## Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate
April 13, 1984

I. Introduction of guests
II. Consideration of the minutes of the March 7, 1984 meeting
III. Continue reports of standing committees re feasibility of study of Senafor Wright's issues
IV. Statement py Vice President Darling re "General Education Commi\&sion"
V. *Report of the Faculty \$tatus \& Welfare Committee (Twyman)
VI. *Report of Budget Study Committee (E1bow)
VII. Report of April 9 meeting with Southern Association Commission visitor (Davis)
VIII. New Business
IX. Announcements
X. Adjournment

ANNOUNCEMENTS

## CORRESPONDENCE

Since the March 7, 1984 meeting letters have been written to:
Faculty Senate Study Committee "A" charging that committee with the study of the Faculty Senate Election process,
IX. Announcements continued......

Correspondence......
Dr. Samuel Richards, Vice President, Health Sciences Center -- tenure policy,

Professors Minor and Hunt, recently named Horn Professors,
Professor Yilliam Nicholls, Arts \& Sciences, informing him of his election to the Faculty Development Committee,

Dr. Robert Rouse pertaining to the self study and Southern Association visitation teams,

Forwarded fo the appropriate administrative officials the Senate approved nominees f\&r appointment to University Councils and Committees,

Dr. Cavazo $\&$ requesting him to address the Senate on April 18 and forwarding to him the resolution approved on March 7, 1984 requesting retention $\phi \mathrm{f}$ the independent office of Vice President for Reseanch,

Faculty Seqate Elections Committee appointing committee members.

The Senate elected to is made up submit the recirculat

Election blllots have been prepared for those schools who have completed pominations and will be circulated as soon as the nomination ballots from the three colleges and schools determine hominees from those areas.

The Budget Study Committee was charged to look into the matter of merit salary raises with specific reference to recommendation 12.1 of the Study Committee $B$ report of February 3, 1984. That recommendation is "to develop and recommend a workable university nerit system".

The committee m\&t on February 16 and March 22 , at which times merit salary was discussed. The dommittee referred to two reports on merit salary that were prepared by the Facuity Status and Welfare Committee in 1979 and 1980. It also reviewed the universfty-wide merit salary policy recently adopted at Texas Women's University and the eqisting merit salary policy of Texas Tech University (OP 32.08, January 31, 1983).

Under current pфlicy, merit salary decisions at Texas Tech University are initiated at the department level and approved by the college dean and the Vice President for Academfc Affairs. The procedures for awarding of merit at the department level var widely, but all give consideration to quality teaching, research productivity, and university community service. Complaints generally involve the weight g.ven to each of the three categories.

The committee fpund the merit salary policy of Texas Women's Universfty to be so vague in its defifition of merit as to be no improvement over current fexas Tech University polify. The comnittee also feels the great diversity of departments and academic activities at Texas Tech University makes it unlikely that a申y more specific policy for perit salary increases could be found that would be a申ceptable to a greater number ff faculty than at present. The locus of primary merif decisions at the department level and following criteria and procedures a\&reed upon in the departments is probably the most practical approach.

However, there is some justification for further investigation of the awarding of merit salary percentages by college and to administrators. The Budget Study Committee reports fok 1982 and 1983 both note considerable variations in percentage of salary increase anong colleges and the 1983 report noted significantly higher percentage salary incerments for administrators than for teaching faculty.

It is the opinion of the Budget Study Committee membership that such investigation does not fall within its charge. The committee recommends that the Faculty Status of Welfare Committee or one of the Faculty Senate Study Committees be charged with investigating the criteria that are used to defermine merity salary distributions among colleges and administrators and making puch recommendations as may be appropriate.


April 1984

REPORT OF THE FACULTY STATUS \& WELFARE COMMITTEE
I.

The committee was charged to consider the feasibility of an indepth study of the following questions raised by Senator Wright:

Are the resourses, 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?

In response, the committee refers Senator Wright, and other intereste Senators and faculyy to the recently published Institutional Self-Study prepared by several large faculty committees, esp. pp. 126-173, the chapter on "Financial Resources." Adding, significantly to their exhaustive study is beyond the committee's capability and inclination.
II. In regard to the statement from the Texas Tech AAUP chapter on tenure policy (see qgenda for March 7, 1984, attachment 非4) the committee recommends the following resolution:

The Faculty §enate is cognizant of the new provision in the tenure policy for renewable-term contracts in the Health Sciences Center. The Senate hereby advises the President of the University that it opposes and will continue to oppose any move to make such appointments in place of tenuretrack appointments in the University proper.

The committe further urges "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 t t hear preliminary appeals."

Briggs L. Twyman Chairperson

