The Faculty Senate met in regular session on Wednesday, October 21, 1992, at 2:30 p.m., in Conference Room 4 in Davis Hall. Chairwoman Mary Ridgway presided.


APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The secretary submitted an incomplete copy of the minutes of the meeting of September 30, 1992. As a result of problems with the recording tape employed, there were incomplete comments and motions. The secretary requests that senators submit corrections for the omitted comments and motions so that the minutes can be revised and submitted for approval at the November 18, 1992, meeting.

REMARKS BY THE CHAIRWOMAN: Chairwoman Ridgway reported that she and Senator Petry would be attending the COFGO meeting in Austin. The agenda for the meeting includes getting well informed on how to survive higher education in the difficult years, performance based funding, and the Lieutenant Governor will review prospects for the 1993 legislative session as it will impact higher education.

She reported being contacted by numerous senators regarding the issue that we've all become familiar with in these past few weeks, and that's academic standards. It has been placed on the agenda and Senator Chiasson will present a resolution regarding this. Needless to say it's a multi-faceted proposal divided into two categories, admissions criteria and academic foundations program. It has many components which include requirements, continuation probation policy, admission standards, provisional admission, and transfer student requirements.

She said, "I perceive that this is an issue that can't be taken on in a single meeting and would suggest that after a reasonable amount of debate and discussion, that action on the resolution will be deferred until the next meeting so that each senator has a chance to survey his or her constituency regarding this very important proposal. I would also recommend that perhaps we invite person or persons from the Academic Standards Committee and anyone else who would be helpful in providing viable information, to make brief presentations on the proposed policies and be available for answering questions.

She announced that the President had appointed her as an ex officio member of the Undergraduate Assembly. She also announced
the called meeting of the Undergraduate Assembly, scheduled for November 10, 1992, at which the academic standard proposal is to be debated. The Undergraduate Assembly is scheduled to vote on the proposal on November 17, 1992, the day before our next scheduled meeting.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT AMACHER: The President stated that he had no remarks for today's meeting except to announce a get acquainted reception at the office of Multi-Cultural Services at 5:30 p.m.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT BAKER: There is a meeting of the Coordinating Board next week. There are several items which may be important to you.

Approximately 6 months ago the Commissioner for Higher Education proposed that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education adopt a new rule which would limit the number of credit hours that the State would fund for doctoral students to 80 hours. Now, for your information, the definition of a doctoral student is someone who’s been admitted to a doctoral program and has either a masters degree or at least 30 hours of masters credit. The proposal would say, that beyond the master degree or the 30 hours of initial credit, which would be funded at the masters level, there would be no more than 80 hours funded at the doctoral level. I think you are all aware that the formula rates for doctoral hours are significantly higher than they are for undergraduate and masters hours.

There was quite a bit of objection to that proposal and the result was that it was referred to a committee. The Commissioner appointed a special committee to make a recommendation to the Coordinating Board. That committee hasn’t made its recommendation. But, at least, unofficially, the committee has voted to recommend that there be a cap on the number of doctoral hours that are funded, but it is to be set at 160 rather than 80 hours.

I think it’s fairly clear that the 160 hours won’t be acceptable to the Coordinating Board or to the Commissioner and I don’t know whether there’ll be some kind of a compromise or how it will come out.

In the past, UTA has had a space standard of 114 square feet per FTE. Under proposed new standards we don’t fare quite as well. The proposed new standard will be somewhere around 98 to 99 square feet per FTE. We currently have about 100 square feet per FTE. So by these proposed standards, we are an institution with excess space. If you look at the various categories, our excess space is all in two areas, office and research space. We are significantly deficient in library and class room laboratory space.

These standards may be good for the State but they don’t track my experience around our campus. We don’t have the excess faculty office space that the proposed formulas suggest we’ve got.
By the same token the research space formula is driven almost entirely by the level of external research funding. The reality is we don’t have a lot of external research funding on this campus. I don’t know how this is going to come out. I don’t know exactly what the implications will be. My guess is that the standards will be adopted.

Some time ago, I believe in 1987-1989, the Legislature passed a law requiring that the Coordinating Board do an evaluation of all doctoral programs within a five year period of time. The Board was to recommend that the programs be reapproved, terminated, or reapproved with conditions. All of our programs have been recommended for reapproval with the exception of the Materials Science program in Engineering. Because it is a relatively new program, it is recommended for reapproval with conditions.

