MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

The Faculty Senate met in regular session on Wednesday, November 18, 1992 at 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room 4 of Davis Hall. Chairwoman Mary Ridgway presided.


APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Chairwoman Ridgway asked for approval of the revised minutes of the meeting of September 30, 1992, and the meeting of October 21, 1992. The minutes were approved.

REMARKS BY THE CHAIRWOMAN: Chairwoman Ridgway reported that in the Presidential Advisory Committee, one of the things that might be a topic for a spring workshop might be faculty governance. She reported that an ad hoc committee was being formed at this time and that we would probably be hosting a workshop and bringing in perhaps some people from outside. The Undergraduate Assembly approved, on November 17, the academic foundation proposal for Academic Standards by a vote of 19 to 11. The Senate’s Academic Liaison proposal for revising the undergraduate student appeal of grade procedure was approved at that meeting with one minor revision which allowed the appellate committee to be set up at either the departmental or college level. She announced that Senator Greene would report on the COFGO meeting which Dr. Ridgway and Dr. Greene had attended a couple of weeks ago in Austin. You should have received a summary of what happened there.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT AMACHER: The President had no general remarks, but did suggest bringing in some off-campus speakers from some places where it works well already to discuss faculty governance processes. He indicated that he was open to suggestions about composition of an ad hoc committee on faculty governance and that what he might do is ask that the Faculty Senate give him half the members because he thinks there should be some administrators on the committee.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT BAKER: Dr. Baker reported that all doctoral programs up for re-approval had been re-approved. The Master of Arts program in Anthropology has been approved. He said that the issue of placing a cap on the number of doctoral credit hours that the State will fund for a given student had come up. The original proposal had called for a cap of 160 hours. The Commissioner for Higher Education was recommending a cap of 140 hours. He indicated that the Coordinating Board didn’t appear inclined to accept the recommendation and that further reductions may be attempted at the January meeting. The Coordinating Board staff announced its intention to undertake a statewide review of all masters and baccalaureate degree programs. At this point the guidelines for implementing the review have not been announced but as soon as those guidelines have been established, the process will begin.

Senator Gaupp: Dr. Baker, is there a reason for such a statewide review? Dr. Baker replied that its part of an overall concern about the cost of higher education in the state. The Coordinating Board hears a lot about duplication of programs and there are questions about whether institutions are trying to offer too many programs.

Senator Gaupp: Is it feasible or desirable to try to interfuse as a general policy of the Board that they will support duplication - duplication, I believe has some advantages. It has nothing to do with accessibility - it has to do with the fact that programs ought to be fairly physically accessible to people in this fairly large state and there ought to be the benefit of having more than one model. Dr. Baker indicated that duplication at the baccalaureate level of basic Arts and Science programs was not to be considered as criterion for approval. There remains an ongoing conflict between
accessibility and costs. I don't sense a great deal of enthusiasm on the part of the staff to do these reviews as it is an enormous job because of the number of programs so my hope is that it will be a whole lot less numerous than it was with the doctoral programs.

**Senator Antoniades:** Does this review of masters and baccalaureate programs deal with accreditation? **Dr. Baker** answered that the fact that they are accredited does not necessarily insure they won't be reviewed, but that the review is to be based on program quality, not needs.

**Chairwoman Ridgway:** Dr. Baker, given the concern for duplication of programs, what is the mentality for downward expansion for upper-level universities that don't have freshmen and sophomores such as UT Tyler, UT Permian Basin that has already been approved to let in the lower - how can that happen when it seems like we are in such a crunch time. **Dr. Baker** stated that the Coordinating Board has consistently taken opposition of the downward expansion of universities - in fact it opposed UT Dallas, UTPB and currently opposes UT Tyler's efforts for downward expansion. The Legislature, however, makes the decisions.

**COFGO Meeting Report:** Senator Greene reported on the COFGO meeting. Dr. Ridgway asked about the ORP possibility? Was the Sunset Report acted upon? Senator Greene stated that they had agreed on the format and he urged each faculty senate to contact members of the State Sunset Commission to encourage retention of the ORP and for the appropriate committee involved here to draw up a resolution regarding all our feelings. It is the feeling of Chairwoman Ridgway that every member needs to become involved more at the local level rather than leaving everything at the State level.

**Chairwoman Ridgway** asked if there were any other Committee Reports. There were none.

**Old Business:** Senator Petry moved that we take off the table the Academic Standards proposal. The motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote. Chairwoman Ridgway introduced Dr. Lewis Baker to speak about the proposal and instructed the Senate to direct any questions about the debate to him.

