

TCU Faculty Senate Meeting
1 December 2011
3:30 – 5:00 PM
Kelly Center Boardroom

Approved Minutes

Senators Present

Onofrio Annunziata, Arnie Barkman, David Bedford, Martin Blessinger, Jon Burgess, Catherine Coleman, Richard Estes, Billy Farmer, Lynn Flahive, Greg Friedman, Sarah Fuentes, Tracy Hanna, Diane Hawley, Bi Ying Hu, San-ky Kim, Carrie Leverenz, Suzy Lockwood, Dianna McFarland, Ed McNertney, Thomas Moeller, Linda Moore, Joddy Murray, Johnny Nhan, Hylda Nugent, Steve Palko, Katie Polzer, Ranga Ramasesh, Magnus Rittby, David Sandell, Chris Sawyer, Marie Schein, Paul Schrodtt, Krista Scott, Alan Shorter, Michael Skinner, Gloria Solomon, Loren Spice, Janet Spitler, Stathis Michaelides, Angela L. Thompson, Michael Strausz, Maggie Thomas, David Vanderwerken, Stephen Weis, Dan Williams, Scott Williams, Barbara Wood

Senators Excused

Julie Baker, Rebecca Dority, Misha Galaganov, Ted Legatski, Jan Quesada, Michael Sawey, Gregory Stephens

Senators Absent

Bob Akin, Ronald Anderson, Jeffrey Geider, R. Eric Simpson, Jo Nell Wells

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM by Chair Dan Williams.

Welcomed Guests

SGA Representative Jennifer Villyard, SGA Representative Rachel Adcock, and Director of the Center for Academic Services Marsha Ramsey

Approval of Minutes of November 3, 2011

The minutes of the November 3rd, 2011, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as amended.

Old Business

1. Presentation by Professor Suzy Lockwood, Chair of the Faculty Governance Committee (PPP document and Inclusivity Resolution) – deferred from the previous senate meeting

Prof. Suzy Lockwood presented the “Resolution on Faculty Inclusivity.” After discussion of rewording, additions, clarifications, and applications, the following resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate:

Resolution on Faculty Inclusivity

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 all full-time TCU faculty should have the opportunity to participate in the structures of governance that are appropriate to them, and

Whereas TCU administrators and faculty must guard against forming specious hierarchies that unnecessarily limit faculty participation due to different ranks, designations, and duties,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the TCU Faculty Senate endorses a policy of inclusivity regarding faculty participation in governance structures; that full-time TCU faculty should not be separated into tiers of greater and lesser privileges due to their different ranks, designations, and duties; and that all full-time TCU faculty have the right to express their concerns and opinions in all appropriate departmental, college, university, and Senate forums.

(Approved by the Faculty Senate December 1, 2011)

Lockwood also introduced a recommendation regarding the “Policy on Employment of Professors of Professional Practice” document that was approved by the Provost and Academic Deans on March 5, 2010. Lockwood stated that a senator from Education approached her regarding a necessary revision. The document refers to “chairs.” However, there are no department chairs or departments in the College of Education. Lockwood proposed a portion of paragraph four be changed to read as follows:

Individuals may be appointed to the rank of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor of Professional Practice. Annual evaluations of Assistant Professors shall be made by the department chair (the tenured faculty in the College of Education) with the advice of the Faculty Advisory Committee for the initial five years of appointment.

FS Chair Dan Williams stated this was a document that was originally created in 2008, amended by the Provost's Council in 2010, and has now come to the Faculty Senate for approval. The intention is to recognize that the shape of the university faculty is changing and to respect the rights of permanent non-tenured faculty on campus. The Provost's intention is to instill as much shared governance across campus as is possible; the purpose of this document is to prevent the creation of a two-tiered system. The question was called and seconded. The Senate voted to accept the change.

2. Presentation by Faculty Senate Chair Dan Williams regarding proposed changes to "On the Evaluation of TCU Faculty Teaching: A TCU Faculty Senate Report."

