

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

MARCH 6, 1978

The seventh meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1977-78 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building at 2:15 p. m. on March 6, 1978.

Chairman William Livingston (Government) presided at the meeting.

I. ATTENDANCE

Present: Barbara Aldave, Rebecca Baltzer, L. Joe Berry, George Blanco, John Bordie, Michel Breger, Robert Brooks, Patricia Cain, Vincente Cantarino, C. T. Clark, James Daniel, Mitzi Dreher, Wm. Duesterhoeft, John Durbin, Donald Foss, Bill Francis, David Gavenda, Austin Gleeson, Philip Gough, Robert Hardgrave, Charles Holahan, Paul Kelley, William Lesso, William Livingston, Neill Megaw, Thomas Philpott, Bonnie Rickelman, James Sledd, Waneen Spirduso, James Vick, David Warner, Gary Wise, Susan Wittig, Lee Worrell, Ron Wyllys.

Absent: Sinclair Black, John Breen, John Brokaw, Heather Carter, Lyle Clark (excused), William Glade (excused), Clark Hubbs, Ira Iscoe (excused), Kenneth Prescott, Mary Ann Rankin, Alan Ross (excused), Kenneth Stokoe, Larry Tomassini, Glenn Welsch, Ralph White (excused), Martha Williams (excused), Leslie Willson, Orville Wyss (excused).

Total members present: 35

Total members absent: 18

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None available.

III. REPORTS OF OFFICERS

A. Report of Chairman

First, Mr. Livingston (Government) reported that the Durbin Committee Report on Grade Inflation, approved with slight modification by the University Council, was ready for imminent distribution to the General Faculty. The report will also be sent to some 65 four-year colleges in Texas.

Next, the Chairman reminded Senators that the "research services" resolution adopted by the Senate had charged the Chairman to appoint a committee to address issues of plagiarism and academic dishonesty. Donald Foss (Psychology) had agreed to chair the committee, but no further appointments had been made. The reason for the arrested development of the committee came about because of another of the resolution's provisions which directed the Chairman to write to the President of the standing Committee on Discipline (Policies), William Wolfe. It became apparent that there was some overlap of concerns between the two committees. Therefore Messrs. Livingston and Foss will meet with the standing committee in order to avert duplication of effort. Mr. Livingston said that he also, as directed by the resolution, had communicated to the President the Senate's action. One of the provisions had asked the administration to verify the existence of research services and to determine whether legal action was appropriate. The President responded by applauding the Senate's action and expressing the opinion that the best

approach to the problem was faculty vigilance. Mr. Livingston had then written back to the President indicating the Senate's strong support of faculty vigilance but pointing out that there still remained the issue of investigation and appropriate legal action which the Senate hoped that the administration would pursue.

The final report of Mr. Livingston concerned several actions taken by the Regents at their Odessa meeting. The Chairman had attended the meeting and with pleasure reported that the President had agreed to pay his travel expenses. The items reported on involved building and/or renovation of mostly athletic-related facilities, a gift of \$25,000 to the University by President Rogers for an endowed scholarship, and the happy fact that the Permanent University Fund had reached one billion dollars.

Mr. Livingston then said that Susan Wittig (English) had asked that the rules be suspended in order that she might make a brief report. Another commitment precluded Ms. Wittig's staying until the "New Business" portion of the agenda was reached. Accordingly, the rules were suspended without objection. Ms. Wittig distributed copies of a statement prepared by the Co-op Board of Directors which thanked the Hardgrave Committee in its thorough review of Co-op textbook policies. The statement also indicated that the Co-op Board had already begun to implement many of the committee's recommendations and was eager to continue a cooperative relationship with the Senate and faculty. (The complete statement is attached as APPENDIX A to these Minutes.) Ms. Wittig then alerted members to a letter they would soon receive inviting them to meet with student leaders in order to "discuss a problem of fairly great significance to the Co-op." The meeting will concern the implications for the Co-op of the Texas Cooperative Act which becomes effective on September 1.

B. Report of Vice-Chairman -- None.

C. Report of Secretary

Mr. Kelley (Educational Psychology) asked members to make three corrections in the agenda materials concerned with the workload. One error, he said, had occurred three times on pp. 1197 and 1198; the phrase "teaching workloads" should be changed to "faculty workloads."

