

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES January 18, 1995 PLEASE POST

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

January 18, 1994

Present: Bible, Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, Weller, and Winek.

Guests: Dean Ron Brown (General Studies), Prof. Michel Conroy (Art), Prof. Dean Geuras (Philosophy), Prof. Mike Hennessy (English), Mr. Mike Moore, Ms. Sandra Akridge

CONTENTS:

26	RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (Prof. Conroy)
a.	RECOMMENDED AWARDS--FALL REVIEW
b.	ANNUAL REPORT--1994-95
c.	PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR FY96
d.	SENATE STANDING RULES
e.	RESEARCH COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
33	BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT (Prof. Caruana)
51	GENERAL STUDIES COUNCIL (Dean Ron Brown)
29	ACADEMIC CORE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
07	PLANNING MEETING WITH LIAISONS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS
14	PAAG DATES FOR SPRING
02.	MINUTES OF 12/7/94
	NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:00 p.m., Senate Chair Swinney presiding.

26 RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT GRANT PROGRAM (Prof. Conroy)

a. RECOMMENDED AWARDS--FALL REVIEW

This is the first time that the Faculty Research Committee has conducted a full-fledged spring and fall application-review process. Thirty-seven persons applied in the fall review. Prof. Conroy presented the names and amounts requested and recommended for the twenty-three grant recipients. A total of \$82,413 was awarded.

The Senate approved these recommendations.

b. ANNUAL REPORT--1994-95

A grand total of \$227,446.40 was allocated in the spring and fall 1994 reviews. Grants are reviewed by School Advisory Committees and these evaluations are used by the Research Committee in ranking candidates.

c. PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR FY96

After discussion, the second draft of the guidelines for obtaining grants was accepted by the Senate, with minor wording changes.

d. SENATE STANDING RULES

The Senate Standing Rules regarding the grant process will need to be changed somewhat to reflect the modified guidelines. Prof. Sawey moved that the Research Committee draft revised standing rules for the Senate's consideration and the Senate concurred.

e. RESEARCH COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Given the new twice-a-year cycle, the Committee on Committees will no longer make recommendations for appointments to the Research Committee. Committee replacements are needed now for Applied Arts and Technology, Liberal Arts, and Education. In addition, Committee chair Conroy's term is due to expire, leaving the Committee with a possible continuity problem. School Advisory Committee members need to be elected from each department.

Following discussion, the Senate voted (1) to have Senators from the three schools submit names for the Committee replacements, (2) to reappoint Prof. Conroy as Committee chair through 1996, and (3) to initiate a selection process through Senators and Liaisons with the cooperation of Department Chairs to elect appropriate departmental representatives--i.e. faculty able and willing to judge research proposals and not applying for Research Enhancement Grants themselves.

The Senate commended Prof. Conroy and the Committee on their excellent work.

Applications for Research Enhancement Grants for FY96 for the spring 1995 review must be submitted to Sponsored Projects by March 1.

### 33 BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT (Prof. Caruana)

The SWT Budget Committee report to the Senate from Bob Northcutt dated May 9, 1994 has been studied by the Senate Subcommittee on Budget and they recommend approval. However, the Subcommittee made three recommendations.

(1) Salary and operating budgeting for the Summer School Sessions should have the same priority as any other line item in the University budget.

(2) The ongoing and future across-the-board cuts should be closely monitored by the Faculty Senate chair, the SWT Budget Committee, and the School Budget Committees.

(3) In light of budgetary short-falls, coupled with the salary equity adjustments, salary compression discussions, and salaries below the norm for all ranks, the University should place the highest budgetary consideration to improve salaries for the teaching faculty, librarians, and staff. [Note: Prof. Horne moved and the Senate approved adding staff to recommendations.]

A lively discussion included: What percent of the budget is spent on teaching salaries and what percent on administration? Is professional nonteaching staff increasing excessively as we grow and diversify functions (i.e. are we gaining from economies of scale or losing from proliferation of programs and offices)? [Note: SWT is supposed to be near the bottom on administrative costs, but are we spending wisely for students re cost/benefits in this area?] Has the 1 percent cutback in budgets been collected from all departments? How is it that money saved

by some departments is then removed from them and disappears into some general pool? [Note: This does not encourage Depts. to save, does it?] Do Departments and Deans know what the Summer budgets will be at the beginning of the fiscal year? [Note: This does not appear to be the case currently, since students and faculty are up-in-the-air until the last minute. Prof. Swinney will check on this Summer budget question.] What will happen to Summer programs in general and when is the Summer Task Force report coming?

The recommendations from the Subcommittee on Budget will be returned to the agenda when responses are obtained on some of the above questions. In addition, there was unanimous consent attempt to monitor carefully both budget cuts and reallocation.

#### 51 GENERAL STUDIES COUNCIL (Guest: Dean Ron Brown)

The GS Council is composed of 16 voting members and replaced a larger advisory body representing each Department. Problems discussed centered around the following: (1) A PPS of 10/93 was given the Council. It included what constituted a quorum and a necessary number for passing a recommendation to the Dean of General Studies. Subsequently the GS Council changed the numbers for these two items. Was the PPS a draft to be altered or was it a mandate? Those present at today's Senate meeting who were on the GS Council at the time disagreed on "draft or not" status of PPS and subsequent changes. It was pointed out that lack of communications, i.e. mailing of agenda and reminders of meetings, hampered reaching of a quorum under the altered guidelines.

A basic issue emerged: Is the Council appropriately constituted for its mission when it does not represent all departments as it did under the old system? It was stated that in "the old days" the Committee on the core curriculum did not have its decisions overturned because it presumably had the approval of all department representatives. The idea was expressed that while the status of General Studies as a School may be in limbo, the idea of a committee to oversee a general studies core is not. What happens with regard to its representation, etc. is most important.

Prof. Pascoe moved that the Senate get all this in writing and Prof. Bible suggested that we then invite Dean Brown back to discuss all the knotty issues. RTA'd until this is on paper and Senate can meet with Dean Brown.

#### 29 ACADEMIC CORE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

The Senate approved two possible candidates for chair to replace Ron Brown and Prof. Swinney will contact them. RTA'd for acceptance information.

#### 07 PLANNING MEETING WITH LIAISONS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS

The meeting will be scheduled for February 8, 1995.

#### 14 PAAG DATES FOR SPRING

PAAG dates for Pres. Supple and VPAA Gratz to meet with the Senate will be: February 1, March 8, April 12, and May 10, 1995. Faculty are invited to attend and submit items for the agenda (in written form) to your Senators.

#### 02 MINUTES OF 12/7/94 The minutes were approved as read. NEW ITEMS

Prof. Swinney presented a handout on "Faculty Salaries at SWT: A Brief History"--a year by year summary of raises here during the last six biennia. This includes general information on merit and

across-the-board raises. This is part of the on-going effort of the Senate to collect relevant data to inform discussion of a variety of salary equity questions, e.g. salary compression, differential salaries, gender and racial equity, golden parachutes, chair merit, etc., which have been raised over the past couple of years.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

MEMORANDUM

25-Jan-1995 09:31am CST

From: EV SWINNEY

Subject: Correction to Minutes

Colleagues:

I received the following proposed correction to last week's minutes this morning. Ev.

I have a correction to the minutes of the last Senate meeting. According to the minutes, those present at the Senate meeting who were on the GS council could not agree concerning whether the original pps was a draft or not. As I recall, the only two faculty members who meet that description--Jon Bible and I-- agreed that the pps was presented as a draft.

This is an important matter. The Faculty Senate seems to have the mistaken impression that the GS council behaved improperly and with ill intent. Such was not the case.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES January 25, 1995 PLEASE POST

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, and Winek. Absent: Pascoe and Weller.

Guests: Dean Ron Brown (General Studies), Prof. Vince Luizzi, Prof. Dean Geuras (Philosophy), Prof. Mike Hennessy (English), Prof. Grady Early (Computer Science), Prof. Edgar Laird (SWT Ombudsman), Ms. Sandra Akridge

CONTENTS:

51	GENERAL STUDIES COUNCIL
36	EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS (Revised Draft of PPS 8.05)
34	TENURE AND PROMOTION APPEALS COMMITTEE (Prof. Bible)
101	BUDGETING FACULTY SALARIES FOR SUMMER
14	PAAG AGENDA FOR 2/1/95
02	MINUTES OF 1/18/95
	NEW ITEMS
	DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT ON FY89 MERIT CYCLE

The meeting began at 4:02, Chair Swinney presiding.

51 GENERAL STUDIES COUNCIL (Guests: Dean Brown and various Council members)

The Senate had earlier received a packet of materials including the two PPSs in question and correspondence from various persons involved in GS Council issues.

Prof. Bible suggested that the following be changed from the original and revised PPS 1.12: (1) the substantive/nonsubstantive distinction be eliminated; (2) a quorum of 11 of the 16 voting members be established; (3) elimination of the 60 day rule for automatic acceptance of decisions which are not acted upon by higher administration; and (4) a majority of the quorum be acceptable for recommendations (instead of two-thirds of all eligible voting members).

Prof. Geuras gave background information on why the PPS was changed and offered the intriguing thought that perhaps the revised PPS was now the official one since it had not been acted upon by the higher administration within the 60 days specified in the original PPS. Prof. Early asked why two committees (the GS Council and the Senate's Core Curriculum Committee) were necessary for oversight. Prof. Bible pointed out the lack of communications between the two groups. Discussion included the representation which might be most effective on an oversight committee. For example, the former General Studies Council had a representative from each department while the current GS Council has a mixture of two elected faculty from each school plus two chairs and three non-voting members (two students and the Director of the Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies). Various persons commented that under either set-up the committee was able to function without gridlock and their decisions had never been overturned by the higher administration. A larger committee always runs the risk, however, of not achieving a quorum.

A motion was made that the two committees meet and decide what to do about the PPS and the overlap situation. The motion failed to carry. Prof. Bible proposed that the original PPS be followed but scratch the "nonsubstantive" issue mechanism and set the quorum at eleven of the sixteen voting members. The motion passed. Prof. Stedman moved that Dean Brown and the GS Council be requested to consider the issues of representation, organization, and mission and report back on their conclusions. The motion carried.

#### 36 EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS (Revised Draft of PPS 8.05)

The Senate considered a revised draft of PPS 8.05, the Annual Evaluation of Department Chairs, which has been approved by CAD. The proposed process includes the "management by results" concept and requires the solicitation of the faculty's evaluation of their chair. The Senate endorsed the draft but will suggest that a method be found to share the results of the evaluation with the faculty of the affected department.

The PPS provides that "In addition to the annual evaluation . . . at least once every three years the dean of the school will conduct a summative review of the chair's performance. This review will be based upon a comprehensive evaluation of the chair's work. The review will include, but not be limited to, a careful consideration of the views of the faculty members in the department, with special emphasis on the views of the tenured and tenure-track faculty." Some Senators commented that they would still prefer a straight three-year renewable term.

The Senate then discussed the future of its own annual questionnaire, i.e. do we need it and, if so, should questions and format be changed? Some of the comments were that despite the usual 40 percent return rate, the evaluations do seem to have some effect. Perhaps some demographics and mechanics could be changed so people are less identifiable. Untenured faculty, especially in small departments, might feel more free to respond. In addition, faculty get feedback only when some results are published in the Star.

Prof. Caruana will chair a committee to look into revisions of the evaluation tool. Chair Swinney will appoint and charge the committee.

#### 34 TENURE AND PROMOTION APPEALS COMMITTEE (Prof. Bible; Guest: Ombudsman Laird)

Prof. Bible presented a revision of the "Procedures for Appeal" section of UPPS 04.04.21 on Faculty Tenure and Promotion. The changes allow a larger role for mediation by the University Ombudsman and should make the process easier on appealing procedural violations. "Denial of tenure" was also added to PPS 8.08 on "Academic Due Process." Prof. Swinney pointed out that under Regents Rules the University cannot give reasons for denial of tenure.

Profs. Laird and Bible will work out the language on the new procedures recommended for the PPS.

#### 101 BUDGETING FACULTY SALARIES FOR SUMMER

The Senate is inclined to recommend that faculty salaries for summer school be put back into departmental budgets, as they were prior to the Oil Glut in the mid 80's. After discussion, it was decided to put this on the PAAG agenda for preliminary consideration. Prof. Swinney will bring this topic to the attention of the Council of Chairs.

14 PAAG AGENDA FOR 2/1/95

The following items were suggested for the next PAAG meeting:

- Summer school budgets
- Legislative prospects for this session
- Implications of using E-mail for political purposes
- Retirement and salary
- Aquarena and its financial status

02 MINUTES OF 1/18/95

The minutes were approved as amended.

NEW ITEMS

DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT ON FY89 MERIT CYCLE

Prof. Swinney distributed data on the FY89 merit cycle which is part of the background for the current SWT faculty compensation policy. This adds to our ongoing data collection for a comprehensive ten-year salary history that we hope to have completed sometime this year.

The report noted that during the last ten years SWT faculty have had no raises three times, across-the-board raises three times, performance only once, merit only once, and performance and merit three times.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary



FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
February 1, 1995

PLEASE POST

-----

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

-----

Present: Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, Weller, and Winek. Absent: Bible.

Guests: Pres. Supple, VPAA Gratz, Prof. Ron Becker (CJ liaison), Ms. Margaret Vaverek (Librarian), Prof. Diane Parkin-Speer (English), Prof. Marion Tangum, Ms. Sandra Akridge, and Mr. Mike Moore.

CONTENTS:

14	PAAG
	1) SUMMER SCHOOL BUDGETING
	2) FUNDING FOR THE NEXT BIENNIUM
	a. SWT LEGISLATIVE AGENDA
	b. POLITICAL ATMOSPHERE IN AUSTIN
	3) FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES IN USING E-MAIL
	4) MID-YEAR FACULTY RAISES AND TRS
	5) AQUARENA
102	SYMPOSIUM ON CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY (Prof. Tangum)
103	COMPUTING EQUIPMENT IN CLASSROOMS (Prof. Sawey)
104	FACULTY CONCERNS FOR UPC (Prof. Winek)
26	RESEARCH COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
02	MINUTES OF 1/25/95
	NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:06, Chair Swinney presiding.

