

DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

October 5, 1992

The second regular meeting of the Faculty Senate for the academic year 1992-1993 convened in Room 212 of the Main Building at 2:15 p.m. on October 5, 1992.

Waneen W. Spirduso (Kinesiology and Health Education) presided.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Daniel A. Bonevac, Brian A. Breman, Oscar G. Brockett, Patrick L. Brockett, Ned H. Burns, Alan K. Cline, Eli P. Cox III, Donald G. Davis, Jr., Randy L. Diehl, Kenneth R. Diller, John D. Dollard, John R. Durbin, Elizabeth W. Fernea, Karl Galinsky, J. David Gavenda, Mark P. Gergen, Paul D. Gottlieb, Betsy S. Greenberg, Sue A. Greninger, Kenneth J. Hale, Martha F. Hilley, George K. Herbert, Joseph M. Horn, Ira Iscoe, Irene Kacandes, J. Parker Lamb, Guy J. Manaster, Susan E. Marshall, John D. Martin, Christine M. Maziar, Karen L. Rascati, Peter J. Riley, Joel F. Sherzer, William G. Spelman, Waneen W. Spirduso, Sharon L. Strover, Madeline C. Sutherland, William O. S. Sutherland, Linda M. Thibodeau, Delbert D. Thiessen, Michael P. Thomas, Patricia A. Wilson, Dolora A. Wojciehowski.

Absent: Caryn L. Carlson (excused), Helen L. Erickson (excused), Alan W. Friedman (excused), Stephen T. Gerald, H. Paul Kelley (excused), Dale E. Klein (excused), Joseph E. Kruppa (excused), Robert G. May (excused), M. Ray Mercer (excused), Deborah K. Morrison (excused), Alba A. Ortiz (excused), Patrick L. Parker (excused), Ricardo Romo, Stanley J. Roux, Jr., Alan T. Schauer, Christine L. Williams (excused).

Total members present 43

Total members absent 16

Waneen W. Spirduso (Kinesiology and Health Education) called the meeting to order.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of the Meeting of August 31, 1992 (DELAYED).

Ms Spirduso advised the Senate that the Minutes of the August 31, 1992, meeting had been delayed.

II. REPORT OF OFFICERS

A. Report of Chair

1. Faculty Representative to Women's Athletic Council

Ms. Spirduso announced that Mike Quinn had been appointed to the Women's Athletic Council by President Livingston to fill the remainder of Maureen Grasso's term.

2. Faculty Representatives to the Administrative Committee

Ms. Spiriduso announced that Paul Gottlieb and Susan Marshall had been chosen by the President to serve on the Administrative Committee of the University Council.

III. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

B. Report from the Committee on Modified Retirement

James T. Doluisio (Dean, College of Pharmacy): "Our committee's primary thrust was related to reviewing retirement policies, but I want to also review with you a change about to occur in modified service because it puts our committee's recommendations in the proper context. Alterations in modified service were developed by another committee. In the past, faculty members serving on modified service received 25% of their academic rate for each three-credit undergraduate course. Under the new procedures there is a ceiling of \$7,000 per course, (\$14,000 per half-time appointment) independent of what the person's academic rate was prior to retirement. This, of course, represents a new budget control on modified service, which will no longer have the impact on the retiree that it once had.

"Turning now to the ad hoc Committee on Modified Retirement, you have a handout containing a letter to the President which covers two recommendations (See Appendix A D&P 4289-4294). Let me review recommendation No. 2 first. In the beginning we sent out a letter to all faculty (who were 55 and older) and put a request in On Campus, asking faculty to indicate what problems they have had regarding retirement plans. The response was impressive, and the general theme was, 'we cannot get the information we need to make a good decision.' We learned that, while those in the Teacher Retirement System get very detailed information including seminars about retirement policies, those faculty on Optional Retirement Programs received virtually no information. The problem, we found, was that there are about eighty ORP programs which is far too many for OPSER to deal with individually. However, 80% of faculty are on ORP. Thus we have recommended that the President instruct OPSER to prepare written materials as well as seminars for faculty on ORP. We have volunteered our committee as a resource to the Personnel Office to help develop questions and answers. We believe that this recommendation will produce informed individuals who will be familiar with the many facets of the Optional Retirement Program. It is our understanding that the office of Personnel Services is already gearing up to provide improved information on ORP.