IV. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

A. Report from Committee on Ways and Means to Implement General Faculty resolutions concerning Faculty Workloads and Teaching Assistants -- Philip Gough (D&P 1198-1208)

First, Mr. Gough (Psychology) said that the recommendations in his Committee's report, distributed the previous week, had been revised within the past 24 hours. The revised version (three pages, non-D&P paginated, which are attached as Appendix B to these Minutes) was distributed to members. Mr. Gough then sketched the history of the committee which "sprang from the resolutions adopted by the General Faculty in March of last year which called for the University to mend its ways concerning faculty workloads and its use of Teaching Assistants. Subsequently--if I remember correctly it was in May--this committee was asked . . . to find ways and means to implement those resolutions We began to work early in the summer, and the first part of our work was concerned with gathering information. We met individually and collectively with a number of individuals, ranging from the President of the University to several Teaching Assistants. [We realized in the fall that] we had, within our committee, a fair microcosm of attitudes around the University, and we set out to . . . discover whether there was any consensus among us. We immediately discovered that we were, if not divided, at least very unclear about one important matter, and that was the predicament in which the University found itself. Some of us believed that the Legislature was concerned about this, others believed that the Legislature was concerned about that. And we made, very early on, some efforts to try to contact the Legislature and other interested parties to see if we could ascertain just

what the real public view of the University was. We were thwarted in this effort, and so we were then forced to turn inward and to look to ourselves.

"We began to find very early on, and I've [alluded to] this, I think, in every report I've made, that there were serious differences among those of us on the committee. [The members,] Bonnie Rickelman, Jack Brokaw, Jim Daniel, Neill Megaw, and myself, represent not only five different departments but five different colleges. . . . So, while none of us claims or has ever claimed to be representative of our various constituencies in any full sense, nonetheless we represent a great variety of viewpoints, and we surely changed very considerably in the kind of values and the kind of changes that we thought were called for. During the fall we met repeatedly trying to see if we could come to some consensus, and in the course of this we decided it would be best to turn to the University community for some answers. We devised, largely through the able assistance of Neill Megaw, a substantial questionnaire which we sent out to every department, academic program and college in the University. And we received [an] overwhelming response, [hearing from] 74 departments and academic programs in some 17 [schools and] colleges. The great majority, something over 65 in total, not only provided us responses that seemed to reflect a great deal of sincerity, but also in many cases, a great deal of effort. That is, the typical case was that the department would appoint a committee to discuss our questionnaire, and that committee in many instances worked at least several weeks prior to writing us a set of detailed responses to the various questions we had.

"Well, early in 1978 then, we tried to digest this material and finally come to grips with the issues and with one another as to what the committee might recommend. The report that you have before you and the recommendations which accompany it represent the outcome of our work. Before turning to the specific recommendations and the discussions surrounding each one, I would remark that we think we began and finished with two general assumptions about the University. In the first case, we believe that most of the faculty at this University and most of the University collectively have met their responsibilities fully in the past. Insofar as we can see, there are individuals and there are individual departments that may have failed us all in not doing the best job they could in teaching the students of this state and providing the kind of educational leadership that we hope this University does. But, we are convinced that most of the members of this University and most of the departments they work for have, in fact, done a fine job. Secondly though, we do believe there are problems with the University, and these are reflected throughout the report. . . . We think if there has been any deficiency within the University it has been with respect to undergraduate education. If the University has failed in any one of the several things it is supposed to do, it is in providing the best training it can for its undergraduates. So we began, and finished I think, with those overriding views about the nature of the University and its faculty.

" . . . our fundamental premise [was to try] to protect what we thought was good about the University and to go after those things that we thought were less than good. We believe that the governance of the University should not only be within the bounds of the University but . . . ought largely to be at the level of the department. And every one of our recommendations, I think, reflects this assumption. That is, we believe that this University should be allowed to define its own pattern of academic work; we believe that this University should, in short, govern itself. We believe that the rules that govern this University ought, insofar as they are to apply to all the institutions in the state, to be very general We think that in the University the majority of the decisions that govern how faculty should work--how much they shall teach and whom they shall teach--should be decided upon at the departmental level [by] those persons who are most intimately concerned with the students they are teaching and with the resources that are available to teach those students. . . ."

