

Annual Committee Report  
Faculty Relations Committee  
Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University  
Academic Year 2014 - 2015

Submitted to: Jan Quesada, Senate Chair  
Submitted by: Dianna McFarland, Committee Chair

### **Committee**

Our Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison was Stathis Michaelides, Senate Chair Elect.

Regular committee members included Gil, Dan; Jenkins, David; Kim, San-ky; Krochmal, Max; Ledbetter, Andrew; McGettigan, Joan; McFarland, Dianna; Ramasesh, Ranga; Shorter, Alan; Williams, Dan; and Woodworth, Steve

**The purpose** of the Faculty Relations Committee (FRC) is to address a particular set of faculty concerns. This includes to monitor the effectiveness of University policies on tenure and/or promotion, to explore issues related to grievances of various types, to attend to benefits and compensation and to consult with Human Resources regarding those benefits and compensation. Lastly, FRC examines any concerns assigned by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Below is listed our standing charges followed by respective committee action, then our specific charges that also followed by any committee action.

### **Standing Charges**

1. Monitor the effectiveness of the University policies on tenure, promotion, and grievance as set forth in the TCU Faculty and Staff Handbook.
2. Monitor the effectiveness and outcomes of faculty conflict resolution processes for ensuring due process.
3. Consult with Human Resources on benefits and compensation. (This is a new charge as of Fall 2015).
4. Provide a liaison with the Gender Equity Committee in order to keep the FS apprised of its findings. (This is a new charge as of Fall 2015).

### **Standing Charge #1**

This charge is to monitor the effectiveness and outcomes for fulltime faculty related to factors influencing tenure for tenure track faculty and promotion for all faculty ranks, including tenure track, professors of professional practice and instructors. To support this charge, each year FRC requests a data report from the Provost's Office. This most recent, annual academic-year report (2013-2014) categorizes findings by

college, faculty rank, and gender (see gender discussion in standing charge #4). Findings include the number of faculty by category who are hired, the number applying for promotion, the number who obtained that promotion, the number denied promotion, the number who resigned, and the number who retired. See the attached report.

The questions below are the specific questions that we forward to the Provost's Office; his staff gather the data and prepare an excel report . Each item number (i.e., 1-6) appears on the report with the corresponding statistics for that respective question. Thus, the item numbers below can be used in interpret the results and is the format familiar to those accumulating the data on our behalf.

1. By college and gender, how many faculty were new-hires and at which rank were they hired?
2. By college, gender, and rank, how many retired?
3. By college, gender and rank, how many left the university via non-retirement?
4. By college, gender and rank, how many applied for a promotion (instructors, PPPs, and tenure track ranks)?
5. Of that group who applied for a promotion and/or tenure, how many by college, gender and rank successfully promoted and how many were denied?
6. We would also like the college/program data collapsed across to see statistics at the university level, too.

**Committee Action:** The committee examined the information and generally found no particular differences across the factors, with one exception. The exception was in hiring practices of females versus males in the Neeley School of Business; 10 males and (only) 2 females were hired for academic year 2013-2014. No specific action was taken to explore the reasons for this difference. The committee also discussed examining ethnicity and race in the future as additional factors. It is not known if this kind of demographic data is available at the time that a faculty's status changes.

### **Standing Charge #2**

This charge involves tracking activity related to grievance processes and monitoring grievance policy activity. Remarks below provide background information related to broad FRC responsibilities and actions regarding grievance.

TCU has two faculty-based policies designed to help resolve various types of disputes. HR typically tracks and reports a small set of metrics to Senate (we request this each spring) the total number of faculty conflicts and those where mediation and peer review was requested. The policies are:

- For faculty conflict related to denials of promotion and/or tenure: the *Faculty Appeal Policy*; this policy was updated by the FRC and approved by Senate in May, 2014.

- Faculty issues for other (non-tenure/promotion) types of dispute resolution processes: the *Conflict Resolution Policy for Faculty*.

**Mediation** includes the facilitation of neutral third-party individuals serving as mediators. For many years, TCU has provided partial funding of training for employees who want mediation training; after training, many of these employees voluntarily serve in TCU disputes. The FRC on occasion has been involved in recruiting faculty to become mediators (Greg Stephens, current Senate Secretary can provide training resource details), to garner funding from the Senate, or facilitate participation with the Provost's Office who also on occasion, has funded training.