14 PAAG (Pres. Supple and VPAA Gratz)

The PAAG minutes will be circulated later, after the President and Vice President have had the opportunity to suggest corrections.

102 SYMPOSIUM ON CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY (Prof. Tangum)

Dr. Tangum noted that "moral demise" in the U.S. is a national hot topic. What should be the role of higher education in stimulating values discussion? A symposium on "Civic Responsibility and Higher Education" will be conducted on February 4th at San Marcos High School and the public is invited to participate. Speakers and panelists will come from across the political spectrum and the topic. Radio station KSTX from San Antonio (89.1 FM) and local Channel 19 will replay the proceedings and there is a possibility of publication in print form. Dr. Tangum stated that this proposal was ranked number one out of forty-seven for the TCH grant because it was asking the community for input, rather than trying to instruct the community on what some group of scholars thought was in the community's interest. People from the surrounding 50 mile radius have been invited through various media and local organizations.

103 COMPUTING EQUIPMENT IN CLASSROOMS (Prof. Sawey)

There is a need for support for equipment in the new teaching laboratories. Areas of support include: (1) Planning (including various computing platforms--IBM and MAC); (2) Maintenance; (3) Upgrading; (4) Controlling access; (5) Training on the use of these facilities. Since there is no firm policy on these areas, it was moved that these questions be referred to the Academic Computing Committee for policy recommendations. The motion passed.

104 FACULTY CONCERNS FOR UPC (Prof. Winek)

The University Planning Council meets on Mondays and wants input from the Senate and the departmental liaisons on our needs from 1995 to the year 2000. The Senate is meeting with the liaisons next week and will pursue this with them. Ideas should be sent to Susan Griffith by February 13th. In the discussion the following were suggested: faculty and staff salaries, parking, modified retirement plan, maintaining current level of benefits, workloads, faculty computing and instruction equipment. The Senate agreed these were all of high priority and this item will return to the agenda.

26 RESEARCH COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

The vacancy for Education was RTA'd. Names were submitted for Applied Arts and Liberal Arts. [Subsequently Prof. Aditi Angirasa (Agriculture) accepted the appointment for Applied Arts and Prof. Kim Folse (Sociology) accepted for Liberal Arts.]

02 MINUTES OF 1/25/95

The minutes were approved as read.

NEW ITEMS

The draft of Associate VPAA Smallwood's assessment center plan was distributed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
February 8, 1995

PLEASE POST

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Horne, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Swinney, Weller, and Winek. Absent: Glassman, Lyman, Stedman.

Guests: Prof. Miriam Echeverria (Modern Languages), Prof. Ron Becker (CJ), Prof. Chris Frost (Psychology), Prof. Jeff Slomka (Computer Science), Prof. Kathy Moffeit (Accounting), Prof. Suji Singh (Math), David Bruner (Librarian), Prof. Diane Parkin-Speer (English), Prof. Don Hazelwood (Math), Prof. Robert Northcutt (Math), Prof. Michel Conroy (Art), Ms. Sandra Akridge, and Mr. Mike Moore.

CONTENTS:

	FACULTY GOVERNANCE ROUND TABLE (Senators, Liaisons, Committee Chairs)
26	RESEARCH COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
27	CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT (Prof. Caruana)
60	T&P APPEALS COMMITTEE NOMINEES
108	BUDGET CYCLE, FY96
02	MINUTES OF 2/1/95
	NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:06, Chair Swinney presiding.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE ROUND TABLE (Senators, Liaisons, Committee Chairs)

Major faculty concerns for the next five years (1995-2000) are being sought from all of us by the University Planning Committee. Dr. Susan Griffith, UPC chair, needs suggestions by February 15th. Prof Winek (Senate representative to UPC) presented a draft list of eight items for the group's consideration and asked for each person present to state major concerns of theirs or their colleagues.

Prof. Northcutt: While FTE faculty have held constant, FTE administrators and professional staff have increased by 32 percent in recent years. There has been a proliferation of administrative titles and persons appointed as one-third or one-half time faculty while being administrators/prof. staff on twelve-month contracts. This means high salaries. Is this the best use of faculty in terms of responsibilities? Aquarena should also be on the list of concerns. New advisement program and its costs should be evaluated.

Prof. Sawey: The structure of the instrument for evaluation of administrators and the disposition of findings should be on the list.

Prof. Hazelwood: The effects of departmental give backs (1-2-2 percent of budgets) need investigation. After lowering the number of instructors and lecturers in the initial round, there is little place to cut except M&O (already stretched thin) and regular faculty lines. Classes are getting bigger and teaching theaters are being emphasized. Also, are the funds really coming back in the form of salaries?

Prof. Weller: Resources should be going toward enhancing quality teaching, but seem to be absorbed elsewhere.

Prof. Bible: We need to do better lobbying. Many legislators seem to think faculty do not do much and apparently do not understand the workload required in teaching, research, and service. In other words, we need to talk to them. In addition, we need to examine the cost-effectiveness of our administrative set-up and the "golden parachutes" of former administrators who have returned to teaching ranks.

Prof. Swinney: We should consider lobbying more through statewide organizations, e.g. TFA and TACT. There are pitfalls for individual action. Collective efforts, such as the TFA lobbying on ORP cuts, are possibly more effective. This means more faculty should affiliate and work with such groups.

Prof. Middlebrook: Concerning #5 and #6 on the draft (maintaining current student to faculty ratio and lowering the number of lecturers and instructors and replacing with tenure track): Under current and projected cutbacks the ratio can be expected to rise and cutting lecturers, etc. for tenure track is not keeping us flexible. Prof. Swinney noted that in the 1988 biennium a raise was given one year and the next year the money was used to hire more faculty to cut student/faculty ratio from 26:1 to 22:1. We overshot and have gone to 20:1. One of the objectives of reallocation is to move back toward 26:1.

Prof. Caruana: The 5 percent (1% FY95, 2% FY96, 2% FY97) across-the-board cuts are a concern. Coming up with 2% cuts for fiscal year 1997 may pose a major problem for some instructional units. Some departments had already been hit by remediation reallocation and there is really no where to get the next 2 percent. Salary compression and market comparability (we are way below in most areas--#1 on the list was competitive salaries) must be on the list of concerns. Also, demographics have changed; students are now older, working, and going to school year-round. This means the summer budget is very important for students to be able to plan ahead. In addition, are we underutilizing non tenure-track faculty, many of whom want to be more involved in activities.

Prof. Bible: Lobbying must point out the damage an ORP cut will do to individual universities.

Prof. Pascoe: Regarding #8 (workload differential) on the draft, VPAA Gratz was going to initiate a workload task force. What has happened to this plan?

Prof. Parkin-Speer: The library budget lacks funds for monographs needed by some departments, such as English. Also, some of her constituents complain that the carillon music is disturbing, especially to classes nearby. She asked about the ongoing cases regarding how TRS was counted in earlier years. Prof. Swinney offered to find out what the disposition was on these.

Dave Bruner: Since the Library has a central role in education, a Senator who represents the Library rather than a Senate Liaison person would be helpful. Librarians are in a national market and their salaries are not competitive (even within the State we are not competitive).

Prof. Moffeit: In the area of State funding, the legislature is considering limiting contributions to social security. This needs immediate attention. (#4 on the list was maintaining current level of benefits.)

Prof. Slomka: There is concern about the current emphasis on large lecture halls. Also, what happens to the money in the computer use fund? We are told it all goes to maintenance of existing equipment for faculty and staff. Are we using our resources in this area wisely? (#3 addressed computer hardware and access to Internet but did not mention maintenance.)

Prof. Davis: #1 on the draft list (competitive faculty salaries) is a high priority. Also, the General Studies curriculum and faculty ownership are a concern. With loss of State funds, perhaps we need to look for other sources of funding.

Prof. Frost: We need to give thought to how we impart critical thinking skills. Capstone was an effort in this direction, but apparently this is slated to go. The literature indicates thinking across disciplines (seeing connections) is necessary for critical thinking. Also, Frost is heading the Task Force on Summer School and a computer forum for ongoing commentary is being established. One issue is the flexibility of resources. For example, education has a heavy load in the summer with returning teachers, and faculty teaching in a long semester and the summer instead of the two long semester contract would be valuable for adequate course offerings.

Prof. Winek: The library does not have funds to keep up-to-date in the various disciplines. Also, regarding #8 on the draft (differential workloads), there needs to be real emphasis on a variety of evaluation criteria for faculty--teaching, grant writing, etc. [The question was asked: You mean hire on either a primarily teaching track or a research track?]

Prof. Becker: The researchers will get promotions and the others won't, since teaching is not rewarded. #6 on the draft (cutting lecturers and instructors) is not good for CJ where the curriculum was initially built on the backs of these people. We don't want to abandon them when they have done and are doing a fine job.

Prof. Echevarria: In Modern Languages we find it difficult to get texts, especially foreign books in a timely manner from the Bookstore. Other stores, e.g. Colloquium, get them. We would like to be free to request or order books from the bookstore that provides the best service.

Prof. Moffeit: Bookstore profit margins should be questioned. A \$31 text in one store cost \$57 in the Bookstore. A book purchased for \$18 from the publisher became a \$36 book on the shelf. [It was noted that a recent report to the Senate said the Bookstore was competitive. Others present came forth with examples to support Prof. Moffeit's point.]

Prof. Caverly: #2 on the draft (parking) is a major concern of faculty and staff because of the time wasted. [HEAF funds can be used to build parking garages if they are incorporated as part of a new building.] Also, we need a University policy to keep lecturers and instructors (#6 was on reducing these positions). We are currently being blocked from joining some of the distance education possibilities, e.g. we could join the A&M hookup for \$10,000. If we don't get on with it, we are going to be left behind. The Technology Committee needs to support this.

Prof. Conroy: The new Research Enhancement Grant guidelines are coming out, but we will need to review them again eventually. With regard to differential workload, Pres. Supple has said the role of service should fall on tenured faculty, as it does not count as much in advancement. It is not practical to think that tenured faculty will carry the entire service load. This idea should be challenged.

Prof. Horne: Non-tenured people do have to jump through that first hoop. Salary is being hit from all directions. The workload will be increased to keep up salaries. Proliferation of programs and administrators (why all those sub-deans, etc.) is dividing the pie in perhaps less than effective ways. Within departments workload can be distributed, but between departments is another matter.

Prof. Ford: Given the importance of the Library to our central mission, career-ladder librarian salaries and other aspects of status (e.g. perhaps tenure/continuing contracts such as Texas Tech just initiated, and many other research libraries already have) should be a high priority to help reduce turnover and boost morale.

Prof. Singh: Back to the budget--new programs say no new money needed but it isn't true. Across the board budget cuts (1-2-2) indicate a lack of evaluation of what is necessary and what can really be cut because of nonperformance. Once a program is in place there is no Sunset evaluation, e.g. General Studies. New programs, such as the Advisement Center at \$250,000 or so, need to be carefully evaluated before becoming set in concrete. [Someone noted that committee recommendations on these things seem to disappear into a black hole rather than being acted upon.] Student service fees generate a lot of money (\$4 million or so?) but \$2 million in athletics does not seem a proper use of these resources. On another subject, use is not being made of evaluations of administrators. [Prof. Frost noted that a program does not have to make money to be useful. Evaluation can be on other criteria and it is always complex.]

Prof. Northcutt: The budget has tentacles; it's tough to figure out what goes where and why. While State percentage has dropped, auxiliary service bring in some funds, and Texas education is cheap compared to other states. Across the board department budget cuts are not fair, just easy for administration to require.

Prof. Singh: TFA audit was a good at getting things going a few years ago.

Prof. Northcutt: Things are more open now than in recent memory with regard to financial status. This does not mean all decisions are made responsibly.

## 26 RESEARCH COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS (Prof. Caverly)

Three names were submitted to fill the Education appointment. Thomas Mandeville was nominated. The motion passed.

## 27 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT (Prof. Caruana)

Two changes were presented: (1) A prefix change to Reading (RDG) for one course; (2) A new Dance option be added to the 3313 Fine Arts component of the general curriculum. Music, Art, Theatre, and Dance are now coordinating and integrating their efforts. A motion was made to accept the report. Motion carried.

## 60 T&P APPEALS COMMITTEE NOMINEES

Profs. Barbara Sanders (PT) and Bill Liddle (History) were nominated to fill appointments. The motion passed.

## 108 BUDGET CYCLE, FY96 (Prof. Swinney)

The Budget Cycle for FY96 has begun. The budget instructions distributed to account managers recently specify, as part of the rationale for the 2% recapture this year, that the

University will "supplement any state appropriated across-the-board pay increase with a combination of across-the-board, merit, or bonus pay plans." In the budget meeting last week, Budget Director Jim Scott said that President Supple is planning to provide a local 1% across-the-board raise and at least a 2% merit pool, regardless of what the State does. That Salary Review forms will be distributed to account managers in late February is another indication that merit raises of some sort are in the offing.

There are a number of questions to be asked. Have departments elected budget representatives to School Budget Committees as required by PPS 1.04? Are School Budget Committees meeting? Since bonuses are mentioned in the budget instructions, are such one-year awards being seriously considered? What is the status of our published performance and merit policy, PPS 7.10? What is the status of the chair merit proposal? Is there any plan to address salary equity issues this year? It was agreed that the budget cycle and related questions should go on the agenda for the joint Senate/CAD meeting on February 22.

Prof. Sawey asked if there were an electronic budget we could see to facilitate departmental discussions.

## 02 MINUTES OF 2/1/95

The minutes were approved as read. PAAG minutes RTA'd until approval is received from President Supple and VPAA Gratz.

