

TCU Faculty Senate Meeting
5 April 2012
3:30 – 5:00 PM
BLUU Chamber

Unapproved Minutes

Senators Present

Bob Akin, Ronald Anderson, Onofrio Annunziata, Arnie Barkman, David Bedford, Martin Blessinger, Jon Burgess, Cynthia Chapa, Brian Clinnin, Richard Estes, Billy Farmer, Greg Friedman, Sarah Fuentes, Jeffrey Geider, Diane Hawley, Bi Ying Hu, Cara Jacocks, San-ky Kim, Ted Legatski, Carrie Leverenz, Suzy Lockwood, Steven Mann, Dianna McFarland, Ed McNertney, Linda Moore, Johnny Nhan, Hylda Nugent, Steve Palko, Katie Polzer, Jan Quesada, Ranga Ramasesh, David Sandell, Chris Sawyer, Marie Schein, Paul Schrodt, Krista Scott, Alan Shorter, R. Eric Simpson, Gloria Solomon, Loren Spice, Janet Spittler, Gregory Stephens, David Vanderwerken, Stephen Weis, Jo Nell Wells, Dan Williams, Barbara Wood, Qiao Zhang

Senators Excused

Lynn Flahive, Misha Galaganov, Tracy Hanna, Stathis Michaelides, Michael Sawey, Michael Strausz, Angela L. Thompson

Senators Absent

Julie Baker, Joddy Murray, Magnus Rittby, Maggie Thomas

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dan Williams at 3:35 PM.

Welcome Guests

Chancellor Victor Boschini, Provost Nowell Donovan, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Kathy Cavins-Tull, Dean of the Library June Koelker, Director of Library Administrative Services James Lutz, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics Chris Del Conte, Assistant Athletics Director for Ticket Operations Sean Conner, ACE Fellow Dr. John Buckwalter, Emeritus Professor of English Bob Frye, and *The Daily Skiff* reporter Ryan Osborn

Approval of Minutes of April 5, 2012

The minutes from the April 5, 2012, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as amended.

Announcements

1. Ms. Susan Oakley, HR, Wellness Gold Program and Great Colleges to Work For

Susan Oakley, Human Resources, said that her department had sent out a reminder about the “Great Colleges to Work For” survey to those who were selected to participate. She encouraged the individuals selected to complete the survey, stating that it would only take about fifteen minutes.

Oakley continued by talking about the Wellness Gold Program, mentioning that several participants were in the room, including Chancellor Victor Boschini (who signed up at the picnic). The program, she explained, is initially six weeks and covers six areas of wellness. Individuals are asked to participate a little bit in each area. Oakley said that they have had some amazing results in terms of lower blood pressures and weight loss. If people have questions or would like to sign up, Oakley encouraged people to contact her or David Upton and they would be happy to put them on the waiting list for the next session.

2. Ms. Janine Kraus, Advancement, Faculty/Staff Campaign

Chair Dan Williams began to introduce Janine Kraus from Advancement who would speak about one of his things, the Faculty/Staff Campaign. Kraus asked Williams if he would like to say anything first; he responded by stating that he has volunteered to help with the Campaign for years because it is a really great program. He stated that we are not “giving money away,” we are “investing in our own infrastructure.” This money is a crucial source of support around the university – for scholarships, for technology, for classroom improvements. This money is directly fed back into our own community. Individuals can choose whatever source of funding they want around the university. Williams said he likes to give to the library because the library is in a situation where journal subscriptions go up around 5% each year. The rate has gone up over 30% during the last five years. While the Provost has been wonderfully generous and gracious in finding money, it is hard for the University to keep up alone. The library can still use our support. Williams proposed that we are in a situation of great concern. The physical plant, made up of the university’s lowest paid employees, contributes at the rate of 89%. That’s incredible. They are shooting for 90% this year. Some of our colleges are a little down the list. Overall, the University was at a 73% contribution rate last year and he would really like to see it hit 75% this year. He stated that Jeanine Kraus would tell the Senate (at which Kraus encouraged Williams to continue) that most universities would boast at a rate of 40-50% participation; people are aghast when Kraus announces the TCU rate of participation. This speaks of how close we are as a community at TCU. Williams hopes that we can continue to keep building on that sense of community.