Dan Williams reminded the Senate that the document is a White Paper, a position paper, from the Faculty Senate. The intention is that it be sent to the Provost and that the Provost would, in turn, send it out to the Deans and department heads with the suggestion that teaching evaluation procedure be reviewed. The first part of the document is a series of principles that state the position of the Faculty Senate. The Provost suggested we take self-assessment out of the "Suggested Best Practices" section of old document and put it in a new document as a principle. The suggested principle would read: *"Principle 6: Student input is a crucial – and required – part of teaching evaluation, yet it should never be the sole criterion for evaluation. When evaluating faculty pedagogy, at least three separate evaluative practices should be used."*

Senator Friedman stated that there had been a significant material change in an element of the document that perhaps was the whole impetus for the generation of this document in the beginning, the section that stated that student evaluations should not account for more than a third of a faculty member's evaluation. Williams stated that the Provost was opposed to the formula of 30% and Williams was attempting a compromise in order to expedite the process. Friedman reminded the Senate of the efforts made in May, 2011, when the proposal was brought to the floor for approval. At that time, significant effort went into getting the wording right on this part of the proposal.

Another senator asked why there was a need to compromise. Chair Williams reiterated his comment of trying to expedite the process. He also said that it was a document of the Faculty Senate and that he would be willing to take a friendly amendment to restore the original wording. It was the consensus of the Senate that the original wording be restored. Senator Lockwood added that, having been faculty senate chair, she felt it was important the Senate support the hard work that had been done in the committees and the FSEC (Faculty Senate Executive Committee). Additional support in this regard was also offered by other senators.

Chair Williams stated that he would make the changes/restorations as suggested and distribute this to the Faculty Senate. Barring strong objection, he would then pass it on to the Provost as our document and ask that it be forwarded to Deans and departments.

Senator Barkman pointed out that another section of the document had been eliminated directly before the listing of the suggested best practices. Williams stated that this could possibly have been a mistake and said that it could certainly be restored. It was offered by Senator Moore that perhaps we could just go back to the original document. Williams said he preferred not doing so because of the clarification that the addition of a new "Principle Two" (faculty responsibility for self-assessment) created. After further discussion, a senator suggested that we return to the original document, insert the new "Principle Two," (maintaining the integrity of the original document and the benefit of the new addition), and that the Senate refrain from further "word-smithing."

Senator Barkman asked if the phrase "members of the evaluation committee" had ever been defined. Williams's response was that that intent of the document was not meant to be prescriptive and that was meant to give departments as much flexibility as possible to contour their own evaluation committees.

Williams reiterated that he would incorporate the changes and send it out to the Faculty Senate. He ended this section of discussion by requesting feedback from the senators when they receive the new document. Senator McFarland added that the original motivation for addressing these issues was because the FSEC and others were hearing from faculty who were not clear about the criteria used to evaluate their teaching. It was intended to push forward a requirement that every department sit down and go over their specific criteria, review them, and consider some of the best practices suggested in the document.

New Business

1. Presentation by Ms. Marsha Ramsey, Director, Center for Academic Services

Marsha Ramsey began her presentation by clarifying how the Center for Academic Services can be found online. She suggested that the easiest ways are by going through the "A to Z" section of the TCU home page (by looking up either Academic Services or Center for Academic Services) or by going directly to <http://www.acs.tcu.edu/>.

Ramsey then began to articulate the work done by the Center, stating they work on academic skills, do advising (especially undecided students and pre-majors), and advise AddRan first-year student and students from Department of Design, Merchandising, and Textiles. They also oversee a program called College 101. They also do disability services and provide resources for faculty and staff.

Ramsey continued with a detailed outline of the work of the Center for Academic Services (CAS) and the support it offers for members of the TCU community. She stressed that if departments would like to have members of the center speak with them, simply contact her or CAS. In addition to information about the various skills the center teaches, Ramsey also detailed the kind of advising they provide for students, and introduced the Senate to the College 101 program and disability services. She also suggested that if faculty members have not updated the disability services portion of the syllabi, they should go the CAS website to get the latest information, as room numbers and telephone numbers have recently changed. Ramsey concluded by taking a few questions from the Senate regarding student numbers in the College 101 program (the first year about 175, last year about 220), and the most common hidden disorders. She closed by thanking the Senate for the opportunity to speak about the work that CAS is doing.

Following Ramsey's presentation, Chair Williams pithily introduced Will Stallworth. As Stallworth will be retiring, Williams thanked him for his decades of service to TCU.

2. Presentation by Mr. Will Stallworth, Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities (campus master plan)

Will Stallworth outlined projects that are currently being completed on campus, citing work on Sadler Hall and the Erma Lowe Hall, the latter a rather dramatic transition. In looking to the future, he reflected on some of the efforts that had already been done in regard to moving parking to the perimeter of the campus in efforts to essentially make TCU a pedestrian campus. He also acknowledged the need for a new parking structure and the need to examine how this might be achieved.