### NEW ITEMS

The question of the cost of new programs, such as the projected Ph.D. in Geography and the new M.A. in Social Work, was raised. It was pointed out that Social Work was under the "nursing formula" and would generate more State support than regular formula funding, which would help offset start-up costs. The initial Geography program costs are not known to us and the more complete proposal will come to the Senate in Fall 1995.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Horne, Lyman, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, Weller, and Winek. Absent: Glassman, Middlebrook.

Guests: Richard Hannan (Athletic Director), Dr. Mike Abbott (Exec. VP), Dr. Pat Cassidy (Assoc. VPAA), Prof. Michel Conroy (Art), Ms. Sandra Akridge, and Mr. Mike Moore.

#### CONTENTS:

71	COST OF ATHLETICS, ETC. (Guest: Athletic Dir. Richard Hannan)
63	PARKING (Guest: EVP Mike Abbott)
83	AGENDA ITEMS FOR MEETING WITH CAD, 2/22/95
104	FACULTY CONCERNS FOR UPC (Prof. Winek)
26	STANDING RULE ON RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT (Prof. Conroy)
02	MINUTES OF 2/8/95
	NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:01, Chair Swinney presiding.

#### 71 COST OF ATHLETICS, ETC. (Guest: Athletic Director Richard Hannan)

1. Academics: A.D. Hannan presented tables showing (1) hours attempted, hours passed, and GPAs for various men's and women's sports, by scholarship and "walk-in" athletes for Fall 1994; (2) athletes compared to the general student population in hours taken, hours passed, and GPA for Fall 1993 and Fall 1994; and (3) academic ranking by team for the last three semesters. A number of interesting points were noted. Athletes compare favorably with the general student population and athletes on scholarship did slightly better than "walk-ins" as a group. Women athletes did particularly well.

A.D. Hannan pointed out the emphasis now being placed on academics. He praised the work of Academic Support Services Coordinator Meg Murray (located in the old Catholic Center), the increased study table responsibility, Project Pass (remedial math and English with computer). The Academic Honors Banquet will fete over 160 honorees this year. Our admission standards are higher (800 SAT, etc.) than NCAA requirements (700, going to 750 this year) and higher than any other school in our Conference. [Students sometimes come with admission letters to other well-known schools but can't get in here. This works a particular hardship on coaches who are recruiting in spring/summer for those sports.] We compete for the top academic athletes by our coaches putting across the quality of our programs. Retention goals, NCAA requirements for "satisfactory progress," increase in transfer students who are more likely to have problems meeting initial satisfactory progress were discussed.



2. Attendance policy: Some faculty do not excuse people for games out of town. Students are urged to meet early with professor with a list of games to try to work out alternative assignments, etc. Hannan would like to see athletes graduate in four years (the average seems to be six years for the general student population). Questions were asked regarding scheduling (including its effect on injuries) and the number of long-distance games. Comment was made on the once-a-year Boosters trip with the team (about 90 will pay their own way to go to Montana State this year, see game, enjoy local tours, fishing, etc.).

3. Expansion of Student-Athlete Advisory Board: Board consists of student athletes and representatives from various groups, but adding a general student category is being considered.

4. Accomplishments: A handout on accomplishments and future goals was distributed. Various women's and men's teams had winning seasons and were in Conference playoffs. Three women won academic awards in national or state competitions and another woman won Southland Conference Outstanding Performer of the year. An improved contract for medical services was negotiated. Booster support is up and an additional \$100,000 endowment member signed-up. Goals were in the area of increased financial support. There was a 32 percent increase in FY93 and 28 percent FY94, but we need to keep it in the 30s for the next five years.

5. Season ticket package: A flyer offering SWT faculty/staff a \$566 athletic ticket package for \$75 was distributed. IRS requirements on offers were discussed.

6. Special projects: Weight room equipment is now respectable. HSE-TV improvements discussed (see #7).

7. Finances: The institutional supplement to athletics is currently \$1.286 million, down from \$1.5 a couple of years ago. The continuing goal is to reduce the supplement by \$100,000 each year. Student service fee helps but raising outside funds is necessary and difficult. In the last three years some corporation packages have developed and TV will pay off eventually, we think. Media exposure should help gate receipts. [Changing divisions was supposed to boost TV income, but that didn't happen. The Conference may go to Thursday night Game of the Week, however.]

A recent NCAA report indicated our category (IAA) averaged a \$4.5 million budget, which we are below. We will have an audit this March (report available in August probably) which is likely to say we are not raising enough outside funds and are relying too heavily on institutional support. Institutional and student fee support are not illegal, but outside sources are preferred.

Discussion followed regarding recruiting of athletes and coaches given lack of scholarships, lower wages and perks for coaches, and higher academic qualifications for students. A new National Clearinghouse for student eligibility (checking high school course content for eligibility) should help us some--by forcing others to come up to our higher standards. Currently we are pushing ourselves as an academic institution with good athletic programs. Presumably being in Division 1 is also attractive for recruiting--although it puts us in a "bigger puddle" regarding competition.

8. NCAA education plan: After our two year probation for a student getting grades while not attending class, great care is being taken to keep skirts clean.

9. Title IX: Some progress for women, but we need more women athletes and teams (golf, swimming, gymnastics, soccer, field hockey are all under consideration) and more scholarship money. Fall 1994 we had 67 women on scholarship and 145 men (68 of the latter were football). Facilities are better. [Comment was made that it was too bad NCAA does not have cycling event, as we have a world-class woman cyclist.]

10. Future:

Conference: Conference is being restructured.

NCAA: Next January NCAA will begin restructuring. The top 60-80 will go off on their own, leaving lower group in limbo on some areas. Our division will try not to lose basketball returns.

63 PARKING (Guest: EVP Mike Abbott)

Dr. Abbott had to leave to catch a plane. Item RTA'd till March 1.

83 AGENDA ITEMS FOR MEETING WITH CAD, 2/22/95

Prof. Swinney suggested the following items as a possible agenda. These are subjects which have returned with frequency to the Senate's attention.

1. Budget cycle, FY96

- a. School budget committees?
- b. Is bonus pay being considered?
- c. Merit cycle this spring?
- d. Status of chair merit proposal?
- e. Salary equity issues?

2. T&P Appeals Committee--shift function from Committee to Ombudsman?

3. Status of capstone course recommendation?

4. Evaluation of administrators.

5. Summer School Task Force.

6. Workload Task Force.

7. Academic Advisement Center.

8. Assessment in General Studies courses.

9. Modified retirement. [Prof. Swinney explained that this program dates from 1982 when Coordinating Board guidelines were issued by Commissioner Ashworth. Eligible faculty can voluntarily modify their employment, i.e., give up their tenure and retire earlier than they otherwise would, while continuing to teach on a one-third or one-half time basis for a pro rata share of their normal salary. There are two concerns that have surfaced as resources have become increasingly scarce and the number of eligible faculty has increased: 1) that some of the contracts unduly restrict the ability of departments to schedule needed courses, and 2) that a strict application of the redistribution of salary formula could make it increasingly difficult for departments and retiring faculty to negotiate VME contracts. The Senate's Retirement Committee is studying our VME program and is expected to submit a report sometime this spring.]

After some discussion the Senate voted to accept the list for next week's joint meeting with CAD.

104 FACULTY CONCERNS FOR UPC (Prof. Winek)

A draft list of concerns will be ready for next week's meeting. RTA'd.

26 STANDING RULE ON RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT (Prof. Conroy)

Suggestions for rewording were discussed. RTA'd for final product.

02 MINUTES OF 2/8/95

The minutes were approved with additions and corrections.

## NEW ITEMS

--A memo from Bill Nance regarding parking at the new Student Center/Bookstore was distributed. Locations were given for new spaces to be constructed on fills, etc. to replace those lost with building construction. Eventually, of course, the parking garage in the new building will help.

--A letter from Prof. John McGee (Finance and Economics) was received concerning the unbalanced constitution of the Mediation Advisory Council (3 students, 8 administrators and one faculty representative) and the areas it might cover (including sexual harassment, grades, discrimination, etc.) and possible legal entanglements.

--Prof. Caruana submitted a newspaper article commenting on a UT-SA controversy over a scrapped proposal to require tenure-track faculty to adhere to one of three tracks: (1) teach 80 percent of their time and spend 20 percent on research/grants and community service (i.e. 7 courses a year), (2) divide time between teaching and research (i.e. 6 courses a year), or (3) spend 80 percent on research/service (i.e. 4 courses a year). UT-SA Senate President Juanita Firestone said the fear was of creating an underclass of teaching-oriented faculty. [Similar concerns were expressed at our Senate meeting last week where a two-track system was discussed, i.e. that currently publishing and research count for tenure and promotion in a far weightier manner than teaching or service.]

The meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

NOTE: The following minutes for February 16, originally circulated on February 17, contain corrections approved by the Senate on March 1.

Present: Bible, Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Horne, Lyman, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, Weller, and Winek. Absent: Glassman, Middlebrook.

Guests: Richard Hannan (Athletic Director), Dr. Mike Abbott (Exec. VP), Dr. Pat Cassidy (Assoc. VPAA), Prof. Michel Conroy (Art), Ms. Sandra Akridge, and Mr. Mike Moore.

CONTENTS:

- 71 COST OF ATHLETICS, ETC. (Guest: Athletic Dir. Richard Hannan)
- 63 PARKING (Guest: EVP Mike Abbott)
- 83 AGENDA ITEMS FOR MEETING WITH CAD, 2/22/95
- 104 FACULTY CONCERNS FOR UPC (Prof. Winek)
- 26 STANDING RULE ON RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT (Prof. Conroy)
- 02 MINUTES OF 2/8/95
- NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:01, Chair Swinney presiding.

71 COST OF ATHLETICS, ETC. (Guest: Athletic Director Richard Hannan)

1. Academics: A.D. Hannan presented tables showing (1) hours attempted, hours passed, and GPAs for various men's and women's sports, by scholarship and "walk-in" athletes for Fall 1994; (2) athletes compared to the general student population in hours taken, hours passed, and GPA for Fall 1993 and Fall 1994; and (3) academic ranking by team for the last three semesters. A number of interesting points were noted. Athletes compare favorably with the general student population and athletes on scholarship did slightly better than "walk-ins" as a group. Women athletes did particularly well.

A.D. Hannan pointed out the emphasis now being placed on academics. He praised the work of Academic Support Services Coordinator Meg Murray (located in the old Catholic Center), the increased study table responsibility, Project Pass (remedial math and English with computer). The Academic Honors Banquet will fete over 160 honorees this year. Our admission standards are higher (800 SAT, etc.) than NCAA requirements (700, going to 750 this year) and higher than any other school in our Conference. [Students sometimes come with admission letters to other well-known schools but can't get in here. This works a particular hardship on coaches who are recruiting in spring/summer for those sports.] We compete for the top academic athletes by our coaches putting across the quality of our programs. Retention goals, NCAA requirements for "satisfactory progress," increase in transfer students who are more likely to have problems meeting initial satisfactory progress were discussed.

2. Attendance policy: Some faculty do not excuse people for games out of town. Students are urged to meet early with professor with a list of games to try to work out alternative assignments, etc. Hannan would like to see athletes graduate in four years (the average seems to be six years for the general student population). Questions were asked regarding scheduling (including its effect on injuries) and the number of long-distance games. Comment was made on

the once-a-year Boosters trip with the team (about 90 will pay their own way to go to Montana State this year, see game, enjoy local tours, fishing, etc.).

3. Expansion of Student-Athlete Advisory Board: Board consists of student athletes and representatives from various groups, but adding a general student category is being considered.

4. Accomplishments: A handout on accomplishments and future goals was distributed. Various women's and men's teams had winning seasons and were in Conference playoffs. Three women won academic awards in national or state competitions and another woman won Southland Conference Outstanding Performer of the year. An improved contract for medical services was negotiated. Booster support is up and an additional \$100,000 endowment member signed-up. Goals were in the area of increased financial support. There was a 32 percent increase in FY93 and 28 percent FY94, but we need to keep it in the 30s for the next five years.

5. Season ticket package: A flyer offering SWT faculty/staff a \$566 athletic ticket package for \$75 was distributed. IRS requirements on offers were discussed.

6. Special projects: Weight room equipment is now respectable. HSE-TV improvements discussed (see #7).

7. Finances: The institutional supplement to athletics is currently \$1.286 million, down from \$1.5 a couple of years ago. The continuing goal is to reduce the supplement by \$100,000 each year. Student service fee helps but raising outside funds is necessary and difficult. In the last three years some corporation packages have developed and TV will pay off eventually, we think. Media exposure should help gate receipts. [Changing divisions was supposed to boost TV income, but that didn't happen. The Conference may go to Thursday night Game of the Week, however.]

A recent NCAA report indicated our category (IAA) averaged a \$4.5 million budget, which we are below. We will have an audit this March (report available in August probably) which is likely to say we are not raising enough outside funds and are relying too heavily on institutional support. Institutional and student fee support are not illegal, but outside sources are preferred.

Discussion followed regarding recruiting of athletes and coaches given lack of scholarships, lower wages and perks for coaches, and higher academic qualifications for students. A new National Clearinghouse for student eligibility (checking high school course content for eligibility) should help us some--by forcing others to come up to our higher standards. Currently we are pushing ourselves as an academic institution with good athletic programs. Presumably being in Division 1 is also attractive for recruiting--although it puts us in a "bigger puddle" regarding competition.

8. NCAA education plan: The plan to educate people regarding NCAA rules was presented.

9. Title IX: Some progress for women, but we need more women athletes and teams (golf, swimming, gymnastics, soccer, field hockey are all under consideration) and more scholarship money. Fall 1994 we had 67 women on scholarship and 145 men (68 of the latter were football). Facilities are better. [Comment was made that it was too bad NCAA does not have cycling event, as we have a world-class woman cyclist.]

