Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

February 3, 1984

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: William J. Mayer-Oakes, President

SUBJECT: Agenda for Meeting #56, February 8, 1984

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, February 8, 1984, at 3:30 p.m. in Room 6, Holden Hall. The agenda is as follows:

I.   Introduction of guests;

II.   Approval of the minutes of the January 11, 1984 meeting;

III.   Report of Nominating Committee (Senator Cummings) - see attachment #1

IV.   Report of Agenda Committee re "24 issues" committee reports
            (Senator Coulter) - see attachment #2

V.   Final report of ad hoc committee "to develop viable policy recommendations
            on external funding" (Senator Williams) - see attachment #3

VI.   "Study priorities" for the Senate (Senator Wright)

VII.   Other Business

VIII.   Adjournment

The Senate Officers Nominations Committee has met. The following persons have been nominated, and each individual has agreed to be on the ballot:

Vice President to complete 1983-84 - Gary Elbow
                                     Neale Pearson

President 1984-85 - Evelyn Davis
                    Reed Richardson

Vice President 1984-85 - Murray Havens
                         Ernest Sullivan

Secretary 1984-85 - Elizabeth Sasser
                    Clarence Teske

Attachment #2

The Senate office has received the final reports of the five committees studying assigned topics from the "24 issues" presented to the Senate in 1982 by President Cavazos. Each committee has submitted a brief statement of their work with the request that the Senate approve their full report and send it on to President Cavazos. The five individual brief statements are attached here. Two copies of each full committee report are available in the Faculty Senate office for consultation by any Senator prior to the February meeting.

On the advice of the five committee chairs, the agenda committee recommends that this group of five reports be approved at the February 1984 meeting and sent to President Cavazos as soon as possible.

The agenda committee also recommends that the report on "innovative course delivery" submitted by the 1982-93 Faculty Development Committee be sent on to the President.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

CHARGE

1. General Education Requirements.
2. Curriculum and Course Analysis and Review.
3. New Academic Programs Development.

SUMMARY

The committee considered primarily only the first topic be-
cause it felt that the criteria for the second and third topics
varied too much from area to area to be appropriately handled on a
University-wide level. Informal polls and interviews were conduct-
ed in all Colleges to determine what general problems exist under
current policy, and what possible solutions might be. Although
there appear to be some difficulties with the current policy, it
seems to work adequately, and there was little general agreement as
to solutions. Concerns included: 1) the timing of general educa-
tion courses is not specified--seniors often take English 131 and
Math 134; 2) students may not be getting much out of some general
education courses; 3) despite the pass-fail option, students tend
not to take courses in areas where they are weak; 4) there may be a
lack of depth in some courses. A bibliography of sources of addi-
tional information concerning General Education as well as curricu-
lum review and new program development was prepared.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. At least two semesters of English should be required as a uni-
   form undergraduate degree requirement at Texas Tech.
2. A grade of C should be required to pass all courses on a
   student's degree plan which are taken under the pass-fail op-
   tion.
3. The impact on class continuity of student-initiated add-drop
   should be reduced to the extent possible, with all possible
   adds completed before classes start.
4. The probation/suspension policy should be revised so that there
   is no discrepancy between the grade-point average required to
   stay in the University (1.5 with fewer than 64 hours) and gra-
   duating (2.0 or 2.5).

FACULTY SENATE

SUBCOMMITTEE A - SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Charge to the committee:

To study and make recommendations concerning:
a) teacher evaluation procedures
b) change and improvement in teaching
c) grading practices

Members:

M.M. Ayoub
Frank Bloomer
Ed Burkhardt
Nancy Hickerson
Judson Maynard
Cora McKown
Elizabeth Sasser

Teaching Climate

The overall philosophy of the university administration should be that of a facilitator of the teaching mission.

There should be far more faculty participation in decision-making.

Trust must be developed so that faculty know that their university role is meaningful.