At this point, Stallworth showed the Senate photographs of recent transformations on campus. He then spoke of aspects of the new master plan that is being developed to meet the needs of the university. The next phase will be examining the eastern portion of the campus; efforts to address the needs of the library, nursing, and several other constituencies will be crucial.

Stallworth continued by discussing energy reduction projects and dispelled the urban myth that TCU does not recycle. TCU recycles all products from the buildings, but occupants do not have to do the sorting, eliminating messes in hallways, etc. While admitting that they need to do better in the residence halls, he believes that in academic and administrative spaces this is working very well. He also spoke of plans for additional sophomore housing. Construction will begin in June, 2012, with occupancy in August, 2013.

A detailed update on the stadium project was presented, as well as the Berry Street initiative and what impact that will have on traffic on the south end of campus.

Stallworth closed by stating that Brite Divinity's Harrison Building will be completed in time for the top of the semester in January of 2012.

3. Presentation by Dr. Bonnie Melhart, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (graduate programs)

Dr. Melhart began her presentation by providing an institutional overview of TCU graduate programs. She spoke about the profile of TCU graduate students, as well as doctoral level programs in Sciences, Humanities, Nursing Practice, and Musical Arts, the sixty Masters level programs, and the three certificate programs offered by TCU. Addressing topics of financial aid, fellowships, assistantships, recruitment, and other challenges that face the programs, she also directed senators to two websites that are used by the programs: www.graduate.tcu.edu/orientation and www.graduate.tcu.edu.

With 1,300 students in graduate programs (14% of the student population), it is university's wish to increase that level to 17 – 20%. It is her opinion that this could be achieved by a combined effort of expanding existing graduate programs and developing new ones. She closed by saying that anyone who had questions regarding graduate programs could contact her by email.

Given that the meeting was behind schedule, Chair Dan Williams apologized to Senator Scott Williams and moved his topic for the Open Forum section to a later meeting in order to accommodate a presentation addressing the core curriculum.

4. Presentation by Professors Ed McNertney, Director of the Core, and Theresa Gaul, Co-Chair, Literary Traditions Learning Community & Chad Lucas

Dr. McNertney began by speaking of the need for the protocol to make changes in the core curriculum. He continued by talking through an "Outline of Emendation and Course Information Policy," justifying why the matter of a change in literary traditions was being brought to the Senate.

Theresa Gall continued by providing a PowerPoint presentation, copies of which Chad Lucas distributed to some Senate members. Gall provided information regarding a survey that had been done about Literary Traditions. After this assessment was completed, there was a need for reconsideration of the second learning outcome: "*Students will demonstrate an understanding of how literature also constructs human cultures.*" The assessment (as well as anecdotal evidence from interested students and faculty) suggested that the language was abstract and "jargony," making it difficult for students to access the concepts that underlie the outcome; this also provided challenges in [student] assessment. The rest of her short presentation provided the data suggesting that changes needed to be made.

In essence, the proposed change for Literary Traditions split the first learning outcome into two separate outcomes: *“Students will demonstrate an understanding of literature as it reflects society and/or the individual”* and *“Students will demonstrate an understanding of literature as it impacts society and/or the individual.”* Gall suggested that these more clearly worded outcomes would make it easier for future committees to design assessment tools regarding literary traditions. Use of this new language in syllabi and in the classroom should reduce student confusion. The committee also thought that there was a need for an additional third learning outcome, a method-based outcome: *“Students will demonstrate familiarity with one or more disciplinary approaches to the study of literature.”* This language exactly replicates the language of Religious Traditions and Citizenship and Social Values learning outcomes.

Dan Williams stated that a friendly amendment had been sent to the FSEC requesting a change of the word “impacts” to “influences” in the new learning outcomes. He also reiterated that the Senate owns the core; it created it and is responsible for it. It is therefore appropriate for the Senate to discuss all changes to it. He stated that the change before the Senate had been approved by the FSEC, then opened the floor for questions. In response to the change of the friendly amendment, Gall stated the committee was trying to be conservative in the changes, especially in their attempt to match existing language in other learning outcomes, but was open to the change.

At this point there was a point of order as to whether or not there was a motion on the floor allowing for discussion of this topic. Senator Bedford stated that, as this had come from the FSEC with its approval, it was already in the form of a motion. Chad Lucas then provided arguments for consistency across the curriculum.

The question was called. Clarification was made that this motion included the friendly amendment to substitute the word “influences” for “impacts.” A vote was taken and the Literary Traditions changes were approved.

Chair Dan Williams then entertained a motion to adjourn, which was seconded. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Shorter
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2011-2012