



Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

March 2, 1984

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: William J. Mayer-Oakes, President
SUBJECT: Agenda for meeting #58, March 7, 1984

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, March 7, 1984, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center. The agenda is as follows:

- I. Introduction of guests.
- II. Approval of minutes of February 8, 1984, meeting.
- III. Report of the Nominating Committee (Senator Cummings) attachment #1.
- IV. Election of officers for 1984-85 (with prepared ballots).
- V. Consideration of a faculty petition on research and graduate studies (attachment #2) and a resolution from Senator Berlin (attachment #3).
- VI. Consideration of a statement from AAUP submitted by Senators Pearson and Elbow (attachment #4).
- VII. Report of the Committee on Committees (Senator Hudson), list of nominees see attachment #5. Senators may amend this report only by moving to strike a name and substitute another. Any person so nominated must have given prior consent to serve.
- VIII. Report of ad hoc committee on "Dead Week" (Senator Adamcik) attachment #6.
- IX. Reports of standing committees re feasibility of study of Senator Wright's issues. (charge and reports, attachment #7).
- X. Report of Faculty Status and Welfare Committee on Faculty Handbook (Senator Twyman).
- XI. Report of meeting with President Cavazos - William J. Mayer-Oakes.
- XII. New Business.
- XIII. Other Business.
- XIV. Announcements (see overleaf).
- XV. Adjournment.

Report of the Faculty Senate Budget Study Committee

February 29, 1984

The Budget Study Committee was charged by the president of the Faculty Senate to study and report on the feasibility of an indepth study of three points raised by Senator Henry Wright in the January meeting of the Faculty Senate. The three points are:

- a) the growth of administration (as opposed to faculty) at TTU since first year as a university (1968?) -- viewing growth in both actual and proportional terms (to faculty and students) as well as the sources of funds which have supported this growth;
- b) the variety of nonclassroom and non-organized "teaching" people and activities which have been supported by funds designated as "teaching monies", since 1968;
- c) the variety of supra and extra-departmental usages of "department operating" funds since 1968.

With respect to item a, the committee finds that data are available from which to chart the growth of administrative positions against FTE and SCH in the university. However, it would be quite difficult, if not impossible, to determine in more than the most general fashion the sources of funding to support any increase in the proportion of administrative positions that might be revealed by the analysis. Even if it were possible to locate accurate data on sources of funding in the administrative archives of the university, the committee believes the time that would be required to conduct a meaningful analysis for the entire university over a period of 16 years is well beyond the capability of a faculty committee.

Item b calls first for a definition of "nonclassroom and non-organized teaching people and activities" that would permit their identification in budget documents. At this point in time, even if such a definition were available, it would be virtually impossible to determine to what extent support of such personnel partly or wholly by teaching monies was appropriate or not for past years and previous university administrations.

The data available in university budgets are neither sufficiently detailed nor accurate to permit a valid study of long-term usages of departmental operating funds as called for in item c. The task would require an extensive audit that is clearly beyond the skills and time availability of any Faculty Senate committee.

The Faculty Senate Budget Study Committee finds that it is not feasible to pursue in depth study of the questions it was assigned to investigate. Furthermore, there was considerable concern on the part of some committee members that it would be inadvisable to carry out such a study even if it were feasible because if the impossibility of determining if administrative budget decisions made 5, 10, or 15 years ago were appropriate and justified or not.

Gary S. Elbow, Chair
Budget Study Committee

Report - Committee "A"

"Yes", study is possible and we consider evaluation the base of establishing accountability. We would like to recommend that administrators (president, vice presidents and deans) be evaluated. We further recommend that a pilot survey be tested this year.

The charge to Committee B was: the feasibility of an in-depth study on the issue of evaluation of administrators.

In reviewing past efforts addressing the evaluation of administrators, it was found that both the Academic Affairs Status Committee (1980) and Faculty Senate Study Committee C (1981) presented reports on the issue. A partial up-date was made of the findings in these reports by Committee B. One of the previous reports found that no formal procedures for evaluation of deans existed. Currently, two colleges were identified as having procedures for regular evaluations of deans by faculty.

In 1983, a subcommittee from the Academic Council developed a model instrument for faculty evaluation of administrators. It seems utilization of the evaluation form by deans was optional.