Mr. Gough then introduced the committee's first revised recommendation. "The first problem the committee addressed was that of the definition of workload. As you know, the workload at this University for some-

time has been defined as four courses or the equivalent per semester, and there have been at least in my sojourn [here], two separate periods in which that has been enforced. [In one of those periods] each faculty member was assigned a certain number of points for the various and sundry activities in which the faculty member was engaged, [with the most points derived from teaching organized courses; the cumulation of] points had to add up to some minimum. But most recently we have been governed by the principle which says that we do, in fact, each teach four courses or the equivalent thereof; in order to demonstrate that's the case, each semester the chairman or someone in each department must fill out a report which shows what organized courses the individual is teaching and, in addition, what equivalent activities that person is engaged in which brings the total load up to four. Well, if you have read the report you know that we view this system after considerable deliberation, as bankrupt. In the first place, we can find in all our discussions with people both within the University and particularly outside the University, no one who accepts this as a definition of what the faculty at this University does. Very few of us teach four courses; most of us teach closer to two, and this is well known. The definition of workload in terms of organized courses or the equivalent in effect is viewed by many as a misrepresentation of what goes on at the University. We concur that it is a [misrepresentation.]

"Second, all of us know that defining workload in terms of organized courses has had, if not exactly a negative effect, at least uncomfortable effects on the way many of us run our lives. . . . We feel that the current definition had tended to distort the very teaching that we do.

"Third, we think that the definition of the workload is not a useful one. It has bad effects, and beyond that it seems not to have any good effects. . . . Presumably [a workload] is devised to make sure that faculty are working at least the bare minimum. The current definition of the workload in our opinion encourages sloth, if anything; that is to say, what it does is to say 'All that you must do is teach your courses, and nothing more is required of you'. . . . [If] a tenured colleague does nothing but show up to teach three courses, his colleagues, his chairman, his administration can do little more than say, 'You show up and teach a fourth'. We think this is unfortunate; we believe that a workload ought to be defined in such a way that it would reward the industrious and work to the disadvantage of those who are less industrious. And we think that the present workload does not.

"We considered, at considerable length, ways of modifying the current workload definition to make it more acceptable. The one we discuss in the report and the one we circulated in the questionnaire . . . was the idea that we might reduce the organized course load from four to three, reduce substantially the number of equivalents, and more carefully enforce such a definition of workload. The problem with this . . . is that there are a number of departments on campus which have workloads lighter than this--that is, teaching loads lighter than this; if we were to enforce this workload we would have, in effect, destroyed the department. We as a committee were not willing to undertake such a heavy responsibility.

"We also considered, though not nearly at such great length, more elaborate formulas of the sort, for example, which have been proposed by the Council of Presidents. But all of these--and indeed any workload formula which is defined solely in terms of the courses we teach--seem to us bound to have an uncomfortable effect at the University. At bottom, the fact is that faculty at this University teach in the form of organized courses, in direct classroom instruction, less than do faculties at most other universities in the state. If we are to pretend otherwise, we are bound to be called liars, hypocrites, cheats, or worse. So it seems to us that we must not pretend that we do teach organized courses as much as others do; we must state honestly and openly that we do not and try to defend that practice.

"Nevertheless, we obviously can't throw away any kind of definition of workload, so we fell back upon that which we think we have in common

with everyone in the state, regardless of what their organized course load might be--namely, that we do work fulltime. By all evidence--the evidence of surveys like TACT; probably more importantly, the evidence of each of us who looks at the person in the office next door--faculty in the University work very hard, and it seems to us that the work ought to be defined in a way which would honor that fact. So we propose in consequence of arguments like these [what has evolved as our first revised recommendation]:

- 1) The minimum faculty workload at The University of Texas at Austin shall be defined as 40 hours per week; this is a quantitative minimum, satisfaction of which shall not be sufficient for continuing employment in the University.

