TCU Faculty Senate Meeting
May 6, 2004

Minutes


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

Approval of minutes
The minutes of the April 8th meeting of the Senate were approved as presented.

OLD BUSINESS

Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics
After giving background information on the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, Chair Lahutsky explained that Senator Linda Moore is the TCU representative in this organization and gave the floor to Senator Moore. Senator Moore updated the Senate on various issues of discussion that took place in the COIA this year. She explained that the NCAA just passed an incentive policy that will reduce the number of scholarships for schools that don’t reach their target rate of graduation of athletes, per team. In cases of consistent inability to maintain their graduation rate, schools will not be allowed to participate in bowl games or tournaments. Senator Moore pointed out that this policy probably wouldn’t impact TCU because of our high graduation rate.
She then described the following issues that are being proposed and discussed by the COIA: 1.) not allowing freshmen to play, 2.) banning mid-week games, and 3.) requesting more specific rules about recruitment activities. Senator Moore stated that the steering committee would meet this summer with athletic academic advisers and with athletic directors. The focus will be on student athletes, emphasizing a concern that student athletes be educated as well as participants in sports. Discussion followed about athletes leaving to enter professional sports and about encouraging intramural sports.
Academic Excellence Committee
Senator George Gilbert highlighted the specific charges of the committee. This year the committee focused on promoting the academic mission of the university. The committee worked in conjunction with the Student Affairs Committee on shared concerns. Senator Gilbert pointed out that AEC committee members discovered that students were very much in favor of “hands-on” academic experiences. Students were also sympathetic to deferring the sorority and fraternity rush period.

In addition, the Committee recommended ways to increase the overall level of scholarship among the faculty through the promotion of research grants for speakers, travel, and library costs. The Committee believes that such support could help to promote a more vibrant and challenging academic environment at TCU.

Senator Andy Fort encouraged next year’s Chair of this committee to find out ahead of time if deferred rush is feasible before spending a lot of time on it. Senator Carolyn Cagle questioned the expression of “if apt at all” in this portion of the committee’s report. Senator David Cross further explained the committee’s intentions and remarked that next year’s committee may investigate the “hidden costs” of the teacher/scholar model.

CORE CURRICULUM
Senator Ed McNertney addressed the Senate about the year’s work of the Core Implementation Committee. This committee has finished the competencies, learning outcomes and action steps of the new core. These were passed by the Faculty Assembly and delivered to the Chancellor. He explained that it is time to move into the academic support side and the non-academic side of implementing the core, that is, the registrar, admissions, and others. The committee will be reaching out to these other areas.

The HMVV committee has met twice and will meet again this coming Monday. Senator McNertney described the initial work of the committee in which they examined representative syllabi of existing courses. The committee has designed a one-page cover sheet for each of the six categories of the HMVV portion of the core. The committee is working to make the process of qualifying courses as simple as possible. They designed a single page that will be attached to the syllabus of a proposed course and then forwarded to the committee for approval. Senator McNertney pointed out that the committee would be vetting courses for the new core curriculum, but will not be approving new courses. In looking at various syllabi, the committee members discovered that many existing courses do fit the outcomes and action steps. Senator Jack Hill, a member of the HMVV committee, told Senators that work on the committee was quite rewarding and interesting. The committee would like to encourage faculty colleagues to begin to look at their courses to see if they might want to submit some of them for approval in one or more of the six HMVV categories. It is the hope of the committee that quite a few courses will be submitted to the committee by August.
Senator Blaise Ferrandino pointed out that it is logical that existing course syllabi fit the criteria since the same faculty helped develop the competencies and outcomes of the core. Senator Ferrandino then read a statement reaffirming a commitment to a liberal education in the arts and sciences. This statement came from a curriculum report that Harvard University recently released. Senator Ferrandino explained that Harvard is just now starting to work on core requirement revisions and will be doing work similar to what TCU has just accomplished. This statement is currently available in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Finally, Senator Melissa Young explained that the HMVV committee wants to be perceived as a liaison or an advocate between faculty proposing courses and the HMVV core. It was noted that this committee does not have a Chair; Senator McNertney will convene the committee and will send proposals to the appropriate committee members. Chair Lahutsky also confirmed that the Center for Teaching Excellence would be conducting workshops for faculty this summer to help faculty propose courses for the new core.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**New Senators**

Chair Lahutsky announced the names of the new Senators just elected to serve on the Senate next year. She introduced those who were present and then thanked the departing Senators for their service. Departing Senators are: Chuck Bamford, Art Busbey, Lori Diel, Nowell Donovan, Mike Sacken, Jeff Todd, and Bill Vanderhoof.

**Report from the Committee on Committees**

Senator Dick Rinewalt explained that in selecting members for the various university committees, the COC tries to get broad representation, which is often a challenge. They are currently working on replacements for faculty who will be on sabbatical next year and other committee needs.

