

9/5/2016 - Dr. Arthur B. Busbey

Below is a table of all the motions passed by the TCU faculty senate that I have been able to find in the archives of the Faculty Senate. Our scanned records start in May of 1970 and as of the date of this table I have not been able to find older minutes.

Any text within curly brackets {} was added by the editor. Such text usually refers to particular minutes where the discussion of a motion was far too long to paste into the table. Text from the minutes was obtained by executing Optical Character Recognition on the old past minutes of the Faculty Senate. Though the editor has spent hundreds of hours searching for passed motions and correcting badly converted text, there may be text he mentioned. In all cases refer to the original text in the archived minutes.

Other difficulties include: some secretaries talked about 'motions' and others talked about 'resolutions' and used them interchangeably while others may have meant them to be used differently. Also some use "passed" and others "carried" and yet others "approved" for a successful motion; the manner in which pages were scanned was, at times, haphazard making it difficult to determine exactly which month the minutes belonged in; some minutes were scanned into several documents (presumably to reduce the file size) and in doing so there was repetition of minutes - I usually combined these files so there may be some duplication of minutes.

Motions passed by the TCU Faculty Senate

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 5/70 | Klein nominated John Zalton and James Edwards as the Faculty representatives on the Task Force on University Governance. Passed unanimously. |
| 9/70 | Venier moved that suggestions for correction and emendation be referred back to the Faculty Senate to be rewritten in line with suggestions made at this Faculty Assembly. Motion passed. |
| 9/70 | Landman: amend III B 5 by changing "An assistant professor lacking" to "An instructor or assistant professor lacking." Motion passed. |
| 10/70 | Durham moved that we constitute a Senate-Trustee relations committee of the chairmen of all the stading Senate committees, including the Chaiman of the Senate. Motion passed. |
| 10/70 | Ferre brought up the question of how appointments are made to the Green Honors Professor chair. Snyder moved the problem be referred to the Committee on Faculty Personnel Problems. Motion passed. |
| 11/70 | Wortham moved that the following resolution sent to the Senate with the approval of the Student House of Representatives be adopted by the Senate: 'Be it resolved that any student who is not on scholastic probation be allowed to audit any course he desires. For those students who wish to have the course placed on their record, a fee of \$5 per course plus any particular fees will be assessed. The student's record will indicate whether or not he attended the course with reasonable regularity. Furthermore, as a mode of nction for those who wish the audit recorded, a special registration will be Peld at the end of the last day of registration so that a student may enroll to audit courses that still have openings. Those professors who ' prefer not to accept audit students may close their section to audit registration. Students who wish to audit a course without fee, a ~ without record, may make arrangements with the instructor, and need not register officially motion passed by a vote of 14 to 13. |
| 2/71 | A discussion of the document on "Tenure Policy for the Faculty of TCU" followed. Motions were made and passed for the following revisions: Page 3, number 5: delete the entire paragraph, beginning "In order to" and ending "entire fourth year."; Page 3, insert between C. 1. and 3. :Permanent tenure shall terminate at age 65, although employment be continued beyond that age in accordance with provisions of the retirement regulations. Page 5, small e: delete the words "The expense of this counsel shall be shared equally by the faculty member and the University (vote: 27-2). Page 5, small i : delete: "The cost to be borne by the University." |
| 2/71 | McKay moved that the Senate accept the tenure document as it stands with these revisors. Passed unanimously. |
| 4/71 | Flowers moved that the Student Conduct Zozxittee be enlarged and that it exist as an interim couzittee known as the Student Appeals Committee until the University Court is established, at which tine the Student Appeals Committee would revert to being the Student Conduct Committee. Motion passed. |
| 4/71 | Tade proposed an amendment t o the motion, to add that Dr. Herrlck serve as TCU representative to the Southwest Conference Athletic Conference for a one-year transitional period. This amendment was defeated. The original motion (to add Herrick's name to the committee) was passed, |
| 4/71 | McKay moved that Herrick's name be removed from the Graduate Council, that Stanley Blocks name be added to the Graduate Council, and that Block's name be removed From Intercollegiate Athletics. Motion carried, |
| 4/71 | Klein moved that the list of names on the committees be approved as amended. Motion passed. The list is being sent to the Chancellor for approval and appointment. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 9/30/1971 | <p>The Senate then voted. on the resolution as amended.The vote was 29 for, none against and none abstaining.</p> <p>APPENDIX I: Copy of the resolution as amended and passed.</p> <p>“The Faculty Senate is troubled by the periodic disquiet in the university community attendant upon the process of granting or refusing permission for outside speakers to appear before student groups on university premises.We feel that the present vague and incomplete process itself contributes to the probability that such disquiet will occur frequently in the future.This will work to the detriment of the entire university, and will create undue friction in the university community instead of the harmony which all desire.</p> <p>Therefore we urge the Chancellor, the Student Life Division, and the House of Student Representatives to redouble their efforts to complete a statement of policy and procedures regarding speaker selection and approval which would be more responsive to the legitimate interest of the students to hear controversial viewpoints, and at the same time would recognize the administration’s inalienable responsibilities and necessary sensitivity to the opinion of the university’s whole constituency.We also pledge the best efforts of this Senate toward this goal, and we instruct the Trustee Relations Committee to make this topic a matter of urgent discussion with its counterpart committee from the Trustees.We further ask the Vice Chancellor for Student Life to make a progress report to this body within thirty days.”</p> |
| 11/71 | <p>The following resolution was moved by Senator Beckelhymer, seconded by Senator Schaeffer, and passed unanimously: “The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University wishes to give expression to its sense of profound loss In the untimely death of head football coach James Noel Pittman. In his brief stay with us Coach Pittman made his presence felt throughout the entire University community.We remember with gratitude his manly bearing, and cordial manner, his composure in competition, victory, and defeat, the discipline he exacted of himself, his staff, and players, his single minded pursuit of excellence in the area of his responsibility, his wholehearted affirmation of life and work. He will be long remembered among his colleagues and friends as an influence both strong and good, not only in athletics but in the entire life of the university and community. We desire that this tribute be entered into the official records of this body, and also be communicated with our deepest sympathy to members of his immediate family.”</p> |
| 11/71 | <p>Senator Evans reported on the "Concept Paper on the Teacher Corps Project" which had been distributed to all Senators at the suggestion of the U. S. government representative. It was moved by Evans and seconded by Schaefer that the Chairman of the Senate write a letter certifying that the Senate is aware of the proposal and gives its approval to it. Motion passed.</p> |
| 12/71 | <p>Senator Graham moved:That the following faculty members of the several schools and colleges indicated be nominated to serve on the committee now being established to consider applicants and select a person to be the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at Texas Christian University: Larry D. Lauer (School of Fine Arts) Eldon G. Kelly (M.J. Neely School of Business) Kathryn Nichols (Harris College of Nursing) M. Jack Suggs (Brite Divinity School) William H. Vanderhoof (School of Education) (AddRan College of Arts and Sciences:) Marjorie D. Lewis (Humanities) William H. Watson (Sciences) John. L. Wortham (Social Sciences) Seconded by Nunn. Motion passed.</p> |
| 12/71 | <p>Senator Hitt , Chairman of the Senate Committee on Faculty-Student Concerns, presented Dean Brewer’s Proposal of the use of a Pass/No Credit system. He indicated that it had not been possible for his committee to meet and act on the proposal. Hitt moved and Schaeffer seconded a motion that the Senate act as a committee of the whole to act on the proposal and make recommendations.The motion passed.</p> |
| 12/71 | <p>Senator Tade submitted the following resolution on salaries and benefits: “Whereas the Chancellor, members of the Board’s Faculty Relations Committee and the and Benefits, and Whereas the Board of Trustees has declared its intent to raise faculty salaries and benefits to a level competitive with other Category I institutions, and, Whereas the Chancellor and Board of Trustees have taken steps to implement their intention through solicitation of special funds and tuition increases, and Whereas salaries increases will be granted in January, 1972, from a special grant of the Amon G. Carter Foundation, Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate commend the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for their concern and action, and Further, be it resolved that the Senate express its appreciation to the Amon G. Carter Foundation for its second gift of \$300,000 which will be used in substantial part for salary increases .” Tade moved adoption. Seconded by Nunn. Motion passed.</p> |
| 12/09/71 | <p>Chairman Wortham announced that Senator Emmet Smith had resigned as chairman of the Committee on University Organization and that he had asked Senator Colquitt if he would be willing to serve. It was moved by Nunn and seconded by Forsyth that Landon Colquitt be made chairman of the Committee on University Organization. Motion passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 12/09/71 | <p>Senator John Hitt , chairman of the Committee on Faculty-Students Concerns presented the action of his committee with regard to the proposed Pass/No Credit system. He indicated that his committee had met and had passed the resolution unanimously in the form in which it was circulated. He indicated what some of the areas of discussion had been and then moved that the proposal be adopted as written. Watson seconded the motion. Senator Evans asked that the Pass/Fail document that had been passed last year be read for information. Chairman Wortham read the document. Senator Kelly moved and Durham seconded that section B.2 be amended as follows: That the last sentence be deleted and the following sentence substituted: "At any time upon request by the instructor the registrar will give the instructor the names of those students in his classes who opted for P/NC."</p> <p>There was considerable discussion on the amendment and then a vote was taken. The motion failed by 9 for and 15 against. Senator Procter moved and Nunn seconded that Section B.4 be amended to read that there be no more than 30 hours of P/NC not including P.E. A vote was taken and the motion failed. The vote was then taken on Senator Hitt's original motion and it passed. The motion as passed reads:</p> <p>"I wish to recommend consideration of the following procedure for an undergraduate P/NC system at T.C.U.</p> <p>A. Retain the present system of A-B-C-D-F as the basic grading system of the University</p> <p>B. Introduce an option for all students of P/NC (Pass and No Credit).</p> <p>1. The P Grade should be the equivalent of A-B-C; the NC, the equivalent of D-F.</p> <p>2. The choice of systems rests with the student. If he desires the P/NC option, he will indicate this choice to the Registrar's office not later than two weeks after classes begin. Such a choice is irrevocable. The system should not allow game playing. The instructor will enter an A-B-C-D-F on the grade sheet at the end of the semester. If the grade is A-B-C, the Registrar will enter a P on the students permanent record. If the grade is D-F, a NC will be entered, The Registrar will then give the instructor the names of those students in his classes who opted for P/NC.</p> <p>3. Neither the P nor the NC will be counted in the student's GPA.</p> <p>4. No limit should be placed on the number of courses taken under the P/NC option with the following exception: Each department shall decide whether to allow its majors the P/NC option in the major and minor fields.</p> <p>5. No minimum GPA should be required to select courses for P/NC."</p> |
| 12/09/71 | <p>Senator Hitt then reported on two other matters which had been brought to the attention of the Committee from the Student House of Representatives. He asked for an expression by the Senate on the desirability of introducing two additional holidays, one in the fall and one in the spring. The Senate was polled and expressed disapproval by a vote of 14 to 4. He then asked for the sense of the Senate on the matter of Preregistration. Hitt moved and Durham seconded a resolution requesting the University Council to study plans for a preregistration system and make available to the Senate the results of their study. The motion passed.</p> |
| 3/72 | <p>The Chairman read a letter from Dr. M.J. Neely, Chairman of the T.C.U. Board of Trustees, expressing appreciation for the resolution of Salaries and Benefits which was passed by the Faculty Senate on December 2nd.</p> |
| 3/72 | <p>Senator Suggs presented "Some Criteria for an Academic Vice-Chancellor" which had been drawn up by the Nominating Committee for Academic Vice Chancellor. There was considerable discussion of the nature and function of this committee and it was pointed out that since it was not a search committee individual Senators or other faculty members should present names of possible candidates directly to the Chancellor rather through the committee. It was moved by Hitt and seconded by Nunn that the criteria should be readopted and the ad hoc committee be dissolved. The motion passed.</p> |
| 3/72 | <p>A letter from Dr. Corder concerning reconsideration of Pass/No credit grading was presented. Senator Daniel moved adoption of the following resolution: "The Faculty Senate commends and endorses the Administrative Council's decision to adopt the credit grading option proposed by Dean Brewer. We protest, however, the article (B.2) which withholds from the teacher knowledge of which basis each of his students has chosen to be graded on. We urge, therefore, that the Administrative Council restate its policy on grading so as to provide that the teacher be informed early in the semester the exact grading status of every student." Seconded by Durham. In the discussion which followed reference was made to the document supporting the resolution which had been circulated to the Senators by Dr. Moffit Cecil. It was pointed out that a response to this document from Vice Chancellor Newcomer was not available and it was moved that because of this the resolution be tabled until the next Senate meeting. Motion to table by Schaeffer, second by Watson. Motion passed.</p> |
| 3/72 | <p>Senator Suggs moved that this statement {see page 5 of the 3/72 minutes for the lengthy statement} be adopted as the expression of the opinion of the Senate concerning appropriate university policy with regard to public office and that it be referred to the Faculty-Trustees Relations Committee for further discussion and implementation. Seconded by Rohman. Motion passed.</p> |
| 5/72 | <p>Chairman Wortham called for nominations for Chairman. Senator Suggs nominated, Winesancker seconded, John Hitt for Chairman. Wassenich moved, James seconded, that Hitt be elected by acclamation. Motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/72 | <p>Corder nominated, Nunn seconded, Betsy Colquitt for Vice chairman. Clay moved, Winesanker seconded, that nominations cease. Passed unanimously. Clay moved that B. Colquitt be elected by acclamation. Motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/72 | <p>Clay nominated, Nunn seconded, David Graham for Secretary. Suggs moved, Arnoult seconded, election by acclamation. Motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/72 | <p>Clegg nominated, Wassenich seconded, Jeff Horn for Assistant Secretary. Winesanker moved, Beckelhymer seconded, election by acclamation. Passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/72 | Clay moved, Suggs seconded, that the Faculty Senate extends its appreciation to outgoing Chairman John Wortham, the other Senate officers, and outgoing Senators for their work in the year just concluded. Passed unanimously. |
| 9/72 | Clay moved that Vice-chairman Colquitt be designated Chairman of the Faculty Senate for the remainder of the 1972-1973 term. Wassenich seconded. Passed unanimously. (Senator L. Colquitt's plaintive "Nay" was gleefully ignored.) |
| 9/72 | Wassenich moved that a Vice-chairman <i>pro tem</i> be elected. Suggs seconded. In the discussion that followed Senator Rohman voiced the opinion that the election of a Vice-chairman <i>pro tem</i> at this time might not be the proper procedure. He suggested that notice of intent to elect a Vice-chairman <i>pro tem</i> be given to the entire Senate before the election is held. Corder moved an amendment to s motion. The amendment states that a Vice-chairman <i>pro tern</i> will be elected after the entire Senate has been informed that such an election is needed. Seconded by Frye. Discussion followed. Passed unanimously. Wassenich's motion passed unanimously. |
| 10/72 | Senator Rohman moved that, pending the receipt of more oreoise information about the existing methods of gathering nominations for, and making appointments to, the Green Honors Chair, the motion from the Committee on Committees be tabled, Senator Schaeffer seconded. Motion passed. |
| 10/72 | Senator Winesanker moved that Drs. Hitt and Secrest be asked to come to the November meeting of the Senate to explain the action that was taken and its rationale. Senator Schaeffer seconded. Motion passed unanimously. {See Minutes for discussion} |
| 10/72 | Senator Bohon moved that the Chairman of the Faculty Senate select an appropriate date before 1 November, 1972, for a meeting of the AddR.an faculty, and that Dean Brewer be asked to appear at the meeting to report on the proposal. Senator Nunn seconded. Senator E. Smith moved an amendment to the motion to call for a meeting of the Faculty Assembly rather than the Add.Ran faculty only. Senator Schaeffer seconded. Senator Wassenich moved a further amendment that Dean Brewer be asked to prepare and distribute a position paper to make the proposal clear, the pa?er to be distributed before the meeting. Senator Frye seconded. The original motion and both amendments passed. |
| 11/72 | Senator Corder moved that the students of Tom Brown be commended for their diligence and applauded for their care. Senator Smith seconded. (This motion was subsequently passed after the discussions noted below.) {See 11/72 Minutes for discussion} |
| 11/72 | Senator Corder presented a statement: Reminded by these discussions that the principle of shared authority has frequently been at issue and never far below the surface, the committee proposes the Senate, through an appropriate committee take up again the quest for shared authority, examining the decision making process, the concept of administrative concurrence, and other related matters, with the goal of renewing ourselves in a mutual pledge to community. We further recommend that the Senate's committee work in concert with the Priorities Committee and any other appropriate agency. Senator Clay moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the statement as a resolution. Senator Beckelhymer seconded. Motion passed unanimously. |
| 3/73 | Senator Suggs presented a report from the Committee of Faculty Political Rights. The committee presented a revision of the statement of faculty political rights and asked Senate approval of the statement that it might be presented to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees for approval. The substantive changes in the new proposal include communication through channels to request time off or leave to pursue political activities, and a provision allowing "approved leave of absence without pay UP to two years with such further extensions as the Chancellor, after consultation with appropriate divisional heads, may grant" • Wassenich moved approval; Boyd seconded. Motion passed. |
| 3/73 | {See pages 1 and 2 of the 1 March, 1973 minutes for all details and discussion.} After further discussion Senator Corder changed his motion to move approval of the concept embodied in the proposal but not the wording. Bohon seconded. Passed. |
| 4/73 | Senator Bohon introduced the matter of parking regulations adopted by Traffic Appeals Board, as reported in the Faculty Bulletin of 20 1973. He moved that the Senate that these regulations be delayed until the new Senate convenes and can discuss then. Dunn seconded. Passed. |
| 4/73 | Chairman B. Colquitt announced that she had been informed that TCU must have a formal statement of promotion policy and grievance procedures for Senator Corder moved that the Senate rely upon the existing EEOC Committee to develop grievance and promotion policies and present them for approval at the meeting of the Senate. Wassenich seconded. Passed unanimously. |
| 5/73 | Senator Betsy Colquitt nominated Senator Manfred Reinecke for chairman. Senator Jeff Horn seconded. Senator Paul Wassenich moved election by acclamation. Senator Winesanker seconded. The motion passed unanimously. |
| 5/73 | Dr. Boyd moved that the Senate resolve that present faculty parking on North and South side of Fountain, West of the Student Center be reserved for the faculty beginning in the 1973-1974 year. Dr. Potter seconded. Passed unanimously. |
| 5/73 | Dr. Corder entered a resolution in commendation of Dr. Betsy Colquitt. Widely seconded. Unanimously passed. |
| 5/73 | Dr. Clay moved that other members of the executive committee be commended. Dr. Wassenich seconded. Passed unanimously. |
| 10/73 | Senator Gossman further moved that no restrictions shall prevent a faculty member from taking graduate or undergraduate guests to the faculty center for coffee or lunch, space permitted. Senator Wassenich seconded. Passed by voice vote. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 5/74 | Ludvigson offered the motion: "Until a clear policy of purpose is enunciated, and the machinery is set up to ensure proper execution, it is moved that the evaluation procedure be delayed. The Senate Evaluation Committee is instructed to meet and take appropriate action in respect to this motion." The motion was seconded by Snyder and passed by voice vote. {See 5/74 Minutes page 2, for discussion}. |
| 9/74 | J. Jones presented a recommendation of the Executive Committee that the Senate offer an amendment to Article II, Section 6.A. of the Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate. The proposal was made to include the Chairman of the past year in the membership of the Executive Committee of each succeeding year in order to provide continuity of Senate leadership. As presented by J. Jones and amended by Reinecke, the proposal was made that Article II, Section 6.A. be changed to read: "Executive Committee. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the Chairman, the Secretary, the Vice Chairman, the Assistant Secretary and the immediate past Chairman, if he is still eligible to be a Senator. If the elective term of Senate membership has for the immediate past Chairman, this member of the Executive Committee will be officio) a member of the Senate." Grossman moved adoption of the proposal, the motion was seconded and passed on voice vote. |
| 10/74 | Reinecke reported for the Committee on Committees that Dr. William Watson requested to be relieved of the chairmanship of the University Computer Center Committee. Reinecke moved that Dr. Leigh Secrest be nominated to the Chancellor as Chairman of the University Computer Center Committee. The motion was seconded and passed on voice vote. Dr. Watson will remain a member of the committee. |
| 10/74 | Snyder reported for the Committee on Social Facilities and Programs that the committee recommended the following interpretation of the Senate resolution of October 4, 1973: "The first part of the resolution, 'That all teaching staff should be allowed use of the Faculty Center,' is construed to mean that teaching fellows, teaching assistants, and all University personnel whose positions would assimilate to faculty status in any way are to be extended this privilege." As to the second part of the resolution which stated that "no restrictions shall prevent a faculty member from taking graduate or undergraduate guests to the faculty center for coffee or lunch, space permitted," the committee considered that the plural could be construed too broadly and recommended "...that the statement does not include the use of the faculty center by anyone of the individuals mentioned in the first part of the resolution in such a way that groups, committees, or classes or seminars would meet during the normal open hours of the Faculty Center." Snyder urged a reasoned interpretation of the term "group" and expressed the intent of the committee to recommend restriction of Faculty Center use to individuals. He further advised that the operating policy of the Faculty Center could be adapted promptly to the expressed intent of the faculty. Hall moved adoption of the committee recommendation as the governing policy of the Faculty Center. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously on voice vote. |
| 10/74 | Reinecke moved a resolution of appreciation to the past Committee on Financial Exigency. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously on voice vote. |
| 11/74 | Reinecke, Chairperson of the Committee on Committees, moved for the adoption of an Ad Hoc Committee on Safety to consult with the administration in achieving compliance with federal occupational safety and health legislation. His motion included the nomination of Dr. John Albright, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Mr. Anthony Jones, Associate Professor of Art, and Mr. Dennis Runge, Instructor in Theater to serve as faculty members of the committee. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously on voice vote. |
| 11/74 | Gossman, member of the Committee on Student Relations, distributed a report on a "Proposed University Wide Judicial System" endorsed by the House of Student Representatives on April 30, 1974. {See extensive discussion on page 2 of the 11/74 minutes} After discussion of the implied scope of the proposed judicial system, Reinecke moved that the report be referred to the University ad hoc Committee on Governance. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously on voice vote. |
| 12/74 | Brewer indicated prompt attention would be given to part (1) of the resolution and suggested that the response to part (2) would be a redundant submission of rules given in the handbook. Ludvigson explained the statement to refer to specific and unique rules utilized by committees individually. Reinecke observed that part (3) constituted a reaffirmation of current Senate authority. Ludvigson's motion for the resolution was seconded and passed on voice vote. {See discussion on pages 3 & 4 of the 12/1974 minutes} |
| 2/75 | It was moved and seconded that the report be accepted by the Senate and that the report be forwarded to the University Provost for such action as <i>might</i> be appropriate. The motion passed unanimously on voice vote. (Copies of the report, with supporting documentation, are available from the Senate Secretary.) {See long discussion on pages 1 and 2 of the 2/1975 minutes} |
| 2/75 | Committee on Committees: Reinecke, Chairperson of the Committee on Committees, recommended that Dr. Marjorie Lewis, Department of English, be nominated by the Senate to replace Dr. Clifford Venier, Department of Chemistry, on the Student Conduct Committee. Dr. Venier is on leave of absence away from the University. Reinecke's motion was seconded and passed unanimously on voice vote. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 2/75 | <p>Reinecke presented the following resolution to be adopted as guidelines by the Committee on University Committees: It is proposed that faculty members be appointed to standing University committees for terms of five years rather than the present one year terms. These terms should be staggered among the members of the committee so that approximately one-fifth of the members are rotated every year. Unless some very special expertise is required, memberships on a University committee should be limited to one five-year term. There are three main advantages to this change. First of all, it means that committees can now go to year-round operation and do not have to be reappointed every year. Secondly, this procedure assures both continuity and the injection of new ideas into the committee. Third, the amount of administrative work both by the University administration and the Committee on Committees will be considerably reduced since only one-fifth as many appointments need to be made every year.</p> <p>Discussion of the motion was in reference to the extra commitment of service such an appointment would require of some faculty members on particularly active committees. The approach of the Committee on University Committees, as explained by Reinecke, would be to distribute the work more evenly between standing committees. Reinecke's motion was seconded and carried on voice vote.</p> |
| 2/75 | <p>The motion was made to approve this interpretation of the functioning of the Committee on Committees; the motion was seconded and passed unanimously on voice vote. {See extensive discussion on pages 3 and 4 of the 2/1975 minutes}</p> |
| 2/75 | <p>Gossman moved that the Senate express concern for access to buildings in which the individual faculty member may have an office. Reference was made to the existing practice of restricting access to outside-door keys for faculty members having offices in Reed Hall. Gossman cited the inconvenience of not being able to use offices in Reed Hall between normal University terms. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously on voice vote.</p> |
| 4/75 | <p>A second document originated by the Student House and entitled "A Bill Concerning Wider Student/Faculty Participation in the University Community" contained a proposal for inclusion of faculty and students on the Board of Trustees. Exception was expressed to the included statement that current practices of the Board deny "...any real (sic) sort of participation in the governance of TCU by either faculty or students..." Snyder moved referral of this House document to the Faculty-Trustee Relations Committee. The motion was seconded and passed on a majority by voice vote. (The bill will be presented to the Faculty-Trustee Relations Committee by the Senate Executive Committee.)</p> |
| 4/75 | <p>Committee on Committees: Committee Chairperson Reinecke distributed lists of nominees to University committees and indicated objectives of the Committee on Committees to reduce faculty assignments, where possible, to one University committee. Staggered terms were set in order to provide continuity on individual committees and to reduce the re-composition of all committees. Reinecke indicated the inclusion of new University standing committees for Research, Safety and Health, and Student Life, and the abolition of the Convocations Committee. Reinecke moved adoption of the nominations to the University committees and the adoption of the additions and deletion from the list of University committees. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously on voice vote.</p> |
| 10/75 | <p>Following the report of the roll call vote on the motion to reject the exclusion of non-tenured faculty from departmental advisory committee, insert these items: Dean Brewer moved to retain the wording of the present document regarding the manner in which members of departmental advisory committees are selected. Motion was second. The motion failed to carry on a show of hands. Senator Quarles moved that departmental committee members should be elected by all full-time faculty in the departments. Seconded. Senator Suggs offered a substitute motion that the manner of selection be referred to the committee for consideration and recommendation. Seconded. Substitute motion passed. Senator Remley moved that in the paragraph numbered 28 the word, "department" be replaced by the word "division". Seconded. Motion passed.</p> |
| 12/75 | <p>Senator Lewis, Chairman of the Committee on Promotion, Tenure, and Grievances, reported that the 1st and 2nd charges to the committee have been passed by the Faculty Senate and that copies of the revised tenure policy have been made. The Grievance Policy has been submitted to Vice Chancellor Brewer. Vice Chancellor Brewer commented that the Grievance Policy would be considered by the Deans Committee.</p> |
| 3/76 | <p>Upon re-opening the meeting, the Chair read several letters from departments and faculty members relating to the proposal furnished by Dean Brewer to establish a policy on textbook adoption. The floor was opened to discussion. In the discussion, some senators reported that such a policy was presently being followed. Other senators reported fears of, and resistance to, any effort to limit faculty prerogatives in text selection and adoption. Mr. Joe Enochs and Mr. Mike Gore were present to present their information and respond to questions. Mr. Enochs reported on the rapidly escalating costs of published materials and the desire to compensate for these costs. In response to a question from Senator Wortham on the number of cases of re-adoption, Mr. Gore reported that 71.4% of texts were dropped for the next time the course is offered. Other procedures were suggested for dealing with the problem, e.g. that data be furnished each department which could then decide on a course of action. Senator Daniel moved to reject the policy as proposed. The motion was seconded. Senator Kelly expressed a preference for a specific resolution. Senator Daniel, with approval of second, offered a substitute motion as follows:</p> <p>Resolved: that the Faculty Senate oppose the adoption of any University policy which would impose restrictions or constraints on the selection and adoption of textbooks.</p> <p>The motion passed on a vote of 18 to 4.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 4/76 | Senator John Wortham presented the report of the Committee on Finances and Compensation (copy in Secretary's file). Contents of report concerns four matters: identification of concept of "fund accounting" survey of current account over past 5 years description of transactions in auxiliary accounts some indicators of economic changes. A question was raised about the unusually large percentage increase in the category, administrative expenses and maintenance. Chancellor Moudy replied that the figures only show relative growth, not appropriateness of expenditures. Senator Suggs moved acceptance of report with appreciation to the committee members and referral to the incoming executive committee. Seconded. Passed. |
| 4/76 | Senator Tucker moved approval of the tentative list of committee appointees. Senator Ray discussed a need for additional representation on the Computer Center Committee from Social Sciences. Senator Wortham nominated Senator Ray as an additional appointee (1981). Seconded, passed on voice vote. {See long discussion on this starting on page 2 of the April, 1976 minutes}. |
| 5/76 | Nominations for Chairman from the floor: None. Motion that nominations close was seconded and passed. Senator Remley was elected Chairman. Nominations for Vice Chairman from the floor: None. Motion that nominations close and Senator Corder be elected by acclamation was seconded and passed. Nominations for Secretary from floor: None. Motion that nominations close was seconded and passed. Senator James was elected Secretary. |
| 5/76 | Senator Graham moved that, by resolution, the Senators commend the outgoing Chairman, William Hall, for his services to the Faculty Senate in 1975-76. Senator amended the motion to include the members of the Executive Committee. The amended motion was seconded and passed unanimously. |
| 3/77 | Finance and Compensation: Chairman Durham presented two reports: TCU Salary Study - Spring Semester 1977 and a 1976-77 report of budgeted faculty salaries in public Texas colleges and universities, both of which are attached. Senator Kelly moved and Senator Corder seconded that the reports be duplicated and circulated to the total faculty. Motion passed. |
| 3/77 | Chairman Remley presented and moved approval by the Senate revision of the Faculty Senate Constitution as outlined below: "Article II. The Faculty Senate. Section 2. Membership. A. Ex Officio Members. The Chancellor of the University or the Executive Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs shall be ex officio members of the Faculty Senate with the right to participate fully in deliberations and to vote." Senator Durham seconded the motion. Senator Graham moved and Senators Jeeter and Felton seconded that the original motion be amended by deleting the word "or" and inserting a comma after the word "University" to read as follows: "...The Chancellor of the the Executive Vice Chancellor and ..." The motion to amend passed. The original motion passed. |
| 4/7/77 | Committee on Committees: Chairman Miller presented the attached recommendations with chairmen as noted. Senator Waits moved, and Senator Hall seconded, that we vote on first eight recommendations first and then on recommendation No. 9. Motion passed. Senator Smith moved, and Senator Hall seconded that recommendation No. 6 be deleted. Motion passed. Senator Hall moved, and Senator Brewer seconded, that "after consultation with the appropriate administrative officer" be added to the second sentence of recommendation No. 1. Motion passed. Vice Chairman Corder called for a vote on recommendations Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8, which passed. Senator Waits moved, and Senator Graham seconded, to adopt recommendation No. 9, which referred to committee appointment recommendations. Motion passed. |
| 4/7/77 | Vice Chairman Corder interrupted committee reports in order to recognize Senator Senter who moved the adoption of the attached resolution from the Ecological Conservation Organization. Dr. James Rurak was present and interpreted the intent of the resolution as an effort to extend the recycling services on campus. Motion passed. |
| 4/7/77 | Senator Moudy recommended that passage of the resolution be deferred until more study could be made of the results from the committee's questionnaire. Senator Senter explained that the resolution is a reflection of faculty responses to the questionnaire, including both answers to the questions and written opinions expressed by a majority of respondents in support of their answers. Senator Brewer moved, and Senator Moudy seconded, to table the motion. The motion passed. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 04/28/77 | <p>Senator Corder moved and Senator Hall seconded that the motion to adopt the resolution tabled at the April 7 meeting be removed from the table. The motion carried. Discussion of the motion to adopt the resolution followed: Senator Corder read a statement favoring the passage of the resolution. He noted that, since the faculty had overwhelmingly accepted the concept of student evaluation, it appeared that the Administration should be glad to receive this overture from the faculty. Senator Brewer moved and Senator Corder seconded to amend the resolution by adding: "Should any question of a chairman's recommendation be raised by an administrator or an advisory committee, the chairman shall meet with the administrator and/or the advisory committee to answer the question?" Senator Felton asked about the Chancellor's thinking concerning the motion. Executive Vice Chancellor Wilsey said that the Chancellor recommends the guidelines outlined in the University Evaluation Committee statement, "Interpreting Faculty Evaluation Data," and that he feels they are consistent with the resolution. Senator Miller proposed an editorial change: substitute for the last three words of the amendment, the words, "clarify evaluation material used by the chairman."</p> <p>Chairman Remley asked permission to speak from the chair. He spoke in favor of the amendment, interpreting it as giving the chairman the opportunity to determine the appropriateness of the evaluation form for use in a particular instance.</p> <p>Senator Hall called the question. The motion to adopt the amendment passed.</p> <p>Senator Durham proposed an editorial change: that the amendment be preceded by the words, "Be it further resolved.</p> <p>Senator Brewer recommended the following editorial change: in the paragraph of the resolution beginning, "Be it therefore resolved that the Senate urges the administration to institute a revision of the current questionnaire form...." the underlined words in the following continuation of the sentence be added "... with oversight of the revision by a University Evaluation Committee which should include at least six full time faculty.</p> <p>Senator Hall moved the question, and the amended and edited resolution passed as quoted below:</p> <p>"Having surveyed the faculty in an attempt to discover the opinion of our colleagues and constituents on the present questionnaire form used for student evaluation of faculty and its administrative use, the Faculty Senate Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance wishes to report a very substantial majority of the respondents favor a student evaluation of faculty but recommend a revision of the form and the practices governing its administrative use.</p> <p>"Be it therefore resolved that the Senate urges the administration to institute a revision of the current questionnaire form with oversight of the revision by a University Evaluation Committee which should include at least six full-time faculty members and that this committee revise the form consulting with each department. Be it further resolved that the Senate urges the administrative use of the statistical information be kept at the department level where similar professional training and experience make interpretation of the data more reliable, and where evaluation materials may be used to augment information on teaching, research, and service which make up the chairman's report concerning the tenure, promotion, and salary of his faculty.</p> <p>"Be it further resolved that, should any question of a chairman's recommendation be raised by an administrator or an advisory committee, the chairman shall meet with the administrator and/or the advisory committee to clarify evaluation material used by the chairman." Committee on Finance: Chairman Durham reported that a report would be made at the May 5 meeting of the Senate, at which time a report of administrative salaries will be presented.</p> <p>Select Committee on the Function and Role of the Faculty Senate: Chairman Reuter reported that, as the committee was not charged to complete its deliberations this year, it will continue to meet and will present its report next year.</p> |
| 5/77 | <p>Chairman Remley presented the Nominating Committee's recommendations for new These were: Chairman: Jim Corder, Vice Chairman: Secretary: Malcolm Arnoult, Secretary: Joyce Harden, Assistant Secretary: Craig Felton. There were no nominations from the floor. The motion that nominations close was seconded and passed for each office and the officers were elected.</p> |
| 5/77 | <p>Senator Venier said that the Art Department used its professional judgment in saying that removal of the picture would be a matter of censorship and moved that the Senate actively support the Art Department's judgment in the matter. The motion was seconded and passed. {See long discussion before this quote on pages 2 & 3 in the 5/1977 minutes}.</p> |
| 10/77 | <p>{See notes starting on page 1 and ending on page 3 of the October, 1977 minutes for motions and their success}</p> |
| 11/77 | <p>{See extensive notes starting on page 1 and ending on page 5 of the November, 1977 minutes for many motions and their success}</p> |
| 12/77 | <p>Chairman Arnoult announced that with the present meeting the number of members of the Faculty Senate had been increased to include the Executive Vice Chancellor. The recommendation passed by the Senate in the Spring of 1977 was approved by the Board of Trustees.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 12/77 | <p>Senator Reinecke distributed copies of a design for implementing the selection of members of future Search Committees for Academic Deans. A copy of the design is included with the minutes.</p> <p>A discussion of the design resulted initially in a motion to reword statement (a) under "A procedure will be considered approved if it" to read:</p> <p>(a) receives the votes of a majority of the full-time faculty of the college in a written ballot.</p> <p>Following discussion of the implications of such wording, Senator Venier amended the {unintelligible} to change the wording back to the original statement: (a) receives a majority of the full-time faculty of the college in a written ballot. Second: Senator Rhodes. Vote: 23 for, 7 against. Senator Moudy moved to table the motion to accept the proposed design. Second: Senator Farrar. Vote: 7 for, 23 against. The question was called and the motion was passed to accept the suggested design.</p> |
| 4/78 | <p>Chairman Arnoult reminded the Senate that the Search Committee Procedures Document was never formally distributed. Senator Dominiak said that she doubted that the Trustees developed the Search policy and that she found it a little difficult to be unhappy with the Board, Senator Adams asked for clarification on methods of resolving the misunderstanding concerning faculty representation on the Search Committee. Senator Wilsey said that he was aware of faculty concern and that the Faculty Advisory Committee would be most active in the selection process, Senator Venier seconded the motion to forward the resolution and the vote was taken. Vote: For - 16, Against - . The motion passed,</p> |
| 4/78 | <p>C. Senator Dominiak shared her response to the recent Assembly where the interim plan was presented. She indicated that she and Senator Hensley had read the full report following the Assembly. Prior to making the following motion she shared with the Senate her reservations about the extent to which the motion expressed the substance of her current concerns.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the Senate convey to the Board of Trustees its concern about the failure of the administration to give thoughtful consideration and voice to the details of such actions as might be required within the next five years to meet the problems stated in the interim plan.</p> <p>It was moved by Senator Procter and seconded to table consideration of the motion to a future meeting. Motion carried.</p> |
| 9/78 | <p>a. recommended Dr. Serge Matulich be nominated to replace Dr. Marjorie Stanley on the Courses of Study Committee to serve until 1983. The motion to recommend Dr. Matulich carried.</p> |
| 9/78 | <p>b. recommended that the following faculty persons constitute the membership of the Select Committee on the Organization of Graduate Instruction and Research--</p> <p>Dr. Joseph Britton AddRan Natural Sciences Dr. Barry Tuchfeld AddRan Social Sciences Dr. John Loud AddRan Humanities Dr. Stan Block Business Dr. Michael Winesanker Fine Arts Dr. John Lottes Education Dr. Ann Richards Nursing Dr. William Watson Graduate Faculty Dr. Richard Hoehn Brite</p> <p>The motion to approve was carried.</p> |
| 10/78 | <p>c. Selection of a new chancellor. Chairman Flowers reminded the Senate of the announcement of the Chancellor's retirement in the State of the University address and the subsequent letter from Dr. Conner, TCU trustee chairman, requesting comments regarding criteria.</p> <p>Chairman Flowers reported the Executive Committee had prepared a draft of a cover letter and questionnaire regarding criteria, proposing that the Senate distribute them to the faculty. Following discussion, there was a motion to "approve the distribution by the Senate, of a questionnaire regarding chancellor criteria and that an Ad Hoc Committee be appointed to develop the final questionnaire." Motion carried (16 yes, 5 no, 2 abstentions).</p> <p>Following additional discussion, there was a motion that "the Ad Hoc Committee submit the result of its work to the Senate for approval prior to the distribution of the questionnaire." Motion carried (14 yes, 7 no, 2 abstentions).</p> <p>Chairman Flowers reported he had written to Dr. Conner expressing concern that there be broad faculty participation in the chancellor search process. He subsequently met with Dr. Conner who is in agreement with the concept of broad faculty participation. Dr. Conner has requested the Executive Committee to suggest possible search procedures. Chairman Flowers asked Senators to forward to the Executive Committee their suggestions about procedures.</p> <p>There was discussion about faculty role in determining the actual criteria.</p> <p>There was a motion that "an Ad Hoc Committee be appointed to draw up a set of chancellor search criteria as a basis for discussion at a meeting of the Senate." Motion did not carry (11 yes, 12 no).</p> |