"Our primary recommendation (No. 1) has to do with proposed phased retirement policy, a policy which is permissible under Regents' Rules and legislative authority. The proposal is that upon retirement from a full-time position, one can develop a contractual relationship with The University (for up to three years) which specifies actions by the faculty member and actions by The University. Such an approach represents an important modification for the new change in the modified service policy. Thus a person can enter this new phased contract, and then move into the new modified service policy with its ceiling on compensation. Notice that, when a faculty member retires, tenure is lost but is replaced by a three-year contract which has been agreed to by the department chair,

budget council, dean, and the executive vice-president and provost. Note also that the proposed policy states that 'a person shall not serve as a member of a department budget council or be elected to serve in the University Council or any committee of faculty to which members are elected by the faculty if a person is retired.' On the other hand, voting status in the general faculty and in colleges and schools can be retained. As you can see from the handout material, the actual document is being reviewed at this time by the UT System Office for approval. I hope the faculty will regard this as a fair policy for themselves and a fair policy for The University.

"Among the areas where new concepts are needed is that of incentives to retirement. In California, for example, the state retirement system (similar to our Teacher Retirement System) is able to add additional years of service to a person nearing age 65 and thus provide extra benefits for immediate retirement. In Texas, however, that approach could not be applied to those in ORP and hence the policy would have no benefit to most faculty throughout the State. Thus Texas should devise a new method of retirement incentive which would be equally beneficial to those in both retirement programs. If any of you have great ideas in this area please contact our committee. Now let me take questions from the floor."

Ira Iscoe (Department of Psychology): "As I understand, a faculty member can accept a three-year phased retirement but then be turned down for future appointments if the department indicates that they do not need the expertise of that particular faculty member. Is that correct?"

Mr. Doluisio: "Right."

Mr. Iscoe: "Therefore, to be safe many will not choose phased retirement because of this uncertainty."

Mr. Doluisio: "I think that is right. And that is why The University must develop an incentive for retirement. Let me note that phased retirement is best for someone who is ready to retire immediately but would be willing to teach part-time for three additional years. However, remember that the teaching duties to be performed must be specified clearly as part of the contract."

Mr. Iscoe: "Just one other technicality that I am sure your committee has considered. When a person retires and is hired at a reduced rate, do the released salary funds stay in the department budget or go to the Dean's office for redistribution?"

Mr. Doluisio: "My experience has been that instructional salaries stay in the department, but the committee has not discussed this aspect of implementation."

Alan K. Cline (Department of Computer Sciences): "I want to ask about a higher level matter having to do with how the retirement policy was constructed. I am very concerned about the state of faculty governance, the role of the Faculty Senate, and the role of the University Council. Several years ago at the time of the federal law changing the mandatory retirement age, the University Administration developed a new policy regarding retirement. As I recall this was done during the summer. I do not recall any consultation with faculty, especially with any of the faculty representative bodies (University Council or Faculty Senate). My question is this: 'Is it intended that this document be submitted to the

University Council or Faculty Senate for review?' I understand the Committee contained five faculty members which I think was a good idea. Neither am I disagreeing with the document, since I have not even studied it. But I want to find out what you think the faculty's role will be, especially the Faculty Senate's role?"

Mr. Doluisio: "I hope that John [Durbin] will respond since the initiative for this committee came from the Senate. However, we were appointed by the President as his advisory committee. We have obtained a very broad input and have provided our advice to the President. Minutes of all our meetings were sent to John [Durbin] and then later to Waneen [Spirduso]. You are hearing it presented today and you have documentation in front of you (except for the actual contract). If indeed you wish to provide additional advice to the President, I would strongly encourage you to do so. All we want is a policy that is fair. And if there is something unfair about this policy, I strongly encourage you to contact the President and let your views be known." Mr. Cline: "It is my understanding then that you do not expect this matter to be submitted to the University Council."

Mr. Doluisio: "I cannot speculate on that. I can only say that this committee was asked to provide advice to the President."

Mr. Cline: The Regents' Rules give the faculty certain rights with respect to governance of faculty welfare. It seems that the faculty are being bypassed."

Mr. Doluisio: "That is another issue, it seems to me."

Ms. Spirduso: "Do you have any sense of the President's predisposition on this? You said earlier that the UT System Office was studying this matter. Does that mean that the President has approved it?"

Mr. Doluisio: "Patty [Ohlendorf], do you want to respond to that question? My understanding is that a draft form of this policy has been sent to UT System for review, and perhaps for approval. Is that correct?"

