

MAY 14 1985

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
2 May 1985

Present: B. Colquitt, Daniel, Giles-Sims, Jackson, Lawrence, Ludvigson, McWhorter, Paulus, S. Tucker, Waits, Wortham, Gouwens, Naff, Routt, Dominiak, Miller, Southard, Vanderhoof, Hodgson, Jurma, Persky, Curry, Hogstel, Payne, Coerver, Hensley, McNertney, Odom, Robinson, Schmidt.

Absent: Newsom, Cole, Forrer, Reuter, Murph, Oppenheimer, Knepper, Smith, Becker, L. Colquitt, Henley.

1. Minutes of April 4 meeting approved.

2. Addition to the Academic Conduct Policy. Don Jackson read the proposed addition to the Academic Conduct Policy and moved its acceptance. Motion seconded by Glenn Routt. After some discussion to clarify the intent of the proposed addition and one minor change, the following statement was approved:

**Computer Misuse** shall be defined also to include any unauthorized use of computer software or hardware through the TCU Computer Center or through any programs, terminals, or free-standing computers owned, leased, or operated by TCU or any of its academic units

3. Neil Daniel introduced the Senators newly elected or re-elected for three-year terms:

James Farrar, Religion Studies	Cherie Lohr, Education
Ken Morgan, Geology	Lisa Fusillo, Theatre/Dance
C.A. Quarles, Physics	Ruth Whitlock, Music
Frank Reuter, History	Willadean Williams, Nursing
Durwood Smith, Biology	Ken Lawrence, At Large
David Polk, Brite	Linda Moore, At Large
Dan French, Business	Bill Vanderhoof, At Large
Keith Odom, At Large, to fill unexpired term of Don Coerver	

4. Report of the ad hoc committee on summer stipends and adjunct faculty compensation. Priscilla Tate, Chair of the ad hoc committee, reported that the committee is using a survey to look at practices at other colleges and universities in our area and around Texas. The questionnaire asks what other schools pay their summer teachers and their part-time faculty and how the institutions arrive at their figures.

During the discussion several Senators mentioned other kinds of information they would like to have for comparison:

- \$ minimum enrollments for a summer course to "make"
- \$ compensation for lab courses as compared with lecture courses
- \$ ceiling on number of courses an individual faculty member can teach in a summer
- \$ upper limit on enrollment for summer courses
- \$ the university's contribution to retirement and other fringe benefits.

Tate said the committee will attempt to gather the information and look at it over the summer. The committee should have a report for the September meeting of the Senate. Don Jackson recommended that the matter be forwarded to the appropriate Senate committee or brought to the Senate floor for discussion in the fall.

5. Election of officers. The following were elected to serve for the 1985-86 academic year:

Chair, Ed McNertney  
Chair Elect, Neil Daniel  
Secretary, Betsy Colquitt  
Assistant Secretary, Rhonda Payne

6. Election for Faculty Budget Committee. The senate elected Dick Waits to serve on the Faculty Budget Committee, replacing John Wortham, whose term has expired.

7. New members for University Advisory Committee. In accordance with a Senate resolution at the December 1984 meeting, the University Advisory Committee has been expanded to eight members so as to allow representation of all schools and divisions. To accommodate the expansion and to fill an expired term, the Senate elected two representatives to the University Advisory Committee: Jean Giles-Sims, Sociology, and David Minter, Geology.

8. Don Jackson read a report from Steve Cole, Chair of the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees has asked that the University Energy Committee continue for one more year and that it be charged to examine whether it should continue after next year.

The ad hoc Committee on Alcohol Awareness has requested that a standing university committee on alcohol awareness be established. The Committee on Committees does not endorse the recommendation of the ad hoc committee. Jackson recommended that the matter be referred back to the Committee on Committees to be acted on next year.

9. A note from Senator Gere Dominiak pointed out that the spring examination schedule includes a conflict--two class periods scheduled for examinations at the same time. Dominiak has asked that the matter of scheduling be taken up with the Registrar's office. The letter was forwarded to McNertney for action next year.

