



Texas Tech University

The Faculty Senate
3-G Holden Hall
Lubbock, Texas 79409 / (806) 742-3656

March 4, 1986

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Margaret E. "Peg" Wilson, President
SUBJECT: Agenda for Meeting #77, March 12, 1986

The Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, March 12, 1986 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 the Minutes of the February 12, 1986 meeting
- III. Election of officers
- IV. Report of Standing Committees
 - A. Committee on Committees - Minifie (see attachment)
 - B. Study Committee C - Burnett (see attachment)
 - C. Study Committee A - Cravens
- V. Report of Ad Hoc Committee
 - Financial Exigency - Aycok
- VI. Old Business
 - A. Computer Usage (LISD) - Haragan
 - B. Grade posting - Haragan
 - C. Faculty Club - Platten
- VII. New Business
 - A. Tenure Study Committee report - Collins
 - B. Budget report - Haragan
- VIII. Other Business

(see back of this page for additional agenda items)

"An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution"

IX. Announcements

- A. Congratulations are in order for Senator Henry Wright for receiving the highest honor bestowed by the Society for Range Management at its recent international meeting. Henry was presented the Renner Award for his contribution to the profession through the use of fire as an ecological tool for improving and managing rangelands in North America.
- B. Congratulations also are given to our Parliamentarian, Vernon McGuire who was recognized by District III, comprised of more than 40 universities and colleges, of the National Debate Tournament. Vernon was presented the award for dedication and service in the areas of coaching, teaching, judging, and administration of forensics.
- C. The Agenda Committee will meet on March 28 at 2:00 p.m. All attachments should be in to Grace prior to that time for inclusion with the April agenda.

X. Adjournment

Attachment IV. A

Committee on Committees Report

To fill the vacancy on the Convocations Committee the Committee on Committees suggests the following persons for Senate approval:

Francis Fusellier, Theatre Arts
Robert Gades, College of Education

Attachment IV. B

Faculty Senate Study Committee C Report

The Committee recommends the following:

1. That all department or area chairpersons serve at the pleasure of the dean and that they be subject to mandatory review every three years.
2. That a chairperson be subject to removal at any time.
3. That in the matter of evaluating chairpersons the several colleges or schools develop evaluation procedures suitable to the needs of each college or school.
4. That the second sentence in paragraph 2C (OP 32.03, Vol. I) be deleted because it is redundant.
5. That the OP be revised carefully:
 - a. to reflect the fact that the School of Law does not have departments or areas, and
 - b. that the sections in the OP about chairpersons be edited and revised carefully to reflect any and all changes.

This afternoon I should like to speak to some of the issues which are of utmost importance to this faculty and to faculties across the state.

The number one issue, in my opinion, is faculty governance or the lack of same. The erosion of faculty governance has been occurring for a number of years. Contrary to opinion of some, the faculties do not wish "to run" their various universities. What they do desire is input into decisions which affect their professional lives. This input has to be more than token briefings; it can best be accomplished by judicious use of university committees and faculty senates or councils. In matters of serious consequence, such as tenure and financial exigency policies, the faculty as a whole should be included in the decision-making procedure.

Boards of Regents are composed largely of business men and women. To be sure, large universities have many of the same characteristics of a business. There is, however, one big difference between administration of a business and that of an educational institution and that difference can be summed up in one word--collegiality. While collegiality has its roots in the church, it has been associated with higher education almost as long as there have been such institutions in this country. University communities tend to look upon themselves more as families than businesses. But even if you buy the business theory, faculty governance is still a viable option. Peters and Waterman, in their best seller, In Search of Excellence, identified eight characteristics shared by 25 successful major corporations. One of those eight was productivity through people. Those successful corporations were people

oriented. They recognized the value of their employees! In a university I can assure you that the faculty is as adamant as any administrator in wanting quality. Perhaps the faculty is even more zealous in wanting excellence than top management. After all, regents and presidents come and go, but good faculty live through a number of administrative changes.

I should like to speak to the charge that has been made that the faculty are self-serving. The detractors who make these charges have never served on a faculty committee. From personal experience I can assure you that when faculty are given an opportunity to contribute to policy and decision making they tend to lean over backward to protect the institution. It gives faculty no pleasure to see the institution, to which they have devoted their expertise and energies, become the object of bad publicity and derision which can only have a negative effect on faculty and student recruiting.

Faculty do care! Please give us the chance to use the wisdom and expertise which we possess to make the institutions of higher education the very best they can be in this state. We will not let you down.

The second most important issue in higher education is the continuance of tenure. Please note that I did not say anything about a tenure policy. If faculty governance is alive and well there will be no problem on a specific policy--administration and faculty working together will solve that problem. The issue is whether or not tenure is necessary at all. The answer must be a resounding "YES". Tenure is not a method by which those who are lazy or incompetent are granted a life-time job. I have read many tenure policies

and I have yet to find one which does not allow the option for ridding the institution of incompetent or immoral tenured faculty members. What I do find is a document which protects a faculty member from being fired for personal or political reasons or for teaching material which may be considered controversial if that material is within his/her area of expertise. We are not in our positions to turn out fact-laden little robots. On the contrary, as our students leave our universities we hope that we may have been one of the instruments which will cause them to think--think through the issues which will face them as they go about their professions, raise their children, serve their communities, state, and nation. In four years every potential problem cannot be delved into but if they have been given the knowledges and techniques necessary to think through an issue and make an independent decision, then we have been successful. We can only accomplish this if we are given the privilege of academic freedom through tenure.

Finally, the issues related to teacher excellence are of utmost importance. I will speak to only three. Texas institutions have long been at a disadvantage in recruiting outstanding faculty when it is discovered that there is no funding for sabbaticals. Even the smallest of institutions in other states recognize the need for post-doctoral work; a chance to travel to other institutions to survey different methodology, equipment, organization, or other facets of a discipline; or the opportunity to travel and study outside the boundaries of the United States. The results obtained from sabbatical leaves enrich not only the faculty member, but the students who benefit from increased expertise, and the institution

as a whole.

While we are already facing a loss of funding, it is imperative that we avoid the easy remedy of reducing the number of faculty by creating "monster" classes. Those who say that one can teach 300 as easily as 30 are wrong. One can impart facts to 300 as easily as 30 but teaching involves interchanges between teacher and students, students and students. In large classes most students believe that they have no personal identity but are simply numbers. Due to simple logistics, testing procedures revert to objective-type items which reveal only fleeting remembrance of facts rather than permanent ability to reason and apply facts. Let us not cheat an entire generation of college students by taking an easy solution to a difficult financial problem.

Finally, most faculty are not turned off or afraid of faculty evaluations, if they are accomplished in a fair and impartial manner. We would rejoice if the same fair and impartial evaluations could be applied to administrators, from the department chair level all the way to the top.

A number of Senators have asked to see what was said in their behalf at the hearing before the Select Committee on Higher Education on February 13, 1986. The Agenda Committee concurred and I offer this, not as an example of great prose but as hopefully representing your major concerns.

MEW