Patricia Ohlendorf (Vice Provost): "Yes, the President has approved this policy and it has been sent to the UT System Office for review. I want to make one clarification on what was said earlier regarding the new retirement policy appearing in the summer. That was the summer of a special legislative session, and representative Libby Linebarger proposed a bill that had the support of the State, TACT, and some other faculty groups (although I do not think it had the support of UT-Austin faculty). My recollection was that this bill had been urged on her by faculty and the state to eliminate the mandatory retirement age for faculty. As you know the mandatory retirement age, except for faculty in institutions of higher education, was eliminated some years ago (and will be nationwide for faculty in 1993). In Texas it was eliminated that summer. In order to comply with this new law, mandatory retirement for faculty was removed from the Regents' Rules. Under the previous policy faculty could retire early and retain tenure. This is not allowed under the new state law. Thus the new retirement policy is a Regents' Rules change mandated by law. This present ad hoc committee, at the urging of the 1991-92 Faculty Senate, is attempting to find a replacement for previous incentives toward early retirement."

Mr. Doluisio: "There was some sentiment among faculty (whom we contacted last year) that those who are approaching retirement would have liked this policy to be in place

so that it would aid them in a decision about retirement. The earlier we can get new policies established will be in the best interests of those approaching retirement."

J. David Gavenda (Department of Physics): "I want to return to your comments about the Optional Retirement Program versus Teacher Retirement System. Over the last couple of years I have talked to Frank Wright, a former executive director of TACT, about that issue. He helped draw up the Optional Retirement Program in the beginning. He said that, if one looks at the founding legislation, there is only one retirement program. And although the money is handled either through Teacher Retirement or through Optional Programs, they are supposed to fall under the same general rules as to how they can be used. He did not think there would be a problem with what you were talking about earlier. It seems to me that, with respect to 'added years' the problem is an actuarial one. The Legislature can not arbitrarily allow people to get five more years of benefits in the TRS system without funding those extra years. And if they can fund those, then they should also fund them in optional programs. That is, they could make contributions to either the TRS program or an optional program for five more years of benefits. Thus Frank did not think there was a technical problem there. Rather it is one of working out the politics."

Mr. Doluisio: "I hope that is the case. However when one considers all State employees who are under a longevity system and then University employees under Teacher Retirement System, I suspect the percentage who have chosen the Optional Retirement Program is rather small in comparison. I hope that we are going to develop a feature for those in the Optional Retirement that is of equal benefit and incentive as one that might be proposed for the Teacher Retirement Program."

Karl Galinsky (Department of Classics): "If one chooses a fifty percent teaching option, is it possible to shift the entire teaching load to one semester, i.e., full-time one semester rather than half-time for two semesters?"

Mr. Doluisio: "Yes, it is my understanding that one can be full time for one semester, zero time for the other semester, and be termed a half-time employee for the year. Also, this can be done whether one is in Optional Retirement or in Teacher Retirement."

Joel F. Sherzer (Department of Anthropology): "As chair of a department, I have been advising faculty about retirement for several years. I am not sure this proposal will make such counseling any easier. I would describe this new policy as a 'bottom up' procedure, meaning that Budget Councils together with chairs and finally deans will be making recommendations. Some faculty might be recommended and others might not. I would presume, knowing the way The University seems to be going at present, there would be greater chances for approval when we recommend faculty who teach large, lower-division classes."

Mr. Doluisio: "Clearly, any good policy can be misused. But if our intent is to give an incentive, and that was really how our committee was developed, then I believe that the new policy does provide an incentive. Consequently it would not be wise for The University to subvert this policy. Obviously, some negotiation regarding required activities would be needed. If I were a department chair, and one of my faculty members was going to enter into a three-year contract which allowed me to recruit a new faculty member in a year or two, I might be flexible in the negotiation."

Mr. Sherzer: "What always seemed to me to be an easy way to do this would be for the department to say we are not going to hire on that line, therefore let us use a portion of the money that we need for this purpose. Then we do not even have to worry about talking to the dean, the provost, and the President. But we have never been able to do that sort of thing with any money that we have had."

Mr. Doluisio: "This is an agreement that the faculty member and The University will honor for three years. It is not a 'handshake agreement'. There is a known end result."

Mr. Sherzer: "But it is not open to everyone. Some people might get it, and some people might not."

Mr. Doluisio: "One cannot predict the exact results at this point."

Mr. Iscoe: "Suppose there was a gifted undergraduate teacher who took on a class of 80-90 students, for a stipend of \$7,000 during modified service? He may as well work for Austin Community College. I think that is sort of demeaning. Good undergraduate teaching is quite difficult, and we are offering only \$7,000."

Mr. Doluisio: "Remember that we are dealing with constant resources and wish to balance The University with young faculty as well as those who have made contributions for many years. There must be some type of trade-off. I honestly do not know if there are going to be exceptions. Some people say the phased contract should be renewable. Others say it should be done only once. Clearly this policy is designed for a University dealing with constant resources that wants to re-energize itself."