| 11/78 | <p>It was moved and seconded that the Senate receive the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and discharge the Committee. carried.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 11/78 | <p>It was moved and seconded that the proposed tenure document, as amended, be approved by the Senate and forwarded to the administration of the University. The motion carried.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the Senate adopt the tenure document and forward it to the proper administrative personnel and trustees. Following discussion questioning whether any item can be acted on in the same meeting as when it is presented, it was moved and seconded to table to the next meeting the previous motion to adopt. Motion carried.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that in order to facilitate the Senate's handling of the tenure document all proposed amendments be submitted in writing to the Executive Committee by November 20, that the Executive Committee be empowered to distinguish between editorial and principle amendments and to make editorial changes and to construct the agenda for the next meeting, and that amendments be circulated to the Senate by December 4. Carried.</p> |
| 11/78 | <p>Senator Venier presented "A Resolution Concerning Inflation and Salaries."</p> <p>It was moved and seconded to adopt the resolution. Discussion followed about inflation, about whether the resolution intends across-the-board raises, about the size of average raises at TCU in the past five years, and how the resolution might be amended. It was suggested the procedure for handling the tenure document be used for the resolution.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded to table consideration of the resolution. Motion carried (17 favored, 4 opposed, 5 abstentions) .</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the Executive Committee express to the Trustee/Faculty Committee the Senate's concern for inflation and salaries. Motion carried.</p> |
| 12/78 | <p>B. It was moved and seconded that suggested change # 4 (on the printed list of suggestions) be considered next. The motion carried.</p> |
| 12/78 | <p>E. Item II.B.2. line 13. It was moved and seconded to separate the two parts of the suggested amendment. The motion carried.</p> <p>a. Insert at the end of the sentence ending "of higher learning," the phrase "subsequent to terminal qualification in her or his field." The change was approved.</p> <p>b. Add this sentence immediately following the above change: "In calculating the maximum probationary period, credit for previous full-time service with the rank of instructor or higher in other accredited institutions of higher learning prior to terminal qualification may be granted at the time of initial appointment." The change was approved.</p> |
| 2/79 | <p>1. Section II. B. 1. Senator Venier moved and it was seconded that the first sentence of the proposed two sentence addition be adopted as follows: "The recommendation for waiver shall be reviewed in parallel with the recommendation for initial appointment." Motion carried. ((The proposed second sentence was, "The Chancellor shall make the final decision whether to forward the nomination to the Board of Trustees."))</p> <p>2. Section II. B. 2. Senator Procter moved and it was seconded to substitute in the third sentence "at least" for "more than" During the discussion, Dr. Secrest stated the departmental chairmen would be included within the seven year rule under either set of words, since departmental chairmen are considered to have full-time academic appointments. The motion was defeated.</p> <p>3. Section II. B. 2.--sentence 5. Senator Venier moved and it was seconded to approve sentence 5 as follows: "However, the probationary period for a person granted credit for service prior to appointment at TCU may extend to as much as four years even if the total full-time service in the profession exceeds seven years." Motion carried.</p> <p>Section II. B. 2. Senator Baird moved and it was seconded to add a new section "d" as follows; "A decision on tenure, favorable or unfavorable, shall be made by the institution at least twelve months prior to the completion of the probationary period." Motion carried.</p> <p>5. A report was given by Senator Secrest of the University attorney's response to the tenure document. The attorney had several questions which were answered (including the offering of rewording suggestions) by the Tenure Committee. See attached letter. The concerns included:</p> <p>(1) Section I. A. No definition as to what constitutes full-time faculty. Committee suggested the change as in item 1 of letter. It was moved and seconded to approve. Motion carried.</p> <p>(2) Section I. B. Any difference between purpose to cover non-tenured faculty and tenured faculty? Question answered by Committee; no action by the Senate was deemed necessary.</p> <p>(3) Section II. B. 1. What is the meaning of "probationary period"? Committee suggested addition of item 3 in letter. It was moved and seconded to approve. Motion carried.</p> <p>(4) Section II. c. 1. What are the "few exceptions"? Committee suggested the wording in item 4 of letter. It was moved and seconded to approve. Motion carried.</p> <p>(5) Section II. E. Concern with tenure tied directly to retirement regulations. Committee suggestion in attached letter (item 5) did not meet with the attorney's approval because it was still tied to retirement. Attorney's new suggestion as reported by Senator Secrest did not meet with the approval of the Senate.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the following statement be substituted for II. E.--"Permanent tenure shall terminate at the legal minimum mandatory retirement age." The motion carried. Senator Secrest will convey the new suggestion to the attorney and report back to the Senate.</p> |
| 2/79 | <p>A suggested substantive revision of Section V of the Tenure document was presented along with the Senate's approved version. Dr. Secrest commented on the proposed changes. It was then moved and seconded to approve the revised Section V (with the addition of the phrase, "or reassignment," at two points). The motion carried. (The approved revised Section V is attached.)</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 2/79 | B. Grievance Document. Senator Clements reviewed the Committee's fall activities and the hearings. It was moved and seconded that the Senate adopt the Faculty Grievance Policy in two parts--full policy statement and shorter summary statement. The motion carried. |
| 2/79 | C. Role and Function of the Senate. Senator Klein reminded the Senate of the "I I reorganization of the Senate" report presented at the December meeting. It was moved and seconded to receive the report and forward it to the faculty. Senator questioned why no departmental representation was considered and why the at-large category was removed. It was moved and seconded to substitute "I I for" in the place of "during" in paragraph C, page 8. Motion carried. It was moved and seconded to add "by lot I I following "shall be broken ... " in paragraph 3 I page 6. Motion carried. It was moved and seconded to ask the Role and Function Committee to reword the document in order to retain the at-large category of membership. Motion carried. |
| 2/79 | D. Committee on Committees. The Committee moved that Dr. Tom Badgett be recommended to the Chancellor for appointment to the Student Organizations Committee. The motion carried. |
| 3/79 | Committee on Role and Function of the Senate. Committee chair, Senator Klein, reported the major changes in the proposed revision of Article II of the Senate Constitution, as follow: --extends terms of office to three years --allows Senators to serve consecutive terms --reduces number of at-large Senators from 14 to 9 --increases minimum school representation from 2 to 3 --relaxes the allocation of officers among schools --calls for a person's expression of interest to serve on Senate prior to election --requires a year of service on Senate prior to service on the Executive Committee. It was moved and seconded that the Senate receive the report and forward it to the faculty as a whole. It was moved and seconded to amend the motion by deleting the Executive Vice-chancellor as an ex-officio member. Motion carried. (Section 2,A) It was moved and seconded to change language in Section 6,A,4, to "Vice Chancellor responsible for academic programs." Motion carried. It was then moved and seconded that Section 2,A be modified to read "Ex Officio Members. The Chancellor of the University, the Vice Chancellor responsible for academic programs, and the immediate past chairman of the Faculty Senate (if not otherwise an elected member of the Senate) shall be ex officio members ..* a" Motion carried. It was moved and seconded that the Executive Committee be charged with desexing the language of the entire document. Motion carried. The original motion, as amended, carried. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 4/79 | <p>Academic Excellence Committee</p> <p>The Committee's report from the March 1, 1979, meeting was removed from the table.</p> <p>1. "Withdrawal from Classes," General Information Catalog, p. 34. It was moved and seconded to shorten from 10 weeks to 5 weeks the calendar for withdrawal.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded to substitute for the original motion: to have the W grade with advisor signature only, permissible through the 8th week; through 12th week permissible but also with dean and instructor signatures; after 12th week, only Q grade possible. It was suggested that the 7th and 10th weeks be used, but the suggestion was not accepted. The substitute motion did not carry.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the "W" be allowed with advisor consent through the last class day of the semester. Motion did not carry.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded to amend the original motion by changing the dates from 5th to 7th week. Motion carried.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded to amend the original motion by deleting the language referring to the criteria for withdrawal after the latest date. Motion did not carry.</p> <p>The original motion as amended carried.</p> <p>2. "Grade Reports," General Information Catalog, p. 31.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded to insert following the second sentence the following: "Unsatisfactory shall be defined as 'D' or 'F' work." It was moved and seconded to amend the motion by insert- ing in the second sentence of "Grade Reports" the word 'undergraduate.' Motion carried. Original motion, as amended, carried. ((Statement now reads: Grades are reported to students at the end of each semester and summer terms. Reports will also be made at mid-semester on undergraduate students who are doing unsatisfactory work in one or more subjects. Unsatisfactory shall be defined as "D" or "F" work. Mid-semester reports of unsatisfactory work are not made a part of the permanent academic record of students.))</p> <p>3. It was moved and seconded that the Faculty Senate suggest to the administration that the final examination pattern be changed as follows:</p> <p>(1) Each examination period be expanded to three hours allowing sufficient time for comprehensive exams written in essay form or laboratory work to be completed.</p> <p>(2) More examination periods be scheduled during the day.</p> <p>(3) That great care be exercised in out" throughout the week examinations for courses which have met at primary class times.</p> <p>It was decided to vote on each separate item.</p> <p>--Item (1). Motion carried.</p> <p>--Item (2) was amended to read "More examination periods be scheduled." Motion carried.</p> <p>--Item (3). Motion carried.</p> <p>4. The Committee on Academic Excellence moved (and it was seconded) as an expression of concern that the faculty carefully observe the procedures of not administering any final examinations during the final week of classes except for laboratories or juried performances in music. Motion carried.</p> |
| 4/79 | <p>Committee on Finance and Compensation</p> <p>Senator Wortham distributed the Committee's report on TCU Faculty Salaries as of January 11 1979. The report was accepted. It was moved and seconded that the Salaries report be distributed to faculty through the Weekly Bulletin. Motion carried.</p> |
| 5/79 | <p>Committee on Committees reported its "Proposed University Committee Assignments for 1979-80." It was moved and seconded to approve the recommendations and forward them to the Administration (except for the University Court members who are appointed by the Senate.) Motion carried.</p> |
| 5/79 | <p>Committee on Finance and Compensation. Senator Wortham, on behalf of the Committee, moved (and it was seconded) that the administration be urged to investigate the feasibility of increasing summer school salary from 7 percent per course to 8 and 1/3 percent. The motion carried.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 11/79 | <p>Academic Excellence Committee - E. Miller for B. Frye</p> <p>a. Recommendations from last year concerning grading policy and length of final exams have been forwarded to the University Council for consideration.</p> <p>b. The committee recommended that the senate not approve Student House "Faculty Evaluation Bill" #79-22. E. Miller moved and seconded that the senate not approve this bill. Discussion ensued. Concern was expressed that the current procedure for student evaluation of faculty was not cost effective and should be revised. It was moved and seconded to table the motion until legal matters could be clarified. The motion to table was defeated. The original motion carried.</p> <p>c. The Committee reported a positive response to the Student House bill #79-10, "A Bill to Encourage Auditing" with slight reservations. E. Miller moved to approve this bill; it was seconded. Discussion ensued. Concern was expressed about the misuse of the audit and about ways of this. The motion carried.</p> |
| 11/79 | <p>Student Relations Committee - W. Barcellona for S. Gore. The response to Student House Bill #79-23 requesting the addition of the minor field on student transcripts was positive. The committee recommends that we endorse the bill to add the declared minor to the student's final transcript when this can be facilitated by modification of the computer program. This was so and seconded, The motion carried.</p> |
| 11/79 | <p>A. Berliner expressed concern about the highly denominational prayers offered at public events at TCU; he moved that the senate recommend to the administration that on those instances sponsored by TCU which are public occasions open to all and/or when it is known that the group present is an inter-faith group, the prayer offered should be an interfaith rather than a strictly Christian or denominational prayer. The motion was seconded. Discussion ensued. It was moved and seconded to table this motion until the next meeting. The motion to table carried.</p> |
| 12/79 | <p>Committee on Committees - S. Hensley reported that the Committee on University Committees met and recommends to the Faculty Senate that five of the following seven individuals be chosen to serve on the search committee for vice chancellor and dean of the university. All seven of the individuals are tenured faculty and have agreed to serve on the search committee if chosen.</p> <p>Ken Lawrence - Religion, Bill Watson - Chemistry, Larry Adams - Sociology, Stan Block - School of Business, Mildred Hogstel - Nursing, Emmet Smith - Fine Arts, John Arnn - Education</p> <p>J. Kelly reported that the Executive Committee had allocated representation according to functional rather than organizational divisions within the university, including graduate and undergraduate representation plus representation from the humanities, physical sciences, social sciences, and the professional schools. S. Hensley moved that the slate be adopted; the motion was seconded. Following a great deal of discussion, the motion was approved.</p> <p>B. Proctor moved that the approved slate of seven names be submitted to the Chancellor. The motion was seconded. In the following discussion, D. Hoehn questioned the advisability of choosing persons who had been in the administrative role as representatives of the faculty on the search committee. A. Miracle voiced his concern with the lack of representation of non-tenured faculty on search committees because of the policy recommended in 1977 by the senate. The motion carried. Dr. Tucker reminded the senate that the formation of an advisory search committee for the position of Vice Chancellor and Dean of the University was a first for this position here at TCU. He also stated that, in the interests of time, he would like to begin advertising the position in the Chronicle before the search committee was formally constituted.</p> <p>N. Daniel moved that the senate concur with the Chancellor on this early advertisement of the position. The motion was seconded. Motion carried.</p> |
| 12/79 | <p>Finances and Compensation - J. Wortham reported that</p> <p>a. The committee is in the process of working out the proposal structure of an advisory budget committee in consultation with the Chancellor.</p> <p>b. In terms of the 1979 committee report, he would like to reiterate that TCU has the lowest rate of summer school compensation in the area (7% of annual salary, with state schools paying 8.3% and Baylor 10%) and also that the committee contends that faculty members responsible for generating the summer school revenues should receive appropriate compensation.</p> <p>c. The committee moved that the administration be urged to increase the summer compensation per course to 8 1/3% of the faculty member's annual salary. The motion was seconded. Following some discussion, the motion carried.</p> |
| 12/79 | <p>A. Berliner moved that his motion on the recommendation of interfaith prayers at public functions at TCU be removed from the table. The motion was seconded. Motion carried. Discussion ensued. S. Gore moved to substitute the following motion for the Berliner motion: that the Senate convey to the administration a concern for sensitivity regarding the content of prayers at public gatherings at TCU. The motion was seconded. Following discussion, the motion carried.</p> |
| 2/80 | <p>Committee on Committees - S. Hensley moved that the following names be recommended to Interim Vice Chancellor Leigh Secret for possible inclusion on the Search Committee for "Director of Continuing Education": M. McCracken, F. Reuter, G. Landwer, L. Clegg, C. Felton, M.L. Bond, and S. Hensley. (It was understood that 5 of the 7 persons would be selected for the committee.) Motion seconded. After some discussion, motion carried. Procter requested that the executive committee consider re-examining the search committee regulation passed by the senate 2 years ago which curtails nominations from the floor when voting on suggested search committee representatives.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 2/80 | Committee on Finances and Compensation - J. Wortham. Data were distributed which included "TCU Instructional Faculty Salary Ranges by Rank and Sex," "TCU Instructional Faculty Salaries by Rank and College," and "Average Compensation and Percentage Change of Faculty in Category I Schools in Texas 1974-75 - 1978-79." It was moved and seconded to distribute this material to the total faculty, with a cover letter of explanation written by Senator Wortham. Motion carried. |
| 2/80 | Committee on Tenure and Promotion: The 8 changes in the new tenure document recommended by the administration before forwarding it to the Board of Trustees were discussed. (See attached) All changes were approved with the exception of #6, removing the sentence broadening the framework of values within which moral turpitude is determined; #7 was amended by substituting the words "the tenured faculty members" for "they". It was moved and seconded to report to the administration that the Senate endorses the 7 modifications in the document and is opposed to the one (#6). Motion carried. Dr. Tucker stated that he would take the senate action under advisement and would forward the tenure document to the trustees in March. |
| 2/80 | The executive committee, acting as the election committee, nominated B. Frye to serve as Vice-Chairman of the senate for the remainder of the 1979-80 year. It was moved and seconded that he be elected by acclamation. Motion carried. It was moved and seconded that Chairman Kelly be requested to write a note of appreciation to K. Snyder for his leadership during the fall. Motion carried. |
| 2/80 | Committee on Committees - S. Hensley moved that the following names be recommended to Interim Vice Chancellor Leigh Secret for possible inclusion on the Search Committee for "Director of Continuing Education": M. McCracken, F. Reuter, G. Landwer, L. Clegg, C. Felton, M.L. Bond, and S. Hensley. (It was understood that 5 of the 7 persons would be selected for the committee.) Motion seconded. After some discussion, motion carried. |
| 2/80 | Data were distributed which included "TCU Instructional Faculty Salary Ranges by Rank and Sex," "TCU Instructional Faculty Salaries by Rank and College," and "Average Compensation and Percentage Change of Faculty in Category I Schools in Texas 1974-75 - 1978-79." It was moved and seconded to distribute this material to the total faculty, with a cover letter of explanation written by Senator Wortham. Motion carried. |
| 2/80 | R. Flowers moved that the senate consider at the March meeting a revision of the statement in the search committee guidelines limiting service on such a committee to tenured faculty. Motion was seconded and carried. |
| 2/80 | J. Rurak moved that the following resolution be considered at the March meeting: Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of TCU go on record as encouraging all faculty to sign the statement drafted by Prof. Don Jackson, appearing on page 2 of the Skiff, Thursday, February 14. To wit: I affirm that I will not participate in, aid, assist, or condone any organization on campus that, in policy or in practice, is racially discriminatory in its membership selection. I will inquire before joining any organization into its policy and practice on this question. And be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate of TCU go on record as opposing the use for faculty functions of any facilities of Clubs or Organizations, which presently do not have an integrated membership. The motion was seconded and carried. |
| 2/80 | Two-day study period. The following statement was moved: "The two-day study period shall be free of all academic classwork and will be given over entirely to preparation for final examinations. Any exceptions to this policy (such as jury exams) must have the approval of the appropriate dean and students must be notified at least two weeks in advance." The motion was carried. |
| 2/80 | Proposal for graduation with honors. It was moved to remove item 2.d. of the Committee Reports from the March 5, 1981 meeting from the table. The motion carried. It was moved that (2.d.) the proposed changes for graduation with honors be approved. The motion was defeated. |
| 2/80 | Scheduling of exams. It was moved that a faculty member who wishes to schedule an exam other than during the final exam period should write a letter stating the reasons for the change to the chairman with a copy to the dean. It was moved to table this motion so that it could be considered along with the motion on exam-scheduling passed at the 3/5/81 meeting, and further It was moved that the Senate reconsider motion 2.e. of the Committee Reports from the March 5, 1981 meeting. The motion was carried. A motion to consider 2.e., regarding the scheduling of final exams was superseded by a motion to refer that item to the Committee. The motion to refer was carried. It was moved to inform the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs that the Senate is reconsidering the matter of scheduling of exams (as expressed in 2.e.) I retracts its endorsement of the past meeting, and will forward the results of that reconsideration when completed. The motion was carried. |
| 2/80 | Ken Lawrence moved the following: "Whereas Dr. Keith C. Odom has tendered his resignation as Director of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University; and "Whereas the Honors Council met on :March 31, 1981 and pro- posed that it be constituted as the Search Committee for the selection of the Director of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University; therefore Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University does hereby ratify and confirm the appointment of the 1980-81 members of the Honors Council of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University as the designated Search Committee for the selection of the Director of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University. Said Search Committee is hereby charged to conduct the search process and to recommend to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs one or more qualified candidates for appointment as the Director of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University on or before May 15, 1981." The motion was carried. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 2/80 | Bob Frye surrendered the chair to Glenn Routt, so that Frye could speak to the composition of the faculty members to aid in the search for the Associate Vice Chancellor for Programs and Curriculum, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Research. Bob distributed position descriptions, and explained both the nature of the positions (staff), and the search process (internal and immediate). After extensive discussion it was moved that the current Executive Committee of the Senate be designated the faculty to participate in the search for the Associate Vice Chancellors positions. The motion was carried. |
| 3/80 | Faculty composition on search committees. R. Flowers moved that the following statement be deleted from the senate search committee guideline recommendations: Section 6 1 paragraph 2--"Except for search committees purposed to make recommendations for departmental chairmen. Faculty Senate nominees to search committees shall be tenured." Motion seconded, Discussion ensued. Motion carried. |
| 3/80 | Jackson statement on racial discrimination. J. Rurak moved adoption of the following resolution: "Be it resolved that the "Faculty Senate of TCU go on record as encouraging all faculty to sign the state- ment drafted by Prof. Don Jackson, appearing on page 2 of the Skiff, Thursday, February 14. To wit: "I affirm that I will not participate in, aid, assist, or condone any organization on campus that, in policy or in practice, is racially discriminatory in its membership selection. I will inquire before joining any organization into its policy and practice on this question." And be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate of TCU go on record as opposing the use for faculty functions of any facilities of Clubs or Organizations, which presently do not have an integrated membership. Motion seconded. Following much discussion, the motion carried. |
| 4/80 | Betsy Colquitt for the Committee on Committees distributed "Recommendations of faculty membership on University Committees 1981-82." A motion to accept the was carried. |
| 5/80 | Finances and Compensation. John Wortham presented the report of the Committee (attached). a. It was recommended that a Faculty Budget Committee as described be established and begin functioning in the Fall of 1980. b. An amendment was proposed that the phrase "which impact on the educational function" in item one under the Charge be deleted. The amendment was defeated. c. After extensive discussion the original motion was carried. |
| 10/80 | It was moved to recommend persons to fill vacancies on three University Committees. The motion was amended, "that the Student Organizing Committee appointment be held until the chair of the Committee communicates concerns regarding the size of the Committee to the chair of the Committee on Committees." The amended motion was passed. The two approved were Howard Stone on the Research Committee and Alicia Travelle on the Traffic Regulations Committee. |
| 10/80 | It was moved that the Faculty Budget Committee in pre- paring its own bylaws report to the Senate its recommendations with regard to the term of elected and appointed members. The motion was passed. |
| 11/80 | {see page 2 of the 11/1980 minutes for discussion of several motions that were passed relative to academic excellence and proposed statements on official audits.} |
| 12/80 | The policy on audits. It was moved that the following statement be approved and be forwarded to the University Council along with the paragraph approved at the November 6 meeting. "An attendance requirement is in effect for all official audits and will be established by the individual instructor. In any event, a student must be present at least seventy-five percent of class time in order for an audit to be officially recorded on his or her transcript." The motion was carried. |
| 12/80 | The Statement of Philosophy and Objectives of the University mailed with the meeting announcement. It was moved "that the Senate accept the statement, endorse its substance, and commend it to the Administration as a Faculty contribution to the re-writing of the Philosophy and Objectives of the University." The Statement was amended to add "undergraduate" to the phrase "to offer only those selected undergraduate professional degree programs" in the last paragraph of page two. After discussion of various items, and the reminder that this is only a "first round" statement, the motion was carried. |
| 12/80 | Linda Haviland moved "that the Committee on Academic Excellence and Alternatives be highly commended for their work in preparing and presenting the Statement." The motion was carried. |
| 2/81 | Jim Kelly moved that the Senate in behalf of the entire faculty express appreciation and congratulations to Chancellor and all others who were responsible for the meeting its goal for the library project. The motion was passed. |
| 3/81 | A resolution concerning by-laws of the University Budget Committee was introduced. A motion to refer the resolution to the University Budget Committee was carried. |
| 3/81 | The Committee moved "that the time limit within which a student may withdraw from a course without consent of instructor and dean be changed from the present end of the tenth week to the end of the eighth week of classes in the semester." The motion was carried. |
| 3/81 | The Committee moved the following regarding final examinations: "As noted on page 52 of the Faculty Handbook, 'exam schedules are officially established. No final examinations are to be given before the beginning of the final exam period. /underlining in the Handbook/. A schedule of such examinations is issued and must be-adhered to rigidly.' We strongly urge chairmen and deans to enforce this rule." The motion was carried. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 3/81 | The Committee made a report on three-hour examination periods. and recommended that no change be made from the present practice of two-hour examination periods. It was moved that the final examination schedule be built around three hour periods. The motion was carried. |
| 3/81 | It was moved that the Senate recommend to the appropriate committee (on scheduling) that no study or class days be eliminated as a result of the prior recommendation to change to three-hour examination periods. The motion was carried. |
| 4/81 | Betsy Colquitt for the Committee on Committees distributed "Recommendations of faculty membership on University Committees 1981-82." A motion to accept the recommendations was carried. |
| 4/81 | Two-day study period. The following statement was moved: "The two-day study period shall be free of all academic classwork and will be given over entirely to preparation for final examinations. Any exceptions to this policy (such as jury exams) must have the approval of the appropriate dean and students must be notified at least two weeks in advance." The motion was carried. |
| 4/81 | Proposal for graduation with honors. It was moved to remove item 2.d. of the Committee Reports from the March 5, 1981 meeting from the table. The motion carried. |
| 4/81 | It was moved to inform the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs that the Senate is reconsidering the matter of scheduling of exams (as expressed in 2.e.) endorsement of the past meeting, and will forward the results of that reconsideration when completed. The motion was carried. |
| 4/81 | Arthur Berliner was nominated by the Executive Committee to be faculty representative to the University Advisory Committee. Motions were made and carried to close the nominations and elect Berliner by acclamation. |
| 4/81 | "Whereas Dr. Keith C. Odom has tendered his resignation as Director of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University; and "Whereas the Honors Council met on :March 31, 1981 and pro- posed that it be constituted as the Search Committee for the selection of the Director of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University; therefore Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University does hereby ratify and confirm the appointment of the 1980-81 members of the Honors Council of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University as the designated Search Committee for the selection of the Director of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University. Said Search Committee is hereby charged to conduct the search process and to recommend to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs one or more qualified candidates for appointment as the Director of the Honors Program of Texas Christian University on or before May 15, 1981." The motion was carried. |
| 4/81 | Bob Frye surrendered the chair to Glenn Routt, so that Frye could speak to the composition of the faculty members to aid in the search for the Associate Vice Chancellor for Programs and Curriculum, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Research. Bob distributed position descriptions, and explained both the nature of the positions (staff), and the search process (internal and immediate). After extensive discussion it was moved that the current Executive Committee of the Senate be designated the faculty to participate in the search for the Associate Vice Chancellors positions. The motion was carried. |
| 5/81 | The first committee report was from Senator Spencer Tucker, chairman Academic Excellence and Alternatives. The following statement on final examinations passed and will go to the University Council for approval: Revision of Statement on Final Examinations All final examinations shall be given at the published official times unless pedagogical necessity requires otherwise. If so, the change must be approved in advance by the Dean of the college or school in which the course is offered, and students must be notified of the change at least thirty days in advance. |
| 5/81 | Discussions centered on the difficulty of complying with this when the grades for seniors have to be in early and some pro- fessors do not want to test those students separately; the problems arising from the policy of allowing students to change an exam time when more than two exams they must take fall within a 24 hour period; the requirements for some performance-projects classes. The policy does not prevent students from petitioning to take exams early if they have special problems, and Senator Farrar said the policy should bring forth some reasoned arguments for early examinations and some informed reasons as to why so many examinations are being given early. The Senate also passed a motion to report all plusses and minuses on final grade sheets and on the student transcripts. |
| 9/81 | {See the extended (and somewhat confusing) discussion from page 2 to page 4 of the 9/1981 minutes related to search committee composition}. |
| 10/81 | Senator Graham said he had 26 signatures on a resolution from Ann Ashworth (see enclosure 2). Frye recommended that the resolution be referred to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate so that body can request the assistance of the University Committee on Evaluation, asking it to report back to the Senate by the Senate's next meeting. Graham moved to table the resolution in favor of the action suggested by Frye. The Senate approved the motion. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 10/81 | Senator Wortham said he had been asked to present a proposed motion for establishing search committees (see enclosure 3). The motion was approved. Frye noted that the old document on search procedures mentioned an Executive Vice Chancellor and a Dean of the Graduate School, positions that no longer exist at TCU. He said the document did need to be brought up to date. |
| 11/81 | Jahn Wortham moved that the minutes of the last meeting be approved as corrected on page 3: "The motion (for establishing search committees) was approved <u>and was sent to the Committee on the Role and Function of the Senate, chaired by Art Berliner.</u> " The correction was accepted and the minutes approved. |
| 11/81 | Faculty Budget Committee, John Wortham, Chairman: Senator Wortham reported that the Budget Committee had met twice: once to consider the quasi-endowment fund and Wayne Ludvigson's faculty salary comparison report, and a second time to discuss assumptions underlying the budget planning for next year. The committee will be meeting with Vice Chancellor Leigh Secrest and Chancellor Tucker to discuss the quasi-endowment and other assumptions in budgeting. Senator Ludvigson presented the faculty salary comparison report, using an overhead projector to display the tables contained in the report. Following his presentation, Senator Berliner asked if the same magnitude of differences between TCU and the other Category I universities also was reflected in TCU's administrators' salaries. Ludvigson said he did not have that information. Senator Wortham noted that the report does not include last year's 13 percent increase for TCU faculty. Senator proposed that the Senate thank Ludvigson for a thorough report. The motion was approved. Senator Clegg recommended that the report be shared with members of the faculty, administration, and trustees. The Senate voted to send complete copies of the report to all members of the TCU faculty and administration and to all members of the Faculty-Trustee Relations Committee who will have on their agenda the item of faculty salaries. As an agenda item, the report will appear as an exhibit in the Faculty-Trustee Relations Committee materials which will be made available to all trustees. |
| 2/82 | Senator Art Berliner formally presented his report which also had been distributed with the agenda for the meeting. Senator Dominiak noted that the changes would have to be constitutional amendments. To Berliner's motion that the wording of the recommendation simply be substituted for appropriate wording in the constitution, Senator Remley asked if that could be done. Berliner withdrew the motion, and Senator Dominiak asked that if voting on the recommendations as just the "sense of the Senate" with constitutional changes to be drafted later, she wanted some clarification of meaning and intent. After discussion, Senator Lysiak moved that the recommendations on page 2 of the report (attached) be adopted. The motion passed. Frye asked that the appropriate amendments to the constitution be drafted to accommodate the motion as passed. |
| 5/82 | Senator Berliner offered a recommendation from his committee on the attendance of Senators at meetings. After much discussion, a motion Senator Steven Cole to table acceptance of the report was approved. Cole's motion stipulated that the committee would report in September on their findings on the attendance record of Senators and what constitutional changes would have to be made. |
| 10/82 | Art Berliner presented the Committee's resolution concerning attendance at Senate meetings. The resolution was passed by the Senate. |
| 12/82 | At the October 1982 meeting of the Senate a resolution was passed requiring the Secretary to report the total number of absences at Senate meetings by Senators for each semester. The following Senators have missed Senate meetings this semester (number in parenthesis): Jerry Cochran (2), Steve Cole (1), Betsy Colquitt (1), Linda Curry (1), Mike Dodson (1), Gerry Dominiack (1), Jim Farrar (2), David Graham (1), Linda Guy (1), Joyce Harden (2), Linda Haviland (1), Dale Huckaby (1), Don Jackson (1), Ann Kirkham (3), Noah Knepper (1), Wayne Ludvigson (1), Margaret McWhorter (1), Keith Odom (1), C.A. Quarles (1), Bill Vanderhoof (1), Ruth Whitlock (1), Willadean Williams (1). All other elected Senators have attended every meeting this fall. |
| 4/83 | Chairman Routt reported that he had received a request from the organization of retired TCU faculty for formal recognition by the University. The Senate passed a resolution recognizing the establishment at TCU of an association of retired TCU professors and requested there be formal recognition by the Administration. |
| 4/83 | Senator Bob Frye introduced a resolution commending the work of the TCU library staff. A copy of this resolution is attached. It was passed unanimously by the Senate. |
| 5/83 | Chairman Routt read a letter from University Librarian Paul Parham expressing appreciation for the resolution concerning the library which was passed by the Senate at its April meeting. |
| 5/83 | Senator John Wortham reported on the work of the Faculty Budget Committee. He noted that the Committee had made progress this past year and reported that the Quasi-Endowment Fund should reach \$20 million in book value this year. Wortham also introduced a resolution expressing appreciation for the recent salary increases. This resolution, a copy of which is attached, was passed unanimously by the Senate. |
| 5/83 | Year-end reports by Senate committees were also cancelled. Ed McNertney of Academic Affairs reported, however, that the Academic Conduct Policy passed by the Senate was approved by University Council with a few minor changes and will go into effect with the Fall semester. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 10/83 | Senator Vanderhoof submitted a report from the Senate Committee on Committees recommending (1) that Dr. Jennifer Watson be suggested as a replacement for Dr. Roger Rees on the Safeguards In Human Research Committee, and (2) that Dr. Ken Morgan be suggested as a replacement for Dr. Mike Dodson as Chair of the Admissions Committee. Moved, seconded, and carried to accept the report. |
| 10/83 | Senator Berliner presented a petition asking that the "thirty-minute permit lot" south of the main entrance revert to full time faculty parking. Moved, seconded, and carried to forward the petition to the Committee on Traffic Regulations and Appeals. |
| 12/83 | The Faculty Budget Committee presented the third annual report on Faculty Compensation at TCU. It was moved, seconded, and passed that this report be distributed to the Faculty. |
| 12/83 | Senator Quarles moved, and Whitlock seconded, that the Senate continue its present form. of dealing with honorary degree nominations and that the Self Study recommendation be rejected. By a vote of 19 for and 16 against this motion passed. There were 3 abstentions. |
| 12/83 | Senator Vanderhoof, Chairman, reported for the Committee on Committees. They recommend that (1) Dr. Gene Alpert (Political Science) be appointed to the Student Conduct Committee, term to end in 1987; and (2) Professor Pat Paulus (Biology) be appointed to the Evaluation Committee, term to end in 1986. Moved, seconded, and passed to forward the Committee's recommendations. |
| 12/83 | <p>Senator Odom, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Academic Excellence, presented a report for that Committee. It has "reviewed TCU Admissions Policies and Admissions portions of the Self Study, including Recommendations of the Standard III Committee on Educational Programs. Dean of Admissions, Edward Boehm, met with the committee to answer questions and supply information not found in the printed sources." The Standard III recommendations were as follows:</p> <p>1. Maintain the current admissions policy for a period sufficient to provide meaningful data for evaluation. 2. Gradually raise the admissions criteria. 3. Continue to grant college credit for "life experience" and to grant college credit for pre-college learning. Have the University Courses of Study Committee provide an annual review of the practice. 4. Adopt the "State Method" of calculation the Ge.P.A.'s of both transfer students and regular students. 5. Place greater priority on quality now that the University has reached an "optimal level" of enrollment. 6. Continue to affirm by statement and by action the University's commitment to academic improvement. Through public relations efforts emphasize academic programs and academic demands at TCU. Urge the Admissions Office to continue to include the faculty in the admissions process.</p> <p>The Academic Excellence Committee "generally agreed with recommendations of numbers 1, 2, and 5... and had a mixed reaction to number 3, though most committee members agreed that 'granting college credit for "life experience" and "pre-college learning" have places in university programs such as the General Studies major and should be continued with proper review." The Committee disagreed with recommendation number 4. The "State Method" bases G.P.A.'s on grades in all courses attempted. TCU presently bases G.P.A.'s on grades in all courses taken once, and only on the last attempt of repeated courses. The Committee could find no clear reason for making a change; instead it supports a TCU grade point average, printed on the transcript, for transfer students, as well as their usually-published overall GPA. Regarding recommendation number 6, Dean Boehm reported that participating faculty members have usually been nominated by the Deans. The Committee recommends strongly "that the Faculty Senate be allowed to nominate faculty members for participation in the admissions process in order to include a larger number of faculty members than has been used previously." Finally, the Committee asked the Senate "to support their request that the Senate Executive Committee discuss these recommendations and questions with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and inform the Senate of the results of that discussion." Moved, seconded, and carried to accept the Committee's report.</p> |
| 3/84 | Reporting for the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance, Senator Daniel said that Senator B. Colquitt, Committee Chair, had met with Vice Chancellor Koehler and they had agreed on certain modifications which resolved the remaining differences between the document and Administration reservations. Senator Daniel distributed a list of the proposed modifications for the Senate's consideration and moved acceptance of the Grievance Policy with the revisions incorporated. Frye seconded. Motion passed. |
| 4/84 | For the Committee on the Role and Function of the Senate, Senator Quarles, Chair, spoke to the resolution his Committee presented at the April 5 meeting. Senator Berliner moved that the Senate accept, on a trial basis for 1984-85, the offer of the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor to attend Senate meetings only by invitation. The motion was seconded. Senator Daniel then moved adoption of the Role and Function Committee's resolution, which had been removed from the table. Seconded. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 20 ayes and 9 nays. (The full text of the resolution is in the Minutes of the Senate Meeting of April 5, 1984.) Senator Berliner's motion was then passed by a vote of 21 ayes and 9 nays. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 9/84 | <p>Keith Odom offered resolutions growing out of the Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Excellence, set for action at the September, 1984, meeting. He asked that the Report, distributed with the agenda, be corrected to show the name of Rhonda Payne as a member of the committee.</p> <p>Resolution 1: that the Senate reaffirm the concept that the university final examination schedule should be observed as published and not be violated.</p> <p>G. Dominiak pointed out that we must make exceptions in the scheduling for graduating seniors. Odom pointed out that the policy of the Registrar already accounts for such exceptions. Resolution passed (voice vote).</p> <p>Resolution 2: that the examination schedule be expanded from two-hour to two-and-one-half-hour periods beginning with spring 1985.</p> <p>S. Cole questioned the need for longer Odom pointed out that the lengthened periods do not require lengthened examinations. S. Hensley pointed out that the lengthened exam period for the regular semester would widen the disparity between those exams and exams in the summer session.</p> <p>Resolution passed (voice vote).</p> <p>Resolution 3: that the examination schedule be rotated so that each course time falls on a different day each spring and fall semester beginning with spring 1985.</p> <p>J. Henley asked the Senate to consider using the exam schedule as a means to even the distribution of students in more and less popular class hours. Odom responded that the committee had considered doing so but decided not to alter the present policy of matching exam times with class times.</p> <p>D. Schmidt pointed out that the examination time for classes at 11 TTh has been out of place for years. P. Paulus responded that with the proposed rotation the exam for 11 TTh would rotate with MWF classes. Odom said that Marvin Keith can put the 11 TTh exam time back into rotation with TTh classes.</p> <p>Resolution passed (voice vote, Henley dissenting).</p> |