**Peer review** (arbitration) is another process utilized at TCU; it occurs when a mediated settlement cannot be reached and the case is forwarded a panel of one's peers. Peer review panelists and mediators are often called upon during the appeal of a tenure and/or promotion denial decision. The Faculty Appeal Policy (FAP) is the relevant policy and is administered by the Provost and the FAP Facilitator who coincidentally (and up to this point in time), has been a member of the FRC. The committee is not directly involved in appeals, but is responsible for updating the policy on appeal processes. David Jenkins is the current Facilitator serving a five-year term beginning fall 2015.

**Metrics.** This year, HR Director of Employee Relations, Susan Oakley, reported the following data to the Faculty Relations committee. Kristen Taylor will assume duties as Conflict Resolution Facilitator on June 1, 2015 and will be the contact for this information in the future.

- HR Incident Inquiries: 56
- HR formal Mediations: 5
- HR informal mediations: 1 (mediation without a formal request/process)
- HR Peer Reviews: 0

**Committee action:** The above information is reported as time allows at a late spring Senate meeting; it was not reported this year due to time constraints.

### **Standing charge #3**

The committee had an ongoing discussion this year on issues of shared governance as related to compensation and benefits. The shared governance concern was linked to continuing campus discussion originating approximately two years ago when TCU retirees lost some of their health insurance benefits with brief prior notification and no participation in the decision made about their health benefits. In addition, the present charge (a new charge as of this fall) was designed to address issues of this sort; it focused committee attention to building relationships with Human Resources.

**Committee action 1:** As early as September of our current year together, FRC voted unanimously to bring forward to Senate a resolution that faculty have representation on the TCU Board of Trustees. The sentiment was that as a

stakeholder in our own compensation and benefits and in keeping with the principles of shared governance as upheld at TCU, we seek opportunity to share our perspectives, to gain perspectives from those charged to lead us, and to have more participation as members and employees of our university. FRC member Dan Williams forwarded to the committee a passage from a historical account of Chancellor Moudy's tenure at TCU indicating that TCU once had Board of Trustee and Chancellor approval for faculty representation with the Board. That passage is attached to this report.

The committee composed a resolution that was brought to Senate floor during the May, 2015 regular meeting. A motion was made and was passed by a small margin to table the resolution to the next academic year. A copy of the resolution is attached.

**Committee action 2:** The FRC also took action regarding our charge to consult with HR on matters related to benefits and compensation. .

We invited Karen Baker (HR Vice Chancellor) and Faith Perkins (HR Director) to meet and discuss with us this new relationship between FRC/Senate and HR. The Chancellor established the University Compensation and Advisory Committee (UCAC) years ago to provide him and his Cabinet annual recommendations regarding benefits and compensation (e.g., merit increase); so, the purpose of this committee activity needed to be differentiated.

The committee offered to HR to serve as a feedback group for ideas or projects that HR is considering; an example would be to provide feedback about a program, a brochure or letter, review a webpage, or to support any efforts that serve faculty needs or issues. Director Perkins was appreciative of our willingness and we all were in agreement that we continue to develop relationships and watch for possible synergies in promoting a connection culture. FRC chair McFarland met later in the year with Baker and Perkins for a brief follow up but no action was required subsequent to that meeting.

#### **Standing Charge #4.**

This last standing charge is related to issues of equity among faculty. The charge was to have a liaison participate on the Provost's Faculty Gender Equity Committee. The gender committee was chaired during 2014-2015 by Bob Vigeland. The next chair, Fran Huckaby, will begin duties in fall 2015.

**Committee action 1:** FRC chair attended the one meeting that was called after FRC became a part of the committee (mid-fall 2015) and subsequently asked Bob Vigeland to attend our April 2015 FRC meeting. Bob reported that the Provost's Office had been analyzing pay differences and making adjustments to gender inequities for the last few years. He also reported that this work is continuing into subsequent years.

**Committee action 2:** In addition to pay equity, there are other factors of equity such as practices in hiring, promotion and tenure. The FRC seeks to monitor these non-pay factors by gender and college through analyzing the data gathered in response to our standing charge #1. As stated above, the committee found one difference—which was in hiring practices among the colleges and schools at TCU. The Neeley School of Business hired 10 males but only 2 females during the academic year 2013-2014. The committee did not explore this unique statistic in order to determine if there were special circumstances that led to this unequal hiring activity for this one particular year.

This ends the section of the report on Standing Charges.