There followed a brief discussion concerning whether to deal with the recommendations seriatim, collectively, or some combination of the two. Mr. Hardgrave (Government) said that his vote on Recommendation 1 was contingent upon how the 40 hour week workload was to be reported (Recommendation 5 and 6). Therefore, he suggested that the first six recommendations be considered collectively. Mr. Gough was agreeable and proceeded to discuss the plan envisaged by the committee for reporting workload.

"As you know, the current workload system requirement is defined in terms of courses. Certification of compliance with this is, at least in many departments, handled in a pro forma way. Indeed, in at least a couple of departments that I know of, no faculty ever has anything to do with certifying that he or she teaches four courses; it is all handled at administrative levels. Furthermore, . . . there is [provision for] absolutely no flexibility [across sub-components of the University] in what shall be considered the appropriate workload. [Flexibility occurs in the determination of the equivalent of an organized course]. . . . As I understand it, a department chairman proposes [the equivalent], a dean ratifies, and it goes on up in that way. Well, the committee feels that the whole system of workload definition and workload reporting ought to be changed. So in briefest outline, what we are proposing is that the workload should be defined as forty hours per week, and that is the only [workload requirement which should be constant across the University]. . . . Within that, though, we believe that each department should specify a set of requirements indicating . . . those patterns of activities which constitute legitimate academic work for the faculty in terms of that department's distinctive educational mission.

"Our aim here is to have each department define what it is that its faculty does. Now this is certainly, in large measure, the way the University used to operate before people began to be concerned about our accountability. . . . I could imagine [and here I speak for myself] that a department might be able to say that we think that in order to compete with departments with comparable quality at other institutions that new faculty members . . . [ought to] be given a reduced organized course load in their first semester on campus. We would suppose that those departments in which kinds of teaching other than organized course teaching occurs,--Nursing, for example, where individual supervision is so very important--that these kinds of activities would be spelled out without making it necessary for one to interpret those as the teaching of an organized course.

"So the . . . second [revised] recommendation is to ask each department to, in effect, present its own workload requirements. We think, though, that a department should not be left alone, not be given carte blanche to do this. Clearly there are departments on this campus that might take advantage of such a system; I know I would try if I were a good Chairman. . . . We can't leave it to departments to define [on their own] what shall be the workload. We think they should be given every opportunity to define what the work will be in their departments and to defend that definition. But those [definitions] should then be scrutinized, and very carefully, we suggested, not only by the administration--that is inevitably going to be the case. . . . [but also by] a standing University committee consisting largely of faculty. . . . That is, we are concerned that it is conceivable that a kind of cordial relationship might exist between a particular department and its dean, and that dean's vice-president, and all the way up, in which case a

particular department might get favored treatment or for whatever other reasons do things which are not acceptable to the University community at large. So we've suggested that a standing committee be created to work with the administration in first evaluating the proposed departmental statements and then subsequently, assuming approval, certifying compliance with the requirements that the departmental statements specify.

"Fourth, we urge [that immediate action be taken to correct any failure to comply with departmental and University requirements.] We think that this should be made explicit to show that we of the University are as anxious, if not more anxious than the private citizens, the members of the Coordinating Board, or the members of the Legislature to try to do something about the faculty at this University who are not carrying their fair share of the work here. We have been struck repeatedly, [in our formal and informal conversations, with concern about] the shirker, I don't know who these individuals are. . . , but it is very clear that many people out in the world believe that there are individuals who are . . . not carrying on the duties for which the state is paying them. . . .

"None of us wants to have imposed on us anything like a 40 hour week which means you will come at 8:00 on Monday morning and leave at 5:00 on Friday afternoon. All of us, I guess, take it as a piece of the reward for the fact that we spend a lot of time working on Saturdays and Sundays; if we have an errand to run on Wednesday morning that we can do it without asking permission of our bosses. Out in the world there is the concern that people are not doing what they ought. I think most of us share the conviction that if you happen to have in your department somebody who is not doing a good job in teaching, who is leaving the University as soon as the classes are over and in general not showing up for departmental affairs or working in the library or the laboratory, I think all of us resent that pattern of behavior more than any citizen of the state. . . .