Kraus stated that she echoes everything Dan Williams said. When she goes to conferences and they find out she is from TCU, the first thing people say to her is,

“Tell me about your Faculty/Staff Campaign.” We are well known across the country for how generous our employees are. She underscored that the Campaign never focuses on dollar amount. It is only focused on participation. She praised the TCU faculty and staff for their support of the institution through their donations. Dan Williams from Faculty Senate and Randy Chambers from the Staff Assembly are co-chairs. If members of the Faculty Senate have not received their packets in the mail, they were encouraged to contact Kraus. She announced that last year the Campaign totaled over \$440,000.00, so it really all adds up when people give what they are able to give. She and her staff are happy to do presentations at any university groups; if so interested, members were asked to contact her directly.

There was a question from the floor regarding payroll deductions. Kraus clarified that if people had already signed up for the payroll deduction, that would continue automatically unless the campaign was notified of any desired changes. One does not need to “re-sign up.” Kraus closed her presentation by thanking the Faculty Senate for this opportunity to speak about the Faculty/Staff Campaign.

3. Reminder: Frogs for the Cure

Chair Williams reminded the Faculty Senate of an announcement he had sent out at the request of Mary Patton, Dean of the College of Education, regarding Frogs Race for the Cure, a great event. There was a fundraiser on Tuesday, April 3rd, 5:00 - 8:00 PM. At Potbelly’s, 25% of sales went toward the team’s goal.

Williams spoke briefly about the Faculty/Staff Picnic held on Saturday, March 31st. This is the first the Faculty Senate joined with the Staff Assembly in this venture. There was a good turnout and many people brought children. Overall, he deemed the joint venture a success.

4. Director of Intercollegiate Athletics Chris Del Conte and Assistant Athletics Director for Ticket Operations Sean Conner – Stadium Seating Review

Williams introduced Del Conte and Conner, stating that, in response to concerns, they would address Athletics and the process for stadium seating selection.

Chris Del Conte began by stating that he had received many emails from faculty and staff on this subject, so he would start from the beginning. He stated that he was hired by the Chancellor, they discussed building a new stadium. The Chancellor and Board of Trustees said that they would build a new stadium, but not one ounce of funding would come from the University; he was to raise every single dime. This was in November. Their goal was to have \$90M by June. The Chancellor said, “Trust me – this is TCU. We’ll have it.” The original plans were to just redo one side of the stadium. However, everyone jumped on board and, in short order, they were at

\$140M, so they decided to do an entire stadium. This all happened in a two-year span. Normally, stated Del Conte, this happens over someone's career.

Del Conte continued by addressing the individual gifts that were the "founding" contributions and the additional gifts given for the stadium. With the size of these gifts, he knew they would need suites. The unintended consequence is that thirty-seven rows of seats would be lost. That meant that 3,600 seats would be missing between the "twenties." That meant that there would be a lot of people who were going to be adjusted. The original plans were made with TCU in the Mountain West Conference. Three months later TCU joined the Big East and they had to start the pricing structure, keeping in mind that they only had a 45,000-seat stadium with roughly 13,000 season ticket holders. In 2006, a priority point system was put in place (as a result of the limited number of Texas/TCU tickets). This was based on how many season tickets one held and direct donations to the Athletic Department. At this point, no one knew TCU was going to build a new stadium. Del Conte decided to have four town hall meetings to explain the process. He gave a brief account of the presentations given at the town hall meetings, as well as the plans to move to the Big East Conference.

He stated clearly that his concern was not anything against the faculty and staff ... it was simply to address the question of how to seat the stadium with fewer seats. In an effort to be transparent, the system was put online so that everyone could see how seats were selected. The first day people were buying twenty, thirty, forty tickets. He relayed what he called "a long story" to give the history since 1992. This included the fact that a university could lose its NCAA qualification if it didn't average 15,000/year in paid attendance. Those individuals who had been buying a large number of season tickets since 1992 had the most points and therefore were able to pick first because of those points. Del Conte then talked through decisions that were made to accommodate the factors of the loss of the number of seats and getting into the Big Twelve. The student section was raised up, the students put down below, and thirty-seven rows of chair-backs and bench-backs. He countered the argument that the west side would be hot. Given that the games in the Big Twelve start at 11:00 AM, 2:00 PM, and 4:00 PM, it is going to be hot everywhere. The non-conference games will be at night. Del Conte also stated that this is not like high school where there is a home side and a visitors' side. Our entire stadium has to be the home side. But he realizes that it is hard for people to get used to that process. He reiterated that there has never been an attempt to shun faculty or staff, that he held four open town hall meetings to discuss this. He again stated that efforts have been made to make this process very transparent. As of today (April 5, 2012), they are at 13,000 tickets sold. They are simply not in the same location.