Committee B recommends implementation of the following objectives by a Faculty Senate Study Committee:

1. identify the current status of faculty evaluation of chairpersons and deans. (This action will up-date the previous studies.)
2. justify the need for faculty evaluation of administrators including purpose and function statements.
3. determine faculty interest in the process and feedback of faculty evaluation of vice-presidents and the president.
4. develop a workable system for faculty evaluation of administrators.
5. provide the opportunity for administrative input and cooperation in the development of the system of evaluation.
6. develop policy and procedure recommendations as part of the system of evaluation.

A Senate Study Committee progress report needs to be presented in May. Before forwarding to the president the final report should be submitted to the Senate for approval by December, 1984.

Committee "C" reports the following:

It is feasible to study:

- 1) procedures that universities use to deal with high percentages of tenured faculty.
- 2) what constitutes a reasonable percentage of tenured faculty within departments, colleges, and universities.
- 3) policies and procedures that help insure the recruitment and retention of quality faculty.

David Welton

SENATE COMMITTEE D REPORT

Registration and classroom problems were the issues assigned to Committee D.

Registration:

The committee members uniformly felt that the impact of registration on the three primary users, namely, students, faculty, and administration, was an item that should receive an "in-depth" study. Topics discussed for possible inclusion in a study were: the merit(s) of scheduling courses by computer with and without regard for student convenience, the validity of the add/drop process, the length of the add/drop period, whether or not all students need to be advised every semester, the time spent by students in the registration process, the time spent by faculty in the advisement process, whether or not our registration process is user-friendly, cost-effective, providing appropriate information to the administration, etc. It was felt that the registration process was very likely being studied by other campus committees and that this study should be performed by a group composed of all users. Therefore, Committee D moves that the Academic Vice President be asked to charge the Campus Registration Committee (hopefully composed of students, faculty, and staff) with the task of studying the registration process and to provide the Faculty Senate a report by November 15, 1984.

Admissions and
Classrooms:

We recommend that a Faculty Senate standing committee be charged with evaluating the quality of classrooms across campus. The committee should consider the space available in terms of both quantity and quality, identify problem areas and, when possible, recommend remedial solutions, formulate classroom standards, etc. The committee should have the option of appointing "expert" members to aid their evaluation.

XIV. Announcements

1. ACTIONS:

- a. Advisory group of Senators met with President Cavazos, February 16.
- b. Met with Vice President Darling on February 14
- c. Met with President Cavazos on February 16
- d. Presented "informal remarks" to Student Senate on February 16.

2. CORRESPONDENCE:

- a. Exchange with President Cavazos re "self-study".
- b. Exchange with President Cavazos re February 16 meeting.
- c. Exchange with President Cavazos re submission and acceptance of Senate recommendation on "research" policy.
- d. Exchange re research and graduate studies reorganization.
- e. Submission of Senate reports on "24 issues", on February 24.
- f. Exchange with David Fisher, President, Student Senate.
- g. Informed Senate officer candidates of Coordinating Board Internships.
- h. Distributed issues raised by Senator Wright to Senate standing committee chairs.
- i. Exchange with Professor Morris, Chair, Faculty Development Committee.
- j. Informed Vice President Darling of result of Senate elections.
- k. Informed Professors Skillern, Schoen, Mayer, Marple and McVay of recent election results.
- l. Exchange with Professor Higdon, Chair, Senate Elections Committee.
- m. Exchange with Professor Wiebe, President of Texas Women's University Faculty Senate on "merit" policy at TWU.
- n. Recognized the 8 recipients of "outstanding researchers" awards from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, and the 3 recipients of special Dads Association Awards.
- o. Requested copy of report, "Critique of faculty development programs" from the Center for Program and Institutional Renewal.
- p. Handled solicitation for Senate assistance with Channel 5 - TV Festival volunteers --- Senators Havens, Mayer-Oakes and Pearson will assist on March 7.

