

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

April 23, 1990

The ninth regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1989-1990 convened in Room 212 of the Main Building at 2:15 p.m. on April 23, 1990.

Chair Wayne A. Danielson (Journalism) presided at the meeting.

I. ATTENDANCE

Present: Lee E. Baker, Daniel A. Bonevac, Nell B. Dale, Wayne A. Danielson, R. Conrad Doenges, Robert A. Duke, John R. Durbin, Gary P. Freeman, J. David Gavenda, William W. Gibson, Jr., Austin, M. Gleeson, Mario J. Gonzalez, Sue A. Greninger, Susan G. Hadden, Robert L. Hardgrave, William L. Hays, Elizabeth A. Hedrick, Ira Iscoe, Gaylord A. Jentz, Malia S. Johnson, H. Paul Kelley, Kenneth W. Kirk, Karrol A. Kitt, Dale E. Klein, Desmond F. Lawler, Mary F. Locniskar, Christine M. Maziar, Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr., Patricia Beatty Nelson, James T. O'Connor, Gene R. Powers, Brenda I. Preyer, John J. Ruskiewicz, Mark D. Shermis, Madeline C. Sutherland, H. Eldon Sutton, Walter Wilczynski, Roxanne K. Williamson, Jack H. Wilmore, Baxter F. Womack, Paul B. Woodruff.

Absent: Rosalie N. Ambrosino, Henry R. Bose, Jr., Oscar G. Brockett, Linda C. Brodkey, Heather L. Carter, Evan B. Carton, Fred P. Ellison (excused), Elizabeth W. Fernea (excused), Anibal Gonzalez-Perez, David B. Gracy, II (excused), Judith A. Jellison, David R. Maidment, Alba A. Ortiz, Patrick L. Parker, Maurice J. Sevigny, Timothy J. Schallert, Gerald E. Speitel.

Total members present: 41

Total members absent: 17

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of the March 5, 1990 meeting (D&P 3326-3341).

Mr. Danielson announced that the minutes of the March 5, Faculty Senate meeting had been distributed (D&P 3326-3341). Hearing no corrections or additions, they were APPROVED as distributed.

B. Minutes of the April 2, 1990 meeting (Delayed).

III. REPORT OF OFFICERS

A. Report of Chair

Mr. Danielson: Today the Chair will give you the benefit of no report, except to say that I would like to instruct the Secretary to attach a listing of this year's committees to the minutes of this final meeting (See Attachment A, D&P 3384-3387). We have not had a formal listing of the committee members in the minutes, so I would like those names to appear in the minutes. I thank the committees for their work this year.

B. Report of Vice Chair - None.

C. Report of Secretary - None.

IV. OLD BUSINESS - None.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Report on Spring Meeting of the Council of Faculty Governance Organizations (CoFGO).

Gary P. Freeman (Government): The CoFGO meeting was held in Austin on Friday and Saturday, April 6 and 7, in conjunction with the meeting of the Texas Association of College Teachers, better known as TACT. There were 42 delegates in attendance representing 25 State institutions of public higher education.

The first order of business on Friday was a short report by each campus representative summarizing the major activities of their organizations during the year. I could circulate a copy of my report if anyone wanted to see it. It was evident that Faculty Senates across the State are confronting a host of common problems, such as budgetary pressures, maintaining faculty interests and participation in university governance, as well as building and enhancing consultation with administrators. However, the situations at the various campuses are quite diverse with some Senates reporting warm relationships with administrators and others describing what amounts to open warfare. The agendas of the Senates vary according to the size of the campus and the importance it places on research.

Some of the most visible matters on our campus appear to be unique. No other campus reported any activity related to intercollegiate athletics, racial or ethnic conflict, or multicultural education. Moreover, many representatives lamented the political apathy of their student bodies. But the underlying issues that do bring all the Senates together appear to be a desire and effort to increase faculty participation in the higher education budget process, both at the State level and on individual campuses and a widespread concern with the quality of undergraduate education.

