

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 18, 1984, in the Senate Room of the University Center with William J. Mayer-Oakes, President, presiding. Senators present were Adamcik, Anderson, Berlin, Bloomer, Burnett, Coulter, Cummings, Davis, Dvoracek, Eissinger, Elbow, R. Freeman, Goss, Gott, Graves, Havens, Khan, McKown, McVay, McLaughlin, Maynard, Mehta, Oberhelman, Pearson, Richardson, Sasser, Shine, Sosebee, Sparkman, Strauss, Sullivan, Teske, Twyman, Wright, Wunder and Zyla. Senators Dixon and Urban were absent because of University business. Senator Gettel was ill. Senators Ayoub, Bubany, Burkhardt, Chonko, B. Freeman, Hickerson, Hudson, Vallabhan, Welton and Williams were also absent.

Guests included Virginia M. Sowell, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs; John Murray, Parliamentarian; Preston Lewis, University News and Publications; Pat Graves, Avalanche Journal; and Laura Tetreault, University Daily.

SUMMARY OF BUSINESS CONDUCTED

At its April 18, 1984, meeting the Faculty Senate:

1. heard reports from the following Standing Committees:

- Committee "A"
- Committee "B"
- Committee "C"
- Committee "D"
- Budget Study
- Faculty Status & Welfare

2. heard a report on the activities of the General Education Committee,
3. heard a report on the meeting with the Southern Association Commission
4. and an inquiry from a senator on the behalf of a constituent concerning tenure and/or promotion.

Mayer-Oakes called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. and recognized guests.

I. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 1984 MEETING

The minutes were corrected to reflect Senator Dixon's absence as being due to illness, otherwise they were approved as circulated.

II. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH MEETING

Faculty Status and Welfare Committee Report - Efficient Use of TTU Resources

Senator Twyman read the charge to this committee - "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?"

Twyman referred Senators and other interested persons to the recently published Institutional Self-Study (especially pages 126-173), chapter on financial resources, and concluded that the answer to the first question is "No." Information pertaining to the second question in the committee charge can also be found in the Self-Study Twyman said. Twyman concluded by saying that his committee could not add to the Institutional Self-Study report.

Standing Committee reports continued.....

Committee A - Issue of administrative accountability

Senator McKown said that this committee had nothing further to add to the original report which stated:

"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.

Committee B - the feasibility of an in-depth study on the issue of evaluation of administrators

Senator Davis reported that 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.

Before forwarding to the President the final report should be submitted to the Senate for approval by December , 1984.

After some discussion of Committee B's recommendation, Twyman moved that Committee B be charged with the implementation of the six objectives. Twyman's motion passed with one objection.

Senator Sullivan observed that the above action required of Committee B would eliminate the need of Committee A's pilot study. McKown, Chair, Committee A agreed.

Committee C - Tenure Track Concepts

The chair of Committee C was not present, Adamick read the following report for the committee.

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.

Standing Committee reports continued.....

Committee C

Twyman observed that most of the committee reports were drafted by the various committees before the publication of the Institutional Self-Study and that all these matters (the 3 points of study cited by Committee C) are addressed in the self-study.

Several Senators disagreed with Twyman that items 1 and 2 of Committee C's report were addressed in the self-study. Shine observed that items 1 and 2 are very important matters to TTU faculty and that these matters should not be allowed to "just disappear."

Sasser voiced objection to the present study committee structure, saying that some persons (as the committees are now structured) may be on committees that they are not interested in and therefore devote little time and effort to the study of the issues with which that committee is involved. Shine suggested senators could volunteer for committee service in their area of interest.

Elbow moved that items 1 and 2 of Committee C's report be referred to the University Tenure and Privilege Committee by the President of the Faculty Senate for action this year. The motion passed unanimously.

Faculty Status & Welfare Committee

Twyman, chair, said that in regard to the statement from the Texas Tech Chapter of the AAUP re: renewable term contracts and non-tenure tract appointments the committee recommends the following resolution:

The Faculty Senate 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 tenure-track appointments in the University proper,

and he further moved the Senate endorse the resolution. After discussion, Twyman's resolution passed.