3. ACADEMIC COUNCIL EXCERPTS (Meeting of February 21, 1984)

- a. Each dean was asked to identify one person to work on a general education committee except Arts and Sciences was asked to provide three individuals.
- b. Deans were asked to identify areas of excellence within each college, that is those that are selected for prominence or which are to be developed to that point.
- c. The Graduate Dean search is underway and is anticipated that an appointment can be made by September 1, 1984. The applications and nomination deadline is April 2, 1984.
- d. There was a brief discussion of the research function and possible reporting arrangements.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment #1. (Cummings letter)
Attachment #2. (unsigned petition)
Attachment #3. (Berlin resolution)
Attachment #4. (AAUP statement)
Attachment #5. (Committee on Committees Report)
Attachment #6. (Dead Week Report)
Attachment #7. (Wright issues:)
- A. February 13 general charge
B.1 Specific charge, Budget Study Committee
B.2 Specific charge, Status & Welfare Committee
B.3 Specific charge, Committee A
B.4 Specific charge, Committee B
B.5 Specific charge, Committee
- C.1 Report, Budget Study Committee
C.2 Report, Committee A
C.3 Report, Committee B
C.4 Report, Committee C
C.5 Report, Committee D

Attachment #1



Texas Tech University

Department of Home Economics Education

DATE: February 23, 1984

TO: Bill Mayer-Oakes, President
Faculty Senate

FROM: Marilyn N. Cummings, Convener
Nominations Committee

MNC

Joe Adamcik has agreed to have his name put on the ballot for Secretary of Faculty Senate 1984-85 as a replacement for Elizabeth Sasser.

February 27, 1984

Professor William Mayer-Oaks,
Faculty Senate
Texas Tech University
Campus

Dear Professor Mayer-Oaks:

The following graduate faculty members are deeply disturbed by the loss of Knox Jones as Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School. From the standpoint of the graduate faculty, he clearly has been the best administrator the University has had since he assumed that position. He has carried out the duties of his office in a fair and impartial manner, encouraged research activity in all departments, found ways to help financially, and offered advice as to sources of funding. His personal integrity and willingness to stand firm on his convictions are exemplary and are worth imitating by others in the central administration.

We are concerned that the loss of Knox Jones may lead to the following results: (1) there will be less emphasis placed on research activity as a vital aspect of faculty responsibility. (2) Academic Publications will no longer be an important outlet for certain kinds of faculty research and creative works. (3) The responsibility for graduate education, academic publications, and allocations of research funds will be placed in the hands of someone who has not demonstrated that he is both a scholar and an administrator. We request that the Faculty Senate discuss our concerns and make strong recommendations to President Cavazos regarding the points raised and make clear that we regard the loss of Professor Jones from his position as a step backward by the current administration.

Berlin resolution

(to be presented from the floor)

Statement approved by Texas Tech University chapter of AAUP,
February 28, 1984.

We are pleased that the ad hoc committee on tenure policy of the Texas Tech University Board of Regents reaffirmed the Board's commitment to the concept of academic tenure. We are, however, deeply concerned about the suggestion that fixed length renewable contracts without tenure be created at Texas Tech University. The purpose of academic tenure is to protect the academic freedom of all faculty. This protection must be made available to all faculty, regardless of the nature of their appointments, if the university is to function properly.

We are also concerned that the existing tenure policy of Texas Tech University does not include provisions for faculty election or appointment of the faculty committee that gives preliminary consideration to tenure appeals. We urge the Faculty Senate to initiate the amendment of the existing tenure policy to specify faculty appointment or election of the faculty committee that is designated to hear preliminary tenure appeals; we request President Cavazos to seek approval of such amendment by polling the faculty before referring it to the Board of Regents.

Neale J. Pearson
Gary Elbow

NOMINEES FOR UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

Athletic Council (2)

1. Jerry Stockton-Ag. Science
2. Joe Cornett-Educational Psychology A & S

Alternates

1. Mike Bobo-Physical Education A & S
2. Jim Jonish-Economics A & S

Honors and Awards (4)

1. David Higdon-English A & S
2. Bruce Eubanks-Math A & S
3. James Heird-Ag Science
4. David Welton-Education

Academic Affairs Information Systems Committee (3)

1. Jerry Perkins-Political Science A & S
2. Janet Minifie-BA
3. Leonard Weiner-Engineering

Academic Publications Policy Committee (4)

1. Alice Denham-Education
2. Joel C. Weinsheimer-English A & S
3. Richard McGlynn-Psychology A & S
4. Sue Couch-Home Economics

Admissions and Retentions Committee (2)

1. James Barrick-Geosciences A & S
2. Danny Mason-Physical Education A & S

Artists and Speakers Committee (1)

1. Jacqueline Reinier-History A & S

Benefits and Retirement Committee (2)