Minutes, 2 May 85

Page 3

10. Speaking on behalf of the Faculty Senate, Ed McNertney thanked Don Jackson for a good Senate year.

11. Adjournment, 4:15 p.m.

Neil Daniel  
Secretary



TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY  
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

Faculty Senate

Mrs. Rebecca S. Roach  
Academic Affairs  
30788  
00000

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
4 April 1985

Present: Cole, B. Colquitt, Daniel, Giles-Sims, Jackson, Ludvigson, McWhorter, Paulus, Reuter, S. Tucker, Waits, Wortham, Gouwens, Naff, Routt, Miller, Southard, Vanderhoof, Hodgson, Knepper, Curry, Payne, Becker, Coerver, L. Colquitt, Henley, McNertney, Schmidt.

Absent: Newsom, Forrer, Lawrence, Dominiak, Murph, Oppenheimer, Jurma, Persky, Smith, Hogstel, Hensley, Odom, Robinson.

1. Call to order, 3:30 p.m.

2. Don Jackson reminded the senators of the meeting of the Faculty Assembly, April 16, 1985, at 4:00 p.m. in the Moudy Building, room 141 N. Vice Chancellor Koehler will be present to address the following agenda:

- Brief report on the Trustees meeting
- Current status of core curriculum revision
- Impact of federal and state budget cuts on financial aid
- Status report on admissions for 1985-86
- Status report on faculty evaluation procedures

3. Report of the Committee on the Role and Function of the Senate, Daryl Schmidt. Schmidt reminded the Senate that in response to a 1984 Senate resolution, the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs have attended meetings of the Faculty Senate only when invited by the Executive Committee. The Committee on Role and Function was charged to consider the effect of the experiment and to offer a resolution on whether the practice should be formalized with a change in their ex officio membership.

The Committee proposed an amendment to the constitution in two parts: (1) amending ARTICLE II, Section 2. Membership, to remove the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor from ex officio membership, and (2) amending ARTICLE II, Section 5. Meetings, to remove the Chancellor's and Vice Chancellor's right to call special meetings of the Senate. The committee offered the amendment as a basis for discussion, but without endorsement.

After some discussion and minor changes in the wording of the amendments, the Senate voted to present the amendments of the Constitution of the Faculty Assembly for a vote, by mail ballot, of the Faculty Assembly. The amendments were

to be presented to the Faculty Assembly separately from the minutes of the April 4 meeting.

4. Approval of the minutes of the Senate meeting 7 March 1985.

5. Report on the composition of an ad hoc committee to study summer teaching stipends and adjunct faculty compensation, Don Jackson. The committee includes Priscilla Tate (AddRan) as Chair, Fred Erisman (English), Don Nichols (Business), Dan French (Business), and Charles FALK (Continuing Education) ex officio. The committee has been asked to report to the Faculty Senate at the May meeting.

6. Report of the University Committee on the university's contribution to the retirement of faculty members who continue to teach full time after age 65, Don Jackson reporting for Floyd Durham. Jackson explained that faculty members are permitted by law to teach from age 65 until age 70, but the university's contribution to retirement stops when the faculty member reaches age 65. The university is within the law to end its contribution at that time, but the result is a significant reduction of income for the faculty members. Jackson pointed out that if the university were to continue the fringe benefits to faculty members between ages 65 and 70, the money would necessarily come out of the pool of funds available for salaries of other faculty members.

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.

7. 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."

8. Report of the Senate Committee on Committees, Steve Cole. Cole presented a list of persons for the Senate to recommend for addition to the University Committees for 1985-86. The Senate approved the list to be forwarded to the Chancellor for action.

Cole reported that the Committee on Energy, inactive in recent years, is now meeting to decide whether the committee should be continued or dissolved.