Del Conte then asked if the senators had any questions regarding his remarks. Chair Williams said that online it looked like a lot more than 13,000 tickets had been sold. Sean Conner and Del Conte clarified that you have to take into account seats for

players' families, recruits, and student areas that have been blocked off, so what one sees online gives the impression that a lot more tickets have been sold than actually have been.

Senator Legatski asked questions regarding the cushion orders that had been cancelled because seats were bench-back. Del Conte responded that people can have cushions, just not backed cushions in those sections. The additional depth of backed cushions adds up, resulting in less room for people in rows below; the additional two-inch width adds up on row width as well, affecting individuals on the ends of the rows.

When asked if there will be "yellow dot" single-seat season tickets, Del Conte responded that there will be, but not until the entire process of seating is completed. This has to do with a discrepancy between what was planned for seats and what has actually been installed.

Senator Mann asked if Del Conte expected an increase in season ticket sales. Del Conte responded that, yes, there has been an increase every year. He also explained the pricing of tickets in general, from season tickets to individual ticket sales.

Senator Palko stated that *The Star Telegram* has given them a 4.0 in selecting new coaches. He asked if it was possible to keep that grade-point average in selecting a new basketball coach. Del Conte said that it has been an exhausting process, but is convinced that we have something to sell in Texas Christian University. TCU's graduation rate for basketball players is 88%. In responding to another concern in this regard, Del Conte stated that we want to win every game, but that we cannot win at all costs. A new coach must realize this. We have to have a coach who knows Texas. Del Conte wants someone to come to TCU who understands that this is a special place. There are coaches who say they want to come in and make "crazy money." "We just aren't going to pay that." We have to be mindful of who we are.

Del Conte then thanked the Senate for the opportunity to appear before it and hoped that all was good.

Emeritus Professor of English Bob Frye (a guest at today's Senate meeting) stated, "I understand that money talks and I think that loyalty ought to count." He wished to make a few observations "without complaining." He recounted coming to TCU in 1966 and buying his first season tickets in 1969. He sat next to Prof. Flowers and his wife, and near organ professor Emmett Smith (who produced thirteen Fulbright scholars – "There are lots of ways to be loyal to TCU."). Also near was M. Jack Suggs, Dean of Brite Divinity School, and translator of The Oxford Study Bible. Frye also spoke of his years coaching the women's basketball team. He stated his tickets had been on about the thirty-seven yard line up under the cover. He added that he appreciates and loves the work that Coach Patterson has done on the "front porch

of the university” and the PR and the Rose Bowl, but that he was disappointed that faculty and staff didn’t have a little bit better shot at some of the seats. But he thanked Del Conte for the work he is doing, said he was glad that Rice let Del Conte come this way, and said he wishes the best for TCU.

Del Conte thanked Frye for his comments, stating that a lot of people feel the same way. However, this was the fairest system that they could figure out, but that he knows there were unintended consequences. He gave an example of one of the things the point system does not take into account: there is an individual who has been buying tickets since 1947, but the point system “is awarded on donations and everything else and he’s now left in a place he could not . . . [*sic*] and that point system was written in 2006.” It is a combination of both. Del Conte continued by saying that, not only did they raise an entire stadium, but his goal with the Frog Club is that they will raise ever one of their scholarship dollars. They are very close to getting every one of their scholarships covered. If they hit that number, that will speak volumes of the support that they have. In conclusion, he said that this [seat selection process] was not to be disloyal – it’s just the system (and he apologized for that), but he had no other way of doing the stadium.

Frye responded by saying, “I not only accept your apology, I just say, ‘Go TCU!’”

Old Business

1. Professors Greg Friedman and Ed McNertney, TCU Core Curriculum Review Charter

Senator Friedman recounted how Senator McNertney had come before the Senate in the fall to talk about the full review of the core curriculum in the 2013-14 academic year. Friedman said the AEC [Academic Excellence Committee] was asked to write a charter for a committee that would do the review. He stated that the proposal distributed with today’s agenda speaks for itself. The more substantial parts have to do with who will be on the committee. They were looking for representatives from all the Colleges. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee is charged with appointing a chair and a few of the other members. Essentially they wanted representatives from each of the standard college divisions and other representatives that were familiar with various major aspects of the Core. The first section of the document says who those will be and how those will be chosen. The later sections of the document outline what the job of that committee will be (which will be to access and review the Core and send any recommendations for changes back to the Faculty Senate). Friedman then said he was happy to take any questions anyone had about anything that is in the proposal.

