

**TCU Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
February 5, 2004**

Senators present: Arnie Barkman, Donelle Barnes, David Bedford, Art Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Lori Diel, Nowell Donovan, Sharon Fairchild, Blaise Ferrandino, Sally Fortenberry, Rob Garnett, George Gilbert, Jack Hill, Nadia Lahutsky, Suzy Lockwood, John Lovett, Ed McNertney, Linda Moore, Don Nichols, Ranga Ramasesh, Dick Rinewalt, Magnus Rittby, Bill Ryan, Ellen Shelton, Gene Smith, Jeff Todd, Bill Vanderhoof, Peggy Watson, Melissa Young.

Senators absent: Chuck Bamford, David Cross, Jack Jones, Tom Guderjan,* Steve Levering,* Carol Thompson,* Andy Fort, Mike Sacken, Molly Weinburgh.
*excused

Guests: Chancellor Boschini, Richard Durán, Marco Lopez, Bob Doran, Joseph Butler, Chris Sawyer, Lynn Flahive, Carrie Leverenz, Steve Sherwood, Melissa Canady, Provost Koehler.

Chair Nadia Lahutsky called the meeting to order and welcomed guests to the meeting.

Approval of minutes: The minutes of the December 4, 2003 Senate meeting were approved with one correction. On the first page, the initials NAACP should read: NCAA

Old Business:

Chair Nadia Lahutsky called on Senator Linda Moore to give the Senate an update on the activities of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). The Chair mentioned that there are four non-BCS schools that are part of the COIA. Senator Moore is thus far the only non-BCS nominee for the Steering Committee. Chair Lahutsky stated that should Senator Moore be placed on the Steering Committee, she would be involved in many e-conversations with the faculty representatives concerning what the next steps will be. She suggested that Senator Moore's service as TCU's representative could be considered her Senate committee assignment. She also said that Senators who are interested in receiving updates on the COIA should send her an e-mail indicating their interest. Senator Moore stated that she could also send the website address of the Coalition to any Senators who were interested.

Core Business

Senator Ed McNertney took the floor to introduce the new Core materials up for discussion. After reminding the Senators of the approval of the HMOVV materials last semester, he explained that the Core Implementation Committee (CIC) had continued to

work on the essential competencies with the various colleges. At this meeting, the committee is bringing forward the outcomes and action steps for the competency areas of fine arts, mathematical reasoning, oral communication, and written communications I and II.

Senator Blaise Ferrandino introduced the outcomes for Fine Arts. He explained the process in which the CIC had had discussions with the faculty from the College of Fine Arts and that the entire faculty of that college had approved them. He pointed out first, that the statement “as appropriate to course focus” (a statement removed from other outcomes statements in the HMOVV categories) had been discussed and purposely inserted because faculty felt it to be appropriate for these definitions. Second, Senator Ferrandino pointed out that the college faculty felt it important to include “tools for assessment” in this document, an important difference between these and the other previously approved outcomes.

Senator Arnie Barkman noted a discrepancy in the two outcomes statements, one saying “basic understanding” and the other simply “understanding.” Discussion ensued on the possibility of making the statements parallel. Senator Ferrandino explained the difference between the two outcomes. He pointed out that the second outcome is what is now being done in the college, that is, students get their fine arts requirement through survey courses. The first outcome involves the applied side of fine arts, that is, students in performance or studio courses. This outcome would allow the college to give students credit for this type of course as a fine arts credit. The college will have to make a decision on what type of applied art course would apply. There is, however, no clear reason for the difference between the statements “basic understanding” and “understanding.” It was decided that the word “basic” could be removed.

Senator Jeff Todd suggested that the elimination of the word “basic” would be clearer since the word “understanding” alone allows for other types of understanding. Senator Moore asked Senator Ferrandino if there were some applied experiences that wouldn’t be considered “basic.” He answered that the college would have to decide on what constitutes an applied experience that would be adequate for fine arts credit. This outcome will be important primarily for students who are not in the College of Fine Arts. This outcome is being included because there are cases in which students have taken a number of music courses but none of them can be counted for fine arts credit.

Senator George Gilbert proposed that the expression “TCU students” in the outcomes statements be changed to “Students” in order to be consistent with other outcomes statements. In answer to another question regarding the inclusion of the word “examples” under the headings *Action Steps* and *Tools for Assessment*, Senator Ferrandino explained that the Fine Arts faculty felt strongly that these should be included. They considered these to be helpful clarifiers indicating that the statements are examples and that not all are required.

Discussion ensued on the definition of “fine arts.” The college will be the final arbiter of whether something proposed would be considered a “fine art.” Senator David Bedford gave an example of a case in which a course in creative writing was not considered a fine art. Senator Ferrandino confirmed that there are specific definitions in the field but it is probably not a good idea to try to establish a definition. He stated that they do not want to be too restrictive. If someone proposes a course that crosses over between humanities and fine arts, the college will fall back on these

outcomes to determine whether it qualifies for a fine arts experience; we will be trusting our colleagues in these fields to make that determination.

The Fine Arts proposal was approved, as amended by the removal of the term “TCU” in the outcomes statements and the removal of the word “basic” in the first outcome statement.