Cole presented the Committee's list of nominations for officers of the Faculty Senate, double-slated in each position except that of Chair. The floor was opened for additional nominations. There being none, the following slate was accepted by acclamation:

Chair	Ed McNertney
Chair Designate	Neil Daniel
	Spencer Tucker
Secretary	Betsy Colquitt
	Etta Miller
Assist. Secretary	Peter Hodgson
	Rhonda Payne

The election of officers will be at the May meeting of the Senate.

#### New Business

9. Charles Becker offered observations on the question addressed by the Chancellor at the March meeting of the Faculty Senate. Becker thanked McNertney and Jackson for representing his views on ethical considerations related to the university's investments. He went on to say that no study exists, academic or professional, that adequately measures "social responsibility of investments." In Becker's opinion "socially responsible" firms have a long record of inherent inefficiency, which would impact the university's rate of return on its investment portfolio. Becker concluded by saying that he was disappointed to have his recommendation for an investment committee turned down. He feels that additional input might be helpful.

10. Ed McNertney reported on a matter raised by Vice Chancellor Koehler at a meeting with the Executive Committee of the Senate. Koehler would like to take to the University Council a statement on illegal use of computers in academic matters, to be incorporated in the Academic Conduct Policy. Koehler has asked the Senate to propose such a statement. The Senate Executive Committee will draft a statement for action at the May meeting.

11. Adjournment, 4:30 p.m.  
Neil Daniel  
Secretary



TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY  
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

Faculty Senate

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
7 March 1985

Present: W. Tucker, Newsom, Cole, B. Colquitt, Daniel, Forrer, Giles-Sims, Jackson, Lawrence, Ludvigson, Paulus, Reuter, S. Tucker, Waits, Wortham, Gouwens, Routt, Murph, Miller, Southard, Vanderhoof, Hodgson, Jurma, Knepper, Persky, Smith, Curry, Hogstel, Payne, Coerver, L. Conquitt, Henley, Hensley, McNertney, Robinson, Schmidt.

Absent Koehler, McWhorter, Naff, Dominiak, Oppenheimer, Becker, Odom.

1. Call to order, 3:35 p.m.
2. Approval of minutes of Senate meeting, 7 February 1985.
3. Betsy Colquitt, for the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievances, presented the revisions of the Grievance document approved by the Senate in March, 1984. Colquitt moved the adoption of the revisions first distributed at the February meeting, 1985. The motion was seconded. After a brief discussion of the revisions, centered particularly on the phrase "on their own behalf" (revision of Section II Applicability, paragraph A), the motion carried on a voice vote. [Copy of revisions attached.]
4. Question for the Chancellor. Don Jackson read the question for the Chancellor distributed with the minutes of the February Senate meeting. The question had to do with monitoring TCU's investment portfolio with an eye to the social and ethical impact of our investments. The Chancellor's answer made the point that he does not agree with the principle of divestiture as an instrument to achieve social ends. The negatives outweigh the positives in such a policy. To churn the portfolio would be costly and would provide disincentives for potential donors, who would regard it as imprudent fiscal policy. Moreover, social issues change, and it would be difficult either to remain responsive to changing issues or to achieve consensus on social and ethical priorities. The Chancellor pledged to continue to work for social change, but insisted he will not use TCU's endowment as an instrument for change.

In follow-up questions Sanoa Hensley asked about the management of TCU's endowment. Chancellor Tucker explained that TCU is increasing and diversifying the management of the endowment. Ed McNertney brought a question from Charles Becker, who could

not be present, asking if it is possible to have an advisory committee, including faculty members, to monitor the management of TCU's portfolio. The Chancellor does not approve of such a course. The task is too large and too complex for the TCU faculty or administration to take on. Asked by Daryl Schmidt if we publish a list of our holding, the Chancellor responded that the information is available to the University Budget Committee, but is not published widely.