There were corrections from the floor regarding the official names of the Colleges listed in the document. Friedman apologized and suggested that we vote on the

document with the understanding that he would go back and correct all the names of the Colleges.

A motion to accept the proposal was moved and seconded. With no further discussion, the proposal was unanimously accepted.

2. Professor Bob Akin, Report on COIA [Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics]
Senator Bob Akin reported that COIA had its annual meeting in January at the University of Tulsa. He stated that they work very closely with the NCAA and the FARs [Faculty Athletics Representatives] and wished to present some of that highlights from discussions held during the annual meeting. He praised Dr. Rhonda Hatcher, TCU's FAR, for her fine work. There is a move afoot to bring in the anti-trust exemptions for the NCAA to congress, so we will be reading about that. Also, Mark Emmert, President of the NCAA, backed off his stance to pay athletes \$2,000 each as a stipend on top of their scholarships. This topic was vigorously discussed. Akin, among others, voiced his opinion that if this was to happen, "the appearance of evil will step in." Who will monitor this? A colleague from Texas voiced that it should be done. Akin then put it into context for the Senate. Of the 119 Division One full athletic programs, six of them make money. If one starts taking \$2,000 per athlete, and TCU have roughly 485 athletes, he suggested that we could do the math on that. [@\$970,00.00]

Akins also stated that the NCAA, really through the Big Ten, is moving for freshmen ineligibility. They would basically take a "grey shirt" year in which they would not play, but spend the year establishing themselves academically. Akins said that he has worked closely with Chris Elrod, Director of TCU's Athletic Academic Services. TCU freshmen that play (*all* sports) have higher GPAs than those who do not play. Most coaches do not want to see this policy of freshmen ineligibility occur. According to Akins, there are inherent issues with the policy: freshmen can't play, they have a reduced practice schedule, and are not held accountable on the practice field in the same way as those who do play.

Another question that arose was "Should COIA advocate changes in the post-season bowl structure?" This brought a lot of discussion. Opinions seemed split about 50/50. Akins said he is fearful of one thing: if that Pandora's Box opens, he is worried about the NCAA if basketball figures out "PBS-type situation." If that happens, the NCAA could conceivably be in for some hard times and possibly be dealt a death blow, in his personal opinion and the opinions of a lot of others around the country. He spoke of the amount of money involved, giving the example of March Madness.

Akins continued by bringing forth an issue that he found "extremely telling." Jennifer Strawley [NCAA Director of Academic and Membership Affairs] and Diane Dickman

[NCAA Managing Director of Academic and Membership Affairs], who both work for the NCAA in their Compliance Division, are having a hard time defining “academic misconduct,” flooring the educators in the room. Akin gave a hypothetical example of how they defined it: if an athlete is taking a test and is sitting between a tutor hired by an athletic department and a student totally unaffiliated with the athletic department, the NCAA sees a violation if the athlete copies from the hired tutor; however, it sees no violation if the athlete copies from the unaffiliated student. Akins stated that he and Larry Gramling, Assistant Department Head of the University of Connecticut Accounting Department, have been contacted by Diane Dickman. They are going to help the NCAA identify and define “academic misconduct.” He suggested that his TCU syllabi might be a good place to start.

Akins then gave Secretary Alan Shorter a copy of his “Report to the Membership,” opting not to read all twenty-three pages into the minutes. He also stated that Linda Moore is chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee and the COIA representative at TCU sits as an *ex officio* member. After thanking Moore (also the former COIA representative) for her service, Akins stated that Moore brought him on as an *ex officio* member and made the suggestion that he be placed on as a voting member. The suggestion then went to the Committee on Committees.

At this point Akins yielded the rest of his time to his esteemed colleague from accounting, Senator Arnie Barkman.

Barkman then proposed changes to the charter of the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee. One proposal is to take the COIA representative, currently not a voting member, and change it to a voting member. There is also a proposed change in the language of the charter. Barkman read a portion of the current charter: “The primary focus of the committee is on academic matters.” The committee would like to add the words “student athlete wellbeing” to the charge. It also currently states that “the committee will seek information from appropriate officials regarding current developments related to student athletes’ academic concerns.” He proposed to add the following words: “and wellbeing, including financial responsibility, budget allocations, facilities resources, and compliance with NCAA rules and regulations. The committee will provide an oversight role, as well as an advocacy role as the voice of student athletes if questions are raised by the Faculty Senate or Student Affairs.”