The MA degree with a major in Anthropology is on a list of programs recommended for approval on a consent calendar. Search committees are engaged in the searches for a new Librarian and Dean of the Graduate School of Social Work.

QUESTIONS FOR VICE PRESIDENT BAKER: Chairwoman Ridgway reported receipt of departmental faculty meeting minutes at which the Vice President discussed formula funding based on credit hours by the categories of hours taught by full professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and part time. The minutes state that formula funding would be based upon who taught the course. If the course was taught by a graduate assistant or part time instructor there would be zero funding.

Dr. Baker replied, "I hope I didn’t say that. I hope it wasn’t reported that way. Where is it reported?"

Chairwoman Ridgway replied that it was the Mathematics Department.

Dr. Baker stated that he hadn’t met with the Mathematics Department. He went on to say, "I don’t know what that context would be. Probably what that refers to is a revised basis for the faculty salary formula which does use a faculty salary which is a composite of the average of the various ranks that teach at a given level in a given area."

"For example take the Masters Program in Mathematics. Mathematics uses the Liberal Arts formula funding rate. The average salary that’s used to drive the formula rate is, in fact, a composite of average salaries of professors, associates, assistants, and other, who actually teach masters level mathematics courses or Liberal Arts courses in the state of Texas. That’s probably what that refers to. It’s not that it wouldn’t be funded, it’s that to some extent the salary used is a reflection of who actually teaches the courses at that level.

Chairwoman Ridgway: It has been suggested that elimination of the summer program would increase faculty research because the
faculty would have more incentive to obtain other research grants.

Vice President Baker: I've never heard of any discussion on doing away with the summer program. Over the years the amount of our money that's gone into the summer program has decreased. Way back in the Dark Ages, a very high percentage, around 18 to 20 percent, of our 12 month expenditures on faculty salaries went into our summer program. I do think that that system provided a disincentive for faculty to find other sources of funding. In fact, this Senate has taken such a position at one point in time. That percentage has decreased over time. I think at one point that was a deliberate effort. More recently, the lack of summer funds has been a budgetary problem. Clearly, with the nature of our institution we cannot do away with our summer program.

Senator Petry: I'd like a clarification on the number of hours allowed for doctoral degrees. Does that include research hours? Dr. Baker replied, "Yes it does."

Senator Trask: Dr. Baker, what is support space? Dr. Baker replied that it's certain kinds of administrative space, shops, electronic repair areas, etc. Anything that's not direct instructional or office space.

Senator Herrmann: President Amacher, I appreciate the fact that you made the chairperson of the Faculty Senate an ex officio member of the Undergraduate Assembly. What does it take to get her a vote? President Amacher replied that it takes a change in the Handbook on Operating Procedures.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Senator Petry distributed part of an information packet that he had recently received from COFGO. The information he provided was about history and activities of COFGO. He particularly directed our attention to items 3, 4, and 5. Item number 4 talks about a data bank of information resources maintained by COFGO. He also called our attention to a summer internship program offered by the Coordinating Board and the opportunity to serve on Coordinating Board committees.

OLD BUSINESS:

Senator Porter: Last spring we were discussing the area of faculty and student academic responsibility. That was being considered by the Academic Liaison Committee. It was tabled at that point. I move that we remove that from the table and refer it back to the new Academic Liaison Committee. The motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

Senator Antoniades made the following motion, "The Faculty Senate
welcomes President Amacher’s stance on dissemination of information. In upgrading the dissemination upward, from School, Department and College levels to the Office of the President, the Senate respectfully suggests to the President, to request through an administrative memorandum, that copies of the faculty approved minutes of the faculty meetings of Schools, Departments, and Colleges, be forwarded to his office on a routine basis." The motion was seconded.

Vice President Baker indicated that he received some minutes but was not sure that he received them all. President Amacher said that the motion was reasonable and that he would send such a memo. A vote on the motion wasn’t necessary. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Chairwoman Ridgway indicated receipt of a proposed revision to chapter 4 of the Handbook on Operating Procedures from Dean Perkins. The Handbook on Operating Procedures requires that this revision be subjected to review and comment by the Faculty Senate.

Senator Fetty moved approval of the proposed revision. The motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote.

