

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

APRIL 3, 1978

The eighth 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 April 3, 1978.

Chairman William Livingston (Government) presided at the meeting.

I. ATTENDANCE

I. Present: Barbara Aldave, Rebecca Baltzer, L. Joe Berry, John Brokaw, Robert Brooks, Heather Carter, James Daniel, Mitzi Dreher, Wm. Duesterhoeft, John Durbin, Donald Foss, David Gavenda, William Glade, Philip Gough, Robert Hardgrave, Charles Holahan, Clark Hubbs, Paul Kelley, William Livingston, Neill Megaw, Thomas Philpott, Bonnie Rickelman, Larry Tomassini, James Vick, Gary Wise, Lee Worrell.

Absent: Sinclair Black, George Blanco (excused), John Bordie, John Breen, Michel Breger, Patricia Cain, Vincente Cantarino, C. T. Clark, Lyle Clark (excused), Bill Francis (excused), Austin Gleeson, Ira Iscoe (excused), William Lesso, Kenneth Prescott, Mary Ann Rankin, Alan Ross (excused), James Sledd, Waneen Spirduso (excused), Kenneth Stokoe (excused), David Warner, Glenn Welsch, Ralph White, Martha Williams, Leslie Willson, Susan Wittig, Ron Wyllys, Orville Wyss (excused). (Three on leave)

Total members present: 26

Total members absent: 27

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Minutes of the meeting of January 16, 1978 (delayed).
- B. Minutes of the meeting of February 6, 1978 (delayed).
- C. Minutes of the meeting of March 6, 1978 (delayed).
- D. Minutes of the Special Meeting of March 13, 1978 (delayed).

III. REPORTS OF OFFICERS

A. Report of Chairman

Two matters were reported on by Chairman Livingston. The first concerned the status of Congressional legislation which would affect the mandatory retirement age of tenured professors. Senator Chafee of Arkansas had informed Mr. Livingston that House-Senate conferees had reported a compromise measure which had been accepted by both Houses of the Congress and which was expected to be signed into law by the President. The bill's effect on tenured professors will be that after July 1, 1982, mandatory retirement because of age for those under 70 will be prohibited.

The second report concerned a Faculty Senate directive emanating from the Senate Committee on Plagiarism. Mr. Livingston had been directed to ask President Rogers to verify the existence of commercial "research services" and to determine whether any legal action might be taken against them by appropriate authorities. "Dr. Rogers answered by saying that [while] the legal sanction might provide one possible route to curbing the abuses,

she thought that direct action by the faculty against individuals who used the services was the most responsible and effective response that the University might take. To that I answered [that] we certainly would agree that that was the most responsible and effective response but not the only one, and that paragraph four of our resolution had actually requested her to determine the existence of these things and to find out what legal action could be taken, because we had no legal counsel available to us. I hoped she would be able to determine whether any legal action, either civil or criminal, might be taken against those services. . . . To which, on March 16, I received another reply which said, 'As noted in my earlier response to you regarding research services, the administration has been concerned about this matter for several years. Throughout this period, possible remedies under existing statutes have been fully explored. To reiterate, I believe faculty action provides the most responsible and effective response to this issue'."

B. Report of Vice-Chairman -- None.

C. Report of Secretary

Paul Kelley (secretary) requested members to furnish him with written copies of motions in order to expedite the preparation of Senate Minutes.

IV. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

First, Mr. Livingston reviewed the action of the Senate at its March 13 special meeting which had been devoted to the Gough Committee Report. "The main motion on the floor was Professor Gough's motion that paragraphs 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the report be adopted. In the course of the meeting, the Senate adopted several amendments to paragraphs 7, 8, and 9. We did not touch 10. At the time it was disclosed that no quorum existed . . . there was a dual motion by Professor Megaw on the floor. I'm advised by Mr. Jeffrey, the [Senate's] Parliamentarian, that the adjournment of the Senate wiped all these motions off the books. Megaw's dual motion, the amendments adopted by the Senate, and the main motion by Professor Gough. The way to get them back on the books however, if we want them on the books, is for Professor Gough to move the adoption of whatever he wants--the amendments, or the non-amended motion, or whatever. Since that time as you may all know, President Rogers has issued a new set of administrative instructions that preempts the field of Teaching Assistants and Assistant Instructors, and I know that the Gough Committee has met several times to contemplate the disarray and will now, no doubt, . . . have a suggestion as to what to do in consequence."

