

MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING #68

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, March 6, 1985, at 3:30 p.m. in the Senate Room of the University Center with Evelyn Davis, President, presiding. Senators present were Adamcik, Burnett, Carlile, Collins, Coulter, Cravens, Curry, K. Davis, Dixon, Dvoracek, Eissinger, Ford, Gettel, Gipson, Goss, Gott, Havens, Keho, Khan, Lee, McKown, Newcomb, Oberhelman, Owens, Rude, Sasser, Sparkman, Steele, Stockton, Strauss, Sullivan, Thornhill, Vallabhan, Welton, Whitsitt, Williams, and Wilson. Senators Blair, Richardson, Teske, Wicker and Wright were absent because of University business. Senators Anderson, Ayoub, Bloomer, Freeman, and Mehta were absent. Senator Shine was absent because of illness and Senator Higdon is on leave from the University.

Vernon McGuire, Associate Professor Speech Communications, served as Parliamentarian. Murray Coulter, senator at-large, served as secretary in the absence of Henry Wright.

Guests included John E. Birdwell, Chairman of Texas Tech Board of Regents; John R. Darling, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, Eugene E. Payne, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Rick Lee, University Daily; Paul Cline, Jr., Avalanche Journal; Preston Lewis, University News & Publications; and Eric Summers, Channel 13.

President Davis called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. and recognized the guests present. Mr. John E. Birdwell, Chairman of the Board of Regents, Texas Tech, was recognized as a special guest.

I. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 13, 1985 MEETING

On page two, Faculty Senate Budget Committee report, line four, the word faired was corrected to fared and the minutes were accepted as corrected.

II. ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE OFFICERS FOR 1985-86

President Davis introduced each of the candidates and ballots were distributed. Senators Williams and Lee counted the ballots. The election results were as follows:

Margaret E. Wilson, HPER, President
Murray Havens, Political Science, Vice President
Julia Whitsitt, English, Secretary

III. BUDGET REPORT - Payne

Eugene E. Payne, Vice President for Finance and Administration, updated the Senate on the State's financial difficulties, which he stated to be of major importance to all Texans. Dr. Payne said: 1) The problems cannot be solved by the Governor and Legislators alone; faculty, staff, administration, and the Board of Regents are all a part of the solution. 2) All state agencies should share in the burden of cuts, and higher education must be prepared to do its share. Agressively seeking outside funds, support for a reasonable tuition increase and the cutting of costs are ways in which higher education can share the burden.

Payne concluded by saying that the Legislature has always treated higher education fairly and the administration is confident that will continue. Even with deep cuts (10% to 20%) it is not a question of whether or not TTU can keep its doors open. The questions is: "Just what will be behind the doors and how many young people will be denied entrance?"

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee on Committees - Welton

The number of nominations received from faculty to fill vacancies on various University Councils and Committees is far short of the number usually received. Welton said that approximately 35 additional nominations were needed. He encouraged his colleagues to send in additional nominations.

Faculty Senate Study Committee C - Burnett

The chairperson referred to the following report circulated with the agenda of the meeting:

The committee met on February 26 pursuant to its charge to investigate and make recommendations concerning the election of a Tenure Hearing Panel.

The committee recommends:

1. That the Faculty Senate Elections Committee proceed with the election of a Tenure Hearing Panel but that each ballot include the following disclaimer: "The conduct of this election by the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Elections Committee in no way suggests or constitutes an endorsement or ratification of the tenure policy adopted by the Board of Regents on September 28, 1984."
2. That the Faculty Senate adopt as a statement of policy a similar disclaimer that participation in the implementation of the new tenure policy is viewed as resulting from contractual obligations of faculty with respect to university service and in no way suggests or constitutes an endorsement or ratification of the tenure policy.

Burnett moved approval of recommendation #1. Several senators, Sullivan, Collins, Steele, K. Davis, Havens, Strauss and McKown asked Burnett several questions and discussed the recommendation. Burnett said the committee considered various possibilities, and largely in response to comments of one of the committee members who is a member of the faculty in the School of Law, it was concluded that faculty would not jeopardize its situation with regard to later action on the tenure policy by participating in the election of a Tenure Hearing Panel. Discussion indicated that there is a contractual obligation, as faculty members, to follow the directive from the administration. The motion to approve recommendation #1 passed - 19 for and 13 against, with 1 abstention.

Committee C's recommendation #2 passed without discussion.

Faculty Senate Study Committee C - Owens

The chairperson reported that the committee had met and is preparing a response to the recommendations from the Admissions and Retention Committee, but that the committee's report has not been finalized and she asked that the committee report be deferred until the April Senate meeting.

Faculty Senate Academic Programs Committee - Dixon

The chairperson gave an interim report outlining interaction with VPAAR office concerning scheduling and registration problems. He noted that Dr. Virginia Sowell, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, had pointed out many restrictions on scheduling set by the Coordinating Board. Dixon expects to have a full report at the next Senate meeting. Newcomb, Wilson, Rude and Steele each commented on various concerns which they requested the Faculty Senate Academic Programs Committee to discuss with Dr. Sowell.

Committee reports continued.....

Ad Hoc Committee on University Status & Progress - Sullivan

According to the chairperson, this committee is conducting a survey. Questionnaires will be sent to the department chairpersons with questions regarding recruitment. Other faculty members will be sent questionnaires with questions about whether or not they are pursuing a job elsewhere. This committee is concerned with the status and progress of the university. It is setting up profiles from 1980 forward on the number and type of students TTU is attracting; the levels of faculty appointments and a number of things dealing with the University budget. This information will be compiled and compared with the same information gathered from other universities and colleges in the state of Texas. This committee hopes to have a report within 2 months. Questionnaires will be circulated after spring break.