Senator Antoniades moved the following: "...that an evaluation of Associate and Assistant Deans or other administrative personnel appointed by the Deans, Chairpersons, or heads of Schools, departments, or colleges of this campus, be conducted periodically, as prescribed for everybody else by the HOF and that such evaluation would include faculty and student participation, that the results of such evaluations with the related statistics be communicated to the VPAA, who should give timely feedback to the interested faculty, that the President be informed on the results of such surveys, and that remedial action—including termination from such duties—be immediately taken if such action is warranted by the result of the evaluation." The motion was seconded.

Senator Duwaji remarked that he had seen a number of these reports and that he didn’t recall any A+ or F evaluations. Usually the conclusions were mixed. This puts a heavy burden on the VPAA and President. A more efficient way of doing evaluations needs to be proposed.

Chairwoman Ridgway asked if the Handbook on Operating Procedures provides a process for such positions. The Vice President responded that the present situation, based on the Handbook on Operating Procedures, calls for annual evaluation of faculty, informal annual evaluation for Deans and chairpersons, and formal evaluations for Deans and chairpersons every four years.

Senator Antoniades commented that he was really talking about the appointed administrative personnel. An evaluation process for these people was never spelled out in the Regents’ Rules or the Handbook on Operating Procedures.
Senator Weed expressed concern about including students on such evaluation committees. Senator Tolbert expressed concern about whether or not students realize the sophistication required to evaluate these people.

Senator Girardot inquired if the motion included administrative assistants? Senator Antoniades responded that administrative assistants are classified personnel.

President Amacher announced his intention to name an ad hoc committee on governance to prepare a policy consistent with the Handbook on Operating Procedure.

Senator Walker moved to table the motion. The motion was tabled.

Senator Chiasson moved approval of the changes in academic standards proposed by the Academic Standards Committee. The motion was seconded.

Senator Chiasson offered the following explanation. "All of you have received a copy of changes in academic standards proposed by the Academic Standards Committee. My own view is that the proposed changes offer a welcome prospect. Two objections that I have heard raised deserve serious consideration. I'm heartened to see that the Academic Standards Committee took these apart.

"The first is the one that President Amacher raised when he expressed his concern about smaller enrollments and formula funding. The second concerns the more specific issue, the size of the minority population. Our main focus should be retention and graduation as well. We aren't doing any student a favor if we let him or her in the door when we know or suspect that he or she is incapable of doing college level work.

"One of the most impressive aspects of the Academic Standards report is the Academic Foundations program. It is shown in detail under section III in the report. The Academic Foundations program aims to provide student support services that are necessary to achieve the goal of retention and graduation.

"I offer two hopes in relation to the reduced budget issue. These may be forlorn and naive hopes. But I would like to think they're near. First of all, that heightened standards, while discouraging perhaps marginal students, students who are flat out unprepared, might in fact draw new applicants who might not have come to UTA. My second hope is that whoever the powers that be are in this scenario, I don't know whether it's the Legislature or the Board of Regents, my great hope is that they are educated to realize that a system in which funding is based primarily or solely on student population rather than graduation rates really does a disservice to the people of Texas, whose taxes support us."

Senator Girardot asked if the proposed changes would violate the mission statement for the institution.
Senator Herrmann remarked that it is very clear that the mission of the University is the pursuit of truth, knowledge, and excellence. Nothing could be clearer.

Senator Petry requested that the senators look at Dean McElroy’s memo of October 2, 1992, and see how far down the list we are right now. He acknowledges that there are other universities that are quite abit above us. But there are some of those schools who have the highest SAT scores that are still getting more students. Senator Petry said, "Whether that’s because of what they are or who they are, I can’t tell. The College of Engineering raised its standards some time ago and it has not had a problem that I’m aware of."

Senator Korzeniowski said, "We can recommend whatever we want, but what does it do if we say yes or no?"

President Amacher replied, "You can answer that as well as I can. The way the Handbook on Operating Procedures is set up, the legislative body for this proposal is the Undergraduate Assembly. The only impact that a resolution from this group might have is to influence some people in the Undergraduate Assembly.

Senator Wood inquired, "If this proposal were adopted this year, how many students would we lose, and what would the dollar and cents impact be on formula funding and library resources? Among the students we’re now graduating, some would be admitted under these new standards, some would not. What is the relative portion of students graduating who would have been admitted under the proposed standards versus the proportion who would not.