10. Future: Conference: Conference may be restructured in football. NCAA: Next January NCAA will vote on a restructuring proposal. The top 60-80 will go off on their own, leaving lower group in limbo on some areas. Our division will try not to lose basketball returns.

63 PARKING (Guest: EVP Mike Abbott)

Dr. Abbott had to leave to catch a plane. Item RTA'd till March 1.

83 AGENDA ITEMS FOR MEETING WITH CAD, 2/22/95

Prof. Swinney suggested the following items as a possible agenda. These are subjects which have returned with frequency to the Senate's attention.

1. Budget cycle, FY96
  - a. School budget committees?
  - b. Is bonus pay being considered?
  - c. Merit cycle this spring?
  - d. Status of chair merit proposal?
  - e. Salary equity issues?
2. T&P Appeals Committee--shift function from Committee to Ombudsman?
3. Status of capstone course recommendation?
4. Evaluation of administrators.
5. Summer School Task Force.
6. Workload Task Force.
7. Academic Advisement Center.
8. Assessment in General Studies courses.

9. Modified retirement. [Prof. Swinney explained that this program dates from 1982 when Coordinating Board guidelines were issued by Commissioner Ashworth. Eligible faculty can voluntarily modify their employment, i.e., give up their tenure and retire earlier than they otherwise would, while continuing to teach on a one-third or one-half time basis for a pro rata share of their normal salary. There are two concerns that have surfaced as resources have become increasingly scarce and the number of eligible faculty has increased: 1) that some of the contracts unduly restrict the ability of departments to schedule needed courses, and 2) that a strict application of the redistribution of salary formula could make it increasingly difficult for departments and retiring faculty to negotiate VME contracts. The Senate's Retirement Committee is studying our VME program and is expected to submit a report sometime this spring.]

After some discussion the Senate voted to accept the list for next week's joint meeting with CAD.

104 FACULTY CONCERNS FOR UPC (Prof. Winek)

A draft list of concerns will be ready for next week's meeting. RTA'd.

26 STANDING RULE ON RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT (Prof. Conroy)

Suggestions for rewording were discussed. RTA'd for final product.

02 MINUTES OF 2/8/95

The minutes were approved with additions and corrections.

NEW ITEMS

--A memo from Bill Nance regarding parking at the new Student Center/Bookstore was distributed. Locations were given for new spaces to be constructed on fills, etc. to replace those lost with building construction. Eventually, of course, the parking garage in the new building will help.

--A letter from Prof. John McGee (Finance and Economics) was received concerning the unbalanced constitution of the Mediation Advisory Council (3 students, 8 administrators and one faculty representative) and the areas it might cover (including sexual harassment, grades, discrimination, etc.) and possible legal entanglements.

--Prof. Caruana submitted a newspaper article commenting on a UT-SA controversy over a scrapped proposal to require tenure-track faculty to adhere to one of three tracks: (1) teach 80 percent of their time and spend 20 percent on research/grants and community service (i.e. 7 courses a year), (2) divide time between teaching and research (i.e. 6 courses a year), or (3) spend 80 percent on research/service (i.e. 4 courses a year). UT-SA Senate President Juanita Firestone said the fear was of creating an underclass of teaching-oriented faculty. [Similar concerns were expressed at our Senate meeting last week where a two-track system was discussed, i.e. that currently publishing and research count for tenure and promotion in a far weightier manner than teaching or service.]

The meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caruana, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, Weller, and Winek. Absent: Caverly.

Guests: VPAA Gratz, AVPAA Smallwood, AVPAA Tangum; Deans Brown, Cheatham, Gowens, Gravitt, Juarez, Martin, Willoughby; Dir. of Continuing Ed. Powell; Ms. Sandra Akridge, and Mr. Mike Moore.

#### CONTENTS: JOINT MEETING WITH THE ACADEMIC DEANS

1. ACC/SWT UPDATE (A-VPAA Smallwood)
2. SUMMER SCHOOL TASK FORCE (Smallwood)
3. ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT CENTER (Smallwood)
4. BUDGET CYCLE, FY96
  - a. SCHOOL BUDGET COMMITTEES?
  - b. IS BONUS PAY BEING CONSIDERED?
  - c. MERIT CYCLE THIS SPRING?
  - d. STATUS OF CHAIR MERIT PROPOSAL?
  - e. SALARY EQUITY ISSUES?
5. TENURE & PROMOTION APPEALS COMMITTEE
6. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS: PPS 8.05 & SENATE EVALUATION
7. WORKLOAD TASK FORCE
8. OTHER ITEMS ON THE PUBLISHED AGENDA, BUT TIME RAN OUT
  - 3-1-3 PROGRAM
  - ASSESSMENT IN GENERAL STUDIES
  - MODIFIED RETIREMENT
  - STATUS OF CAPSTONE COURSE RECOMMENDATION

The meeting began at 4:08, VPAA Gratz/Chair Swinney co-presiding.

1. ACC/SWT UPDATE (AVPAA Smallwood)

Tables were presented profiling the 185 students enrolled in the new ACC/SWT program this fall. County of residence, basis of admission, age, ethnicity, major, and general course areas taken were indicated. Only 8 were already enrolled at SWT and perhaps 35 were former students (possibly indicating academic probation in past); 17 were SWT employees. Further analysis was requested to show those specifically in math/science preparation courses. SMHS reports seem favorable except for occasional parking problems when other school activities are in progress.

2. SUMMER SCHOOL TASK FORCE (Smallwood)

To gather initial data on needs, two open forum meetings with faculty were held last summer and 5,100 student received questionnaires. Chris Frost chairs the new Committee composed of six faculty, a graduate and an undergraduate student. Recommendations are expected by Sept./Oct.



Questions from the floor included whether more money was saved by shutting down in the summer or winter [Reply: Usually summer because of high AC costs], the meaning of "world-class" summer program [Reply: Internet requests out now re possible benchmark programs], are these recommendations or will they become practice without review [Reply: Recommendations, which will go through regular channels for review], will research be included as well as courses [Reply: Should be included], and is there any sense of what direction this is going [Reply: No hidden agenda--Committee is on its own], and will this mesh with Handbook info on summer school [Reply: May have to change Handbook, etc. if it does not fit with program ultimately accepted].

### 3. ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT CENTER (Smallwood)

Rationale for reworking advisement process: SACS and TASP recommendations, student survey suggests needs, need for better student retention. Over 3,000 students answered questionnaires regarding their thoughts on current advisement. Overall ratings: 10% excellent, 38% good, 32% adequate, 15% weak, and 5% poor. About half seemed satisfied and half wanted something a little (or a lot) better.

Handout was distributed of 2/6/95 draft for three phase-in years. Phase I (6/95-5/96): Numerous activities by new advisement center to serve freshmen and transfers and develop better ways to implement advisement process (\$280,172 in one-time and recurring expenses). Phase II (6/96-5/97): Advisor training workshops and pick up of new groups to advise, e.g. advanced undeclared majors and international students (\$179,012 in recurring expenses). Phase III (6/97-5/98): Implement School advisement plans (\$24,500 one-time and \$564,292 recurring=\$588,792).

Questions in the discussion which followed centered around whether it was wise to spend nearly \$600,000 a year from student fees for a new center (during a time of retrenchment) rather than add a few more resources to the existing system of advisement. (For example, the question of salaries for the three part-time administrators and new professional counselors arose. At the same time departments are cutting secretaries who do some of the straightforward advising or directing of students to appropriate faculty. M&O/travel was also questioned.)

### 4. BUDGET CYCLE, FY96

- a. SCHOOL BUDGET COMMITTEES?
- b. IS BONUS PAY BEING CONSIDERED?
- c. MERIT CYCLE THIS SPRING?
- d. STATUS OF CHAIR MERIT PROPOSAL?
- e. SALARY EQUITY ISSUES?

The above were discussed in more-or-less conjoined ways. Are senior faculty really involved as they should be in budget decisions? Opinions of those present indicated that in some departments it was yes, in others, no. Can directors of programs be cut back from 12 to 9 month salaries as a part of budget reduction? [Answer: Yes.]

Can all faculty be sent a readable spreadsheet on their budget (electronically) for consideration? [Yes.]

Can any new monies from State go to stopping the current 1-2-2 budget cuts? [No, earmarked basically for faculty salaries.]

Five percent across the board cuts (1-2-2) in concrete? [Deans get a chance to defend specific programs that would be zapped. Ergo, some programs may take bigger hits to salvage others.]

Are classified personnel protected from 1-2-2 cuts? [No, but will have to deal with Personnel. Everything on table, presumably. Maybe need to do further checking on any protected groups.] One comment from a Dean--a sentiment the Senate has contemplated before--"There is no way to get faculty salaries up without cutting personnel." This means bigger classes and possible cuts in upper-division smaller classes.

Merit, bonus, and salary equity (no mention of chair merit) are rather up in the air until the Legislature gives us an indication on funding. Earlier it was bruited about that there would be a "merit pot." Not until we know if longevity/COLA raises are in the offing--perhaps on the coat-tails of the public school teachers bill. [We are now 35th in the nation on average public school salaries--down from 21st in 1984/85. Every year we fall further behind in terms of state averages and in terms of Texas inflation.] If we get State funding for across the board longevity, then we can consider merit and bonuses. It was suggested that bonuses might provide as much or more incentive than merit which adds to base pay from thence forward. Because of falling so far behind inflation and the national norms, perhaps emphasis should be on raising all salaries. Under these conditions, perhaps merit takes a backseat to longevity and one-time bonuses.

#### 5. TENURE & PROMOTION APPEALS COMMITTEE

The proposal from Committee chair Bible and Ombudsman Laird suggested that procedural grievances be turned over to the Ombudsman and the Committee be abolished. After the review cycle substantive error for promotion may be grieved under University PPS 8.08. Candidates denied tenure may appeal to chair, school dean, and VPAA, but may not grieve under PPS 8.08. They can, however, allege violation of academic freedom or discrimination in an appeal to the President and request a hearing (Regent's Rules paragraph 4.236--Faculty Handbook, p. 8). Some caveats arose in discussion, but there appeared to be some support for this simplification of procedure although no poll was taken.

#### 6. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS: PPS 8.05, ANNUAL EVALUATION

Previously the Senate had approved of draft PPS 8.05 with the additional suggestion that there be a mechanism for feedback to the faculty on the evaluation. The Senate had also agreed that a Committee should examine the existing faculty evaluation of administrators form it sends out, since the return rate of about 40% is less that we would like and may be skewed for numerous reasons, e.g. apathy or fear of retaliation in small departments. In the discussion it was pointed out that some Deans thought the new PPS draft did away with the separate Senate evaluation. The argument was made that the two types of information might disagree. [Question: Isn't that useful to know?] Another question was why incompetent administrators continued in office when the whole dept. was protesting. [Note: If there is a difference of opinion between CAD and the Senate, it was not resolved here.]

#### 7. WORKLOAD TASK FORCE (VPAA Gratz)

The newly appointed task force will meet next week for the first time and will look at four sister schools (maybe others?) regarding our situation.

- #### 8. OTHER ITEMS ON THE PUBLISHED AGENDA, BUT TIME RAN OUT
- 3-1-3 PROGRAM
  - ASSESSMENT IN GENERAL STUDIES
  - MODIFIED RETIREMENT
  - STATUS OF CAPSTONE COURSE RECOMMENDATION

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, and Winek. Absent: Weller.

Guests: Pres. Supple, EVP Abbott, Capt. Gil Peyton (UPD), Steve Prentice (Parking Control), Prof. Edgar Laird (Ombudsman), Rachel Para (Univ. Star), J. Stewart Driscoll (Univ. Star), Mike Moore, Sandra Akridge.

#### CONTENTS:

	PROPOSED BILL TO ADD LAMAR TO OUR SYSTEM (Pres. Supple)
63	PARKING (EVP Mike Abbott, Gil Peyton, Steve Prentice)
82	ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT
104	FACULTY CONCERNS FOR UPC (Prof. Winek)
34	TENURE AND PROMOTION APPEALS COMMITTEE (Prof. Bible)
36	EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS
39	SUMMER INSURANCE PAYMENTS (Prof. Early letter of 1/20/95)
02	MINUTES OF PAAG 2/1/95, 2/15/94, AND 2/22/95
	NEW BUSINESS

The meeting began at 4:03, Pres. Swinney presiding.

#### PROPOSED BILL TO ADD LAMAR TO OUR SYSTEM (Pres. Supple)

Pres. Supple indicated there would be a Board of Regents meeting tomorrow at Huntsville at which Rep. Stiles' bill to add the components of Lamar University at Orange, Port Arthur, and Beaumont to our university system will be discussed. There is speculation by some that this might add some political clout on system-wide issues. On the other hand, there is some uncertainty regarding adding two two-year schools to the system. Questions were asked about how Lamar felt about this. It appears some units are more eager than others, possibly reflecting the concerns of the two-year schools in a system dominated by four-year schools.

#### 63 PARKING (EVP Mike Abbott, Gil Peyton, Steve Prentice)

The Master Plan called for four parking garages to fill needs. The two which are now in the planning stage are The Pit (to be attached to the new General Classroom Building) and the one to be attached to the new Student Center. Construction will start in fall 1995 and be completed in 1997. The three-story garage in The Pit will contain 300 spaces which will help compensate for the spaces that will be lost on North LBJ when the bus turnaround is completed. The new Student Center garage is scheduled for about 325 pay-as-you-go slots (hourly, monthly, yearly).

For the two years of building, temporary lots will be constructed near College Inn and by the Cogeneration Plant, and more restricted spaces will be opened up near Hill House and possible other sites. What about patient parking for the Infirmary and Health Professions? Temporary lot near College Inn will have to suffice until pay-as-you-go parking is finished. The new Technology Bldg. is supposed to be completed in 1998, apparently on top of some of the temporary lots which will be needed during the time of its construction. [Answer: We'll check into that.] It appears that restricted parking will be very tight over the next two years, and it is not clear that there will be a net gain after planned projects are completed. One Senator noted that a garage in the Kellam/Education Bldg. area is badly needed.