Clear and consistent statements of the teaching goals of the university should be developed by the cooperation of faculty and administrators and then incorporated into evaluative processes.

Support for Teaching

Teaching programs need to become more future oriented. This orientation requires time, study, travel, financial support, and flexibility of structuring programs.

More effort is needed in acquiring, upgrading, and maintaining teaching equipment and facilities.

Research funds which consistently are used to supplement the department operating budget are misused. Departments should be funded an adequate level for all educational activities.

Administrators should remember they serve the university which is composed of students and faculty. Especially the role of legal council as the President's (and administration's) advisor should be defined and broadened to include a knowledge of sympathy for the viewpoints of faculty and students. The role should be of a concerned mediator at a number of levels.

Streamlining purchasing, research services, budget, travel and all the support systems must be attempted.

Evaluation

Evaluations should go to the individual evaluated as the first step of the process.

The individual should send the teaching evaluation forward to the chairperson with any comments that seem pertinent.

Summaries for all full-time faculty should be in accessible files to those involved in peer review, tenure, and promotion.

The faculty should be invited to evaluate all administrators, including the President.

If an evaluation summary of a faculty member is used in a report, the faculty member should have the opportunity to review the report before it is forwarded.

If a standardized university teaching evaluation form is developed, it should contain short, simple core concepts. Academic areas are so diverse that every opportunity for specialized components should be allowed.

No evaluations should be reduced totally to a numerical equivalent.

Grading Practices

Presently, departments set grading practices. There is a variation within the University. The present flexibility should be retained.

STUDY COMMITTEE B-REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

Faculty and Chairpersons Surveys On
Research Atmosphere

Charge

Faculty Senate Study Committee B was charged with the responsibility of studying the research atmosphere at Texas Tech University. Specific issues for investigation as proposed by President Cavazos were: (1) improvement of research atmosphere, (2) increase of external research funding, and (3) increase of endowments for academic support.

Faculty Survey Objectives

The purpose of this study was (1) to determine how faculty at Texas Tech University evaluate the "research atmosphere" in the university and (2) to identify channels for improvement of the research/creative environment. Evaluation of the research atmosphere was broken into the following components:

1. Evaluation of research and creative activities as criteria in promotion and tenure decisons;
2. Evaluation of support given to research and creative activities of the faculty by specific units and organizations within the university;
3. Identification of problems encountered by the faculty in the conduct of research and creative activities; and,
4. Assessment of the faculty motivations for research and creative activities.

Faculty Survey Conclusions

Based on the objective part of the faculty questionnaire, results indicated that TTU faculty perceive the overall research atmosphere between fair and good. There are definite signs of discontent.

Heavy teaching loads are the most important obstacle to r/c activities at TTU, according to the faculty. Other problems are too much committee work, inadequate funding and lack of equipment.

Even though the Office of Research Services received a slightly above average rating, 30.3 percent of the faculty rated it as either "poor" or "fair" in terms of perceived support. The Library, Computer Center, and Travel Services obtained an average or slightly below average rating with Purchasing receiving the lowest rating among the five service areas.

Most faculty agree that r/c activities are important to the University's mission and should be important criteria in tenure and promotion evaluations. The faculty would like to increase research and creative output.

Given these results, it can be concluded that most Texas Tech University faculty would like to increase research and creative output, and probably could do so, if designated problems are attenuated.

Chairpersons Survey

For the most part, chairpersons have a definite perception of the role of research and its benefits for the individual, the programs, and the university. However, they need to have evidence there is administrative support in terms of understanding of research problems and a firm commitment to make necessary policy changes to strengthen the research atmosphere at Texas Tech University (see attachment for recommendations).

OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are based on the compilation of results from both the faculty and the department chairperson questionnaires. Individual faculty members perceive a great deal of pressure being placed on them to obtain more and more outside funding and that research should culminate with publications. This pressure is intensified by heavy teaching loads, committee work and directing of theses and dissertations. To reduce some of the pressure on individuals and to obtain the desired end results, the following recommendations are directed toward central administration:

1. Teaching and research/creative activities should be given comparable consideration in decisions for tenure, promotion and merit raises.
2. Evaluation of research/creative activities needs to reflect more than simply counting "professional" publications and amount of grant funding.
3. Establishment of a flexible teaching schedule policy to allow for heavy research commitments.
4. Operations should be revised in the support areas of purchasing, accounting, travel, budget, library, research services, and computer center to accommodate the needs of the researcher. More specifically, these changes are recommended:
   a. streamline purchasing and accounting procedures to reduce turnaround time (prompt payment) and find an effective mechanism to deal with emergencies,
   b. increase library holdings which are relevant to research areas,
   c. extend computer resource support in terms of number of terminals, personnel assistance for computer users, and computer capability (mainframe),
   d. research services need to adopt follow-through procedures after grants are obtained, give earlier notices on RFP's, and provide personal help with research proposal writing.
5. Support service units should be evaluated periodically and held accountable for their support of faculty research activities.
6. Cooperative research ventures should be encouraged between experienced and less experienced or productive and less productive investigators.
7. A reward and procedural system should be devised which supports multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research.

8. Redistribute or convert university funds to indirectly support research by increasing funds for: (1) travel expenses for presentations and networking, and for contacting potential contributors or funding agencies; (2) departmental operating budgets which are presently dependent on absorbing funds from research projects; (3) sabbatical leave or faculty development program; (4) office staff/personnel to help in preparing research proposals and typing manuscripts; and (5) purchase and maintenance of major equipment which is useful both for teaching and research.

9. The symbiotic relationship between faculty research endeavors and a viable graduate program is recognized. The graduate program could be strengthened by the following means: (1) increasing FTE and AOF for departments with increased graduate enrollments; (2) increasing the stipends for teaching and research assistants and part-time instructors by $1200-$1300 per year; (3) awarding fellowships and grants to outstanding candidates for graduate school; (4) increasing the number of teaching assistantships available; and (5) increasing recruiting efforts for graduate students.

10. Central administration should increase efforts to inform the legislature about our research activities and to obtain more institutional research funds from the legislature.

11. In order to improve the research image of TTU with the faculty and the public at large, a periodical publication should be established which describes in each issue in non-technical language several representative research projects being conducted or recently completed.

12. Establish a university committee(s) to: (1) develop and recommend a workable university merit system; and (2) develop and recommend procedures which will encourage interdisciplinary research.

13. Since faculty and department chairpersons are uneasy and dissatisfied with current administrative decisions governing research projects, a system for two-way communication needs to be established between central administration and faculty. Faculty should be actively involved in TTU research policy making and governance. A climate of trust from all sides should be fostered.

14. The Office of Development needs to develop a program for securing endowments which utilizes and interacts well with campus departmental resources. Departments should be encouraged, even assisted, in contacting private agencies, industry and individuals. The program needs to be comprehensive and sufficiently understood by all academic units.

Faculty Senate Study Committee C
Final Report

Charge:

1. Computer Usage by Students
2. Increased Use of Computers in Programs and Courses

Findings:

1. Virtually every department anticipates a significant increase (100 to 500 percent) in computer usage over the next five years.

2. Departments indicated general dissatisfaction with the services provided by the central computing facility, most notably slow turn-around time and difficulty in gaining terminal access.

3. A strong desire for ready access to word processing capability was commonly expressed.

4. There is a proliferation of independent (microcomputer) systems, both in departments and among individual faculty, that are being used for teaching, research, and administrative purposes

5. There is serious concern, especially among science-related departments and faculty, that research and instruction will have a lower priority than administrative record keeping on the central university system.

6. Three programs, SCRIPT, SAS, and SPSS, constitute the bulk of mainframe computer use.

7. There is very high demand among faculty for training in computer programming and in the specialized programs that are available.