Barkman stated that these changes have the blessing of COIA, the Committee on Committees, the Provost, and the Chancellor, and is in complete accord with retreat document from the Trustees that indicates “we take the stewardship of our athletic endeavors very seriously.”

Barkman then asked for unanimous support for this measure that would appear in the Faculty Senate records. When called for a vote by Chair Williams, the Senate gave its unanimous approval for the changes.

There was a brief discussion about the definition of *ex officio* and that it did not necessarily mean “non-voting.” Barkman said that historically the term, as it has applied to COIA, has meant “non-voting” and that this measure would ensure clarity of the aforementioned position having voting power.

New Business

1. Dean of the Library June Koelker and Director of Library Administrative Services James Lutz – Mary Couts Burnett Library Review

Dean Koelker began by giving some context for the fifteen-minute presentation she and James Lutz were about to present (as part of the current year’s academic master plan). They deemed that the library was to develop a “state of the library” report. As an introduction to the presentation for the Faculty Senate, she stated that it would be in two parts: the first segment would give the Senate a visual background to the history of the library; the second segment would be a PowerPoint presentation. Koelker then yielded the floor to James Lutz.

Lutz prefaced the presentation by saying that we would see an update on where the library has been and where it is going. He then proceeded to give a very detailed history of the development of the TCU library. A partial list of the items covered were the original models used by the library, the conversion from card catalogues to computers, the changes to the physical structure of the library, changes in the usage of materials policies, storage spaces, access procedures, the development of “Frog Pods” as collaborative computer spaces, digitization, special collections, introduction of the café, studies regarding student use of the library and its spaces, the library’s desperate need for more space, and the opportunities and challenges that gifts and special collections pose. He also mentioned that currently the library sees 86% of TCU students coming through its doors. He also pointed out that students need larger individual space in the library, upwards of four feet, because of the use of laptops, iPhones, and other technology devices. He also included images of other university libraries that featured their renovations and adaptations. At the end of this impressive and useful presentation, the Senate responded with a loud and long round of applause.

Koelker stated that she would be happy to provide senators with a PowerPoint presentation that deals with the conceptual approach. She stated that our image of a library often reflects the libraries that we grew up with, but this is not today’s world. Today there is a greater concern for spaces as learning environments and supporting different needs. Koelker then offered to answer any questions from the Senate.

Senator Palko commented that the current library is a wonderful place to be, a nice environment, and a fabulous resource. He asked Koelker about the pros and cons as we possibly look to the future of libraries in “the cloud” and the librarian as “cloud guide.” Koelker responded by talking about Digital Rights Management, saying that only one user can use those books at a time. She also said that more and more of the library’s budget goes to subscriptions, so the library doesn’t own any of that. They buy an annual license to use it. She proposed that the reason we are not seeing as many e-books so far is because the pricing models for Amazon and Kindle are very much “purchaser-only.” She is trying to keep abreast of some of the newer models where she can buy a site license for TCU that can be downloaded to a variety of different products. She also commented that things vary significantly from discipline to discipline in regard to how they use their information. Age of information can also be very important for certain disciplines. In addition, with the expansion of international scholarship, not all countries have the same electronic publishing alternatives. She stated that years ago she would have been more concerned with storage, but today there are more options for storage. The larger concern, actually, is that more people are doing more physically in the library building. She outlined how students use the library resources differently that in the past. Ultimately, students are spending longer periods of time in the library. She also stated that (in regard to “the cloud”) the concern is often ownership. She also spoke of the beauty of digital searching that cannot occur with printed materials. To put things into perspective, she stated that one hundred years of *The New York Times* has been digitalized and is all text searchable. There are also automated software products to do bibliographies.

When asked if she saw the need for more or less floor space in the future, Koelker responded that they would need different floor space. She is trying to store things differently, keeping in mind that some things need to be browsed, while others are not used that way (e.g., technical reports). The floor space is needed for students for studying.

Senator Barkman raised his concerns about the speed of advancements in technology, wondering if things that are retrievable with today’s technology will be retrievable in the future, especially those items that are not retrieved very frequently.

