling, Vice-President for Academic Affairs; Ernest Sullivan, Parliamentarian; Preston Lewis, University News and Publications; Professors William J. Mayer-Oakes and Donald T. Dietz and representatives from the University Daily, the Avalanche Journal and the television media.

#### SUMMARY OF BUSINESS CONDUCTED

At its February 10, 1982 meeting the Faculty Senate:

1. heard a report from the Nominating Committee;
2. approved a slate of nominees of persons to serve on the Energy Usage and Conservation Committee;
3. heard a report from Senate Standing Study Committees A and B and from the Faculty Status & Welfare Committee;
4. discussed the revision of the Tenure Policy;
5. discussed faculty participation in commencement;
6. referred to the Undergraduate Programs Committee the Student Senate's resolution requesting a change in grade point average and designation of Deans' Honor Lists;
7. proposed a meeting to resolve the problems in regard to Library photocopying;
8. discussed procedures in organizational review and possible reorganization of the College of Arts and Sciences;
9. instructed the President of the Senate to write to Dr. John R. Darling, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, thanking him for accepting the recommendations of the Tenure Policy Review Committee;
10. heard a brief report from Lewis Hill, Chairperson of the Faculty Benefits and Retirement Committee concerning health insurance policies and costs.

Newcomb called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. and recognized guests.

#### I. MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 20, 1982 MEETING

Schoen moved the minutes be accepted as distributed. The motion passed.

II. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE - Masten

Masten, Chairperson, submitted the following slate of nominees for Senate approval.

PRESIDENT

Dr. Patricia B. Horridge  
Clothing & Textiles

Dr. Virginia M. Sowell  
College of Education

SECRETARY

Dr. Marvin Cepica  
Ag. Education

Dr. Lloyd V. Urban  
Water Resources

VICE-PRESIDENT

Dr. Neale J. Pearson  
Political Science

Cliff H. Keho  
Civil Engineering

The President then asked for nominations from the floor. None were made. Faculty Senate officers for 1982-1983 will be elected at the March 1982 Senate meeting.

III. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - Malloy

Malloy reported that the Committee on Committees had selected the slate of nominees for the Energy Usage and Conservation Committee and moved Senate approval of the slate of nominees. Those nominated were Lane K. Anderson, Business Administration; Donald L. Gustafson, Electrical Engineering; Bruce M. Kramer, School of Law; Cora McKown, Home Economics; and Richard W. Tock, Chemical Engineering. Otto B. Schacht, Engineering Technology and Gerald Skoog, College of Education were nominated as alternates to serve on the committee. The slate of nominees was approved.

IV. REPORTS OF THE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES A and B and FACULTY STATUS & WELFARE COMMITTEE

Committee A - Chairperson Robert Moreland said this committee will have a report for the next Senate meeting.

Committee B - Chairperson Keho reported that this committee is studying the matter of the call for applications for mini-development grants and will report sometime after its next meeting which is scheduled for March 8, 1982.

Faculty Status & Welfare Committee - Nelson, Chairperson, said that the committee had considered the proposal that the Faculty Senate offices in Holden Hall be remodeled to provide a new meeting place for the Faculty Senate and had decided not to recommend this proposal to the Faculty Senate. The Committee decided that before going further with this matter it would like to hear from the Senate as to whether it actually wants to move its meeting place. So far, only one Senator has expressed a desire to move the meeting place.

The Faculty Status & Welfare Committee will review the Faculty Handbook now being revised, Nelson said.