William O. S. Sutherland (Department of English): "I want to comment on the three-year arrangement. It seems to me, having watched people in my own department retire, that some of them retired at 70. However, others retired much earlier than that because they were able to. If they taught under the previous modified service policy they were able to have a satisfactory income by supplementing their retirement with teaching. However, if someone were to consider retiring at 65 under this phased retirement policy, the term limit of three years might be a positive disincentive. If The University is anxious to get at least some of that money which it got under the previous modified service policy, it might be wise to consider carefully the age at which faculty want to begin this phased retirement. Maybe for some, three years would be an acceptable number, but for others five years would be more attractive. I understand The University's urgent desire to capture all of the salary, but if it creates a positive disincentive, it will not capture any of it for awhile."

Mr. Doluisio: "Let me say that we tried to strike a balance between the needs of individuals (who are 35, 45, and 65 years old), and needs of The University to continue recruiting young assistant professors. What I am hearing today is basically a concern about retirement. We had hoped for a positive interpretation rather than a negative one. I would like to suggest that, if indeed you have concerns, they should be formalized and sent to the President. But as you put forth your views, you should do so with the interest of the entire faculty, which includes those who are in mid-career, those who are just starting out, as well as those who are nearing the end of their careers. I hope that you balance your views and your advice, if you choose to provide it. I am somewhat surprised by the general

theme I have heard today because we did have extensive faculty input into this committee. However, if the Senate coalesces around another approach, then I think that you should provide that advice to the President at this time."

Mr. Galinsky: "It seems that we at UT are always re-inventing the wheel. Did you look at any other institutions and their experiences for this three-year plan?"

Mr. Doluisio: "We had an extensive list of approaches at other universities. One of the things we were concerned about is hurting The University. At some institutions we have seen 57- and 59-year old faculty, who are at the top of their skills, being given a window of opportunity for early retirement that ends up damaging their institution. However, many of the features of those retirement programs are applicable only to our Teacher Retirement System. We did not see many prototypes at other places that would be applicable to those in the Optional Retirement Program."

Mark P. Gergen (School of Law): "Are you proposing a salary cap on modified service, or is that proposal on another track?"

Mr. Doluisio: "That is another committee."

Mr. Gergen: "I gather UT would limit phased retirement (that is part-time) to three years. Is this going to implicitly limit our ability to give part-time tenure contracts to other people? Thus, if there is an older person we want to hire part-time we can only give them a three-year contract?"

Ms. Ohlendorf: "There are still a few people who chose early retirement and kept tenure. But our current policy is to not have part-time tenured appointments."

Mr. Gergen: "Is there now a hard rule against part-time tenured appointments? Because we in the Law School have considered such appointments to be possible."

Mr. Doluisio: "I did not know there were any examples of part-time tenured faculty."

Mr. Gergen: "My question is, is there a formal rule against it?"

Ms. Ohlendorf: "Yes."

Mr. Doluisio: "To my knowledge, at the time, all part-time appointments are annual appointments and need to be renewed each year."

Ms. Spirduso: "Thank you very much, Dean Doluisio. We really appreciate your taking the time to give us a report on this and answer all of these hard questions. John, did you want to make a parting comment?"

John R. Durbin, (Department of Mathematics): "Regarding the role of the Senate, I agree with Jim that, if the Senate wants to, it should send its opinion to the President. In response to questions about faculty input, the faculty members that were put on the committee were recommended by me. I recommended four names, and tried to get people who were forceful and who would take this issue seriously. And I think they were very

concerned with getting as much faculty input as possible."

Ms. Spirduso: "If any of you have questions about this policy and would like to have those transmitted to the President, write your questions and give them to me. I will put them together in some way to make sure that the President receives them. If you would like to have more discussion of this issue in the Faculty Senate, please let me know."

II. REPORT OF THE CHAIR (Continued)

Ms. Spirduso: "We have several other items to discuss. But first, be sure and sign up for one of the four Senate committees on the list being distributed. Based on meetings with former Faculty Senate chairs and other groups of faculty, there seems to be concern about these four issues regarding the big picture of this university. Since we will have a new president coming shortly, along with several other changes in the central administration, now is the time for us emphasize the issues that we think are important."

IV. NEW BUSINESS (Continued)

A. New Committee Structure

1. Faculty Advisory Committee on University Budget

"We have discussed previously the budget advisory committee which was active last year. We have asked Chair Gay Jentz to meet a few more times to discuss possible structure and function of a new budget committee which would be active throughout the year and have systematic interactions with central administration on budget."