**Dr. Lewis Baker:** The admissions standards proposal approved by the Undergraduate Assembly at its November 17, 1992 meeting raised standards at freshman and transfer levels. The objective was to give us a pattern of admissions for an enrollment management system. We hope the system will bring more students into UTA and at places where they can succeed.

A portion of the proposal which has been largely overlooked is creation of cooperative programs with community colleges in this area to define more clearly what students need to do to get ready to attend UTA. Discussions with community colleges suggest that their consensus is that while some students are ready to come to UTA most of their students need to remain on their campuses long enough to complete the associate degree, or at least to complete UTA's core.

This whole proposal fits into something you discussed earlier, faculty self-governance. The proposal is going to give you some tools for doing that at the departmental and college levels as distinct from the University level. The proposal sets up a centralized advising system for new students coming into the system. This system will work much more closely with our current registration system. The system will be able to enforce rules in your behalf for specific courses better than you have been able to do. So, I have been warning deans that if you have any rules you don't want enforced, you had better get rid of them.
The proposal will call on departments to make a number of decisions. If you have specific courses within the core that you want your majors to take (for example, specific math or science courses), you're going to need to let us know, because we will be able to guide your students into that. You're going to have to rethink your probation policy in light of two things: 1) first, you'll have very few majors who are on probation, because they'll never get to you; and 2) you'll have to set up a program that deals with students who are fairly far along rather than freshmen you are used to dealing with now.

You're going to need to think some, for those of you not in the professional schools who are already doing this to some extent, about what qualifications, what kinds of preparations do you want someone you want to admit as a major to your program to have. There are a number of different criteria being used around campus.

This program is going to present you with more questions than you want to answer. But it is going to give you some tools for managing your enrollment. It puts some of the tougher decisions departments have to make in terms of quantity vs. quality, how many can we really teach in this format vs. that format down at the local level. It's going to encourage a lot of self-governance in a lot of ways.

It's probably also going to be quite a nuisance to you in the spring semester as we look to you to tell us what you want as enrollment in these areas; setting up who's going to be coming into a major; at what point are they coming into a major; how will you evaluate them; what kind of core courses do you want them to have coming in; any number of questions like these.

The proposal is a very wide-ranging proposal. It incorporates a lot of things that have been done over the last few years in terms of core curriculum. Centralized advising which was recommended two or three years ago by the undergraduate assembly, has not really been fully implemented, and probation policy which was discussed at length but we have not really adjusted that to this point. Across the board all of these things we have tried to put together in such a way that they will work toward the same goal - a reconciliation so that each department will have more effective control over their undergraduate programs.

Chairwoman Ridgway: Tom Hall presented some SAT correlations at Undergraduate Assembly indicating that the SAT and GPA had a .10 correlation. He indicated that you (Dr. Lewis Baker) had helped prepare these data to some extent. Also, in talking to Burley, he indicated that the National Academy of Sciences said the Math and Science portions of the tests were not reliable predictors because they were being taught by the schools. We also heard the fact that women scored lower on the SAT but perhaps had higher GPA's in the areas they went into. Could you offer any information on that?

Dr. Lewis Baker: I supplied Tom Hall with some data. The sample size was 600 out of our 20,000 students. This sample was then divided into five (5) subgroups which had very restricted ranges of SAT within correlations which were low. I believe that overall the SAT/GPA correlations here are very strong. The rank in class data give a slightly better correlation. The combination of these two gives the best prediction overall.

The correlation between overall GPA and SAT is roughly the correlation between freshman chemistry and organic chemistry. It's roughly the correlation time between business math and the first financial analysis course. It's roughly in line with all sorts of course sequences that we would intuitively expect to exist, and which we in fact use as prerequisites for courses we routinely rely upon in advising students and in setting academic regulations. If you reject them as a basis for operations you have to basically reject the notion of academic advising and prerequisites and a lot of other things we rely on too, which intuitively seem to work.
As for Math SAT, nationally it correlates very well with courses taken and performances in those courses in high courses. Here at UTA, Math/SAT correlates better with GPA than the verbal SAT. This is not the usual case in the national sample. I suspect this has a lot to do with the presence here of the technical school, technically oriented programs and grade distribution in science, but the Math SAT is a very good correlator here. As for women, they do outperform their SATs by roughly a quarter of a grade point overall. So do Asian students, and nursing students. Those seem to be the three groups that outperform, not only in SAT prediction but other predictions based on rank in class or any other prediction. They just outperform. I just don't know what to do about it. I would say that the women will get their revenge in our new probation policy - once the proposal is implemented, two thirds of people thrown out under probation regulations will be men.

