

MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING #66

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, January 16, 1985, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Evelyn Davis, President, presiding. Senators present were Adamcik, Ayoub, Bloomer, Burnett, Carlile, Collins, Coulter, Curry, K. Davis, Dixon, Dvoracek, Gettel, Gipson, Goss, Gott, Havens, Higdon, Keho, Khan, Lee, Mehta, Newcomb, Oberhelman, Owens, Rude, Sasser, Shine, Sparkman, Steele, Strauss, Sullivan, Teske, Thornhill, Vallabhan, Whitsitt, Williams, Wilson, and Wright. Senators Anderson, Blair, Eissinger, Richardson, Stockton, Welton, and Wicker were absent because of University business. Senator Ford was absent due to illness and Senator Cravens was absent because of illness in his family. Senators Freeman and McKown were absent.

Vernon McGuire, Associate Professor, Speech Communications, served as Parliamentarian.

Guests included Drs. John R. Darling and C. Len Ainsworth, from the office of academic affairs and research; Dr. Eugene E. Payne from the office of finance and administration; Preston Lewis, University News and Publications; Rick Lee, University Daily; Paul Cline, Jr., Avalanche Journal; Barbara Williams, Channel 28; David Barnett and Jim Noble, Student Senate, and Neale Pearson, Political Science.

President Davis called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. and recognized guests.

I. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 12, 1984 MEETING

Davis asked for corrections to the minutes, hearing none, she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

II. REPORT ON FINANCIAL EXIGENCY PLAN BY DR. DARLING

Plan was drafted by former Tenure & Privilege Committee and sent to Dr. Cavazos via Dr. Darling on 3/20/84. Dr. Darling mentioned that the President wanted the Faculty Senate to work with Dr. Darling and Dr. Campbell to come up with a policy that would eventually go to the Academic Council. Then the policy would go to the general faculty for a non-binding referendum vote. The President and the Board of Regents would make final changes. A Financial Exigency Policy needs to be in place by 6/1/85.

Several responses came from the senators. Dr. Sullivan asked why the administration has waited for a full year to draft an Exigency Policy. Dr. Darling did not respond. Jacquelin Collins, said that we should have some assurance that our efforts on a Financial Exigency Policy will be taken in good faith by the President before we spend a lot of time on it. Further Dr. Collins said that the first order of business was to redo the tenure policy. Ben Newcomb supported Collins by saying that the Financial Exigency Plan is not backed up by the tenure policy. Dr. Sasser asked that President Evelyn Davis ask Dr. Cavazos for a response to the proposed Financial Exigency Plan.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Committee A - Bloomer

The committee has not met, so they had no report. Higdon directed the Faculty Senate President to be sure that this committee meets before our next meeting.

Committee Reports continued.....

- B. Academic Programs Committee - Dixon  
No report

- C. ad hoc Committee on Campus and Community Relations - Collins  
Collins submitted a written report concerning his conversation with Bee Zeeck on Insight. She said that nothing had been carried to her as of January 10, 1985. Further, she said anything now would be history.

Bee Zeeck suggested that Insight report on Faculty Senate activities routinely. She was willing to change the deadlines for submitting material to Insight for publication in order to accommodate the Faculty Senate meeting dates.

A Faculty Senate response to the Board of Regents' statement on October 18, 1984, has been written. A copy of the statement is in Jacquelin Collins' hands and the Faculty Senate voted without opposition for him to carry this to Bee Zeeck.

Collins moved that Insight cover our Faculty Senate meetings. After some discussion the motion carried with 28 yes votes and 5 no votes.

- D. ad hoc Committee on University Status and Progress - Sullivan  
Sullivan mentioned a variety of activities that this committee would look at -- recruiting of faculty and students at TTU with an emphasis on quality, retention of faculty and students, research funding, endowments and how we compare to other universities in Texas. This information will serve as a data base for the university administration and Faculty Senate.

- E. Committee on Committees - Mehta  
This committee submitted the following nominations:

Nominations Committee for Faculty Senate Officers for 1985-86  
Murray Coulter, Arts & Sciences; Kishor C. Mehta, College of Engineering and Evelyn Davis, Home Economics

Faculty Senate Tenure and Privilege Committee  
Jacquelin Collins, Arts & Sciences; James Graves, Agriculture;  
Nina Ronshausen, Education; Joe Adamcik, Arts & Sciences; and  
a fifth nominee is still considering the invitation.