### **Specific Charges**

1. Develop and recommend a protocol—especially when area expertise is a factor—for ad hoc investigative committees.
2. Investigate the role of adjunct faculty at TCU and recommend ways to enhance the relationship between these instructors and the university community.

**Specific charge #1:** The purpose of this charge was that the committee discover and make relevant recommendations regarding protocols or processes used to compose an ad hoc committee or task force made up of TCU faculty who are called upon to participate in investigations of misconduct involving other TCU faculty.

**Committee action:** At our September, 2014, meeting, FRC discussed priorities regarding the entire set of charges for this academic year. As a result, we decided by consensus to focus on this charge after dealing with other charges. The committee was very busy all year long thus this charge was not addressed.

**Specific charge #2:** This charge addresses concerns expressed by faculty across the past few years about adjunct faculty. Concerns have included that adjuncts have limited resources such as space to see students, computer availability, and lower than average pay. Other concerns are that adjuncts are teaching too many TCU Core classes, may not be well informed about the core, and may need additional training.

**Committee action 1:** FRC discussed these adjunct-related topics in early fall and determined that a sub-committee was needed to focus attention on the variety of concerns and areas of interest. FRC asked Andrew Ledbetter to chair this sub-committee and he agreed to take on this rather large multi-layered project.

**Subcommittee action overview:** Chair Ledbetter recruited assistance from FRC member Krochmal and FRC chair McFarland. However, Dr. Ledbetter by far did the “lion’s share of the work” and the committee thanks him. The subcommittee work is listed below. A set of four attachments resulted from this charge and they

include (a) a summary of findings from data provided by TCU Institutional Research, dated Feb, 2015; (b) a preliminary report of survey findings from TCU adjunct faculty, dated Mar, 2015; (c) a full data report dated April, 2015 and (d) the Senate draft resolution presented at the April 30<sup>th</sup> regular Senate meeting.

Below find the subcommittee actions listed numerically with inserts at appropriate moments when the entire FRC committee took relevant action. The subcommittee:

1. Examined information from Institutional Research on adjunct faculty, presented a summary at the February, 2015, FRC meeting and discussed the use of a survey in order to gather direct information from TCU adjuncts and chairs. (see attached February Adjunct report).

**Committee action 2:** FRC committee supported the Adjunct subcommittee developing and administering a survey to adjuncts and to chairs, with some expressing that time might not allow both surveys to be administered in one semester.

2. Examined regional and national data on adjunct faculty educational ranks and pay rates.
3. Developed and administered an electronic survey to TCU adjunct faculty members.
4. Analyzed and summarized preliminary findings of the adjuncts survey in a report presented and discussed in the March, 2015, FRC meeting (see Preliminary Report of March, 2015).

**Committee action 3:** At the March FRC meeting, based on the preliminary report and discussion, the committee voted unanimously to support a boost to adjunct pay rates by increasing the salary amounts listed in 'Guidelines for (Re)Appointment of Adjunct or Part-Time Faculty' (drafted by the Provost's Office) by \$1,000 per 3 credit hour course.

5. Developed and administered an electronic survey of TCU department chairs.
6. Analyzed and summarized the complete results of the adjunct faculty survey along with results from department chair survey. These results were discussed in the April, 2015, FRC meeting. The most compelling finding from both surveys was consistent with the March result--that adjunct pay was relatively low (see report for criteria). Many adjuncts reported being paid more locally and TCU department chairs in general reported that it would be helpful to their efforts to be able to pay more to adjuncts. Additional findings were that in most cases, adjuncts seem to have adequate space and computer resources.
7. Drafted a resolution consistent with the March FRC decision and with the additional findings from April, then emailed it to the committee in anticipation of presenting the resolution to Senate for final edits.

8. At the April 30, 2015, regular Senate meeting, presented findings of the final report and the draft resolution. There was no vote sought on this resolution as it was presented as a draft.

**Report Conclusion:** The Faculty Relations Committee had a large set of responsibilities and charges this year. As chair, I would like to recognize and thank each and every individual for their commitment and participation!

Respectfully submitted,

Dianna McFarland, Ph.D.  
Faculty Relations Chair 2014-2015

**List of Attachments to this report**

1. Historical report of Faculty Relations on the BoT
2. BoT Representation Resolution
3. Fulltime Faculty report on promotion, etc.
4. February 2015 presented, Adjunct pre-report
5. March 2015 presented, Adjunct preliminary findings (spss data)
6. April 2015 presented, Adjunct Data Final report prepared 4.22.15
7. April 2015 Adjunct Draft Resolution