"[Fifth], we would expect each and every department to have something to say about what its faculty ought to teach. But we ask here for considerable latitude in the definition of what the work of the faculty shall be, and we think that in order to merit the kind of trust [or] latitude that is called for in the first part, we must show that we are willing to be accountable--that we are willing to tell not only our own administration, not only the Regents, but also the Legislature and the people of the state precisely what it is that we are doing and not to do this in any formulaic way. So we call for, in the fifth [revised] recommendation, the adoption of a new and detailed individual faculty work report, to be filed each semester and to be departmentally certified; this report [is] to serve as the measure by which compliance with the workload requirement is to be assessed, as described in earlier recommendations. I would remark on the side . . . that there are two views about this that have been prevalent in our committee. . . . First, . . . we are concerned with the idea of adding still more paper work to our already full burdens in that regard; the problem is . . . we think we can't afford not to. . . . We must be willing to take an hour, or two hours if it took that, once a semester to write down in detail all it is that we do as members of this faculty. We don't think, in the end, that is asking too much of an individual faculty member, and quite apart from that we think it is an absolute necessity. . . . [Also] there was a feeling on the part of some in the committee that this report ought to be an opportunity for individuals to spell out any new activities the faculty member was engaged in [as well as course particulars]-- not just to report the kind of courses that are being taught, but show what the nature of the teaching in those courses was, what efforts were being made to improve it, how the course was being modified, and the like. . . .

"Finally, we ask that each department file a cumulative workload report. . . . The emphasis here is not that the department should simply repeat all . . . that information that the individuals have provided, but [rather] present information about teaching in that department so that any of us in the University, or any interested person outside the University, can look at a given department. . . and decide how students in that department are

taught. [For example:] Are students in introductory courses taught by full professors? Are students in graduate seminars taught by other graduate students? [The departmental report should] spell out what the pattern of instruction in the department is by including . . . a summary analysis showing what level of instructor is teaching what courses to what students." Mr. Gough in effect moved the adoption of the first six REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS.

Mr. Hardgrave expressed concerns about the quality of a single report prepared at the end of a semester. His feeling was that such a report would be "a kind of subjective determination as to the relative amount of time we spent engaged in each of the activities as determined as to the relative amount of time we spent engaged in each of the activities as recognized by our individual departments, and faculty research [would be] the residual into which any time not specifically identified as teaching, committee, or office hours, would fall. No one would ever be under 40 hours; in fact, I would suspect even if the most rigorous monitoring were to occur, most of us would in all honesty be, as statistics have revealed again and again, far in excess of this 40 hour minimum. . . . What concerns me is exactly how [research and publication, which we must do if we are not to perish] is to be determined or recognized. [Are we] to be expected to keep logs in which we indicate the amount of time we might be spending in our own independent research or . . . in preparation for each of the classes that we teach? Very frequently we may spend as many as two or three hours each evening preparing lectures or teaching materials for the following day's classes. I think all of these are legitimate concerns. I fail to see that a once a semester summary report can really adequately do more than what is now done by the rather unsystematic term 'equivalence'."

Mr. Berry (Microbiology), while commending the committee's effort said that the report was "depressing." "The fact that this University is brought to its knees by a need to justify its existence, I find most depressing; I suppose we have no alternative, but to do something to justify our existence. . . . Are we the only ones in the major state universities who are having to, in effect, justify our income by some kind of reporting? The first step in unionization is the 40-hour week, and there are many faculties in the United States, many universities which are unionized now. I thought when I left the East and came to the Great Southwest that we would be one of the last universities unionized, but it seems to me this is the first step towards unionization. The tone of the document is 'us' and 'them', management versus labor. We've got to prove that we work; the department or the department chairman must certify that we work our 40-hour week and that we have earned our living. How can a department chairman [so] certify? Does this mean that we must report to the departmental chairman at regular intervals and tell him or his delegated man exactly what we have done that week so that he can then certify at the end of the semester that our report is accurate and precise? If I were a departmental chairman, I would be very hard pressed to certify the way the members of the department spend their time. I would not have done that when I was chairman, and I don't think many chairmen can do that if they are doing what they are supposed to do. Mr. Chairman, you are a research man, [my] chairman is a research man, and chairmen should be research men, [but] it is very difficult for chairmen to be research men because the demand on their time is enormous. How can [my chairman] certify the accuracy of how I spent my 40 hours each week during the semester--how much time I spent in preparation of my lectures, how many hours I worked in the lab, and so on? These are to be time-consuming documents. I agree that an hour or two or three a semester we probably should be willing to devote to justification of our existence, but these are going to be very detailed documents; and I want to know who is going to read them. Will the Chairman have to read each document of each departmental member? Will the deans read all the departmental documents of each faculty member, or is this one more generation of mountains of paper that will go into a file and be buried for the rest of time? This worries me and . . . I have to report in all honesty what a depressing thing it is."