Koelker gave the example of the advent of videotape and compared that to today. Owning a VCR is becoming a rarity. When the University accepted the Van Cliburn archives, it was in various formats, including foreign formats. Given these types of examples, she concurred that there were reasons for concern regarding “retrievability.” She added that her job is easier because she is not at a research-level library and gave the example of Ohio State trying to pull all of its holdings into the 21st century. She also said that collecting patterns of a library (in regard to medical, biblical, and other special collections) reflect the curriculum of the university and make a library unique.

Chair Williams thanked Dean Koelker and James Lutz for their informative presentation.

2. Professor Suzy Lockwood, FGC [Faculty Governance Committee]
Resolution on Administrative Review

Professor Suzy Lockwood presented the following resolution on behalf of the Faculty Governance Committee:

*Resolution on Multisource Assessment of Academic Administrators
As submitted by the Faculty Governance Committee to the TCU Faculty Senate
March 29th, 2012*

Whereas TCU affirms a campus culture that emphasizes collaboration, reciprocity, cooperation, and connectivity, and

Whereas TCU upholds a firm institutional commitment to shared governance and a participatory process that encourages faculty involvement, and

Whereas multisource assessment is a performance assessment tool employed in many organizations that includes feedback from all stakeholders, members, and participants, including administrative subordinates, peers, and supervisors, and

Whereas there are no current, consistent protocols for the review of academic administrators,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the TCU Faculty Senate recommends the use of multisource assessment to review the performance of academic administrators. The assessment process should be completed by the evaluated administrators sharing their resultant thoughts and plans with their faculty.

Lockwood stated that the resolution involves multi-source assessment of academic administrators. There was one amendment that was sent forward to the committee concerning the above phrase “*Whereas there are no current, consistent protocols for the review of academic administrators.*” It was brought to their attention that the business school does have such a review system in place. Lockwood proposed that the phrase in question be changed to “*Whereas there are no current, consistent University-wide protocols ...*”

She continued by saying that the purpose of this resolution was to state that the Faculty Senate recommends the use of multi-source assessment to review the performance of academic administrator and continued quoting the final paragraph of the resolution.

One senator raised a concern that requesting “consistent university-wide protocols” might not reflect the differing goals of various departments. Senator Bedford asked for clarification of the phrase “multi-source assessment.” Lockwood stated that there

would be variety in the ways in which information is obtained, that it is not just one method. Senator Barkman spoke to the various methods in which the business school gathers information used for evaluation.

Chair Williams asked if there were additional comments. When asked if individual departments would define the methods of gathering information and was the document defining “multi-source” as insisting a department must use more than one method, Williams clarified that the Faculty Senate is making a recommendation to the Provost, but does not legislate university policy. He thought that perhaps the Provost might appoint a committee or sanction the standing evaluation committee to develop protocols that would include each department in a college. Lockwood reiterated that this was a resolution. Williams added that through this document the Faculty Senate would be taking a position that academic administrators ought to be reviewed.

Senator McNertney asked if other level of academic administrators other than deans (such as unit or department chairs) would be included in this review. Lockwood responded, “Yes, it could be” and spoke a bit about what the policies are in the Harris College. She believes that some of this evaluation is already going on in some parts of the University. The intent of the resolution was to insure that there is an opportunity for some evaluation going on at all levels of the academic administrators.

Senator McFarland spoke of a discussion she had with Ray Drenner, Chair of Biology, wherein he offered some information for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. McPharland recalled that Drenner had been a highly respected chair for about nine or ten years and he told her he had never been evaluated and would welcome it. He values evaluation and spoke to McFarland of some of the ways in which the department had improved its own curriculum through evaluation they had gotten on some courses, especially routinely taught courses. McFarland thought it was great that a chair would speak up in support of evaluation. She also suggested that, as the University moves forward, we are redefining ourselves and who we are. She lauded the Provost for administering a change in the manner in which deans across the campus were evaluated this year.

When there were suggestions of “wordsmithing” the portion of the resolution that stated “*Whereas there are no current, consistent University-wide protocols ...*”, Chair Williams suggested that in the interest of time they [Faculty Governance Committee] would try to rework the phrasing on that and that the Faculty Senate vote on the principle.

Chair Williams called for a vote on the resolution; the Faculty Senate passed it unanimously.

Additional Announcement

Senator Barkman reminded the Senate of the upcoming Holocaust Museum that would be held in the BLUU on Monday and Tuesday. Professor Harriet Cohen of Social Work will be speaking of her trips to the Polish Death Camps on Tuesday evening at 7:00 PM.

The Senate meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Shorter
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2011-2012