Questions were raised about funding. HEAF funds will be used for The Pit construction and possibly bonds for the Student Center garage. HEAF funds originally planned to cover garages attached to buildings now seem to have been earmarked for other use, leaving us to float bonds or even consider outside private ownership (an idea that did not seem to be supported by many present). [We notice that projected HEAF fund expenditures for the next decade include projects which will eliminate current parking spaces but does not include expenditures to replace them.]

The Transportation and Parking Committee (on which Swinney and Middlebrook sit) will be discussing such issues as where and what to charge for parking. There will be increased charges, no doubt, as we are below what other schools levy; figures of \$100 a year (and up) were given for other large Texas schools. A Senator pointed out that cheaper parking was a perk that helped make up for our generally lower salaries.

Letters received by the Senate indicate uneven enforcement and possible uncourteous treatment of faculty regarding parking violations. [Response: High turnover makes training problematic for new personnel, but consolidation of the appeals process under one board has reduced both dismissals and appeals. Statistics for 1993 and 1994 were distributed indicating that nearly 76 percent of appeals received dismissal under the old system (Jan.-May 1993).] What happens to fines? [They go into the General Fund. Would dedicating fee and permit money to enforcement help solve the problem? Some persons are not fazed, apparently, by paying high fines for many tickets each month and these folks will be the ones who don't mind high fees for dedicated parking spaces. A Senator noted that enforcing the rules in the red zone (i.e., towing misparked cars) would possibly correct the problem.]

## 82 ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

The Academic Advisement draft of 2/6/95 was received last week. A number of strongly worded opinions peppered the discussion of the proposal. While SACS recommended we systematize our advising, 80 percent of students in the recent survey reported their advising was excellent/good/adequate. A few resources could be used to improve existing advising sources in departments and schools, etc. without the nearly \$1 million outlay over the next three years and the \$500,000 plus annually thereafter projected by the advising plan. Retention is often mentioned as the reason for having an Advisement Center, but advising failures have definitely not been demonstrated to be among the major reasons students leave school. These monies could be better spent in the Library [or scholarships?]. Advisement of undeclared majors and transfer students could be done elsewhere without the projected increase administration costs.

A motion carried unanimously that Pres. Swinney convey a strong message of Senate displeasure to VPAA Gratz and Pres. Supple over the Advisement Center.

104 FACULTY CONCERNS FOR UPC (Prof. Winek)

A list of ten major faculty concerns was reviewed. Some merging in computer hardware needs and training was suggested. "Differentiating" workload, re weight of teaching, research, and service, was discussed again. It was pointed out that this only works after one jumps through the research hoop for tenure. Regarding salaries, faculty/staff/professional librarians could be brought together into one statement. All agreed on the UPC points with these consolidations.

34 TENURE AND PROMOTION APPEALS COMMITTEE (Profs. Bible and Laird)

The Senate voted to approve empowering the Ombudsman to handle procedural matters in tenure and promotion cycle cases.

[The Senate forwarded the following memorandum to VPAA Gratz with copies to President Supple and the Deans:

"The Faculty Senate strongly and unanimously recommends that the special Appeals Committee authorized by UPPS 04.04.21 be abolished and that the function of that committee (adjudicating procedural errors while the Tenure and Promotion Cycle is in progress) be assigned to the University Ombudsman. The current machinery is cumbersome to establish, difficult to maintain, poorly understood, and seldom used. The kinds of technical questions which come up in procedural appeals can much more effectively be handled, we believe, by one person who is thoroughly familiar with University rules, regulations, and procedures.

"To accomplish the change we suggest will require modification of two University policy statements--PPS 8.08 and UPPS 04.04.21. Therefore, we ask that you and the Council of Academic Deans endorse our proposal and forward it with a positive recommendation to the President's Cabinet via University Council.

"The specific language changes we recommend are as follows:

"1) Add the following sentence to paragraph 4 in PPS 8.08:

"Also, the Ombudsman is empowered to adjudicate alleged procedural errors during the annual tenure and promotion cycle (see UPPS 04.04.21)."

"2) Delete the current paragraphs 6.01 and 6.02 in UPPS 04.04.21 and substitute the following:

"6.01 Candidates for tenure and/or promotion who are denied by Senior Faculty and Chair or by School Review Group and Dean and who allege a procedural error may present the evidence of such error to the University Ombudsman. The Ombudsman, following an investigation which establishes that such an error was a determining factor in the denial, can return the candidate's application to the pool of active applications to be considered at the next level of evaluation. See PPS 8.08.

"6.02 Candidates denied promotion who allege a substantive error may grieve the decision under University Grievance policy, PPS 8.08, after the review cycle is completed.

""6.03 Candidates denied tenure who allege a substantive error may discuss the decision with chair, school dean, and VPAA, but the decision may not be grieved under PPS 8.08.

""6.04 Candidates denied tenure who allege violation of academic freedom or discrimination may present their allegation to the President and request a hearing as provided for in Regent's Rules in paragraph 4.236. (See Faculty Handbook p.8.)""]

### 36 EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

The Senate will continue its annual evaluation of administrators and appointed Prof. Caruana to chair a committee to refine this instrument.

### 39 SUMMER INSURANCE PAYMENTS (Prof. Early letter of 1/20/95)

The Senate agreed there ought to be some way to tax-shelter the summer payments of faculty on nine-month contracts who pay a lump-sum for summer insurance coverage. Prof. Swinney will discuss what the difficulties in doing this are with Michelle Massey and VPF&SS Nance.

### 02 MINUTES OF PAAG 2/1/95, 2/15/94, AND 2/22/95

The minutes of these three meetings were approved with corrections.

### NEW BUSINESS

--The Mills letter on TRS and ORP retirement was distributed.

--HEAF spreadsheets from FY1986 to FY2000 were distributed.

--Prof. Northcutt's letter on the SWT Budget Committee meeting of 2/21/95 was distributed. Their discussion included Aquarena Springs costs, ORP, State work force reductions, the proposed Advisement Center, legislative changes in TEA and TASP, and ACC offerings.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
March 8, 1995 PLEASE POST

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Swinney, Weller, and Winek. Absent: Bible, Lyman, Stedman.

Guests: Pres. Supple, VPAA Gratz, AVPAA Smallwood, Prof. Susan Day (Special Assistant to Pres.), Prof. Dee Carson (Ag), Rachel Para (Univ. Star), J. Stewart Driscoll (Univ. Star), Adolf Trudeau (Univ. Star), Mike Moore, Sandra Akridge.

CONTENTS:

14 PAAG (Pres. Supple, VPAA Gratz, AVPAA Smallwood)

BUDGET CYCLE, FY 96  
ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT CENTER

75 PLANNING FOR BILL NANCE'S BUDGET PRESENTATION ON MARCH 22  
26 STANDING RULE ON RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT (Prof. Conroy)  
29 ACADEMIC CORE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT  
68 SENATE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD  
02 MINUTES OF 3/1/95  
NEW BUSINESS

The meeting began at 4:04, Chair Swinney presiding.

14 PAAG (Pres. Supple, VPAA Gratz, AVPAA Smallwood)

The PAAG minutes will be circulated later.

75 PLANNING FOR BILL NANCE'S BUDGET PRESENTATION ON MARCH 22

Deans, Chairs, Prof. Northcutt's Budget Committee, Senate liaisons, and faculty are invited to attend the March 22nd meeting on the 11th floor of JCK at 4:00 p.m. The session will be an educational experience on how the process works. Specific issues will also be addressed. For example, what is the impact on faculty, given that we are cutting some in our 1-2-2 departmental reductions? When a line disappears, where does it go? Can departments carry over funds? What effects are auxiliary services having on our budget, e.g. Comanche Hills, Aquarena Springs?

26 STANDING RULE ON RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT (Prof. Conroy)

The Committee's revision of REG guidelines was accepted. The Senate unanimously moved to congratulate Prof. Michel Conroy and her Committee on their hard work and job well done.

29 ACADEMIC CORE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

RTA'd.

68 SENATE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

In 1992 we lost one of the three teaching awards the Senate gave to the SWT Piper Professor nominees. SWT is now allowed only two Piper Professor candidates. It was proposed that the funds (\$500) be used to provide a Senate Distinguished Service Award. The Senate holds that this would be a modest means of rewarding an area that is necessary to the functioning of the University but does not receive acclaim. The definition of service is a minor problem which can be overcome. Faculty could nominate candidates and documentation would be provided for a Committee to examine, as the teaching awards are done. This would require the addition of an article to the Standing Rules. The Senate agreed that we should proceed on this. [Note: The draft Standing Rule includes, "Current members of the Senate are not eligible...."]

02 MINUTES OF 3/1/95

The minutes of 3/1/95 were approved as read.

NEW BUSINESS

--The Evaluation of Administrators Committee will meet after Spring Break to examine alternative means of carrying forth the Senate's annual evaluation. Discussion indicated that over the years the evaluations have had some effect on pointing out trouble spots and provided cumulative evidence from an additional source, i.e. without it administrators are evaluated only by their superiors.

--A letter from Prof. Sam Tarsitano (Biology) was received regarding the contract with PFM and the quality of food in University cafeterias.

--Data on departmental earning from course and lab fees was distributed.

--A booklet describing the Preparing Future Faculty program was distributed. Under the coordination of Graduate Dean Willoughby, SWT is participating in this program as part of a cluster including UT, Austin Community College, and St. Edward's. Earlier this year a number of UT doctoral candidates and their advisors spent the day on our campus attending orientation sessions and visiting classes.

--A letter was received from Prof. Francis Rose (Chair, Biology) addressing the \$10 property deposit that students pay. Currently the student can elect to have the deposit returned or designate that it be donated to (1) the Alumni Association, or (2) to one of the Schools. Why can a student not be allowed to donate it to a department or some other unit of the University, as is done elsewhere?

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary



FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
March 22, 1995

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caruana, Caverly, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, Weller, and Winek.

Guests: VPFSS William Nance, James Scott (Budgeting), Kathy Voges (Auxiliary Services), Sam Paul (VPFSS Systems Analyst), Diane Burzynski (Accounting), Valerie Morrison (Accounting), Clinton Boyd (Accounting), Chuck Spradling (ISS), James Dorsey (ISS), Katrina Druart (Admissions), Prof. Jim Irvin (Chair, Chem), Dean Paul Gowens (Business), Prof. Lydia Blanchard (Chair, Eng), Dean Jack Gravitt (Liberal Arts), Dean Mariel Muir (Science), Dr. Bill Mears (Dir., LRC), Prof. Glenn Longley (Dir., EARDC), Rachel Para (Univ. Star), Prof. Don Matlock (Chair, Soc.), Prof. Shirley Ogletree (Chair, Psych), Prof. James Crawford (Chair, Physics), Prof. Brian Row (Chair, Art), Mike Moore, Sandra Akridge.

CONTENTS:

FACULTY SENATE BUDGET WORKSHOP (VPFSS Nance)

FY96 BUDGET DEVELOPMENT CYCLE  
STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS & REQUEST FOR NEW FUNDING FORM  
PRIMARY SOURCES OF REVENUE  
STATE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS (AND COORDINATING BOARD FORMULAS)  
TX HIGHER ED SPENDING RE PERSONAL INCOME, POPULATION, AND  
PER STUDENT, COMPARED TO 10 OTHER POPULOUS STATES  
HIGHER ED AS PERCENTAGE OF GENERAL REVENUE APPROPRIATIONS,  
1970-1995  
TX GENERAL REVENUE AS DECLINING SHARE OF HIGHER ED REVENUE  
FY94 APPROPRIATION PER FTE STUDENT, 34 SENIOR COLLEGES IN TX  
MEAN FACULTY SALARIES BY RANK, SENIOR COLLEGES IN TX  
STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS  
ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER FTE STUDENT, TX PUBLIC  
UNIVERSITIES  
ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS BY CATEGORY, TX PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES  
CURRENT STATUS OF SENATE BILL 2 & HOUSE BILL 1  
SWT FY1995 BUDGET  
SWT FY1994 SOURCES OF LOCAL FUNDS FOR E&G ACTIVITIES  
BUDGET BREAKDOWN BY CATEGORY  
REALLOCATION OF 1% "RECAPTURE" AND TUITION INCREASE  
PROJECTED "RECAPTURE" BY DIVISION, FY1995 & 1996  
RESERVE BALANCES, PLANNED EXPENDITURES  
UNRESTRICTED, UNRESERVED FUND BALANCES, 1990 TO 1995

The meeting began at 4:05, Chair Swinney presiding.

VPFSS Nance discussed a handout of charts and tables prepared for the assembled deans, chairs, senate, senate liaisons, and interested others. Copies of this 29-page document, an excellent summary of current funding and expenditure numbers, can be obtained from Mr. Nance's office (2244) or from the Senate Office (8323).

#### FY96 BUDGET DEVELOPMENT CYCLE

The legislature meets in odd years which means the university budgets will go to the Board in August (instead of May as in even years) after we see what the legislature does.

#### STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS & REQUEST FOR NEW FUNDING FORM

New funding requests must say what strategic plan goal the request would be fulfilling. There is a form to move monies around between funds already allocated. The 2 percent reduction form was explained. Departmental budget forms will include a line for a senior faculty person to sign off that faculty were consulted on the change or request.

#### PRIMARY SOURCES OF REVENUE

- (1) Operating revenues (E&G funds),
- (2) Auxiliary enterprises funds: (a) unpledged, i.e. fees and income from not regularly scheduled academic functions but directly involving students--counseling, health clinic, fine arts productions, etc. and (b) pledged, i.e. income from facilities constructed through revenue bonds--student housing, cafeteria, bookstore, etc.,
- (3) Designated funds (revenues designated by governing board for specific services--HEAF, general service fee, course fee, etc.),
- (4) Restricted funds (outside agencies have restricted their grants, contracts, or gifts),
- (5) Unrestricted gift funds (private, endowment funds used to enrich on-going operations).