Mr. Gough said that before dealing with the Committee Report, he wished to address two situations which were vexing. The first concerned criticism which had been directed at the committee by Mr. Sledd and others. To Mr. Sledd's charge that the committee had conspired to do nothing as long as possible, he said: "I think quite the opposite is true, and I wish to respond to that allegation. It would be quite easy, I think, to make the kind of recommendations which Mr. Sledd would have us adopt. If you are convinced that the character of the University is fundamentally different from what it ought to be, then you can simply make recommendations which would vastly change that. [One person] suggested to me that he believed that most research at the University is trivial; another [person] suggested to me he believes that that research which is not trivial serves either the federal government or big business and ought to be funded by one or the other of those agencies. The members of the committee don't share that belief--at least, to my knowledge we don't. We believe that research is absolutely the backbone of this University and that [which] separates us

from other institutions in the state, which have what we think is a different function. We felt it absolutely imperative to try to preserve the research function of the University. . . . In that light, then, . . . I was surprised by the vigor of the response to our suggestion that we . . . subscribe to a 40-hour work-week. . . . I saw two [newspapers] while I was on my spring break which carried an [Associated Press] story about the Faculty Senate's consideration of workload, and in both of those papers [the AP story] was followed the next day [by] an editorial on the part of the paper about the faculty being responsive to the concerns of the people of the state.

"I think realistically we must have a workload. If we [do], we either have one that is . . . defined in terms of organized courses (which will have the effect of doing horrendous damage at the very least to our science and engineering departments), or we must define it . . . something like [the way] we did, I think we worked very hard to try to come to a definition of workload which was not only defensible but [which] would enable the University to take a far more positive stand about its activities than [it] has taken in the past. In fact, . . . it's our understanding that whether or not this University adopts such a workload, the Coordinating Board committee [on that matter] is going to insist that every university and every institution of higher learning in this state subscribes to a minimum workload of 40 hours. . . .

"This Committee has certainly worked harder at its task than any I've ever served on . . . [and I take umbrage] at the allegation that we either dragged our feet or otherwise shirked our duties. What we did try to do was to make recommendations which would change those things which we think are wrong with the University, genuinely quite apart from any concern about their effect on our public image.

"We were, as a group, convinced that the University has made too extensive use of Teaching Assistants and that many charges about Teaching Assistants being placed in the classroom without qualification were true. We tried to frame a set of recommendations which, we think, would go a long way towards changing that. Happily, I guess, from our point of view, the administration has made moot much of what we recommended last time, and we're not prepared to raise those [issues] again. They are now part of what the University is going to do. . . .

"[The second situation which troubles me is] a line in The Daily Texan this morning in which it was alleged that the reason there was similarity between our recommendations and those of the administration was because we had had substantial input from Dr. Fonken. That 'input' took the form of one . . . meeting at the beginning of the year and one conference in which I sat in Dr. Fonken's office and told him what our report was going to contain. . . . We did know that the administration had such a thing afoot--that is, the intent to turn over graduate student teaching duties only to Assistant Instructors, but the administration consistently refused even to provide us with a draft of their proposals for changes in the Handbook of Operating Procedures.

"The upshot of all this, in respect to our recommendations about Teaching Assistants [is this]: we propose simply . . . to withdraw, not to [move the acceptance of Recommendations] 7, 8, 9, and 10. We would make some observations, though, that we hope would at least become part of the record of the Faculty Senate.

"One concern was formerly Recommendation 8, namely:

8. The appointment to the rank of Assistant Instructor to teach a given course shall require prior departmental certification of qualification to teach that course.

"We would note that our intent was clearly that an Assistant Instructor be certified and appointed to teach a particular course. The

current recommendations, as they have been distributed for the Handbook of Operating Procedures, specify simply that someone must be . . . qualified to be an Assistant Instructor (and that means an MA, or the equivalent, . . . prior service as a TA, and prior registration in 398T). [In other words,] you must be an AI to teach, and to be an AI you must have met these requirements. There is [no mention of certifying] that the AI is qualified to teach the particular course to which that person will be assigned. And we talked about this some last week and tried to think of ways in which we might incorporate or recommend that our concern be incorporated and decided that there would be no way that wouldn't be so Byzantine as to bring upon a discussion of the sort that we had at the last Faculty Senate meeting. And so we decided simply to express our concern about this issue, but not to make any recommendations.

"Secondly, with respect to [Recommendation 9, in which] we asked [that] every department carefully examine the possibility of training its graduate students to teach a wider range of courses. . . . we hope that it is noted that it was the concern of the committee that each and every department at this University should, in the first instance, be far more concerned to make use of a graduate student as a junior faculty member [to contribute to the] education of that graduate student rather than [to be concerned with] replacing faculty in the classroom. To that end, we hope that every department will carefully examine the possibility of training the graduate students to teach a wider range of courses by giving them an opportunity to assist, and even to lecture, in such courses. [Furthermore], the use of graduate students in this way should have no negative effect on the salary of its students. We [further] hope that no system of two classes of instructors--those who actually teach in freshman English or Spanish or Accounting, and those who are assisting in the more advanced courses--comes about.