Wayne Roberts, a staff member of the Legislative Budget Board, outlined the politics and process of higher education funding. Among his more notable observations were that Texas will be undergoing significant changes at the legislative level in State education politics. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, State Treasurer and Comptroller will all change at the November election. Important committee chairs in both the House and the Senate also will be vacated. Thus, we are entering a period of great uncertainty and transition as these new "players" get settled. Roberts pointed out that the greatest competition for State funds are economic development, prisons, public education, workers' compensation, and higher education. He doubted that higher education would continue to be a priority issue since the interests of the leading candidates for statewide office are focusing around drugs, abortion, ethics, and redistricting. Traditionally, the State Senate has supported higher education as an adjunct to a high-tech economic development strategy which has resulted in relatively more support for the U.T. and A&M Systems due to our greater orientation to research. He also made a number of other pertinent predictions, the most provocative being that in the near future, there will be mandatory substance abuse testing for all State employees, including university professors.

The discussion that followed Robert's talk tended to focus on formula funding. He noted that the Legislative Budget Board does not believe that the formulas reflect true cost, and he suggested that there might be some attempt to amend them. This probably would hurt U.T. Austin since we teach more sciences and graduate seminar classes which are more highly valued under the formula system than are other lower and upper division undergraduate classes.

One action taken at the meeting of CoFGO followed an hour long debate and I think passed by just a couple of votes:

Resolved that CoFGO should communicate its conviction that the Legislature, in its effort to find adequate funding for public education, should not take money away from current appropriations to higher education, particularly not by removing remedial funding or by rescinding the 3% faculty pay raise for 1990-91, nor should it decrease higher education funding in any long-range financing plan. And, that CoFGO should encourage Faculty Senates to educate all faculty regarding Texas' overall funding needs in order that stable and comprehensive support for education at all levels could be available in the future.

I presume this resolution was forwarded to the Legislature in some form.

My general impressions of the meeting were that CoFGO, as an organization, is now well institutionalized, adequately funded, and likely to exist for some time. I would think that this Senate's primary goal, with respect to CoFGO, would be to institutionalize our own representation on that organization to provide some sort of continuity from year to year.

Mr. Danielson: On April 18, the first meeting of the Faculty Advisory Group to the Regents was held. William Hays and I attended and Bill will give a report on that historic meeting.

B. Report on First Meeting of the Faculty Advisory Group to the Regents

William L. Hays (Educational Psychology) This initial meeting was primarily organizational and informational in nature. Fifteen campuses were represented, nine general purpose campuses and six medical or health science campuses. We were welcomed and given a quick briefing by Chancellor Hans Mark who made a special point of discussing the legal and traditional constraints that surround the Board regarding the kinds of contact they can and cannot have with people involved in matters that potentially could be on the Board's agenda. So within those constraints, he suggested some very good ideas regarding how we might provide input into the deliberations of the Board. Vice Chancellor James Duncan also gave us some ideas that he thought might be germane for our future work.

One problem we addressed was the way in which the membership of the faculty advisory group was selected. The general feeling was that the individual should have been elected by some formal faculty body rather than being appointed by the President of each institution. It is not clear how the future members will be selected, so we need to recommend to the Chancellor how we think membership should be selected while trying to assure some continuity for the group's future deliberations.

An interim Chair of the group was selected, Dr. Richard Caldwell, Head of the Chemistry Department at U.T. Dallas. Wayne Danielson was elected Secretary of the Faculty Advisory Committee.

We decided to organize ourselves into two large committees, one being a Committee on Committees to determine our future structure and secondly, a committee to identify agenda items for future meetings. We also have a Nominating Committee to select a permanent chairperson and secretary.

Future agenda items will include the accountability of the present health insurance carrier, faculty salaries and fringe benefits, focusing on their impact on recruitment and retention at the various campuses. More parochial matters include professional constraints on the health science campuses, faculty evaluation of administrators, and the role of faculty in support of the U.T. System legislative agenda.

I think I can speak for Wayne when I say the tone of this group was cordial and cooperative which I think bodes fairly well for the future. We look forward to our first Regental contact at our October meeting.

Mr. Danielson indicated he wanted the minutes of this Faculty Advisory Group to the Regents meeting to be attached as an appendix to the minutes of this meeting (See Attachment B D&P 3389-3391).

