

MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #114

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, March 14, 1990 in the Senate Room of the University Center with President Julia Whitsitt presiding. Senators present were Barr, Beckner, Brink, Burnett, Couch, Curry, Dometrius, Ervin, Finn, Fish, Harp, Hall, Hartwell, Hayes, Hennessey, Hildebrand, Howe, Hurst, Long, McClendon, Mann, Nathan, O'Callaghan, Owens, Pearson, Peters, Peterson, Piatt, Rinehart, R. Smith, Strauss, Tock, Trost, Troyansky, Vann, Wagner, Westney, Williams, and Wilson. Senators Andrews, Hill, Kimmel, Lee, Mehta, Richardson, J. Smith, Tallent and Thompson were absent with reason.

I. Introduction of guests

President Whitsitt called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. and recognized the following guests: Robert Lawless, President, Len Ainsworth, Vice Provost; Virginia Sowell, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; Mary Ann Higdon, TTU Library; Denise Jackson, Director of Annual Giving, Office of Development; Robert Sweazy, Vice Provost for Research, Don Cosby, Vice President for Fiscal Affairs; Steve Kauffman, News & Publications; Jim Barlow, Lubbock Avalanche-Journal; and Connie Swinney, University Daily.

Professor John Bliese served as Parliamentarian for the meeting.

II. Consideration of the minutes of the February 14, 1990 meeting.

The minutes were approved as circulated.

III. Election of Faculty Senate Officers for 1990-91

The nominating committee composed of Senators Burnett, Finn, and Trost also served as the elections committee. The elections committee distributed, collected, and counted written ballots. Officers elected were as follows:

President - James Brink
Vice-President - Shelley Harp
Secretary - Weldon Beckner

IV. Reports from Faculty Senate Standing and Ad Hoc committees

A. Committee on Committees

Senator Wagner reported for Senator Mehta, chairperson. The proposed committee list was distributed with the agenda. Wagner moved acceptance of the report. Motion passed. Wagner asked for nominations for committees that have yet to be filled. In preparing the committee nominations selections are made based on academic area and gender.

B. Budget Study

Senator Fish announced that this committee is studying hiring/firing statistics by rank and plans to have the report

soon. Senator Fish asked for the return of the questionnaire regarding salaries which was previously mailed.

C. Committee A

Senator Couch, chairperson, reported regarding the incorporation of librarians and archivists as representation on the Faculty Senate. Faculty members with a 50 percent or more administrative appointment are not eligible for membership on the Faculty Senate or university committees. If this policy were extended to the library staff at least six persons would be ineligible for membership in the Faculty Senate. Committee A unanimously recommended that the same policy that applies to faculty also apply to library staff. Senator Couch moved the acceptance of this recommendation. Motion passed.

D. Committee C

Senator Brink submitted a written report (attached) evaluating the proposal that Texas Tech University facilitate the employment of dual-career couples. Committee C opposed the formation of an office for this purpose. Senator Brink moved the adoption of the report as the position of the Faculty Senate. Motion passed.

V. Report on Councils

A. The Provost's Council report is attached. The Academic Council consisted only of routine matters. The Operations Council has not met since the last Faculty Senate meeting. The representative to the Development Council had no report.

B. Senator Peters distributed a working document describing the research council of the university (attached). Persons who wish to make comments should direct them to Jane Winer, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences or Senator Peters.

C. Senator Hayes submitted a written report from the Graduate Council (attached).

D. Senator Brink, representative to the Student Senate, reported that this body is studying the following:

1. A cooperative education program in which students work in business or industry as part of their university curricula.
2. AIDS awareness with emphasis on placing condoms at accessible places on campus.
3. Allocation of \$130,000 among the various campus organizations

E. Senator Westney reported for the Comprehensive Writing Task Force on their study of the implications for teaching the comprehensive writing classes, especially for junior faculty members.

VI. Old Business

A. Vice President for Fiscal Affairs Don Cosby summarized the Coopers & Lybrand report on medical insurance programs. This report provided an overview of the years between 1983 and 1989

and a detailed analysis of an eighteen months period.