2. University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee

"This committee will study the feasibility of a university-wide committee on promotion and tenure and, if appropriate, also study the structure and function of such a committee. At present final decisions on promotion and tenure are made by the president and two vice-presidents although we have strong faculty input at the departmental and college levels. The question is, is it an effective procedure for 150 vitas or resumes to be read by three people for the final decision? Is there a better way? Although, no one wants another layer of bureaucracy, there is a possibility that more faculty input could be provided to the final decision process."

3. Faculty Committee to Recommend Criteria for University Program Review

"This committee would be addressing the notion of a system to review programs on a rational basis so that, if we were required to make hard decisions about programs (either growth or reduction), we would have a system in place, and would not have to react in an emergency fashion. This subject, incidentally, is being discussed by the UT System and in all of the components."

4. Faculty Committee to Review Strategic Plan

"How many of you have seen The University's strategic plan? Only a few faculty have reviewed this document because it was put together by the administration. Several

questions have arisen among various faculty. One of the big questions is, 'who is looking at the big picture and how do various actions affect The University as a whole?' For example, when somebody recommends a new program or new courses, how is that going to affect The University? You will recall that, when the matter of multicultural courses arose last year, many faculty were concerned that no one seemed to know how the new requirement would affect the entire university. And no one knew what kinds of redundancy would be created. We do not have any current plan that examines programs and courses in any all-university fashion. What if we have runaway growth in a given area? Who decides on whether it is allowed to continue or whether there ought to be some curtailments. And what happens to the rest of The University if one department decides not to offer a service course anymore. There are many issues that have been raised about how The University functions as a community."

B. Report from Committee on Modified Retirement (Order of Business was reversed to hear this report at the outset of the meeting.)

C. Discussion of the newly created Division of Rhetoric and Writing

Ms. Spirduso: "As you know, a division of rhetoric and writing was approved by the President August 28, 1992 and will become operational June 1, 1993. You have received a document outlining its function, structure, logistics, faculty, and rationale. There have been several questions raised, but I think we need to keep in mind that this division has been approved by the President and it will exist as of June 1. What we will be discussing here are some of the faculty concerns regarding the nature of the approval process. One concern is that the Division Director will apparently have some control over some English graduate courses, and that he or she will have control over the selection and scheduling of T.A.'s. However, the Director could possibly replace A.I.'s with Lecturers. In addition the Director can appoint faculty members and, although he/she will consult with the chair of the faculty member's department, he/she does not have to obtain approval from the chair. What will the nature of these appointments be? What will the nature of the arrangements with faculty of other departments be? What happens in the recruiting, evaluating, promoting, and terminating of faculty? Those functions generally are held to be the responsibility of faculty, so as to insure the quality of faculty. And yet it is unclear how these faculty might be appointed and function partly under the jurisdiction of the English chair's responsibility and partly under the Division Director. I am going to open the floor to any comments that you might have or any suggestions regarding what might be an appropriate response for the Senate on this issue."

Mr. Galinsky: "It seems to me that this entire matter is under discussion by the Dean [of Liberal Arts] and the [English] Department. I really do not see any reason for the Faculty Senate to interpose itself at this point. Referring to the memo of September 9, 1992, from Evan Carton, the graduate advisor, he notes that Dean King had indicated that the document we received was not meant to be prescriptive in its details and was open to modification with respect to particulars. The ongoing discussion is reiterated by the dean in his letter of September 9 to Joe Kruppa, chair of the English Department. It seems to me this is not a one-sided, heavy-handed sinister situation. Obviously, this is a matter of concern to faculty of the Department of English, as it well should be. But in light of the ongoing discussions, I do not see much of a purpose for the Senate to enter the situation."

Elizabeth W. Ferne (Department of English): I would differ with Professor Galinsky because I think the issue of rhetoric and composition, though we may wish to make it a separate category, really does affect more than the Department of English or the College of Liberal Arts. We are talking about basic educational procedures and processes. The fact that many operational matters have to be worked out is certainly true. However, many are concerned with the effect on students, particularly since only one member of the English Department faculty was in favor of this proposal. Again we are back to issues of faculty governance and the relationship of English (or any other liberal arts subject) to the entire university curriculum. I do think this is in the purview of the Faculty Senate. Should people wish to speak, I would certainly see that that was appropriate."

Mr. Galinsky: "I do not wish to deny anyone the right to speak here. My comment should not be taken in that way. On the business of faculty governance, I went over to the Faculty Senate office and picked up the copy of the Bean report. The genesis of this recommendation for a separate division is a faculty-student committee that, so far as I could see, had no particular axes to grind. They discussed this matter at length. Thus this recommendation came about as a result of considerable faculty input. It does affect the entire university and many people on campus think it is a very good idea. If there are other opinions, it is entirely legitimate for the Faculty Senate to listen to them."