| 10/84 | <p>Daryl Schmidt, Chair of the Senate Committee on the Role and Function of the Senate, presented four amendments to the Constitution of the Faculty Assembly, calling for separate votes on the proposed amendments .</p> <p>Amendment 1: to change the office of Vice Chairman to "Chair Elect." S. Tucker moved adoption. The motion carried on a voice vote.</p> <p>Amendment 2: to designate the Committee on Committees as the Nominating Committee for Senate officers. s. Tucker moved adoption. The motion carried on a voice vote.</p> <p>Amendment 3: to allow summer deliberations of the Faculty Senate to include participation by representatives of the Senate committees. S. Tucker moved adoption. The motion carried on a voice vote.</p> <p>Amendment 4: to empower the Executive Committee to appoint committees deemed necessary for the functioning of the Senate. Dominiak moved adoption. The motion carried on a voice vote.</p> <p>Jean Giles-Simms requested that the wording of the Constitution be changed throughout to replace Chairman with Chair. Schmidt accepted the request as a friendly amendment.</p> <p>The amendments to the Constitution passed by the Faculty Senate will be distributed by mail to the entire Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Assembly must have one month's notice, then they will vote on the proposed Constitutional amendments by mail ballot.</p> |
| 10/84 | <p>Odom moved that the amendments be submitted to the Faculty Assembly as four separate amendments, to be voted on separately. The motion carried on a voice vote.</p> |
| 10/84 | <p>Claudia Camp addressed the Senate as a representative of the Hunger Week Committee, seeking the Senate's endorsement of the 1984 Hunger Project. Naff moved adoption of the resolution as presented by the Hunger Week Committee. The motion carried on a voice vote.</p> |
| 10/84 | <p>Ed McNertney, representing the Executive Committee, introduced a faculty suggestion that the Faculty Center be converted to a Faculty Club, administered by a faculty committee. Ludvigson moved that the Executive Committee appoint an ad hoc committee to study the suggestion and report to the Faculty Senate. The motion carried on a voice vote.</p> |
| 10/84 | <p>McNertney announced that the November meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held in the Faculty Center instead of in the Richardson Board Room. Curry moved that the November meeting of the Faculty Center be held in the Richardson Board Room. The motion carried on a voice vote.</p> |
| 11/84 | <p>Steve Cole, on behalf of the Senate Committee on Committees, then presented two names for the faculty positions, Manny Reinecke and Ted Klein. The nominations were moved and seconded. Jackson reviewed the reasons for the need for the Planning Committee, noting in particular that planning documents would now be reviewed by a Committee before being sent to the Chancellor. Question was called for and the motion passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 12/84 | Steve Cole, Chair of the Committee on Committees moved for nomination of William Baird (Brite) and Stanley Block (Business). The motion was seconded and passed by a voice vote without dissent. |
| 12/84 | Neil Daniel reported the results of the recent balloting on proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Faculty Assembly. The four amendments would (1) change the office of Vice Chairman to Chair-Elect, (2) designate the Committee on Committees as the Nominating Committee for Senate officers, (3) allow summer deliberations of the Senate Executive Committee to include participation by representatives of the Senate Committees, and (4) empower the Senate Executive Committee to appoint additional committees. All four amendments passed by the required two-thirds majority. |
| 3/85 | As an item of new business Wayne Ludvigson brought a motion from the Faculty Budget Committee, recommending that an ad hoc committee be appointed to study the pay scale for summer teaching and the related matter of pay scale for part-time and adjunct faculty members. Seconded by McNertney, the motion passed on a voice vote. |
| 3/85 | <p>From Grievance Policy passed 3/1/84</p> <p>I. Purpose This document provides procedures for by members of the faculty of Texas Christian University, and if an injustice is established, for recommending equitable redress for the grievant.</p> <p>II. Applicability A. Persons who may lodge a under this policy are the faculty of TCU as defined by the current Faculty/University Staff Handbook (1983-84 Handbook, p. 16). Included are full-time and part-time faculty named in current of academic units of the University. Part-time faculty members are covered by this policy from the date of their appointment until all course responsibilities are completed. B. A grievance is defined as a claim that injustice has resulted from actions of employees of Texas Christian University' or from policies approved by members of its Board of Trustees, or from conditions for which employees or the Board of Trustees are responsible. Injustices are actions or conditions that inflict loss, hardship, or the like in relation to the grievant's work at TCU and that involve error, unfairness, or the violation of rights, policies, regulations, or established procedures, whether the procedures have been formally enunciated or have their existence only in practice.</p> <p>Revision of Purpose/Applicability sections--2/5/85</p> <p>I. Purpose This document provides procedures for investigating grievances lodged by members of the faculty of Texas Christian University and for recommending equitable redress for the grievant if an injustice as defined below is established.</p> <p>II. Applicability A. As defined in the current TCU Faculty/University Staff Handbook (for p. 17), Texas Christian University faculty covered by this policy and therefore eligible to file a grievance on their own behalf are full-time faculty, probationary faculty, temporary faculty, and part-time faculty named in current budgets of academic units of the University. This policy does not apply either to graduate students with assignments or to occasional faculty teaching on a course-by-course contract. B. A grievance as here defined is a claim that injustice related to terms and conditions of employment has resulted from actions of employees of Texas Christian University and/or from policies approved by members of its Board of Trustees. Injustices are actions or conditions that inflict loss, hardship, or the like in relation to the grievant's employment as a TCU faculty member.</p> <p>Revision 2: Section 5, page 9 of original document, concerning Chancellor's receiving of the recommendations on the handling of the grievance.</p> <p>From Grievance Policy passed 3/1/84</p> <p>5. As soon as the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designated agent* receives a report of a moral grievance, the may take immediate action to implement the recommendations of the report. If the Chancellor rejects the conclusions or declines to implement the recommendations of a report, the Chancellor..../hereafter- unchanged/ -</p> <p>Revision of Section 5--2/5/84</p> <p>5. As soon as the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designated agent* receives the report: of the Hearing Committee, the Chancellor has the privilege and responsibility of accepting or rejecting the conclusions and recommendations of the report. If the Chancellor accepts the recommendations of the report, they must be promptly expedited. If the Chancellor rejects the conclusions or declines to implement all recommendations of the report, the Chancellor..../hereafter unchanged/</p> |
| 4/85 | After some discussion Glen Routt moved that the Faculty Senate recommend to the administration that the university should continue its contribution to retirement and other benefits beyond the age of 65 until the person retires from full-time service. This recommendation should apply to all persons to whose retirement plan the university normally contributes. The motion passed on a voice vote, and the resolution was thereby adopted. The Chair will forward the resolution to the Chancellor. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 4/85 | Resolution on participation in convocations and commencements, Don Jackson. Jackson read the resolution distributed with the April minutes. Glen Routt offered some changes intended to strengthen the resolution. After emendation on the floor the Senate passed on a voice vote the following resolution: "Be it resolved that any person holding an academic appointment at the university shall be entitled and expected to participate in processions held in conjunction with university convocations or commencements. "Be it further resolved that any person holding an administrative, university staff, or general staff appointment or position at the university and who has received an academic degree at the masters level or higher shall be entitled and encouraged to participate in processions held in conjunction with university convocations or commencements." |
| 9/85 | The chair asked Betsy Colquitt, who chairs the Core Revision Committee, to comment on the work of the committee. She noted that the committee is to meet on September 6 and that November 1 is set as the date for the Committee's revised report on the core. This report is to take account of suggestions in the four papers on core revision. In the following Senate discussion, a motion was passed requesting that a summary of the four current papers and the November report be distributed to the Senate. |
| 10/85 | In the following discussion, Senators expressed concern about faculty exclusion from the processes leading to the new summer school policies. A motion to request Dr. Koehler and Dr. Falk make a report at a forthcoming Senate meeting (probably in December) passed. |
| 12/85 | Dr. Daryl Schmidt, chair of the Role and Function of the Senate, moved approval of the motion on the Budget and Finance Committee (this motion was presented to the Senate in November and is included in the minutes of the meeting). The motion passed and will be submitted to the Faculty Assembly. |
| 12/85 | He also moved approval of the substitute motion on the Senate term of the Senate Chair-elect (the substitute motion was also included in the November minutes). The motion as further amended in the December meeting reads: ART. II. Section 4. Officers. C. Eligibility for Office. Any elected Senator who served in the Senate during the current academic year is eligible for nomination to any office providing there is at least one year remaining in the Senator's term. If the Senate term of the office of the Chair-elect shall expire before the conclusion of the Chair-elect's term of office as Chair, the Chair-elect shall be designated an ex-officio member of the Senate during the term as Chair. After brief discussion, the motion passed; this revision of the Senate Constitution is also to be sent to the Faculty Assembly for a vote. |
| 2/86 | Dr. McNertney called on Dr. Spencer Tucker, who moved that the tabled motion about a minimal GPA in the major be open for discussion. This motion passed, and Dr. Tucker, chair of the Academic Excellence Committee, presented a slightly revised version of the earlier motion: The Academic Excellence Committee of the Faculty Senate proposes that requirements for graduation include the accomplishment of a grade point average in the candidate's major field(s) at least equal to that expected for graduation from the university, i.e., 2.0. Further, the Committee recommends that the Senate propose that academic departments consider whether they would deem it appropriate to require students majoring in their field to achieve a GPA higher than 2.0 and indicate their decision to the appropriate dean. Dr. Tucker's motion to approve this policy was seconded. He noted that SMU, Trinity, and Rice had similar or more rigorous policies than this; of other Texas institutions comparable to TCU, only Baylor has no such requirement. The Senate passed this motion; the Senate Secretary is to send a copy of the motion to Dr. Koehler with the request that it be considered by the University Council. |
| 4/86 | Dr. McNertney noted that Chancellor Tucker had approved the revision of the Grievance Policy which the Senate passed in Spring 1985. The new policy became effective in Fall 1986. |
| 4/86 | {See discussions starting on page 1 and ending on page 3 of the 4, 1986 minutes} |
| 4/86 | Dr. Daniel made the following motion, which the Senate passed: The Faculty Senate Committee on Committees works long and difficult hours filling the committees that do such important work for the University; We therefore extend our thanks to the Committee on Committees for its tireless and useful service. |
| 4/86 | Senators then discussed several matters in the Core Revision Committee Report, the first being the Report's recommendation that comprehensive examinations be required in all core courses. It was mentioned that academic freedom might be compromised by such a requirement and that for many courses, e.g., the freshman writing workshop classes, comprehensive finals were inappropriate. It was also noted that the proposed Core Oversight Committee might threaten academic freedom. Out of the discussion came the following motion, proposed by Dr. Dominiak, amended by Dr. Schmidt, and passed by the Senate: The sense of the Faculty Senate is that the proposed Core Oversight Committee, charged with approving courses acceptable for core credit, should not have the authority to require comprehensive examinations in all core courses. Though the Senate encourages comprehensive final examinations, such exams are unsuited to many courses likely to be a part of core study. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/86 | The next agenda item was Dr. Jurma's report for the Committee on Committees the first portion of this report was recommendations on faculty appointees to University committees (report is attached, with changes/corrections entered). He noted that Dr. Spencer Tucker was the nominee for appointment to the Budget Committee and that an emeritus faculty member was added to the Insurance, Retirements, Benefits Committee (Dr. Jeff Horn is recommended for this membership). The Committee on Committees report also recommends faculty members for the committee structures created by the Grievance Policy effective Fall 1986. Dr. Jurma commented that his Committee's report reflected a distribution criterion so that major academic units of the University were represented on University Committees. A motion to approve these recommendations passed. |
| 10/86 | Dr. Daniel called upon Bill Vanderhoof to present the report from Committee on Committees. The following resolution was proposed: "Moved that the Faculty Senate recommend to the Chancellor that the 'Animal Care and Use Committee' be designated as a university committee, that it be listed in the Faculty University Staff Handbook along with its description, namely, 'Develops standards and reviews proposed projects to insure compliance with Federal and University policies related to the humane care and use of laboratory animals in research,' that a statement of policy governing the composition of the committee and the selection of its members be drafted." Included in the discussion for this proposal, Bill Vanderhoof recommended the recognition of those people who have served on this committee up to this point in time. Neil Daniel remarked that the composition of the committee was prescribed by NIH. The motion was seconded and passed. The Chair indicated that he would send a memo to the committee requesting a draft clarifying the work of the committee. |
| 10/86 | The first proposal was that the Faculty Senate Committee on Budget and Finance look into the costs of the administrative reorganizations now underway and report its findings to the Faculty Senate as soon as possible. A motion to accept the proposal was made and passed. |
| 10/86 | The second proposal concerned the library situation. Spencer Tucker's resolution read as follows: WHEREAS the Senate is aware that TCU faculty members are deeply disturbed about the backlog in cataloging at the library; and recognizing that the library staff have taken steps to alleviate the crisis; and recognizing that the administration has been responsive to the crisis by allotting an additional general staff position to the library; the Faculty Senate, with due appreciation for these constructive efforts, nonetheless urges that: 1. the general staff position, newly allotted, be immediately "unfrozen," and 2 the library and the university administration seek means to divert unused salary allocations within the library's budget to employ temporary and/or part time personnel to alleviate the situation until such time as the cataloging backlog is significantly reduced. , After a brief discussion, the following friendly amendment was added: we further request that the Vice Chancellor for Affairs respond to the Faculty Senate regarding this matter. :The amendment was accepted. |
| 10/86 | The CORE Curriculum. The proposal for the new CORE curriculum went through the University Courses of Study Committee and on Monday, September 29, 1986, went to the University Council. The proposal was passed by both committees. It will take approximately one more year for the new courses to be passed and for the CORE (UCR) Oversight Committee to be engaged. The Chair stated that Dr. Koehler will exercise his prerogative to appoint that committee. |
| 12/86 | The Academic Excellence Committee report offered by Ken Morgan is attached. Ken stressed that this committee has not addressed the budget or management of the library. Invited guests from the Library answered questions particularly regarding external funding. Spencer Tucker moved that the Senate recognize the University's request for funding for retroconversion, commend the action and urge that these efforts continue as a priority for TCU. The motion was seconded and passed. |
| 12/86 | The Committee on Role and Function report was offered by Durward Smith and is attached. After discussion regarding both purpose and process of the proposal, the question was called. The motion was passed. |
| 4/87 | Daryl Schmidt presented the report which circulated with the agenda from the ad hoc Committee on the Importance of Teaching. Much discussion followed, including questions about the activities included in the definition of teaching, current tenure and promotion documents being implemented by college, and the role of the advisory committee(s) in evaluating teaching as a criterion. Ed McNertney moved to amend the resolution by striking item #2 from the document. C.A. Quarles seconded this motion to the motion to amend was defeated. The major motion, charges to Tenure and Promotion Committee, was carried. |
| 4/87 | The attached report from the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance was submitted by Dave Gouwens. The recommendations accompanying both items were passed by the Senate. |
| 4/87 | Budget Committee Report: Chair Dick Waits presented the attached Faculty Compensation Study to the Senate. He reviewed and explained some tables and data sources, noting that Category I schools, with which TCU is grouped, must award 30 doctorates annually and have at least 3 departments offering a doctorate. The historical pattern of increases and decreases in salaries were discussed. Senators were informed that AAUP data excludes schools of medicine and law, so that comparisons are more realistic for universities without those schools. Faculty were encouraged to use the formula on the last page of the report to compare current and past salaries. Art Berliner moved that the Executive Committee address the issues of salary inequities of women and adjunct faculty with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Jim Farrar seconded the motion, and it was passed after brief discussion. Additionally, the Budget Committee will continue to explore the salary issues with Dr. Secrest. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 4/87 | <p>After careful consideration of the philosophy of the drop policy at TCU, the Faculty Senate concurs with the six objectives developed in 1981:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.To promote academic soundness and integrity. 2.To foster among students a sense of responsibility for academic achievement. 3.To provide a fair and equitable system for students and faculty. 4.To foster among students the ability to make sound decisions within a reasonable time. 5.To provide a consistent policy that will be clear to all segments of the university community. 6.To upgrade the academic standards of TCU. <p>We are concerned, however, that academic integrity and standards are compromised by allowing students 10 weeks of a semester to evaluate their performance in a class. Many student{s} withdraw from classes simply to avoid a failing grade. This has resulted in grade inflation. The senate does not think low grades alone are an acceptable reason for dropping a class (especially after 2/3 of a semester). We therefore recommend to the administration that the period for drops initiated by students and requiring signatures from the student's advisor and instructor be reduced from 10 weeks to 8 weeks. After the 8-week drop period, the student can only be removed from the rolls if granted a "Q" by the dean.</p> <p>Shortening the drop period will continue our efforts to improve our academic integrity and will better meet our responsibility to promote appropriate academic standards at TCU.</p> <p>Submitted by the Senate Committee on Academic Excellence Passed by the Faculty Senate April 2, 1987</p> |
| 9/87 | <p>Vice-Chancellor Bivin has asked the Senate to consider the question of the solicitation of complimentary texts on campus and their purchase and sale by the University Store. After the expression of some opinions and concerns on this issue by a number of senators, Senator Tucker moved that "discussion of this issue be tabled." The motion failed. Senator Lawrence then moved that "the Executive Committee prepare a statement on this matter expressing the consensus of the Senate and bring it to the floor of the Senate for discussion." Senator Jones pointed out that three specific issues were involved, namely, (1) faculty selling complimentary copies of texts, (2) the prohibition of solicitation activities on campus by buyers of such texts, and (3) the university store accepting complimentary copies as used books. Senator Flowers suggested the prudence of waiting to examine the V.C.'s policy statement before the Senate took action. Senator Paulus proposed that the Senate's statement should incorporate the rationale for such a policy. Senator McNertney's query addressed to the Senate as to whether there was any serious opposition to such a policy was met with a lack of audible responses. The motion (Senator Lawrence's) passed.</p> |
| 10/87 | <p>Senator Routt moved the adoption of the "Procedures for Presentation of Resolutions to the Senate". (This document had been attached to the agenda for the October meeting.) The motion was passed by the Senate.</p> |
| 11/87 | <p>A student initiated withdrawal policy has been approved by the University Council. The policy ultimately passed by the Council is basically the one that was originally proposed by the Senate. No 'WP' or 'WF' grades will be issued, and the time for withdrawing from a course has been reduced to six weeks.</p> |
| 2/88 | <p>Elections Calendar: The schedule for elections as described in the Constitution is unworkable for this semester because of the early completion date. Senator Daniel made the motion that the calendar for elections be set aside for this semester only. [Action] Motion seconded and passed.</p> |
| 2/88 | <p>Grievance Personnel: Chairman Schmidt asked for approval for the continuation of the current members who were elected and selected for 1986-87. There were no grievances in the past year, but some are anticipated. [Action] Motion passed.</p> |
| 2/88 | <p>A motion to suspend the rules of the Senate was made to allow the body to consider the matter of the creation of a new University Committee without delay. The motion carried.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that a new University Committee, an Institutional Bio-Safety Committee, be established. The Chair responded in the affirmative to two questions raised by Senators, namely, "Was the committee required by federal regulations?", and "Was a separate committee necessary?" The motion passed.</p> |
| 3/88 | <p>{See discussion starting on page 1 through page 2 of the 3/1998 minutes. Scan of pages extremely bad and would require retyping for this table.}</p> |
| 4/88 | <p>Senator Folio distributed the Committee's recommendations for University Committee membership for the 1988-89 academic year. Senator Daniel moved (Senator Lawrence seconded) that the recommendations be accepted. The motion passed without dissent. (List of Committee recommendations attached).</p> |
| 4/88 | <p>The Senate passed (unanimously) a resolution commending the Committee on Committee for its efforts in performing the arduous tasks associated with its charge, and particularly to Cynthia Folio, who has been unbelievably patient.</p> |
| 11/88 | <p>Role and Function of the Senate</p> <p>After a brief discussion led by Senator Keen-Payne, both proposals from the committee passed with a unanimous vote:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We recommend that the College of Fine Arts and Communication elect Senators by two divisions (Fine Arts and Communication) and have two representatives on the University Advisory Committee. 2. We also recommend that the Senate adopt the document (included in the last Agenda) describing faculty involvement in search committees. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 12/88 | <p>Senator Toulouse presented a four-part resolution to the Senate concerning the proposed creation of an Undergraduate Council. (The document, with one amendment by the Senate, is included in this issue of the Minutes.) The main concern of the Academic Excellence Committee that is reflected in the first part of the resolution, is that curricular matters should be handled by faculty and that curricular committees should be chaired by faculty, not administrators. It was mentioned that secretaries from the appropriate administrative offices should be available to support the faculty member who chairs a curricular committee. The second point in the resolution is concerned mostly with the change that would occur in the process of selecting committee members. Senator Folio explained the advantages of the present process whereby the Committee on Committees carefully selects members from faculty who have expressed an interest in serving on the committee. Senator Paulus mentioned that all members of the University Curriculum Advisory Committee are appointed and that many of our curricular committees are beginning to take on a strong "appointed" flavor. The last two parts of the resolution were mainly editorial. The resolution passed with a unanimous vote.</p> |
| 3/89 | <p>The third document, "Faculty Advisory Committee Structure," was passed with one amendment--on page 4, Part IV (Structure) the first statement should read "No faculty member shall serve on more than one advisory committee AT ANY ONE TIME".</p> |
| 3/89 | <p>Senator Keen-Payne discussed the proposed changes to the Constitution and Bylaws (the last part of the March 2nd Agenda) . She explained that the committee's main purpose was to separate the Bylaws from the body of the Constitution since any changes to the latter must go before the Board of Trustees, whereas the Bylaws do not. Furthermore, the committee deleted some the the specific wording, such as the mandate that meetings and elections had to take place at certain times of the year. The changes were editorial rather than substantive. The document passed and will go to the full faculty for a vote. Pending approval, the document will then go to the Board in March for final consideration.</p> |
| 4/89 | <p>Select Committee on Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Senators Daniel and Keen-Payne presented the final draft of the Policy to the Senate with a few Amendments (the changes are listed and also underscored in the document, which is included in this month's Minutes) . Senator Daniel thanked the Department of Philosophy and Vice Chancellor Barr for helping with these last minute refinements. The amendments were approved, but there was some discussion of the document. Senator Wong asked if we should define "timely" response (page 4), but past instances suggest it is better not to impose a deadline. Senator Becker was concerned that the illustrations on page 6 might encourage false accusations, but Senator Keen-Payne made the point that if awareness is increased, instances tend to decline instead. Senator Lewis pointed out that this list appears in the TCU calendar, and there is no apparent increase in accusations. There was also some concern that the last paragraph might be stated too strongly, but evidently this reflects the law and the view of the court. The Document passed unanimously. The Senate moved to congratulate Senators Daniel and Keen-Payne for their hard work through many revisions of this document.</p> |
| 4/89 | <p>The previous grievance procedure was hypothetical and untried; the new policy benefits from the wisdom of practical application, written by people who have been involved in the process. The 3-tiered process should help solve the problem of inconsistency in presentation of the grievance {by adding advisors} and should help weed out some grievances before the hearing stage. Most of the changes in the document occur at the top of page 2, which clarifies the decision about what goes before the hearing committee. Also, the order of events on page 3 are obviously different. Other details, such as record-keeping and choosing a chair, are clarified. Senator Toulouse suggested that the reference to the Handbook on page 6 should give page numbers or topic headings. But since the "appellate routes" are dependent on the type of grievance, the document was amended so that the word "all" is inserted before "appellate." The document (with this one amendment) passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/89 | <p>Senator Flowers presented the final revision of the Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion Policy (included in the May 4 Agenda) . The most recent revisions resulted from the Faculty Assembly and from correspondence. Senator Toulouse asked about the wording on the last page and all agreed that "Faculty holding this rank" should be changed to "Candidates for this rank." There was also concern about the deletion of the paragraph on p. 11 of the Faculty/Staff Handbook (under 3. Assistant Professor) about participating in professional organizations, presenting papers, and contributing through publication and creative activities. The reason for the deletion was that the requirements for promotion to Assistant Professor usually only requires completion of the doctorate. It was suggested that "and scholarship" be added to "teaching" in that same section. The revised document passed with the two amendments discussed above.</p> |
| 5/89 | <p>Chair Moore distributed a proposal for the formation of a Senate Select Committee on Minority Issues for next year. Its purpose is to study and evaluate the various reports and plans regarding minority issues and determine the best means to provide a unified approach to addressing the concerns; it will also provide concrete plans for implementation and present a proposal to the Faculty Senate. Members of the committee will be Linda Moore (chair), Teoby Gomez, Hart Kayser, Don Jackson, Doug Simpson, and Morri Wong. The differences between this committee and the proposed Minority Concerns Committee are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Select Committee works within a time-frame of one year; the University Committee is on-going. The former would generate charges for the latter. The former would promote communication among departments and provide direction for the whole campus. The former would sponsor forums and other means of communicating and educating. The former would be more of a "brainstorming" committee; its agenda would be open-ended. <p>The proposal to establish this Select Committee was passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 10/89 | <p>Committee on Committees Chair Terry Ellmore reported on the committee work and moved that Rudolf Brun be appointed to the Honors Council. Even though Professor Brun is on leave, he indicated a desire and willingness to serve. The motion was seconded and carried by vote of the Senate.</p> <p>Senator Ellmore also reported on the charge to "Examine the appointment or selection process of appointing members of the University Core Advisory Committee, and made the following motion: The University Core Advisory Committee become a University Committee and as such, have membership selected by the Senate Committee on Committees. The motion was seconded and discussion followed clarifying the process of appointment now in use. Additional discussion dealt with the title of the committee, the question of the chair of the committee, and the support needed by the committee. The question was called, voted on and the motion passed.</p> |
| 10/89 | <p>A second charge was then addressed. The charge was to "Examine the issue of selecting an ex officio member of the Senate from the TCU Retiree Association". Jeff Horn attended the meeting of the Committee. Advantages and problems were presented. Referring to page 44 of the 1989-1990 Handbook, it was recommended that a standing invitation for a faculty member from the Retiree Association to attend Senate meetings with no voting privileges. The Faculty person would be chosen by the Association. Formal motions were made on both issues, seconded and carried by vote of the Senate.</p> |
| 11/89 | <p>COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES: Senator Ellmore presented the report from this committee by presenting two motions for action by the Senate.</p> <p>The first motion was: "It is recommended that the TCU Retirees Association form its own Committee on Committees to select appropriate nominees for University committees and to nominate those selected to the Chancellor." Senator Graham questioned the motion in terms of the committee's original charge which was to determine the advisability of inclusion of members of the TCU Retirees Association on University committees. Senator Ellmore responded that the committee has done that and this motion represents the next step. Senator Klein noted that members can be staff or faculty and questioned whether there was any determination as to qualifications of retirees appointed to specific committees. Senator Lewis replied that it was open to all committees. The Chair reminded senators that final determination of committee appointments is the choice of the Vice Chancellor. Senator Odom questioned whether these members would be voting members. Senator Ellmore replied that the motion does not address that issue. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> |
| 11/89 | <p>The second motion was: "The Faculty Senate should recommend to the Chancellor that he accept retired faculty on University committees as additional members of the committee". Senator McNertney questioned how many retired members. Senator Ellmore stated appointment would be by the Vice Chancellor but the motion didn't address limits.</p> <p>Senator Klein clarified that the term additional meant that these members were not to replace existing faculty members. Senator Craven requested the history of the motion and the Chair responded. Senator Lewis noted that retired Chancellors and Vice Chancellors could then theoretically serve on University committees. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> |
| 11/89 | <p>ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE SENATE: Senator Gorman reported from this committee by presenting a motion for Senate action. The motion was: "The past Chair of the Faculty Senate will serve as custodian of the Senate archives which are housed in the library". The question was called and the motion carried without discussion.</p> |
| 12/89 | <p>SELECT COMMITTEE ON MINORITY CONCERNS: Senator Moore reported on the committee's response to the Chancellor's reply to the recommendation to establish the committee (attached). The committee is concerned because the Chancellor recommended a minority students committee administrative oversight by Vice Chancellor Barr. The intent of the committee making the initial recommendation was that the administrative oversight as well as the committee needed to be centralized, not focused on either students or faculty. It was moved and seconded that the Executive Committee refer the concerns with endorsement by the Senate to the Chancellor. Senator Dominiak questioned whether foreign students should be considered a minority population in this context. Senator Moore responded that this issue as well as many others should be addressed in the committee's charges. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> |
| 12/89 | <p>REVISED SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY: Senator Moore responded to the Dean's suggestions regarding the sexual harassment policy (distributed Spring 1989). There is no objection to suggestions 1, 3, and 4. The committee does object to the suggestions that students be included in the pool of trained individuals and asked Gail Zimmerman to address this. Ms. Zimmerman stated that this inclusion was discussed in the committee's initial deliberations and rejected because it is likely that lengthy ongoing training would be required and there may be a need for more extensive training related to age, maturity, and awareness of the issues by students.</p> <p>There a motion that the Senate accept suggestion 1, 3, and 4 and delete the sentence regarding consensual relations. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> |
| 2/90 | <p>COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - Senator Ellmore reported on two of the charges given to this committee. The first charge was to survey all faculty regarding their interest in and willingness to serve on university committees. This survey is in the mail. The second charge was to survey the faculty regarding appropriate structure, composition, size, and charges of committees. This was done and there seems to be general consensus that no changes are necessary. Senator Ellmore pointed out that the Senate does not have the authority to change a committee's charge and made the following motion: It is moved that the Senate recommend to administration that administrators seek the advice of the Senate prior to any change in committee's charge. The motion was seconded, the question called and the motion carried.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 2/90 | <p>STUDENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE: Senator Graham presented a report from this committee (attached), The motion to form a select committee on academic honesty was discussed. The composition of this committee was clarified as not being limited to members of the senate. Based on discussion in the student relations committee last year, Senator Martin questioned whether academic dishonesty is a big enough issue on this campus to warrant a select committee. Senator Steele commented that the title Academic Honesty reflects a continuing issue and a positive statement that does not necessarily have negative implications. The chair commented that the title was not positive or negative but would raise consciousness regarding the entire issue. Emeritus Professor Routt commented that he had recently seen a survey of high school students reporting that 65% of them cheat. Senator Farrar suggested that the issue might be better addressed under the auspices of the academic excellence committee rather than student relations. Senator Ehrman reported that a study 10 - 15 years ago on this campus revealed academic dishonesty but there were no measures available to effectively deal with it. Many cases of academic dishonesty arise from dereliction of faculty responsibility in monitoring exams etc. Senator Becker reported an incident many years ago which involved a student caught cheating and who failed. A lawsuit resulted and the university decided the faculty was at fault. Senator Becker spoke in favor of an honor system which could work very well at TCU. A discussion was held between Senator Farrar and Senator Klein regarding which committee this issue should be housed in. Senator King stated that the discussion underscored the need for the formation of a select committee since this is a broad issue requiring a multifaceted approach and goes beyond the faculty Senate. He commended the proactive view of the student relations committee. A discussion was held between the chair and Senator Nichols regarding whether students or faculty or both should be the target of this committee.</p> <p>The chair in an effort to clarify the structure of the committee asked for a motion to add the words Faculty Senate prior to select committee in the original motion. Senator Graham so moved and the motion was seconded. Senator Ehrman questioned what the committee will do. Senator Graham responded that the items in II. are suggestions but the committee certainly isn't limited to them. Senator Franzwa commented that it is important to consider consistent ways of implementing present policy. Senator Watson commented that there is an increased sensitivity to issues regarding ethics on this campus and the formation of this committee follows this theme and seems a logical outcome.</p> <p>The question was called and both the amendment and the original motion carried.</p> |
| 2/90 | <p>COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC HONESTY: Senator King moved that the Senate consider the four changes in the Academic Conduct Policy proposed as attached to the Minutes of the April meeting of the Faculty Senate. The questions were called, and all four motions carried.</p> |
| 2/90 | <p>Chair-Elect Gaul next asked Senators to consider the change in the Grievance Policy that was attached to the Minutes of the April meeting of the Faculty Senate. Chair-Elect Gaul noted that the word "advise" in the recommended addition to the policy should have been "advice". The question was called, and the motion carried.</p> |
| 4/90 | <p>ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE: Senator Moore reported that the Academic Excellence was meeting and addressing its charges. The committee expressed concern that many of the charges were redundant with other committees. Work is in progress to delineate and act upon them. The committee will have a full report for the May meeting. A recommendation was made that in May of each year members of committees submit charges for the following academic year for that committee. The recommendation was moved and seconded. It was clarified that committee charges would then be the responsibility of the present committee, the faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the previous committee. Senator Dominak suggested that all senators be invited to submit input regarding committee charges for the next year at that time. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> |
| 4/90 | <p>Senator Lewis read a resolution (attached) commending students for their concern for and interest in good teaching as well as the student's mature and responsible actions. A motion was made and seconded to accept the resolution. Clarification of specific events leading to the motion was requested by Senator Dominak. Senator Moore responded that the motion does not refer to specific events and is general in nature and should be handled in that manner. The question was called and carried with four abstentions.</p> |
| 5/90 | <p>SUSPENSION OF BY-LAWS: A motion was made and seconded to suspend the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate in order to seat the senator from business. Senate By-Laws require that two individuals from each unit run for a senate seat. There was only one individual from the College of Business willing to stand for election. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> |
| 5/90 | <p>Academic Excellence: Senator Moore reported on the charges and accomplishments of this Committee (attached). A motion was made and seconded to accept the report. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> <p>Select Committee on Minority Affairs: Senator Moore presented goals formulated by this committee for Senate approval (attached). A motion was made and seconded. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> |
| 5/90 | <p>Tenure, Promotion and Grievance: Action was requested on the previously distributed proposed policy for Extension of the Probationary Period for Tenure. The Senate was reminded of the wording change in Section I line 3 to read "by the end of the academic year prior to the final tenure review". Senator Moore questioned the bypassing of the College Advisory Committee. Senator Davis responded that one member of Harris College of Nursing had responded that was appropriate. Senator Wong expressed concern that justifiable cause for extension would become a option of the various departments. Senator Lamb responded that ultimately this was true in any case--this document simply provides the Deans and Vice Chancellor with the option to extend the probationary period. The question was called and the motion carried.</p> |
| 5/90 | <p>Committee on Committee's: Senator Ellmore distributed a motion to change the charge to the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee (attached). It was moved and seconded this change be approved and the motion carried.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/90 | Advisory Committee Structure: The policy as revised by the Deans was considered. Senator Odom moved that the word "ordinarily", as added by the Deans, prior to "no department shall be represented by more than one member of the committee" be deleted. The motion was carried. It was moved and seconded to approve the policy as changed. The motion carried. |
| 5/90 | Grievance Policy: The policy as revised by the Deans was considered. It was moved and seconded that the statement "The grievance is responsible for initiating the appellate processes within 15 academic days of the alleged injustice" be deleted. The motion carried. Senator Dominiak moved and it was seconded that the time limit for filing a grievance be 25 days, as in the original document, instead of the 15 suggested. The motion carried. Senator Graham moved and it was seconded that the paragraph on pertaining to prevention of suspension of the grievance without pay during the hearing, which was removed, be reinstated in its entirety. The motion carried. Several editorial changes were suggested and noted. A motion was made and seconded for approval of the document. The motion carried. |
| 5/90 | Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy: A motion was made and seconded for approval of the revised policy. Senator Graham moved that the following paragraph be reinstated: "The criteria here stated are not to affect adversely the ranks held by members of the faculty, at the time of adoption of the policy, but following its adoption the policy will apply to all decisions regarding appointment ... etc. These criteria also apply to part time and adjunct faculty appointments." The motion carried. The question was called on the first motion and it carried. Several editorial changes were suggested. |
| 9/90 | Academic Conduct Policy: Changes in the proposed Academic Conduct Policy were discussed. Senator Dominiak asked for a clarification section I.E. (Computer Misuse) and suggested that the word "effecting" be changed to "affecting". The Chair explained that the intent of section I.E. of the Academic Conduct Policy (Computer Misuse) was directed solely toward unauthorized or illegal use of computers for the purpose of affecting the academic standing of a student. Other types of computer misuse were not covered by this policy. The motion to change the word "effecting" to "affecting" in Section I.E. of the Academic Conduct Policy was moved and seconded. The question was called, and the motion carried. |
| 10/90 | Report from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs regarding proposal to stop the tenure clock: Vice Chancellor Koehler addressed the Senate regarding the proposal to stop the tenure clock that was approved by the Faculty Senate on May 3, 1990. The deans and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs do not support the proposal for a number of reasons. First, the policy as written would place TCU in a position of non-compliance with AAUP policy regarding tenure procedures. Second, the policy does not contain categories of situations which would be considered as possible reasons to request an extension of the probationary period. Third, the decision to extend the probationary period should be made coincident to or soon after the event. Fourth, if the department chair does not support the request to extend the probationary period, there is no need to forward the request to the appropriate dean or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Senator Lamb suggested that the categories of situations which would be considered possible reasons to request an extension of the probationary period were so numerous that it was best to leave specific situations unstated. Senator Lamb also asked if another draft of the proposal could be resubmitted. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs responded that (1) it would be possible to submit another draft of the proposal, and (2) he felt the categories of situations could be stated. Senator Morgan asked if a mechanism was currently in place to consider requests to extend the probationary period. Vice Chancellor Koehler responded that during the years that he has been Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, two requests to extend the probationary period have been made. In both cases, the request was granted. Senator Craven suggested that perhaps a statement regarding the existing possibility of extension of the probationary period should be printed in the Handbook. Senator Tucker stated that existing policy could be stated either in the Faculty Handbook or communicated to faculty at the time of initial employment in tenure track positions. Senator Lamb concurred that this information could be stated in a letter sent to new faculty in tenure track positions. Vice Chancellor Koehler responded that he felt the best approach would be for Department Advisory Committees and Chairs to make the recommendation for extension of the probationary period as a part of the annual tenure review letter. Vice Chancellor Koehler also suggested that deans and chairs could be reminded each year of the possibility to make such a recommendation. It was moved and seconded that the Senate Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance reconsider the proposal. The question was called, and the motion carried. |
