

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

MAY 1, 1978

The ninth meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1977-78 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building at 2:15 P. M. on May 1, 1978.

Chairman William Livingston (Government) presided at the meeting.

ATTENDANCE

I.

Present: Barbara Aldave, Rebecca Baltzer, John Bordie, John Breen, Robert Brooks, Heather Carter, James Daniel, Mitzi Dreher, William Duesterhoeft, John Durbin, Donald Foss, David Gavenda, William Glade, Austin Gleeson, Philip Gough, Robert Hardgrave, Charles Holahan, Clark Hubbs, Paul Kelley, William Lesso, William Livingston, Neill Megaw, Thomas Philpott, Mary Ann Rankin, Bonnie Rickelman, James Sledd, Waneen Spirduso, Larry Tomassini, Glenn Welsch, Gary Wise, Lee Worrell, Ron Wyllys.

Absent: L. Joe Berry (excused), Sinclair Black, George Blanco (excused), Michel Breger, John Brokaw, Patricia Cain, Vicente Cantarino, C. T. Clark, Lyle Clark (excused), Bill Francis (excused), Ira Iscoe (excused), Kenneth Prescott, Alan Ross (excused), Kenneth Stokoe (excused), James Vick (excused), David Warner, Ralph White, Martha Williams, Leslie Willson (excused), Susan Wittig, Orville Wyss (excused).

Total members present: 32 Total members absent: 21

II.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. None were ready for approval.

III.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

A. Chairman Livingston's report consisted of reporting the membership composition of two committees. Members appointed to serve on the Nominating Committee for Senate Officers were: Austin Gleeson, Chairman, Rebecca Baltzer, Vincente Cantarino, Lee Worrell and Ron Wyllys.

Senate by-laws mandate the annual creation of a Committee on the Athletics Council comprised of two members plus the Senate Chairman who is to serve as committee chairman. [The role of the committee is to transmit to the President the names of five faculty members, one of whom she will select to serve on the Athletics Council.] John Breen and Clark Hubbs were the two Senate members appointed. The Chairman's report concluded with the solicitation of member's suggestions to both committees.

B. Report of Vice-Chairman -- no report.

C. Report of Secretary -- no report.

IV.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

B. Report from the Committee on Admissions, Enrollments, and Tenure -- Leslie Willson (D&P 1211-1233)

Mr. Livingston said that the Willson Committee Report, "long and elaborate", had been circulated. In the Chairman's opinion, the Senate would need more than one meeting to deal with the Report and it seemed reasonable to postpone consideration until Fall. This had been discussed

with Mr. Willson, whose schedule made it difficult for him to attend today's meeting.

- A. Report from Committee on Ways and Means to Implement General Faculty Resolutions Concerning Teaching Workloads and Teaching Assistants -- Philip Gough (D&P of the Faculty Senate 1198-1208 and D&P of the University Council 7131-7150; the recommendations forwarded to the University Council appear on U.C. D&P 7132-33.)

Chairman Philip Gough (Psychology) said that as a result of University Council discussion of his committee's report and a letter subsequently written by Mr. Sledd in which it was suggested that the matter of a 40-hour work week should be laid to rest, he had called a meeting of the committee. Given the criticism of the committee's recommendation, Mr. Gough said he had some sympathy with the Sledd position and thus proposed that the committee ask the Senate to agree to the withdrawal of the first recommendation [40-hour work load]. The Committee, however, did not support Mr. Gough's proposal; to the contrary, the committee chose to urge the Senate to encourage the council to vote in support of the recommendation.

Mr. Sledd (English) was the first to speak. "It seems to me that the 40-hour week says exactly nothing. We all work more than 40 hours, the real question is what do we work at; and the report says nothing on that subject. That is what the Legislature is concerned with. Every year we come up with statistics of how hard we work, but think of the things we could work at. We could work running a Faculty Bingo game, or we could open a sporting house in the Texas Union; any number of things would allow you to spend 40 hours a week. So what I suggested in the letter was that we delete [Recommendation] 1, and limit [Recommendation] 2 to a two year period, that we ask the administration to send this information to the Legislature and say this is what we do, and then if they don't like it they can say they don't like it. The advantage of this, it seems to me, is that we would have things out in the open. The Legislature would be fully informed. They could make their judgment, and if they approve, we would have a mandate; and if they didn't approve, then we would have something to reason together about. . . ."