Ad Hoc Committee on Campus and Community Relations - Collins

Bee Zeeck is moving forward with the task of setting up a Speaker's Bureau. The next issue if Insight will have an informative article and a form for faculty members to fill out listing topics they are capable of speaking on. The preparation of a brochure is underway.

The committee is going forward with plans to acquire information on how TTU as an institution and how TTU as a number of individuals contribute to the community of Lubbock financially, culturally and etc.

Report on the Conference on Faculty Governance Organizations - Sullivan

On February 22, 1985 Sullivan, representing the Faculty Senate and TTU faculty, attended the Conference on Faculty Governance Organizations in Austin. Before going to the conference Sullivan met with Bob Youde, Coordinator for Higher Education, in the Governor's office. Youde was surprised to learn that there is still a problem at TTU with the President, Board of Regents and faculty. Youde and Sullivan discussed the appointment of regents at TTU. Sullivan then met with Senator Montford and discussed the regent appointments with him. Montford thought it unlikely that local persons would be appointed to the TTU Board of Regents.

The main topic of discussion at the Texas Council of Faculty Governance Organization meeting was the budget situation. Speakers at the meeting were various legislators and their aids and committee members who are involved in the preparation of the Governor's budget. Everyone had a different opinion of the budget situation. It was thought that the Hobby budget will not pass. No public official would commit to a decrease of less than 8%. No reliable information on the budget is expected until May 27 when the Governor is required to sign a budget document. Financial exigency was also discussed at great length Sullivan said.

Executive Committee Report - Davis

An ad hoc Committee for Developing Financial Exigency Policy & Procedures has been formed. Members are: Wendell Aycock, A&S; Sue Couch, Home Economics; James Eissinger, Law; Miriam Ershkowitz, A&S; Shelby Hunt, Business Administration; William Sparkman, College of Education; Robert Sweazy, Engineering; and Margaret Wilson, A&S. President Davis will act as an ex officio member of the committee.

President Davis' Report on Meetings between ad hoc Committee of Board of Regents,
President Cavazos and Faculty Senate Officers (February 20, 1985)

Those present at the meeting were Regents Larry Johnson, Chairperson of the ad hoc committee, Rex Fuller, Jerry Ford, John Birdwell, President Lauro Cavazos and Senate officers Evelyn Davis, Henry Wright and substituting for Ernest Sullivan was Jacq Collins. The meeting took place in the conference room of the Board of Regents Suite.

The objective of the ad hoc committee is to work with representatives of the Student Association, representatives of the Faculty Senate, the Horn Professors, Academic Deans, and other groups for the development of better communications and an atmosphere of more cooperation within the University community. The ad hoc committee was appointed to hear concerns, discuss issues, and exchange ideas regarding campus matters of particular interest to the faculty, students and administration.

The Regents described the meeting as "up-beat" and one said he thought they had learned a lot that day. The meeting was characterized by an honest exchange of ideas and straightforward language from all parties. The meeting spanned 1½ hours.

Your faculty representatives presented the main issue on campus as one of poor management on the part of the administration. Specific illustrations were given to help the Regents understand the problem. Some of these examples were:

- *Accounting services does not pay bills for 6 to 9 months and apparently has trouble keeping good budget records. This impedes progress on research projects and necessitates extra departmental and personal bookkeeping.

The Regents seemed to think this problem could be resolved shortly.

- *The point was made that not only was the tenure policy a "bad" policy but the process for its development was ineffectual. The ad hoc committee indicated that the faculty had misrepresented the tenure policy to the public and our colleagues at other universities. The misunderstanding stemmed from a difference in interpretation of the 5 year faculty reviews. It is possible to interpret the five year reviews as five year term contracts. The tenure policy states, "A comprehensive performance review of each tenured faculty member will be conducted every five years." This does appear to place the status of tenure on the line for each tenured faculty person.

It was clear that the Regents at the meeting did not perceive the tenure policy in the same way that most of the faculty members do. We asked for renegotiation of a tenure policy for Texas Tech University.

- *After the lengthy tenure discussion, attention was focused on the fact that the faculty is showing signs of low morale. Some specific symptoms were given such as it seems more faculty than usual are actively seeking positions elsewhere. Procedures are becoming tighter and more controlled which creates a hostile environment discouraging to risk taking and new ideas.

We briefly discussed the process of developing a financial exigency policy with procedures. The President wanted the faculty to know their involvement in the development process was essential. Dr. Cavazos agreed to discuss the things he dislikes about a proposed policy prior to its presentation to the faculty for a vote.

Some of the issues discussed were:

- *Non-tenure track hiring on professorial levels

- *Specific details on the process involved in developing the financial exigency policy

- *Faculty actively seeking jobs elsewhere


- *Reasons for 5 percent immediate budget reductions (Response: to present a serious image in our efforts to cut the budget and to carry over funds to the next year)

We asked the President about the 5 percent cuts in state supported research. He stated this is a mistake and he would investigate the problem.

- *The President indicated that he had not reviewed any procedures for implementation of the new tenure policy but he would be prepared to discuss the subject at our next meeting.

In the discussion that followed one senator asked if the optimism expressed by President Davis meant that there was some indication that the tenure policy might be reconsidered by the Regents. Davis indicated that the Board members present did not say that would happen. However, at that point, Chairman Birdwell volunteered that the Board members did not say they would not.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.


Murray W. Coulter
Acting Secretary