Senator Burley Walker: I'd make the observation that it would be incredibly surprising if you didn't get good correlation between SATs for math and science and high school grades since they're teaching the tests in high schools. The fact remains that it doesn't track what they do in college. Dr. Wheeler in our Human Resource Management area looks at this in amazement. He says no reputable company offering psychological performance testing for companies trying to select employees would put their name to such a test and try to use it as a basis for evaluating potential employees. You could probably enhance the predictive value by a factor of five or six if you tossed a coin and said heads we admit and tails we don't. To say the SAT is the best we've got is to charitably say it's the best of the worst. But it isn't going to solve the problem.

If you're going to talk about the kind of distribution we have, we're reducing the population from which we're trying to attract students. Now, maybe we should be doing that. I'm not prepared to say that. But raising the SAT scores in the face of 20 year declines in SAT scores doesn't sound like a reasonable way of solving the problem. It sounds more like opting for a path that makes us a part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

With respect to advising, some 33 years of experience in doing that on this campus makes me very skeptical about how well this is going to work. I go through this every semester when the Registrar's Office tells me students aren't being enrolled in courses when advanced registration printouts and class rolls show that they are.

In terms of centralized advising, the biggest problem we have is a capstone-required course, a senior level course. Twenty percent of the enrollment in that course in which we always run out of seats, is represented by students who are not business majors, but are undecided. They didn't make the hurdle for admission as business majors, but they're still taking business courses. Maybe we can come up with a way to change that by redefining the prerequisites. That's a possibility. That's not the Registrar's responsibility, that's ours.

Dr. Lewis Baker: Centralized advising won't be centralized for business majors, once they are business majors, but at the freshman and sophomore level, where things are more confused. I think having one unit is going to allow us to work more effectively. I'm not going to promise you that the prerequisites are going to be absolutely enforced all the time, but I think that your advisors should be keyed into all the prerequisites.

Senator Walker: I don't have any objection to centralized advising. I went to a school that had centralized advising. But that was in the 1950's. It worked very well. But I'm skeptical about all the benefits we're necessarily going to obtain. I'm not persuaded that it will guarantee that we're going to somehow get better students or take students, and some of our minutes said marginal students, I'm not worried about marginal students, maybe we can do something with them. Sub-marginal students, the ones presumably we're keeping out, we shouldn't have to worry about with respect to advising. They ought not be here in the first place. So, I'm not sure we're gaining anything except a lot of sound and fury, which in the Shakespearian sense, signifies nothing.
Senator Wood: Did you say at the beginning of your presentation that Hall's data measuring the correlation between SAT scores and GPAs here at UTA was .10? Chairwoman Ridgway replied that it was an R-squared value of .10.

Senator Wood: You interpret that as a promising correlation?

Dr. Lewis Baker: I don’t interpret it as being particularly meaningful one way or the other.

Senator Petry: (To Dr. Baker) I understand that there is the possibility that there are universities which have requirements for admission which they don’t adhere to. Dr. Baker responded that there is some anecdotal evidence of this. Chairwoman Ridgway asked Dr. Baker to explain the amendment passed by the Undergraduate Assembly to provide for individual case reviews for those students who don’t meet the admission standards. Dr. Baker explained that the amendment allows for individual reviews using other indicators other than just class ranking and standardized tests to make evaluations of individuals.

Senator Walker: What proportion of the Dallas Independent School District, high school graduating class would be eligible for admission if the new standard were in effect? Their latest average SAT was about 747 for the whole district. For a district of that size we might expect a normal distribution of scores. Dr. Lewis Baker stated that he had not seen the figures, but if it is a normal distribution, most of them would be ineligible, except for the top 10%.

Senator Walker: You talk about our setting admission standards so that we’re going to do things for the State if we say we will only consider the top ten percent of the graduating class for admission. That’s incredible! Dr. Lewis Baker responded that a large number would be ineligible under our present standards. Senator Walker replied that raising the standards wouldn’t be a problem if the students are already ineligible.

Senator Hissong: Has there been any evidence or reports that indicate when the standards go up, enrollment goes up with it?

