



## TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

The Faculty Senate

3-G Holden Hall  
Box 41032  
Lubbock, TX 79409-1032  
(806) 742-3656

December 1, 1993

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Sue Couch, President

RE: Agenda for meeting #147, December 8, 1993  
3:15 p.m., University Center Senate Room

### AGENDA

- I. Call to order and introduction of guests
- II. Approval of the minutes of the November 10, 1993 meeting
- III. Remarks from President Lawless on University Goals
- IV. Remarks from Executive Vice President and Provost Haragan
- V. Reports from University Councils
  - Academic Council--Oliver Hensley
  - Graduate Council--M. Catherine Miller
  - Research Council--Fred Wagner
  - Development Council--Richard Zartman
  - Other
- VI. Reports from Committees of the Faculty Senate
  - Committee on Committees
  - Study Committee A
  - Other
- VII. Old Business
  - Appointment of Athletic Department Representative to Faculty Senate
  - Vice Provost Sweazy's Address to Senate on ARP/ATP Funding
  - Appointment of Senate Representative to General Education Committee
  - Faculty Performance Study Committee
  - Other
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment

# TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

Department of Biological Sciences  
Box 43131  
Lubbock, Texas 79409-3131 U.S.A.

Phone: 806-742-2715 (main office) 806-742-2707 (Haigler office)

FAX: 806-742-2963

Date: November 30, 1993  
To: Sue Couch  
From: Candace Haigler *ch*  
RE: Revised proposal of the motion to the Faculty Senate

*(see next page)*  
I propose the following revision of the page to be sent to the Faculty Senate. The only significant changes are in the first paragraph. You will note that I have omitted explicit references to possible negative implications of this decision, while at the same time stating my opinion that the committee is currently unnecessary. Can you agree that this is an acceptable compromise? If not please call again. (Please call again anyway to confirm that you have received this.)

Just one additional personal comment to you related to one of our past conversations: I think we need to try to get beyond the "zero sum game" concept in terms of long-range thinking as much as possible. It is possible that because of over-expansion when money was plentiful,

*TTU* ~~we~~ cannot support everything for the future that we attempted in the past. Therefore, some retraction may be necessary, truly making it a "zero-sum game" in the short run. (It is obvious that what is best for the institution in the long term may be quite painful for some individuals in the short term. However, tenure and the Faculty Senate-initiated financial exigency policy provides protection of livelihood for long-term faculty members if a particular area is de-emphasized.)

For the long-term future, it is not a "zero sum game", in my opinion, because high achievement in each area will have a positive impact on the image of the university and, hopefully, our legislative appropriations relative to other universities and endowment giving. Therefore, faculty need to applaud and promote the success of other units as well as striving for excellence in their own. Part of this implies seeking that each unit has appropriate and competitive resources for the mission defined for it as part of institutional planning. (It might be that some areas will be primarily involved in undergraduate education, while others have equally strong graduate components. There is nothing wrong with this, particularly if new faculty are hired with honest expectations.) It is likely true that "appropriate and competitive resources" will not imply equal \$ amounts or even \$ amounts/student for each area. For example, laboratories and laboratory-based undergraduate and graduate teaching are very expensive. I do not think that some faculty find it easy to contemplate that unequal allocation of resources may be appropriate and just. It will continue to be disturbing to me when faculty members advocate advance of their own discipline by tearing down another.

Finally, none of us have been immune from recent painful cuts. I hope that we can all work toward encouraging the university to define what the institution will support and at what level, followed by supporting each other in getting the "appropriate and competitive resources" for each area.

\* implying, also, that it defines for itself

To: The Officers and Members of the Faculty Senate  
From: Candace Haigler, Member of the Faculty Senate *ah*  
RE: A motion in regard to the Faculty Senate Faculty Performance Study Committee

### **Reasoning Behind the Motion**

I was disappointed by the action of the Faculty Senate in regard to establishing at this particular time the committee named above. In my view, the Provost made a good faith effort to constitute a 13 member task force that was fully representative of the Faculty Senate (6 members) and the faculty at large. Furthermore, we had assurances from the chairperson and Faculty Senate members of the task force that an agenda had not been dictated--everything of importance to any faculty member could be and would be discussed.

Accepting that two committees will exist, I am now concerned that there is great potential for our action to minimize effective faculty input regarding this important problem. For example, faculty members may well receive two questionnaires from the two committees on the same issues. Which one will they fill out? Virtually simultaneous solicitations for information from two committees will increase the probability that neither will be taken seriously. I think that it is our responsibility as the Faculty Senate not to propagate such a potentially confusing situation to the faculty at large, especially on such an important issue.

Therefore, to fulfill our responsibility as representatives of the faculty, we should not confuse them about mechanisms for effective comment on faculty productivity or request more time from them than absolutely necessary. In that spirit, I propose the following motion:

### **The Motion**

***The Faculty Senate Faculty Performance Study Committee is directed to work as cooperatively as possible with the Provost-originated Productivity Task Force, particularly in regard to soliciting information and comments from the general faculty only in a unified format or formats as will be mutually agreed upon by the two committees.***

Dr. John Burns, Chairperson of the Productivity Task Force, has expressed his willingness to work in this way if so desired by the Faculty Senate.

Proposed resolution on the High Riders incident:

Whereas, the High Riders spirit organization has acted in a discriminatory manner in disciplining a pregnant undergraduate, and

Whereas, the Christian standards clause in its constitution is inherently discriminatory against Jews, Moslems, agnostics and other religious dissenters and minorities on campus, and

Whereas, the leadership of the said organization has refused to remedy the above-mentioned grievance and has refused to alter its constitution, by-laws and policies to eliminate discriminatory references and practices,

Therefore, the Dean of Students and Vice-President for Student Affairs should see that High Riders is de-certified as a recognized student organization; is refused future funding from student government or state sources; is denied access to campus and university facilities; and is required to refund any funds it has received since being in violation of the non-discriminatory provisions of University regulations and federal and state law;

Further, that the Dean of Students require that the officers of the said organization offer a written apology to the aggrieved student and that the organization amend its constitution to eliminate discriminatory policies before it be allowed to operate on the Texas Tech campus again.

Presented from the floor by Catherine Miller -- under new business  
Senators voted to TABLE the motion until more information on the matter is obtained from the Dean of Students.