President Amacher said that he had asked those same questions and was told that the necessary data to answer the questions aren’t in the student database. Answers would have to be obtained on a sample basis. He indicated that the Math Department had studied the matter and concluded that SAT scores were largely irrelevant. What overwhelmed the test was whether or not the students took 3 or four units of Math in high school.

Senator Wood asked what would be the policy for provisional students who don’t meet the higher standards. Are we merely moving these students from active to provisional status? What would be the likely impact on academic support programs, on academic development programs? There’s nothing that indicates how much money is to be put into these things.

Senator Weed asked why a transfer student with less than 29 hours must satisfy a fairly rigorous SAT score, being in the bottom quartile of their high school class. What is the thinking on the requirements for transfer students? These students seem at a disadvantage. I’m afraid it’ll keep students at junior colleges too long. They’ll go for the full 70 hours they can transfer.

Vice President Baker said that students with fewer than 30 hours
can enter under the freshman requirements. That's the current policy.

Senator Herrmann asked, "What are we supposed to do? Are we supposed to vote to recommend that thing? I have two major objections. The term research University appears which always makes me mad. A university is an institution where one learns by teaching and research, there's no such thing as a research University.

"The senate did pass almost identical admission requirements several years ago, and we also passed in April of last year, high school graduation requirements which are more important. I note that the Undergraduate Assembly didn't take that up."

President Amacher stated that he had discussed the matter with the presidents of UTEP, Brownsville, and Pan American, who are groping with the same issue we are. He reported that they are absolutely and adamantly opposed to use of SAT scores. They are moving toward unit requirements in Mathematics.

Senator Herrmann offered an amendment to the motion under consideration. "...that the high school graduation requirements approved by the Senate in April of 1992 which substituted 3 units for Mathematics requirements and 3 units of science. The motion was seconded.

Senator Walker: "I have to admit I'm not sure how all of this fits together. It seems to me that we're approaching a common problem from very different directions. So I would ask if it is possible for us to meet with the Academic Standards Committee to see if there is some common basis we can talk about before we pass on this resolution. I really don't see that we're getting very close to a solution when we're approaching it from opposite directions. I don't have any objections to your proposal Ulrich other than the fact that I'm not sure that simple substitution is the way to come up with the solution."

President Amacher said, "Let me comment on the question you asked earlier, because I think you've got some implications from my answer that I certainly didn't intend about admission requirements at other institutions. In my entire experience across a wide group of universities, it usually worked like this.

We would like to have next year, X number of students. We think in our best judgment, and in almost every case this was not a public discussion, it certainly wasn't anything but an administrative decision, that we need, in order to have a workable budget, X number of students. Then you get with the admissions people and it is very inexact in terms of how many you have to admit in order to produce the number you want. The admission standards go up and down. That's been my experience."

Senator Holder: My experience in Foreign Language is that students who are serious about their major tend to transfer out.
The high school senior who take the national exams are going wherever they can get the money.

Senator Duwaji: The minutes of our last meeting show that among issues of concern to the faculty, admissions standards are at the bottom of the list.

Senator Porter: Math and science requirements speak to a certain component of student preparedness. It doesn’t address language skills or anything. It seems to me that we’re complicating matters rather than facilitating them. To add one more component into the formula when the SAT score covers both the verbal and math components.

Senator Herrmann responded that his point is to get the high schools to do their job, to get the students prepared for university life. That can be done much better with high school requirements than SAT scores. But the difficulty is to get anything through.

The basic thing, why we need higher requirements is because they don’t come prepared. They know they don’t need to be prepared because we accept almost everybody. So why should they work when it was time to work, before their college life?

Senator Wood: I get very strong, very motivated, very capable students. I get very poor students. I’m not really sure that if I ran a check on the students I would discover that the really poor ones had only two units of math and the really good ones had 3 or 4 units of math. I don’t think that would be a useful discrimination instrument, for the courses I teach. I think this is what Senator Porter’s getting at. I kind of like Senator Walker’s idea. Maybe if the Academic Standards Committee is really interested in what we say, maybe they could take 30 minutes or more at one of our meetings. I’d like to see this tabled.

The amendment passed.

Senator Wood moved that the resolution to approve the proposal by the Academic Standards Committee be tabled. The motion was seconded and passed on a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

[Signature]
Burley Walker
Secretary of the Faculty Senate