5. Executive Session: consideration of nominations for Honorary Degrees.

6. Doug Newsom introduced a tentative plan to develop an association of independent scholars who might chose to affiliate with the university in some informal structure. She explained that the Senate Executive Committee has prepared a list of potential benefits for such affiliated scholars, now being reviewed by the Chancellor. The fiscal implications require study. The Executive Committee will soon bring a proposal to the Faculty Senate.

7. Don Jackson raised the issue of participation in commencements, convocations, and other formal faculty occasions. The university has no formal policy on who may participate. Part of the motive for establishing guidelines for participation in such events is that participation might increase if eligibility were clearly defined. Jackson outlined some possible criteria: university staff members might be included by virtue of their position on the staff, or we might establish level of completed education as a condition of participation. The Faculty Senate is in a position to recommend whatever criteria it likes. In follow-up discussion there was general agreement that it is in the best interest of the faculty to police itself on the matter of participation in academic convocations and processions.

8. Bill Jurma reported for the Executive Committee on the results of his investigation of professional liability insurance. The university has an indemnification policy that the administration feels is well-motivated and adequate. Liability insurance is available from a number of risk management agencies, but is costly. The best buy in professional liability for professors is offered through AAUP, which offers \$500,000 coverage for about \$30 over the cost of AAUP membership.

9. Don Jackson introduced the Executive Committee's intention to discontinue listing the University-Wide Teacher Education Committee as a university committee in the Faculty/Staff Handbook. According to Steve Cole, Chair of the Committee on Committees, the committee in question has for years been constituted and appointed by the School of Education, not by the Committee on Committees. Jackson offered to set the matter straight in time for the next edition of the Handbook.

10. Daryl Schmidt presented the report of the Committee on



the Role and Function of the Senate. Charged with investigating the consequences of the policy that allows senators to succeed themselves, the Committee on Role and Function recommends no change in policy. [Committee report attached.]

11. 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.

12. Adjournment, 4:55 p.m.

Neil Daniel  
Secretary

Attachments:

Revisions of the Grievance Policy  
Report of the Senate Committee on Role and Function of  
the Senate

Faculty Senate Committee on the Role and Function of the Senate  
REPORT TO THE SENATE ON CONSECUTIVE RE-ELECTION OF SENATORS

March 7, 1985

Re-election data since 1978-79, when Senate terms were 2 years.

1979. 21 Senate terms expired, none re-elected.

1980. 17 terms expired, 3 re-elected.

In 1981 the Senate increased terms to three years and expanded from 38 to 42 members.

1981. 21 terms expired (all elected new 2 yr earlier), 8 re-elected (all 8 elected to 3 yr terms, none re-elected 3 years later).

1982. 8 terms expired, 5 re-elected (only one had been previously re-elected).

1983. 13 terms expired, 5 re-elected (1 previously re-elected).

1984. 13 terms expired and 3 resigned, 2 re-elected (neither to the college seat, but at-large).

If these yearly reconstructions are correct, only two current senators have been elected to more than two consecutive terms.

The sentiment of our committee is, "If it's not broke, don't fix it." Apparently the current practices of (1) determining "willingness to serve," (2) requiring resignation for any term of leave or sabbatical, and (3) maintaining attendance records, with absences published at the end of each semester, have provided sufficient turn-over in the Senate roster that no restriction limiting consecutive re-election is needed.

Submitted,

(signed)  
Daryl Schmidt, Chair

[revised and edited, ND]

Revision 1: Purpose and Applicability sections

From Grievance Policy passed 3/1/84

I. Purpose

This document provides procedures for investigating grievance~~s~~ lodged by members of the faculty of Texas Christian University, and if an injustice is established, for recommending equitable redress for the grievant.

II. Applicability

A. Persons who may lodge a grievance 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 budgets 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.

Revision of Purpose/Applicability sections--2/5/85

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.

II. Applicability

A. As defined in the current TCU Faculty/University Staff Handbook (for 1984-85, 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 teaching/research 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.

Revision 2: Section 5, page 9 of original document, concerning Chancellor's receiving of the recommendations on the handling of the grievance.