1. Charles Biggs-Math A & S
2. Tommy Moores-BA

Biosafety Committee (1) Expertise in biohazards

1. Shan Bilimoria-Biology A & S

Bookstore Advisory Committee (2)

1. Robert Amason-BA
2. William Nickols-Political Science A & S

Campus Security and Emergency Committee (1)

1. JoAnn Shroyer-Home Economics

Code of Student Affairs Committee (2)

1. Gary Poffenbarger-English A & S
2. James Heird-Animal Science

Convocations Committee (2)

1. William Hartwell-Music A & S
2. Sue Couch-Home Economics

Energy Conservation Committee (1) Engineering

1. Cliff Kehc-Engineering

Faculty Senate Committee on Elections (1)

1. Pat Shaw-English A & S

International Education Committee (2)

1. H.J. Hsia-Mass Communications A & S
2. Dayton Roberts-Education

Library Committee (2)

1. Evan Jobe-Philosophy A & S
2. Michael Rylander-Biology A & S

page two (committees)

Minority Affairs Committee (5)

1. Cynthia Jones-Speech and Hearing A & S
2. Daniel Nathan-Philosophy A & S
3. David Payne-Music A & S
4. Elizabeth Fox-Home Economics
5. Hazel Taylor-Education

Parking Violations Appeals Committee (2)

1. Richard Zartman-Agriculture
2. Clive Kinghorn-Mass Communications A & S

Patent and Copyright Committee (1)

1. Dennis Harp-Mass Communications A & S

Protection of Human Subjects Committee (2)

1. Nina L. Ronshausen-Education
2. Jeff Rupp-Physical Education A & S

Radiation and Laser Safety Committee (3) 2 active in radioactive materials
1 active in lasers

1. Tom Krile-Engineering
2. Robert Bethea-Engineering
3. Heyward Ramsey-Engineering

Special Hearing Panel for Tenure and Privilege Committee (10) Senior Faculty

1. Murry Coulter-Biology A & S
2. Paul Munter-BA
3. Weldon Beckner-Education
4. Bob Rucker-Mass Communications A & S
5. Bill Jordon-Speech A & S
6. Gerald Skoog-Education
7. Gary Elbow-Geography A & S
8. Carolyn Ater-Home Economics
9. Cora McKown - Home Economics
10. Jerry Berlin-Arts & Sciences

Student Financial Aids/Scholarship Committee (1)

1. Gordon Davis-Animal Science

Student Publications Committee (3)

1. Jon Wardrip-Mass Communications A & S
2. Pamela Cummings-Home Economics
3. Jay Blanchard-Education

University Discipline Committee (2) 3 alternates

1. Virginia Wheelles-Speech A & S
2. Patricia Horridge-Home Economics

Alternates

1. Hershel Womack-Mass Communications A & S
- 2.
- 3.

University Discipline Appeals Committee (2) 2 alternates

1. William Hartwell-Music A & S
2. John Nevius-Education

Alternates

1. Benjamin Duran-Math A & S
2. Ashton Thornhill-Mass Communications A & S

University Safety Committee (1) Engineering

1. H. Lee Reynolds-Engineering

Warm-Blooded Animal Committee (1)

1. Julian E. Spallholz - Home Economics

Committee on Committee members: Jerry Hudson, Chair, C. Reed Richardson, Lane Anderson, David Welton, Kishor Mehta, Evelyn Davis and James Eissinger



Texas Tech University

Department of Chemistry

TO: Agenda Committee, Faculty Senate

FROM: Joe A. Adamcik, Chairman, ad hoc.
Committee to Study Dead Week Policies *Joe*

The subject Committee has completed its study and its report is attached. We request that this report be attached to the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting of March 7, 1984. You will note that the report includes a motion to be presented to the Senate; I intend to make this motion on behalf of the Committee at the time the report is presented to the Senate.

Report of the ad hoc Committee to Study Dead Week Policies

The ad hoc Committee to Study Dead Week Policies has queried other institutions of higher learning in the state about their policies with regard to Dead Week. There was a considerable variation in their practices; many had no such policy.

The Committee concluded that there is no current evidence for a compelling need to change our policy and the Committee does not recommend such a change.

However, the Committee does feel that it is important to provide free time for students to prepare for examinations and regrets that the "day of no classes" has been discontinued. It further notes that at least one other institution (The University of Texas at Austin) is able to provide three full days (including a weekend) after classes end and before final examinations begin. This is made possible by scheduling the Commencement a week later than does Texas Tech.