In reference to the committee’s charge to improve the appointment of student members to university committees, he explained that the committee talked with Jay Zeidman, President of Student Government. As a result of these discussions, Jay has worked out a system that will produce good student participants. The COC felt they had good cooperation from student government about this question.

Senator Rinewalt next stated that COC developed the slate of new Senate officers after speaking with the nominees and the Executive Committee. These nominees have agreed to being placed on the slate.

Senator Lahutsky underscored the importance of this committee and confirmed that the staffing of the university committees would be worked out over the summer.

**Student Relations Committee**

Senator Melissa Young took the floor to present the report of this committee.
She pointed out that our connection with students is extremely important. She noted that students are always interested in knowing that we are interested in their concerns. She recommended this committee as a very rewarding one to serve on.

After reviewing the standing charges to the committee, Senator Young addressed the committee’s work on the specific charges. The first was to continue working with the Academic Excellence Committee on the subject of academic integrity. She remarked that the committee often found it difficult to track down the officers of the Student House of Representatives; therefore they worked more regularly with students on other committees, such as Katie Gordon on the Integrity Council and Anthony Opperman of the Student House Academic Affairs Committee. The SRC committee members found that students are very interested in fostering a culture of integrity at TCU.

In reference to the second specific charge, Senator Young described the Joint Assembly of the Staff, Student House, and Faculty Senate held in the fall. The subject of the Assembly was how to develop and support a culture of integrity at TCU.

Another issue the committee dealt with was advising. The committee met with Anthony Opperman and other members of the SGA Academic Affairs Committee who addressed the Senate earlier this year expressing student concerns about advising. The SRC found that students feel their needs in advising are not being met. Students attribute these shortcomings to the teacher scholar model. She reported that students sent out a survey concerning advising, the results of which will be released next year. Senator Young recommended that next year’s committee be charged to follow-up on this issue.

Senator Young next reported that, in response to the students’ expressed desire for stronger communication with faculty, each Student Relations Committee member attended at least one meeting of the Student House of Representatives to observe how students work in their own environment. They found these meetings to be efficient and professional.

Finally, Senator Young stated that the committee found that students had little concern about the new SPOT form since most of them don’t remember the old ones. She recommended this be removed from future charges to the committee and that it be taken up again in a couple years.

**Tenure, Promotion, Grievance Committee**

Senator Jack Hill reviewed the standing charges for this committee. He then explained that the committee worked principally on the specific charge to review the appropriateness of the Conflict Resolution Policy for disputes involving faculty and to propose changes making it applicable to faculty. The committee reviewed this document, consulted with Shari Barnes of Human Resources, and at the December Senate meeting, proposed revisions. The Senate approved the revisions. It was pointed out that this policy refers only to conflicts between individuals, and does not pertain to tenure and promotion issues. Senator Hill suggested that the committee should continue to reflect on the
mechanisms in the Handbook for dealing with grievances. He also acknowledged the work done on this charge by last year’s committee members.

**Faculty Governance Committee**

Senator Carolyn Cagle reviewed this committee’s first specific charge concerning the revisions and changes to the Faculty Assembly Constitution and By-laws, which were distributed to Senators. The second specific charge dealt with faculty service. The consensus of the committee was that service is still an important part of faculty performance at TCU. As a committee they bought into the idea of finding a way of measuring and evaluating service. It was her impression that this issue was passed to the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance committee earlier this year.

Senator Cagle next highlighted the committee’s recommendations regarding their third specific charge, which was to consider ways to increase the visibility, credibility, and effectiveness of the Senate. She pointed out the variety of ideas of the committee listed in the committee’s report. Senator Cagle explained that the committee explored the current Senate election process and worked to determine the optimal size of the Senate. In consultation with Assistant Secretary Rob Garnett, the committee reconsidered the number of Senators in relation to committee needs. Senator Cagle stated that the committee recommends that next year’s FGC examine this question and look at the number of committees and consider proposing new ones in order to improve the effectiveness of the Senate. The committee also discussed the “At large” positions in the Senate and questioned the need for this category.

Senator Cagle reported that the FGC carried out charges four (by helping draft the HMVV charter) and five (with the proposals on the offices of Historian and Parliamentarian). Finally, she reviewed the committee’s five suggestions for next year’s committee. She noted especially the suggestion that the Senate try to recover its home office in the Faculty Center in Reed Hall. Senator Ferrandino explained that the Executive Committee had mentioned this to the Chancellor, who is supportive of the idea of the Senate having a home office. The Chancellor assured us that there would be space when the student center is remodeled. Senator Cagle reviewed the other suggestions for next year’s FGC.

Chair Lahutsky acknowledged the large number of issues that the FGC has brought out. She commented on the difficulty of determining how certain matters should be handled, such as approving the new Core, due to needed updating of the Faculty Staff Handbook. She said she is considering having a summit on governance issues to review and update the Handbook during the month of May.