From Grievance Policy passed 3/1/84

5. As soon as the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designated agent\* receives a report of a moral grievance, the Chancellor 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/

Revision of Section 5--2/5/84

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/

Note: the \* refers to the following note, in which there is no proposed revision:

\*Further reference to the Chancellor in this section is understood to include the phrase "or the Chancellor's designated agent."

Dr William H Koehler  
Academic Affairs, VC  
30788  
00000



MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
7 FEBRUARY 1985

Present: Newsom, Cole, Daniel, Forrer, Giles-Sims, Jackson, Lawrence, Ludvigson, McWhorter, Paulus, S. Tucker, Waits, Wortham, Gouwens, Naff, Routt, Dominiak, Murph, Miller, Jurma, Smith, Curry, Hogstel, Payne, Becker, Coerver, L. Conquitt, Henley, Hensley, McNertney, Odom, Robinson, Schmidt.

Absent: B. Colquitt, Reuter, Oppenheimer, Southard, Vanderhoof, Hodgson, Knepper, Persky.

Guests: Libby Proffer and Carol Adcock, Student Life; Jack Larson and Sarah Smith, Student House of Representatives

Call to order by Chair Don Jackson at 3:30 p.m.

The Minutes of the Senate Meeting, 6 December 1984, were approved as distributed.

Report of the Senate Committee on Student Relations. Pat Paulus, Chair of the Committee corrected the information on the calendar included with the committee's report and distributed with the Agenda. Plan II on the calendar, as originally distributed, had Classes End on Wed., Dec. 10, 10:00 p.m., and Study Day on Thur., Dec. 11.

As corrected, Plan II should show Classes End, Tues., Dec. 9, 10:00 p.m., Study Days, Wed., Dec. 10 and Thur., Dec. 11.

As discussion on the proposal got underway, Sarah Smith, Immediate Past President of the Student House, took the floor to explain the benefits and drawbacks of the various plans as the students perceive them.

Plan III is the Deans' proposal. Its principal features are no fall break in October, extension of the Thanksgiving break to include Wednesday before Thanksgiving, and starting final exams on Friday, December 12. Smith explained that the students oppose the extra day at Thanksgiving. They feel it is an irresistible invitation to students to take a full week off. Moving final exam week one day earlier, she explained, represents a decision by the Council of Deans and is not negotiable.

Plan I is the option favored by the students. Plan I would entail converting the MWF/TR distribution of classes to a Monday-Thursday, Tuesday-Friday schedule, with class length adjusted to 1:15 hours all days. Wednesdays would be reserved for committee meetings, guest lectures, convocations, and the like. The regularized

Minutes

7 February 1985

Page 2

Wednesdays off would alleviate the need for a fall semester break and for study days as well. The students acknowledge that this radical adjustment of class schedules will find objections and will take time. They hope for implementation later than the fall of 1986 and argue for Plan II as an interim plan.

Plan II is similar to Plan III in preserving the weekly schedule of classes unchanged. It would institute a Fall Semester Break (a three day weekend) some time around October 17. It would not add to the Thanksgiving Break except by eliminating evening classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

Paulus moved the adoption of Plan I as a long-term plan with Plan II to serve as an interim calendar for academic 1986-87. The motion was seconded by Becker. At the suggestion of Giles-Sims, the motion was divided.

Motion 1. The Senate approves Plan I as a subject for study with respect to the feasibility of its implementation. AS later amended, the motion includes a request that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Faculty Senate, and the Student House of Representatives consult and name a committee to study the plan. On a division of the house, the motion carried 20-4.