Twyman continued by stating the the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee further urges the Faculty Senate refer the matter of initiating the amendment of the existing tenure policy to specify faculty appointment or election of the faculty committee that is designated to hear preliminary appeals to the Tenure and Privilege Committee and he made that statement into the form of a motion. Twyman's motion to refer the matter to the Tenure and Privilege Committee passed unanimously.

Committee D

Berlin, chair, suggested that Committee D's report be considered in two parts, the first part being registration. He read the following report:

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 merits(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

Standing Committee reports continued.....

Committee D

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.

Berlin concluded this portion of Committee D's report by moving "that the Academic Vice President be asked to charge the Campus Admissions and 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." Berlin's motion passed. He then continued Committee D's report on classrooms by the following motion:

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.

III. REPORT ON THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE - Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Virginia Sowell, reported that this committee has been constituted by Vice President Darling to address the issue of whether or not we should have certain basic core curriculum requirements for the University in that TTU graduates would have had exposure to certain areas. Deans of the various undergraduate colleges were asked to appoint people to the committee and Sowell will chair the committee. The committee is charged with making recommendations concerning general education in terms of the purpose of what students should have as a part of general education as graduates of TTU and how to achieve this purpose. This committee will develop recommendations which will go to the academic colleges for review by the faculty in those colleges (probably during departmental meetings). Those recommendations will then go back to the General Education Committee and to the faculty again if necessary. Finally, recommendations will be made to Vice President Darling, President Cavazos and the Board of Regents. Sowell said that input from the faculty is welcome, even at this primary stage. So far the areas addressed by this committee are: the need to handle the English language with precision; the need for thinking skills and the ability to integrate and communicate horizontally as well as vertically; the need to develop curiosity so that the student will continue his education on his own; the need for computational skills; the need for awareness of the fine arts and contributions to various civilizations; the need for knowledge of the nature of science; the need for the understanding of the systems of technology for the future and the need to develop a sense of the history of civilization. Basically the question is, do we have courses that are not just basic courses for majors in that field but could be incorporated into the general education requirements. How flexible should the requirements be and so forth? Sowell concluded by saying that the committee hopes to have something in writing for faculty to critique next Fall.

IV. REPORT OF THE BUDGET STUDY COMMITTEE

Elbow referred to this committee's report circulated with the agenda of the meeting and stated that this committee was asked to look into a recommendation to develop and recommend a workable University merit system. Comparisons were made with merit salary policies of other universities and procedures used here and the committee reviewed two reports done by Faculty Senate committees in 1979 and 1980. The committee concluded that the present system under which Tech operates is "about as good as any other system

Report of the Budget Study Committee continued.....

that one might come up with." However, since there is some unhappiness in certain areas the committee recommends that the Faculty Status & Welfare Committee or one of the Faculty Senate Study Committees be charged with investigating the criteria that are used to determine merit salary distributions among colleges and administrators and making such recommendations as may be appropriate.


V. REPORT OF THE APRIL 9 MEETING WITH SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION COMMISSION VISITOR

Davis reported on the meeting with Dr. John Lyons, site visitor, from the University of Alabama. The major part of the time was spent in discussing tenure and promotion she said. The communication problem between faculty and administration was also discussed. For the most part, topics discussed were those that have been discussed on the floor of the Senate for the past two or three years.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

McLaughlin raised an inquiry on behalf of a constituent concerning a time for review of candidates turned back for tenure and/or promotion at the level of the Academic Vice President's office. McLaughlin stated that he interpreted Dr. Darling's statement made earlier to mean that in the future if a candidate for tenure and/or promotion had his application approved at all levels and subsequently disapproved at the academic affairs level there would be in the future a time, before the final decision was made, in which the candidate could replead his/her case in hopes of reversing the decision to deny tenure and/or promotion. In the case of the constituent of which McLaughlin spoke this was not done.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.



Murray Coulter, Secretary