Mathematical Reasoning

Senator McNertney introduced this competency. The people that worked on it were Senator Nowell Donovan and Professor Steve Weis. Professor Bob Doran of the Math Department was present to answer any questions. Professor Doran explained the process that was used in designing the outcomes. He stated that they used the model of word problems in designing the outcomes. In the action steps, students are expected to translate problems into statements and, once the word problem is worked out, the next step is to solve the problem. He reviewed the definitions of the action steps.

Senator Todd questioned whether a course in logic would satisfy these outcomes. Professor Doran answered affirmatively, pointing out that they currently accept a course in mathematical logic, taught by philosophy, for math credit.

The Mathematical Reasoning document was unanimously approved as presented.

Oral Communication

Senator McNertney presented the Oral Communication document for approval. The faculty responsible for it were Professors Lynn Flahive and Chris Sawyer. Professor Sawyer described the process for arriving at the outcomes and action steps for this category. He explained that the discipline of Communications has been working since 1990 to articulate competencies for beginning college students in the area. This facilitated the development of these action steps and outcomes. He further explained the meaning of the outcomes, explaining that the action steps support the overall goal of the development of oral and verbal skills in real time, face to face encounters. He stated that they recognize that there are a number of technological advances that may bring changes, but the goal is to develop skills for live encounters.

Senator Arnie Barkman suggested that the beginning sentences of the action steps be made parallel to others. They should be changed to: “Students will...” Senator Carolyn Cagle suggested that the outcomes statements be changed from “Students will demonstrate an ability” to “Students will demonstrate the ability to.... construct and deliver ...” and “Students will demonstrate the ability to facilitate” Senator Cagle also asked for an explanation of what is meant by “special occasion speeches.”

Chair Lahutsky asked Professor Sawyer to comment on the fact that this core requirement will constitute an additional load for the Department of Communication Studies. Professor Sawyer explained that the department anticipates developing additional courses mainly focusing on the second outcome. They will take into consideration the fact that majors from different departments may have interests in different types of skill sets. They will be happy to have conversations with other colleges about this.

The Oral Communication document was approved with the above-mentioned amendments in the outcomes statements.

Written Communication I

Senator McNertney presented the texts of Written Communication I and II, pointing out the change in the wording of the title. He explained that Catherine Wehlburg of the CIC worked with Carrie Leverenz, Director of Composition, Steve Sherwood of the Writing Center, and Dan Williams, Chair of the Department of English, in the development of these outcomes and action steps. These professors were present to answer questions and explain the document.

Professor Leverenz explained that the proposed outcomes were based on recently developed national outcomes statement. Some of the national statement was included in the first year document and some in the second year. The composition committee wrote a shorter version of an outcome statement for the existing composition courses. This describes what we are already doing in TCU's current first and second year courses. She explained that this document may have more specificity than necessary, and that could be discussed. The categories of the outcomes have to do with rhetorical situations, conventions, and with process.

Professor Leverenz also pointed out an editorial change in the third action step of the second outcome: "situate *one's* own claims" should be changed to: "situate *their* own claims."

Senator Todd expressed concern that these are so detailed that other disciplines may not be able to propose courses in this category. It seems that they are written so that only courses in composition offered in the English department would satisfy the requirements. Professor Leverenz responded that that was not the intention and that she would be happy to talk about alternatives. Chair Lahutsky remarked that there still would be writing emphasis courses, offered by other disciplines. Professor Leverenz explained how English faculty make the distinction between a course whose focus is on students learning to write and courses in which students use writing in other disciplines. Writing emphasis courses are using writing to learn and are not focused on students learning to write.

Senator Gilbert suggested that the first action step might be changed from requiring "four" assignments to requiring "multiple" ones. In addition, on the Written Communication II document, the references to ENGL 10803 should be changed to *Written Communication I*.

Professor Leverenz also added that, in the third outcome of the Written Communication I document, language will be included along the lines of: "Proofreading according to conventions of edited American English..." This might be better placed as an action step.

Chair Lahutsky suggested that, because of the numerous editing changes and proofreading needed, the Secretary of the Senate and Senator Ferrandino will take note of these suggestions and so that the revised version might be proposed at the next Senate meeting.

Written communication II

Discussion next turned to the second document, Written Communications II.

The references to ENGL 10183 will be changed to *Written communication I*. It was asked whether the word “electronic” was necessary in the third outcome. Professor Leverentz answered that it is not, this is language left over from the national standards.

Senator Melissa Young asked for clarification as to whether all action steps would be required. Professor Leverentz stated that the outcomes are all necessary but that the action steps are recommended. Discussion ensued about the need for a statement somewhere as to whether or not all action steps are required. Senator McNertney stated that this has come up quite often. It is not up to the CIC to decide this question for the various categories; it is up to the people who are responsible for each area to make that determination. A statement regarding this requirement needs to be included somewhere in each document; there cannot be a general statement for all categories. He envisioned that each category would have its own statement saying whether all or some of the action steps are required.

Chair Lahutsky then suggested that the Written Communication I and II documents be returned to the committees for further refinement, taking into consideration these suggestions.

