TCU Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
March 4, 2004

Senators present: Arnie Barkman, Donelle Barnes, David Bedford, Carolyn Cagle, Lori Diel, Nowell Donovan, Sharon Fairchild, Blaise Ferrandino, Andy Fort, Rob Garnett, George Gilbert, Tom Guderjan, Nadia Lahutsky, Steve Levering, Suzy Lockwood, John Lovett, Ed McNertney, Linda Moore, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Carol Thompson, Peggy Watson, Melissa Young.

Senators absent: Chuck Bamford, Art Busbey, Sally Fortenberry*, Jack Hill*, Jack Jones, Ed McNertney*, Don Nichols, Ranga Ramasesh*, Magnus Rittby, Mike Sacken, Ellen Shelton, Gene Smith, Jeff Todd*, Bill Vanderhoof, Molly Weinburgh

*excused

Guests: Emily Burgwyn, Melissa Canady, Greg Franzwa, Dave Grebel, Barbara Herman, Provost William Koehler, Jane Kucko, Marco Lopez, Claire Sanders, Steve Sherwood, Steve Weiss, Dan Williams, Student representatives of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Student House.

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

Approval of minutes
 The minutes of the February 5th meeting of the Senate were approved as presented.

Core business
        Chair Lahutsky asked for an update on the formation of the HMVV committee. Senator Dick Rinehart reported that Professor Bob Vigeland has agreed to serve on this committee but that they are still looking for representatives from literature and fine arts.

        In the absence of Senator Ed McNertney, chair of the Core Implementation Committee, Senator Blaise Ferrandino presented the business of the Core to the Senate.

Written Communication I and II

        These documents have been refined and edited since the last Senate meeting. They have also been approved by the CIC. Professor Carrie Leverentz explained some of those changes. The committee eliminated language that was directly connected to the existing Writing I and II courses. She also explained that the descriptions have been streamlined and edited.
        After some discussion, the Written Communication I and II outcomes and action steps were approved unanimously.
        Senator Carol Thompson asked if all or some action steps would be required. Although this will vary in each of the Core areas, the Written Communication action steps will all be required, thus "and" will be implied between action steps.   Since

competency areas will differ as to whether all actions steps are required ("and") or at least one required ("or"), there will be a statement for each outcome specifying whether or not one or more action step is needed.

Writing Emphasis

Professor Steve Sherwood presented this document and answered questions. He explained that the committee wanted to avoid making this requirement so onerous that people would avoid proposing courses for this category. Their intention was to allow each discipline to determine its own, specific requirements. Although these steps are purposely loose, they have maintained certain requirements. They were written with the idea that action steps would be considered "or" statements.

Senator Linda Moore asked if all disciplines would be required to have a writing emphasis course. Senator Ferrandino explained that it had been suggested that at least one course would be available to each discipline. There was a strong recommendation that each discipline would have its students take a writing emphasis course in their field. It was further explained that the former requirement of 2500 words for writing emphasis was eliminated because this was a random number that was chosen with little rationale. Instead of a word count, the writing faculty believe that a certain number and variety of writing samples is preferable to merely numbers of words.

Senator Thompson asked for clarification about whether or not the outcomes of writing emphasis are considered "or" statements. It was stated that the CIC would like to encourage departments to include the process of writing as a requirement, but that is up to each department. Discussion next turned to a consideration of whether writing drafts is considered process writing and how the idea of a "draft" may differ in various disciplines. Discussion continued about revising and rewriting assignments and how the proposed outcomes change the current UCR Writing Emphasis requirement. Professor Leverentz explained that the committee wants this competency to have the widest possible application for all disciplines. Professor Dan Williams confirmed that the idea was to keep it from being too prescriptive and to allow departments to design what works best for their own courses.

The Writing Emphasis competency document was approved as presented.

Natural Sciences

Professor Steve Weiss presented the document for this competency area. He explained that the committee members working on these outcomes interpreted the outcomes as "and" statements. These outcomes and action steps were put together by a college committee and were approved by the College of Science and Engineering. It was stated that courses outside the sciences (such as archeology) could be created for this competency. In response to a question regarding why the word "examples" was included in the "Student Action Steps" title, Professor Weiss explained that the committee wanted to emphasize that other ways are also acceptable. These represent the best thinking of the committee, but they don't prescribe how to do it; they are not an exhaustive list.

The Natural Sciences document was approved as presented.

Social Sciences

Professor Claire Sanders, who had helped work on this document, was available to answer questions. She explained that these action steps were created with the aid of the AddRan Curriculum Committee and were approved by the AddRan College of Humanities and Social Sciences last month. She pointed out that the words "social science methodology" were considered necessary and had therefore been added to the outcome statement. Senator Carolyn Cagle commented that the language was too "uni-directional" and that she would like to see wording that conveys bi-directionality between the human experience and social processes. Discussion ensued on this point, particularly about the need to include the notion of reciprocity between the individual and society. Senator Rob Garnett explained that "human interaction" was inserted (in the second action step) in order to include the idea of mutual interaction between humans and society. Senator Melissa Young expressed concern that the outcome as stated ("students will understand and apply social science methodology") was too ambitious, especially for introductory courses.   To her, the conjunction of "understand and apply" suggested mastery rather than competent understanding.