Ms. Spirduso: "The letter you have from Bob King to English Chair Joe Kruppa, indicated that he wanted to get a committee of faculty to work with him to flesh out the plan and that this committee would include faculty from the Department of English as well as other departments. Bob King has indicated that he is willing to do that. There were several faculty who felt very strongly that this should be brought before the Faculty Senate."

Mr. Durbin: "Although I was not one of those who said it should be brought before the Faculty Senate, I did raise questions to the University Council and I do not plan to say anything about it until Dean King comments to the Council, and tells us what is going on. Then there might be a number of people who want to say something."

Brian A. Bremen (Department of English): "I would like to apprise the Senate of a few concerns of the [English] Department itself. With respect to the Bean committee, there was only one member of the English Department on that committee, Larry Carver (an associate dean). As was mentioned before, there is only one member in the department who is in favor of this separate division. Several people, both graduate students and faculty, think that one of the real strengths of the present rhetoric program is its marriage with the literature program. The creation of a separate division would really destroy this strength. These are concerns of the English faculty."

Irene Kacandes (Department of Germanic Languages): "Anything that could so dramatically affect the life of a department and its faculty should not be undertaken without consultation of that faculty. I would hate to think, as much as I trust my dean, that he could divide my department without faculty approval."

Ms. Spirduso: "Maybe one of the questions that faculty might want to ask Dean King at the University Council meeting is how much consultation occurred before that final document was sent forward to the President."

John D. Dollard (Department of Mathematics): "Upon reading the document describing the new division and looking at the rationale, I came to wonder who had written it. There seems to be an accusatory element involved. I finally thought I understood the rationale when I read the sentence, 'Given the size and interests of the current English Department, it can be predicted that insufficient attention will be paid to expository writing courses.' I wonder who it was that reached that conclusion, and whether it is warranted."

Ms. Kacandes: "One of my concerns as a faculty member is how satisfied the current members of the English Department are with the committee that has been set up to investigate how the Division of Rhetoric will operate. As Professor Galinsky suggested, we have been assured that a committee is going to discuss this rather fully. But I was wondering who has actually been appointed to that committee and how comfortable the faculty members of the English Department feel with the composition of that committee. Does anyone have an answer to that?"

Mr. Sutherland: "I do not believe our department chairman is here, but to my knowledge no committee has been appointed yet. That rationale (noted by Professor Dollard) is a false history of composition in the department. The department has had a very prominent national role in composition, and I say that because I was the first chairman of freshman English as well as chairman of the department for almost seven years. Many of our faculty have been active in national organizations relating to instruction in composition. Most of the English faculty who have been involved in composition agree that, if there is a better way to teach composition, then let us do it. We are all in favor of that. However, if faculty will read student evaluations, (as most of us have had to do over the years) they will see that teaching basic composition is a difficult matter. In the present instance it appears that the students are essentially happy with the current method of instruction. We have spent a tremendous amount of time in training instructors and in supervision. It is my understanding that this aspect was not discussed in the Bean committee. The recommendation was brought in by a subcommittee and simply accepted by the committee. One of the things that bothers us is that this matter has not received very much discussion. It may have in the administration, but it appeared in the Bean committee report in December or July, then it appeared in the On Campus publication sometime in the middle of May when most of us were about to leave. Then the final decision was made on August 28. It all happened very quickly and very quietly."

"We think it is important for people to know about the experience of other institutions. For example, the University of Michigan Engineering School decided to teach composition to its students. After three or four years, they then asked the English Department to take back the course. The Michigan State University did exactly the same thing for about ten years and then decided to put this instructional program back into the English Department. However, when it came time to merge the two departments there were all kinds of objections from the English Department because the Composition Department, had not exerted proper standards in giving people tenure. Since composition involves only lower division courses, what one must do to obtain tenure is apparently quite different from what one would have to do to obtain tenure in a department that has both lower division undergraduate and graduate work."

"I would say the Educational Policy Committee would be a good one to look at the experiences that other institutions have had. This study should not take an argumentative stance, but ask what is best for the students. What we have tried to do in the English

Department is what we thought was best for the students. I am arguing that we should not have an adversarial relationship with the administration. They should work for our good, and we should work for their good. In these cases we have all got to work for the students. Although I realize this particular matter has been settled, we would like for the process to get an airing. The tenor of the meeting held in the [English] department concerned what was best for students. It was not adversarial in tone. I would like to see this subject go to the Educational Policy committee because, as Professor Fernea indicated, it is of interest to everybody.