Motion 2. The Senate approves the Plan II calendar to be implemented for the fall semester, 1986, as an interim plan until the deliberations on Plan I are concluded. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Excellence. In the absence of Chair Frank Reuter, Committee Member Keith Odom moved that the Report of the Committee on Academic Excellence, presented to the Senate at its December 6 meeting, be approved by the Senate and forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

In the discussion of the motion Daniel raised questions about proficiency examinations mentioned in the Report of the Core Curriculum Revision Committee and implicitly accepted in Paragraph 5 of the Report of the Committee on Academic Excellence. Daniel moved that the second sentence of Paragraph 5 be stricken from the report. Motion seconded by Wortham. Motion defeated. Dick Waits moved to amend the report by changing the second sentence of Paragraph 5 to read: An alternative to proficiency examinations should be used as a means of assessing students' writing skills. Paulus seconded. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Following discussion of other points in the report, the Senate voted to approve the Report of the Committee on Academic Excellence as amended and to forward the report to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Minutes  
7 February 1985  
Page 3

The Chair suspended the agenda to introduce two reports of importance.

John Wortham distributed the Faculty Budget Committee Report on Faculty Compensation at TCU, 1983-84. In remarks on the report, Wortham pointed to the conclusions of the committee, that 1983-84 was a good year for TCU in that we moved up in relation to other universities and in real income, but that we slipped back some in 1984-85. The report has been forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Finance. It is attached to the minutes for distribution to the faculty.

Neil Daniel distributed the Report of the Senate Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievances. The report and the recommendations of the committee regarding changes in the proposed grievance document will be placed on the agenda for March 7.

Announcements.

Don Jackson reminded the Senators that February 15 is the deadline for faculty nominations for Honorary Degrees.

Chancellor Tucker will attend the March 7 Senate meeting. The Chancellor will be on hand to consider nominations for Honorary Degrees and to answer a question submitted by mail to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee [attached].

Deferred to the March meeting as well is the matter held over from the February agenda: participation by University Staff members in university convocations and academic processions.

Adjournment at 5:00 p.m.

Neil Daniel  
Secretary

## QUESTION FOR THE CHANCELLOR

Submitted by a Faculty Member to the Faculty Senate

Now that TCU's endowment has grown into major money which is, to my understanding, managed off campus, I would like to ask if there is anyone on campus or off, monitoring our investment portfolio from an ethical perspective. It seems to me, that, with the size of TCU's endowment, we need to be sensitive to the social and ethical impact of our investments, so that we do not find ourselves unwittingly owning diamond mines in South Africa, running guns in Central America, manufacturing napalm, etc.



FACULTY COMPENSATION AT TCU  
1983-84  
FACULTY BUDGET COMMITTEE

Joe Helmick and John Wortham\*

This is the fourth annual report on Faculty Compensation at TCU. Two points should be kept in mind as one reviews the analysis of these data. (1) This report primarily deals with 1983-1984 data. AAUP data for salaries for 1984-1985, i.e., current compensation, will not become available until September 1985. Therefore, comparisons between current salaries at TCU and those of other universities are presented in an abbreviated fashion based on a sample of 1866 faculty members (Chronicle, December, 1984). (2) Since the AAUP has changed the way it presents compensation data, more emphasis will be given to salary data than that of total compensation. However, since fringe benefits have constituted a stable percentage of the total compensation--18 to 20 percent, the analysis of the data allows comparable conclusions to be drawn.

The major source of data for this report is the Academic Bulletin of the AAUP. Definitions of categories of schools are those developed by the American Association of University Professors.

To evaluate the status of faculty compensation, one needs to identify the goals considered by the Administration and the Faculty Budget Committee in their discussion concerning faculty salaries.

These goals are as follows:

1. To maintain the long-run fiscal soundness of the University.
2. To improve the real income of the faculty.
3. To keep compensation competitive with comparable universities.
4. To treat all faculty on an equitable basis regardless of sex, age, race or rank.

\*The authors assume the responsibility for errors occurring in this report.

Discussion of the first goal lies beyond the scope of this report. The administration however, has reported that the financial status of TCU is quite good. Available data tend to confirm this evaluation.

The focus of this report will concentrate on the objectives of increases in real income, maintenance of a competitive posture and the achievement of equity in the salary distribution.