| 11/90 | The Senate discussed the following proposal from Senator Tucker: "Resolved, that the Faculty Senate calls on the TCU administration not to add any new academic programs until funds are found to make up the shortfall in the library acquisitions budget for periodicals. We also call on the University Library Committee to study the adequacy of the overall library budget at TCU and report on this as soon as possible to the Faculty Senate." Senator Franzwa suggested that it might be better to recommend that the TCU administration not add any new academic programs that would make any additional demands on the library budget. Senator Payne stated that the real issue is that the library should not fall from the constant scrutiny of the faculty. The Chair stated that he felt that the Library Committee is currently quite active in communicating information to the faculty. The Chair further stated that the Senate should not get in the way of the proposals of new programs being made by the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees. Senator Tucker's proposal was amended to read: "Resolved, that the Faculty Senate calls on the TCU administration not to add any new academic programs that would make any additional demands on the library budget without incremental funding. We also call on the University Library Committee to study the of the overall library budget at TCU and report on this as soon as possible to the Faculty Senate." The question was called, and the motion carried. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 2/91 | At the suggestion of several Senators, Mr. Bivin was to be asked to address the Senate regarding the actual implementation of the policy. Senator Morgan urged the Senate assign a Senate Committee the charge of routine monitoring of policy implementation. The question was called, and the motion carried. |
| 2/91 | <p>TENURE, PROMOTION, AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE: The Chair moved that Senators consider the statement regarding extension of the probationary period for non-tenured faculty that would be added to department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents and verbally announced by the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the new faculty briefing each year:</p> <p>In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non-tenured faculty member's professional performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. Such request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence. In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to de facto tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such request to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean. "</p> <p>As an example of the actual implementation of the policy under discussion, the Chair announced that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has been recently notified that a faculty member had been immediately celled to Active Duty associated with Operation Desert Storm. An offer from Vice Chancellor Koehler to count or not count the current academic year toward the probationary period was made to the faculty member. The faculty member was told that she will be reinstated on the payroll as soon as she returns to TCU, but the probationary period will not begin again until the beginning of the fall semester following the faculty member's release from Active Duty and return to TCU. The question was called, and the motion carried.</p> |
| 3/91 | <p>COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES: SenBt. or Tucker asked the Senate to endorse a list of nominees recommended by the Committee on Committees who would serve as Mediators and a Hearing Committee as required by the University Grievance Policy. The proposed Mediators are as follows: Toni Craven (1993), Bob Blenton (1994), Pet Paulus (1995), Manfred Reinecky, (1992), and Gregg Franzwa (1995). The proposed Hearing Committee includes: Ron Flowers (1994), Betsy Colquitt (1993), and Jennifer Watson (1995). Proposed Alternatives for the Hearing Committee include: Rhonde Keen-Paynee (1994), Jim Chambers (1995), Roger Pfaffenberger (1994), Wayne Barcelona (1993), and Luther Clegg (1993).</p> <p>The question to endorse the nominated Mediators, Hearing Committee, and Hearing Committee Alternatives was called, and the motion carried.</p> |
| 3/91 | The Committee on Committees next requested the Senate to endorse a policy which would give University Committee Chairpersons the right to recommend that certain people not be reappointed to the Committee for a variety of reasons which includes lack of attendance at Committee meetings and of interest in Committee activities. The Chair explained that the Chancellor did endorse the policy as proposed. Senator Fenker suggested that this policy would be another form of evaluation. Chair-Elect Gaul pointed out that Chairpersons would contact Committee members prior to recommending that these Committee members not be re-appointed to Committees. The purpose of contact would allow a Committee member the option of explaining why they have not been able to come to Committee meetings or had shown an apparent lack of interest in Committee activities. Those Committee members who wished to remain appointed to the Committee would be allowed the option. Chair-Elect Gaul further responded that the Chancellor would not know the reason for not re-appointing the member to the committee. The question was called, and the motion carried. |
| 3/91 | Senator Fort suggested that the Executive Committee contact Senator Moore regarding a proposal for another way of formally recognizing Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday. The Question was called and the motion carried. |
| 4/91 | TENURE, PROMOTION AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE: Senator Lysiak addressed the Senate regarding selection of graduate faculty membership (report attached to the minutes from the February Senate meeting). Senator Lysiak moved that the three recommendations be approved. Senator Butler inquired about a situation in which a faculty member would be applying for graduate faculty membership and the chair of the department would not be a member of the graduate faculty. Senator Lysiak responded that both the chair and the graduate faculty within the department would be informed when a faculty member applied for graduate faculty membership. Senator Odom asked why applications would be submitted to tenured graduate faculty. Senator Lysiak responded that he would support the removal of the word "tenured" from the proposal. The question was called, and the motion regarding the three recommendations carried. |
| 4/91 | REPORT FROM ACADEMIC HONESTY COMMITTEE: Senator King announced that the committee was in the process of developing materials. At the present time, the Academic Honesty Committee did not recommend the establishment of an honor code or honor system at TCU. Senator King stated that the majority of colleges and universities do not have honor codes. Senator Becker recommended that a proposal for the establishment of an honor code be placed on the agenda for the May Senate meeting. The question was called, and the motion carried. |
| 5/91 | COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES: Senator Tucker requested Senate endorsement of the Committee on Committee recommendations for University Committees for the next academic year. The question was called, and the motion carried. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 5/91 | ROLE AND FUNCTION COMMITTEE: Senator Forrer presented Senators with a detailed report of the activities of the Role and Function Committee for the present academic year (attached). Senator Forrer moved for the adoption of the recommendations outlined in the report. The question was called, and the motion carried. Senator Forrer also announced that an outline of a Faculty Senate Handbook has been prepared. |
| 11/91 | It was suggested by the Committee on the Role and Function of the Faculty Senate that the Executive Committee consider commissioning either a faculty member, an Emeritus professor or a graduate student to write a general history of the Faculty Senate, including a listing of all policies the Senate has passed since its first meeting on May, 1968; |
| 2/92 | Senator Gaul then yielded the floor to Senator Lysiak, chair of the senate tenure, promotion b grievance committee. Senator Lysiak, referring to distributed documents, presented the committee's proposal to amend the T.C.U. Faculty Handbook regarding the position of tenure-track instructor. Brief discussion followed. The proposal to amend was voted and carried. |
| 2/92 | Senator Lysiak announced that it was his committee's decision to allow T.C.U.- academic departments to exercise a degree of local sovereignty regarding the matter of academic leaves of absence. His committee, however, made two recommendations: 1. that leaves of absence would be made available to both tenured and non-tenured faculty 2. that each advisory committee at the departmental level be asked to distribute to interested and affected parties a statement of policies and procedures pertinent to securing academic leaves (thus, each affected person would know the relevant criteria) Senator Gaul then ruled that the recommendations of Senator Lysiak and his committee would be considered separately. The floor was then opened to discussion regarding the first proposal. Senator Dominiak raised a question of wording which was quickly resolved to everyone's satisfaction. Senator McNertney then raised the question of whether leaves would prove beneficial or otherwise for non-tenured faculty persons. Senator Lysiak responded that he felt the leaves might be viewed as beneficial since they afforded tenure-track candidates time to undertake additional research. Senator Fort then suggested that faculty might need a reduction in teaching loads (he cited the 2 course loads common at major research universities) as well as increased leaves of absence given T.C.U. 's stated goal of becoming a premier research institution. Senator Nichols asked whether the policy paid leaves or both paid and unpaid leaves. Senator Gaul responded that it applied to paid leaves. At this point the committee's first recommendation was voted and carried. Discussion then commenced relative the second recommendation. Senator Oberkircher raised the issue of whether policy consistency among the various academic departments should be addressed. Discussion followed and shortly thereafter the committee's second recommendation was voted and carried. |
| 2/92 | The Senate considered the recommended change in Emeritus Faculty status as included in the October, 1991, minutes of the Faculty Senate. A motion was made to split the question into two parts: (1) the deletion of the definition of Emeritus Faculty status, and (2) the procedure for nomination to Emeritus Faculty status. The motion carried. |
| 2/92 | The question to delete the I Meritorious Service I phrase was called, and the motion carried. The motion regarding the procedure for nomination to Emeritus Faculty status was considered. There was no discussion. The question was called, and the motion carried. The Senate next considered the recommended addition to the Retirement Policy as attached to the minutes of the October, 1991, meeting of the Faculty Senate. The question of adding the statement as proposed was called, and the motion carried. |
| 4/92 | The pending motion from the Academic Excellence Committee for the establishment of a Senate Select Committee on Teaching Excellence was considered. The question was called, and the motion carried. |
| 5/92 | The call for 1995-96 University committees assignments were distributed (see attached) by Senator Vigeland. Committee on Committees did an extensive review of committee charges. The affirmative action committee is being proposed to be changed to the Committee on Campus Diversity & Affirmative Action (See attachment page 7). Senator Vigeland moved that this change be approved. Senator Tucker seconded the motion and it passed. Senator Vigeland moved the University Committee recommended assignments for 1995- 96 be approved (see attachment pp. 8-10). Senator Raessler seconded the motion which passed. |
| 5/92 | Committee on committees: Senator Tucker circulated a recommendation to appoint Jackie Callanan to the University Evaluation Committee and a recommended revision to the charge of the Evaluation Committee (bold indicates additions) as follows: "Studies and recommends changes in the evaluation procedures off/for faculty and academic administrators. The committee annually reviews the forms, the mechanics of distribution, and the methods of tabulating results." Senator Tucker moved that the Senate endorse the recommendations noted above. The question was called, and the motion carried. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 5/92 | <p>The Chair next directed the Senate to consider the proposed revision to the Emeritus Statement. The Chair reported that Vice Chancellor Koehler suggested that the final sentence of the first paragraph of the revision read as follows: for emeritus status usually will have held permanent tenure, have been associated with TCU for at least ten years and have made meritorious contributions to the University." Senator Cagle noted that a member of the Harris College of Nursing faculty was not in favor of the proposal. This faculty member believes that Emeritus status is more of a promotion concept than a tenure decision. The College Advisory Committee, therefore, is the proper body to discuss and recommend that status. Finally, the idea of having to ask the candidate for consent to take the request for the recommendation for Emeritus status to the tenured faculty was also not supported. The question was called, and the motion carried.</p> |
| 5/92 | <p>Senator Tucker next circulated recommended appointments to University Committees and recommended changes in appointment to the Faculty Grievance Committee. Senator Tucker thanked Ernest Couch and Art Busb(e)y for implementing a computer program to assist with recommendations for appointment to University Committees. Senator Tucker moved that the Senate endorse the recommendations for appointment to University Committees. The question was called, and the motion carried. Faculty are urged to contact their individual Senators for copies of the recommended faculty appointments to University Committees.</p> |
| 5/92 | <p>Committee on Committees: Spencer Tucker, Chair of the Committee on Committees, moved that the Senate approve the election of Andy Fort (Humanities) and Jennifer Watson (Fine Arts/Communications) as members of the University Advisory Committee and Andy Fort (Religion) as the new member of the Budget and Finance Committee. Senator Tucker also moved for Senate endorsement of Faculty Grievance Committee nominees. The question was called, and the motion carried.</p> |
| 10/92 | <p>Academic Excellence Committee: Investigate the policy of indicating a "W" on student transcripts after only one week of student enrollment.</p> <p>Senator Fortenberry, Chair of the Academic Excellence Committee, (AEC) presented the committee members (Senators Dominiak, Fenker, Forrer, Freeman, Stephenson, and Oberkircher) and provided an overview of the current University policy of issuing a grade of "W" on a student's transcript and student concern about the policy. Students believe that the "W" may incorrectly infer that a student withdrew from a class because of a failing grade, and this may affect future employment decisions. Student concern focuses also on the short time for a withdrawal decision because, in many instances, students do not have sufficient time to evaluate a class. Relevant to policy, the University currently issues a "W" on a transcript when a student withdraws from a course after the first five class days of enrollment (prior to this time, no "W" appears on the transcript). This policy, according to Registrar Pat Miller, is in compliance with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers' Handbook, Academic Record and Transcript Guide.</p> <p>Variation in the starting day of classes throughout the past several semesters has created problems with the length of time students have had to evaluate continuance in a class. For example, in the Fall 1992 semester, students with a Tuesday night class had not met their class even once before the withdrawal date since University classes started on a Wednesday. Senators agreed that students should have the opportunity to evaluate a class at least once before making the decision to withdraw from it. Additional discussion focused on the financial implications of issuing a "W" in a course which a student has never attended due to scheduling (an issue which the AEC agreed to address later), whether TCU would be out of compliance with the association used for decisions in this area if a change was made (probably not), and the need for consistency from semester to semester for withdrawal periods. After considering the issue, the following motion was presented by the AEC and seconded by Senator Babitch:</p> <p>The Committee moves to extend the "pre-W" period from five class days to fourteen calendar days from the starting day of the semester. The Committee defines "pre-W" as that period of time during which a student can withdraw from a class with no W appearing on the transcript. The question was called, and the motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 10/92 | <p>4. exploring the Senate resolution passed on May 7, 1992 on administrative salaries. The Chair provided an overview of the Skiff article which prompted Senate activity on this matter. The Chair noted that the Executive Committee had met with John Roach, Chair of the Board of Trustees, shortly after the resolution was passed. At that time, it was learned that an endowment supplements the Chancellor's base salary, although stipulations to the endowment do not allow the base salary of the Chancellor to be affected. The donors felt strongly that the Chancellor of the University should be compensated sufficiently to guarantee strong leadership. The Chair also stated that, based on published documents, Bill and Jean Tucker have given more than a half million dollars to TCU.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 11/92 | <p>Academic Excellence Committee: Investigate the feasibility of having faculty evaluate (or complete instruments assessing perceptions of) peers, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor (in addition to department Chairs) during the next round of administrative evaluation.</p> <p>Motion for consideration: The Academic Excellence Committee moves to extend the existing faculty evaluation procedure in the following manner: That faculty, annually, evaluate their Chair, Dean, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor. That Chairs, annually, evaluate their Dean, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor. And that, annually, Deans evaluate the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor.</p> <p>Senator Fortenberry, Chair of the AEC, presented the motion as outlined in the November meeting agenda. According to the AEC Chair, the motion reflects the spirit of a similar motion presented to the Senate last year. Senator Fortenberry and Senator Gorman, Chair of the University Evaluation Committee responded to several questions which included: what forms would be used (currently under development or refinement), how will one have access to data (still undetermined), and will the forms relate to perceptions (yes). Senate acceptance of the motion will allow referral to the University Evaluation Committee which will implement the concept, Senator Gorman noted. The Evaluation Committee has discussed the process and endorses the AEC motion. Evaluations this year will be similar to those used last year with addition of a question concerning whether the evaluator has direct or indirect contact with the person evaluated. It remains unclear who will use the data from the evaluations.</p> <p>Senator Babitch questioned whether the Senate would be notified of the process of administrator evaluation once it is in place. Discussion also focused on whether non-academic administrators should also be evaluated (e.g., Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs) since faculty have interactions with these individuals as well. Senator Fortenberry commented that the charge to the AEC was only for the administrators stated in the motion. An amendment by Senator Becker to change the original motion to ". that faculty, annually, evaluate at least their Chair ..". failed. The original motion was then passed.</p> |
| 11/92 | <p>Committee on Committees: Represent the interests of the faculty in structure, functions, and membership of University committees/ explore with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate ways to increase the efficacy of University service of faculty.</p> <p>Motion for consideration: The Committee on Committees recommends that all University-wide councils, and College and University Advisory Committee members be elected by the faculty.</p> <p>Senator Couch, Chair of the Committee on Committees, stated the intent of this motion is to reduce the total number of people on these committees and to give faculty a direct voice into membership of the councils. Smaller committee size, Senator Couch suggested, would also increase committee efficiency. Reduction in size would occur by eliminating appointed positions. Since the original motion did not include a change to committee size, Senator King asked that the original motion be split to allow discussion of the proposed elective process of University-wide councils separate from College and University Advisory Committees. Discussion focused on whether fewer committee members would actually increase committee efficiency. Various Senators expressed concern about the process of equitably distributing elected members from various schools/colleges across the proposed committees. Senator Couch stated he would consider any feedback about this concern. The question was called for the part of the motion related to University-wide councils, and it passed by voice vote.</p> |
| 12/92 | <p>Report from Dr. Fred Heath, Library Director, on the status of the library budget and possible changes in the acquisition of periodicals. Through an audiovisual presentation, Dr. Heath sought the support of the Faculty Senate for an increase in the library budget. This increase would allow maintenance of present programs and support of campus research despite escalating costs of periodicals. Citing an requested increase of \$200,000 in the materials budget, Dr. Heath noted that the cost of journals are expected to increase 16.8% in the next year. This increase will make continued purchase of current periodical subscriptions, especially costly European journals, quite expensive. However, approximately 46% of current faculty feel that periodical holdings are inadequate, and cutting of journal subscriptions on the basis of expense would not further faculty and student research at the University. After detailing the annual budget for colleges in the University, Dr. Heath noted that TCU doctoral programs require the same journals as larger universities (a concept described as "non-linear and non-elastic"). In fact, the current doctoral programs in AddRan consume the greatest amount in library acquisition monies.</p> <p>To meet the challenge of retaining current periodical use and staying within budgetary restraints, Dr. Heath proposed switching to electronic access for some scientific journals. Noting that approximately \$60,000 worth of periodical collections are currently rarely used, Dr. Heath commented these journal subscriptions could be cancelled based on collaborative decision-making of the College/ Department and the Library. However, through electronic access and the current InterNET, these journal table of contents could be scanned, relevant journal articles requested, and copies of the article usually faxed within 24 hours to an interested party (much faster than inter-library loan). This process has been used by approximately 38 faculty this year and seems to be working well. Adoption of electronic periodical access would allow updating of current periodicals which are used frequently. Dr. Heath noted that electronic access would allow individual faculty accounts for resource acquisition, would improve journal mix and number, and help control costs. Some Senators expressed concern about supporting the proposal for funds to improve electronic access for the library. Concern revolved around several areas: currently FAX (electronic access) provides poor quality photos, and it may prove difficult to evaluate the content of an article and justify payment for copying it merely by reading the title of the article in a table of contents. Various Senators expressed appreciation to Dr. Heath for his working in improving library resources at TCU. Dr. Heath responded that he would appreciate the support of his proposal by the Senate today due to the budget deadline. After discussion and agreement that the Senate could vote on an unpublished motion relevant to this issue, Chair King read a letter from the University Library Committee which endorsed Dr. Heath's proposal for increased library funding. Senator Fort moved, and Senator Odom seconded the motion to endorse the University Library Committee statement. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 12/92 | <p>Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee: Reconsider the issue of fair treatment of first year faculty (tabled from last year). Motion for consideration: The Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee recommends the following statement be substituted for the current tenure policy, section IIB, 4b, p. 11 of the Faculty Handbook: The progress of faculty will be reviewed by the department chairperson and tenured faculty within their department as early as possible in their first year of employment. The first year faculty will be informed in writing of the results of the review no later than February 15. If the faculty member wishes to respond to the review, he or she should request a conference.</p> <p>Senator Garrison, member of the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee presented the motion and the proposed changes in the Handbook. Senator McNertney asked what "as early as possible" meant. Senator Wilson, Chair of the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee, responded that the committee believed review of first year faculty should occur as early as possible but clearly by February 15. The intent of the committee was to insure that first year faculty are evaluated and that this evaluation occurs early enough for faculty to know about problems. The motion was presented, and it passed.</p> |
| 2/93 | <p>Role and Function of the Senate Committee: develop a statement of ethical guidelines for faculty performance. Motion for consideration: The Role and Function Committee proposes that the Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University adopt the 1987 American Association of University Professors Statement of Professional Ethics and that a statement affirming thus be placed in the Faculty Handbook.</p> <p>Senator Raessler, Chair of this committee, presented the motion. He noted that after review of several statements on this issue, the AAUP one appeared to best reflect critical areas of advancement of knowledge, academic freedom, concern for faculty governance, the right of faculty to seek change, and a guarantee of faculty rights. Senator Raessler also presented the following further action for the recommended motion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. copy of the statement should be attached to the agenda and the resulting minutes of the Senate Meeting when this is passed. b. every new and part-time faculty from this day forward should receive copies of the adopted statement. c. that the administration and the Board of Trustees be informed of this adoption and encouraged to read same. d. the Executive Committee of the Senate should be encouraged to use this adoption to guarantee, in the future, the right and security of the academic freedom which this document advocates to all members of the academic community of Texas Christian University. <p>The motion with further actions was presented and passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/93 | <p>committee on Committees: Represent the interests of the faculty in the structure, functions, and membership of University committees/explore with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate ways to increase the efficacy of University service of faculty. Motion for consideration: The Committee on Committees proposes that College and University Advisory Committees will be elected by the appropriate faculty member constituencies. The number and composition will be determined by the divisions within the respective colleges. The University Advisory Committee will be composed of 9 members: 3 from AddRan (one from each division), 2 from Fine Arts and Communication (one from each division), and one each from Business, Nursing, Education, and Brite.</p> <p>Senator Couch, Chair of this committee, affirmed that the intent of the motion is to increase faculty input into advisory committees at the college and University level. Considerable discussion focused on whether the proposal might actually decrease representation of some departments. Senator Couch responded the Committee on Committees is not proposing a change to the process, the number of faculty elected to these groups, or the input of departments into the college advisory process.</p> <p>Senator Franzwa noted that the motion is ambiguous; the statement could be interpreted as meaning that colleges would work out their own advisory committee structure according to the Handbook but that the University Advisory Committee would be more structured. The motion was called and by hand vote passed by 15 to 13.</p> |
| 2/93 | <p>Senator Fort: recommended that all Senate votes be recorded as voted and that the appropriate terminology such as "unanimous." and numbers of hand votes cast be delineated as relevant in minutes of meetings. After consensus, the motion was presented and passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 3/93 | <p>Role and Function of the Senate Committee: Explore means of communication between Senators and their constituencies and make recommendations.</p> <p>Motion for consideration: The Role and Function Committee recommends the following be adopted by the TCU Faculty Senate in an effort to both facilitate and improve communication between Senators and their constituencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall write a synopsis of each meeting and forward it to University Relations for publication in the next issue of the Faculty Bulletin. 2. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall prepare an annual report that briefly details the activities and outcomes of the Faculty Senate for the previous academic year. This report shall be distributed to all faculty with the September Faculty Senate agenda and should provide both information and a mind set for the upcoming year. 3. A list of Senators and their constituencies should be distributed with the agenda for the September meeting of the Faculty Senate. 4. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall request the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs to direct the Deans and Chairs to ask Senators to report at each faculty meeting. <p>At all general faculty assemblies, the Chair of the Faculty Senate will report the activities of the Senate to those present. In addition, at least one meeting in an academic year of the Faculty Assembly will be held in a town hall format so that all faculty may voice opinions and concerns pertaining to TCU.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Each Senator will be requested to send a letter to his/her constituency informing them of meeting dates and asking for agenda items. 7. During the opening luncheon, the Chair of the Faculty Senate is encouraged to be more forceful in requesting that all faculty members attend and use the Senate. <p>Senator Raessler, Chair of the Role and Function Committee, introduced the motion. It was agreed by the Senate to change the wording in #7 to read "encouraged to be forceful."</p> <p>After discussion about the items, the seven recommendations were voted on as a block. The motion passed with 2 votes in opposition.</p> |
| 3/93 | <p>Motion for consideration: The Role and Function Committee recommends that the Chair of the Faculty Senate explore the Senators' opinions regarding the taping of the meeting by the Skiff reporter and going on record with the results of the survey.</p> <p>Senator Raessler noted that in the past, some Senators have not wanted the meetings taped, but a formal vote on this issue has never been taken to reflect the wishes of the total Senate. Senators agreed to add "and the Senate Secretary" to the motion and to clarify that taping would be audiotaping. The motion, therefore, would read "audiotaping of the meeting by the Skiff reporter and the Senate Secretary and . . ." The question was called and passed.</p> |
| 3/93 | <p>Committee on Committees: Survey faculty to determine individual interests and qualifications for University committee service.</p> <p>Senator Couch, Chair of Committee on Committees, submitted a motion to be voted on in the April meeting which proposes to clarify the current election procedure for Faculty Senate officers (on 4/1 agenda) . Senators agreed that campaign statements may be included with the agenda for the May Senate meeting.</p> <p>Faculty responses to the Committee on Committees' survey requesting faculty committee choices are currently being returned.</p> <p>According to Senator Couch, an average of 54% of faculty did not serve on any University committee during 1991-2. Several Senators commented that University service should be part of the faculty role and is, in fact, stated as an expectation in the recently approved AAUP statement on professional ethics. Senator Breyer stated that most departments and the University do not seem to value service activities for promotion and tenure. It was suggested that the Senate needs to raise the consciousness of the Deans, Chairs, and other administrators about the value of Faculty Senate and other University service. Senator Tucker formulated a motion for the Senate to examine the service issue next year. This motion will be voted on in the April meeting.</p> <p>Motion proposed by Senator Babitch: Resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to Chancellor Tucker for providing the 1993-94 financial planning document and cover letter dated 1/15/93. We are gratified that the administration is rapidly complying with the Self-Study suggestions regarding budgetary input from the faculty.</p> <p>This motion passed unanimously. Chair King reminded Senators to feel free to submit resolutions commending positive things going on in the University.</p> |
| 4/93 | <p>Proposed Additions to the 1993-94 Nontenured Progress, Tenure, and Promotion Calendar and Procedures</p> <p>Senators received a copy of this at the March meeting and had perused for reaction in this meeting. The question was called to approve the document, and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 4/93 | <p>Merited Leave of Absence Program for Non-tenured Faculty</p> <p>A copy of this document was also circulated to all Senators at the April meeting. The question was called, and it passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 4/93 | <p>Committee on Committees: Explore with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate ways to increase the efficiency of University service of faculty.</p> <p>motion for consideration: The Committee on Committees recommends the following to improve the procedure for election of Faculty Senate officers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. at the March meeting each year, it will be announced that nominations from the floor for Senate offices will be take place at the April meeting. b. Senate officers will be nominated from the floor at the April meeting. c. Campaign statements may be included with the agenda for the May meeting. d. Discussion and voting will take place in the May meeting. <p>Senator Couch, Chair of Committee on Committees, presented the motion. Discussion focused on the rationale for requiring or not requiring campaign statements from those persons on the slate for election. Senators decided to leave the motion as stated at least for the present year to evaluate its impact on the election process. Senator Gaul stated concern about nominations being offered from the floor today when it is not known who will be re-elected or who will be new Senators for next year. After agreement that only those persons who are re-elected will appear on the ballot, the motion as proposed by the Committee on Committees was presented and passed.</p> |
| 4/93 | <p>Motion by Senator Tucker: It is the sense of the Senate that University service is a part of faculty duties and we urge, pending a study of the whole service issue by the Senate next year, that Chairs and Deans consider University service an important component of faculty evaluation.</p> <p>Chair King presented the motion which passed unanimously.</p> |
| 4/93 | <p>Motion by Senator Fort: It is reconunended that an appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate examine self-study documents relevant to faculty comments about academic administrator performance and report recommendations to the Senate.</p> <p>Chair King responded that all Senate committees had as their charge this year to examine relevant Self-Study documents. The motion was presented, and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/93 | <p>Academic Excellence Committee: Explore development of formal evaluation of academic advising If such a formal evaluation is recommended, outline a procedure.</p> <p>motion for consideration: The Academic Excellence Committee: recommends that an official University Committee be established to study advising at Texas Christian University. This committee's charge should include but not be limited to: 1) studying and determining what currently constitutes advising at TCU through the review of current advising methods utilized by various departments and colleges and surveying the student body, 2) developing standards and recommending changes that will assist in more effective advising; and, 3) establishing methods for evaluating effective advising and rewarding outstanding advisors. It is recommended that the Director of the Center for Academic Services be a member of this Committee, as well as a staff advisor, undergraduate faculty advisors, graduate faculty advisors, and students.</p> <p>In the absence of Senator Fortenberry, Chair of the Academic Excellence Committee, Chair Kinng read the motion. There was no discussion, and the motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/93 | <p>{See two discussions in the 5/93 minutes on page 4 relative to Finals and the University Calendar. Text is so badly scanned I would have to retype the entire page.}</p> |
| 5/93 | <p>{See discussion in the 5/93 minutes on page 6. Text is so badly scanned I would have to retype the entire page.}</p> |
| 5/93 | <p>{See discussion in the 5/93 minutes on page 7 relative to faculty salaries. Text is so badly scanned I would have to retype the entire page.}</p> |
| 10/93 | <p>At the November 5, 1992 Faculty Senate Meeting the Committee on Committees presented this motion for consideration: The Committee on Committees recommends that all University-wide councils, and College and University Advisory Committee members be elected by the faculty. Senator Couch, Chair of the Committee on Committees, stated the intent of this motion was to reduce the total number of people on these committees and to give faculty a direct voice into membership of the councils. Smaller committee size, Senator Couch suggested, would also increase committee efficiency. Reduction in size would occur by eliminating appointed positions. Since the original motion did not include d change to size, Senator King asked that the original motion be split to allow discussion of the proposed elective process of University-wide councils separate from college and University Advisory Committees. Discussion focused on whether fewer committee members would actually increase committee efficiency. Various Senators expressed concern about the process of equitably distributing elected members from various schools/colleges across the proposed committees. Senator Couch stated he would consider any feedback about this concern. The question was called for the part of the motion related to University-wide councils, and it passed by voice vote.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 11/93 | <p>Senator Fortenberry noted that the Role and Function Committee added four members to the current Undergraduate Council to allow faculty input relevant to undergraduate concerns. Chair Breyer offered a friendly amendment consisting of having eight members on the Council, one from each division. Senator Tucker seconded this motion. Rationale for this amendment included decreasing faculty service workload which often counts little in the University. Other Senators disagreed that a smaller Council would not be better, that Undergraduate Council service is very important and perhaps service workload could be cut from other areas not so critical to the University, and that many faculty would relish the opportunity to serve on the Council. A larger committee may increase diversity of opinion, offer assistance within colleges/divisions to handle the workload of the Undergraduate Council, and allow for experienced and new faculty to serve concurrently on the Council. Two representatives from each division could also create a balance in making decisions affecting various colleges/departments.</p> <p>The proposed Breyer amendment was presented and failed by a hand count of 16 to 8. The original motion as presented by the Role and Function Committee was presented and passed by voice vote.</p> |
| 11/93 | <p>Senator Fortenberry reviewed the rationale decreasing the current number of members on the Graduate Council by three members including the appointed members but excluding the ex-officio members. Chair Breyer suggested a friendly amendment which would include Harris College of Nursing as having one elected member on the Graduate Council. Senator Davis from Harris College of Nursing agreed that this would seem equitable with research currently occurring in that College. Senator King noted that Senator Davis has served well in providing guidance in Speech Communication graduate student work. The amendment was presented and passed unanimously.</p> |
| 11/93 | <p>Chair Breyer made a "friendly amendment" to decrease the total membership of the Graduate Council to 9 (rather than 12 as proposed by the Role and Function Committee) so that each division would have one representative (including Harris College of Nursing, as previously approved). By hand vote, the motion passed by a vote of 21 to 9. Senator Fortenberry noted that the process of eligibility will be determined later particularly since some colleges require tenured status for serving on the Graduate Council, and some colleges do not.</p> <p>Senators continued active discussion about whether the Senate had been inconsistent in deciding similar processes for faculty election to the Undergraduate and Graduate Council. Several Senators stated that with less faculty representation on the Graduate Council, the message may be sent to the University that undergraduate issues and programs are more important than graduate programs. Dr. Helmich noted that it is not true that work at the graduate level requires less work and added that a weak rationale currently exists to decrease present Graduate Council membership and to justify a change. Sensing a need for Senators to talk more to their constituencies about the impact of the proposed motions presented by the Role and Function Committee today, Senator Vanderhoof offered a motion to table the motion relevant to the Graduate Council. The motion to table was presented and passed 24 to 9. Senators agreed to talk to their constituencies and to return to the December meeting for continued discussion on this matter. The Role and Function Committee moves that two (2) faculty members be elected At-Large to the University Council in addition to the current configuration of faculty members from each college/division.</p> <p>Senator Fortenberry noted that the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs has indicated that all ex-officio members of the current University Council will remain. Thus, the intent of the motion is to equalize elected members with ex-officio members. At the present time, elected and appointed members comprise the University Council, and a process to elect the proposed At-Large members would need to be developed. The motion was presented as printed and passed unanimously. The Role and Function Committee moves that those faculty considered for membership on the University Council be tenured faculty. Senator Fortenberry indicated that currently some departments have this requirement, and others do not. The motion was presented and passed.</p> |
| 12/93 | <p>I. Chair Breyer led discussion of the proposal from the Role and Function committee on developing a procedure for the direct election of faculty to the Graduate Council. Various Senators voiced their views on whether all Council members should be elected, and on the appropriate representation for this Council (e. g. should Harris College of Nursing have a representative and should the Neeley School of Business have more representatives). It was pointed out that adding three appointed members to the Council would address possible problems of distribution among units, and of gender and minority representation. In response, Chair Breyer remarked that all current women and minority members of the Council were in fact elected. The Graduate Council's opposition to the election of all its members was noted.</p> <p>Senator Odom moved and the Senate agreed unanimously that Chair Brayer's amendment from the last Senate meeting to reduce the Council's numbers be removed from the Role and Function Committee's original motion (November minutes, p. 5), and it was moved and agreed unanimously that the change from 12 to 9 elected members approved last meeting be rescinded. Sen. Odom then moved that the Graduate Council be composed of 12 elected members with the membership divided following the Role and Function motion (November minutes, p. 5). This motion passed with 21 in favor and 10 opposed.</p> |
| 12/93 | <p>All University mediators should be trained by a professional from outside the University, selected by the Executive Committee of the Senate. This motion passed with two dissenting votes.</p> <p>B. A professional mediator should advise (amended from: participate with) the University mediators in the mediation process. Discussion ensued. Questions were raised as to whether an outside mediator would well understand the workings of the University, whether their techniques would be relevant to this setting, and whether they too would be seen as "tools of the administration." Supporters of the motion held that these problems were not insurmountable and were outweighed by the value of experts in mediation advising in the process. The motion passed 16 to 9.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 2/94 | <p>Report from Gregg Franzwa, Vice-Chair of the Senate, on consensual dating document distributed at December meeting. Senator Franzwa referred Senators to pp. 5-6 of the December minutes and suggested to the group several editorial changes based on feedback from Dr. Koehler. These included the following:</p> <p>line 2 of policy text: "...ethics for a teacher or staff member to initiate "</p> <p>line 4: "... indirect supervision of the faculty .Q.L staff member ..."</p> <p>line 9: "faculty member or staff who is or ..."</p> <p>line 10: "should not enter subsequently into a professional ..."</p> <p>line 11: "that person and, thus, faculty and staff members should avoid consensual relationships whenever there is a real possibility of subsequent professional relations."</p> <p>Senator Franzwa explained that the changes reflect the reality that sometimes University staff is involved in evaluation of student work and, thus, could be involved in a consensual dating situation. Discussion ensued about whether the suggested changes would cover various situations involving consensual relations between students and faculty/staff. Senator Franzwa responded that the wish of TCU administration is for a document which will decrease the number of cases of sexual harassment which reach the Vice-Chancellor's desk and that this document will most likely have that result. A motion was made to accept the changes suggested by Senator Franzwa, and the motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/94 | <p>That the Senate authorize an ad hoc committee to be called Peer Advisors. The membership will be recruited by the Executive Committee of the Senate from faculty in and outside the Senate. The committee's charges will include offering informal advising to those who seek it on matters related to sexual harassment and establishing faculty workshops on sexual harassment. Senator Raessler agreed that such an advisory group sounds fine but indicted concern that this group might not be as well trained as current sexual harassment officers. He also indicated that by the time a sexual harassment case reaches administration level, perhaps attorneys are needed more than peer advisors. Senator Franzwa responded that the current sexual harassment document speaks against the involvement of attorneys unless a case reaches top administration. The intent of the Peer Advisors Group, Senators Fort and Franzwa continued, is to prevent the isolation which faculty may experience under the present policy when they have been accused of sexual harassment. Training of the members of the Peer Advisors Group would occur to provide optimal assistance to those accused. Senator Harris noted the validity of having a trained support person for the accused faculty. Other concerns with the present policy include a perception that the person harassed receives more help than the one accused of harassment and the Peer Advisors Group would alleviate that concern. The question was called about approval of the motion on the establishment of the ad hoc committee (Peer Advisors), and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/94 | <p>Motion #1: election of membership of Undergraduate Council (SEE SPECIFICS IN NOVEMBER MINUTES): Senators agreed that if a faculty member did not want to run for election, that person could talk to the relevant Dean to withdraw the name from consideration. The question was called, and the motion was accepted unanimously.</p> <p>Motion #2: election of membership of University Council (SEE SPECIFICS IN NOVEMBER MINUTES): Senator Fortenberry noted that the only change with membership is that the membership as proposed would be only full time tenured faculty. The question was called, and it passed unanimously.</p> <p>Motion #3: election of membership to Graduate Council (SEE SPECIFICS IN NOVEMBER MINUTES): According to Senator Fortenberry, adjunct faculty would no longer be eligible for Graduate Council membership with this proposal. Thus, the first three listings would be changes to the membership of this body. The question was called, and it passed unanimously.</p> <p>Motion #5: The Role and Function Committee moves that the membership and description of the University Curriculum Committee be published in the Faculty and Staff Handbook along with all other University Councils. According to Senator Fortenberry, Dr. Koehler agrees that this committee (the University Curriculum Advisory Committee), established in 1986 as a standing committee, should be published in the Handbook. Senator Dominiak noted that the Senate has had limited input into that committee's composition and process of election and she would hope this would change if the proposed motion was accepted. The motion was presented and passed unanimously.</p> |