The Social Sciences document as returned to the committee for further clarification.

Humanities

Professor Gregg Franzwa was present to answer questions concerning the Humanities document. He stated that the outcomes are considered "or" statements. The faculty of AddRan College has approved this document. Senator Andy Fort commented that his department found that they are already accomplishing these outcomes in their courses.

The Humanities document was approved unanimously.

Draft statement on Assessment of the Core Curriculum

The next agenda item was to discuss this document, distributed to Senators prior to the meeting. Discussion ensued concerning how to assure ongoing assessment of the Core Curriculum. Senator Ferrandino explained the CIC's concerns about this issue and the Committee's desire to have some mechanism established for assessment of the Core. The intention of the CIC was not to dictate how this will occur. They developed this statement in order to give some structure to a process; it is not meant to be prescriptive. Chair Lahutsky asked Melissa Canady what the current status of the Assessment Committee is. Professor Canady described the history of the committee over the last two years and explained that it does not have formal university standing. She would like to have this committee formalized as a university committee. She also explained that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools does not require the university to have such a committee. Chair Lahutsky confirmed that we would like to institutionalize this somehow and asked Provost Koehler what the process is for establishing a new university

committee. Provost Koehler said that the Senate could propose it to the Committee on Committees. Senator Moore made a motion that we begin the process of getting this committee approved as a university committee. A motion to start the process of establishing the Assessment Committee as an official university committee passed unanimously. Chair Lahutsky asked Senator Dick Rinehart to begin thinking about how to accomplish this.

The assessment calendar accompanying the draft statement under discussion was explained to the Senate. The CIC thought that the model of the Academic Program Review would be useful and that this would help dispel any anxiety or concern about the process of assessing the core. Questions or comments about the schedule can be addressed to Professor Canady.

Finally, it was announced that fruitful conversations with the Registrar concerning the implementation of the core had begun.

Proposals from the Faculty Governance Committee

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 charge 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.

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.

Chair Lahutsky called for the vote to create this new university committee. The motion was approved.

Chair Lahutsky stated that we will send all the materials forward with our strong recommendations concerning the issues brought up in this discussion.

Other FGC proposals:

1. Article I, Section 2B. After some discussion concerning the meaning of "full-time instructional staff," the proposed language was approved with changes, as follows:

"Full-time faculty with rank of Instructor or above, full-time administrative officers with similar faculty rank, and full-time instructional staff are members of the Faculty Assembly with the right to participate in deliberations and to vote."

2. Article II, section 1, C1-3.

This change is being proposed in order to clarify current vague language. It clarifies the process and is more efficient. The proposed changes were accepted, as written.

3. Article II, section 3-B.

After considerable discussion, during which Senators Moore, Guderjan, and Fort expressed reservations about formalizing the participation of the Executive Committee in nominating officers. This proposed change was voted down.

4. Article II, section 4-A.

Senator Cagle explained that this change provides for language stating that the Senate may meet more frequently than the current language. After discussion, this proposal was withdrawn.

5. Article II, section 4- (new D).

Senator Cagle explained the wording of this new proposal concerning voting by e-ballot. She explained that, with this proposal, the Senate is voting to allow e-balloting on issues that had been discussed on the floor. Discussion ensued concerning what is meant by majority vote of Senate. Senator Rinewalt confirmed that "majority" means the majority of Senators present at the Senate meeting. The proposed language was approved, with one editing change, as follows:

"The Senate may vote on motions per electronic vote (e-ballot) if a face-to-face Senate discussion has been held but final details on an issue need to be clarified and communicated to Senators before an official vote by e-ballot occurs. E-balloting may

also occur if special circumstances exist. In either case, the Senate must approve, by majority vote, voting by e-ballot."

Article II, section 5D.

Senator Cagle explained that this article refers to the current Budget and Finance Committee and defines how the election of committee members takes place.

The Senate voted to deleted the present language. The FGC withdrew the proposed language. The Committee will return to the Senate with a proposal of where this language should be placed appropriately.

Concluding these discussions, Chair Lahutsky pointed out that these changes would have to be approved next by the Board of Trustees in April. She also reminded Senators of the creation of two new Senate positions of Historian and Parliamentarian, already approved by the Senate in September, but included in the packet distributed to the Senators.

Strategic Planning Project

Professor Jane Kucko took the floor. As Chair of the Sub-committee on the Undergraduate Experience, a committee of the university Strategic Planning Project, she explained that the committee was interested in discovering Senator's opinions related to two questions, which had already been sent to Senators. These were:
1. What should be the hallmarks of the undergraduate experience?
2. How does the TCU Experience reflect the university's mission statement?

Professor Kucko and her fellow committee members were at this meeting to listen to Senators' ideas and to gather information. During the discussion that followed, Senators answered these questions by mentioning the following characteristics: the face to face interaction with faculty, the academic challenge that takes place in many venues, the challenge to meet the university mission, and finally, an appreciation for the large body of knowledge that has been passed down through the years to contemporary society. Professor Kucko thanked the Senate for this discussion and reminded Senators of the Town Hall discussion scheduled for March 31st in the Student Center lounge.

Chair Lahutsky adjourned the meeting and asked that all visitors leave while the Senate went into executive session to discuss nominations for honorary degrees.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Fairchild