Mr. Livingston said that he presumed that the adoption of Mr. Sledd's suggestion would necessitate a fairly elaborate report. Ms. Aldave (Law) said that her understanding of the Sledd proposal was the deletion of "our prior resolution of approving the 40-hour week requirement as well as implementing a new reporting requirement. Originally I opposed the 40-hour week resolution when it passed through the Senate, but I now would oppose repealing it because I'm afraid [the rescission] might be construed as signaling our disinclination to commit ourselves to work even 40 hours. . . . I see no necessary reason that it must be repealed in order also to implement a reporting requirement." Mr. Livingston recalled Dean Rostow's remark to the effect that it was questionable which would be the worse headline--FACULTY ACCEPTS A 40 HOUR WEEK, or FACULTY REFUSES A 40 HOUR WEEK.

There were questions about the parliamentary status of the University Council's action on the Gough committee report. Mr. Livingston explained as follows: "As I remember, [when the Council adjourned] there was on the floor a main motion by me that [Recommendation] 1 be adopted. It was amended successfully on a motion by John Bordie to add that other phrase, that merely working 40 hours wasn't enough. Then at the motion of Leslie Willson, [Recommendations] 1 and 2 were combined, and that was successfully passed by the Council. At that time an adjournment took place, which wipes off the floor any amendments and any main motion. . . . I don't think the University Council has adopted any part of the Gough report at this time; it only tinkered with some of the things being proposed as part of the Gough report. We will have to start all over, and if the Senate wishes to submit an amended set of recommendations, then it is quite clear that it can do so, or at least I believe it's true that we can do so; [we] are not fettered by anything that happened in the Council last time, which still leaves open the question of what are we going to recommend."

Mr. Hardgrave (Government) said that he had supported in the Council Mr. Sledd's motion, but that he needed clarification about the nature of the proposed reporting. "My question is, first, whether it is Professor Sledd's intention that these reports be translated into hour equivalencies or whether, on the other hand, they [would] be an opportunity not simply to justify but to proclaim what it is we do at The University of Texas?"

Mr. Sledd responded that to him, hour equivalents made no sense. "We all work far more than 8 hours a day, and we'll continue to; and if we don't, as I said before, we're crazy. . . . What I would like to see is simply a statement to the Legislature, 'Look, this is what we do with the money you give us. This is what we think is right; if you don't like it, tell us.' I don't see any reason to have a standing University committee and another snowstorm of paper work. . . . So I don't see the point of [Recommendation] 3 or 4. . . ." If we tell the Legislature, through the appropriate offices, 'This is what we do', that is all we are called upon to do. If they don't like it they will tell us."

Mr. Livingston said that he was still unclear about the nature of the reporting envisioned by Mr. Sledd. Mr. Sledd responded, "I would like to see a recommendation by the Council to the President that she ask each department for such a report as is specified in [Recommendation] 2 and [that] the time for making those reports be strictly limited so they won't go on forever. I would like to see her transmit that information to the presiding officer of the two houses, and then we sit back."

Mr. Megaw (English) spoke at considerable length in support of Recommendation 1: the 40-hour workload proposal. He reminded Senators that the impetus for the work of the committee was implementation of the resolutions of the General Faculty, one of which promised we would come up with a minimum, individual, faculty, workload.

Mr. Sledd offered a motion which would (1) delete Recommendations 1, 3, and 4, (2) add to Recommendation 2 (departmental reports) the provision that the President communicate the departmental reports to both houses of the Texas Legislature, and (3) that Recommendation 2, as amended, would be in effect for a maximum of two years. [Recommendation 2 was as follows:]

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

Mr. Worrell (Pharmacy) spoke against the Sledd motion. He was unsupportive of the deletion of Recommendations 1 and 3, and was of the view that Recommendation 2 needed more teeth in it. Mr. Daniel (Mathematics), and Ms. Baltzer (Music) also spoke against the provisions of the Sledd motion; both thought there should be a University-wide faculty committee which should establish standards for the departments and evaluate the departmental reports.