| 3/94 | <p>Report from the University Evaluation Committee on the Process and Procedure for Administrator Evaluation. Kathleen Mueller, Chair of the University Evaluation Committee, and Mary Anne Gorman, past Committee Chair and current Senator spoke to the recommendation printed on p. 13 of the March agenda. Currently, there is no philosophy or written policy that outlines the process or technique of administrator evaluation. Discussion focused on the advisability of an ad hoc committee to develop these essential materials to refine the evaluation process. Senators agreed that the Executive Committee of the Senate would be charged with determining the composition of the ad hoc group. Several Senators expressed concern about the large size of the proposed ad hoc committee (potentially 20-30 people) and whether effective decision-making could be made. Senator Gorman noted that having all members present to make decisions may work better than in prior years when various groups provided feedback to the Evaluation Committee which then developed a process only to have Administration revise the work of the Committee. After discussion, there was consensus that the Senate could only make a recommendation about the proposed ad hoc committee and its mission since the Evaluation Committee is not a Senate committee but a University Committee. One Senator noted that faculty evaluation of both academic administrators and non-academic administrators need to be considered in the recommendation. The question was called about acceptance of the recommendation proposed by the Evaluation Committee and passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 3/94 | <p>motion #1: Over the past decades the TCU faculty has had no role in the shaping of intercollegiate athletics policies. Given recent developments regarding the Southwest Conference and the impact of the future direction of TCU athletics to the entire University, the faculty believes that it should be directly involved in the decision-making process. The Faculty Senate requests that the administration bring the Faculty Senate Executive Committee into the deliberative process regarding the future of TCU athletics. Discussion ensued about this motion relevant to the following issues: whether the Executive Committee would represent the voice of the faculty in the deliberations, how faculty would be polled for their opinions on the topic, how TCU has not developed contingency plans for demise of the SWC when this has seemed inevitable for several years, and whether a motion to administration would improve the situation. Others believed that the motion would send a signal to administration about the concern of faculty for the longterm impact-throughout the University if changes occur in the current TCU athletics program. Senators agreed that faculty should be involved in decisions revolving around the future of athletics at TCU. The question was called, and the motion passed.</p> |
| 4/94 | <p>Concern about modification of the original rationale for abolishment of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee as offered by the Committee on Committees occurred. Senators accepted the revised statement of "All indications are that changing the charge to the committee would not be sufficient to improve the situation" (deletion of the last four lines of the original rationale printed in March agenda packet, p. 28) to define the rationale for abolishing this committee. Chair Breyer called the question about acceptance of the Committee on Committee's motion to abolish the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, and it passed by a hand count of 6 to 8. {See long discussion leading to this paragraph starting on page 1 and going to page 3 of the 4/94 minutes}.</p> |
| 4/94 | <p>Report from Student Relations Committee: Explore the process reestablishing Frog Finders; if reestablishment is proposed a mechanism of operation which would allow this to be a viable entity to serve the University community Senator Pohl presented the motion from the Student Relations Committee to endorse reinstatement of Frog Finders according to the March 10, 1994 proposal. After some discussion, the question was called and passed by voice vote with two Senators opposed.</p> |
| 4/94 | <p>Report from Student Relations Committee: Meet with officers of the Student House of Representatives at least annually to track issues of concern to the student community of the University (see attached revisions on Academic Conduct Policy, March Senate meeting) Senator Pohl presented to Senators a supplemental handout addressing semantical changes to the policy presented in the March meeting (see attached). The first suggested change was further altered to read "(written or verbal)" to "{orally or in writing}" to improve clarity of the statement. Senator Pohl emphasized that p. 13 would need to be renumbered as reflected on the handout distributed in the March meeting. In response to a question posed by Senator Dominiak, Senator Pohl commented that the Faculty/ Staff Handbook outlines the University's standard appellate procedures. After some discussion, Senators agreed that students should be allowed to pursue an issue of academic conduct at a higher administrative level which may not necessarily involve the faculty member, chair, Dean, and Provost chain of command order to protect a student's safety. Several Senators spoke of the differences in the appeal process of students being accused of academic misconduct and those bringing forth the charge of such conduct (the student accused must follow the faculty, chair, Dean, and Provost chain of command in the appeal process). Senator Franzwa requested clarification whether the only change on page 11 of the document was the lead and, and Senator Pohl noted this was correct. The question was called to approve the changes to the Academic Conduct Policy formulated by the Student Relations Committee and as stated in the March 41 1994 Proposal, and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 4/94 | <p>Report from the Role and Function Committee: Develop a procedure for direct election of faculty to University Council, Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, and the Budget and Finance Committee by the Faculty Senate (see attachments to Senate agenda for specific motions). Senator Fortenberry, Chair of Role and Function, rationale for this proposal involves increasing faculty representation and viewpoints on University committees. Relevant to the proposed changes to the Budget and Finance Committee, Senator Hensley noted this committee is not a Senate Committee and therefore, membership cannot be changed by Senate action. However, the committee appears in the Constitution of the Senate, so Senators agreed that the committee is under the purview of the Senate. The question was called to change the composition and election of members of the Budget and Finance Committee and it passed by a voice count with two Senators opposed.</p> <p>The second motion dealing with circulating the minutes of the Graduate Council to members of the Graduate Faculty was called and passed unanimously.</p> <p>The third motion relevant to changing the composition and election of the University Curriculum Committee was called and passed unanimously. Senators Hatcher and Fortenberry clarified that Donna Jackson (Registrar) and Neil Daniel (Writing Center) are both ex-officio members of the committee as well.</p> <p>The fourth motion dealing with distributing minutes University Curriculum Committee to departmental chairs to further disseminate to interested faculty was also presented. This motion also passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 4/94 | <p>Report from the Academic Excellence Committee: Review Self-Study documents on part-time faculty, workload, staffing, and class six and develop needed Senate motions to enact these recommendations.</p> <p>Senator Vanderhoof, Chair of the Academic Excellence Committee, presented an overview of the motions prepared by his committee and printed in the April agenda (see April agenda). Discussion on the first motion involving the limited attention that the administration has given faculty recommendations made for the Self-Study occurred. The motion was presented, and it passed unanimously.</p> <p>The second motion dealing with a need for the Provost to reinstate equipment lines into departmental budgets was presented. Several Senators noted how constrained they have been not to be able to purchase equipment from supply budgets.</p> <p>Senator Comer, Chair of Computer Science, noted that he has essentially no repair budget but is encouraged to use resources to buy new computers and software. He also noted that software is currently categorized under capital costs and budget lines need to be clarified to effectively manage resources. Chair Breyer noted that this topic of equipment budgets and the need for faculty input into changes to the budget process will be one addressed at the Faculty Assembly scheduled for April 28. The motion by the Academic Excellence Committee was presented and passed unanimously.</p> <p>The third motion related to priority intervention by the University for improvement in library space and physical condition was also presented. A support letter from Senator Couch, Chair of the University Library Committee, supported the motion (see attached). Additionally, the University Librarian, Professor Seal, verbalized the need for additional space compatible with needed technology and stated his desire to work with the Senate on this issue. Senator Tucker inquired why Library expansion and modification is not part of the current Capital Campaign with the obvious needs of the University related to library support. Senator Freeman noted that currently renovation of the Library is scheduled for the next century. The question was called to support the motion, and it passed unanimously. Chair Breyer thanked the Academic Excellence Committee for its support and noted the Executive Committee will work to address the motions.</p> |
| 4/94 | <p>Report from the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee: Monitor the operations of the University policies on tenure and promotion as set forth by the Handbook for TCU Faculty and University Staff.</p> <p>Senator Hatcher, in the absence of the Chair of the Role and Function Committee, Senator Raessler, provided background to the motions listed in the April agenda (see April agenda). Fort noted that motion I has been discussed before but no has ever been reached. He welcomes clarification on this issue which would be provided by the motion. The motion to have the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research address the Faculty Senate on Graduate Council membership was presented and passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/94 | <p>Chair Breyer voiced that faculty input in this area might be more valued if a higher administrative level was involved in insurance decisions. Several Senators agreed that Vice-Chancellor McGowan might be more sympathetic to faculty concerns due to his experience with the "community as scholars' model." The motion to change the administrative oversight for the Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits Committee to the Vice-Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs was presented, and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 10/94 | <p>The Resolution: The Faculty Senate resolves to support an increase in resources to the University Honors Program particularly in the areas of physical space and clerical assistance.</p> <p>Senator Fort stated that past Honors Director David Grant and current Director Kathryn McDorman identified these two items as the most important for the Honors Program. The purpose of this resolution is to show faculty support. Senator Dominiak stated that she was glad to see the Honors Program as a part of the University Campaign but questioned the selectivity of the resolutions that are brought forth to the senate. She requested that the executive committee think about the priorities that the senate has and perhaps evaluate the priorities of the campaign before proposing future resolutions. The vote on the resolution was held and it passed.</p> |
| 10/94 | <p>Senator Franzwa announced that the University does have a plan for handling the parking situation on our campus. The plan will be passed onto the University Traffic Committee for evaluation and input. Senator Franzwa added that the Traffic Committee is short two individuals and that this may be a prime opportunity to provide input into the University's plan for parking. We were asked to encourage our constituents and fellow senators to get involved and provide opinions to the traffic committee regarding this important issue.</p> |
| 10/94 | <p>THE RESOLUTION REGARDING THE HONORS PROGRAM</p> <p>The following resolution was presented to the Senate for adoption:</p> <p>The Resolution: The Faculty Senate resolves to support an increase in resources to the University Honors Program particularly in the areas of physical space and clerical assistance.</p> <p>Senator Fort stated that past Honors Director David Grant and current Director Kathryn McDorman identified these two items as the most important for the Honors Program. The purpose of this resolution is to show faculty support.</p> <p>Senator Dominiak stated that she was glad to see the Honors Program as a part of the University Campaign but questioned the selectivity of the resolutions that are brought forth to the senate. She requested that the executive committee think about the priorities that the senate has and perhaps evaluate the priorities of the campaign before proposing future resolutions. The vote on the resolution was held and it passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 11/94 | <p>Motion Regarding Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee (RIB) Senator Tucker moved to support the following recommendations by Dr. Ken Morgan, chair of RIB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. that the Faculty Senate Request TCU to consult the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee prior to any decisions being made and B. that the Chair of the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee shall report to the Faculty Senate on an annual basis. <p>Senator Babitch seconded the motion. The motion passed.</p> |
| 11/94 | <p>Senator Dominiak inquired as to whether or not all new faculty need mentors. Senator McNertney stated that the development of the process was in response to a senator recommendation passed last December (see December 2, 1993 minutes, page 4).</p> |
| 11/94 | <p>Motion Regarding Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee (RIB) Senator Tucker moved to support the following recommendations by Dr. Ken Morgan, chair of RIB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. that the Faculty Senate Request TCU to consult the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee prior to any decisions being made and B. that the Chair of the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee shall report to the Faculty Senate on an annual basis. <p>Senator Babitch seconded the motion. The motion passed.</p> |
| 12/94 | <p>Senator McNertney moved that the November 3, 1994 minutes be approved. Senator Breyer seconded the motion. The motion passed.</p> |
| 12/94 | <p>Senator King presented the following motion on behalf of the Role and Function Committee: The Role and Function Committee Moves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. an annual letter from the Chair of the Senate be written to Department Chairs, articulating the professional values of Senate membership and asking for departmental support for such memberships, including support for Senators from that particular academic unit. B. that the Senate's work be publicized through continued publication of Senate activity in the Faculty Bulletin and through an end-of-the-year summary sent directly to faculty. C. that these procedures be included in the appropriate written responsibilities of the Executive Committee so that the ideas will continue to be promulgated to future Executive Committees. <p>Senator Odom seconded the motion. Senator Ludvigson recommended that in addition to this information, that a summary of senate activities and university budget information also be included. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 12/94 | <p>The second motion from the Role and Function Committee was presented: After discussion with a representative of the budget committee, we move that the committee's first standing charge be changed: Current: Participate in an advisory capacity in formulation of budgetary priorities and allocations for the University. Proposed: Assess faculty views regarding budgetary priorities and communicate those views to the University in time to be considered in the budget preparation process. Report to the Senate the extent to which the University budget reflects those faculty budgetary priorities. Senator McNertney seconded the motion. This motion would allow faculty input for all university budget issues and would assist in facilitating more effective communication. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 12/94 | <p>The third motion presented by the Role and Function Committee is as follows: We move that the following guidelines be used for obtaining nominations for the Senate Offices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Nominations for Senate Office will be actively sought by the committee on Committees on or before the March senate meeting. b. The committee on Committees will contact nominees to establish willingness to serve. The Committee will insure that there is at least one nominee for each office. c. Nominations will be announced at the April senate meeting. Nominations from the floor will also be requested. Elections will be held at the May meeting. <p>Senator Becker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 12/94 | <p>The fourth motion from the Role and Function Committee is as follows: We move that appointments to the UCR Committee be made in consultation with the Senate Committee on Committees. Senator Fort seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 12/94 | <p>BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE The committee moves the following change be recorded in the Faculty/Staff Handbook (p.57): Budget and Finance Committee: Delete the first two sentences and replace with: The committee shall consist of five members, each elected by the Senate at the final Senate meeting of an academic year. At least three committee members shall be senators. Members will serve three year terms, with no more than two terms expiring each year. Senator Breyer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 12/94 | <p>Motion Regarding the WAC Faculty Representative Senator Dominiak moved the following: The faculty representative to the Western Association Conference (WAC) shall be one whose primary responsibility is teaching not administration. Senator Babitch seconded the motion. Senator Raessler made the following friendly amendment: ...representative to the NCAA and Western Association Conference ... Senator Breyer stated that there is a tremendous amount of time and energy that is required of the WAC and NCAA faculty representative and that continuity in the appointment is very important. Senator McNertney moved that the motion be tabled. The motion passed.</p> |
| 2/95 | <p>Senator King presented the following motion on behalf of the Role and Function Committee: The Role and Function Committee Moves: A. an annual letter from the Chair of the Senate be written to Department Chairs, articulating the professional values of Senate membership and asking for departmental support for such memberships, including support for Senators from that particular academic unit. B. that the Senate's work be publicized through continued publication of Senate activity in the Faculty Bulletin and through an end-of-the-year summary sent directly to faculty. C. that these procedures be included in the appropriate written responsibilities of the Executive Committee so that the ideas will continue to be promulgated to future Executive Committees. Senator Odom seconded the motion. Senator Ludvigson recommended that in addition to this information, that a summary of senate activities and university budget information also be included. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/95 | <p>The second motion from the Role and Function Committee was presented: After discussion with a representative of the budget committee, we move that the committee's first standing charge be changed: Current: Participate in an advisory capacity in formulation of budgetary priorities and allocations for the University. Proposed: Assess faculty views regarding budgetary priorities and communicate those views to the University in time to be considered in the budget preparation process. Report to the Senate the extent to which the University budget reflects those faculty budgetary priorities. Senator McNertney seconded the motion. This motion would allow faculty input for all university budget issues and would assist in facilitating more effective communication. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/95 | <p>The third motion presented by the Role and Function Committee is as follows: We move that the following guidelines be used for obtaining nominations for the Senate Offices: a. Nominations for Senate Office will be actively sought by the committee on Committees on or before the March senate meeting. b. The committee on Committees will contact nominees to establish willingness to serve. The Committee will insure that there is at least one nominee for each office. c. Nominations will be announced at the April senate meeting. Nominations from the floor will also be requested. Elections will be held at the May meeting. Senator Becker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/95 | <p>The fourth motion from the Role and Function Committee is as follows: We move that appointments to the UCR Committee be made in consultation with the Senate Committee on Committees. Senator Fort seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/95 | <p>Budget and Finance Committee: Delete the first two sentences and replace with: The committee shall consist of five members, each elected by the Senate at the final Senate meeting of an academic year. At least three committee members shall be senators. Members will serve three year terms, with no more than two terms expiring each year. Senator Breyer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/95 | <p>Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Proposed Charge: Advises the administration on the conduct of the university's intercollegiate athletics program, especially in regard to academic issues. Provides communication between the athletics department, faculty, staff, students, administration, and trustees. Advises and is kept informed by the university's representative to the NCAA and WAC. Senator McNertney seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.</p> |
| 2/95 | <p>The call for 1995-96 University committees assignments were distributed {see attached} by Senator Vigeland. Committee on Committees did an extensive review of committee charges. The affirmative action committee is being proposed to be changed to the Committee on Campus Diversity & Affirmative Action (See attachment page 7). Senator Vigeland moved that this change be approved. Senator Tucker seconded the motion and it passed. Senator Vigeland moved the University Committee recommended assignments for 1995- 96 be approved {see attachment pp. 8-10}. Senator Raessler seconded the motion which passed.</p> |
| 2/95 | <p>Motions from the Executive Committee Motion 1: A member of the Executive Committee shall be a member of the University Budget Committee. This will ensure communication between the senate and the administration. The motion passed. Motion 2: The Faculty Senate endorses the creation and use of an alternative identification number and the provision of financial resources in order to make this possible. The motion passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 3/95 | <p>MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION--THE ADDITION TO REED HALL</p> <p>Senator Tucker presented the motion for consideration regarding the addition to Reed Hall. Senator Tucker distributed information regarding ADA and introduced the students from Dr. Linda Moore's social work class whose mission is to promote campus awareness about barrier free design. Senator Tucker presented the overview of the resolution stating that access to Reed Hall is very limited. This affects not only individuals with limitations, but also faculty who often have heavy physical loads (teaching materials, equipment, etc.). This addition could be incorporated into enhancing the Student Center and would also include additional classroom space. Also, it is the of the motion to get a commitment and priority for this expansion, not to take precedence over current building projects. Senator Bobich asked for rationale for tying the elevator expansion with the request for adding classrooms to Reed Hall. Senator Tucker stated that the priority is the elevator; however, with long-term goals of expanding the Student Center, this may an opportunity for expanding Reed Hall.</p> <p>Senator Bobich expressed concern that through this resolution, the needed addition of an elevator may be lost. Senator Raessler stated concern that there are other buildings that have limited access and the prevention of other construction is limiting. Senator Tucker stated that the renovation to the Student Center is listed as a goal in the University Campaign and that this project may be a very logical time for the expansion to Reed Hall.</p> <p>Student House President Scott Wheatley appealed to the Faculty Senate to take a strong stance regarding this issue. He stated that a similar motion will be presented to the Student House later this month (see attachment page 7). Senator Breyer stated that he believed that there are two issues in this resolution: the need for the elevator and the need for expansion. It may be easier to see results by separating the issues. Senator King reconfirmed concern over delaying other building projects. Senator Keen-Payne presented the following friendly amendment to Senator Tucker's Motion:</p> <p>The Faculty Senate asks that the highest priority be assigned to providing full handicapped access to classrooms and the offices on campus. We ask that special attention be given to provision of elevator access to all three floors of Reed Hall, possibly by adding a new wing to Reed Hall connecting the Student Center. We ask that no new construction be initiated on campus until a commitment to this project is made.</p> <p>Senator Tucker accepted the amendment and Senator Odom called the question. Nineteen senators voted affirmatively, 10 senators opposed the motion, 6 senators abstained. The motion passed.</p> |
| 5/95 | <p>Senator Bobich stated that since teaching is the main component of this university, faculty should be evaluated both semesters. Senator Bobich moved that the senate recommend that all faculty be evaluated both semesters during the academic year contingent upon funding availability from instructional services. Senator Breyer seconded the motion.</p> <p>Senator Couch asked about how team-teaching situations are evaluated. Senator Bobich said that Mr. Kitchen's is looking into tailoring forms to meet different types of course instruction including team teaching. Senator Couch reconfirmed that the existing form is inappropriate for team-teaching and other course formats.</p> <p>Senator Couch made a friendly amendment that this motion would not include team-teaching until a proper form could be developed. Senator Babich accepted the friendly amendment. Senator Tucker called the question. The motion passed.</p> |
| 5/95 | <p>COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES</p> <p>The call for 1995-96 University committees assignments were distributed (see attached) by Senator Vigeland. Committee on Committees did an extensive review of committee charges. The affirmative action committee is being proposed to be changed to the Committee on Campus Diversity & Affirmative Action (See attachment page 7). Senator Vigeland moved that this change be approved. Senator Tucker seconded the motion and it passed.</p> <p>Senator Vigeland moved the University Committee recommended assignments for 1995- 96 be approved (see attachment pp. 8-10). Senator Raessler seconded the motion which passed.</p> |
| 9/95 | <p>Senator Bobich stated that since teaching is the main component of this university, faculty should be evaluated both semesters. Senator Bobich moved that the senate recommend that all faculty be evaluated both semesters during the academic year contingent upon funding availability from instructional services. Senator Breyer seconded the motion.</p> <p>Senator Couch asked about how team-teaching situations are evaluated. Senator Bobich said that Mr. Kitchen's is looking into tailoring forms to meet different types of course instruction including team teaching. Senator Couch reconfirmed that the existing form is inappropriate for team-teaching and other course formats.</p> <p>Senator Couch made a friendly amendment that this motion would not include team-teaching until a proper form could be developed. Senator Bobich accepted the friendly amendment. Senator Tucker called the question. The motion passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 10/95 | <p>Update on Retirement, Insurance, Benefits Committee from Dr. Ken Morgan, Chair</p> <p>Dr. Morgan presented an update on the work of this committee. The following is the report by Dr. Morgan:</p> <p>"What a difference a year makes. After years of frustration by many former members and chairs of the RIB committee, I came to the Senate and asked for support in seeking more input and participation in the decision making process that affects all of the TCU family. The Senate responded with a resolution of support and I can now honestly say that the administration, particularly, Vice-Chancellor Ed Biven reacted in a positive way. I am happy to announce that I have been fully involved in the negotiations for our new health and dental plan which will be announced at the faculty assembly next Tuesday after the RIB committee has had a chance to review and hopefully approve our recommendations."</p> <p>"Our goals were to make sure we did not lose benefits, provide continuity of service, expand our selection of doctors, maintain a cap on present and future cost for all current and past employees and use provided competition to our advantage. A total of 5 health insurance providers responded with a second and a third bid in response to the competition. The results of these bids and a recommendation will be passed on to the RIB committee for review tomorrow at 2:00 pm."</p> <p>"The nice part of this is that I can at least say, there should be no increases in health care cost for anyone at TCU or for any of our retired employees for 1996. And, if there are decreases, they will be for everyone insured through TCU."</p> <p>"Why?"</p> <p>"• We have experienced a better than average track record on medical expenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Dallas/Fort Worth area is experiencing competition for health care plans. • Working together for established common goals." <p>Dr. Ken Morgan also announced that the new Director of Human Resources is John Weiss from the University of the Pacific. Director Weiss will join TCU October 1, 1995.</p> <p>Sharon Hudson, chair of the Benefits Committee of the Office Staff Personnel Council (OSP) and Mary Lane, Past OSP chair presented general staff concerns to the senate. The following is Ms. Hudson's report:</p> <p>"I am Sharon Hudson and I am Chair of the Benefits Committee of the Office Staff Personnel Council, that represents all General Staff employees. With me today, is Mary Lane, past OSP chair and a member of my committee. I'd like to thank Sally Fortenberry and Ken Morgan for allowing me to share with you General Staff concerns regarding retirement benefits at TCU."</p> <p>"The Benefits Committee was asked by the OSP Council to examine the retirement benefits currently offered to the General Staff. When we started to explore the issue, it led to several conversations with different administrators. At their suggestions, we did two surveys. One survey was of universities similar to TCU in enrollment and educational mission. Out of the 12 surveyed, 10 schools offered the same benefits to all their employees, regardless of their exempt or non-exempt status. Only Baylor and TCU distinguished between its groups of employees."</p> <p>"We conducted a second survey of the 650 General Staff of TCU seeking their input, their understanding about the retirement benefits they receive and their major concerns regarding those benefits. Of the 250 surveys returned General Staff members stated that improvement in retirement benefits was the number one change they would like to see made."</p> <p>"All our study and research has lead us to two conclusions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We believe that employees with different skills, experience, and education should be compensated at different salary levels that reflect and honor those differences--and that health and retirement benefits should be equal for all employees. 2. We also believe that the firm financial base at TCU could support an adjustment and even equalization without penalizing anyone. We have come to this Faculty Senate to seek your support in this issue. We know there is strength in numbers and in seeking alliances with other concerned groups--especially this group that has been so effective in communicating and working with the administration." <p>"Therefore, we would ask that the Faculty Senate have the RIB Committee study this issue so that they may return with a resolution or recommendation for the improvement in the General Staff retirement benefits, and this issue could then be presented to the Administration."</p> <p>"Thank you for your time and your concern. I deeply appreciate this opportunity to speak with you. If you have questions, Mary Lane and I will be glad to answer them."</p> <p>Senator Freeman asked if the Harris Plan is receptive to change and improving their services. Dr. Morgan responded affirmatively. He added that there will be complete cooperation between the RIB committee, the University and the insurance companies and that there will be several informative meetings for faculty and staff.</p> <p>Senator Tucker moved that the Senate support the request from the Benefits Committee of the Office Staff Personnel Council to have the RIB Committee investigate retirement equalization and to report to the Senate. Senator Becker seconded the motion which passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 11/95 | <p>RESOLUTION FROM STAN TRACHTENBURG Senator Trachtenburg presented a resolution that would establish a joint-faculty administration task force on retirement opportunities and incentives to faculty. The motion was seconded and is as follows: A Resolution to Establish a Joint Faculty-Administration Task Force on Retirement Opportunities and Incentives to Faculty. Whereas, there is no fixed age retirement for the University faculty and Whereas, it is in the mutual interest of both faculty and the University that faculty retire before their teaching and research effectiveness becomes compromised; and Whereas, it is important to academic freedom that individual faculty members continue to determine when they wish to fully or partially discontinue active service, and Whereas such incentives have been offered by the University on an individual an informal basis; Now therefore Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That a joint faculty-administration Task Force be established to examine the range of financial and other benefits that would be provided by the University to retiring faculty, to assess the future costs and policy implication of such benefits, and to consider the establishment of a comprehensive scheme of incentives and benefits that might be available to the retiring faculty and 2. That the Task Force consist of four faculty members to be elected at large by the faculty senate and one appointed by the Chair of the faculty senate. In addition, two member of this Task Force will be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The chair of this Task Force will be elected by its members. 3. That the Task Force will solicit input from the faculty. And that the Task Force will make an initial report of its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate at its first meeting in the Spring, 1996 semester. <p>Senator Trachtenburg supported the resolution stating that an investigation into retirement opportunities including established retirement packages is needed. Dr. Ken Morgan, chair of the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee (RIB) concurred that there is a need to address this issue. He further stated that the RIB is very interested in this issue and would be willing to research this issue. However, Senator Trachtenburg stated that this task force would be very focused on retirement opportunities and Incentives. His concern is that this is a very important and expansive undertaking and that an existing committee such as the RIB may not have the time to investigate this issue. Several senators concurred. A lengthy discussion ensued as to whether the RIB committee should address this issue or not. It was determined that initially a task force could investigate this issue with a recommendation to then formally involve the RIB Committee. Senator Trachtenburg restated that his main concern is that there is a group of individuals who will focus on this important issue. Dr. Morgan concurred that this is a significant undertaking. If a task force is formed, he requested that the RIB be kept apprised of the task force findings. The senate concurred. The motion passed.</p> |
| 11/95 | <p>MOTION FROM CHAIR FORTENBERRY REGARDING SKIFF REPORTER Chair Fortenberry presented the following motion: In order to maintain communication with the university community via the TCU Daily Skiff, I move that the Faculty Senate Chair extend the invitation to the Skiff Reporter, to continue the coverage of the regularly scheduled Senate Meetings during the 1995-96 school year. The motion passed.</p> |
| 11/95 | <p>COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES, RHONDA HATCHER, CHAIR On behalf of Committee on Committees, Senator Hatcher presented the following motion: Before administration establishes a university-level ad hoc committee or equivalent, the rationale for the establishment and the charges should be reported to the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees. Whenever appropriate, the Committee on Committees will request that the tasks be assigned to a standing university committee. In the event that the Committee on Committees determines that it is not appropriate to make such an assignment, an ad hoc committee will be formed with recommendations from the Committee on Committee for faculty members. A lengthy discussion regarding the motion occurred. Several senators agreed with the intent of the motion as it appears that often ad hoc committees or task forces are created when a university committee is already in place to address the issue. Senators Cagle and Davis inquired as to whether or not university committees are able to handle issues that may arise during the summer months. Senator Fortenberry answered affirmatively or in the event that a committee cannot meet at that time, the executive committee can address issues from administration since the executive committee does meet during the summer.</p> |
| 11/95 | <p>TENURE, PROMOTION AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE, MIKE SACKEN, CHAIR Senator Sacken presented the following motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that page 15 of the Faculty Handbook, Section II (B) (1), be changed to read: "As a general rule, more than five years of service in this rank are expected before consideration to a full professorship." The rationale for this motion stems from faculty misinterpreting the current text which reads, "As a general rule, five years of service . . ." Senator Sacken explained that there has been administrative concern over faculty misinterpreting the text and applying for promotion at the beginning of the fifth year rather than at the end. The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee discussed this issue and therefore presents the motion. Senator Nichols stated that it may be more clear to add the words "applying for" before "consideration. Senator Sacken accepted this amendment. Therefore the motion reads: "As a general rule, more than five years of service in this rank are expected before applying for consideration to a full professorship." The motion passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 12/95 | <p>REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS Carolyn Cagle presented the proposed changes to the constitution and by-laws of the senate. The changes were based upon current practices of the senate. These changes need approval from the senate, faculty and final approval from the Board of Trustees. Senator Fort moved that the proposed changes to the Senate Constitution be accepted. Senator Oberkircher seconded the motion which passed. Senator Fort moved that the proposed changes to the Senate By-Laws be approved. Senator Oberkircher seconded the motion which passed.</p> |
| 12/95 | <p>TENURE, PROMOTION, AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE (Mike Sacken, Chair) Senator Sacken presented the motion to adopt the academic freedom definition as defined by AAUP. The committee recommends the following motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that TCU adopt the definition of Academic Freedom based upon the AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and place this definition on page 10 of the Faculty Staff Handbook under the current Academic Freedom Section. Dr. Sacken clarified that this is the standard definition utilized in academia. While it is clear that TCU does support academic freedom, a definition needs to be in place in the Faculty/Staff Handbook. The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee presented the motion which seconded and passed.</p> |
| 2/96 | <p>Academic Excellence Senator Sherrie Reynolds presented a report on behalf of the Academic Excellence Committee (see attached report). Senator Reynolds stated that the focus of the committee's work this year has been on the Freshmen Experience including the Freshmen Seminar Program. The major concerns that the committee discussed regarded the number of faculty necessary to implement the program and academic integrity of the seminars. Senator Infantino expressed concern over the issue of hiring faculty with one year contracts over tenured-track faculty. Senator Fort inquired as to whether or not we expressed these concern over the nature of these contracts with Dr. Koehler. Dr. Fortenberry responded affirmatively and further explained that the administration is committed to obtaining more faculty to replace the reliance on part-time faculty and to support the freshmen experience. Senator Reynolds confirmed that the faculty are committed to the freshmen experience including the freshmen seminar program. However, there is concern over how the program is going to be implemented. Senator Franzwa stated that perhaps the larger issue is the instructor year-to-year contract verses the tenure-track appointment. Senator Infantino inquired as to whether or not any department had requested a year-to-year appointment. Senator Kucko responded affirmatively by stating that in some cases, a year-to-year appointment with an individual with extensive professional experience is a definite asset to an applied field of study. Further discussion regarding the nature of a year-to-year contract occurred. Senator Fort moved that the Faculty Senate call a special session to meet with Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs William Koehler, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dr. Larry Adams, and perhaps representatives from the Student House to discuss the issue. Fred Oberkircher seconded the motion. The motion passed with a tentative meeting date being scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 1996.</p> |
| 2/96 | <p>Role & Function Committee Carolyn Cagle, Chair of the Role and Function Committee reported that the revisions to the Senate By-Laws and Constitution has passed the Faculty Senate. A faculty-wide election for approval of the changes has been instigated. Upon approval, the changes will be presented to the Board of Trustees for final approval.</p> |
| 4/96 | <p>The following Motion from the Senate Student Relations Committee was passed: To institute as policy of the Faculty Senate a joint meeting of the Faculty Senate and the House of Student Representatives each fall and spring semester. Said meetings to be held in order to discuss areas of mutual concern and to help foster increased communication between these two bodies. Said meetings to be arranged by the Presidents of both bodies.</p> |
| 4/96 | <p>RETIREMENT, INSURANCE AND BENEFITS COMMITTEE, DR. KEN MORGAN, CHAIR Dr. Ken Morgan presented the following motion which will be presented to TCU administration on April 5: The RIB Committee solicits the support of the Faculty Senate for the following recommendation formulated on March 26, 1996 to the Administration: "We request the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services review our current benefits package. This request is based on differences in retirement contributions for general staff, university staff and faculty and concerns about other differences in the package relative to the general staff. We request "options" be explored that might improve the present package without reduction of current benefits, and the findings reported back to the RIB committee in the Fall of 1996." Senator Grant asked Dr. Morgan if he would accept a friendly amendment that clarified that this affects all university employees. The amendment was accepted. Therefore the last sentence of the motion reads: "...We request "options" be explored that might improve the present package of all employees without reduction of current benefits." Senator Becker asked if reduction in faculty benefits is an option in order to gain equity for all employees. Dr. Morgan stated that this is not an option. Dr. Morgan further stated that it appears that there is support from the administration to investigate this issue. The motion passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/96 | <p>MOTIONS FROM THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</p> <p>Motion: The Faculty Senate endorses the election of a faculty member to the Board of Trustees of Texas Christian University. Senator Grant asked if the senate would elect the member or would the Board of Trustees elect a faculty member? Chair Fortenberry stated that the faculty at large would elect a member to the Board. Chancellor Tucker clarified that the Board of Trustees elect their own members. Therefore, the intent of the motion is that the Board of Trustees would elect a faculty member to the Board. The motion passed.</p> <p>Motion: The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall meet with the Academic Deans of TCU at least once per semester to enhance communication and planning. Senator Fortenberry stated that the purpose of this motion is to provide a direct communication link between the Faculty Senate and the Academic Deans. This includes participation at the annual, fall retreat with the deans. The motion passed.</p> |