Dr. Lewis Baker: The last time we raised standards, enrollment went up by five percent, but we don’t know that it was because of the increase in standards. I would urge you to look at the alternative transfer program. I think we can make an argument that if you prepare students better at junior colleges, they would do better when they get here.

Senator Walker: That suggests that we ought to be an upper level university rather than offering four-year baccalaureate degree programs.

Dr. Lewis Baker: Not entirely.

Senator Porter: I understand that when UT Austin increased standards 10 years ago in an effort to cap enrollment, they got more applications.

Dr. Lewis Baker: Research and education rarely will control for many of these things. There were many things going on at the time the standards went up. Economy went down at the same time standards went up and students decided to go to school since they couldn’t get jobs.
Senator Weed: Is there a plan afoot to quadruple our efforts to recruit good students in the Metroplex? This university has always been very thin at recruiting qualified students. We've just sort of set here and let them come to us. Are we going to become more competitive out there seeking these students? Dr. Bill Baker replied 'I would hope so. That's independent of whether standards are changed or not. We've tried to work out early admission programs with Arlington, Duncanville and Mansfield ISDs. We're talking about their top students. We're doing the same thing with the community colleges.'

Further discussion followed concerning recruiting.

Chairwoman Ridgway: Vice President Baker, maybe this pertains to the Academic Foundation, but do you perceive any problems with undergraduate assembly, I think with Political Science even though it was tabled, suggesting a 2.5 entry and then a 2.0 to stay in the area of Political Science and yet perhaps that person wants to teach, and CPTE says they must have a 2.75 in your academic major, is this a bit of a conflict? Do you perceive that another unit that does not have an academic major can perhaps tell that person what they have to do with their academic major that is different than their own entrance admissions?

Vice President Baker: Conflict bothers me. It bothers me - that was in a sense what started this whole thing - that everybody wants to set requirements above and beyond University requirements. We have students who can never get into a program - they are in "never, never land." We have situations where students can never get into a program, but they complete all the requirements for graduation - they go in the side door. That is what we are trying to roll back - that tendency for preferential requirements of different programs. Because it leads to pushing students into areas they don't necessarily want to study but where they can get in and like gravity, everything sinks down to the lowest level - some people get over run with students and they want to raise their requirements. Pretty soon we've got all these departments without good communication with the students and we are not going to change that overnight as an institution. The intent is to roll this back, eventually and evenly, so eventually we won't be caught in that conflicting situation. I don't like teacher education. I don't like it at all but they have problems and precedence is set by a number of other units and it is hard to say "no" to one once you've opened that door.

Chairwoman Ridgway: Is there any more debate, question, discussion on the motion?

Senator Pape: The Engineers on the Undergraduate Assembly are going along with centralized advising? Across the country the Engineers are screaming at centralized advising. Dr. Lewis Baker replied that the Engineers will have the option of providing advising to the Pre-majors and the Academic Foundations program can enforce that requirement.

Chairwoman Ridgway explained that the Academic Admissions package, plus the amended motion by Senator Hermann to include the additional requirement that admission standards substitute 3 units of high school mathematics and 3 units of science was to be voted upon. Senator Petry requested a secret ballot. A Yes vote means that you support the motion to adopt the academic standards as amended - a No vote means you are not in favor of the motion. The motion to stop debate carried. The question was called. Ballots were cast and there were 25 yeas, 6 nays, and 1 abstention.

New Business: Professor Ladde requests that the Committee on Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Responsibility give him a hearing as he alleges violation of his academic freedom, denial of due process and administrative changing of grades without his consent.

Professor Ladde: (A summary of Professor Ladde's statements). Professor Ladde summarized the sequence of events concerning grade changes for a section of MATH 3335 he taught during the Fall semester of 1990. Professor
Ladde wanted to bring the situation to the attention of the Faculty Senate. He stated that at the end of the Fall, 1990 semester, he personally discussed with each student his/her final grade, in his office. It was his experience that there were no complaints at that time. On January 14, 1991 the Department Chairman brought to his attention the student complaints. Professor Ladde was told at that time that the complaints had already been discussed with the Advisory Committee, the Dean, and Associate Chairman and others, prior to his own knowledge about the complaints. The Chairman gave Professor Ladde only one four-page complaint letter from a student whose grade was "F". Professor Ladde stated he was shocked and surprised that he had been teaching 25 years and had never had anything of this kind. Professor Ladde stated he was told by the Chairman - "You are destroying the department, raise the grades." Professor Ladde stated he told the chairman that this was not professionally proper and that he could not do that. He stated that he also expressed at that time that there is a due process to express concerns to the restructure unless there is compelling evidence that show that there is any discrimination, differential treatment of procedural irregularities. Without these, Professor Ladde told the Chairman that it is unfair to the profession, unfair to him to make any changes under a superior's pressures. Professor Ladde stated the Chairman gave him only one four-page letter from one student who had a failure grade. He never gave any other letters at that time even though he requested them of him.