#### V. DISCUSSION OF THE TENURE POLICY

At this point in the meeting Newcomb, President of the Faculty Senate, asked to insert as the next item of business discussion of the proposed revision of the tenure policy. The Senate gave its unanimous consent to this request. Newcomb read from a letter received from Vice-President Darling regarding the status of the Tenure Policy Review: "After listening to the expression of faculty concern at the recent Tenure Policy Proposal Hearings and reviewing the recommendations of the Tenure Policy Review Committee, it would appear that at this point further work needs to be done in order to evolve the revised tenure policy document that is consistent with the goals of the faculty and the administration. As the next step I have asked the Tenure Policy Review Committee, chaired by Dr. Wm. B. Conroy, to prepare a new revision of the Tenure Policy based upon their report of last September and on additional comments and information the committee has received at this time. Please express my appreciation to the Senate for its interest and concern in this matter." Newcomb said the revised Tenure Policy is now being considered by the Tenure Policy Review Committee, working from a document they developed in July 1981. A copy of the July 1981 document is in the Senate office, and Dr. Conroy has said that his committee would welcome comments from anyone interested. This is not a substitute for formal faculty consideration, but is meant to provide additional input for the committee. The report of the Tenure Policy Review Committee to Vice-President Darling, made subsequent to the recent hearings, will also be available in the Senate office for anyone to read.

Newcomb said the matter of procedures subsequent to these recent developments is still "up in the air." In a recent meeting with Dr. Darling, Newcomb said that he had presented the Faculty Senate's "best case" for the procedures which were recommended at the last meeting in regard to what steps should be followed when the Tenure Policy Review Committee makes its report. Dr. Darling informed him at that time that this matter had not been settled. When questioned during the Senate meeting, Dr. Darling responded that nothing had changed in this regard. President Cavazos plans to determine further procedures after the Tenure Policy Review Committee makes its report, Darling said.

Brink moved that the Faculty Senate instruct its president to pursue with President Cavazos immediate implementation of the procedures for adopting a revised tenure policy. The motion passed.

#### VI. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION INITIATED AT JANUARY 20 MEETING, IN RE: "RELATIVELY LIMITED FACULTY PARTICIPATION" AT FALL COMMENCEMENT

Newcomb said that the matter of commencement, generally, is being considered by the Convocations Committee and the Administrative Council and the possibility of a reworking of the entire ceremony is under consideration. The matter for discussion in the Senate is Dr. Darling's earlier expression of concern about the lack of attendance of faculty members at the Fall Commencement. Schoen moved that the Faculty Senate go on record as "believing that it is appropriate for the administration to take steps to encourage faculty participation in commencement and to devise procedures for ensuring appropriate participation." Clements, Sowell, and Owens spoke in agreement with Schoen's motion. Brink pointed out that there seems to be a difference in opinion as to whether or not faculty attendance at the Fall Commencement was poor. Schoen's motion passed.

VII. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION FROM STUDENT SENATE REQUESTING CHANGE IN GRADE POINT AVERAGE AND DESIGNATION OF DEANS' HONOR LIST

Mark Henderson, President, Student Association, presented the following resolution to the Faculty Senate and addressed the Senate, giving the history of reasons for the Student Senate's resolution and requesting Faculty Senate cooperation and support of this resolution.

Whereas, The Administrative Council of Texas Tech University has established a 3.5 GPA as requirement for the Dean's Honor Roll; and

Whereas, This proposal could have a negative impact on motivation; and

Whereas, Texas Tech University should establish a distinguished Dean's List for students who have achieved a 3.75 to 4.0 GPA, and a Dean's List for those students achieving a 3.25 to 3.74 GPA; now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Student Senate of Texas Tech University strongly recommends the implementation of this proposal; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Dr. Lauro Cavazos, President of Texas Tech University; Dr. John Darling, Vice President of Academic Affairs; Dr. Carl Stem, Dean of Business Administration; Dr. Robert Anderson, Dean of Education; Dr. John Bradford, Dean of Engineering; Dr. Samuel Curl, Dean of Agriculture; Dr. Lawrence Graves, Dean of Arts and Sciences; and Dr. Bess Haley, Dean of Home Economics.

Cochran moved Senate endorsement of the resolution and commitment to a Senate study committee for further consideration. Pearson presented data on high grades and students taking fewer than 12 hours and suggested that Senators should consider this information as they study the Student Senate's resolution. Anderson, Wilson, Nelson, and Mark Henderson discussed various aspects of this issue. The motion passed and was referred to the Undergraduate Programs Committee, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate.

VIII. CONSIDERATION OF RESPONSE OF DR. DARLING ON QUESTION OF LIBRARY PHOTOCOPYING

The Agenda Committee proposed that a meeting be arranged by the Senate office which will result in firm agreements that will solve the problems in regard to Library photocopying. Participants should be Vice-President Payne, Vice-President Darling, Ex-Students' Executive Director Dean, Library Committee Chairperson Ronald Galyean, and two senators to be chosen by the Senate at the February meeting.