**Senate elections**

Senator Garnett distributed ballots for the election of representatives on the University Advisory Committee, the Budget Advisory Committee, and the slate of Senate officers for next year.
Senators were asked to vote for an AddRan Humanities representative to serve a three-year term on the University Advisory Committee. Senator Garnett read the list of current members of the Advisory Committee. The Senate elected Andy Fort (Religion) to this position.

The second ballot was for the members of the Budget Advisory Committee. Chair Lahutsky reminded Senators of how this new committee is being formed and who served on it this past year. Since Senator Gene Smith asked to be removed from the committee, the Senate needed to elect one new representative. Chair Lahutsky explained that the two people on the ballot had already expressed their willingness to serve. She opened the floor for other nominations. Senator Ferrandino noted that serving on the committee had been very fruitful and that he found it to be a very worthwhile service. There being no nominations from the floor, Senators were asked to cast their ballots. Stu Youngblood (Management) was elected to fill this position.

The third election was for the slate of new officers for the 2004-2005 Senate. Senator Lahutsky explained that Senator Rinewalt, Chair of the COC, and the Executive Committee had generated the proposed slate. Both she and Senator Rinewalt had called on possible candidates. The floor was opened for other nominations. The proposed slate was: Chair, Blaise Ferrandino; Chair-elect, Mags Rittby; Past-chair, Nadia Lahutsky; Secretary, Sharon Fairchild; Assistant Secretary, Rob Garnett. Senators were reminded that the Chair-elect has an automatic one-year term on the Budget Advisory Committee. There being no nominations from the floor, the slate was approved by acclamation.

**Announcements**

Senator Lahutsky asked Melissa Canady for a report on the FESSE survey recently administered to TCU faculty. Professor Canady stated that there had been a 43% response rate. The results of the survey will be obtained some time this summer and will be communicated to the Senate next fall. She also announced that gift certificates would be awarded to two people as a prize for participating in the survey.

Chair Lahutsky asked Director of Admissions Ray Brown to report on admissions news. He stated that there will be approximately 1600 freshmen and that they would be of very high quality.

The Chair next gave the floor to Provost Koehler. Dr. Koehler made a special presentation to Senator Andy Fort. He then delivered a statement to the Senate, which is attached to these minutes.

**Presentations**

Chair Lahutsky next presented Senator Ed McNertney a gift from the Senate to thank him for his many hours of work on the Core Implementation Committee. The Executive Committee then presented Chair Lahutsky with a gift from the Senate in thanks for her service. She then passed the gavel to the new Chair of the Faculty Senate, Senator Ferrandino.
The meeting was adjourned and Senators and guests were invited to stay for refreshments.

Respectfully submitted,
Sharon L. Fairchild

Addendum

Provost Koehler’s final remarks to the Faculty Senate
May 6, 2004

Colleagues, thank you for this moment of personal privilege, and special thanks to each and all for the wonderful gift of attending the Culinary Institute of America. You were right on target, as many of you know; cooking is one of the loves of my life. The experience will be memorable, and all the more so because you made it possible. My comments will be brief but not extemporaneous.

Someone once said, “The most important things I know are those that I learned after I knew everything.” This is probably where I am in my life. I have worked with you directly for over two decades. You have never betrayed a confidence and more importantly, you have taught me to trust you, the faculty. I am convinced that if you are given sufficient information, you collectively will make rational decisions that are in the best interest of TCU. And the Senate is in a position to do just that. I once read, “The most common way people give up their power is by thinking they don't have any.”

As I depart, I challenge the Senate to create opportunities and affirm the responsibility of leadership. Specifically:

- Continue to shoulder the responsibility of seeing that our students achieve,
- Assume the responsibility for the professional welfare of our colleagues, and
- Accept the responsibility for the ethical conduct of our profession.

With regard to student achievement, do not reject assessment; rather use the results of assessment to improve the educational experience of future students. Do not become fixated on the assessment of every student in every instructional setting. Find
ways to examine the learning of your class, your majors collectively, and find ways to
know if the new core is producing the results you want for the majority of students. At
times you will be advantaged by seeing the forest as a panorama rather than a collection
of trees.

As to the welfare of our colleagues, try to move beyond the almost meaningless
exercise in which we participate under the guise of post-tenure review. We need to do
post tenure review for the sake of our colleagues, not SACS. Take time to reflect on your
own professional interests. Do they not change with time? Throw away the cookie cutter
of teaching, research and service and find ways to weave the current interests and
enthusiasm of a colleague into the tapestry of departmental and university activities.
Help one another understand that each of us contributes in different ways at different
times in our career, and that’s okay. Use these differences constructively; do not penalize
colleagues for it.

We adopted the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. Have we implemented
it? I challenge you to deal with breeches of professional ethics in ways similar to those
used by the medical and legal professions.

Would it not be more appropriate for peers to review and sanction colleagues as
appropriate, than to leave such professional judgments to administrators? Why do we not
have a faculty ethics committee?

I know, without doubt, you, individually and collectively, can achieve meaningful
goals; accomplish great things that will significantly change this University for the better
forever. Just do it! Thanks for the memories!