

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Voting Faculty

Faculty Senate President William Mayer-Oakes called the Special Meeting of the TTU Voting Faculty to order at 2:45, Friday, May 11, 1984, in the University Center Theater.

Responding to Mayer-Oakes call for nominations for a secretary, Professor Ernest Sullivan nominated Professor Leon Higdon. Professor Evelyn Davis seconded the nomination, and Higdon was declared elected.

Higdon read the amended call for the meeting:

Resolved that the "call" for the April 27 special meeting of all TTU voting faculty (which is to be re-convened May 11, 1984 at 2:30 p.m.) be amended to add the option for motions from the floor in reference to actions on the tenure policy by President Cavazos or the TTU Board of Regents.

Hearing no corrections or revisions, Mayer-Oakes declared the minutes of the April 27, 1984 meeting approved as distributed.

Mayer-Oakes briefly described the handouts distributed at the meeting. These were: (1) two resolutions unanimously adopted by the Faculty Senate, May 9, 1984, (2) Mayer-Oakes' statement read at the May 11, 1984 TTU Board of Regents meeting, (3) a statement from the Board of Regents Ad Hoc Committee, (4) a statement made to the TTU Board of Regents by J. Fred Bucy, May 11, 1984, and (5) a resolution prepared by the members of the Agenda Committee for consideration.

Declaring the floor open, Mayer-Oakes recognized Sullivan who commented on President Cavazos' remark that the Faculty Senate was outside his lines of consultation. Sullivan moved approval of the following resolution:

Whereas, the Constitution of the Faculty Senate of Texas Tech University adopted and ratified by the Faculty Council, the voting faculty, the President of the University and the Board of Regents on 11-1-77 and as amended 4-18-79 designates the TTU Faculty Senate as the representative of the TTU faculty;

Be it resolved, that the TTU Faculty Senate and/or representatives selected by the Faculty Senate represent the TTU faculty in the collaborative development among the Regents, Administration, and faculty of a new tenure policy;

Be it further resolved, that Faculty Senate President Mayer-Oakes communicate this resolution to President Lauro Cavazos and the Board of Regents.

Professor Roland Smith seconded the motion.

In the discussion which followed, Professor Neale Pearson deemed the motion appropriate and asked that the tenure policy mentioned in paragraph two be identified as the policy statement developed and approved by faculty and administration in 1982. He added that Mr. Bucy's statement did not recognize faculty participation. He found it ironic, he added, that the Board had approved appointment with tenure for several persons at its May 11, 1984 meeting, the same meeting at which Mr. Bucy made his statement. Pearson saw a double standard operating. He urged approval of the resolution and called for faculty and administration to co-operate in the development of a tenure policy.

Professor Henry Thomas objected to the word new in the resolution's second paragraph and suggested striking it and substituting a. Smith suggested substituting

May 11, 1984 meeting, minutes, page two

any for a new, and Professor William Nicholls formally moved this amendment. The amendment was unanimously approved.

The resolution, thus amended, was unanimously approved.

Professor Ben Newcomb moved that the voting faculty assembled affirm the intent of the May 9, 1984 Faculty Senate resolutions to the effect that the 1982 policy be the basis for discussion of any future tenure policy. This motion was seconded and then approved unanimously.

Newcomb observed that the voting faculty should look closely at Mr. Bucy's statement. He read the statement and observed that the fifteen largest universities in Texas include many which differ from TTU in that they lack graduate programs and have not been designated multi-purpose universities. He further objected to imprecise phrasing such as drifting towards and remarked that a percentage of 56% tenured was barely above the 53% tenured average at the fifteen universities.

Professor Magne Kristiansen added that the voting faculty needed to know the specific percentages at Texas A&M and Houston to reach valid comparisons and that such information should be available.

Professor Kary Mathis asked how the percentages are calculated, noting that using budgeted FTE and total number of tenured faculty does not necessarily provide valid figures.

Professor William Sparkman read and moved adoption of the following:

I move that the President of the Faculty Senate convey to President Cavazos the sentiment of the faculty at large deploring the labor versus management mentality that seems to permeate the Board of Regents. Further, we respectfully recommend that President Cavazos be requested to exercise his appropriate responsibility to apprise the University's Board of Regents regarding the nature, purpose, and function of a university, especially the ways in which a university differs from a private corporation and a medical school.