"The one suggestion that we would like to offer [concerns TA workload. Let me read a resolution we received from the College of Humanities.]

'Resolved: That the Faculty of the College of Humanities urge the Gough Committee, the Graduate Assembly, and the President of the University to revise the rule which requires all Humanities graduate assistants [to] take 9 hours of course work (even though a substantial number of them, as in English, are teaching 6), so that no Teaching Assistant will be required to take and teach more than a total of four courses.'

"I hope my colleagues on the committee will correct me if I misstate our consensus on this. I think it is the case that we all share the belief that requiring graduate students in any department--Humanities or otherwise-- . . . [to] take 9 hours and asking them--whether they be Teaching Assistants or Assistant Instructors, . . . [to] take three courses and teach two courses is excessive. Our concern, and what we would like to [recommend] is that the rules of the University be amended so that no Assistant Instructor [would] be required to take and to teach more than a total of four courses.

"We differ within the committee [about] whether . . . the College of Humanities (or whoever else would use AI's in this way) should reduce the teaching load [or whether] the 9 hour requirement should be relaxed. . . ."

A lengthy discussion followed about the ramifications of various possible wordings of AI work/course load reduction. The discussion culminated in a motion offered by Mr. Daniel (Mathematics) which would refer to the Graduate Assembly for its consideration the following resolution for study and recommendation:

RESOLVED: That no Assistant Instructor be required to take and to teach more than a total of four courses.

The motion was APPROVED unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Daniel then moved that the Faculty Senate approve REVISED RECOMMENDATION 10 of the Gough Committee:

REVISED RECOMMENDATION 10:

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 be 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.

The motion was ADOPTED unanimously, by voice vote, without further debate.

Mr. Gough then made some general remarks about REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS 11-15, which concerned undergraduate education. "It is the conviction of some of us . . . that the heart of our problem with people in the state is that we've neglected their children. In [recent] editorials . . . there was no mention of the research function of the University or the fact research might be taking people's time away from the classroom. Indeed, it is my reading of history that no one in the Legislature [has] expressed any concern about the fact that faculty at this University were engaged in research. [In my judgment], both the people of the state and the members of the Legislature were proud of the fact that this was a first class research institution. . . . Legislative concern about faculty workloads arose only when there came a chorus of voices from alumni, from the parents of students, and from other observers of . . . the University which suggested that we were turning over the teaching of undergraduates to Teaching Assistants while we went our merry way doing other things. Hence the Committee's final . . . recommendations are addressed to meet what we think is a serious flaw in the University, namely the investment that the University makes in our undergraduate education.

"I hasten to say that it is my conviction, at least as a member of the faculty, that there is no incompatibility between undergraduate education and research; indeed, quite the opposite. A student, potentially at least, can get the best education he can anywhere in this state at The University of Texas at Austin precisely because we are engaged in the kind of research and scholarship that we are.

"I do think it's the case, though, that what is needed is some diversion of resources from graduate education to undergraduate, and . . . I think history [because of declining graduate enrollments] is calling for this anyway. . . . We think that the University ought to rededicate itself to undergraduate education, and [we thus] offer, the final five recommendations."

Mr. Gough next MOVED the adoption of REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS 11-15, and then he presented for discussion REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS 11:

11. Each department shall give full consideration to the educational needs of its undergraduate students before determining its course offerings for each semester.

There being no discussion, Mr. Gough moved on to REVISED RECOMMENDATION 12:

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.

Mr. Gavenda (Physics) spoke against the recommendation, saying that it made no sense to him to say you "would hire only those who have

demonstrated a potential for excellent undergraduate teaching if you aren't also willing to pass a resolution saying we will only hire those who have demonstrated a potential for excellent graduate teaching. This is expecting too much to expect that every single individual will be able to do an excellent job of each of these duties."

Mr. Berry (Microbiology) questioned the demonstrability of potential for undergraduate teaching. "Nearly all of our young people have had no, or very limited, experience in lecturing. They have not had the opportunity; they have been concentrating on research and scholarship."

Mr. Glade (Economics) suggested less stringency by the insertion of "normally" before hire.