| 5/96 | <p>{See long summary of motions passed by the Senate during the 1995-1996 year and their status as of the date of the minutes. These are on document pages 26 and 27 and on PDF file pages 41 and 42. Scan is very bad and it is very difficult to read the summary - OCR didn't work at all.}</p> |
| 5/96 | <p>From: Senate Committee on Tenure, Promotion & Grievance</p> <p>We received three specific charges at the beginning of the year; all three were completed.</p> <p>1. Develop a procedure for the university to be able to maintain the vita and supporting materials for all faculty denied tenure and/or promotion.</p> <p>By letter dated March 17, Dr. Koehler notified all TCU deans that all materials considered during the tenure process should be forwarded to his office for archiving and will not be returned. This apparently addresses the charge directly.</p> <p>2. Determine procedure on submissions of Tenure and Promotion materials with regards to all letters from review committees or groups being sent forward to the University Advisory Committee.</p> <p>All letters will be sent forward from now on (see Koehler's letter of 3/17/95, in which he specifies that he will be provided "the judgment of the tenured faculty and that of advisory committees").</p> <p>3. Addition of Statement from AAUP Policy Document to Section IIB, No. 4 of TCU Tenure Policy.</p> <p>This recommendation was approved by the Senate and forwarded to TCU's administration.</p> <p>4. One additional change in policy involved language on page 15 of the current Handbook, in section II(B)(1), which is part of the Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion, the concluding sentence reads: "As a general rule, five years of service in this rank are expected before consideration to a full professorship." There has been some confusion in the interpretation of this language, according to the Provost, leading to some Associate Professors submitting materials for review for Full Professor at the beginning of their 5th year as an associate, rather than at the beginning of their 6th year, as was intended by the drafters. Those submitting a year early are at some risk of refusal. Thus, the Provost requested that the sentence be redrafted as follows: "As a general rule, more than five years of service in this rank are expected before consideration to a full professorship."</p> <p>The committee's recommendation, with slight wording modifications, was passed by the Senate..</p> |
| 5/96 | <p>Specific Charge 2</p> <p>The committee made the following motion (in its amended form), and it was passed by the Faculty Senate: Before administrators establish a university level ad hoc committee or equivalent, the rationale for establishing the committee and the specific charges should be reported to the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees. Whenever appropriate, the Committee on Committees will request that the tasks be assigned to a standing university committee. In the event that the Committee on Committees determines that it is not appropriate to make such an assignment, an ad hoc committee will be formed with recommendations from the Committee on Committees for faculty members.</p> |
| 10/96 | <p>After some discussion, it was moved and seconded that future Senate meetings be held in Dan Rogers Hall, room 264. The motion passed by unanimous consent.</p> |
| 10/96 | <p>The next issue to be addressed was the matter of smoking in the Faculty Lounge. After limited discussion, Senator Curry made the motion that it be a non-smoking facility; seconded by Senator Wilson. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 11/96 | <p>The Executive Committee considered the proposed Teaching Materials Policy and came up with an Alternative Teaching Materials Policy (attached) for discussion by the Senate. It was moved and seconded that this be the alternative proposal which will be forwarded to the deans and Provost Koehler.</p> <p>Discussion ensued:</p> <p>Senator Reinecke stated that this is a reasonable, moderate, middle-of-the-road, collegial proposal but he questioned its value should it be a beginning stage for negotiation. Should it be accepted as is, he would have no difficulty with it.</p> <p>Senator Oberkircher suggested removing "as the most appropriate material for the course objectives" from the first sentence of paragraph 2 of the proposal. He stated that if the professor justified the use of the book and the chair of the department approved its use, then the intent was accomplished.</p> <p>Several senators questioned such matters as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens if the textbook selection is performed by a committee? • What happens if the department chair teaches courses? Would the dean to whom the chair reports then approve the textbook use? <p>Numerous attempts were made to reword the policy in order that it reflect the many views presented.</p> <p>Senator Miles stated that this policy was designed to stop the few faculty who are excessive, but it also insults many faculty and will create more red tape. Senator Grant suggested that the issue here is potential conflict of interest and that the word "may" is a dangerous thing and might create additional problems. This was then discussed. Senator Becker stated that this is not only a matter of conflict of interest, but also an issue of academic freedom. Senator Donovan suggested that the entire second paragraph be deleted and thus we would simply be saying that a faculty member may not publish their course notes and "get a buck out of it."</p> <p>Senator Paulus observed that we are really dealing with two problems: (1) textbooks published by known publishing houses and (2) having custom publishing of ones notes and charging students for that. She asked Provost Koehler which of these problems should be addressed.</p> <p>Provost Koehler responded that the specific instance which brought all of this up was a TCU faculty member who published a book through a publishing house. The price charged was considerably above the norm for that particular type and level of book and the royalty deal was considerably above what would be considered a normal royalty percentage. When the chair and dean asked about conflict of interest, the individual responded that there is no rule or policy against this, and he was correct.</p> <p>Senator Reinecke then made a motion to table this item on the agenda based on the new information made available by the Provost since new additional data will be required. The motion passed by unanimous consent.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 3/97 | <p>Ken Morgan, Chair of the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits (RIB) committee reported on a recommendation for retirement contributions for the general staff (attached). The recommendation was the result of 18 months of study to find a solution which met the following criteria: 1) no reduction of current benefits and 2) no increase in contributions from the University. The proposed solution is to create a vesting program which would allow the increased retirement benefits for general staff while meeting the criteria.</p> <p>Senator Pfaffenberger asked about grandfathering. Ken Morgan said that would be done. Also, faculty recruited for positions at the Associate or Professor rank might be vested immediately, at the discretion of the Chancellor.</p> <p>Senator Becker asked if the committee looked at compound interest when they evaluated the feasibility. Ken Morgan said that they were not able to.</p> <p>Senator Vigeland commented that the annual net cost appears to be about \$10,000.</p> <p>Senator Paulus said that the proposal is clever and as good as can be done. It has a realistic shot and she urges support of it. She commented that she also thinks it is unfortunate that personnel have to find their own enhancement.</p> <p>Senator Becker asked if Provost Koehler had any thoughts about it. Provost Koehler said that he did not think it was appropriate for him to try to influence the Senate. He mentioned that he didn't know if it was appropriate to choose one benefit from an array of benefits. He said that he would feel better if a benefits expert would look at it.</p> <p>Senator Fortenberry said that a benefits expert looked at it last summer and could not find another way to do it.</p> <p>Senator Becker moved and Senator Reinecke seconded the following motion: That the Senate endorse the proposal presented by the RIB committee.</p> <p>Senator Nichols commented that he didn't know that the Senate needed to endorse the proposal with this particular option.</p> <p>Senator Vigeland said that he was also concerned that we got the proposal today and haven't had time to talk it over with constituents.</p> <p>Senator Becker accepted a friendly amendment changing his motion to: That the Senate endorse in principal the proposal of the RIB committee.</p> <p>Additional discussion followed.</p> <p>Senator Vigeland asked if a month's delay would lessen the value of the Senate's support.</p> <p>Senator Greer asked whether there was any consideration of whether we have more trouble finding faculty than general staff. He suggested that maybe the reason that the University hasn't done this before is because we are not having trouble finding general staff.</p> <p>Senator Reinecke said that the number of general staff with 10 years of service is extremely small. While there is not a problem finding general staff, there does seem to be a problem keeping them. This proposal will increase the loyalty and longevity of general staff.</p> <p>Senator Grant moved to postpone consideration of the proposal. The motion was seconded by Senator Miles. The motion failed by 17 {against} to 14 (for) with 5 abstentions.</p> <p>Senator Greer presented the recommendations of the Role and Function Committee {attached}. He reminded the Senate that we discussed these recommendations extensively at the last meeting and he reviewed the changes to the proposal.</p> <p>Senator Fortenberry moved that we support recommendation 1 as submitted by the Role and Function Committee. It was seconded by Senator Rinewalt. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p>Senator Oberkircher moved that we support recommendation 2 as submitted by the Role and Function Committee. It was seconded by Senator Vigeland. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p>Senator Cagle moved that we support recommendation 3 as submitted by the Role and Function Committee. It was seconded by Senator Miles. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p>Senator Cagle moved that we support recommendation 4 as submitted by the Role and Function Committee. It was seconded by Senator Miles. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> <p>Senator Oberkircher moved that we support recommendation 3 as submitted by the Role and Function Committee. It was seconded by Senator Kucko. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 3/97 | <p>Senator Pfaffenberger reported on the recommendations of the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee (attached). Senator Pfaffenberger said that there is a proposal to create a Center for the Support of Teaching being developed. He said that he did not bring the proposal because it is a work in progress and that the committee's recommendation is in support of development of a Center rather than support of a particular proposal. Joe Babich asked "what if they had a Center and no one came?" Senator Pfaffenberger said that he was sure there were some faculty who could not be drawn to the Center, but that others would be. Marian Red asked how much student involvement there would be. Senator Pfaffenberger said that there would be student representation on the committee. Senator Becker asked if the subject came up as to whether teaching can really be taught. Senator Pfaffenberger said that they had discussed that and they had discussed the "art and craft" of teaching. He said that much can be done to help with the craft and with such things as use of technology. He asked Provost Koehler if he had any comment. Provost Koehler said that he began to talk with the Executive Committee a year ago about transitioning instructional services to something more, so he supports this idea. Joe Babich commented that he thought it was not a good idea to build a big Center and put a lot of money into it when there was no sense of support. Senator Pfaffenberger said he has been at two other universities where a Center like this existed. A demand for the service has to be generated. The Center would build gradually. The proposal is still in the conceptual stages. He stated again that his committee is asking for support of the general concept, not of a particular proposal. Chair Martin commented that this first came up as a specific proposal from Larry Kitchens. When the Provost presented it to the Executive Committee, the Committee asked to work with the proposal in the Senate since it deals with teaching which is the concern of the faculty. Chair Martin reminded us that the Committee is asking that we support the concept, not the specifics. The Senate is trying to take responsibility in an area where we should take responsibility, which is in the support of teaching. Senator Greer moved acceptance of the recommendation as submitted by the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee. Senator Vigeland seconded the motion. It was passed unanimously.</p> |
| 3/97 | <p>Chair Martin called attention to the Teaching Materials Polley (attached) and commented that this is about the eighth version of it. Senator Smith moved acceptance of the policy as submitted. Senator Greer seconded the motion. Senator Vigeland suggested that "royalties" should be changed to "financial benefit" because the statement was now broader than just publication of books. Senator Grant said that he was opposed to that because that would include such things as owning stock in a publishing house from which some small benefit might accrue as a result of requiring a textbook. Senator Vigeland changed his recommendation to "direct financial benefit". Senator Grant said that the addition of the word "direct" would take care of his objection. Senator Grant said that the chair of his department had said that he did not feel qualified to judge whether a text was appropriate in a field outside of his expertise. Senator Vigeland said that the chair makes that judgement already when he/she signs the book order. Some discussion followed. Senator Paulus pointed out that we are really talking about something that will only come up in rare cases. Senator Pfaffenberger asked if it would cover a situation where a faculty member requires a book written by another faculty member. Chair Martin said that it does not apply to that case. Chair Martin called for the question: That the Senate accept the proposed Teaching Material Policy with the amendment: "if the instructor receives direct financial benefit. The motion passed. (32 in favor, 4 opposed).</p> |
| 4/97 | <p>Senator Becker represented his motion on the collegiality issue which reads: "As a matter of form we rescind the statement in the Faculty Handbook ('the ability to work effectively with colleagues and students'), not passing judgement, because it should not have been in the handbook in the first place" (Senate minutes, April 3, 1997, page 8, paragraph two). The motion was then amended by Becker that the issue then be turned over to the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee for consideration as they find appropriate with the understanding that the issue is one of consequence. Senator Reinecke seconded the motion. Senator Grant noted that in approving this motion, as amended, the Senate does not suggest that getting along with others is not an important issue. The amendment to the motion was then restated before the vote: "That the issue of collegiality be turned over to the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee for further consideration." The amendment to the motion passed unanimously, the motion itself, which reads: "That the statement in the Faculty Handbook which reads 'The ability to work effectively with colleagues and students' be rescinded from the Faculty Handbook and the issue of collegiality be turned over to the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee for further consideration." The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/97 | <p>Senator David Grant presented the year end report of the Academic Excellence Committee (attached) and requested Senate action on two recommendations of the committee which are stated in Appendix B of the report. 1. The committee does not recommend the adoption of the document entitled "Procedure to Amend University Core Requirements," dated May 1996, by the Senate Executive Committee, which received the document from the Provost. The motion was made by Senator Reynolds and seconded by Senator Miles and passed by unanimous consent. 2. The committee recommends that next year a formal evaluation of the UCR be undertaken by the Undergraduate Council'. The motion was made by Senator Vigeland and seconded by Senator Franzwa and passed by unanimous consent.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/97 | <p>Senator Pffaffenberger presented the following recommendations to the Senate for action: (The recommendations are stated in entirety in the report of the Promotion, Tenure and Grievance Committee and are attached to the minutes.)</p> <p>Recommendation #1 (page 5 of the report)</p> <p>The Provost appoint an Advisory Board to assist in the development of a teaching center at TCU. The members of the Advisory Board should include two members of the 1996-1997 Senate Promotion, Tenure and Grievance Committee, at least two recipients of teaching awards, a student representative, and Larry Kitchens, current director of the Center for Instructional Support. The Board should advise the Provost on the following: (1) goals and objectives of the center; and (2) a timetable for the development of the center. The specific charge to the Board should be the development of a proposal for the teaching center. The creation of a proposal will require the Board to conduct research on existing centers to determine the best way to develop a center at TCU. The suggested name for the center: Center to Support Teaching.</p> <p>Discussion followed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Senator Hughes questioned whether there was any discussion about the dialogue of philosophy and policies of teaching which is not represented in the document. Answer: It would be assumed that this was the case. Centers investigated at other universities indicated that this does occur. 2. Senator Becker suggested that the chair of the Student Honors Cabinet may well be included on the Board. 3. Chair Martin recommended that senators who have suggestions should E-mail their ideas to Senator Pffaffenberger so they might be considered. <p>Motion to adopt Recommendation #1 was made by Senator Becker and seconded by Senator Smith. Motion passed by unanimous consent.</p> <p>Recommendation #2 (page 7 of the report)</p> <p>The Faculty Senate Promotion, Tenure and Grievance Committee be charged in the 1997-98 academic year with the task of crafting a statement of policy concerning the review of tenured faculty for the Faculty and University Staff Handbook. In addition, the committee should also be charged with researching methods of reviewing tenured faculty for comparison with the review processes in use by academic departments at TCU.</p> <p>Motion to adopt Recommendation #2 was made by Senator Grant and seconded by Senator Miles and passed by unanimous consent.</p> <p>Recommendation #3 (page 8 of the report)</p> <p>The Provost should establish a one-half day workshop in August each year for all department chairs. The workshop should focus on the methods of evaluating teaching and on the importance and methods of goal-setting and goal-matching in the review process of tenured faculty. Eventually, this workshop should be sponsored and administered by the Center to Support Teaching at TCU.</p> <p>Discussion followed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Senator Donovan suggested that the chairs must also communicate the rules to the faculty as well, after they have gone through this workshop. 2. Senator Pffaffenberger stated his belief that very few departments can be outstanding in these reviews either due to the chair or the faculty composition. 3. Senator Raessler commented that Provost Koehler has consistently had yearly workshops for chairs even though they were not necessarily on the subject of post tenure review. 4. Discussion then centered on the length of this workshops - 1 hour, 2 hours, ½ day??? <p>Senator Grant then proposed an amendment to the motion which would change the second sentence to read "the workshop should focus on the methods of evaluating teaching and on the methods of reviewing tenured faculty." The motion was seconded by Linda Moore. The amended motion passed by unanimous consent.</p> <p>Recommendation #4 (page 11 of the report)</p> <p>The Provost should charge the Evaluation Committee for the 1997-98 academic year with studying methods for evaluating teaching and, based on the study, recommending methods for use by departments at TCU in the evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness. The Evaluation Committee should also be charged with recommending a policy concerning the use of the written responses by students on the student perception evaluation instrument.</p> <p>Discussion followed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Senator Reinecke stated support for the motion. 2. Senator Garrison expressed concern that certain departments might be mandated to use evaluation methods that might not be appropriate for that particular department. 3. The first sentence of the motion was then amended to read: "The Provost should charge the Evaluation Committee for the 1997-98 academic year with studying methods for evaluating teaching, and based on the study, recommending methods to departments at TCU for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. <p>A motion to adopt the amended motion was made by Senator Grant and seconded by Senator Franzwa and received passage by unanimous consent.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/97 | <p>Senator Moore reported for Senator Oberkircher, Chair of the Student Relations Committee, who was absent. (Recommendations attached.)</p> <p>Recommendation #1 The Senate should be involved in the development of policies regarding the new computer system as they relate to academic matters and advising. Discussion followed: 1. Senator Reinecke questioned how this committee is related to the Academic Computing Committee? The response was uncertain; however, Chair Martin commented that this recommendation includes academic matters as well as the advising process; thus the Senate would be well served to have this as well as the other committee. 2. Senator Reinecke also expressed concern over software being chosen and/or purchased. 3. Senator Bobich questioned whether advising will really be a component in the new computer system recently purchased? Senator Moore responded that the first areas serviced with the new system will be administration. Chair-elect Vigeland stated that the software for the system has not yet been chosen, but the modules likely to go in first are the financial module and the human resource module. He is not aware that the student schedule even exists yet; thus we have plenty of opportunity to be involved in this. Motion for adoption made by Senator Garrison and seconded by Senator Vigeland. The motion passed by unanimous consent.</p> <p>Recommendation #2 That the Senate both encourage the administration to provide computers and network connections for all advisors, and work with the House of Student Representatives to consider funding through the House. Discussion followed: 1. Senator Grant moved to delete the final phrase of the recommendation with regard to the working with the Student House for funding through the House, and seconded by Senator Franzwa. The amendment passed by unanimous consent. 2. Senator Nicholson questioned whether, through this motion we are saying that it is more important to have a computer in the office of a faculty member for advising than it is for research and teaching? After much further discussion it was decided that a process of computer purchase was sorely needed; however, this is a different issue and should probably stand on its own. The amended motion was made by Senator Garrison and seconded by Senator Smith. The motion passed by unanimous consent.</p> <p>Recommendation #3 The Senate should encourage the administration to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty through the Center for Academic Services. Discussion followed: 1. Senator Bobich questioned whether this should be for all new faculty or only new faculty advisors. It was decided that the statement should read "all new faculty advisors" and this addition was accepted by friendly amendment. 2. Assistant Secretary Reynolds questioned whether all faculty members who are advisors will also receive this training? Answer: Hopefully. The motion, amended by friendly amendment, was made by Senator Garrison and seconded by Senator Smith.</p> <p>Recommendation #4 The Senate should encourage the administration to formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and, with input from the Faculty Senate, select and implement the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation. Discussion followed: 1. Senator Bobich questioned whether the administration should do this or whether we should do this. Should we not make the recommendations? Answer: The administration would need to make the connection. 2. Assistant Secretary Reynold suggested that we have insufficient information about this to be able to recommend. We would need more information about the organization and what kinds of things they do. 3. Senator Paulus then moved to amend the motion by stating that the "Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation." The amended motion by friendly amendment was made by Senator Franzwa and seconded by Senator Jenkins and passed by unanimous consent.</p> |
| 5/97 | <p>Lana Allman presented the report from the Academic Appeals Committee on the Procedures for Grade Appeals. Discussion followed: 1. Senator Grant expressed concern over the fact that the Academic Appeals Committee is part of this process and that there are students on the Academic Appeals Committee. He stated belief that the appeal should go directly from the Academic Dean to the Provost. 2. The Senate agreed to send this matter back to committee to remove the Academic Appeals Committee from the process on the basis that grades are a factor which should be dealt with by faculty and administration, and student judgement should not be part of this process. 3. After more discussion, observations, and questions centering on two basic issues: A. Should the Dean's decision or the Provost's decision be the final one, and B. May the Dean change the grade of a faculty member? It was decided to accept a motion that: Procedures for Grade Appeals #1 - #3 be accepted and that Procedure #4 be sent back to committee for further consideration. Motion by Senator Becker, seconded by Senator Smith. The motion passed by a majority with six senators opposing.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/97 | <p>Chair Martin commented on the process of the search committee for a Chancellor. The Executive Committee quizzed the Provost with regard to this issue, and although he is not setting up the process, he did suggest that there probably will be a traditional search committee and the search committee will be sensitive to the agreement that was reached in 1988 with regard to faculty representation: that is, there will be as many faculty represented as any other group. Also, the faculty appointed will reflect sensitivity to appropriate representation including gender and ethnicity.</p> <p>Senator Bobich then made "emergency" motions that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Executive Committee urge that the Faculty Senate elect the faculty members on the search committee. (Seconded by Senator Becker). 2. The Faculty Senate recommend that the next Chancellor possess an earned doctorate. (Seconded by Senator Hughes.) <p>The motions passed by unanimous consent.</p> |
| 3/98 | <p>Senator Garrison made the motion to amend the Senate Bylaws to incorporate the attendance policy currently in effect. The policy would be included in Article 2, Section 2, Item B of the Bylaws under a new number 9. Section 10 would reference the procedure currently used to replace a Senator when their position is vacated. Section 6 of the Bylaws would include the Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate. Senator Oberkircher seconded the motion. Senator Sacken called for the vote and the motion was passed with a unanimous vote.</p> |
| 4/98 | <p>{See extended discussion on pages 3 through 5 on the 4/1998 minutes on criteria for Professional Review and Development}</p> |
| 4/98 | <p>Senator Pfaffenberger then spoke on the issue of the use of faculty mediators in grievance cases and whether to make recommendations to continue, modify or discontinue their use. The committee recommendations are on page 9 of the report (attached). Senator Paulus questioned the possibility of using off campus non employee mediators who are truly neutral.</p> <p>Senator Franzwa noted that in the past 20 years there has never been a successful grievance brought against the university. Thus it is all quite academic. Senator Pfaffenberger did note, however, that there have been cases involving procedures where there have been out of court settlements where mediation did have some degree of success, at least monetarily. He then called for the question. The vote was taken and the vote passed by unanimous consent.</p> |
| 4/98 | <p>Senator Pfaffenberger then spoke on the issue of collegiality as a part of the tenure process. The committee recommendations are on page 12 of the report (attached). Senator Fortenberry stated that Dr. Koehler suggested that issues of collegiality really should appear in the professional ethics section of the Handbook for Faculty and University Staff, but this would need to be done next year. Senator Clemons stated his hope that no such statement will then mysteriously appear in the handbook. Senator Grant expressed concern over the wording of the recommendation which states: "Collegiality should not be considered as an explicit factor." His concern was over the word "explicit." Senator Pfaffenberger accepted that recommendation as a friendly amendment so therefore, the first sentence of the recommendation will read: "Collegiality should not be considered as a factor in future decisions." Senator Garrison spoke against the recommendation because she feels that collegiality should be considered as a factor in the tenure review. The question was called for. therefore discussion ceased. Chair Vigeland then conducted the vote on the recommendation Senator Grant called for a point of order, stating that the body must vote on the question of whether or not they are ready to take a vote. This was then voted upon with 23 for and 8 against, therefore. the vote on the issue may occur. The vote was then taken on the recommendation on page 12 of the 1998 Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee Report. The vote was 16 for and 15 against, thus the recommendation of the committee was accepted.</p> |
| 4/98 | <p>Senator Pfaffenberger then presented the recommendation on page 13 of the report requesting time for further study on the issue of extending the tenure clock for persons in their probationary period for persons who receive FMLA leaves. A vote was taken on postponing action on this issue and it passed by unanimous consent.</p> |
| 4/98 | <p>Senator Grant moved that the Grade Appeals Policy distributed with the agendas for this meeting be adopted. A friendly amendment was accepted to line six of number one of the Procedures for Grade Appeals which will now read "The faculty member will respond in writing to the department chair concerning the student's appeal." The amended motion was passed by unanimous consent.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 10/98 | <p>Motion 1: That the time period for Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty be modified from three years to five years, the specific language of the change to be incorporated in the Post Tenure Review Policy adopted by the Senate on 30 April 1998 as follows (changes indicated in bold): Current policy: "Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated triennially by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty." Proposed revision: "Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated at least every five years by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedure for review of tenured faculty." Senator Pfaffenberger responded to a question as to why the Executive Committee recommends the change from three years to five years. He indicated that there was strong sentiment among the faculty who attended the Faculty Assembly last spring that flexibility be given to departments to schedule these reviews in light of the differing time frames for research in different disciplines. The motion was approved, 27-0.</p> <p>Motion 2: That maternity leave be incorporated into the existing "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as follows (additions indicated in bold): "In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non-tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth. Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted. In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to de facto tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean." Discussion of the motion: Senator George Brown asked the relation of this new policy to the FMLA. Chair Reynolds indicated that this was being addressed separately. Senator Bobich suggested that the proposed policy was discriminatory in that it gave an extension to female faculty members but not to males who become fathers. Senator Hughes expressed concern about the male's role but noted that there are physiological pressures on women in pregnancy. Provost Koehler indicated that we don't know what impact this policy will have, but it is proposed as a way of responding to a perceived need. Senator Pfaffenberger noted that the FMLA addresses the procedure for granting leave time to fathers who need it. Senator noted that we don't know if such a policy will be often used, but it can be a significant recruiting tool for new female faculty. Senator Fortenberry called the question. The motion to call the question was approved. The motion to add the maternity policy to the Statement of Tenure Probationary period was approved, 23-3.</p> <p>Motion 3: That the note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period," passed by the Faculty Senate on 2/7/91 and which currently reads: "This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents and is verbally announced by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the new faculty briefing each year." be amended to read: "This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents." Chair Reynolds indicated that, because this was published now in all department and college documents, there was no longer a need to announce it verbally. The motion was approved, 29-0.</p> <p>Motion 4: That the Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy be amended to include as a sixth criteria for appointment, reappointment, and tenure the following: "Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics" (See Attachment B for the proposed amended Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy). Senator Bobich spoke in favor of the motion. No one spoke against it. The motion was approved, 28-0.</p> |
| 5/99 | <p>Student House of Representatives Resolution 99-6. Chair Reynolds introduced Sara Donaldson from the Student Government Association to present a resolution concerning the resurrection of the Frog Finder. Joe Bobitch moved that the Senate support this resolution: "Whereas: Registration for classes can be a stressful process, and Whereas: The Frog Finder . . . is a consistent way to provide better service and more information about courses to the students, and Whereas: The Professors Web Page . . . would be the easiest way for professors to provide this information to the students. Let it be resolved: That the House of Student Representatives requests that the Office of the Registrar resurrect the Frog Finder as a web page linked to the class scheduling web pages. Respectfully submitted: Academic Affairs Committee" The motion to support this resolution from the SGA was approved.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 9/99 | <p>Chair Pfaffenberger commented on the process of forming search committees for the deans. He has received 113 e-mails and telephone calls, some from the same persons, raising questions and offering opinions about the process. So he explained what happened and why it happened. The Executive Committee met with the Provost last Thursday about the search process. In three of the four units the units had put forth recommendations for faculty to serve on the committees. The Provost at his meeting last Thursday with the Executive Committee brought to the Committee's attention the policy passed by the Faculty Senate in 1988 delineating the composition of, and procedures for selecting members to, dean search committees. (Copies of this policy were distributed [see Attachment C]). The policy states that a majority of the membership on these search committees would be faculty, that a majority of the faculty would be elected, and that the chair would be selected from the elected membership. Time is of essence in getting these search committees organized, so the Executive Committee agreed that since three of the units had already nominated faculty, we would put forward those names to the faculty for approval, but the ballots would also allow for write-ins. Since AddRan had not yet finalized a list of nominees, we were able to use a different process whereby each faculty member in the humanities and social sciences was asked if he or she would be willing to serve on the search committee. All faculty who responded that they would be willing were listed on the ballot. But even this caused problems in that some units decided to put forward only one name by having only one member of the unit return the form indicating his or her willingness to serve.</p> |
| 10/99 | <p>Senator Fort's motion to change the name of freshman seminars to first-year seminars, postponed from the September Senate meeting, was brought back to the table. Chair Pfaffenberger asked for clarification that Senator Fort intended this as a recommendation to the Undergraduate Council, which is the faculty body responsible for the undergraduate curriculum. Senator Fort clarified that this is the case: the motion is to recommend to the Undergraduate Council that the name of the freshman seminars be changed to first-year seminars. Points in the discussion: A concern was raised that first-year student might apply to first-year transfer students, and the character of the seminars would be dramatically changed if transfer students were allowed to enroll. Fort indicated that his intention was not to change the composition of the seminars, but to change the language used to describe them. The motion carried 13-12.</p> |
| 10/99 | <p>Chair Pfaffenberger introduced Mary Lane, Chair of the newly created Staff Assembly. The following motion was suggested by the Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits Committee (RIB) and Chancellor Ferrari. Senator Becker moved that we adopt the motion: That (1) the Chair-elect of the Staff Assembly be appointed Co-Chair of the Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits Committee with the current faculty Co-Chair; and (2) the Chair of the Staff Assembly Policy Review Committee also be added as a member of the RIB Committee.</p> <p>Ken Morgan, Chair of the RIB Committee was present to answer questions. Major points in the discussion: Will having co-chairs dilute the bargaining power of the committee? Prof. Morgan did not think so since all employees have common interests and faculty and staff have been more together than they have been apart on benefits and retirement issues. Having co-chairs will show that one committee is the spokesperson for all persons effected by benefits. The point was also made that the increased constituency served by the committee would mean more power, not diluted power. Another question was raised as to whether having the chair-elect of the Staff Assembly designated as the co-chair would not be disadvantageous, since this would mean a new staff co-chair each year. It was noted that Prof. Morgan has chaired the committee for several years and his success in doing so results partly from his long-term experience with leading the committee. This was recognized as a point for future consideration but no change in the motion was suggested. The motion was adopted.</p> |
| 12/99 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed name change and change in charge for the Undergraduate Admissions Committee. The Committee on Committee brought to the floor a recommendation that originated in the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to change the name and charge of that committee. <p>Current name: Undergraduate Admissions Committee Proposed name: Undergraduate Admissions and Retention Committee Current charge: Annually reviews university policies on admission. Is consulted on proposed changes in admissions procedures. Keeps abreast of innovations occurring elsewhere and makes recommendations when such innovations appear relevant to TCU. Annually reviews student retention statistics and recommends changes in admission policies and procedures. Proposed charge: Annually reviews undergraduate admission, enrollment, and retention statistics. Facilitates communication between the Admissions Office and other members of the university community, including the Faculty Senate. Serves in a responsive and proactive manner to consider issues concerning admissions and retention, including annual and strategic goals. Senator Fort moved that the recommendation be approved and the motion was adopted.</p> |
| 12/99 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy and process pertaining to the nomination of individuals for honorary degrees. Chair Pfaffenberger opened the floor for discussion of changes to the existing 1974 Senate policy for nominating individuals for honorary degrees and presented the Executive Committee's suggestions for modifications. After debate and discussion a motion to approve the modified policy as found in Appendix A was made by Pat Bradley and the motion was approved. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 2/00 | <p>Revision of the bylaws regarding allocation of Senate seats. The Executive Committee placed on the floor the following motion, the intent of which is to bring the Senate's Bylaws in conformity to the new college structure that will go into effect in June 2000: That Article II, Section 2, Part A of The Bylaws of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate be modified to read as follows:</p> <p>"A. Members representing the several schools and colleges. Each school and college is allocated one member in the Faculty Senate for every eleven full-time members in that school or college, with an additional seat allocated when there are six or more full-time faculty beyond multiples of eleven. No school or college, or division of Addran College of Humanities and Social Sciences, shall be allocated fewer than three members, with at least one member elected at each regular election."</p> <p>Discussion of the motion focused on the ambiguity in this statement, now that there is a School of Music within the College of Fine Arts and a College of Nursing within the College of Health Sciences and Human Services. Senator Fort moved that the motion be tabled and sent back to the Executive Committee for rewording to eliminate the ambiguity. The motion to table was approved.</p> |
| 2/00 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution concerning pedestrian safety on University Drive. Senator Bobich brought the following resolution to the floor and Senator Franzwa made a motion to adopt it: <p>Too many T.C.U. constituents are being run over by careless drivers. Therefore, the T.C.U. Faculty Senate requests that the chancellor ask Bob Bolen to work hard to get all the T.C.U. crosswalks on University Drive raised as they are in front of Paschal High School, to better mark all crosswalks, to eliminate parking in front of "Flash, The University Store," and to do everything else that he and the University can do to decrease automobile accidents on campus.</p> <p>Several persons spoke from their own experiences of the pedestrian dangers on University Drive. Senator Donovan suggested putting up large purple signs with "Caution: Frog Crossing." Senator Fort asked what is the best way to proceed. Ed Biven, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Service, present as a guest, suggested that the city has a traffic manager whom we can ask to come out to look at the situation. If senators give him a list of things to bring to that traffic manager, he'll see what's possible. The resolution passed.</p> |
| 3/00 | <p>The following motion was introduced to change the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate concerning the allocation of Senate positions to academic units: ARTICLE II. THE FACULTY SENATE Section 2. Membership and Elections</p> <p>A. Members representing the several academic units comprising TCU. These academic units are: Addran College of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Science and Engineering, M.J. Neeley School of Business, College of Health Sciences and Human Services, College of Fine Arts, College of Communication, and School of Education. Each academic unit is allocated one member in the Faculty Senate for every eleven full-time members in that unit, with an additional seat allocated when there are six or more full-time faculty beyond multiples of eleven. No academic unit, or division of Addran College of Humanities and Social Sciences, shall be allocated fewer than three members, with at least one member elected at each regular interval.</p> <p>This motion was approved and the appropriate change in the Faculty and University Staff Handbook for the 2000-2001 academic year will be made.</p> |
| 3/00 | <p>Senator Moore introduced a motion to make the Chief Marshall position a fixed four year term. The motion passed.</p> |
| 4/00 | <p>I. To charge the Senate Student Relations Committee with meeting each semester with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and to report at the end of the semester its activities in this regard.</p> <p>The motion was approved. This change in the Student Relations Committee standing charge will be made effective with the 2000-2001 academic year.</p> |
| 4/00 | <p>Report from the Promotion, Tenure and Grievance Committee, presented by Senator Fortenberry, Committee Chair. The recommendations made by the PTG committee led to considerable discussion which resulted in the following motion introduced by Senator Fort: The Senate ask the administration to entertain consideration of these recommendations. This motion passed.</p> |
| 4/00 | <p>The following motion was introduced by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate:</p> <p>"That (1) the Staff Assembly Committee on Committees elect for a five-year term the Co-chair of the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee with the current faculty Co-chair; and (2) the Chair of the Staff Assembly Policy Review Committee also be added as a member of the RIB Committee."</p> <p>This motion was approved.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/00 | <p>Tabled motions from Faculty Governance Committee recommendations. Senator Flahive moved to untable the following motion brought from the Faculty Governance Committee that was tabled at the 6 April meeting: That the Senate create additional Faculty Senate committees to meet with the following vice chancellors: Administrative Services and University Advancement.</p> <p>The motion to untable was approved. Senator Clayton Brown, chair of the Faculty Governance Committee suggested that the motion be amended as follows: That the Senate create one additional Faculty Senate committee to meet with the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and the Vice Chancellor for University Advancement, and that this committee comprise six members, of which at least one be a senator.</p> <p>Linda Moore moved that the suggested amendment to the motion be adopted, and it was. Senator Reynolds then argued against the amended motion, noting that there were already Senate conversations with these vice chancellors because the chair of the Faculty Senate was now invited to attend the meetings of the Glen Rose Group—the chancellor, the deans, and the vice chancellors. Senator Fort noted that the Senate ought to be proactive and approve this new committee. Senator Flahive worried that the Committee on Committees would have difficulty filling such a committee due to the scarcity of faculty willing to serve on committees. The question was called and the amended motion was defeated.</p> <p>Senator Flahive moved to remove from the table the following motion made and tabled at the 6 April meeting: That the Faculty Senate support the current relationship between the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees and state that its expectation is that contact will continue at the present level.</p> <p>The motion to remove from the table passed. This recommendation was tabled in April so that the Executive Committee could examine whether a request to meet formally with the Board after each Board meeting should be added. Senator Grant reported that the Executive Committee had looked at this motion and did not believe that any such additional meeting was necessary. Chair Pfaffenberger called the question on the original motion and it was approved.</p> |