8. Approximately 50% of the faculty surveyed currently have some association with computers. A like number of students have used some form of computer services; generally students are more satisfied with those service than are faculty.

9. Over 50% of students surveyed were unaware of the Computer Learning Facility; among those students who were aware, their major usage was for programming, not recreation.

Recommendations:

1. There is a clear need to expand, perhaps even double, current access to computing equipment.

2. With increased computer accessibility there is a parallel need for additional faculty instruction. Further, a computer consultant should be on duty in a lab or terminal area, and be "on call" for rendering assistance with various packages and programs.

3. Student proficiency in computer utilizations should be conducted through the academic departments in applications appropriate to the particular discipline

Faculty Senate Committee D: Report Summary

I. Charges:

1.   Undergraduate Student Recruitment.
2.   Academic Program Counseling.
3.   Career Counseling and Planning.

II. Findings:

Student recruitment efforts that were stepped-up in 1981 appear to be effective and making good use of available resources.   TTU has a limited number (120) of recruiting scholarships and lags behind comparable institutions in both the number and size of scholarships for top students.   The Office of Development is aware of this problem and hopes to raise over $10 million to support the scholarship program.

The approaches to academic program counseling vary widely between departments, schools and/or colleges. Studies on the effectiveness of the counseling program(s) are virtually nonexistent. The faculty perceives there to be little reward for advising.   The new preregistration system will probably alter academic program counseling.

The attrition rate of freshmen might be lowered by career counseling. Separate offices for career counseling and planning and placement makes little sense and appears to be inefficient. Some discontent exists with the interview signup system, with the prescreening of interviewees, and with the rotation of interviewing employers.

III. Recommendations:

The recruiting effort should continue at a high level of operation and the effectiveness of the various new programs should be evaluated as early as possible.   Attempts should be made to secure new entry-level scholarship funds and the Office of New Student Relations should be given the flexibility to make earlier offers of financial aid.   The Offices of New Student Relations, Student Financial Aids, and Development must be closely coordinated in the effort to raise funds, to specify the needs for which funds are raised, and to direct the new resources to prospective students.

The University and its constituent units should devote considerable resources during the 1984-1985 academic year to a comprehensive study of advising.   A campus committee composed of students, faculty, and administrators should be appointed to evaluate student advising (academic program counseling, impact of the preregistration system, summer orientation, the University Counseling Center, Planning and Placement Service, etc.).   The University, especially Arts and Sciences, should devote more resources to counseling and advising undecided majors.   A greater effort should be made to provide freshman with career counseling.

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES PERTAINING TO THE CONDUCT OF
RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

I. Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members

Scholarly activity, which includes research, is vital to the University's teaching and public service missions. Hence, within the framework of existing University policies, a faculty member is free to:

a) choose the subject of research or scholarly activity;
b) initiate and conduct such activity;
c) seek the necessary resources to conduct such activity, and to exercise control over those resources;
d) disseminate the results of such activity in an appropriate manner.

In return for this freedom to conduct scholarly activity and research a faculty member is responsible for:

a) maintaining professional integrity within and external to the University;
b) honoring professional obligations to the University and, when relevant, to external funding entities.

II. Rights and Responsibilities of the University

A. Normally the University will not intervene in the research or scholarly activity of a faculty member except to render, where possible, assistance to the individual conducting the activity. In a few specialized situations, however, it may be necessary for the University to suspend, modify, or terminate the scholarly activity or research of a faculty member for adequate cause. Adequate cause for such action includes:

1) demonstrated evidence of professional incompetence, supported by documentation:
2) continuing or repeated substantial neglect of professional responsibilities;
3) professionally unacceptable activity in the conduct of scholarly work (plagiarism, research fraud, etc):
4) mental or physical disability of continuing nature that is sufficient to prevent continued direction of the activity.

B. Additionally, when unresolvable administrative or technical disputes arise between principal investigators on research projects funded by an external entity, the University administration may intervene in the role of arbitrator to settle the dispute when intervention is invited by one or more of the faculty members involved, or upon administrative determination that the dispute seriously jeopardizes the contractual obligations of the University.