Mr. Megaw (English) offered an amendment which would preface the recommendation with "with the exception of units engaged exclusively in graduate instruction." Ms. Aldave (Law) said that since the caption at the top of the page was "Undergraduate Education," she had been assuming that all the recommendations exclusively so pertained. Mr. Gough responded that such was the committee's intent.

The Megaw amendment was ADOPTED and Mr. Glade then MOVED an amendment to insert the word "normally" between the words

Mr. Durbin (Mathematics) expressed the view that the Glade amendment would weaken the recommendation to the point of meaninglessness. Mr. Daniel (Mathematics) said that he thought the nature of the amendment should incorporate language which instead of inserting the word "normally", would add something like "with rare and justified exceptions," . . . [thereby legitimizing] "the position of saying, 'The reason we want to do this is that this person is such a marvelous research person or so valuable as a graduate teacher that that far outweighs the disadvantage of an undergraduate teacher'."

Mr. Gavenda suggested that the Recommendation should explicitly include reference to graduate as well as undergraduate teaching. Mr. Worrell (Pharmacy), suggested that the word "undergraduate" be eliminated; the phraseology would thus be "potential for teaching." At this juncture (or shortly thereafter), a vote was taken on the Glade amendment (to insert the word "normally") and it was DEFEATED.

Mr. Worrell moved an amendment to delete the Megaw amendment and delete "undergraduate." Thus the Worrell amendment would revise Recommendation 12 to read:

12. The University shall hire as new faculty only those who have demonstrated a potential for excellent teaching and the desire to engage in it.

Mr. Holahan (Psychology) spoke against the Worrell amendment, saying it had the effect of disregarding the committee's intent, "which was to make a public statement to the people of the state and the Legislature in terms of assurance that we are committed to undergraduate teaching in addition to graduate teaching."

After further discussion, a vote was taken and the Worrell amendment ADOPTED.

Next, Mr. Duesterhoeft (Electrical Engineering) offered a substitute motion for the just-amended Recommendation 12:

12. "Each department shall give full consideration to the educational needs of its undergraduate students in the recruitment and development of its faculty.

Mr. Gough supported the substitute, expressing the view that

the Worrell amendment had "gutted the intent" of the original recommendation. Two motions were then adopted unanimously--the first to substitute the Duesterhoeft amendment, the second to ADOPT it.

Next, Mr. Gough introduced REVISED RECOMMENDATION 13:

13. The promotion and tenure policies at the University shall not preclude promotion on the basis of teaching alone.

Mr. Gough said the committee's intent was not to dilute the University's high standards for promotion with respect to research and scholarship. Instead, the intent "is simply to make it possible for those units in which research and scholarship are not as important as they are elsewhere to promote their people." He added that current promotion and tenure policies precluded promotion exclusively on the basis of extraordinary teaching.

Mr. Philpott (History) said that he agreed with the motion's intent, but that the prevailing winds at U. T. Austin would be difficult to combat. He pointed out that within the past 12 months, seven persons who had won major teaching awards had been dismissed. The persons to be convinced, he said, were faculty, "colleagues, chairmen, deans, and the people in the President's group who decide finally about promotion."

The motion was then ADOPTED without dissent.

Next, Mr. Gough introduced REVISED RECOMMENDATION 14 in a new form:

14. Each department shall conduct an annual evaluation of the teaching of each of its faculty.

He noted that the earlier wording of REVISED RECOMMENDATION 14 had been further revised by the committee in order to delete the portion requiring the evaluations to include both faculty and student judgment. There was "division among the committee on this. . . . I voted for universal student evaluations; and others of the committee were not nearly as extreme as I . . . , but all of us share the conviction that if there is one thing that is imperative to the improvement of the teaching and faculty at this University, it is that we put teaching under some kind of a spotlight. In particular, we are asking here that . . . each and every department shall conduct some form of evaluation. As in the rest of our document, we tried to leave the form of the evaluation . . . in the hands of a given department so that the department can take into account the particular manner of instruction within that department. . . ."

Mr. Hubbs (Zoology) said that he agreed with the recommendation's philosophy but that in large departments, particularly, annual evaluations of all faculty members would increase the workload appreciably.

Mr. Megaw (English) strongly supported the motion and stressed the importance of the quality of the annual review. He cited the Philosophy Department's review procedure as prototypic. "Their people are given not only a statement of the criteria for retention and promotion, but they are informed in advance of the exact details of the mechanism by which they will be evaluated. They are then informed annually of the date of the review, and before that review they have several long, untiring interviews with senior members of the department. Their classes are visited by senior members of the department, all of whom, by the way, report [that] this is a very rewarding experience indeed. They are given a chance to perfect their files by submitting additional materials; they can talk about the things they have in mind for the next year as well as the projects that have already been completed. They are then informed of the results of the evaluation and given a chance to enter informal requests of reconsideration at that point, before the materials are sent forward to the deans. It goes on like that; it is just remarkably good system. . . ."