| 5/00 | <p>That the Faculty Senate forward a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for consideration and submission to the University Administration that calls for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a rush policy that recognizes the primary academic mission of the University and accordingly restricts all rush activities of Greek organizations to the periods falling between academic semesters and terms when no classes or examinations are scheduled, and 2. a change in the timing of rush that recognizes the primary academic mission of the University and accordingly moves all rush activities of Greek organizations to the period between the end of final examinations in the Fall Semester and the first scheduled classes of the Spring semester. <p>Senator Fort moved approval of this recommendation. Points in the discussion included the importance of keeping in mind that delaying formal rush would only increase informal rush, the importance of keeping the entering freshman experience as broad as possible, and the symbolic value that a vote to delay rush would have in emphasizing academics. A vote was taken and the motion carried.</p> |
| 4/01 | <p>At the request of the Chair, Senator Ron Watson moved to change the agenda to allow the presentation by VC Ed Bivin and Mr. Will Stalworth to be given first. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.</p> |
| 4/01 | <p>The floor was opened for discussion of the Grievance Committee Report. Senator Kolesar noted that he received no email inquires about the report. A lively discussion ensued, the gist of which was that the senate felt some slight clarification of the wording was needed in order to protect the prerogative of the faculty in the tenure process. Senator Kolesar was charged with making the changes. Senator Bobich made the motion to table the report until the April meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Fort and unanimously passed by the senate.</p> |
| 4/01 | <p>Senator Franzwa suggested that the Faculty Senate should have discussion on the merit of having a faculty member on the Board of Trustees. He said that the new trustees were “all mostly CEOs” and was wondering how many board members have any academic background or educational experience. He asked how perspective board members were identified. He informally proposed that a faculty member be appointed to the to the board.</p> <p>Senator Fort asked if the Chair could run this by senior administrators. Senator Bobich noted that SMU has a faculty member on the board. Senator Sacken said he could understand why employees were not on the board. He suggested having about a non-TCU academic on the board. Senator Moore said that this suggested appear in last year’s governance committee report and suggested we should look at the report. Senator Franzwa suggested we appoint an emeritus TCU faculty member.</p> <p>Senator Fort made a motion to have the executive committee discuss this with the Provost and Chancellor. Senator Flahive seconded the motion and it was passed by the senate.</p> |
| 5/01 | <p>Senator D. Grant moved, and Senator P. Watson seconded, a motion to remove the grievance policy proposal, from the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee (TP&G), that we tabled in April and open it for discussion.</p> <p>Senator Kolesar, Chair of the TP&G, presented the recommendations for modifications to the document.</p> <p>Senator J. Bobich moved to approve and Senator R. Pfaffenberger seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 5/01 | <p>COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Chair L. Flahive made 2 motions</p> <p>1. Moved that an ad hoc committee be formed over the summer to report to Senate in the fall to consider combining quasi-judicial committees. This motion was approved unanimously.</p> <p>2. Moved to reduce memberships as recommended in the report. This motion was approved unanimously.</p> |
| 5/01 | <p>STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE Senator M. Butler presented the SAC recommendation that the GPA to maintain a scholarship be maintained at 3.0 rather than increasing once a student completed their freshman year.</p> <p>It was suggested that this should be effective starting Fall 2002.</p> <p>Senator Bobich moved that we accept the recommendation and the motion was seconded by Senator Flahive. The motion was passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/01 | <p>TENURE, PROMOTION AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE The TPGC suggests that the TCU vita needs to include more information on teaching. The Committee moved that a revised vita be passed on to the administration for consideration and adoption. Details are present in the report.</p> <p>Senator L. Moore asked if there was a time limit and suggested 5 to 10 years for reporting teaching data. Senator Fort does not like the suggested focus on the amount of time spent in- or outside of a particular class.</p> <p>Senator C. Becker made a motion to postpone discussion to a Fall 2001 meeting. Senator D. Rinewalt seconded the motion. The motion passed.</p> |
| 10/01 | <p>Senator Flahive recommended deleting the discussion on academic dishonesty from printed motion #1. This issue has been placed under the charge of the Academic Excellence Committee this year</p> <p>Senator King asked how many members would serve on a panel. We were told that the number would probably be 3 to 5. He then asked if anyone had any idea of the number of cases that would be heard each year. Mike Russel said he was not really sure, but he thinks 3 to 4 cases a year. He asked if this changed the administrative process any way. Senator Flahive and Mike Russel said this is nonacademic so it doesn't involve department level issues. Also still have student bill of rights.</p> <p>Senator Brown asked what kinds of cases would be involved. Mike Russel said this would include cases such as fraternity hazing, sexual assault and assault.</p> <p>Motion 1 - Passed unanimously Motion 2 - Passed unanimously</p> |
| 10/01 | <p>Lacking a formal motion from the TP&G Committee on the suggested edits, Senator Brown suggested the Senate discuss and "straw" vote on the five recommended item changes. This will allow the Committee to see which proposed changes are supported by the Senate and help them with future motions. The Senate agreed to vote on the 5 changes in red on the revised document that was circulated via email. Each vote below is referenced to the item number.</p> <p>11. No discussion. Aye 19 Nay 8. Motion supported. 12. No discussion. Aye 23 Nay 4. Motion supported.</p> |
| 11/01 | <p>Senator King then presented a motion to applaud the Star Telegram editorial by Senator Franzwa in defense of the Academy in the face of suggested irresponsibility. The motion received unanimous support from the Senate and was passed.</p> |
| 12/01 | <p>Senator Fort proposed that we table the motion so that advocates could contact faculty who are interested and ask what they think the committee should do. He said more consultation was needed on the issue. The motion to table was seconded by Senator Bobich.</p> <p>Aye – 18, Nay – 11 – the motion was tabled.</p> <p>{See discussion on pages 1 and 2 of the 12/2001 minutes}</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 12/01 | <p>Senator King moved to alter the Vitae format. Only points 11 and 12 were brought forward. Other items were dropped after the straw vote in the November Faculty Senate meeting. Items 11 and 12 were approved in the straw vote. Senator King noted there were no chronological constraints on the length of teaching material that could be included. He said that points 11 and 12 would be retroactive if they are adopted and used. Senator Fort suggested that there should be explicit time lengths. Senator Woodward noted that in general the points cover only information for the past year. It was suggested that there is some confusion with the TCU vitae and the annual report. Senator Nichols noted that nothing says 11 and 12 are optional. He said that an explicit number of years should be included. Senator Brown said the longer the term the better. Senator Fort said it should be at least 5 years. Senator Brown asked if the term should start with the most recent promotion. Senator Fort suggested that the term be at least 5 years but suggested that someone could use a longer term. Senator Watson asked how the longer duration would contribute to interpretation of the vitae. It was pointed out that Senator Franzwa would be the best one to answer that question but that he was not available at the meeting. Senator Bobich noted that teaching was not given weight in the TCU Vitae so these points were added on to better demonstrate the quality of one's teaching experience. Senator King said the Vitae should show all the new courses and additional course preparation. It was asked if the Vitae should include information on a year by year basis. Senator King said the Vitae usually summarizes 5 years of activity. Senator Woodward noted that one is supposed to turn in vitae as annual event. Senator Hensley stated that the School of Business does this every year. Senator King said that these components may not be required everywhere. Senator Flahive asked why credit hour generation information was included. Senator King said this information allows one to determine who teaches large classes. Senator Young said that the information seemed redundant. Senator King said the document could be sent back to committee or there could be a friendly amendment to strike the number of credit hours and add a stipulation to address this information for of at least five years. Senator Fort suggested accepting a friendly amendment that would strike the number of credit hours and including a phrase noting that at least 5 years must be recorded with more years at the discretion of the faculty member. Provost Koehler asked what would happen if faculty don't want to include this information in a given department or school. Senator Brown noted that faculty have to submit teaching and research information. Specific and different forms are required for performance events. If these new points are official and approved, then he feels they will be used. Senator Woodward said he still thought this was duplicate information. Senator Brown said it was not duplication, as this was different. Senator Fort noted that the Faculty Senate is advisory so we will have to see how this is accepted by the administration. Senator Kompare asked if it was possible to indicate the UCR code where applicable, but Senator King noted that the Core is in flux so that would not be a requirement at this time. Senator Watson asked if colleges feel this is duplicating effort and wondered if this data would improve teaching. Senator Nichols said he was sympathetic and favoured no limit being listed. He noted that faculty can also have long lists in their vitae. Senator Becker asked Provost Koehler if he saw anything in the motion that would materially improve the Vitae. The Provost said that more information is better than less. Senator Fort said that this information is important and that he is in favour of it. Senator Flahive called the question. The Faculty Senate voted on the amended motion and it was unanimously approved</p> |
| 2/02 | <p>Senator King moved to revive the tabled motion on the proposed Health and Safety Committee and the motion passed. Senator Rinewalt reminded us that the motion from the last meeting was to approve this new Health and Safety Committee. The COC contacted 7 faculty who would serve on the committee so the COC feels there is support for the committee and urges approval. There was no further discussion. The motion to appoint the committee passed with 3 opposing votes.</p> |
| 2/02 | <p>Senator Brown made a motion to hold a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on Thursday (2/14/2002) The motion passed.</p> |
| 3/02 | <p>Senator King discussed the issue of calendar versus academic days. He strongly suggested that we should use academic days, which are practically better when it comes to holiday periods. Senator King made a motion that we reinsert academic days in the TP&G grievance document. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 3/02 | <p>The Overlay Committee</p> <p>A document was passed around, reflecting the changes made in the Overlay Committee document from April and providing information on the number of students in each college. It was suggested that the number of faculty on the Overlay Committee be a function of the number of students enrolled in a college.</p> <p>Senator Fort said that degree faculty participation (at the college level) in the Core should be taken into consideration when considering Committee composition. Senator Franzwa also supported this notion.</p> <p>Senator Kompore suggested an amendment, where we reduce 3 to 2 for each large college and then add 1 ethicist back to committee. Senator Frable supports Senator Kompore. The general question of how an ethicist would be selected appeared and it was suggested that this person could be elected from the senate.</p> <p>Senators were requested to submit nominations for Committee members. We agreed that Colleges could submit names in a manner that was up to the individual colleges, though it was suggested that senators from a college could submit nominees.</p> <p>The motion to accept the Overlay Committee proposal was passed with 2 nay votes.</p> |
| 4/02 | <p>Report of the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee</p> <p>Senator Kolesar presented a brief report on the modified document, that now includes the 'modern' feature of mediation and noted that the TP&G Committee considered the document to be very positive and useful. One person, not on faculty senate (with experience in grievance matters), felt that a mediation time of 20 days was insufficient and Senator Kolesar suggested 30 days. Senator Fort noted that the person Senator Kolesar mentioned was from the Religion Department and had also suggested 30 days. Senator Brown noted that the document did not specify if calendar or working days were meant. Senator Kolesar said the Committee meant calendar days, so Senator Brown agreed that 30 days seemed appropriate.</p> <p>When asked, the Chancellor noted that he would like the document to permit 2 calendar weeks for the final decision by the Chancellor.</p> <p>Because of questions on the meaning of 'days', the Senate agreed that the final document should clearly state that calendar days are meant.</p> <p>Senator Kolesar noted that the procedure set forth in the document is designed to allow problems to be solved at the lowest levels before having to submit them to the highest administration.</p> <p>Senator Brown moved to accept the document with suggested changes. Senator Fairchild seconded the motion. With no opposition the motion carried.</p> |
| 9/02 | <p>The Chair presented the problem of having to elect a new Chair-Elect [because of the departure of Chair George Brown, over the summer]. She noted that Senator Lahutsky volunteered to run for the position of Chair-elect and that since there was only a single candidate that we could move to elect by acclamation.</p> <p>Senator Fortenberry moved (seconded by Senator Cagle) to elect Senator Lahutsky as the new Chair-Elect by acclamation. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 10/02 | <p>Chair Watson briefly discussed the problem of recruiting new senators. The Faculty Senate Handbook says any vacancies are to be filled by the Election Committee and FSEC is the Election Committee. Therefore, the FSEC introduced three 3 new senator candidates. Senator Fort introduced the new senators: Bill Ryan, Tom Guderjan and Carol Thompson. He noted that there are still two openings in Science and Engineering, three in Fine Arts, one in Education and one in business. Senators from these areas were encouraged to talk to potential candidates.</p> <p>Senator Lahutsky moved that we thank the new senators. The motion was seconded by Senator Fortenbury. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 12/02 | <p>The Chair greeted guests and read the names of faculty serving on the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC).</p> <p>Senator Cagle moved that approval of the November, 2002 minutes be deferred to the February, 2003 meeting. The motion was approved.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 12/02 | <p>Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) Presentation</p> <p>A polished draft of the new CCC proposal was distributed to Senate members. Ex-Senator Nowell Donovan, member of the CCC, noted that committee tried to first think of the needs of students and did their best to leave 'turf issues' out of considerations. The CCC tried to be as objective as possible and thus some compromises are present. He reminded the Senate that the document that was distributed was a working document, a draft, of a minimalist core design. They felt it important to make a lean core that would be distributed to the colleges and that it would be up to the colleges to provide tweaking appropriate for that college. He then provided a distilled view of the overlay model and the content area and noted that the design was driven by outcomes. He noted a number of things that still must be done:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There must be input from stakeholders. 2. The model must be carefully refined. 3. The vetting process must be carefully clarified. 4. We must assemble a catalog of those current courses that would meet the expectations for new core classes. 5. The matter of instructor credit assignment must be discussed for those cases where there are team-taught interdepartmental courses. Imaginative and careful consideration is required here. <p>The CCC notes that student advising is of critical concern here. They feel TCU needs to take a clear and detailed look at advising and devise an efficient, human-based advising system. He noted that the SGA and student body are very interested in the new core and want to help.</p> <p>The Executive Committee presented the Faculty Senate a draft motion concerning acceptance of the core model and commitment to continued development. After a vigorous clarifying discussion, the motion was finalized.</p> <p>The Faculty Senate endorses the basic overlay model for a TCU undergraduate core curriculum as developed by the Core Curriculum Committee and requests that the Committee offer, by April 1, 2003, a final version, including the completion of outcome descriptions, and steps toward implementation. We understand that this model may still undergo changes as discussions continue during the spring of 2003 and as the individual colleges are consulted more extensively. The final version is subject to the approval of the Senate and then of all faculty.</p> <p>Senator Sacken moved that we accept the motion and it was seconded by Senator Gene Smith. After discussion Senator Flahive called the question. The motion passed with 25 votes.</p> |
| 2/03 | <p>Senator Spence-Cagle noted that there are then two motions before the Senate. The first motion is to accept the Tenure and Promotion Grievance Policy as attached to February agenda, and the second is to have the TP&G Committee work with Staff and HR to modify the current conflict resolution policy to include grievances among and between faculty and staff.</p> <p>Senator Shelton seconded both motions.</p> <p>Both motions passed unanimously (the modified conflict resolution policy should be ready to present by end of term).</p> |
| 2/03 | <p>Motion Passed by the TCU Faculty Senate, 6 February 2003</p> <p>WHEREAS the core business of the University must continue even in a time of shrinking endowments and rising expenses; and</p> <p>WHEREAS the core business of the University—that without which the institution would not exist—is the instruction of students and the contribution to knowledge through basic research; and</p> <p>WHEREAS current faculty on tenure track will be expected to maintain their research programs as they proceed through their probationary periods; and</p> <p>WHEREAS the budget approved at the January 2003 Board of Trustees meeting reduces Research and Creative Activities by \$83,000 and the Instructional Development (and Education in a Global Society) funds by \$20,000, leaving only funds for new faculty grants and some amount for international experiences for faculty;</p> <p>THEREFORE, be it resolved that the TCU Faculty Senate expresses its grave concern over this matter and authorizes the Executive Committee of the Senate to enter into discussions with the Provost to reconsider, in a timely manner, this portion of the budget.</p> |
| 5/03 | <p>Faculty Governance Committee - Lee Woodward</p> <p>Senator Woodward briefly summarized the suggestions and; the report was distributed for the May meeting. A lively discussion followed and it became clear there was not sufficient time to complete senate debate.</p> <p>Senator Paul King moved to take all 6 recommendations to the FGC next year. Senator Fairchild seconded the motion and it passed with one vote against.</p> |
| 9/03 | <p>Spring 2003 report of Faculty Governance Committee</p> <p>The Spring 2003 report of the Faculty Governance Committee was distributed, via e- mail. Chair Lahutsky explained that the FGC had presented this report at the May meeting. At that time it was tabled because of time limitations during the meeting. The Executive Committee moved that this report be sent to the current Faculty Governance committee. The committee will be charged to continue the work of the report.</p> <p>The motion was passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 9/03 | <p>The Core HMV&V outcomes, distributed at the beginning of this meeting, are the result of this work. In addition to the development of these outcomes statements, a “Road Map” for the steps in implementing the new Core was developed and the decision was made to propose the establishment of the Core Implementation Committee (CIC).</p> <p>The Executive Committee put forth the motion that Ed McNertney be named chair of this committee. The motion was approved unanimously.</p> |
| 9/03 | <p>Senator McNertney reported on the next steps to be taken. He recapped the various committees and work that was done in previous years to develop a new Core Curriculum, thanking all members of the preceding committees for their hard work. He acknowledged the extra efforts and service of Senator Nowell Donovan in coordinating the work of the committee.</p> <p>Senator McNertney presented for discussion the charges and the structure of the new Curriculum Implementation Committee. The Executive Committee moved that the Senate approve the charges to the CIC. Discussion concerning the charges to the CIC followed.</p> <p>Senator Fort suggested that the Academic Excellence Committee would be interested in the item dealing with the marketing of the new core. Senator McNertney agreed to add this suggestion to proposed document.</p> <p>Senator Rittby asked how often the committee would report back to the Senate.</p> <p>Senator McNertney explained that the first two items would be brought back to Senate for approval before being presented to the faculty as a whole. He estimated that the committee would be able to bring something back to the Senate by November. Discussion continued concerning the time-consuming work that the committee would entail. Senator Hill asked whether the CIC would eventually be the vetting committee for the HMV&V courses, and Senator McNertney explained that the HMV & V vetting committee would eventually assume the functions of the current UCAC. In response to Senator Todd’s question regarding size and make-up of the vetting committee, Chair Lahutsky confirmed that the charge to the committee is to decide on the structure and make-up of the subsequent vetting committee.</p> <p>Senator Ferrandino explained that, by virtue of its work with the Deans in developing their specific course requirements, the committee would gain experience that will help them handle the vetting of courses.</p> <p>The “Road Map” outlining the timetable for developing the Core, calls for the first report of the CIC to be in November; the Senate agreed that informal update reports can be made at other Senate meetings during the year.</p> <p>The motion was made to approve the charges to the new CIC, with one change. The charges will include the suggestion that the CIC work with Academic Excellence Committee to monitor the marketing of the new core.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 9/03 | <p>Due to problems that occurred during the summer semester this year concerning course enrollment requirements, Senator McNertney asked the Senate to consider university policy about summer courses. He moved that the Executive Committee examine the policies concerning pay, enrollment, and oversight of summer course offerings.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 10/03 | <p>Religious Traditions</p> <p>Discussion then ensued concerning the action steps for this category.</p> <p>Senator Jeff Todd raised a question concerning the stated outcome and whether the outcome could be met with the study of only one disciplinary approach. Professor Schmidt explained that the meaning of the word “discipline” was meant to mean “discipline” in the classic, general sense. The action steps were meant to address the ways, but the outcome was worded in order to indicate that this is not just a religion category. Courses from other “disciplines” can be included in this outcome.</p> <p>Senator Arnie Barkman asked whether or not the question of measuring the action steps had been considered; has the committee considered how they will be assessed. Professor Schmidt and Senator McNertney confirmed that this is under discussion; Professor Schmidt explained that there are conversations going on about this matter in the religion department. The committee has talked about this a lot, the steps are not created without having this in mind. Senator Blaise Ferrandino remarked that this question has been discussed a lot in the committee meetings and that Melissa Canady has helped formulate action steps making suggestions with this in mind.</p> <p>Senator David Bedford asked about the second outcome, questioning the wording of “through the study of” and how students would demonstrate that. Melissa Canady explained that the measurable part is “the student will demonstrate knowledge of,” while “through the study of” is a clarification of how this would happen. Students would have to demonstrate their knowledge through some work product such as an essay or an examination, etc. Further discussion took place concerning the wording of the outcome statement. Professor Schmidt reminded senators that they are not asked to re-write the outcomes statements, but to scrutinize the actions steps that will lead to the outcomes. He stated that the committee responsible may need to explain the meaning of the outcomes, but that they were already approved last year by the faculty assembly. It is true that the committee was given the latitude to “wordsmith” the outcomes.</p> <p>Regarding the action steps, Senator George Gilbert questioned the need for the parenthetical statement in the second action step (for the first outcome) that states: “through such media as specified by instructor.”</p> <p>Senator Donelle Barnes questioned the use of the expression “various dimensions of religion” noting that she wouldn’t want to imply that there is only one religion. Professor Schmidt explained that these terms are meant to express the general concept of religion, not a specific religion. They are meant to be taken in a global, theoretical meaning. This question will show up frequently; using the singular form reflects the overall conceptual meaning.</p> <p>Senator Ferrandino further explained that, if one reads the action in the context of the outcome, it is clear that making everything plural is unnecessary. The decision was made among the committee members to use the singular in these terms, expressing their abstract, general sense.</p> <p>It was agreed that the phrase “through such media as specified by the instructor” would be deleted.</p> <p>Senator Andy Fort then asked about who will be interpreting or judging these action steps. Chair Lahutsky answered that it will be the oversight committee. Senator Fort inquired about the make up of the committee. Chair Lahutsky explained that the committee has been working on a draft of the charter for the HMVV oversight committee, which would determine such things, but they are not at the stage to present it. Senator Fort further pointed out that we have been working hard to establish trust and he would like to be sure that people who are most experienced in understanding the various disciplines and things such as how many action steps or outcomes must be satisfied should be on that committee.</p> <p>Senator Jeff Todd again addressed the question of how many action steps would be required. Discussion continued on how courses would satisfy the action steps and that all action steps may not be required of a course in order for it to qualify for the category. Senator Ferrandino restated that this issue is addressed in the document handed out at beginning of the Senate meeting.</p> <p>Senator Jack Jones posed a question concerning the audience intended for the outcomes and action steps. He asked whether faculty not hearing these discussions will be able to understand them. Chair Lahutsky explained that the oversight committee will be the primary interpreter, but that the audience will be faculty and the committee will be holding sessions that will address this issue. Chair Lahutsky called for the Senate to vote on accepting the Religious Traditions action steps with the deletion of “through such media as specified by the instructor.”</p> <p>The proposal was accepted as amended.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 10/03 | <p>Historical Traditions Senator McNertney next presented the Historical Traditions action steps. He pointed out that this one has only one outcome with three action steps. The history faculty felt this was the best approach. Senator Barnes questioned the need for the sentence in the third action step “such media as specified by the instructor.” Professor Claire Sanders explained that it was meant to leave the choice of media up to the instructor; they wanted to avoid the appearance that they are telling the instructor how to achieve the outcome. The statement “through such media as specified by the instructor” will be stricken. Senator Fort remarked that some people would appreciate the inclusion of the statement that the media used is up to the instructor since many faculty use a variety of media and not just books. This might be mentioned in a paragraph somewhere outside the action steps and could be stated as a general principle in all the categories. Professor Sanders confirmed that all three action steps must be done to achieve the outcome. Discussion ensued on the development of the three action steps for one outcome. Senator McNertney explained that it is the preference of those who wrote this that all three of the action steps be a part of the document. More discussion followed concerning how faculty will know what is meant by the action steps and whether or not all of them are required for various outcomes. Senator Ferrandino explained that the committee does not intend that these be the only means, but they represent the best thinking on how to get to the outcome. Other approaches to achieving the outcome can be considered. The motion to approve the Historical Traditions proposal, with the removal of the statement “through such media as specified by the instructor” in the third action step, passed unanimously.</p> |
| 10/03 | <p>Literary Traditions Senator McNertney next presented the action steps for Literary Traditions. Senator Gilbert questioned the need for the expression “appropriate to course focus” in several of these action steps. Senator Ferrandino explained that the committee wanted to make it clear that the focus of the course may vary, not all are necessary, but the focus may be British literature, drama, poetry, fiction, or other, that is the reason for the statement being added. Senator Todd asked for clarification about how many outcomes would have to be satisfied. Senator Ferrandino explained that one outcome is necessary. Senator Todd remarked that most literary courses would satisfy the second outcome. Discussion ensued on the idea of the influence of literature on society. Senator Bedford asked for an explanation of how the two outcomes are different. Senator Ferrandino explained that one refers to the impact on society, while the other is the reflection of society. The issue of impact is a more broad-based issue; “construct” refers to a specific trend, or literature, that is designed for a specific purpose. Professor Schmidt confirmed that the goal is to provide enough range to be open to a wide variety of courses. Discussion followed about the difference between “impact” and “construct.” It was suggested that the first action step for the first outcome be revised to read: “Students will read and analyze fiction, drama, poetry, etc, appropriate to course focus and examine the role of this material in influencing society.” Senator Carol Thompson expressed concern that the outcomes appear to be concerned with social and historical subjects and does not address the idea of genre in literature or the appreciation of literature. Senator Peggy Watson mentioned that many courses are taught in other ways, but that these are appropriate for a core requirement. Concern was expressed about the impression that the outcomes do not seem to address questions of literary genre and literary themes, etc. Senator Ferrandino explained that the committee members and department consultants felt that the issues of genre would automatically be present in a course of literature. Discussion of importance of genre followed. Senator Todd expressed concern that the outcome statements do not address any technical aspects of literature. Senator Fort moved that the Literary Traditions action steps and outcomes be returned to the CIC so that the committee could consider the questions raised. The motion passed.</p> |
| 10/03 | <p>Cultural Awareness Senator McNertney presented the action steps for Cultural Awareness, explaining that two people who are at this meeting, Melissa Canady and Senator Thompson worked on this. There were no questions, Chair Lahutsky pointed out that it is very clear that one or more actions steps are required, not all of them. The question was called to accept the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 10/03 | <p>Global Awareness Senator McNertney then presented the action steps for Global Awareness. It was noted that the word “geographic” was omitted in the form that was sent out to senators last week. It was agreed that the word “geographic” be added after the word “economic” in the first action step for the second outcome. Senator Todd asked about the first outcome. He asked if there is a place for the immersion of the student in another culture. Senator Bedford questioned whether the meaning of global awareness is just how to sell a product to another culture. Discussion ensued concerning the meaning of the outcome. Senator Ferrandino referred the senators to the competency statement for this category. In reference to the first action step for the second outcome, Melissa Canady explained that all approaches and/or disciplines cannot be listed. Discussion centered on how to re-phrase this action step in order to avoid leaving out a particular approach. It was decided to re-word as follows: “Students will learn to employ discipline-specific skill sets in their analyses of global issues.” The motion to accept “Global Awareness” action steps, with this change, was passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 10/03 | <p>Citizenship and Social values Senator McNertney introduced this category. Senator Bedford stated that he likes the word “responsibilities” and the idea of individual responsibilities in the second action step of the first outcome. With the addition of a comma in the competency statement and in third outcome statement after the word “professional,” the motion to accept the Citizenship and Social values proposal passed.</p> |
| 10/03 | <p>Faculty Governance Committee motion Senator Carolyn Cagle, Chair of the FGC, brought two motions from the Faculty Governance Committee for approval by the Senate. First motion: The Faculty Governance Committee moves that the Faculty Senate delegate responsibilities of a new office of historian to the Past-Chair of the Faculty Senate. These responsibilities would include advising the current Chair on the historical foundation of current Senate initiatives; serving as a resource at Senate meetings; and consulting with previous Senate Chairs and officers to resolve questions regarding past Senate actions that cannot be fully explicated from examination of prior relevant meeting minutes. In the discussion that followed Chair Lahutsky explained the need for this office. Senator Andy Fort suggested that a list of all past chairs be readily available, perhaps on the Senate Web page. The motion passed unanimously. Second motion: The Faculty Governance Committee moves that the Faculty Senate normally delegate to the Committee on Committees Chair the responsibility of Parliamentarian during Senate meetings. This would allow a person in a specific but rotating Senate position outside the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to render parliamentary decisions during meetings. During discussion Senator Fort pointed out that this places an additional burden on the position of Chair of the COC. That person would have to be aware and willing to take on this role as well as that of Chair of the COC. Although it is possible that an individual would not want to do both, the aim is to lodge the office somewhere. The position will become effective this year. Dick Rinewalt has already agreed to accept the role of Parliamentarian. The motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 12/03 | <p>Report from the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee Senator Jack Hill, Chair of the committee, introduced the proposal being brought by the TPG committee and previously distributed to Senators. Continuing work that was done last year, the TPG committee has amended the existing Conflict Resolution policy to include faculty, per its charge for this year. He thanked Senator Mike Sacken and last year’s committee for their work on this issue. The TPG Committee now brings an amended policy to the Senate for its approval and adoption. Senator Hill explained the need for the amended policy. The Conflict Resolution policy does not supersede the grievance policy for tenure and promotion in the TCU Faculty/Staff Handbook, which is not effective for disputes between individuals that are not related to tenure and promotion. The existing Conflict Resolution policy was developed primarily to resolve work-related problems and disputes among staff and was not written to apply to faculty. The proposed changes would ensure that the policy used by Human Resources would be inclusive of faculty. A large number of disputes have been successfully mediated with this policy. Shari Barnes from the Human Resources Department explained that it has been a highly effective policy. Senator Hill pointed out that only four disputes reached the level of peer review, proving that the Conflict Resolution policy provides a way to address various problems and disputes before they become larger. The Chair then called for discussion and questions. Senator Fort confirmed that the more one hears about this procedure, the more favorable and sympathetic toward it one becomes. Shari Barnes pointed out that, even though the policy provides for an ultimate appeal to the Chancellor, one has never been brought that far. Senator Gilbert expressed concern about the rapidity of the schedule of deadlines in the policy, especially during the summer. Shari Barnes explained that the procedure can be flexible but, in mediation situations, it is better to resolve the problem as soon as possible. Chair Lahutsky called for the vote and the motion to approve the proposed Faculty Conflict Resolution Policy passed. The Senate Executive Committee will take the policy to the Chancellor for approval. Professor Greg Stephens, Chair of the Mediators Committee, announced that there is a need for more mediators. He encouraged Senators and faculty to consider becoming mediators.</p> |
| 12/03 | <p>The Chair next entertained a motion from Senator Gilbert. He requested that a letter he drafted be sent to Athletic Director Eric Hyman, football Coach Gary Patterson, Provost Koehler, and Chancellor Boschini, with the Senate’s endorsement. The letter commends TCU’s decision to give priority to students’ academic work during final exam week by refusing to accept the invitation to the GMAC Bowl game. The complete text of the letter is found in the addendum to these minutes. The Senate moved to pass the motion.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 3/04 | <p>Proposals from the Faculty Governance Committee</p> <p>Discussion turned to several changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution that the Faculty Governance Committee brought to the floor. Senator Carolyn Cagle presented these changes, distributed to Senators prior to the meeting, on behalf of the committee. The first proposal was to establish the Budget Advisory Committee as a new university committee. Senator Cagle explained that several members of the Senate had worked with Vice-Chancellor Carol Campbell on the structure of this committee as well as on its charge. The proposed change makes the committee larger than what it has been in the past. It also makes the committee a part of the TCU long-term budget planning. Aiming for a balance of representation, the authors of this proposal included students, staff, and faculty as members. The committee will report to both the Faculty Senate and the Staff Assembly. Since it will be a university committee, the Committee on Committees would determine the members. David Grebel stated that the executive committee of the Staff Assembly approved this proposal and it was generally well received by the members of the Staff Assembly.</p> <p>Concern was expressed about having a student member on the committee. Senator Cagle said that Vice-Chancellor Campbell feels strongly about having student representation. Discussion ensued concerning confidentiality and student membership. Senator Cagle explained that Vice-Chancellor Campbell would like to have the flexibility of choosing the student, instead of the student being selected by the Committee on Committees. She was more concerned with having flexibility than she was about assuring confidentiality on the part of a student member. David Grebel said that the question of student membership had been discussed at the Staff Assembly meeting. He felt that it is appropriate to let Vice-Chancellor Campbell have the possibility of choosing the student. Chair Lahutsky pointed out that this new committee would replace the current Senate Budget Committee. When Vice-Chancellor Campbell created the Budget Advisory Committee, the Chair-elect of the Senate was placed on the new committee, and the Senate Budget and Finance Committee ceased to operate. Discussion took place on the history of the Senate Budget Committee. Senator John Lovett asked about the size and distribution of the members of the committee. He expressed concern about increasing the number of committees in the Senate. Senator Ferrandino pointed out that this does not represent an increase in committee member needs because the Senate has already been providing members to the former committee. This change is a very important one especially in that it compels the Vice Chancellor of Finance to report to the faculty.</p> <p>Chair Lahutsky called for the vote to create this new university committee. The motion was approved.</p> |
| 4/04 | <p>Senator McNertney reminded Senators that, at the last Senate meeting, these outcomes and action steps were returned to the Core Implementation Committee for further refinement. He explained that, since then, a great number of individuals were consulted. The resulting revised document is now being brought to the Senate for approval.</p> <p>Professor Melissa Canady explained how the document had been re-worked. The committee addressed the two issues that were of concern: first was the perceived need to better express the bi-directionality between human experience and social processes; second was the implication that students will be able to use social science methodology. Senators felt that the outcomes implied too high an expectation of students' ability to use this methodology.</p> <p>Professor Canady explained that the committee decided to define what is meant by "methodology in social sciences" and to place this definition outside the outcome statement in a footnote. In the version circulated to Senators, this footnote appears at the bottom of the page. Senator Ferrandino explained that the footnote would be inserted inside the "Outcome" box. Discussion ensued on where to put the footnote on methodology. It was decided that it is better left as a footnote. Further discussion occurred on students' ability to use social science methodology. Professor Canady and Senator Garnett further explained the reasoning behind the proposed expectations. Senator Andy Fort moved that the Senate accept this document as presented. Dean Mary Volcansek explained the difference between this proposed document and what had been approved by AddRan College, mentioning that this was an improvement.</p> <p>A motion to approve the Social Sciences outcomes and action steps passed.</p> |
| 4/04 | <p>Provost Koehler indicated a willingness to provide more training if chairs will take advantage of it. He will send chairs to the annual ACE training for new chairs. Chair Pfaffenberger suggested that we ought to do this training on campus. Senator Fort expressed a concern that we take seriously the budgetary implications of these recommendations and moved that the Senate ask the administration to entertain considerations of these recommendations. Senator Fort's motion passed.</p> |
| 4/04 | <p>The Executive Committee brought the following motion to the floor: That (1) the Staff Assembly Committee on Committees elect for a five-year term the co-chair of the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee with the current faculty Co-Chair; and (2) the Chair of the Staff Assembly Policy Review Committee also be added as a member of the RIB Committee. Chair Pfaffenberger indicated that this was recommended by the Staff Assembly as a modification of a motion we passed on 7 October. Senator Jenkins moved approval of the motion and it was adopted.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 9/04 | <p>Motion to amend the outcomes and action steps of Written Communication II.</p> <p>The TCU Faculty Senate accepts the amendment to the outcomes and action steps portion of the Written Communication II competency as specified on the attached document.</p> <p>Chair Ferrandino opened the discussion by reiterating that this proposed change would be announced to the faculty but that in approving this change, we will be acting on behalf of the Faculty Assembly. He clarified the proposed wording regarding computer competency, pointing out that we are only voting on the fourth learning outcome indicated in italics.</p> <p>Senator King expressed concern that SACS would be dictating what technical skills should be learned. Chair Ferrandino agreed that we would not want to allow that, but he felt certain that these outcomes were already the intention of this portion of the Core, before SACS came into it. Senator King expressed reservations about identifying the skills since certain computer competencies that are essential today will be soon outdated. Professor Melhart pointed out that we do need to satisfy SACS, since they accredit us. In any case, they do allow us to say what the basic computer skills are. Professor Carrie Leverenz mentioned that she and other English department faculty agreed to add this outcome because their courses are already doing it. All the written communication 2 courses meet the proposed outcomes. Further discussion ensued on the need to state explicitly what we are already doing and not allowing SACS to determine our curriculum outcomes. Senator George Gilbert proposed striking the word “standard” in the third action step so that it reads as follows: “Students will use word processing software to produce and format texts.” The motion, with this change, passed unanimously.</p> |
| 9/04 | <p>Motion from the Senate Executive Committee regarding eligibility for honorary degrees</p> <p>Chair Ferrandino presented the following motion from the Executive Committee: “Individuals in the full-time employ of TCU shall not, normally, be considered candidates for honorary degrees.”</p> <p>He explained the background for this motion. Over the past several years there’s been a growing sense of unease within the Senate about our lack of a clear policy in this area. At the Senate’s request, he researched the honorary degree policies of several institutions (Baylor, Houston, Vanderbilt, SMU, Texas Tech) and found, as one might expect, that these institutions rarely award honorary degrees to their own full-time employees. He also spoke to Chancellor Boschini on this matter. The Chancellor’s advice was to reflect on our own needs and traditions and to try to craft a policy that’s “right for us.”</p> <p>Discussion followed on the need for this specific provision, and on the proposed language of the provision.</p> <p>Based on everyone’s comments and suggestions, Chair Ferrandino proposed a restated version of the original motion: “Full-time or part-time employees of TCU will not normally be considered candidates for honorary degrees.”</p> <p>Further discussion followed.</p> <p>A few senators voiced concern that the word “normally” would make this a meaningless policy. In this vein, Senator Young noted that it would be unlikely to deter nominations since nominators will probably be inclined to think that their candidate merits an exception to the rule. Others suggested that such a statement of “normal” practice would nonetheless be valuable. It would give Senators a clearly defined “norm” to guide their deliberations over honorary degree nominations in cases where nominees are in the employ of the University, while also providing flexibility to deal with exceptional cases such as the recent nominations of Jim Wright and Bob Bolen.</p> <p>The amended motion (as stated above) passed unanimously.</p> |