Mr. Hardgrave (Government) made a motion to amend the Sledd motion in such a way as to effect separate consideration of the deletion of Recommendation 1 from consideration of the deletion of Recommendation 3 and 4.

At this juncture, Mr. Gavenda (Physics) questioned parliamentarily the Senate proceedings. It was his view that since the Senate had already acted on the Gough committee report, there had to be a motion to reconsider before reconsideration could legitimately occur. Mr. Daniel concurred.

Mr. Livingston said that the Gavenda point was clearly in good parliamentary order but perhaps that procedure was unnecessarily lengthy. He then ruled against Mr. Gavenda's point of order and asked the Senate

either to sustain or reject his ruling. By a 19 - 11 vote, the ruling was sustained, Mr. Livingston said, "with embarrassment" because he thought "Gavenda was right."

After further clarification of the nature of the Hardgrave motion to separate the Sledd motion, a vote was taken and the motion PASSED 22 - 6. Then a vote was taken on the amended Sledd motion, summarized as follows by the Chairman: "[The Sledd motion, as amended, is] to delete Recommendation 1, leaving Recommendation 2 as adopted by the Senate and adding to it the provision that the President be requested to convey the results of these departmental self-analyses to the two houses of the Legislature, and that the system continue for two years at a maximum." The amended Sledd motion was then ADOPTED by a vote of 22 - 4, with 5 abstentions.

The next action taken by the Senate was to ADOPT by a vote of 23 - 6 a motion by Mr. Worrell (who had supported at an earlier meeting the adoption of Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4) to reconsider Recommendations 2 and 4, which were:

Recommendation 3. A standing university committee shall be created which, together with the administration, shall evaluate the proposed departmental requirements, and subsequently shall certify compliance with these requirements.

Recommendation 4. Immediate action shall be taken to correct failure to comply with departmental or University requirements.

There followed a very lengthy discussion about how best to deal with recommendations 3 and 4--amend, delete, combine. Motions to amend were made and passed, withdrawn, or defeated. Finally, however, Mr. Durbin (Mathematics) observed that there seemed widespread support for the deletion of Recommendations 3 and 4 altogether. He felt that a vote on that deletion might spare the Senate further unproductive deliberations. Mr. Durbin then moved that Recommendations 3 and 4 be rescinded; that motion was APPROVED by a vote of 18 - 7, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. Livingston summarized the Senate's action to this point: "We have worked our way through Section 1, which was originally [Recommendations] 1, 2, 3, and 4, and it now consists of [Recommendation] 2 only, though modified by the original codicil added by Mr. Sledd in his motion to the effect that the President shall be requested to convey the results of these departmental definitions to both houses of the Legislature, and the two year maximum to prevail." The lone recommendation in Section 1 would thus be:

Each department shall define and justify, in writing, its workload requirements, specifying those patterns of teaching, research, and other academic activities, that constitute legitimate academic work for its faculty in terms of that department's distinctive educational mission. In formulating its requirements, each department shall honor the University's commitment to undergraduate and graduate teaching. The President shall be requested to convey the results of those departmental statements to both houses of the Legislature. The System is to continue for two years at a maximum.

After a brief discussion, it was decided that the University Council would be petitioned to change its next meeting date from May 22 to May 15. It was thought that the existence of a quorum on the 22nd was problematical and that the Senate's action should be considered by the Council before fall. It was also decided that a special, brief meeting of the Senate would be scheduled on May 15 at 1:30 p. m. in order to consider two matters: the election of Senate officers and the sending of a panel of nominees to the President for here selection of one to serve on the Athletics Council.

The final item of business emanated from a recommendation by Mr. Philpott (History), who thought there should be "an explanatory document to go along with these recommendations that states our understanding of the mission of the University--why we feel about such things as teaching loads as we do." Mr. Wyllys (Library Science) agreed with Mr. Philpott. After a brief discussion, it was decided that an ad hoc committee should be created to carry out the Philpott suggestion.

The Senate the adjourned at 4:10 p. m., to convene next in special session on May 15 at 1:30 p. m. in MAI 212.

H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The Faculty Senate