Mr. Gough responded by saying that according to Coordinating Board staff, legislatures' interest in the accountability of faculty at state-supported institutions was "rampant." He said also that the committee

believed that ultimate responsibility for verifying the self-reports of faculty members rested with the departments.

Mr. Worrell (Pharmacy) said that he failed to see the logic in revised recommendation one, wherein a minimum workload was defined at 40 hours, the satisfactory completion of which was insufficient for continued University employment. Mr. Worrell also took exception to revised recommendation four: "Immediate action shall be taken to correct any individual or departmental failure to comply with departmental or University requirements." Mr. Worrell said that "there are places on this campus where the faculty member has no control whatsoever of his teaching load. . . . I'm well aware of a full professor . . . who within the past three years has lost three successive required courses, one after the other, and then developed an elective course which attracted about 40 or 50 students and was deprived of that course the following semester. There has been no charge whatsoever of incompetence or irresponsibility or anything else with respect to his teaching function. The reason the arrangements were changed was simply because they had some new faculty members [that] had to have a teaching load. Now when that sort of thing goes on, I don't think the individual faculty member should be held responsible. . . ." Mr. Worrell therefore thought that the reference (in recommendation four) to the "individual" should be improved.

Waneen Spirduso (Health, Physical Education, and Recreation) said that she would "find it very difficult to support any document that . . . isn't going to specify what legitimate academic work is. I think that is the crucial issue of this whole discussion, I applaud the committee's interest in letting the department determine what legitimate academic work is; [however,] when you have a standing committee which shall evaluate that, it means that the committee [also must] determine what legitimate academic work is. . . . When that happens, it means that the committee in fact is going to decide what is legitimate and what isn't. And if they decide that the department's concerns are not legitimate, it means that they will reject [those concerns], and the department then will have to re-define [legitimate academic work]." Ms. Spirduso further said the third revised recommendation could lead to the standing committee's "dictating the department's distinctive educational mission or philosophy." Reiterating, Ms. Spirduso said she thought it necessary for the Senate recommendation to define legitimate academic work.

Mr. Gough responded that he did not share Ms. Spirduso's apprehensions about the effect of a standing committee. "I should think that if reasonable people are presented a reasonable justification, there would be no reason for them to impose any rigid set of requirements on any department whatsoever."

Mr. Durbin (Mathematics) wondered if workload documentation, however specific, would accomplish anything. "It seems like it is as much the problem of the Coordinating Board and the Legislature as it is [of ours]. They think some of us are shirkers, they must believe that some of us are liars. . . . I don't see that certifying all these numbers is really going to change things. I've heard that one of the reasons the Legislature is mad at us was because [some people]--administrators, or whatever--were very arrogant and wouldn't tell what we're doing. Could you tell us if the University has tried to let the Coordinating Board know exactly what we're doing, [and] if the Coordinating Board has really tried to find out what we do? It seems to me like they could send down a committee, three or five people they trust, to the departments and let them follow us around for a day. They can sit there and watch what we do. Has that really been tried? It seems like that would be much better than all of this system. [Lack of trust is at the heart of this matter.]"

Mr. Gavenda (Physics) cited the experience "years ago" of the Gage Committee which tackled the workload question. That committee devised a point system for faculty activity, but "by the time we were through, we had such a complicated document [that] no one would take it seriously [the report was thrown out, which] probably was very wise. But we've come to the crucial issue right now, how are we going to write down what it is we think

is important for a university to be about [in a form] that outsiders who aren't scholars can read and accept."

