



## Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

November 3, 1982

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Virginia M. Sowell, President

SUBJECT: Agenda for meeting #45, November 10, 1982

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, November 10, 1982, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

I. Introduction of newly elected Senator and guests

II. Approval of minutes of the October 13, 1982 meeting

III. Business

A. Report of Institutional Self-Study Steering Committee  
Robert Rouse

B. Report of the Convocations Committee - Fred Wagner

C. Report of Director of Library Services - E. Dale Cluff

D. Report of Affirmative Action Director - Julio Llanas

IV. Report of the Committee on Committees

V. Reports of Study Committees

Senate Study Committee A - Cora McKown

Senate Study Committee B - Tom Bacon

Senate Study Committee C - Ben Newcomb

Senate Study Committee D - Clarke Cochran

Academic Programs Committee - Alice Denham

Faculty Status & Welfare Committee - Charles Bubany

VI. Other business and announcements

1. Election Committee (Professors Steele, Higdon, and Whitehead) counted votes on the proposed tenure policy. Observers from the Faculty Senate Office and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs were present. The count was:

547 voting (of 738 eligible)

471 for

48 against

28 abstentions

VI. Other business and announcements continued.....

2. Conducted election for member of the Faculty Senate from the College of Arts and Sciences due to resignation of Professor John Kice. Position filled by Professor Jerry Hudson, Mass Communications.
3. Began procedures to fill vacancy for College of Arts and Sciences due to resignation of Beverly Gilbert.
4. Received letter of resignation from Professor Thomas Bacon for the spring semester. Replacement election will be conducted in December.
5. Faculty Senate president attended state meeting of Council of Faculty Governance Organizations, Austin, Texas, October 15-16. A report is included with this agenda.
6. Responded to inquiry from the Coordinating Board for Higher Education concerning faculty workload policy by saying that the required reporting of faculty workload is professionally demeaning, but is not a burdensome requirement for administrators or faculty. Efforts to repeal the legislation might open the door to greater reporting requirements and restrictions on faculty.
7. Faculty Senate president read final copy of the proposed tenure policy before it was sent to the voting faculty.

Summary of Academic Council minutes

1. The Director of the Museum will sit with the Academic Council.
2. Continuing Education and the Center for Professional Development of the College of Business Administration reported to the Board of Regents on October 29.
3. A proposed academic program review procedure was presented by Dr. Knox Jones. The ten year review cycle for all units will be continued, but it is hoped a revised schedule will reduce the impact and unnecessary reporting of academic units. Other accreditation and review documents that are normally generated during this period will serve as a basis for academic review.
4. Approved a proposal for a new program in Restaurant, Hotel and Institutional Management.
5. Reviewed proposed draft of financial exigency policy and voted to strongly approve the need for a financial exigency policy and to approve in principle this draft with the additional suggestion that the last paragraph be changed to include "will be given special consideration when a vacancy occurs."
6. Copies of statements of need for repair, rehabilitation and new construction were distributed for informational purposes.

• October 18, 1982

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Virginia M. Sowell

RE: Council of Faculty Governance Organizations Meeting October 15-16, 1982

The entire focus of the two days was the function of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. Staff members from the Division of Senior Colleges and Universities who met with us included Larry Pettit, Bill Sanford, Ross Hice, Nil Whittington and Jerry Pritchard. Topics covered included revisions of campus role and scope statements, funding for building construction and renovation, revision of academic data collection and reporting, and review of doctoral programs.

In the meetings we were given an overview of this division of the board, which was characterized as having strong influence over academic course approval but only medium influence in budgetary matters through its formula funding responsibilities.

Specific points included the following:

1. The staff is looking at various ways to evaluate the percentage of small classes on each campus.
2. The staff is supporting new legislation allowing each university to have approximately 2% of its classes in off-campus settings with no penalty.
3. Small changes can be handled through the 12-question format rather than the more extensive 30-question format. Criteria for these non-substantive changes are:
  - a. No implications for changes in scope
  - b. No significant new costs
  - c. No issue of university duplication
  - d. Clear potential for high quality
4. The staff is recommending the following in 1982:
  - a. Changes in procedures for updating course approvals
  - b. Prior approval needed for support areas for new courses
  - c. New courses should be within range of authorization
  - d. Untaught courses should be eliminated after four years if no justification can be made for continuing
  - e. The same course taught under "topics" labels should be limited to two years; course approval should be sought in order not to continue ad infinitum
5. Universities do not have to give up present courses to get new ones if the rationale is logical and present course offerings are not considered overloaded.