The Committee moves that the subject of the possibility of instituting such days of no classes and making necessary adjustments in the Calendar to accommodate this be assigned to an appropriate Study Committee of the Faculty Senate for study and report.

Joe A. Adamcik
Georgette Gettel
Nancy Hickerson
Ronald Sosebee
Bill Sparkman



Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate

February 13, 1984

TO: All Senate Standing Committees
 FROM: Agenda Committee
 SUBJECT: Distribution of issues raised by Senator Wright

The various issues raised by Senator Wright in the Senate during the January and February meetings (and in preparation for a special meeting with President Cavazos) have been arranged as follows, for study and report back to the Senate at its March meeting.

| <u>Issue</u> | <u>Committee</u> | <u>Charge</u> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Administrative growth | Budget Study Com. | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 2. Use of teaching funds | Budget Study Com. | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 3. Use of dept. operating funds | Budget Study Com. | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 4. "True university education" | Academic Programs Com. | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 5. Efficient use of TTU resources | Faculty Status and Welfare Com. | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 6. Administrative accountability | Com "A" | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 7. Administrator evaluation | Com "B" | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 8. Tenure track concepts | Com "C" | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 9. Registration & classroom problems | Com. "D" | Feasibility of "indepth" study |
| 10. Coordination and Implementation | Agenda Com. | Feasibility of "indepth" study |

Each committee is to evaluate the "feasibility" of a study committee working in depth on the assigned issue. Committee actions appropriate to the limited objective might include, but not be limited to: identifying sources of information, techniques of study, pertinent past studies here or elsewhere. An assessment of the significance of this topic to the advancement of TTU faculty interests also should be made. Is it worthwhile for faculty to spend significant time and energy on this topic?

While time is short before the March regular Senate meeting, one or two meetings of each committee may well achieve the limited objective of a feasibility decision. Both Senator Wright and your Senate officers will be available to meet with your committee if this is desired. A more detailed charge statement will be available for each committee's first meeting.

February 9, 1984

CHARGE TO 1983-84 BUDGET STUDY COMMITTEE

1. The normal, standard prescribed annual charge - get on with it, aim for interim report at April meeting and final annual report at May meeting.
2. Look into the matter of "merit" salary raises for both faculty and administrators, along the lines implied in recommendation 12.1 of the Study Committee B report approved by Senate at February meeting. Provide interim report at April meeting, final annual or progress report at May meeting.
3. Following up suggestions of Senator Henry Wright, look at the "feasibility" of an "indepth" study of:
 - a) the growth of administration (as opposed to faculty) at TTU since first year as a University (1968?) -- viewing growth in both actual and terms proportional (to faculty and students) as well as the sources of funds which have supported this growth;
 - b) the variety of nonclassroom and non-organized "teaching" people and activities which have been supported by funds designated as "teaching monies", since 1968;
 - c) the variety of supra and extra - departmental usages of "department operating" funds since 1968.

Present feasibility recommendations to the March Senate meeting.

Charge to Status and Welfare Committee

Efficient Use of TTU Resources

Are the resources, both fiscal and other, available to the University used in such a manner as most efficiently to advance its mission in teaching and research? What are the facts, and what is the faculty's perception of the facts?

Charge to Committee "A"

Consider administrators accountability with respect to:

- a. To whom should administrators be accountable?
- b. In what way and to what extent should they be accountable?
- c. Should they be expected or required to respond to specific inquiry from:
 1. above
 2. lateral
 3. below

Charge to Committee "B"

Consider administrators evaluation with respect to:

- a. Should administrators be evaluated?
- b. If so, by whom?
- c. By what mechanism

plus:

1. Review of past efforts in this direction at TTU.
2. Review of the current internal evaluation form used by Academic Affairs.
3. Consider bilateral (i.e. "bottom up" as well as "top down" evaluation) as alternate to current unilateral procedure.
4. Other pertinent information you may have.

Charge to Committee "D"

Registration and Classrooms

Does the current system of planning for class offerings and of registration provide, to the greatest extent possible and with maximum efficiencies in the use of faculty time and other resources, for the students to have the opportunities of taking the courses they need in a timely fashion? If not, what changes are desirable?