| 1/05 | <p>Core Emendation Policy approval</p> <p>Chair Ferrandino brought a motion from the Executive Committee to approve the Emendation and Course Information Policy for the University Core Curriculum, which had been distributed to Senators. He noted that a few minor changes had been made to the draft presented in December, such as the title and some rearrangement of the material. There being no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.</p> |
| 3/05 | <p>Motion to endorse the COIA report. Chair Ferrandino gave the floor to Senator Linda Moore to discuss the outline of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics recommendations, which had been sent to all Senators. She noted that this is only an outline and that the entire document is considerably longer. Senator Moore mentioned that the full document is available (on the Senate Web page) to anyone interested. She pointed out that many of the issues presented by the COIA have already been addressed by TCU and that we look good compared to other universities on many of these issues. She then reviewed the various categories of the recommendations: admissions processes, scholarships, curricular integrity, scheduling of competitions, and advising. In the category of scholarships, she noted that the Coalition agreed to recommend a five-year commitment on scholarships, which most schools already do since athletes have five years of eligibility. The Coalition further recommended that only an academic person other than a coach could revoke a scholarship. Senator Moore noted that the Coalition had a considerable discussion about need-based scholarships, which is still up for further discussion. On the subject of curricular integrity, the Coalition is concerned about athletes getting both negative and positive academic treatment.</p> <p>Senator Moore highlighted the following other issues: allowing coaches to teach credit courses, giving credit for physical education courses, and dealing with the problem of the amount of time students spend on athletic events and miss class. Senator Moore stated that the recommendation to form a Faculty Athletics Representative-led task force has been withdrawn. As for the category of academic advising, Senator Moore emphasized that the Coalition’s recommendations are considered best practices and we are not obligated to do them. Senator Moore responded to various questions from Senators, and a discussion on advising of student athletes ensued. She described the advising procedure for athletes at TCU. Finally, Senator Arnie Barkman brought to the Senate’s attention a recent newspaper article on the academic performance and graduation rates of athletes in various universities, pointing out that TCU placed 6th out of 14 in graduation rate rankings of universities in Conference USA.</p> <p>Chair Ferrandino made the motion to endorse the COIA report. The motion passed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 3/05 | Motion from Committee on Committees: Chair Ferrandino read the first motion: Change the name of the “Safeguard in Human Research Committee” to “Institutional Review Board for Human Research.” This motion passed unanimously. |
| 3/05 | <p>Chair Ferrandino next presented the committee’s second motion to change the name and charge of the Instructional Development Committee. Catherine Wehlburg explained why she and the COC thought this was an improvement to the existing charge. Currently, there are three separate bodies with no connections; this change would create a single body. In response to a question, she said that this does not mean that grants for Instructional Development will be under the jurisdiction of the Center for Teaching Excellence. A question arose concerning whether there were any instructional strategies other than “technology” that would be considered by this committee. Ms. Wehlburg confirmed that the Instructional Development Committee is not limited to technology. Discussion clarified the meaning of the title “Teaching, Learning, and Instructional Technology.” The word “technology” at the end of the title does not apply to all the preceding elements. The committee will be concerned with instructional technology and teaching and learning, as separate elements.</p> <p>Discussion next centered on what would be included in the report to the Faculty Senate mentioned at the end of the charge. The COC added this in order to give the Instructional Development Committee some accountability and to assure that the Senate would get some information on the Committee’s actions. Finally, Ms. Wehlburg stated that the budget line items of the various units would stay where they are; this is an attempt to bring all these entities together.</p> <p>The motion was approved unanimously.</p> |
| 4/05 | <p>Motion to endorse the continuation of the Core Implementation Committee and its charge. Chair Ferrandino presented the motion (previously distributed to all Senators) to endorse the continuation of the CIC and called for discussion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>The second motion to approve the six charges was placed on the floor for discussion. Chair Ferrandino reviewed each charge. He explained that the final one looks to the future and deals with how to set up the assessment procedures. He explained that the assessment cycle begins in 2007.</p> <p>Senator Lahutsky asked whether the third charge would include questions about transfer students. Senator McNertney answered affirmatively; he explained that the Admissions office defines whether or not a student is a transfer student (this is not always clear, notably in the case of incoming freshmen who have a large number of advance placement credits). The Admissions office and the Registrar will resolve such issues. The motion to approve the charges passed unanimously.</p> |
| 4/05 | <p>Motions from the Faculty Governance Committee</p> <p>Chair Ferrandino gave the floor to Senator Cagle to discuss the motions of the Faculty Governance Committee concerning changes in the Senate By-laws (previously distributed). She began by thanking the committee members for their work. She explained that the committee plans to bring the motions concerning the size of the Senate (discussed at the last Senate meeting) to the next meeting. She then invoked the committee’s charge to edit the Senate By-laws in order to bring them up to date concerning various committees and the resulting re-ordering of the By-laws. Senator Lahutsky took the floor to explain the format of the proposed changes. She reviewed the parts that are new and those that are the same, but numbered differently.</p> <p>After discussion took place on the items in Section 5 of the By-laws, the following corrected versions were approved (corrections in bold):</p> <p>Item D: The Executive Committee shall serve as a screening committee in forwarding names of nominees for honorary degrees to the full Senate prior to their going to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees (see Constitution Art. II, § 1.C).</p> <p>Item G: The Executive Committee and the Senate Chair shall annually communicate in writing, to the Department Chairs and Deans of all Senators, their gratitude for the time and commitment of each Senator and in recognition of the support provided by those administrative levels without which the Senate could not conduct its work.</p> <p>Chair Ferrandino asked the Senate for permission to vote on Section 5 only. The changes were approved unanimously. Chair Ferrandino’s motion to place Section 6 on the floor passed unanimously</p> <p>After considerable discussion on the wording in this Section, the following changes were proposed (changes in bold):</p> <p>Item A: The Academic Excellence Committee shall monitor and review the academic policies and practices of the University.</p> <p>Item B: The Committee on Committees shall nominate to the proper appointing parties faculty members to serve on University Committees as well as on ad hoc committees, task forces, etc., established by the Senate, Student House, or Administration.</p> <p>Item D: The Student Relations Committee shall represent the Senate in matters relating to student concerns.”</p> <p>Item E: Discussion of this item concerned the power of the TPG Committee to monitor the effectiveness of university tenure, promotion and grievance policies. Senator Lahutsky pointed out that the TPG task force would be working on these issues, which may result in major changes. Further discussion resulted in the following revision:</p> <p>Item E: The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee shall monitor the effectiveness of University policies on tenure, promotion, and grievance found in the Handbook for Faculty and Staff.</p> <p>The changes in Section 6 were approved.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 5/05 | <p>I. Motion to approve amended version of the Faculty Conflict Resolution Policy</p> <p>Chair Ferrandino gave the floor to Senator Stu Youngblood to discuss the revisions that had been made to the Faculty Conflict Resolution Policy. Senator Youngblood distributed a comparison sheet and explained the changes that had been made at the Provost Council, which he stated were mostly cosmetic. He explained that the goal of the approval process was to educate those involved. He then displayed a chart that he and Greg Stephens had worked on, which showed five years of data related to mediation contacts at TCU since 2001. This data related to conflicts that had been resolved under the current staff Conflict Resolution Policy. The graph revealed that, since the introduction of the staff Conflict Resolution Policy, resolution of most problems took place informally. In addition, the graph showed that with conflicts that were pursued to the level of mediation, fewer of them went to the level of peer review than had in the past. In the last five years, only two peer reviews have been done. The data shows that, with the new Conflict Resolution Policy, problems are now resolved early in the process.</p> <p>With a second chart of data showing number of litigation cases, Senator Youngblood showed that, prior to the existence of the staff Conflict Resolution Policy, there was no way to resolve problems and, therefore, there was a larger number of litigation cases. After the year 2000, cases were resolved through mediation. Since then we have been able to resolve most cases through mediation. One case is still pending this year. He further explained the benefits of mediation in regards to TCU's insurance policy. When we resolve disputes internally, our insurance policy doesn't count such conflicts against our cost for insurance. The faculty Conflict Resolution Policy should give TCU the ability to resolve conflicts before they become costly in terms of time and expense. Senator Youngblood reminded Senators that this policy resolves only disputes that are non-tenure and promotion issues and that it will be an Academic Affairs policy, not a Human Resources policy. He then answered Senators' questions about the definition of "days" in the document, explaining that they are defined as business days.</p> <p>Senator David Grant suggested a clarification in the paragraph entitled "Definitions." Discussion ensued concerning the statement that Step 4 of the policy applies only to non-tenure track faculty members. As a result of the discussion, the final sentence of the "Definitions" paragraph was revised to read: "Issues related to faculty tenure, promotion and/or reappointment are not considered for tenure-track faculty under this policy."</p> <p>The motion to approve the amended version of the faculty Conflict Resolution Policy passed unanimously. Chair Ferrandino stated that the policy would be brought to the Faculty Assembly in the fall, and then to the University Council to become finalized.</p> |
| 5/05 | <p>Motion concerning election of Senators, changes in By-laws</p> <p>Senator Cagle again took the floor to present the motions of the FGC proposing changes in the Senate By-laws related to the size of the Senate and the election of Senators. She reminded Senators of the previous discussions that took place at the April 7 Senate meeting regarding the size of the Senate. She explained that Motions 1 and 2 would be taken together first. She explained the choice of the word "normal" that is used in Section 2 A. This motion eliminates the idea of the previous standard of a 11 to 1 ratio. Senator Fort objected to eliminating the 11 to 1 ratio and questioned why the number 45 was considered to be the "normal" number and why the number of committee members needs to be set at a fixed number. Senator Don Nichols pointed out that the other proposed changes provide for proportional representation. The intent is for the entire university to be represented, the proposed system is flexible enough to allow for changes. Senator Grant pointed out some of the difficulties that would result if the number of Senators were fixed. Since the number of faculty in the university is not always even, there would almost always be a need to adjust the number of Senators. It was suggested that Section 2, part A 2 addresses this question.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the term "full-time faculty" be added to this paragraph. In answer to a question on the definition of the term "full-time faculty," Senator Nadia Lahutsky pointed out that the definition is found in the Senate Constitution. Senator Fort also objected to eliminating "at-large" members. There was extended discussion on proportional representation. Senator George Gilbert pointed out that, if ever the TCU faculty increased considerably, we could end up with an extremely large Senate.</p> <p>Motions 1 and 2 were withdrawn; motions 1 through 5 were then placed on the floor as a whole so that the Senate could consider the entire section and discuss all related paragraphs. Discussion ensued concerning part A 3, which allows the Election Committee to fill open positions. In such cases, Senator Fort asked what the term of office would be. If it were a three-year term this would effectively take away the representation of the unit whose position had not been filled during that time. At-large membership would solve the problem of losing a slot for three years. Discussion continued; Senator Gilbert maintained that a unit would lose its representation for only one year because the following year the proportion would be re-determined for the elections in the next year. Senator Paul King stated that at-large membership tends to favor larger units. Senators then discussed the question of whether or not Senators represent their units or whether they represent the university as a whole.</p> <p>Finally, it was the general sense of the Senate that these changes represented many implications that needed further reflection. Since people had concerns that couldn't be answered by simply sharing opinions, it was suggested that it would be better to analyze the impact of the proposed changes and to see data based on past experience. Senators would need time to reflect on the changes and their impact. Discussion then turned to the status of the motions on the floor. The committee could either withdraw the motions, ask the Senate to vote on the motions, or postpone the debate. Considerable debate resulted in a motion to postpone the discussion. The motion passed.</p> |
| 8/05 | <p>Senator David Grant took the floor to address the proceedings of the Academic Excellence Committee (AEC) and Senate regarding the +/- grading motion from the May 2005 Senate meeting. Senator Grant made a motion that a new version of the motion presented to the Senate at the May 2005 meeting be placed on the floor for Senate consideration. The motion to consider the substitute was seconded and carried.</p> <p>{See the long motion starting on page 2 through page 5 in the 08/2005 minutes}</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 12/05 | <p>Committee on Committees motion regarding the Animal Care and Use Committee (Sally Fortenberry) Senator Fortenberry introduced a motion, shown below, to change the size of the Animal Care and Use Committee. The rationales for this motion are included in this motion. The motion was passed by voice vote. Resolved, the size of the Animal Care and Use Committee shall be increased by 2 faculty members. Rationale: 1. To ensure the required quorum will always be met when meetings are called as dictated by the federal guidelines governing the Animal Care and Use Committee 2. To assure the chair of the committee and all other faculty members on the committee that workload will be manageable so that proposals are reviewed in a timely manner 3. To provide a committee that is composed of a majority of faculty members Passed by the TCU Faculty Senate, Dec. 1, 2005</p> |
| 2/06 | <p>Remarks on likely Faculty Governance Committee motion (Nadia Lahutsky) A proposed motion describing a motion to amend Section II.2 of the Faculty Senate By- Laws was distributed. Senator Lahutsky reported that, based on prior e-mail exchanges, it appears there is little support for a smaller Senate. A majority of those providing feedback were not in support of the at-large position. Therefore, the FGC's motion keeps the Senate at the same size, but does away with the at-large position. A procedure for filling seats coming open because of resignations, etc., is also in the motion. Suggested additional steps were also included in the motion. Senator Rittby asked why the draft used the term; "a recent election" instead of "the last election" in the section describing replacement of seats coming open. Nadia Lahutsky stated that there may not have been an open seat (i.e. election) for the unit in question during the last election. Senator Ferrandino stated that the need for at-large seats is appropriate for bodies in which there are many competing parties, some of which are too small to win in any one unit, but significant overall. The Senate is not such a body. The Senate moved to vote on the motion. The motion (below in Garamond font) passed. {See the long motion starting on page 3 through page 4 in the 02/2006 minutes}</p> |
| 2/06 | <p>Committee on Committees motion regarding ex-officio (Dick Rinewalt) Senator Rinewalt presented a motion to change the status certain non-faculty members from "ex officio" to "liaison". Senator Quarles asked whether this motion precludes future changes. Senator Rinewalt stated that it did not. Senator Jack Hill asked when this would take effect. Senator Rinewalt stated that it would take effect in the fall of 2006 with the new handbook. Senator Barkman stated that this current proposal describes how most committees operated in practice. The motion (below in Garamond font) passed by voice vote. {See the long motion starting on page 5 through page 6 in the 02/2006 minutes}</p> |
| 3/06 | <p>Motion from the Academic Excellence Committee to endorse and forward a request for plus/minus grading (David Grant) Senator Grant overviewed the proposed definitions and grading scheme. Included in the proposed grading scheme is wording defining a "C-" as a passing grade. This is designed to make the new system compatible with normal transfer policies. Senator Moore asked Senator Grant for information regarding the recent TCU Student House vote on plus/minus. Chair Andy Fort stated that the recent change in delegates in the student house, and the fact that Senator Grant was away on other business that day, played a key role. Senator Grant stated he spoke with Kim Appel, the advisor to the student House who was at the house session. In her opinion, the vote was based on the new House members wanting more information, rather than them being against plus/minus. Senator Rinewalt spoke against the motion. He stated that studies indicate individual GPA's are seldom changed by plus-minus. Therefore plus/minus will not appreciably affect the student's overall GPA and prospects for the future. Senator Grant stated that there are individual changes, although there is little change in the aggregate. Senator Bedford stated that he would be troubled if he assigned a student an "A-" and it cost that student a 4.0. Senator Barkman spoke in favor of plus-minus. Senator Joe Butler spoke in favor based on experience at other institutions. Senator Jack Jones spoke in favor of plus-minus based on experience with it in the MBA program. The Senate voted on the motion. The motion passed 16 votes to 5 with some abstentions. The motion is below and on the following three pages (pp 3 – 5). {See the long motion starting on page 3 through page 5 in the 03/2006 minutes}</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|--|
| 3/06 | <p>Motion to endorse the University Compensation Advisory Committee (Andy Fort) Because Senator Ferrandino was away, Chair Andy Fort introduced this motion. He gave a brief history of the University Compensation Advisory Committee (UCAC). Chancellor Boschini briefly took the floor. He stated that his motivation in forming the committee, at the instigation of both the Faculty Senate and Staff Assembly Executive Committees, was that all elements of compensation should be considered together, not in isolation. Senator Fortenberry stated that the members appointed to the RIB Committee were “rolled over” into the current UCAC members. Senator Nichols stated he supported the broader charge. The motion (shown below) passed by a show of hands. Motion to endorse the creation of the University Compensation Advisory Committee (UCAC) “The FSEC moves that the TCU Faculty Senate endorse the creation of a University Advisory Committee (UCAC) which would operate as follows: UCAC Charge, Structure, and Operation: Charge: This committee would review university compensation initiatives and provide guidance and advice to the administration in light of the university’s compensation philosophy. This review and guidance would include ongoing evaluation of market data for salaries, progress toward meeting comprehensive compensation plans, and current and future policies and procedures relating to retirement, insurance and other faculty/staff benefits. Structure and Operation: The committee will be composed of appropriate representation of faculty and staff and be co-chaired by a faculty and staff member. The UCAC will consist of 15 voting members (two of whom will function as co-chairs), 3 advisory liaisons from Human Resources: and 2 people providing administrative oversight. The voting members will be as follows: 6 members of the faculty, 6 members of the staff (each serving five year terms), the past chair of the Staff Assembly, the past chair of the Faculty Senate (each serving one year terms), and a TCU retiree (serving a three years term). One staff member and one faculty member will function together as co-chairs. The Chancellor will appoint chairs on an annual basis. The Chancellor will appoint committee members for designated terms. Members will include the most recent past chairs of the Staff Assembly and the Faculty Senate. The committee will require a quorum in order to vote on recommendations and advance passed recommendations to the university’s administration. For purposes of this committee, a quorum is defined as three faculty, three staff and two additional members. The advisory liaisons from Human Resources will be: The Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources; the Director of Compensation; and the Director of Employee relations. The Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration will provide administrative oversight.” 3/30/06 Passed 30 March, 2006</p> <p>Motion, “trailer” to above motion, to dissolve the Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits Committee (Andy Fort) Chair Andy Fort presented this motion in place of Senator Ferrandino. The Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits Committee is no longer needed because the UCAC supersedes its functions. Further, its membership is being “rolled over” into the UCAC. The motion (below) passed by a show of hands. Motion to decommission the Retirement, Insurance, and Benefit Committee (RIB) (This is a “trailer” motion to be put forward and considered only if the Senate approves the motion endorsing the creation of the UCAC). “The FSEC moves that the TCU Faculty Senate endorse a recommendation that the Retirement, Insurance, and benefit Committee be decommissioned if, and at such time that, the University Compensation Advisory Committee (UCAC) is fully approved and in operation.” Passed 30 March, 2006</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 5/08 | <p>Proposed Faculty Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Appeal Policy (FAP) – Senator McFarland, Chair of Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee)</p> <p>Senator McFarland and Chair Youngblood provided a brief history of the FAP and directed Senator’s to two handouts. They stated the latest draft is simplified and more succinct. Within the new draft, changes include the term “ombudsman” being replaced with “facilitator.” The word “review” was inserted replacing “substantive and procedural.” The term “Informal Facilitated Discussion” was also inserted. One of the main changes to the policy is that faculty can appeal on any basis, not just substantive and procedural issues. An amendment was proposed, seconded, and passed concerning inserting “reappointment” within the appropriate areas of the document. An example is the insertion of “reappointment” within the following sentence on Page 3, 1st paragraph, 2nd line. “This policy applies exclusively to faculty for whom a promotional track exists (e.g., tenure-track faculty, professors of professional practice, clinical professors) who wish to appeal promotion and/or tenure denial decisions.”</p> <p>The sentence will read, as amended, “This policy applies exclusively to faculty for whom a promotional track exists (e.g., tenure-track faculty, professors of professional practice, clinical professors) who wish to appeal reappointment, promotion and/or tenure denial decisions.”</p> <p>The following was amended on Page 4, within the paragraph designated by the heading, “University Level Review.” The word, “always” is to be deleted from the following:</p> <p>“The FAHC may always choose to consult with the Departmental and/or College Advisory Committee members as well as the Department Chair and College Dean before rendering a decision.”</p> <p>The sentence will read, as amended, “The FAHC may choose to consult with the Departmental and/or College Advisory Committee members as well as the Department Chair and College Dean before rendering a decision.”</p> <p>Senator Huckaby asked the Senate to wait on approving the policy in order to be able to take the policy back to her colleagues. Senator Lahutsky asked if Senators had enough time to review the policy. Discussion was held concerning these matters. Senator Legatski asked to call the question, indicating that a two-thirds majority vote must be garnered to stop the discussion. The Senate voted to stop the discussion.</p> <p>Senator McFarland called for a vote to pass the FAP, noting the amendments. The Senators voted 26 to 1 in favor of approving the FAP. A motion was added for the FSEC to create a task force to work with the Provost Council in regard to issues involving the FAP. The motion was seconded and approved.</p> |
| 10/08 | <p>Motion 2 – Policies regulating the number of times a course may be retaken are the province of the college offering the course. In the case of a course offered by one unit, which is required in the major degree plan of another, the Deans of the respective units, in cooperation with the Provost, will reach an agreement on policy.</p> <p>The current TCU course retake policy does not have a limit on the number of times a course can be retaken. The majority of courses are retaken only once. There are varying policies across Colleges as to retaking courses. The motion allows Colleges to institute a course retake policy.</p> <p>Registrar Pat Miller stated there are approximately four courses that are retaken but the total number of courses retaken each semester is insignificant. The motion was passed as proposed.</p> |
| 12/08 | <p>3. Green Challenge to Faculty Senate Committees (Senator Suzy Lockwood)</p> <p>The following motion was put forth by Senator Lockwood:</p> <p>Whereas TCU and the Faculty Senate are making efforts to think globally and act locally, and</p> <p>Whereas the Faculty Senate has pledged to, and should model green behavior, and</p> <p>Whereas the cost of printing the Faculty/Staff Handbook is \$9400.00 yearly,</p> <p>The Faculty Governance Committee moves that the Faculty/Staff Handbook be an exclusively electronic document available on the TCU webpage linked to as many sites as necessary to make the information available to all faculty.</p> <p>A discussion was held and the motion passed with only one dissenting vote.</p> |
| 10/09 | <p>ARTICLE I. THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY Section I. Meetings</p> <p>A. Regular meetings. The Faculty Assembly shall meet during the University session as necessary, with at least one regular meeting each semester. The date and time of the regular meetings shall be set by the Chair of the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>B. Special meetings. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall call a Special Meeting of the Faculty Assembly at any time upon the request of the Chancellor, the Provost, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, or the written request of thirty members of the Faculty Assembly.</p> <p>C. Twenty percent (20%) of voting members shall constitute a quorum.</p> <p>The Faculty Senate Faculty Governance Committee proposed removing, “with at least one regular meeting each semester.” Discussion ensued and several Senators expressed concern about not having a mandate for a Faculty Assembly, while others indicated we should not meet just to meet and referred to the poor attendance at recent Faculty Assemblies. A motion was brought forward to delete “with at least one regular meeting each semester” and add “a majority of Faculty Senate” in the following section:</p> <p>B. Special meetings. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall call a Special Meeting of the Faculty Assembly at any time upon the request of the Chancellor, the Provost, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, a majority of the Faculty Senate, or the written request of thirty members of the Faculty Assembly.</p> <p>The motion was passed with all in favor except for one Senator being opposed.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 12/10 | Approval of Honor Code Operationalization: Dr. Ted Legatski, Senate Chair of the Student Relations Committee, underlined the group effort of the Academic Excellence Committee and the Student Relations Committee to bring this document to fruition. Dr. Legatski reminded Senators that the latest revisions to the document are posted on the Faculty Senate website. These revisions include the name of the document that was changed to the TCU Undergraduate Academic Honor Code to avoid any confusion with the Graduate Honor Code in place at the Neeley School of Business. The motion to adopt the operationalization of the Honor Code passed. |
| 2/11 | SPOT Evaluations and Small Classes Dr. Greg Friedman, Chair of the Academic Excellence Committee and Dr. Judy Groulx, Chair of the Evaluation Committee invited Senators to discuss a proposed motion to restrict the use of quantitative SPOT evaluations for classes with smaller enrollments. Greg Friedman reviewed the terms of the motion: TCU Faculty Senate Motion on Student Perception of Teaching survey: a. Student Perception of Teaching surveys shall not be required in classes with three or fewer enrolled students at the time of university survey distribution. b. Student Perception of Teaching surveys shall not be required to include quantitative questions (i.e. questions that require a numerical rating as an answer) in classes with seven or fewer enrolled students at the time of university survey distribution. A brief discussion followed, then, the motion passed. |
| 5/11 | Greg Friedman underlined the collaboration of the Academic Excellence Committee with SGA and the Student Relations Committee to write a draft that would operationalize the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code. The Senate passed the motion. |
| 5/11 | Prof. Shorter presented to the Faculty Senate guiding principles and best- practice recommendations for evaluation of teaching based on the compilation and analysis of the survey results. These principles will open up a campus-wide, faculty- led discussion of the evaluation of teaching as one component of the overall faculty performance. One goal of these principles and recommendations is to make clear that SPOTs evaluations cannot be the only measure of a faculty teaching. After a discussion of the wording of some of the principles and the Best Practices, as well as “friendly” amendments presented by the Academic Excellence Committee, the Faculty Senate approved the motion to endorse these principles with the suggested wording amendments and submit them to the Provost. |
| 11/11 | Presentation by Professor Ted Legatski, Chair of the Student Relations Committee (wireless resolution) Senator Legatski began by stating that the Student Relations Committee is charged with being the liaison between the Faculty Senate and student government (and students in general). Consistent across meetings with both the past and current presidents of SGA have been concerns about access to computers, particularly that our system appears to be PC-centric and Mac users are put at a significant disadvantage. A few weeks ago Senator Legatski received a very supportive letter from the Vice President of Internal Affairs for SGA acknowledging that Bryan Lucas and other IT people are working on this issue, but wondering if there any way the faculty could get on board with this, too. Legatski had spoken with Chair Williams and the Student Relations Committee about it and presented a resolution from SGA (distributed with the agenda for this meeting) to the Faculty Senate. The bottom line, Legatski explained, is that it asks the Faculty Senate to support the resolution addressing concerns about reliable student access to TCU networks, access by TCU faculty and support staff to the Internet (as well as IT support), and equal treatment for Mac and PC users. It urges the Faculty Senate to make this a very high priority. This is not adversarial in any way, Legatski stated, but expresses the position that this is a high priority for students and ought to be a high priority for faculty, even if it isn't a high priority for faculty personally. Legatski then asked for questions. Bryan Lucas stated that he would love an opportunity to address the Student Relations Committee and give an update on where they are on those issues. On behalf of the Student Relations Committee, Legatski moved for the adoption of the SGA resolution. The motion was seconded. With no further discussion, the resolution was unanimously and formally adopted. |
| 11/11 | Presentation by Professor Ed McNertney, Director of the Core (Writing Committee Charter) Referencing his last appearance before the Faculty Senate, Professor Ed McNertney stated that he had gone through the procedure for a writing committee charter and that it was now time to formally constitute the committee. McNertney moved that the Writing Committee Charter (distributed with the agenda for this meeting) be officially adopted. The motion was seconded. Senator Moore asked how this was different from what was current practice. McNertney said that there really was nothing different, that the Senate would just be “constituting this.” There had been a committee, but it turned into a committee that vetted courses; however, it wasn't ever officially constituted. When asked by Senator Murray why this needed to a Senate committee, McNertney stated that since the faculty “owns the core curriculum,” it makes the most sense to house it in the Senate. After a short discussion, the motion was voted upon and passed. The Writing Committee Charter was formally adopted. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 12/11 | <p>Presentation by Professors Ed McNertney, Director of the Core, and Theresa Gaul, Co-Chair, Literary Traditions Learning Community & Chad Lucas</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| 2/12 | <p>Arnie Barkman, Chair of the Committee on Committees (COC), explained that his committee oversees the rest of the Faculty Senate committees (twenty-four committees total – three research committees and twenty-one university committees). This past fall, they conducted an orientation for new chairs. Approximately thirteen chairs attended that session. In the spring, they need replacements on committees for those who rotate off, resign, or retire. Keeping in mind the need for a broad cross section (age, experience, length of employment at TCU, schools, departments, and so forth) of the university on each committee, they send out a survey at the end of February requesting individual interest in the various committees. Working with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, they also make suggestions in terms of finding individuals who are willing to serve as Faculty Senate officers next year.</p> <p>The other main business of the Committee on Committees is dealing with changes that may need to be made regarding committee composition or the charges of the committee. Barkman gave examples of changes from the Student Publications Committee and the old Faculty Grievance Policy.</p> <p>He also spoke of the work this past fall regarding the Mediators Committee. Their charge needs to be changed to reflect the new system under which they will be operating. Barkman then entertained a motion to accept the changes in the charge. He explained that these changes had the approval of the Committee on Committees, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC), the Grievance Committee, and the Provost. It was so moved and seconded. The only discussion was clarification that the document reflected wording changes suggested prior to today's meeting by Senator Friedman. The motion to accept the changes passed.</p> |
| 3/12 | <p>{See long discussion about eSpots starting on page 2 and continuing to page 4 on the 3/2012 minutes}</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------|---|
| 4/12 | <p>Professors Greg Friedman and Ed McNertney, TCU Core Curriculum Review Charter</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| 9/13 | <p>A proposal was made by Chair Sawyer for replacing Arnie Barkman on the University Budget Advisory Committee. The Faculty Senate is expected to have a member representing the Senate on this committee. Suzy Lockwood, a sitting Senator, is already a member of the Budget Advisory Committee, and it was proposed that she formally represent the Senate on the committee.</p> <p>a. Jan Quesada moved to nominate Suzy as the Senate representative on the committee.</p> <p>b. The motion was seconded, and then unanimously approved by the Senate.</p> |
| 2/14 | <p>The Academic Excellence Committee put forward a resolution regarding the establishment of foreign language houses, to wit:</p> <p>a. "The Faculty Senate supports the establishment of a German Language House and a French Language House. It also calls for the Provost to work with the Department of Modern Language Studies, Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs Dr. Kathy Cavins-Tull, and Director of Housing Craig Allen to provide sufficient funding to support them."</p> <p>b. These would not be separate buildings, but areas set up within existing student housing, such as a floor or other definable space.</p> <p>c. Subsequent discussion addressed issues of:</p> <p>i. Whether the Senate should be involved in approving resolutions that would require the University to provide an unspecified amount of funding.</p> <p>ii. Whether this would set a precedent for special housing for other groups. General agreement was reached that these are academically relevant recommendations, not interest groups, and thus do not set such a precedent for non-academically oriented groups to have separate housing.</p> <p>iii. The benefits of immersion training/experience for students in foreign language studies.</p> <p>d. A suggestion was made to remove names from the resolution, leaving titles only. This was adopted as a friendly amendment, and the change was made.</p> <p>e. Another suggestion was made to change the wording of the resolution to indicate that the houses would be made available to a select group of students. Only 16 beds will be available, so admission to the program will be necessarily select, and will involve an application by interested students. Thus, this suggestion was not adopted.</p> <p>f. A motion was made to approve the resolution, and the subsequent vote carried the motion with one abstention.</p> |
| 3/14 | <p>Senator Barkman brought forward a proposal for a change in the Computer Committee, initiated by the Committee on Committees. The recommended changes involves changing the Committee's name to the Technology Committee, and changing the number of faculty who are members of the committee from nine to seven, seeking reasonable representation from across the academic units of the university. The motion was unanimously approved.</p> |
| 3/14 | <p>Walter Betts (Systems Librarian, Mary Coats Burnett Library) introduced a Declaration of the Right to Libraries, and requested that Senators who are in favor sign the Declaration. Others who wish to support the Declaration may sign virtually at: txla.org/declaration-signing. Senator Williams made a motion that the Senate support the Declaration as a united body, and the motion passed unanimously.</p> |
| 5/14 | <p>Dianna McFarland, Chair of the TPG Committee, re-introduced a Resolution to Adopt the Revised Faculty Appeal Policy, discussion of which began in our April meeting.</p> <p>a. Three motions were offered for consideration by the Senate. The changes having to do with each of these motions having been distributed to the Senate ahead of time, motions were made and seconded to approve each of them in turn.</p> <p>b. The first motion had to do with edits and corrections to the policy document. It was approved without discussion.</p> <p>c. A second motion sought approval of changes made to Rationale 1 and 3-6 for semantic clarity and consistency between the revised policy and established TCU practices and/or other TCU policies. All changes associated with this motion were approved and passed by the Senate.</p> <p>d. A third motion sought approval of changes to the TCU Faculty Appeal Policy 2010 referenced as Rationales 7-8 for congruence with current TCU practice. All changes associated with this motion were passed by the Senate.</p> |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|----------------------|--|
| 9/14 | Chair Quesada discussed the Executive Committee's initiative to form a task force on the TCU Promise, the purpose of which is to explore and make recommendations regarding recent changes in retiree benefits and their long-term non-financial (as well as financial) implications for the implied social contract between faculty and the University. The task force membership includes both current and retired faculty. Charges for the task force are detailed in the accompanying PP presentation from Chair Quesada. a. A motion was made and seconded to secure a "sense of the Senate" to heartily support and encourage the work of this task force, which was resoundingly and unanimously approved by voice vote. |
| 4/15 | Recommendation from COC to sunset International Students Committee: Passed |
| 4/15 | Recommendation from FSEC supporting reporting of student class absences via my.tcu.edu portal: Passed |
| 11/15 | The AEC made a recommendation that the TCU Faculty Senate withdraw from COIA (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics). It appears that COIA has become increasingly ostracized from the NCAA, perhaps because of an adversarial relationship between the two organizations. For a variety of reasons, it appears that there is not a positive cost to benefit relationship. It was suggested that a better approach would be for our Faculty Athletic Representative (Rhonda Hatcher) to visit with the AEC committee several times a year. A motion was made to withdraw from COIA, it was seconded, and the vote was unanimously in favor of withdrawing. Our outgoing COIA rep will inform COIA that we will withdraw. |
| 4/16 | A resolution from the Educational Evaluation Committee was presented by Dr. Frye (committee chair). Prior to presenting the resolution, she reviewed findings from the committee's survey of faculty regarding use of the Student Perceptions of Teaching evaluations. A motion came from the committee to approve the resolution, and passed unanimously in the Senate. |
| 4/16 | Dr. Ted Legatski then presented a joint resolution from the Executive Committee and the Governance Committee proposing standardization of certain language in the Faculty-Staff Handbook relevant to Senate operations. One wordsmithing amendment was recommended and accepted. The motion to approve the resolution passed. |
| 5/16 | A "Resolution on Potential Curricular Disruptions" was presented, and is appended at the end of these minutes. Discussion of the resolution proceeded. Following discussion, a motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the resolution as written. |
| 5/16 | Ted Legatski provided a brief update on progress toward Senate elections. Five colleges or schools have uncontested elections. A motion was seconded to approve the uncontested slate by acclamation, and was voted on (and passed) by the Senate. There are three schools with contested elections, and competitive elections will be held the week after spring break. A motion was made to approve the Faculty Senate terms for the Harris College of Nursing and Health Sciences, and was seconded. The Senate voted unanimously to approve the motion. The deadline for nominations for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is March 23rd. Nominees will be presented at the April 7th Senate meeting. The elections will be on April 28th. Additional nominations will be permitted at that time. |
| 2013-2014 AEC report | The AEC should follow up on the progress of the Testing Center, as our resolution was passed on Feb. 6, 2014. |
| 2013-2014 Coc report | We received a proposal from the Computer and Telecommunications Committee which requested a change in name to "Technology" to better reflect the work of the committee. Also in the proposal was a request to change the number of faculty on the committee from nine to seven and require, to the extent possible, that there is a representative from each college (Business, Communication, Education, Fine Arts, Liberal Arts, Nursing and Health Sciences, Science and Engineering) on the committee. Note that Ranch Management and Honors College were excluded. Reasons for the changes included difficulty in getting proper attendance at meetings given the size and constituencies of the committee. It was also stated in the revised charge that the committee should participate in planning and decision-making with regard to campus technology initiatives. This proposal was passed by the Committee on Committees and the Faculty Senate |
| 2014-2015 AEC report | The Honors College wants to reconstitute its advisory committee as two separate committees. Currently, the Honors College Advisory Committee plays the combined roles that the Advisory Committees and Curriculum Committees play in TCU's other colleges, and the Honors College would like to similarly separate out two committees to perform these separate functions. As the AEC wrote the charter for the current Honors College Advisory Committee and as that charter was passed through the Senate, the Honors College has requested that the Senate officially decommission the existing committee and approve the creation of the new committees. Dean Robbins believes there will be a plan in place to bring to the Senate in the fall. As the AEC's Honors College liaison, Loren Spice has been actively involved in these discussions. |
| 2014-2015 AEC report | In 2013-2014, the Faculty Senate passed a motion encouraging the university to open a testing center. As the already-high need for such a testing center continues to mount, several colleges have undertaken the process of beginning to develop their own testing centers. However, such ad hoc, individual solutions are unlikely to meet all needs, and the development of a centralized university-level testing center is still a necessity. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee should continue to press this point with the administration. |

| Month/ Year | Motion |
|------------------------|---|
| 2014-2015 AEC report | In 2008, the Faculty Senate passed a motion suggesting that internal GPA computations for students who have taken a course multiple times use the average of the earned grades (as opposed to the current procedure by which "last grade stands"). The passing of that motion was due to several compelling reasons, not least of which was that this is how student GPAs are computed externally, and so this internal computation gives students a misleading appraisal of their graduate school prospects. Despite repeated requests for action or other official response, the Provost has not acted on this resolution. The Executive Committee should demand an official response from the Provost. |
| 2014-2015 FRC report | 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. |
| 2014-2015 FS Chair rpt | The SRC also discussed the Honor Code—developed and passed by SGA and the Faculty Senate in 2009, but never implemented—and intends to streamline the proposed system over the summer in order to have an Honor Code ready for "trial" implementation in the Fall 2015 semester. |