The state used to fund most of costs but now tuition and fees and profits from auxiliary services, etc. are funding a larger share. Lab fees reduce general revenue by that amount but course fees can be used in M&O to offset costs. While some universities have been in trouble for misuse of course fees, we should be in good shape in summer audit because we follow similar pattern of UNT who had no audit problems. Deans usually return all course fees to departments, unless there is some instructional activity for the school that they must fund. Dean Gowens suggested a workshop on course fee usage to make sure everyone knew how to stay in compliance. Auxiliary profits can be used as we will. Bond projects must by law show a 1.25 percent profit above indebtedness.

#### STATE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS (AND COORDINATING BOARD FORMULAS)

Flow chart on this was explained and the formula-driven decision on why SWT was 33rd of 34 in funding per student was discussed. For example, SWT has its largest enrollment in disciplines which get low funding, all undergrads are funded at the same rate but we have a large proportion in higher division classes which are more expensive than large undergrad sections, and we have no doctoral programs yet (which are funded at a higher rate). Also we are a big school and presumed to have economies of scale, i.e. small schools get more in student FTE for administration, etc. It was suggested that the funding for upper and lower division undergrads needs to be differentiated in the formula to give a more realistic picture of actual costs.

## TEXAS HIGHER ED SPENDING RE PERSONAL INCOME, POPULATION, AND PER STUDENT, COMPARED TO 10 OTHER POPULOUS STATES

Texas looks fairly average in dollars spent on on higher ed by personal income and by population, until the dollars per student are compared. Texas has a high proportion of young people and they tend to go to publicly supported schools. We are 9th of the eleven in state spending per higher ed student.

## HIGHER ED AS PERCENTAGE OF GENERAL REVENUE APPROPRIATIONS, 1970-1995

In 1970 higher ed was about 58 percent of general revenue appropriations in Texas and now it is about 20 percent.

## TX GENERAL REVENUE AS DECLINING SHARE OF HIGHER ED REVENUE

As recently as 1984 the state funded about 55 percent of higher ed costs. In 1994 this was about 40 percent. Higher tuition, student fees, grants from outside agencies, and auxiliary enterprises have had to take up the slack locally.

## FY94 APPROPRIATION PER FTE STUDENT, 34 SENIOR COLLEGES IN TX

As mentioned above, SWT is next to the bottom on state funding per student of the 34 public senior colleges. SWT receives \$2,398 from general revenue per student and \$3,124 from all-fund appropriations. [Again, it was suggested that the formula for funding undergrads needs serious attention, given our numbers of upper-division students.]

## MEAN FACULTY SALARIES BY RANK, SENIOR COLLEGES IN TX

As you expected we are well below the mean at all ranks except lecturer. For the top four ranks, we are 16.8 percent below the mean (about 83 percent of what the average TX faculty person makes).

## STUDENT/FACULTY RATIOS, 1989/90-1992/93

SWT has held around 21 to 22 FTE students per FTE faculty, but this will be going up as we cut positions to meet budget reallocations. Six of the 30-some TX public colleges had higher ratios in 1992/93; the average was 18.5. The float upward is being done in the name of raising salaries of those who are left to teach.

## ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS PER FTE STUDENT, TX PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

SWT is the third from the bottom in administrative costs per student. Questions were raised on how trustworthy figures from universities were, given that administration could be hidden in faculty salaries.

## ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS BY CATEGORY, TX PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

In the eleven categories of administrative costs, SWT is in the lowest third on almost everything. This begs the question on whether we are terribly efficient, others are very inefficient, or we are not providing some students with services in the "institutional support" categories included here.

## CURRENT STATUS OF SENATE BILL 2 & HOUSE BILL 1

Bills look like they will get out of committee to the floor of both houses with rider cuts dismissed. Rider cuts included proportional retirement, ORP cuts, workers' comp and unemployment comp cuts, employment cap, utilities shortfall, etc. If these appropriations bills are passed as they are coming out of committee, SWT will come out slightly ahead of last year rather than taking a major hit--as would be the case if the riders were passed.

### SWT FY1995 BUDGET

This table is a broad view of expenditures, budgeted and other non-budgeted.

### SWT FY1994 SOURCES OF LOCAL FUNDS FOR E&G ACTIVITIES

\$10,435,190 expected in general and course fees, designated funds interest, vending income, HEAF, etc.

### BUDGET BREAKDOWN BY CATEGORY

Total estimated budget for the year is \$128,524,704 (\$58,636,604 in salaries and \$69,888,098 in operating expenses). Categories run from faculty salaries (\$33 million), to dept. operations, to admin., library, physical plant, security, custodial, utilities, staff benefits, etc. A question was asked on whether we could get percentages of budget in categories from other schools, to see how we stack up.

### REALLOCATION OF 1% "RECAPTURE" AND TUITION INCREASE

New money for the current fiscal year included \$1,167,276 from the 1% recapture and \$438,017 from the tuition increase. \$956,788 was used for the 3 percent raise in December. Probably \$250,000 will be spent to fund a permanent shortfall in summer salaries. This leaves an uncommitted balance of about \$400,000.

### PROJECTED "RECAPTURE" BY DIVISION, FY1995 & 1996

The 2 percent recapture this year will raise something over \$2,000,000. Decision making as to how this will be spent will begin at the EPC (Executive Planning Committee, i.e., Vice President's and Deans) Retreat at Aquarena next week. An additional 3% faculty and staff raise would use about half the money; the remainder could be reallocated for other needs justified under the strategic plan. Question: could the entire amount be used for a 6% raise? Nance: Yes, theoretically that could be done, but there are other priorities, so it is not likely. The recapture table, shows what each division (Pres., EVP, Academic Affairs, F&SS, Student Affairs, University Advancement) is supposed to return from their budgets and how much has been recovered to date.

[Note: if an additional 3% internal raise is provided from this year's recapture funds, it could take several forms--across-the-board, performance, merit, bonus, lump sum, etc. The Senate may make a recommendation on this. Faculty with suggestions should share them with their Senator.]

### RESERVE BALANCES, PLANNED EXPENDITURES

We are trying to spend-down on these funds from FY92 \$16.1 million to FY95 \$9.44 million where we will hold. Areas of expenditure were outlined, such as equipment, clinic, parking garage, child development center, library, etc.

## UNRESTRICTED, UNRESERVED FUND BALANCES, 1990 TO 1995

These are free cash reserves we are spending down on.

Questions from the floor:

--What about auxiliary enterprise profits, namely Aquarena?

Answer: Aquarena is not holding its own, when Caper's is included [\$360,000 in the hole.] The golf course and the park and Pepper's are paying their way. The Regents are asking that we settle this soon.

Perhaps Caper's will be let to someone else. Since the purchase was done with bonds, we ended up paying PFM to run the operation while we absorbed the loses. Under tax law we might be able to lease 10 percent of the operation to a new bidder. New ideas are planned for "edutainment" at Aquarena to feature aquariums with endangered species (sorry, Ralph), archaeology exhibits and digs, theatre and musical productions, etc. Currently we cannot compete with our old-time entertainment vis a vis Fiesta World, Sea World, etc. Bus tour companies say they want something with a new twist, more spark.

--What has happened with our mortgage diversification funds (derivatives) that created an uproar last fall? Answer: Yields are now about 7.3 percent (down from peak of 12 percent, or so) and market value is coming back up. We have done well over the past few years and will not lose anything if we do not sell until maturity. Of course, with hindsight we see that more diversification would have been better.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

The Senate is grateful to Mr. Nance for his clear and candid presentation and to Jim Scott and Kathy Voges who provided backup information.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
March 29, 1995

PLEASE POST

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caruana, Davis, Ford, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, and Winek. Absent: Caverly, Glassman, and Weller.

Guests: Librarians David Bruner (liaison), David Motson, Barbara Potts, Pam Spooner, Sheila Torres-Blank, and Margaret Vaverek; John Clark (University Star), Mike Moore, Sandra Akridge.

CONTENTS:

- 100 LIBRARIANS' PAY AND STATUS (Prof. Ford)
- 108 BUDGET CYCLE, FY96
- 82 ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT CENTER
- 11 SENATE ELECTIONS
- 29 ACADEMIC CORE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT
- 116 AQUARENA AND FOOD SERVICE (Tarsitano Letter)
- 117 PROPERTY DEPOSITS (Rose Letter)
- 02 MINUTES OF 3/8/95 (Senate and PAAG) and 3/22/95  
NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:03, Chair Swinney presiding.

100 LIBRARIANS' PAY AND STATUS (Prof. Ford)

A 64-page document which had been distributed to Senators was summarized. (1) Career ladder salaries were set in 1987 (entry level at \$21,744, etc. for all steps above) and have not been revamped since then. SWT is the lowest in entry level of all sister-schools in Texas, public four-year colleges in the Southwest, and national averages. This contributes to our 50 percent turnover rate in career-ladder librarians within a two-year period. [Dept. head administrative librarians are not on the career-ladder pay scale, but are on a scale administered by Personnel.

(2) Status and working conditions are a second source of personnel and morale loss. Documentation was presented regarding the number of hours and services provided (e.g. tours and instruction in computer indexes, etc.) with our small staff per student and faculty FTE. SWT is way at the top on services provided and way at the bottom on staff available. Policies within the SWT library vary from department to department.

The Subcommittee recommended that we adopt a plan similar to the one adopted by Texas Tech in Fall 1994, with a support letter from their Faculty Senate (an executive summary of their plan and the Senate letter are included in the SWT document).

In sum, the Subcommittee recommends the following:

--Base entry-level pay for career-ladder librarians be set at \$25,000 to meet the local and regional market, with all salaries above be raised 28 or 29 steps to avoid compression and keep all the system in line. [Note: The Library administration recommends 29 steps in their budget request of 3/22/95, for both career-ladder and administrative librarians.]

--A formal mechanism be established to review periodically the pay scale and keep career-ladder librarians' pay in tandem with other professionals. This committee should include representatives from career-ladder professionals and an outside person(s) from another area, such as Counseling (which has a healthy career-ladder) or Personnel which has control over library administrative salaries.

Status includes the following recommendations:

--"Academic status" with continuing contracts (i.e. tenure) after six years of probation. Once librarians at SWT had tenure but this was lost many years ago and only two librarians have been here long enough to retain that status.

--Immediate attention to scheduling and working conditions. Policies regarding schedules and so forth need to be established by a committee including those involved.

--Participation in development leaves and governance (e.g. appointment to University committees, as well as ex-officio representation on CAD and a Faculty Senator designated to consult with the Library liaison).

--Evaluation procedures which include credit for personal development and university service, based on established criteria and peer review.

Senators asked two basic questions: (1) How much will this cost? [Answer, provided subsequently by Joan Heath who had the data in the Library budget request: \$62,460 to raise the 16 career-ladder librarians 29 steps and \$41,088 to raise the 7 administrative librarians 29 steps. The Subcommittee did not ask for a 29-step increase for the latter group, but suggested their salaries should be examined as part of the overall picture.] (2) What titles are librarians seeking? Answer: Academic status with tenure is a category in-between full-faculty status and staff. Titles are not the same as faculty, e.g. TX Tech uses Assistant Librarian/Archivist, Associate Librarian/Archivist, Librarian/Archivist as titles. SWT has Librarian I-IV titles. Our designations could remain the same or we could adopt the Tech titles. In the survey of librarians the Subcommittee distributed in January, 100 percent of the career-ladder librarians said they did not seek "pure faculty status," but an alternative status should be considered.

The Senate agreed to send the report to Pres. Supple and VPAA Gratz and put it on the PAAG agenda for April 12.

108 BUDGET CYCLE, FY96

A 3 percent raise for next year is under consideration by the Administration. This would cost \$1.4 million, roughly half of the \$2.1 million to be recaptured funds from departments this year. The question is, "What form should the raise take"? The options are: across-the-board percentage of salary, lump sum (across the board or by rank), bonuses (which are not part of ongoing salary), and merit (which becomes part of base salary).

It was pointed out that University policy (PPS 7.10) does not permit merit until cost-of-living has been taken into account. [We need to obtain a base for a COLA raise.] It was suggested that inflation hits those at the bottom of the pay scale harder and lump sums rather than percentage of salary would help them more. Apparently we have done this before under Pres. McCrocklin.

An article was distributed regarding social psychology/human resource management studies on extrinsic rewards, such as pay. If the pay is deemed adequate and equitable [our catch-22], intrinsic rewards and working conditions which promote feelings of creativity and contribution to the community are more effective than money.

Equity is a problem both within departments and across disciplines. Who is to measure equity and on what criteria is a slippery problem. Equity examination includes sex, ethnicity, compression, differential markets, and those who have been left out of the question, such as librarians.

A "straw poll" indicated the Senate generally favored the following: (1) We would prefer performance as defined in policy rather than across-the-board; (2) We would prefer a lump sum increase or some graduated scale by rank rather than a percentage of total salary; (3) If merit is given, we would prefer it take the form of a bonus, and (4) We would like to see some attempt to address the thorny issue of equity, e.g. salary compression, differential salaries, librarian's salaries, etc.

The Senate will discuss these matters with the President at the next PAAG meeting, April 12.

## 82 ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT CENTER

The report on the center was discussed. Student opinion on advising is rather comparable to national data collected by ACT (i.e. very dissatisfied and dissatisfied: ACT 17 percent, SWT 20 percent). Some Schools have already voted to "fix the system in place" rather than create a new center with new administrative costs. This is in accord with the Senate's earlier suggestion that advisement stay in General Studies.