Mr. Daniel (Mathematics) spoke in strong support of annual evaluations of all faculty members but offered an amendment which would restore the earlier wording of REVISED RECOMMENDATION 14, making it read as follows:

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.

Mr. Brokaw (Drama) spoke in support of leaving the nature and implementation of the evaluation to departmental discretion. Mr. Gavenda (Physics) voiced his support of the Daniel amendment.

After further discussion, the Daniel amendment was DEFEATED by a voice vote. There then followed a brief discussion which concerned various means of conducting faculty evaluations.

Mr. Gough then introduced the last recommendation, REVISED RECOMMENDATION 15.

15. Every course at the University, excluding laboratory and discussion sections, shall be taught primarily by faculty with the rank of instructor or above.

He said that "if there is anything that this faculty has done which has earned it the enmity of the people of the state, and this [is] being reflected in the attitude of the Legislature toward us, it is this abrogation of the teaching responsibility in freshman and sophomore courses. We recognize the necessity to allow graduate students [to teach lower division courses in order to] provide the teaching experience that these students need [for] placement in the academic world. We recognize, too, that there are not enough . . . faculty to teach every course at this University, especially in the size of sections and the kind of classes that we would like to teach. Nonetheless, members of the committee believe that it is the faculty's responsibility to teach every course at this University, and [that] in those few departments which have turned entire courses over to Teaching Assistants and Assistant Instructors, this must be reversed.

"And so our proposal is straightforward, that every course shall be taught primarily by faculty with the rank of instructor or above. In the text we interpret this to mean that one more than half of all the students registered in every course at the University must be taught by faculty."

There was discussion about the ramifications of the recommendation with regard to multi-sectional courses and class sub-sections--discussion and laboratory. It was generally recognized that the effect of the recommendation in some departments would be of considerable magnitude.

Mr. Brooks (RTF) spoke against the recommendation: "I feel . . . that the Assistant Instructors [who will] be teaching under the new proposal from the administration will be qualified to teach these courses, and I feel that they should be given the opportunity to teach them. Several comments have been made that teaching experience is desirable among those who go out in their first jobs, and I think this does provide an opportunity for our students to achieve some kind of teaching experience, plus the fact that I think the administration has gone to a certain amount of trouble to show that these people will be qualified to teach these courses."

Mr. Gough responded that there was "nothing in this proposal which would deny any graduate student the right to teach in anything. It does mean that if the English Department, for example, wishes to give . . . teaching experience to its graduate students, they cannot do it entirely in

Freshman composition unless the faculty [are teaching English composition] as much as the Assistant Instructors are." In response to further inquiry of Mr. Brooks, Mr. Gough used a hypothetical example to illustrate the committee's intent: "If there are 100 sections of the beginning composition course [with] 2,500 students registered, 1,249 can be taught by Assistant Instructors in as many sections as the English Department wants to [put them]." Mr. Brooks said that he was unable to so interpret the recommendation. Mr. Gough said that the definition of "primarily" was contained in the text of the committee's report.

Mr. Livingston suggested that the recommendation should be re-worded in order to delete "primarily"; Mr. Daniel thought that "course" should be defined. Mr. Megaw thought that "multi-sectional" should be inserted to modify course. Finally, after considerable discussion, none of the suggested amendments to REVISED RECOMMENDATION 15 were approved.

REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS 10 - 15, as amended, were then ADOPTED. Members of the Gough Committee were thanked by a round of hearty applause for their long and hard work.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Durbin (Mathematics) pointed out that there were but five weeks of classes remaining and asked whether Regents Chairman Shivers had responded to the Senate request for expediting the creation of a presidential search committee. Mr. Livingston responded that he had heard nothing.

Mr. Megaw (English) requested that the Chairman look at the new TA/AI policy to ascertain whether or not it is the care that the AI's academic freedom will be protected. The Chairman agreed to do so.

The final item concerned the reconstruction of the Gough Committee report in light of Senate action and administration-initiated policy change affecting some parts of it. It was decided that the Senate Chairman, Secretary Kelley and Mr. Gough would undertake that task prior to the reports' transmittal to the University Council. With that the Senate adjourned, to convene next on May 1, 1978 at 2:15 P. M. in Main Building, Room 212.

H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The Faculty Senate

Distributed to members of the Faculty Senate and to Members of the General Faculty who want Minutes on August 29, 1979