#### I. Real Income of Faculty

Table I presents the average compensation of faculty at TCU and at other category I schools in Texas from 1970-71 to 1983-84. Although average compensation at TCU increased 195 percent during this period of time, real income increased by only 21.3 percent or an average of 1.63 percent per year. Real income for the United States as measured by personal income expressed in constant dollars increased 32 per cent from 1970 to 1984.

A review of the change in compensation of TCU faculty expressed in 1978 dollars (See Table II) from 1978-79 to 1982-83 reveals that real income remained almost constant. The increase in compensation was very close to the change in prices as measured by the Consumer Price Index. However, financially, the academic year 1983-84 was a very good one for the faculty of TCU. An increase of 12.9 percent occurred in real income. Average compensation expressed in current dollars increased 15.3 percent while prices rose only 3.8 percent.

#### II. Competitiveness of TCU's Compensation

Tables III, IV, VIII and XI contrast the compensation of the faculty at TCU with those of US Category I Universities, Texas Category I schools, and local prestigious universities with Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi

chapters. In 1982-83, AAUP redefined the Category I Schools in the following way:

Category I (Doctoral-Level Institutions). These are institutions characterized by a significant level and breadth of activity in and commitment to a doctoral-level education as measured by the number of doctorate recipients and the diversity in doctoral-level program offerings. Included in this category are those institutions that are not considered specialized schools and which grant a minimum of thirty doctoral-level degrees. These degrees must be granted in three or more doctoral-level programs at the doctoral level.

In the 1983-84 AAUP Annual Report, TCU is listed as a Category I school. Three schools in Texas formerly listed in this category were changed to Category IIA--East Texas State University, Texas Southern University and the University of Dallas. The total number of category I schools in the United States dropped from 201 in 1981-82 to 163 in 1983-84.

Table I presents the average compensation of the eleven Category I schools in Texas from 1970-71 to 1983-84. Although TCU compensation is still below the mean of these 11 schools by \$1,900, 'a giant step has been made to narrow the gap. In 1982-83, the difference was \$4400.

From 1982-83 to 1983-84, average compensation of Texas Category I schools in constant dollars increased 3.7 percent while the real income of TCU faculty increased 12.9 percent (See Table II).

In 1982-83 when TCU's average compensation was ranked against the other Category I Texas schools, TCU ranked eleventh out of eleven schools. In 1983-84, TCU's rank had changed to eighth. (Table III)

To provide an overview of TCU's compensation relative to other universities, an index is constructed using TCU's salaries as a base. (See Table V). In 1970-71, TCU's average faculty salary was 83 percent of that for the Texas Category I schools. In 1983-84, the index had increased to 96 percent.

Past reports compared TCU's compensation to that of faculty of universities in Texas and adjoining states that have chapters of Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi. This comparison's group was called "Local Distinguished Universities" or LDU. This category is comprised of the following nine schools: University of Arkansas, University of New Mexico, University of Oklahoma, University of Texas at Austin, Baylor, Rice, Southern Methodist University, Tulane, and Texas Christian University. Average compensation of faculty for this group in 1983-84 was \$38,100, which is \$2,500 below the average compensation for all U.S. Category I schools with Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi chapters. TCU's average compensation is \$1,200 below the mean of the LDU faculties or 96.9 percent of that average. (See Table IV)

Of the nine universities in the LDU category, TCU's compensation ranked ninth in 1981-82. In 1983-84, TCU ranked fifth. Rice, SMU, UT-Austin, and Tulane all have higher compensation.

In 1983-84 TCU's salaries were 95 percent of those U.S. Category I schools (See Table V) as compared to 87 percent in 1982-83. Of the 163 Category I schools in the United States, TCU's salaries ranked 97th as compared to 142nd in 1982-83. (See Table XII)

In 1981-82 only one percent of the Category I schools in the United States had compensation below that at TCU. By 1983-84, TCU's compensation had reached the 12th percentile. Even greater improvement occurred in 1983-84 when compensation ranking reached the 40th percentile (See Table XIII).