The Senate moved that a memo be sent to Pres. Supple and VPAA Gratz that we keep the current system with new students and undeclareds advised in General Studies, improve it, and hire faculty out-of-load to help in counseling as needed. [This is the system UT-Arlington was using before their administration set up a new system, which made all concerned rather unhappy.] Hiring faculty out-of-load has three advantages: (1) Faculty who are being cut down to part-time due to budget reductions and those who want to boost their stagnant salaries can pick up some losses; (2) The literature supports the idea that faculty contact with students aids retention; and (3) This allows flexibility, i.e. the ability to move people into assignments without hiring new counseling staff who are less familiar with the system.

## 11 SENATE ELECTIONS

Senators Caruana (School of Health Professions) and Davis' (Liberal Arts) terms are expiring. The School of Business has lost a senator by FTE calculations, but sitting senators will complete their terms.

The Faculty Grievance Committee will need nominees. If departments do not nominate persons, then senators from those Schools will have to do so. Education and Science have ongoing appointments, but the other five Schools will need nominees.



Article X of the Senate's Standing Rules regarding Grievance Committee personnel was amended to include the following: (1) name change of the committee and (2) inclusion of tenured associate professors, along with full professors. The change was moved, seconded, and adopted by the Senate. See AA-PPS 8.08 for faculty grievance process.

#### 29 ACADEMIC CORE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

The Committee on Committees recommended that Prof. Rebecca Bell-Metereau be appointed. The Senate concurred.

#### 116 AQUARENA AND FOOD SERVICE (Tarsitano Letter)

The Senate approved a letter to Prof. Tarsitano regarding our inquiry into Caper's management contract and the quality of food in the cafeteria. Contracts for management and/or shutdown of Caper's are under examination by the administration. An inspection of the cafeteria kitchen will be arranged by Kathy Voges at Prof. Tarsitano's convenience.

#### 117 PROPERTY DEPOSITS (Rose Letter)

The Senate voted to send a letter to VPFSS Bill Nance asking for a review of the current policy of restricting solicitation of student property deposits to Alumni Affairs. Currently students are asked upon graduation if they want a refund or if they want to contribute the \$10 to the Alumni Association/School (half goes to AA and half to School for scholarships). Some Schools actively solicit and others do not. While this is not megabucks, it an interesting point regarding students' rights to say where their contributions should go. Perhaps some would like their contributions to go directly to departments, or elsewhere. The Senate has no recommendations at this time, but suggests a reexamination of policy.

#### 02 MINUTES OF 3/8/95 (Senate and PAAG) and 3/22/95

The minutes were approved as read.

#### NEW ITEMS

--The Honors Committee memo regarding the necessity for a funding of faculty for the Honors Program was discussed. The Honors Program has subsisted on departments contributing their faculty to teach in the program. Now that lines are being cut and departments need faculty to teach courses in their own disciplines, this generosity cannot be expected to continue. Without the ability to reimburse departments, the Honors Program will eventually fold.

--Prof. Sawey suggested that using \$264,210 in HEAF funds for revamping an area on the 11th floor in Alkek Library for a photo gallery should be examined. The proposed gallery would be 2,300 square feet; that puts the cost at over \$100 per square foot in an already existing structure.

--SWT attorney Bill Fly has replied to the Senate's question on whether faculty/staff can lobby legislators by e-mail through our system with a negative reply. Don't do it. The Senate will send this out by e-mail to all faculty.

--VP of Student Affairs James Studer will be invited to a future Senate meeting to discuss student retention.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m. Ramona Ford  
Secretary

PAAG - FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
April 12, 1995

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Caverly, Caruana, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, Weller, and Winek. Absent: Bible

Guests: Pres. Supple, VPAA Gratz; Prof. Diane Parkin-Speer (English); Prof. Susan Day (Special Asst. to Pres.); Librarians David Bruner (liaison), Bill Griffin, Leigh Kilman, Sam Khosh-Khui, Lori Maxwell, David Motson, Barbara Potts, Andrea Schwartz, Joan Shedivy, Pam Spooner, Sheila Torres-Blank, and Margaret Vaverek; Teclo Garcia (San Marcos Daily Record), Rachel Para (University Star), Mike Moore, Sandra Akridge.

CONTENTS:

14	PAAG
	LIBRARIANS' PAY AND STATUS
	FACULTY RAISES
	ATHLETICS IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN
	Ph.D. PROPOSAL IN GEOGRAPHY
	OTHER Q&A
29	COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT
11	SENATE ELECTIONS
62	MODIFIED RETIREMENT
02	MINUTES OF 4/5/95
	NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:03, Chair Swinney presiding.

14 PAAG

LIBRARIANS' PAY AND STATUS

Pres. Supple said he and VPAA Gratz had reviewed the Senate Subcommittee's report. Personnel has now completed a report on how far off all staff are from market salaries. When we see whether the State is going to provide additional salary monies (not very encouraging), we will know how much money we have to bring up all salaries into some kind of market parity, i.e. whether we can afford to bring everyone up to 100 percent parity or will have to settle for a lower percentage of parity. Librarians will be fitted into the big picture. Maybe there are others who are just as poorly paid compared to the market, e.g. perhaps doctors in the clinic, computer center personnel, etc. We will be comparing secretary to secretary, librarian rank to librarian rank,

faculty rank to faculty rank, etc. [The Senate will soon receive a copy of Personnel's report.] It will cost at least \$3.2 million to bring up the bottom levels, and \$5.1 million to bring everyone up to parity.

Several Senators brought up that career-ladder librarians were at the bottom in pay compared to our sister schools and the pay scale had not been changed since the ladder was installed in 1989, which is unacceptable. Administrative librarians and even staff (poor though their pay be) have had market adjustments since then. Prof. Pascoe noted that it was easier for higher paid faculty and other professionals to live on their salaries than for professional career-ladder librarians to live on theirs, whatever the parity might be with sister schools among faculty.

Prof. Parkin-Speer stated that the librarians are a special case. The English Dept. was much concerned that we hold on to our excellent professional library staff who provide the heart of the system, helping our students with appropriate research materials for their assignments. Frequent librarian turnover impedes this process. Prof. Ford stated that the cost of bringing up the 16 career-ladder librarians to the median of sister schools was only \$62,460. A new Librarian I position has just been filled in the Music Dept. at nearly parity, while the career-ladder librarians at Alkek are entering at \$21,744--\$3,256 below parity.

Prof. Sawey asked when the decision would be made regarding parity. Answer: The decision will be made by summer when the budget is put together.

On the issue of librarians' status, Pres. Supple stated that he was not in favor of faculty status and tenure for librarians, because where he had worked before in the State University of New York (SUNY) system it was not well liked. Prof. Ford noted (1) the Subcommittee did not ask for pure faculty status, but an in-between status and continuing contract (tenure) after six-year probation, such as Texas Tech put in place last fall, and (2) tenured status such as the City University of New York (CUNY) had when she was a reference librarian there was well liked. [The report indicates that either faculty status or academic status with continuing contracts is widespread throughout the U.S. and is growing in Texas.]

Pres. Supple agreed that the Library should be included in TQM training and group formation. This might help to smoothe some morale problems and gain librarian input. The issues can be brought forward and resolved through TQM conversation. This item will return to the agenda in two weeks, April 26th.

## FACULTY RAISES

Pres. Supple indicated that since the State contribution has not been ascertained, an across the board raise has not yet been designated from the 2 percent recapture from departmental budgets. [Note: As reported in earlier minutes, slightly over half of the \$2 million recapture would give a 3 percent raise.] The entire 2 percent was never intended to be entirely for salary increases but includes strategic planning initiatives, as well. Lower pay should be brought up on a sliding scale with regard to those who are farthest behind, i.e. neither lump sum nor across the board for everyone. A discussion followed as to the difficulties with the merit system: whether it is fairly distributed in all departments, that there are many years without merit monies, that teaching is not rewarded, that without merit we are on a longevity pay plan, that perhaps merit could be awarded every year and backpay could be issued in good years, perhaps promotion with larger steps could be used, merit reward could be in-kind (e.g. time off for research), etc. The Pres. said perhaps there should be a permanent pot established for merit in lean years.

Pres. Supple offered a new distribution plan for consideration, based on departmental performance, e.g. high performing depts. could receive more funds. This would free depts. to encourage faculty to do their specialities in grants, research, or teaching. Questions were asked

with regard to (1) Does this not apply only to tenured faculty who have overcome the publishing hurdle (Prof. Caruana)? (2) This pits dept. against dept. which is not a good organizational strategy (Prof. Middlebrook). Answer: Yes, faculty tenure qualifications are individual, not departmental. There has to be some consideration for good faculty in poor departments. No opinion on hand-to-hand combat among depts.

A handout was distributed comparing SWT median faculty salaries to national data on Comprehensive IIA schools collected by AAUP, Fall 1994. SWT was 14 to 19 percent lower than the median, depending on rank.

#### ATHLETICS IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN

Pres. Supple noted that athletics should be part of the strategic plan (with input from across the campus) but is not. Last year the NCAA started requiring mission statements and is sending out investigative teams. He will soon be participating on one of these teams and will be reporting back. Prof. Sawey noted that the student government and the faculty were wondering about the subsidies (e.g. student fees) going to athletics. Pres. Supple replied that TCU and Southeast Louisiana had abolished athletics and are now reinstating them because of drops in enrollment, although the connection between the two was not established. Benchmarking is needed on schools of our size regarding enrollment and athletics. The mission statement we develop could be used in the strategic plan. Major restructuring is occurring in NCAA; some conferences seem to be collapsing, others are adding schools.

The Senate will be watching the athletic situation with interest.

#### Ph.D. PROPOSAL IN GEOGRAPHY

The Senate asked how Geography's plan fast-tracked past the faculty who are supposed to be in control of the curriculum. Pres. Supple indicated that we operated a little differently on our first Ph.D. program because of the opportunity presented by the Board of Regents and Coordinating Board and strong outside support from the American Association of Geography, National Geographic, UT and A&M. The proposed emphasis of the Ph.D. is in a new area and waiting three years might keep us from being the cutting edge. In addition, an unnamed Ph.D. program was in our strategic plan for introduction at this time and this looked like the obvious choice. Once we are a successful Ph.D. granting institution, other departments can go through regular channels with more ease.

Questions were asked about the start-up costs and what happens if we don't get a special line item from the State. Answer: We did not go forward with this depending on the line item. Obviously it could impact the university as a whole. Question: The program is supposed to break even (become "income neutral") in FY99, but this is mostly through grants. How can grants be expected to support the program to that degree? Answer: Grants offset faculty salaries and support graduate students in research and teaching. This is common in many universities. How will we support the program with Library materials estimated at \$50,000 to \$100,000? Answer: Line-item State support is expected.

Aquarena Springs will be a focal center for Biology, Anthropology, and Geography to develop "ecotourist management" and "edutainment." Currently conservation officers in parks do not have the background to mesh the areas of education and recreation.

#### OTHER Q&A

--University growth has been projected to be 30 percent in the next 10 years (30,000 in 2005). We must plan for quality. The faculty to student ratio will probably rise. We are in a

growth area demographically and geographically. The number of students will increase, as will summer, weekend, and evening courses. This projection is based on demographic growth, students in high school (and the percentage we get), and other factors. UT and A&M currently have capped their enrollments--an area which can always be changed.

29 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

The annual report of 3/27/95 has been distributed and is available in the Reserve section of the Alkek Library. The RTA'd.

11 SENATE ELECTIONS

The Senate approved that ballots for Senators in Liberal Arts and Health Professions will be distributed this week. Grievance Committee ballots will also be distributed.

62 MODIFIED RETIREMENT

No time for discussion. RTA'd.

02 MINUTES OF 4/5/95

The minutes were approved as read.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
April 19, 1995

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caverly, Caruana, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Swinney, Weller, and Winek. Absent: Stedman

Guests: Development leave candidates: Profs. Manny Brand, Suzanne Fitch, Dennis Fitzsimons, Dalton Gross, Harry Stephen Hager, Roger Jones, George Morgan, Tinker Murray, Kate Peirce, Robert Randolph, Paul Rosenblum, and Joseph Yick; Mike Moore, Sandra Akridge.

CONTENTS:

- 13 DEVELOPMENTAL LEAVE INTERVIEWS:  
    PROF. MANNY BRAND (MUSIC)  
    PROF. SUZANNE FITCH (SPEECH COMMUNICATION)  
    PROF. DENNIS FITZSIMONS (GEOGRAPHY AND PLANNING)  
    PROF. DALTON GROSS (ENGLISH)  
    PROF. HARRY STEPHEN HAGER (MUSIC)  
    PROF. ROGER JONES (ENGLISH)  
    PROF. GEORGE MORGAN (CIS)  
    PROF. TINKER MURRAY (HPER)  
    PROF. KATE PEIRCE (MASS COMMUNICATIONS)  
    PROF. ROBERT RANDOLPH (ENGLISH)  
    PROF. PAUL ROSENBLUM (BIOLOGY)  
    PROF. JOSEPH YICK (HISTORY)
- 36 EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS  
    NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:05, Chair Swinney presiding.

DEVELOPMENTAL LEAVE INTERVIEWS:

PROF. MANNY BRAND (Chair, MUSIC)

Dr. Brand edited an issue of a major music education journal some years ago which featured music education in other countries. He proposes to follow up on responses to investigate the goals, processes, and problems (social and economic) which some other nations face in this area. Through surveys (some models are available in print) and case and ethnographic studies he would survey the United Kingdom, Russia, and other countries.

#### PROF. SUZANNE FITCH (SPEECH COMMUNICATION)

Dr. Fitch has published an article on Sojourner Truth, former slave and powerful speaker for abolition and women's rights. There are two biographical works coming out on her from historians, but this project (in conjunction with Prof. Rosanne Mandziuk) would focus on "narrative criticism" of her speeches and songs. Since Truth was illiterate there are no direct transcripts of her work, but observers have commented on her speech and song content and style and these are available in newspaper and journal articles, etc.

#### PROF. DENNIS FITZSIMONS (GEOGRAPHY AND PLANNING)

Dr. Fitzsimons proposes to integrate World Wide Web into class and laboratory usage. Articles should also generate from this.