C. There also may be some research projects at the University where the impetus for the initiation and promotion of the project originated administratively within the University. Such "institutional" projects are then carried on for the University by one or more faculty members, with one of those faculty members serving as Director of the project for the University. The director of such a project holds an appointive administrative position and may be replaced by the University if there is clear evidence that this will expedite or materially enhance the conduct of the project.

D. When working with external funding entities regarding the support of specific research projects, University officials should not normally conduct substantive negotiations or discussions with officials of the external funding entity unless the

faculty member who is or will be principal investigator of the project is first notified of the proposed discussions and content thereof. When notification cannot be effected before substantive discussions occur, the principal investigator should be notified promptly of the content of such discussions when they are concluded.

III. Procedures for Administrative Intervention in Scholarly Activity and Research

A. When a University administrator (beginning at the level of department chairperson) has intervened, or proposes to intervene, in scholarly activity or research not funded by an external entity, and the affected faculty member feels he or she has a grievance, the matter shall be handled in accordance with the University Faculty Grievance Procedures.

B. Administrative intervention in scholarly activity or research funded by an external entity may have potentially serious and irreparable consequences for the faculty member and for the University. Therefore, the following statements and special procedures govern administrative intervention in externally funded activity:

1. The Vice President for Research is the University administrator primarily responsible for a decision to terminate or revise, through appropriate administrative channels, a faculty member's externally funded activity.

2. Should problems arise with respect to a faculty member's externally funded activity, the Vice President for Research or other concerned administrators shall attempt to resolve these problems through informal discussion with the faculty member.

3. If informal discussion with the faculty member fails to produce a mutually agreeable solution, or if the faculty member declines informal discussion, and a University administrator believes that adequate cause exists to terminate or revise the faculty member's externally funded activity, the Vice President for Research shall (a) notify the affected faculty member of the proposed termination or revision and the reason therefor, and (b) refer the matter to a Research Advisory Committee.

4. The Research Advisory Committee shall be composed of three persons selected on the basis of their ability to evaluate the reason for the proposed intervention and its impact on the affected faculty member, on the research activity, and on the University. The first member will be selected by the Vice President for Research from a list of five faculty members submitted by the affected faculty member. The second member will be selected by the Vice President for Research from the non-administrative faculty. The third member will be selected by the Vice President for Research from membership of the Faculty Grievance Panel. The affected faculty member shall have the right to disqualify the Vice President's selection of either the second or the third member (but not both). If the faculty member's single disqualification is exercised, the Vice President shall select a replacement from the appropriate group who is not subject to disqualification. Failure of the affected faculty member to provide a list of five faculty members shall be construed as a waiver of the right to have the matter heard by the Research Advisory Committee. Selection of the Research Advisory Committee shall be completed within five days.

5. Within five days from formation of the Research Advisory Committee, the administration and the affected faculty member shall present their respective positions and any supporting materials to the Committee for its advice.

6. The Committee will report in writing to the Vice President for Research and the affected faculty member within one week from completion of the hearing, and its report will advise that the proposed intervention is either justified or not justified or will recommend an alternate solution to the problem.

7. After receipt of the committee's advice, the Vice President for Research will withdraw or implement the proposed intervention or take other action deemed

appropriate under the circumstances.

8. The procedures and time limits prescribed in paragraphs 2 through 7 shall be followed unless extraordinary circumstances of imperative necessity prevent their implementation. Time limits may be varied upon the mutual consent of the Vice President for Research, the affected faculty member, and, when relevant, the Research Advisory Committee.

·9. If the affected faculty member is not satisfied with the administrative action taken, the faculty member may then appeal directly to the President of the University who shall hear the appeal in accordance with Parts II and III of the Faculty Grievance Procedures, except that no person who served on the Research Advisory Committee shall serve on the President's Grievance Committee.