He then deviated from the agenda and asked for a report from the Research Committee.

J. David Gavenda (Physics): Our Committee has been very productive this year. We plan to submit a final report within the next few weeks, which will have specific recommendations for action. Our interest is centered on the following topics: first, current and proposed programs to facilitate faculty efforts to obtain external funding for research, especially methods for making information more readily available to faculty regarding funding agencies via existing campus publications and library systems; secondly, procedures for allocating internal funds for faculty research, such as URI budgeting. One of our committee members has been collecting information from other universities regarding their policies for allocating overhead monies recovered from grants and contracts. And finally, although apparently a low priority for the administration but uppermost in the minds of many faculty, our Committee is looking at the status of faculty development leaves.

VI. OTHER ITEMS

A. Recommendations from Admissions and Registration Committee for Changes in Criteria for Admission of Transfer Students and Entering Freshmen (D&P 12807-12808)

Mr. Danielson introduced the Chair of the Admissions and Registration Committee, Joe Kruppa.

Joseph E. Kruppa (English) explained that his Committee had developed three proposals. First, transfer students, would have to have 30 hours or more before they transfer here. Second, students who apply with 54 hours or more would have to have a GPA of 3.0 for automatic admission and would be subject to review if their GPA is between 2.50 and 2.99. Third, all entering freshmen, even those in the top 10 percent of their high school class, would have to have an SAT score of at least 800 to be eligible for regular admission.

Mr. Kruppa briefly summarized the Committee's rationale for each of its proposals. He explained that the first proposal would enable the University to defer about 300 entering students per year.

Also, junior colleges would benefit by being able to retain good students beyond two semesters. The second proposal would involve about 1,400 students who would be 'subject to review', with about 950 of them projected to subsequently enroll.

The third proposal is potentially the most controversial. The Committee first proposed setting a minimum SAT score of 900, but thought 800 would be more palatable. Students with an SAT score below 800 have a 29 percent graduation rate. Regarding the impact of this third proposal on minority students, the Committee believes we do a great disservice to many minority students when we admit them with an SAT score below 800, they then have a bad experience here, and simply leave the institution at the end of the semester or at the end of the year.

Patricia B. Nelson (School of Nursing) asked if the Committee had any statistics regarding minority transfer students and their success records. She wanted to know how many minority students are usually represented in groups of students whose transfer GPA is between 2.50 and 2.99, and what kind of criteria were being used to determine probability for success in selecting which of those students to admit.

Mr. Kruppa explained that that question would have to be answered by someone from the Office of Admissions. He did make it clear that the proposal certainly was not meant to automatically exclude minority students, but rather it created another review process.

Mr. Hays (Educational Psychology) stated that with the second proposal, if a student who falls below 2.50 will not be admitted, the proposal should say so explicitly.

Nell B. Dale (Computer Science) asked what "completed successfully" means in the first proposal.

Mr. Kruppa answered, by completing 30 hours with grades that are transferable to the University.

Desmond F. Lawler (Civil Engineering) asked how the 29 percent graduation rate figure for students with SAT scores below 800 compared to other students' graduation rates.

Mr. Kruppa said the graduation rate for other students is over 50 percent.

Mr. Danielson commented that the main concern people appear to have is whether these proposals will have a differential effect on minority admissions.

Mr. Kruppa responded that they are not intended to do so, and if the review process is carried out carefully by the Office of Admissions, there should not be any effect on minority student enrollment.

Mr. Danielson wondered if there would be any faculty oversight over the review process.

Mr. Kruppa responded that there is faculty oversight on the Admissions and Registration Committee itself.

Ms. Dale asked for a clarification of the first proposal and whether it means that anyone who has completed 30 hours successfully will automatically be admitted.

Mr. Kruppa said that was not the intent of the Committee.

Malia S. Johnson (School of Nursing) requested a breakdown of graduation rates based on ethnicity. She commented that some faculty have a concern over what happens in the Admissions Office when they look at this type of information which is why faculty would like some kind of input to ensure minority students do not "fall through the cracks."