Professor Ladde stated that there were three departmental committees involved in this grade grievance/complaint process:

1. The Advisory Committee
2. The Confidential Committee (originally called as the Special Committee of Senior Faculty) the goals of which were to
   a. study this case in depth
   b. clarify any faults of Professor Ladde's or students
   c. determine the extent of damage to the department
3. The Special Faculty Committee, the goals of which were to
   a. review the grades
   b. make the grade change corrections where appropriate

Professor Ladde stated that the only report he received through the Chairman of the Mathematics Department was the report from the Confidential Committee, dated February 8, 1991. The meeting was chaired by the Associate Chairman. The report stated:

The Committee recommends the following:
1. Professor Ladde be given a copy of all the student letters of complaint, with the names of the students removed.
2. Professor Ladde be instructed to evaluate both the course and the grades in his section of MATH 3335.

All the existing tests of MATH-3335-101 were graded by the two professors who have recently taught this course. One instructor graded slightly higher than Professor Ladde and one graded slightly lower.

On May 2, 1991, the original grade complaints were twisted to include syllabus coverage and preparedness issues. Professor Ladde reported that new charges were not brought to his attention until May 8, 1991 and these were learned through the copy of the memo dated May 7, 1991 from the Dean to the Vice President of Academic Affairs which had included copies of the department's memos of May 2, 1991. He says these allegations were never made by the students in their original complaints, and that they were not justified by the Associate Chairman, the Chairman or the Dean.
Professor Ladde stated he made several attempts to discuss the case with the Dean but was unsuccessful. He had been advised on April 29, 1991 by the Dean to write up his concerns and give them to the Dean, which he did on May 9, 1991. This report was given to the Vice President by Professor Ladde on May 9, 1991. On May 22, 1991, Professor Ladde met with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the first time an administrator had given him an opportunity to discuss the matter. He was able to express his serious concerns about the case and wrote a very strong but humble protest, along with justifications to the Vice President and made serious attempts to find the conclusion about the case. On June 10, 1991, he made an appeal of the decision on the grade changes to the President. Professor Ladde stated he had made a serious attempt to resolve this mysterious case with the Chairman of the Department of Mathematics.

Professor Ladde stated that he presented his case to the Chairman of the Equity Committee of the Faculty Senate on October 30, 1991, and that he met with the Equity Committee on November 14, 1991 and January 24, 1992. He received a complete report of the Equity Committee at the end of May, 1992. The Equity Committee findings contains the following conclusions:

"The Equity Committee finds that Professor Ladde was treated unfairly in this matter. However, the Equity Committee notes that this may be the result of Professor Ladde’s refusal to discuss the matter with students unless they first withdrew their appeal of grades. It was clearly improper for Professor Ladde to insist that the students negate what they were entitled to do. The Equity Committee further finds that Professor... was attempting to maintain and present a balanced perspective of the situation.

The Equity Committee finds no evidence of salary discrimination."

Professor Ladde believes his academic freedom and procedural due process has been violated by the handling of the grade complaints, shallow evaluations, erroneous and incorrect conclusions, the lack of a full hearing by the departmental committees, the twisting of the original grade complaints to include syllabus coverage and preparedness, and the grade changes.

In conclusion, Professor Ladde made the following request of the Faculty Senate:
1. to bring this matter before the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom and Responsibilities as well as any other appropriate committees as soon as possible
2. that the committee conduct an open hearing; and
3. that the outcome of the committee's action be reported to the Faculty Senate.

Chairwoman Ridgway referred Professor Ladde’s request to the committee so that it can provide a hearing.

Senator Antoniades inquired to whom does this committee report? He also inquired about restrictions involving open meetings. Chairwoman Ridgway stated that the committee reports to the President. Vice President Bill Baker said that the meetings aren't subject to open meeting regulations. They aren't required to be open. That doesn't mean they can't be. If the individual requests an open meeting, it probably can be.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:
Burley Walker
Secretary of the Faculty Senate
Sandra Warner, transcriber