Slate for the Senate Representatives to the HMOVV Committee

The Chair then introduced this agenda item. The Senate Executive asked the Senate to vote on a slate of individuals who would be the Senate representatives serving on the HMOVV committee. The Executive Committee has consulted with the CIC about the best representatives for this committee. Referring to the charter description of the make-up of the HMOVV committee, Chair Lahutsky summarized the make-up of the committee. The five representatives from the CIC will be: Janet Kelly (education), Lynn Flahive (communications), Ed McNertney (social sciences), Claire Sanders (history), and either Steve Weis or Nowell Donovan, depending on the outcome of the Provost search.

The Chair announced that the Executive Committee has received expressions of willingness to serve on the committee from Senators Jack Hill (humanities) and Melissa Young (communications) and that these are the slate that the Executive Committee was bringing to the Senate to vote on. She further explained that the HMOVV committee will be rounded out with “at large” members. Bob Vigeland has agreed to be one of these members, but two others are being sought. Chair Lahutsky remarked that the intention was to include as many schools and university areas as possible, a goal the Executive Committee feels was accomplished.

The slate was approved unanimously.

New business:

E-balloting

Senator Carolyn Cagle, Chair of the Faculty Governance Committee brought to the floor the committee’s concerns relating to voting online, or “e-balloting.” She asked for discussion concerning whether or not it is feasible to propose e-balloting for Senate business. Senator Cagle had sent a list of questions about this issue to Senators the day before this meeting. She explained that the FGC consulted with Professor Art Busbey to confirm that the technology is sufficiently sophisticated to allow confidential e-balloting.

The committee wants to be cautious about doing this and is concerned that, even though e-balloting is efficient, it may take away the possibility of discussion. The committee would like to open a dialogue on this issue and to discuss which types of issues should be voted on by e-balloting. Last year the Executive Committee realized that, first, there was no provision in the Senate rules to allow this, and second, the technology at that time was not adequate.

Discussion ensued about what would need to be voted on in this way. Senator Peggy Watson gave an example that occurred last year when a vote on the new Core was taken at a forum. Those who were unable to attend the forum felt disenfranchised since they were unable to vote because they weren't present. E-balloting would have allowed everyone to vote in that circumstance. Since there was no provision for e-balloting in the rules, it was not done.

Senator Rob Garnett stated that e-balloting would be useful and would help facilitate voting on Senate membership. Senator Bedford expressed discomfort with e-balloting, due to the lack of privacy. Senator Fortenberry commented that there could always be a caucus before a vote and that voting could be done online after a conversation was held. Senator Ferrandino remarked that e-balloting would not be advisable for major issues, but for example, the minor changes in the new Core proposal could be voted on via e-balloting.

Art Busbey addressed the question of security. He stated that since it would be applied to Senate issues, the Executive Committee would be the only group to get the information. In addition, it would require a PIN number to vote, assuring that it would be secure. Senator Nowell Donovan suggested that the by-laws could specify that the Executive Committee would be allowed to make the determination as to whether an issue could be voted on via e-mail. Senator Cagle thanked the Senate for the discussion; the Faculty Governance Committee will take this feedback and develop a proposal.

Announcements

Chair Lahutsky introduced Melissa Canady, Director of Assessment. Professor Canady announced that this spring TCU is going to participate in the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), a faculty survey similar to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in which TCU currently participates. She distributed a summary statement about the FSSE and how it will be administered at TCU. This survey is administered by the same organization that does the NSSE. TCU faculty will soon receive a memo from their Deans regarding participation in the survey, which will be conducted electronically. Professor Canady encouraged all faculty to participate. The hope is to compare the results of the FSSE and the NSSE. Adjunct faculty will be included. As an incentive, all faculty that participate will be eligible for a \$250 gift certificate.

Chair Lahutsky confirmed that security of the information would be assured by the survey agency at Indiana University. The agency will send us the data, but faculty identification will be protected. Discussion ensued on the size of the sample and its use. Chair Lahutsky and Professor Canady asked Senators to encourage faculty to participate in order to assure better results.

The Chair announced that the Faculty Assembly would be held on March 11 at 3:30 in Room 141 Moudy Building.

Professor Rhonda Hatcher announced that on Thursday, Feb 12 at 7:30 PM, there would be a panel discussion on athletics in the Daniel Meyer Coliseum to which all faculty are invited. There will be several well-known individuals who will participate in this panel, including the current president of NCAA. She stated that the topic should be of great interest to all at TCU and that it is a significant event being held on campus. She encouraged people to attend.

Chair Lahutsky gave the floor to Chancellor Boschini, who updated the Senate on the status of the Provost search. He asked faculty to turn in their evaluations of the three candidates who were interviewed on campus. He emphasized that he was very interested in receiving as much feedback as possible and mentioned that if individuals were not comfortable writing their evaluations, they were welcome to call him or stop in his office. In addition, in reference to Professor Canady's remarks about the FESSE, he spoke highly of the Center for Post-secondary Research at Indiana University and its Director, Dr. George Kuh, who will be speaking at the inauguration in March.

Chair Lahutsky adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Fairchild