"Although I am glad to see the administration making a gesture to undergraduate education, I think it is a misguided gesture. For example of our freshman class, 60% place out of English 306. We teach only the 40% who must take E306, and the others do not take any Freshman English. My proposal to the administration has been to leave E306 outside The University. Let students take that course prior to entering the University, and then let us teach those students who are going to graduate. The 60% we do not teach are just the ones we ought to be teaching. That is the kind of gesture I would like to make to undergraduate education as far as freshman English is concerned."

Ms. Spirduso: "Regarding the letter sent by Bob King to Joe Kruppa, indicating that he wanted to meet with him on September 16th to get some names and form a committee, to your knowledge has this committee been named?"

Mr. Sutherland: "I know a number of people have sent in their names saying they would not like to be on the committee. The last that I heard the committee had not been formed."

Joseph M. Horn (Department of Psychology): "Although Bill Sutherland spoke about a false history in the evaluation of this proposal, I was struck by his representations of the current teaching of composition courses, particularly saying that they were tough courses and that students were happy with them. On the contrary, during the discussions that we have had for the past couple of years, I think we have seen a lot of unhappiness with the current system of composition instruction. However, I think we can agree on one thing, that we ought to be doing what is best for the students, both current and future. It seems to me, given the current operation of composition classes, that this new arrangement offers every possibility for substantial improvements. I attended a seminar sponsored by the Department of English last spring. It was quite clear to me that many faculty in the English Department believe that grammar is politics, and one does not really teach grammar anymore, one does not grade papers for grammar because that teaches these young people to obey the power structure. Therefore, there really cannot be any limits to the kind of communication we place on people. This seemed to be a prominent theme in the English Department seminar about teachers bringing their personal values to the teaching of freshman English. If we are talking about an accurate history of this course, I think it is highly relevant that we talk about the philosophy of teaching these courses."

Mr. Gergen: "Quoting our constitution, it is within our power to express our views on matters affecting the organization, activities, and policies of The University of Texas. We could debate this issue but I am very uncomfortable debating it without a formal resolution. That is, we should request a particular action or express a particular policy as being the sentiment of the Senate. Frankly, I would like to see those from the English Department (or someone else) prepare such a resolution that we could consider formally."

My preference would be procedural, that is, asking for this matter to go to a specific committee or to a certain group for review."

Ms. Spirduso: "A resolution would probably be premature without hearing what will be discussed at the next University Council meeting. The dean has not even given his remarks. But I think your point is well taken. If someone would be interested in such a resolution, that person could work it up and we could certainly discuss it in the future. There are very few things the Senate can do in this particular instance other than express some kind of concern about faculty governance issues."

Mr. Cline: "I do not have an opinion on the Division of Writing and Rhetoric. However, I am amazed at how much happens at this university over the summer. Some parallels have been drawn between the Division of Rhetoric and the Division of Biological Sciences. It is true that both of them begin with the word 'Division'. As I understand, the Division of Biological Sciences was formed because we had three regular Biology Departments--Microbiology, Zoology, and Botany. There were some courses that seemed common to them and the division would make a sensible place to teach those courses. I guess I do not see the relation between the reason for that structure and the reason for this one. It (Rhetoric) seems to me to be a strange parallel. Lastly, when we come to the University Council with this one, there are two issues of concern. One is, should there be such a Division of Rhetoric and Writing? Another one is, what is the process by which this was created?"

Ms. Kacandes: "I want to suggest that we register, in writing to Dean King, our concerns about both the genesis of the Division of Rhetoric and Composition, and about the composition of the committee that will be setting up the division. We would like these two issues addressed explicitly at the University Council meeting or in writing to us as a Faculty Senate."

Mr. Dollard: "We already have a list of questions (that are in writing) which came from John Durbin. I wonder to what extent these new questions supersede them or whether they are in general agreement?"

Ms. Spirduso: "Does anyone object to adding two questions to the list prepared by John [Durbin]? (There were no objections) Are there further comments about this topic?"

Kenneth R. Diller (Department of Mechanical Engineering): "I have another question, regarding the intention of this division to affect faculty in any department other than the English Department, or in a College other than Liberal Arts. For example, in the College of Engineering, we employ faculty to teach composition and writing as part of our curriculum. Are the long-term implications in the formation of this [Rhetoric] division that these faculty (in Engineering) would become part of this Division, or would they be in a separate entity in which composition is being taught outside of the English Department and outside of the Division of Rhetoric and Composition?"

Ms. Spirduso: "That is a good question. Are there others?"