Responding to Mr. Durbin's remarks, Mr. Livingston said: "There has never been any effort that I know anything about from the Coordinating Board or other members of the legislative staff to send anybody up here to follow somebody around all day long. But part of the history that has produced the effort and this report has been one of an increasing and intensifying concern within the Legislature about teaching loads and workloads, but mostly they specify workloads in terms of teaching loads. You will recall that there was an effort seven or eight years ago in the Legislature to adopt teaching loads . . . , which was forestalled only by the Board of Regents adopting one of their own. We then saw the Board of Regents alter that partly at the instance of faculty objections about 5 years ago, at which time [the Regents] introduced the present one which is based on a 12-hour teaching load. Last year the Legislature came [very close to] imposing a new workload, which was thwarted by people like Jim Daniel and others in this room [who] persuaded the Senate to abandon it. Every indicator that I'm apprised of suggests that that effort is going to be renewed with increased vigor during the coming legislative session. Certainly that is the opinion of the people at the Coordinating Board and the opinion at System headquarters downtown. The difficulty is that everytime they've tried this (they being the Legislature or anyone else), they've tried it in terms of teaching loads. I see this report as having its principle thrust in the direction of altering the calculus by which faculty productivity is measured, not by teaching hours but by the total activity of the faculty member. I think when the committee got to that point, it said to itself, 'How can we convey that kind of complex activity in terms that are easily recognizable by Legislators and the general public?'. . . It isn't that [the Legislature] really wants to know but that they really want to regulate; they want to be able to guarantee to their constituents that these eggheads are not just wasting the state's money."

Mr. Sledd (English) said that to him the heart of the issue was the function of the University. He could enthusiastically support Senate efforts to deal with that question and "numerical measures and more reports" seemed "trivial." Discussion then returned to the matter of a 40-hour work load.

Mr. Worrell (Pharmacy) MOVED to amend REVISED RECOMMENDATION 1 to read as follows:

The minimum faculty work load at The University of Texas at Austin shall be defined as 40 hours per week; mere quantitative satisfaction of this minimum shall not be sufficient for continuing employment in the University.

After some discussion the amendment was APPROVED.

Mr. Worrell next MOVED to amend REVISED RECOMMENDATION 4 to read as follows:

Immediate action shall be taken to correct any failure to comply with departmental or University requirements.

Mr. Lesso (Mechanical Engineering) pointed out that REVISED RECOMMENDATION 4, even as amended, failed to specify who was to be responsible for taking the immediate action.

Mr. Breger (Astronomy), spoke in favor of the amendment. Like Mr. Worrell, he was concerned about faculty members who teach "what they are told to teach and therefore should not be punished for the omission of any departmental chairman or dean. . . ."

After a brief discussion, the Worrell amendment was ADOPTED. Next, in two separate motions Ms. Wittig and Mr. Daniel MOVED that REVISED RECOMMENDATION 2 be amended to read as follows:

Each department shall define and justify, in writing, its work load requirements, specifying those patterns of teaching, research, and other academic responsibilities that constitute legitimate academic work for its faculty in terms of that department's distinctive educational mission. In its requirements each department shall honor the University's commitment to undergraduate and graduate teaching.

After Mr. Sledd spoke in support of the Wittig amendment, both amendments were then APPROVED.

Then, Mr. Duesterhoeft (Electrical Engineering) made a MOTION to separate REVISED, and now amended, RECOMMENDATION 2 from the subsequent five. (Earlier, it had been decided that the first six revised recommendations would be considered collectively.) After discussion of the possible ramifications of such action, a vote was taken, and the MOTION to separate was DEFEATED 14 - 15.

Finally, a vote was taken on the first six REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS as amended. The outcome was ADOPTION by a vote of 16 - 11, with 2 abstentions. Due to the lateness of the hour, it was decided that the Senate would meet in special session a week hence in order to continue its deliberations on the Gough Committee report.

V. OLD BUSINESS -- None.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

The final item of business was a MOTION offered by Mr. Hardgrave. Calling attention to an editorial in the March 6 Daily Texan and acknowledging his use of some of the phrasing in that editorial, the MOTION was voted upon after Mr. Philpott's (History) amendment was accepted. In its final form the MOTION read as follows:

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate urges the Chairman of the Board of Regents to initiate proceedings toward the selection of a duly constituted search committee as soon as possible in order to provide ample time to review candidates and provide the Regents with sufficient time to select the next President of The University of Texas at Austin.