Mr. Kruppa had some figures, but Mr. Danielson commented that he thought the same kind of questions would be raised at the University Council meeting, and he encouraged the Committee to bring more statistical data to that meeting.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) expressed his opposition to the third proposal because of its impact on minority students. He thought a 30 percent graduation rate for these people was extremely high when one considers they have come from minority high schools that are seriously underfunded. "These kids deserve a chance. There are not many of them and I think they need every chance that they can get to enroll and succeed in whatever they choose to study. These students have graduated in the top 10 percent of their class and I think we should welcome them at this university."

Mr. Kruppa indicated Mr. McDaniel made a good point and the Committee believes there definitely needs to be an informed debate on this proposal.

Robert L. Hardgrave (Government) also supported Mr. McDaniel's comments. He indicated he thought the University has a special obligation to minority students who have demonstrated a capacity to excel, and that it was "a cruel hoax to admit such students to the University and then allow them to fail without providing special support." He thought those students should be targeted and helped so their success rate can rise above 30 percent.

Mr. Lawler also spoke in opposition to the third proposal. "I think these people are proven winners in the sense that they have shown that they can make it and we should give them a chance. And I think that the statistics show quite clearly that this proposal would be highly discriminatory against Blacks and Hispanics."

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Report and Recommendations from the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee (D&P 3342-3348)

Mr. Danielson introduced the Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Eldon Sutton.

H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology) indicated he was presenting his report for discussion purposes only. He said the Committee had spent some of its time discussing the development of a core curriculum.

"The Committee recommends that U.T. Austin continue to adhere to its present system of Basic Education Requirements as meeting the desirable purposes of a core curriculum. We further urge that the Administration resist efforts to subject the U.T. Austin core curricula to external review, particularly when that review has as its goal the imposition of uniformity among institutions in the State. There also is great concern about the transferability of courses among various institutions being dictated by the Coordinating Board.

The next topic we attempted to deal with was multicultural courses, an issue that has received national and local concern. We recognized that new multicultural courses and course requirements will not be developed without substantial debate quite beyond the ability of our committee to resolve. We have tried to develop some positive recommendations about what could be done to support multicultural courses."

He then described some potential roadblocks that will need to be removed. One was the fact that the legislative requirement for American Government and American History tie up 12 hours of the 18 hour Basic Education Requirement. Another problem is that many of the multicultural courses that are now available on campus are not easily identified because of the confusing way they are cross-listed in the catalogs.

"Our summary recommendation is that the University administration seek to have the legislative requirements in History and Government dropped, thus creating space in the curricula for greater options in the social sciences, including multicultural courses." The Committee also recommends "that a Committee on Multicultural Courses be established for the purpose of identifying existing multicultural courses and encouraging the formation of new courses."

"Our last concern was with Substantial Writing Courses." Mr. Sutton described how the SWC requirement was being met in various departments and colleges. He then reported that the Committee was recommending that the requirement for Substantial Writing Courses be reaffirmed as part of the university-wide Basic Education Requirements. The Committee further recommended that "each college be directed to develop programs to provide instruction to its majors and be given the flexibility to respond in ways that may be especially suitable for its own

students." Finally, every effort should be made by the Administration and the Colleges to fund these programs at "meaningful levels."

Mr. Danielson extended the privilege of the floor to any students present who might want to comment.

Mr. Kruppa questioned the figures that some Colleges were giving as to the number of SWC courses they would have to teach to cover all their students (See Appendix A. Report of the Curriculum Committee, D&P 3347).

Mr. Sutton responded that the Committee did not tell each College how it should decide how many courses it needed to meet its requirement, and obviously they used different guidelines.

Mr. McDaniel suggested that the Committee's three recommendations be divided into smaller segments since more than one issue was being addressed in each recommendation. The eventual vote should be on each issue. He went on to say, "We keep oscillating between wanting a university committee or a college committee to act on these matters. Everytime the Senate has suggested that it ought to be a faculty prerogative, the Provost has argued against it and we have lost the vote. Now I hope we win it this time, but I think it will be easier to win if it is separately phrased. And in regards to funding, the Senate has not been successful in suggesting that the administration fund anything."