The motion was seconded by several faculty members. Smith moved amendment of apprise the University's Board of Regents to apprise the University's President and Board of Regents. The motion was seconded. Several faculty noted that this would place the President in the position of apprising the President. Mayer-Oakes asked Sparkman to reread his motion.

The proposed amendment failed by a vote of 97 to 74.

Professor Kristiansen called the faculty's attention to the "small problem" the Department of Electrical Engineering experienced last year in securing collegial action between faculty and administration.

Professor Lewis Hill objected that the motion was irrelevant to the main issue and would further antagonize the Board of Regents at the very time when co-operation was needed. He moved that the motion be tabled. Several faculty seconded his motion.

Mayer-Oakes ruled the motion to table out of order and invited Hill and Sparkman forward for consultation with the Chair and the Parliamentarian, John Murray. Following consultation, Mayer-Oakes ruled both Hill's and Sparkman's motions out of order.

Professor Phil Lehrman asked guidance in procedures for challenging the ruling and then moved to appeal the decision of the chair. The motion was seconded. Further consultation between the Chair and Parliamentarian followed.

May 11, 1984 meeting, minutes, page four

Professor Thomas asked if a group of faculty could be appointed to study information and start getting data available for presentation. Mayer-Oakes noted that the Faculty Senate has directed the Tenure and Privilege Committee to look into these matters. Several faculty members urged the committee to act before the Board of Regents' August meeting.

Professor Monty Strauss moved adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.


David Leon Higdon



Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

May 15, 1984

Dr. Lauro F. Cavazos
President
Texas Tech University
Campus

Dear President Cavazos:

As presiding officer of the May 11 called meeting of the Texas Tech University voting faculty, I was instructed to provide you with certain specific items of information, viz., the three specific resolutions and motions passed at that meeting. I attach the minutes of the meeting with the passed motions indicated in the margin.

In addition, I thought it might be helpful to provide you with additional pertinent information. A second enclosure is the statement made at graduation by one of our outstanding 1984 graduating seniors. Lisa Davis has won a fellowship to the University of Michigan. She will be going to Ann Arbor in the fall in order to pursue graduate studies in ancient history. I find her ideas worth considering.

A third enclosure is the letter I recently sent to the chairperson of the University's elected Tenure and Privilege Committee. At the regular April meeting, the Senate acted to begin study of some of the tenure matters which Regent Bucy spoke about last Friday.

At the risk of being repetitive, I think it is important to again urge you to see that the Board utilizes the proper mechanisms established for independent faculty participation in governance. This is particularly important as you move forward in consideration of the University's tenure context needs.

I agree with Henry Shine and many other faculty members that there is a wide reservoir of faculty expertise and good will available to you, if you will but seek it. I hope you will. I would personally like to see us united as a University community, tenure battle wounds healed, in time for the kickoff of our most important capital fund campaign, in September 1985.

Sincerely yours,

William J. Mayer-Oakes
President

cc: Board of Regents
All TTU Faculty

Encl: May 11 minutes
L. Davis talk
T&P letter

Statement presented and read to Texas Tech University Board of Regents, May 11, 1984
by William J. Mayer-Oakes, President of the Texas Tech University Faculty Senate.

Madame Chairman, Members of the Board of Regents, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My purpose here today is to speak on the topic of the recently proposed new tenure policy. The opportunity to do this is probably an historic "first time" event, and the Faculty has noted and appreciates the generosity of the Board in granting the President of the Faculty Senate this privilege. While we were disappointed at not having the opportunity to meet with the working committee of the Board yesterday, the recommendation from the ad hoc committee that it "...will delay consideration of a tenure policy revision until next fall" is an encouraging sign to the Faculty. It is a positive step in reaction to the interests of the Faculty and supports today's first step in the creation of a direct dialogue between the Board of Regents and the Faculty.

In accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (approved in 1978 by the Board of Regents) faculty members at Texas Tech University have a legitimate, democratic mechanism through which to voice their interests and to advise the President of the University. There are, of course, other means for the President to hear of faculty interests, e.g., through his various levels of administrative staff, or from individual faculty members.

The primary value of the Faculty Senate lies in its fundamental nature as a university governance institution. As a formal institution the Faculty Senate reflects both the democratic concepts elemental in American society, e.g., "governing with the consent of the governed", and the continuous historical nature of faculty participation in university governance at Texas Tech University, a stream of reality transcending changing administrations, Presidents, Board members and Faculty!

With responsible leadership from the Faculty through their duly elected representatives in the Senate, a Faculty-wide response to the April 20 proposal by President Cavazos and the ad hoc committee was achieved in systematic and rapid fashion. The

Senate, in appropriate manner, called for a meeting of the voting faculty. This meeting was held on April 27, just one week after faculty learned of the proposed new policy.

Department administrators, College administrators and individual faculty members expressed, at this meeting, a variety of specific reasons for disapproving of the proposed policy. No one spoke in support of it. Four distinguished faculty leaders presented carefully prepared, clear, responsible and reasonable statements of negative reaction to the policy and its manner of promulgation. One of our most eminent and widely respected senior professors, Horn Professor Henry Shine urged that the President and the Board reconsider and change their planned course of action.

A mail ballot (properly called for by the Faculty Senate) of all voting Faculty demonstrated the overwhelming disapproval of the proposed policy (95% disapproved; 85% of the eligible voters did in fact vote -- a record high turnout; the numbers are even more impressive -- 644 faculty disapproved, 21 approved, 9 abstained.) Meanwhile, as the week-long balloting was taking place, various groups of faculty were preparing statements, evidently encouraged by the informative and responsible April 27 meeting of nearly 600 faculty. The student senate voted to uphold the view of the voting faculty. The Arts and Sciences College, the College of Education, the Graduate Council, the Academic Council (of Deans), the AAUP and TACT chapters plus other groups (including the Horn Professors) and individuals in letters to the President and the Board gave a variety of reasons for stopping and/or changing the course proposed by President Cavazos to the Board for action today.

Perhaps the most detailed, cogent and persuasive statement was the five page document coming from the Law School Faculty. I recommend that every Board member study this carefully. I commend the School of Law Faculty for their exemplary leadership.

Finally, on Wednesday, May 9 the Faculty Senate, with a mass of faculty responses before it took action to advise the President and the Board by means of two resolutions which are now in your hands.

Faculty generally believe in and have similar goals for Texas Tech University as do the Regents. We agree with the Board in seeking the "best" for the long run interests of the university. We agree with the Board in proceeding to achieve this by responsible, legitimate means, that is, within the framework of our respective charters -- for the Board through its Policy and for the Faculty through its Constitution and Bylaws. While we may agree on the ends (or goals) to be achieved, it is abundantly clear from the events of the past three weeks that there is yet no agreement on means (or procedures). In fact, the paramount concern has become more clearly the context of governance procedures surrounding the specific tenure policy proposed.

There should be no disagreement, however, on elemental terms. Item 06.04 (2) (A) of Board policy specifies the three principal interested parties to tenure. They are "the President, the faculty, and the Board of Regents." The legitimacy of the Faculty Senate and its officers as the voice of the Faculty is clearly indicated in the Constitution, Articles II, IV, and V, especially Section 6.

I hope that the Board is seriously interested in uniting the various members of the University community into a harmonious whole, working together to achieve higher levels of excellence for our young and dynamic institution. I hope the Board will accept the recommendations of the ad hoc committee to delay decision, and will also accept the advice of the Faculty Senate in its resolution, especially with regard to proceeding with "critical deliberation and collaborative effort among appropriate representatives of the Regents, the Faculty and the President".

The Board is urged to consider very seriously their attitude of openness to the democratic ideals as well as the practical realities of responsible running of the University in the interests of the citizens of Texas. The Faculty is open and willing to work with the President and the Board as partners for the future of our common interests in the institution we all serve. The Faculty is united and has spoken clearly and responsibly in asserting its proper role. The President of the Faculty Senate thanks you for this opportunity to speak.