Martha F. Hilley (Department of Music): "Although it has been said this division is going to happen on June 1, 1993, in a recent meeting with Vice President Fonken, he indicated that this was simply a proposal, and that the operating plan had not been

developed. What are we to make of this apparent conflict?"

Ms. Spirduso: "The letter signed by President Cunningham approved this proposal subject to fiscal review and approval of the operating plan by the Provost. I think that everyone agreed that it will happen. What is not settled is how it will operate."

Ms. Kacandes: "Could I suggest the following for additional questions? I propose that we append four questions to those that Professor Durbin has already set forth. (1) the genesis of the proposal for a Division of Rhetoric and Composition with specific regard to consultation with the English Department faculty, (2) whether or not this division has already been funded by The University, (3) how this division will affect composition as it is taught in other departments and colleges, (4) the intended composition of the committee that will develop the operating plan for the Division of Rhetoric and Composition."

D. Information on Tax Sheltered Annuities

Ms. Spirduso: "I received an answer regarding tax sheltered annuities. We talked at the last meeting about the ceiling that has been put on tax sheltered annuities, and some faculty had questions about whether The University had interpreted the tax law too conservatively, producing a ceiling which was too low. I talked to a member of the Law School about this, and he indicated that the tax code sets three different limits on the amount that one can shelter. The person that I talked to is not a tax specialist, but he talked to someone who is a specialist in benefits for faculty. They also called a lawyer in Washington, D.C., used by the UT System. Briefly the answer is that it would not be worth the expense for one individual to hire a specialist to determine whether higher ceilings could be used. However, it might be worthwhile for some faculty organization to hire such a specialist. He thought that the UT System is pretty close to being right about it. If you are interested in having me call Larry Wright of the Texas Faculty Association to see what he is doing about this, let me know."

E. COFGO Communications

Ms. Spirduso: "The other item that I wanted to bring up with you is the COFGO meeting on Friday and Saturday, October 30 and 31. On Friday, Lieutenant Governor Bob Bullock will speak about the 1993 Legislature and how he thinks it will impact higher education. In addition, Representative Rick Williamson of Weatherford, who sponsored the performance-based funding proposal in the Legislature, will answer questions and discussions about this subject. At the banquet Nancy Atlas, a Houston attorney and the Chair of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, will share her concerns for higher education. She will speak about the faculty role in response to these concerns. On Saturday there will be meetings of various COFGO committees. I have some materials and registration forms for any who wish to attend."

F. Listing of Major University Issues

Ms. Spirduso: "Here is an opportunity for faculty to make some changes in faculty governance, and possibly have input to the policies of the new University administration. What I want you to do is to provide written answers to this question: 'what are the two or three most influential changes in policy, philosophy, or procedures that you believe would improve The University?' Here are some examples that I have received from other faculty.

(1) The process of developing business policy and making decisions such as occur in data processing and accounting, purchasing, etc., should be reviewed in terms of how they affect the productivity and effectiveness of faculty and the development of students. (2) This campus is drifting gradually toward decentralization, as colleges differ more and more in areas such as faculty salaries, departmental resources, and admissions control. Is this in the best interest of The University? The central administration, with substantial faculty input, should review this trend and prioritize its activities. (3) The University should adopt a long range plan that is developed from the faculty up to the central administration, instead of from the top down. Although the current Strategic Plan is a start in the right direction it does not address some critical issues. (4) Administrators should share with faculty at least some of the responsibilities for The University budgeting process. Financial and resource incentives should be developed for research productivity and successful grantsmanship, and should be distributed to principal investigators in the colleges. (5) The central organizational structure for administering undergraduate and graduate programs, coordinating and facilitating research programs, and developing and controlling the research infrastructure should be reviewed.

"This is the time when we should come up with some suggestions and indicate our concerns. Even if our recommendations are not approved, the fact that we have worked on them will probably cause the Administration to consider them also. If you would indicate your suggestions, we will probably put these together in synoptic form and make sure that the new President has these for consideration. We may also want to discuss them in the Senate."

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no committee reports.

VI. OTHER ITEMS

1. Items from the floor

Ms. Spirduso: "At our November meeting I have scheduled Marsha Moss to talk about performance-based funding, and its implications for our campus. By that time we will also have been to the COFGO meeting and will have heard various legislative leaders, so we can give you a good summary of how performance-based funding may influence us.

2. Announcement of upcoming items for University Council Agenda.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:02. p.m. to convene next on November 2, 1992, at 2:15 p.m. in Main Building 212.

J. Parker Lamb
J. Parker Lamb, Secretary
The Faculty Senate