1. The following summary points were presented:

- a. Health care insurance is a little underpriced; life insurance is a little overpriced.
- b. The administration costs of Equicor is relatively high. Since we are on a premium stabilization funding plan, our program takes on some of the features of self insurance.
- c. Health care providers express extreme hesitancy regarding some of the newer features of the plan, such as HMO's.
- d. The vast majority of the Texas Tech employees are in Lubbock, therefore we have an opportunity to use our purchasing power. We might make an agreement with one or more of the hospitals. On the other hand, Lubbock hospitals, with the exception of the University Medical Center, are at 95 percent utilization. Most hospitals in the country are at 65 percent utilization. We could enter into contracts with major physician groups. Since prescription drugs constitute about 8 to 10 percent of our total costs we could issue prescription drug cards and reduce this cost somewhat.

2. We could consider self-insurance. The problem is that some new medical technologies cause large swings in utilization rates. We considered self-insurance last year and decided not to go this route. The state of Texas may develop a self-insurance plan. Committees of several major agencies are considering this approach. The Coordinating Board Advisory may produce a plan which includes all Texas senior universities. Questions regarding the Texas Tech's health insurance plan may be directed either to Vice President Don Cosby's office or to the university Benefits Committee. We hope to have a direction within the next 30 days so that we can take bids and have a plan ready by September 1, 1990.

B. President Whitsitt announced that she is working with the Dean of Students' Office to implement the three-year-old report from the Task Force on Academic Dishonesty.

VII. New Business

A. President Whitsitt reported that she and Senator Wagner met recently with Frances Sage, Coordinating Board staff member assigned to Texas Tech. The west Texas region constitutes her assigned area. She was on campus to get a feel for specific issues and to update herself regarding the status of Texas Tech. She knows a great deal about the faculty concerns and is sympathetic with the faculty perspective. We discussed the administration-faculty relations, governance structure, and problems related to the stringent budget. She would like any faculty who have questions about the Coordinating Board to get in touch with her.

B. The Revised Grievance Procedures have arrived in the Faculty Senate office. The revision proposes to reduce the steps in the procedure, remove the time limits, and change the administrative officer from the president to the provost. Whitsitt will refer the proposal to a senate committee.

C. President Whitsitt announced that she had received a letter from a faculty member citing a proposed merger between two departments. This letter inquired regarding the possible existence of a university-wide policy to ensure an appropriate faculty role in administrative re-structuring. According to Provost Haragan there is no written policy. This letter requested that the Faculty Senate consider proposing a general policy describing what the nature of faculty participation should be. Senator Hennessey moved that a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate consider the issue of faculty participation in administrative structuring of colleges and provide recommendations to the Senate. With a second the motion passed.

D. Senator Sweazy was congratulated on receiving the Engineer of the Year award.

VIII. Remarks by Associate Vice-President Sowell

A. Faculty convocation will be April 3, in the University Theater at 3:30 p.m.. President Lawless will give a state of the university address and faculty awards will be given.

B. Commencement will be May 12. Faculty will be informed when the name of the speaker is known. The all-university ceremony is at 9:00 a.m. at which the doctoral candidates will be hooded and degrees will be awarded *en masse*. At 11:00 a. m. and 1:00 p.m. diplomas will be awarded individually within each college.

C. The Task Force on Student Evaluations, headed by Dean Haley, has received a response from the Senate. The Student Senate response is due March 15. The Task Force will then meet to discuss the various recommendations and revise their report.

D. Faculty are invited to submit nominations for Vice-President for Development to Dean Sam Curl, College of Agricultural Sciences.

IX. Announcements

A. The Agenda Committee will meet Monday, April 2, at 1:30 p.m.

B. All committee chairpersons and conveners should complete their reports for the May meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Betty Wagner
Secretary 1989-90

To: Faculty Senate

From: Faculty Senate Representative on the Graduate Council

Subject: Graduate Council meeting of March 1, 1990

1. The issue of the publication of theses or dissertations involving student/faculty collaboration is somewhat more complex than reported in the minutes of the meeting and implied in "after considerable discussion" phrase. Normally, the student becomes the holder of the copyright since he is supposed to have contributed original research. The dissertation/thesis director (who may have acquired funding for the whole project) also could have contributed original research. This situation would normally indicate joint authorship (with the student as first author). Some students, however, do not move quickly in taking the necessary steps in putting the thesis/dissertation into publication form (or in cooperating with the faculty researcher to that end) and therefore hinder the publication efforts of the faculty member. Some type of agreement is needed, therefore, to permit the faculty member to publish results unilaterally after the elapse of some specified amount of time. Copyright violation is a possible implication if this procedure is not thought out in a comprehensive fashion. If there are other dimensions or implications to this issue faculty members are urged to point these out to the Dean of the Graduate School.