Acceptance of these nominees passed without opposition.

- F. Budget Study Committee - Mehta  
This committee has not met because there has not been an apparent need. Now, there appears to be need for a meeting and to elect a chairperson. The committee is scheduled to meet on January 22, 1985.

One item that the committee will look at is the change in faculty salaries over the past 4 to 5 years relative to other universities.

Committee reports continued.....

E. Executive Committee - Davis and Wright

Davis mentioned that we had received letters of support from Tyler and West Texas State concerning the tenure crisis at TTU. We now have letters from more than half of the state universities in Texas.

Davis gave an overview of the meeting with President Cavazos. On January 14, 1985, Davis said that she thought it a positive sign that we had a meeting scheduled with Dr. Cavazos. She also thought it a positive sign that he was willing to discuss the financial exigency problem with the Faculty Senate. However, she saw very little change in his attitude toward the faculty.

Davis compared the discussion last summer (July 16, 1984) on tenure with the exchanges at the last meeting on the Financial Exigency policy. During the summer meeting, Davis stressed the importance of faculty ratification of any tenure policy prior to Board of Regents approval. When she told him 97 percent of the faculty surveyed had indicated the need for faculty ratification of a policy, Dr. Cavazos responded by saying the question should not have been on the questionnaire. At the last meeting he agreed to a non-binding vote by the faculty on a financial exigency policy.

Wright reported on the general content of the meeting with Dr. Cavazos. Substantive comments were as follows:

1. Dr. Cavazos addressed the Financial Exigency Plan in the presence of Dr. Darling. He said, "We are going to have to spell it out. I would like you (the Faculty Senate) to work with Dr. Darling and Dr. Campbell to come up with a policy that would eventually go to the Academic Council, then to the general faculty for a non-binding referendum, then to the President and Board of Regents." He stressed that this work needs to be completed by June.
2. The President expressed a deep concern to advance TTU in the face of forthcoming budget cuts.
3. President Cavazos discussed his proposal for a "University System at TTU" that would be presented to the Board of Regents and ultimately sent to the Texas Legislature for approval.
4. In response to a question on how to retain our best graduate faculty, Dr. Cavazos stressed the importance of improving TTU's buildings and purchasing new equipment for laboratories. Monies from Proposition II will help to meet these objectives.
5. At the end of our meeting, he asked for our advice on reorganization and said, "Let's begin anew."
6. The Faculty Senate officers will meet with Dr. Cavazos again at 10:30 a.m. on January 31.

IV. FINANCIAL STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY - PAYNE

A. "I am more discouraged about the outlook for universities than ever before. The legislature passed a large tax bill last summer for public school, highways and prisons. Most of those legislatures who voted on that bill are not back. The interpretation by the legislature is that the people of Texas do not want a tax increase. This year's legislature is dominated by Republicans, and they are very conservative."

Financial State of the University by Dr. Payne continued.....

B. "Our communities need to know what is happening. We are being asked to take a 27% cut from our 1984-85 budget, not the budget that we proposed." There is no reasonable way that we can absorb a 27% cut. We will have fewer class sections, larger classes, library acquisitions cut, deteriorated buildings, and on and on.

C. There is a 1.0 billion shortfall for this coming biennium and that may be raised to 1.2 or 1.3 billion this spring.

D. Our problem in funding for higher education is a long-term problem. We need a larger tax base if we want to have a strong university compared to other states. If our sales tax were raised from 4 1/8 to 5%, it would raise an additional 1.7 billion dollars each year. State leadership is not about to get in front of a tax bill. The general public will have to plead with legislative representatives to raise our taxes before they will consider the idea.

E. Our "friends" say, "Don't worry, we are going to take care of you." But what they mean is that we will reduce your cut to 10%.

F. Without a strong university system in Texas, untold billions of tax revenue will be lost because fewer industries will want to come to Texas. International trends in industry are tied to quality of higher education.

G. Tuition would need to increase tenfold the present fee to cover the shortfall in higher education. This is not possible in the near future. Moreover, it is not politically practical to think of eliminating any universities.

The meeting adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

*Henry A. Wright*  
Henry A. Wright, Secretary  
Faculty Senate