The MOTION was adopted unanimously, and the Senate adjourned to convene next in special session at 2:15 P. M. on March 13.

H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The Faculty Senate

APPENDIX A.

Statement of March 6, 1978, from University Co-Operative Society

To the Faculty Senate

The Board of Directors of the University Cooperative Society would like to thank Professor Hardgrave and the committee which recently completed its very thorough study of the Co-op's textbook policies. The report will serve as a useful guide to the Board as it continues its careful review of the policies and procedures of textbook supply.

The Board has already taken steps to implement many of the committee's recommendations. It has moved to establish more effective communication with departmental staff and faculty members on the ordering of books. The textbook management system is also being carefully reviewed to improve its efficiency and reduce its cost. And the Board is considering the implementation of a computer system that will allow textbook personnel to keep more effective day-to-day track of orders and textbooks.

These improvements, however, also require the full cooperation of the faculty of the University: in completing order forms on time, in minimizing changes in texts from semester to semester, in standardizing texts for multi-section courses, and in keeping book costs within reasonable bounds. As the committee pointed out, we must all recognize our individual and departmental responsibilities if students are to have an adequate and timely supply of the books they need.

The Board looks forward to continued cooperation with the Senate and the Faculty in this important area.

Respectfully,

(signed by Susan Wittig)

Dr. Susan Wittig, Chair
Co-op Board of Directors

APPENDIX B.

REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS distributed at the March 6, 1978 Senate meeting by Chairman Phil Gough of the Committee on Ways and Means to Implement General Faculty Resolutions concerning Faculty Workloads and Teaching Assistants.

Work Load/Teaching Load

1. The minimum faculty workload at The University of Texas at Austin shall be defined as 40 hours per week; this is a quantitative minimum, satisfaction of which shall not be sufficient for continuing employment in the University.
2. Each department shall define and justify, in writing, its workload requirements specifying those patterns of activity which constitute legitimate academic work for its faculty in terms of that departments' distinctive educational mission.
3. A standing university committee, shall be created which, together with the administration, shall evaluate the proposed departmental requirements, and subsequently shall certify compliance with those requirements.
4. Immediate action shall be taken to correct any individual or departmental failure to comply with departmental or University requirements.

Work Load Reporting

5. The University adopt, as soon as possible, a new and detailed individual faculty work report, to be filed each semester and departmentally certified, this report to serve as the measure by which compliance with the work load requirement is to be assessed as described in earlier recommendations, and;
6. Each department shall file, each semester, a departmental workload report, including a summary and analysis showing who (i.e., what kind of instructor) is teaching what courses (i.e., type and level) to what students.

Teaching Assistants

7. No Teaching Assistant shall be permitted to assume major responsibility for any class at the University, with the exception of laboratory or discussion sections clearly labeled as such.
8. An appointment to the rank of Assistant Instructor to teach a given course shall require prior departmental certification of qualification to teach that course.
9. Every department shall carefully examine the possibility of training its graduate students to teach a wider range of courses, by giving them the opportunity to assist, and even to lecture, in such courses. To serve this purpose, it shall be possible for a graduate student simultaneously to hold appointments as Teaching Assistant and Assistant Instructor in different courses.
10. Each department, with the active and meaningful participation of its graduate assistants, and in consultation with the Graduate School, shall determine the minimum number of hours per week required to carry out each of the duties it requires of its assistants as employees, and then guarantee that none is required to devote more hours per week to the total duties required than the number of hours for which the assistant is paid, and that the total demands on the student in terms of both teaching and graduate study shall not be exorbitant.

Undergraduate Education

11. Each department shall give full consideration to the educational needs of its undergraduate students before determining its course offerings for each semester.
12. The University shall hire as new faculty only those who have demonstrated a potential for excellent undergraduate teaching and the desire to engage in it.
13. The promotion and tenure policies of the University shall not preclude promotion on the basis of teaching alone.
14. Each department shall conduct an annual evaluation of the teaching of each of its faculty; this evaluation must include student and faculty judgment, and access to the results shall not be restricted to the individual faculty member.
15. Every course at the University, excluding laboratory and discussion sections, shall be taught primarily by faculty with the rank of instructor or above.