Robert A. Hayes
Senator

March 14, 1990

Report from Faculty Senate Study Committee C

Re: Dual-career couple hiring

Committee C examined the March 19, 1989, report of the "Committee on Dual-Career Couples" addressed to Executive Vice President and Provost Haragan. The 1989 report is contained in the Faculty Senate agenda for the March 14, 1990, meeting.

After carefully considering both the philosophy of a policy of hiring dual-career couples and the specific recommendations submitted to Dr. Haragan in the March 29 report, Committee C offers the following:

1. Dual-career couples are more plentiful in academe than ever before, and satisfaction and long term commitment to Texas Tech might be facilitated if both partners had employment in their chosen fields in the same geographical locale. However, Committee C registers concern that a formal policy to hire dual-career couples may discriminate against qualified applicants with other personal profiles.

2. There is no agreement on Committee C that a formal office need be established to foster dual-career couple placement. When the situation arises in which two qualified individuals happen to be married to each other, then the academic units in question should work together and with the appropriate administrative offices to coordinate hiring. Committee C is strongly opposed to a formal office which might be construed to "make deals departments couldn't refuse" when the initiative for such hiring properly belongs to the academic unit. Although Committee C recognizes that dual-career couple hiring might be beneficial, such an effort should result from the satisfaction of academic units involved that the best qualified individuals are being considered. Then and only then should the administration make every effort to hire the candidates. The administration is in place to administer, and it should provide support when such support is called for by the appropriate academic units. Under no circumstances should a department or area be forced or enticed to hire someone not of their choosing, no matter how desirable a dual-career policy might be.

THE RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY
OF TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

Texas Tech University, designated by the State of Texas and by the Federal government as one of the nation's select research universities, accepts the responsibilities of conducting research that will advance its academic strengths, the economic development of Texas, and the well-being of the Nation and humanity. Texas Tech University is a comprehensive graduate research university offering an array of undergraduate, master's, doctoral and special professional degrees. The faculty and students of Texas Tech University are committed to advancing its international reputation as a center for excellence in research and education. Scholarship is fostered by the following philosophical principles and commitments essential for the practice of unfettered inquiry:

1. The University supports and values a full spectrum of research activities. The word "research" in this context embodies a comprehensive range of creative undertakings. Such projects may be traditional or innovative, funded or unfunded, and include basic and applied investigations in the sciences and technology, development, production research and technology transfer, scholarly inquiry in the humanities, and original contributions in fine arts and performing arts. Research productivity may be defined by various disciplines but it is not synonymous with the receipt of extramural funding. The rare and valuable intellectual gifts required to accomplish these missions are supported by the University through its commitment to develop and maintain many centers of excellence in research.
2. Research is problem-driven, and may cut across disciplinary boundaries. New disciplinary and interdisciplinary organizational structures have evolved, and will continue to evolve, to respond to the current and future needs of our faculty.
3. As a steward of knowledge for humankind, the University is ideologically and financially committed to supporting all scholarly functions, including research--the practice essential in scholarship.
4. The continuous and rigorous affirmation of academic

freedom and independent scholarship at Texas Tech University sustains its scholars and their work toward excellence in research. The University encourages independent scholarship, the sine qua non of academic life.

5. As one of the nation's leading research institutions, Texas Tech University proudly acknowledges its responsibility to expand the frontiers of knowledge. The University is grateful to patrons of its programs in art, humanities, sciences and engineering who have made it possible for faculty and students to uplift the human spirit and improve human conditions. Dedicated researchers are invited to join its faculty and students in their search for knowledge and their service to humanity.

Attachment, Item V. A, Provost Council
Report on Provost's Council Meeting
March 5, 1990

Graduate Dean Clyde Hendrick reported to the Provost's Council that he is committing some of his discretionary budget to recruiting graduate students. His efforts will support the recruiting already being done by individual colleges, schools, and departments, and will include such things as preparing "generic" videotapes to be supplemented with specific materials, buying lists of potential students from the Educational Testing Service, and hiring a graduate student recruiter to work with Marty Grassel of New Student Relations.

A proposed revision of the Faculty Grievance Procedure was discussed. After some further revision and editorial work it will be forwarded to the Senate for comment. The new version reduces the complexity of the present procedure and entirely eliminates the specific time limits on the various stages of the process.