

Texas Tech University Faculty Senate

1996-1997:09

April 9, 1997 Minutes # 179

Faculty Status and Welfare Committee Recommendations for Changes in OP 32.32

Senator Dunham presented a written report at the meeting including the original OP 32.32, the recommended changes and the justification for each change. Each change was presented as a separate motion. Bold, underlined portions indicate the changed portions or additions to OP 32.32.

Recommendation #1- Recommended wording of item 5a (paragraph 1) is: Any faculty member, **whose evaluation reflects a pattern of unsatisfactory performance**, as agreed upon by the dean and chairperson/coordinator, will be informed in writing of deficiencies in teaching, creative activity or research, or service. The motion was unanimously amended to substitute the word **“incompetent”** in place of **“unsatisfactory.”** The committee agreed to change the OP 32.32 to use consistent wording throughout the resolutions replacing “unsatisfactory” with the word “incompetent.” The recommendation as amended passed.

Recommendation #2- Item 3 should also include an additional item (f) which should read: **All units should have a procedure established whereby a committee of peers will be available to arbitrate disagreement between an individual faculty member and the chairperson/coordinator regarding an annual review at the faculty member’s request. If the arbitration is not successful, a copy of the committee’s recommendations should become part of the annual evaluation.** The recommendation passed.

Recommendation #3- Item 3 should include an additional item (g) which should read: **5g. Such a peer review committee should be chosen by preestablished procedures agreed upon by the majority of the voting members of the faculty member’s academic unit.**

2. 5a (paragraph 2) should be rewritten as:

Each academic unit **will** develop preestablished procedures agreed upon by the voting members of the faculty member’s academic unit for involving other faculty in the formulation of a written program of development **when requested by the faculty member involved.** Senator George proposed an amendment that “should” be changed to

“shall.” Senator Virginia Thompson seconded the motion. Motion to amend passed. Amended motion passed.

Recommendation #4- Item 5a should be rewritten as:

5a. A written program of development, **for a reasonable time but no more than two years,** will be established in consultation with the chairperson and the faculty member. Motion passed.

Recommendation #5- Item 5b should be reworded as:

5b. The faculty member and the chairperson/coordinator will continue to provide reports **at the end of each semester** summarizing progress toward development objectives. For the individual on a development program, the dean and the chairperson/coordinator will provide an evaluation report at **the end of each academic semester (which will be reviewed by a committee of peers if so requested by the faculty member)** to the individual that will be signed by the dean, chairperson, coordinator, and faculty member. The motion passed.

The following is separate from the above sections, but still within the same minutes.

Request for Administration response to OP 32.32 Revisions

Senator Held moved that: **The Faculty Senate request a response to the Senate’s proposed changes in OP 32.32 before the Senate’s next meeting of April 20, 1997. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.** The timely response is requested so that the issue can be discussed at the last meeting of the Senate for the year and the information can be used to prepare for a forum.