#### PROF. DALTON GROSS (ENGLISH)

Dr. Gross would like to produce an annotated version of Dos Passos' *The Big Money*, the last of the U.S.A. trilogy. Many of Dos Passos' allusions to then-current affairs are now lost on modern audiences, and an annotation of events he referred to would be of use to both literary student and historian in placing his works in context.

#### PROF. HARRY STEPHEN HAGER (MUSIC)

Dr. Hager would like to promote the acceptance of French horn and harp duos, which flourished in the early 19th century but have declined since then. He and his wife (an accomplished harpist) would like to promote this by concert tours and the production of a compact disc.

Alternatively, the small Republic of Dominica may get funds (possibly from OAS) to establish a brass training academy. Currently there is no horn training available. If the Republic gets these funds, Dr. Hager would forego the French horn/harp tour for helping them establish such an institute. He was not optimistic about the funds being available in the near future. If this were to become a possibility, he could use the information to add to the Caribbean section of *Music 1311*.

#### PROF. ROGER JONES (ENGLISH)

Dr. Jones would like to finish a book of poetry which he has already started. In addition, he would like to add to the media available for the American literature course taught by the Department. This would mean scanning works of art, photos, and other texts and adding sound as course component for use by all those who teach the course in the new multimedia setting.

#### PROF. GEORGE MORGAN (CIS)

Dr. Morgan would like to revise the overall curriculum for discussion and decision by the faculty. This would include incorporation of the world wide computer network, other multimedia innovations, and surveying what the business world wants of graduates. Untenured and lower ranks of faculty who are interested in this project cannot take time from their own publishing, so he suggests that he take this project on to fruition.

#### PROF. TINKER MURRAY (HPER)

Dr. Murray, who has been researching youth fitness, would like to spend time with the Cooper Institute for Aerobic Research. The Institute has collected and continues to collect a massive amount of data on the effects of exercise on health. This obviously affects the heart and

may also affect the immune system. This study would contribute to the literature and to courses at SWT.

#### PROF. KATE PEIRCE (MASS COMMUNICATIONS)

Dr. Peirce proposes to research the effects of media on teens. She has done research in this area through content analysis of media, but has not had the opportunity to study the impacts of media on teens. She would like to survey 400-500 youth in Central Texas and interview 100 or so in-depth regarding their media experience and attitudes. Her model would be Peggy Ornstein's School Girls. The media examined would be TV, magazines, newspapers, and radio. Socialization and roles models would be among the areas surveyed.

#### PROF. ROBERT RANDOLPH (ENGLISH)

Dr. Randolph has begun a work applying Whitehead's "process theology" (as developed by John Cobb at Claremont) and Carl Jung's psychology to the study of literature. Process theology and Jungian archetypes offer images of hope and "God" as a process continually straining to bring the world into harmony (despite what humans do to mess up that harmony). Whiteheadian process would require that we keep building on all previous interpretations of literature and add one of our own, as opposed to deconstruction which "digs down into the text and gets lost."

#### PROF. PAUL ROSENBLUM (BIOLOGY)

Dr. Rosenblum would like to continue his research at Alberta (where they have the appropriate apparatus and funds for analysis) on the effects of nutrition on the reproduction of fish. While we know that diet affects their reproduction, the physiological switches (brain, gonads?) which turn it off are not understood. This has meaning for aquaculture and for protection of endangered species. He noted that while diet also has an effect on human reproduction, the reproductive systems of fish and humans are quite different and there is no direct carry over.

#### PROF. JOSEPH YICK (HISTORY)

Dr. Yick has a forthcoming book on urban communist China (M.E. Sharpe). The urban political economy will be very important for China's future and he proposes to pursue the ongoing development, using archives and interviewing informants in Beijing, Hong Kong, and elsewhere. This will also be an opportunity to buy books and to talk to universities regarding possible exchanges with SWT. In addition, his studies will add to the courses he teaches on China.

After lengthy discussion the candidates were ranked and the list will go forward to the VPAA and the President.

### 36 EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

The Senate's annual evaluation of administrators will not be done this year. In view of the facts that (1) a new policy on evaluation of chairs which provides for faculty participation has been adopted by CAD, (2) the Senate's ad hoc Committee on Evaluation has not had time to meet and make recommendations, and (3) the evaluation is relatively expensive and the Senate's coffers are relatively bare, the body postponed further consideration of this topic until the ad hoc Committee's report is available.



**NEW ITEMS**

No time for introduction of new items.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

**Ramona Ford  
Secretary**

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
April 26, 1995

NOTE: Faculty Senate minutes are distributed as soon as practicable following each meeting via E-Mail to Senators, Liaisons, Chairs of Senate Committees, Departmental Chairs and Secretaries, Deans, members of the President's Cabinet, and other members of this academic community who have requested to be placed on our mailing list. They are also posted in VAX Notes. Our intent is that recipients, particularly departmental secretaries, will post hard copies on bulletin boards in areas frequented by faculty.

Questions regarding the content of minutes may be addressed to any Faculty Senator.

Present: Bible, Caverly, Caruana, Davis, Ford, Glassman, Horne, Lyman, Middlebrook, Pascoe, Sawey, Stedman, Swinney, Weller, and Winek.

Guests: VPSA James Studer; Librarians: David Bruner (Senate liaison), Leigh Kilman, David E. Motson, Andrea Schwartz, Pam Spooner, Sheila Torres-Blank, Margaret Vaverek; Prof. David Nelson (Mass Communications), Prof. Paula Renfro (Mass Comm.); Mike Moore, Sandra Akridge.

CONTENTS:

- 100 LIBRARIANS' PAY AND STATUS
- 29 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT (Prof. Caruana)
- 123 RETENTION, ETC. (Guest: VPSA James Studer)
- 11 SENATE ELECTIONS
- 02 PAAG MINUTES OF 4/12 AND SENATE MINUTES OF 4/19  
NEW ITEMS

The meeting began at 4:03, Chair Swinney presiding.

100 LIBRARIANS' PAY AND STATUS

The Subcommittee report and its recommendations on librarians' pay and status of March 23, 1995, were discussed. The Senate voted to support (1) a 29-step increase in career-ladder librarians' pay to match the median pay in Texas sister-schools and the Southwest, (2) an eventual change to "academic status" and (3) immediate attention to scheduling and related concerns which we suggest may be ameliorated through inclusion in TQM initiatives. In addition, the Senate charged the Subcommittee with providing a report detailing what "academic status" and its ramifications would entail, presumably similar to the Texas Tech Library's report which Tech's Faculty Senate supported last October.

Following is a copy of the Senate's recommendations to President Supple:

"After carefully studying the report of our subcommittee, evaluating your comments at our PAAG meeting on April 12, and perusing the University Staff Salary Survey for FY95, the Senate offers the following recommendations:

"1) We urge implementation of our subcommittee's proposal that the beginning salary for career-ladder librarians at SWT be increased from Step 180 to Step 209 (i.e., from an annual salary of \$21,744 to \$25,128) effective September 1, 1995.

The 16 professionals currently in ranks Librarian I through Librarian III should receive this 29 step increase. This increase would place librarian's salaries just slightly above the lowest paid temporary lecturers (Step 202) with comparable educational requirements, a master's degree.

"This salary adjustment is judged by the Senate to be a very high priority. For whatever reason and by whatever set of circumstances, this institution, especially since the career ladder was established in 1987, has somehow forgotten that librarians are highly-trained, well-educated professionals whose contribution to the central mission of the university is absolutely essential. In the Senate's strong opinion, to pay them markedly less than the lowest paid lecturer in the most crowded discipline is unconscionable.

"Further, this institution appears to have overlooked the fact that Librarians, unlike most staff included in the Market Salary Survey compiled by Personnel, are recruited in a national market. Thus, they are similar to faculty, administrators, counselors, etc. Career-ladder librarians who have left employment at SWT in the last few years (and there have been a good many) have obtained jobs at universities, public libraries, or corporations dealing with library automation in Washington, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Maryland, Virginia, California, as well as Texas. Thus, it is unrealistic, we believe, to evaluate their salaries in terms of local market conditions.

"Because of the special education and expertise required of librarians, the valuable contribution they make to the educational process, and the national market in which they must be recruited, the Senate strongly believes that the pay scale of the career-ladder librarians must be raised as a special salary equity adjustment.

"2) The Senate is persuaded that some sort of academic status must eventually be extended to the professional librarians here. That, after all, is clearly the national prevailing practice and one must, at the very least, ask why we are so out of pattern. As our subcommittee has suggested, this should not be faculty status, but rather something uniquely suited to the librarian's role. Although the Texas Tech model is suggestive, the Senate is not yet prepared to make a specific recommendation, because, in our minds, the theoretical question of status is, at present, too confused with more mundane, practical, day-to-day issues involving schedules, workload, communication, and morale.

"3) These practical issues, the resolution of which could lead to a definition of status, are, theoretically at least, amenable to intervention through TQM. Therefore, the Senate strongly endorses the subcommittee's recommendation that you authorize a Quality Initiative for the Library as a means of addressing status and related issues.

"In the meantime, we have charged our subcommittee to begin work drafting a specific status proposal for consideration of the academic community prior to the deadline for Regental rule changes next year.

"Thank you for your consideration."

## 29 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT (Prof. Caruana)

The Senate preliminarily considered the Curriculum Committee's report on the proposed M.A. in Mass Communications.

In March 1990 the Board of Regents approved a proposal for an MA in Mass Communications, but the proposal was withdrawn before it could be acted upon by the Coordinating Board. The Curriculum Committee reviewed the proposal, found it well thought out,

and recommends that the proposal go forward. Prof. Renfro explained the degree plan. It is intended to be a terminal degree and offers the student a choice of several media areas, such as print, electronic, television. The 18 hour core consists of research, theory, statistics taken in an outside department, and so forth. Nine hours may be taken in an outside minor. The department began preparing for the master's several years ago by increasing undergraduate requirements to control enrollment. This allows them to offer graduate courses with existing faculty. The Dean borrowed a \$36,000 salary line some years ago which he will return for support of graduate assistants and the department will allocate \$5,000 from M&O to cover other program costs.

After discussion the Senate moved to circulate the proposal immediately to the University Council, asked that Appendix G be clarified, and will return the item for final decision to next week's agenda. It was also suggested that the half-time release for the graduate advisor seemed out of pattern and, perhaps, should be reconsidered.

### 123 RETENTION, ETC. (Guest: VPSA James Studer)

VPSA Studer presented a handout outlining the mission statement, goals, and organizational structure of the Student Affairs Office and the other offices with which it interfaces. The Student Affairs Council is made up of representatives from all of these groups which offer services to students, e.g. the Student Center, Rec. Sports, Residence Life, Counseling, Multicultural Student Affairs, Student Health, Career Services, Admissions, and Financial Aid. Many special programs are handled by the Dean of Students' Office, Multicultural Student Affairs, and the Counseling Center. Grants support some efforts, such as math and history supplemental instruction in residence halls under the Retention Incentive Grant Programs. The Residential College based on the English college model of students living in the same halls and taking classes in blocs together should be underway this year in Beretta and Brogdon Halls.

Tables showing GPA, probation, and retention rates of the freshman classes of 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994 were discussed. Admissions requirements have been raised since 1991. GPAs are up and the number of students on probation in subsequent semesters has dropped, but retention rates have not improved as much as expected. We are still losing 36-37 percent by the sophomore year. We would like to get that down to around 25 percent. About half of the entering freshmen will be gone by the junior year. For transfer students (those who come in with 30 hours or more) the story is similar, better grades, less probation, little change in retention (about 30 percent drop out by third semester). About 46 percent of new students are transfers. By tracking students who transfer among public institutions within the State, we have found that we get more students from other schools than they do from us, except for A&M. The students we lose to UT and A&M, however, have higher GPAs than the ones we get from them.

SWT was compared to data collected by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities for student graduation rates within six years of their entering school. Our graduation rate within six years was 32 percent, compared to 37.4 percent in our peer group, and 40.5 percent in all AASCU schools. Rates were also broken down by gender and ethnicity. SWT's African American students graduate at a slightly higher rate, 33.3 percent, than our general rate--and better than the Black rate of 28 percent for all AASCU schools.

Discussion followed regarding possible dropout factors: GPA, fees, job market, lack of personal contact with faculty, low morale of some faculty (it may be catching by students), lack of in-service training for teaching large classes, system and catalog need streamlining and simplifying so students will have proper course sequencing and make fewer errors in course selection. One senator suggested that in addition to beefing up advising, perhaps the catalog and requirements could be put on computer so students could ask questions and get straight answers. A large part of the undergraduate student body are seniors who are taking a long time to graduate.

Better advising and urging students to take 15-16 hours a semester (SCH is declining) might help them graduate in a more timely fashion.

According to an AASCU study of retention programs: "Research on student retention suggests that administrative commitment; strategic planning and assessment; early, direct and frequent feedback to students; commitment to student success; and a focus on teaching improvement are effective campus strategies to improve retention and graduation rates at state colleges and universities."

If retention rates were 75 percent after freshman year, instead of 63 percent or so, \$2.8 million would be generated, according to estimates.

Enrollment projections are that it will drop slightly next fall and increase steadily thereafter.

## 11 SENATE ELECTIONS

The elections to Faculty Senate and the Grievance Committee will be completed by May 1st. The Senate agreed to hold a special session on Tuesday, May 2nd, 2:00 to 5:00 to finish the year's business and to elect Senate officers for next year. The end of the year PAAG meeting will be held May 10th. Senate meetings will be held once a month in the summer.

## 02 PAAG MINUTES OF 4/12 AND SENATE MINUTES OF 4/19

The PAAG minutes of 4/12 and minutes of 4/19/95 were approved.

## NEW ITEMS

One of the senators has been asked by a development leave candidate whether the Senate would reconsider the proposal. The Senate declined.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Ramona Ford  
Secretary