Schoen moved that the Agenda Committee's proposal be accepted by the Senate. Smith moved to amend the Agenda Committee's proposal to include the name of James Brink as one of the two Senators. Smith's amendment to the motion passed. Hill moved to further amend the Agenda Committee's original proposal by having the President of the Faculty Senate appoint the second Senator to attend the meeting. Hill's motion passed. The Agenda Committee's proposal as amended passed.

IX. DISCUSSION OF PROCEDURES IN RE: ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW AND POSSIBLE REORGANIZATION  
OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Elbow said that he was concerned with the tendency of the administration to appoint ad hoc committees to study new issues and to ignore established faculty committees such as university committees and the Faculty Senate. Another matter of concern is the administration's tendency to present proposals through these ad hoc procedures with very short time periods for faculty to consider the issues and formulate responses. He gave as an example the fact that the Advisory Committee to Review the Organization of the College of Arts and Sciences has been told that its work must be completed within two months. Wilson questioned the importance of the committee concluding its work in such a short period of time. Darling replied giving several reasons: 1) previously collected data regarding some of these issues was already available to the committee; 2) the committee was able to conclude its work quickly and did not feel the need for more time; and 3) the need for lead time on getting any re-organization in place by Fall 1983.

Tan, a member of the ad hoc committee, stated that the Committee felt adequate time and material were available. Wilson, Burkhardt, and Darling discussed the matter further.

Smith addressed the issue of the use of ad hoc committees and said that it might be appropriate for the faculty to suggest that it is dissatisfied with having an ad hoc committee form each time something new comes up to be dealt with.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

Elbow quoted from the minutes of a recent meeting of the deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, "The Academic Vice-President has announced the University is to limit its FTE to 1100, currently operating at 1115, and the college at the moment has been reduced to 640 for next year, 10 below current..." Elbow questioned the rationale for determining FTE and why the administration feels it is necessary to reduce FTE at this time. Darling responded that Elbow's information was not accurate and that the communication to the Academic Council was that Fall 1981 was technically budgeted for 1124 FTE. Assuming that enrollments are to stay reasonably low, we will be budgeting at 1124 FTE for Fall 1982. The 1100 figure came into the discussion of faculty ratio. It is the feeling that FTE should not be increased in the University in a time in which enrollments are reasonably low. Dr. Darling noted the possibility of reallocation within the University, but FTE for the University will be the same in 1982-1983 as in 1981-1982 with no reduction.

Owens moved that the Senate instruct its president, on behalf of the faculty, to write a letter to Dr. Darling thanking him for accepting the recommendations of the Tenure Policy Review Committee on tenure and promotion. The motion passed.

Cochran, referring to an agenda item under "announcements" indicating that the Faculty Benefits and Retirement Committee has tabulated its poll of the faculty, asked that Professor Hill, Chairperson of that committee, inform the Senate of some of the results of that poll. Hill responded that a health insurance bid with two options seems desirable. The first is a \$100 deductible standard comprehensive policy with the \$100

Minutes

Faculty Senate Meeting #39

February 10, 1982

Page 6.

Other business continued.....

deductible waived with every hospital admission; a policy such as this would be necessary to meet the minimum requirements specified by the State. Another option is a \$500 deductible standard comprehensive coverage. There is also the question of whether the University should stay with the "retention" type of contract such as we now have or go to the combination self-funding or limited self-funding contract. The committee feels that these issues need the expertise of a professional insurance consultant, and the committee will recommend to the Board of Regents at their next meeting that the Board retain a professional insurance consultant to assist in drawing up specifications before the contract is put out for bids.

Newcomb informed the Senate that Dr. Ewalt had replied in regard to the Senate's recommendation and that the official procedure for the handling of cheating cases will be publicized in the Catalog, Insight, the Faculty Handbook (when a new one is published) and in the Systems and Procedures Manual.

Smith's motion for adjournment at 5:10 p.m. passed.



Clarke E. Cochran, Secretary  
Faculty Senate