Mr. Sutton: In the case of Recommendation 1, our adherence to the present system of basic education requirements is not meant to mean that we believe that the present listing of basic education requirements should not be reviewed and changed if necessary. It is true that the surveillance of the writing requirements has been delegated to the deans. Perhaps I am just skeptical enough about how it is being carried out in some colleges to think that university-wide surveillance, even if only an annual review and report, would be very helpful.

Mr. McDaniel MOVED that the Faculty Senate request that the President appoint an ad hoc Committee on Multicultural Courses for the purpose of identifying existing multicultural courses, preparing a list of such courses with an indication that they satisfy degree requirements, and encouraging the formation of new courses.

Mr. Danielson accepted the motion and opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Preyer (Art History) commented that there was a huge question as to what multicultural courses are and that question needs to be answered before any listing of such courses can be created.

Mr. McDaniel responded that he agreed with Ms. Preyer, but nothing will get done if we wait until everybody agrees on what a multicultural course is. Once a list is published, adjustments can then be made, but it is a start and that is what needs to be done.

Mr. Danielson asked for a vote on the motion and the motion PASSED.

Dennis Hranitzky (Students' Association) introduced himself and gave a brief summary of what the Students' Association had done in regards to working with other student organizations in addressing the multiculturalism issue. The plan is to submit a specific proposal to the University Council next year. The proposal as it now stands would call for a three-hour multicultural course required of all entering students that would focus on American cultures, with another three-hour course being required from the existing menu of courses already available. He then suggested that some multicultural courses could also meet the legislated History and Government requirement as well as Substantial Writing Course criteria. He also stated that he thought it is important that the faculty recognize the fact that the minority community has already explored this issue extensively and that he hoped that any committee that might be formed would be willing to work closely with minority students. He urged that something needed to be done now and that the matter will not rest during some indefinite study period.

Mr. Danielson concluded the discussion by saying he understood the urgency of the students' feelings, but he also felt the issue need to be carefully considered within the University and that will take some time. He commended the students for the work they had done so far and he pledged to them that the Senate will continue to work with them on this matter.

Mr. Danielson then asked for a report on the elections for next year's Senate officers.

Gaylord A. Jentz (Management Science and Information Systems) had been asked to conduct the election of officers in the SPECIAL meeting that preceded the regular one. Mr. Jentz reported that a total of seven votes separated all three positions, but the results were as follows:

Chair: Mario Gonzalez (Electrical and Computer Engineering)
Vice Chair: Helen L. Erickson (Nursing)
Secretary: John A. Daly (Speech Communication)

VI. OTHER ITEMS

B. Announcement of Upcoming Items on the University Council Agenda

H. Paul Kelley reported that the only agenda item he knew of was the proposal from the Admissions and Registration Committee. The Annual Reports of the Standing Committees had been circulated for comment at the Council meeting. He indicated that his office had received several last-minute catalog changes and that he would try to circulate them soon for approval on the no-protest basis. If there are any protests, they can be brought up and acted upon at the Council meeting.

He then corrected some misinformation that was reported in the newspaper about the last University Council meeting. The legislation with regard to making course instructor surveys mandatory is not on its way to the President. The next step is that it must be circulated to the General Faculty for approval on a no-protest basis. If it is protested by ten or more faculty, there has to be a called meeting of the General Faculty to act on it. If there is no quorum at that meeting, it has to come back before the University Council for further action. All of this must take place before it is finally approved by the General Faculty and only then would it be sent to the President for his review.

Mr. Jentz: I think we have had excellent leadership during this particular year in the Faculty Senate. It has not only been one where we have had somebody out in the forefront for the faculty, but it has been enjoyable to come to the meetings and listen to Wayne Danielson propound on all sorts of philosophies, including being called a 'Chair.' I would like to propose at this particular time that the Senate extend to Wayne our gratitude for this last year and our congratulations on a job well done. (APPLAUSE)

Mr. Danielson thanked the Senate and adjourned the meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Kenneth W. Kirk
Kenneth W. Kirk, Secretary
The Faculty Senate