Another useful procedure for rating salaries of a university is to determine the percentile of the distribution of salaries in which that particular school falls. Table VI, gives the 95th, 80th, 60th, 40th, and the 20 percentiles for the four professional ranks. Also presented in Table VI are the ratings from 1 to 5 assigned various ranks by the American Association of University Professors. Comparing TCU's compensation as presented in Table I, with the percentiles in Table VI revealed that the TCU salaries for TCU Professors and Associate Professors fall above the 40th percentile and are ranked "3." Assistant Professors are ranked "2" while Instructors are ranked "1." This ranking represents a significant improvement from 1982-83 when all ranks except Instructors were ranked "4." Instructors' salaries were ranked "3" in 1982-83.

Compensation comprises salaries plus fringe benefits. Benefits consist of tuition benefits, retirement, social security, health insurance contributions, and unemployment and Workmen's Compensation. In 1982-83, total benefits were 19.9 per cent of salaries. One year later, the ratio had increased to 20.5 percent. The dollar amount of the increase was approximately \$350,000. Most of this increase was in social security and retirement contributions. Due to change in the method by which fringe benefits are computed, data in Table VIII are not comparable to those appearing in earlier reports.

Table VIII presents benefits as a percentage of salaries for all Category I schools in Texas. TCU ranked fourth of the eleven schools on which data were available in the 1983-84 academic year.

A review of the data in Table VIII raises several questions. Why was there no change in the ratios of benefits to salaries at Baylor, North Texas State University, UT-Austin, and UT-Dallas? Surely the costs of Social Security and Workmen's Compensation increased

at these institutions. What caused the decrease in the ratios at Texas Tech University, Texas Women's University and Texas A&M? These institutions must have had increases in Social Security and Workmen's Compensation costs. Before any significance is given to the shifts in ranking of Category I Texas schools, the above questions need to be resolved.

### III. Salary Distribution Relative to Sex and Academic Rank

The third objective to be considered in this report examines the distribution of salaries for inequities on the basis of sex or professional ranks.

Tables IX and X present salary data for women at TCU and for Texas Category I schools. At TCU, women's salaries as a percentage of those for men increased only slightly in all ranks from 1982-83 to 1983-84. For example the change for Professors was from 90.8 to 91.1.

A comparison of women's salaries at TCU to those of women of Category I schools in Texas revealed that women's professor salaries were 97 percent of the average in 1983-84, or a salary gap of \$1,200. In 1982-83 the ratio was 90 percent with a gap of \$3,500.

The relationship between men's and women's salaries at TCU is about the same as that which exists at all U.S. Category I schools (See Table IX & X).

Tables V and XI provide data for evaluating the relationship between the salaries at various professional ranks at TCU. Average Professor's salaries at TCU in 1982-83 were 90 percent of all U.S. Category I Professors' salaries. In 1983-84 the relative relationship had improved to 97 percent while Associate Professors' salaries had an 8 percent change from 91 to 99 percent. Assistant Professors' salaries shifted from 92 to 101. TCU Instructors' salaries continued to register a higher than national average pay scale. They were 15 percent above the Category I schools Instructors' salaries in 1983-84.

Although all TCU ranks showed dramatic percentage increases in 1983-84, when compared to the relative increases in compensation in Category I schools, the discrepancies between the ranks continues to exist. If the goal to reduce these discrepancies is to be achieved the average increase for Professor ranks must exceed the increases going to other ranks (See Table XI).

#### IV. Summary and Conclusions

TCU made significant progress in 1983-84 in closing the gap between its faculty compensation and that of Category I schools' average compensation. In current dollars, TCU's average compensation increased 16.8 percent while income in constant dollars increased 12.9 percent. From 1970-71 to 1983-84, compensation in constant dollars has increased 21.3 percent or about 1.63 percent per year.

Although the average salaries of Texas Category I schools increased only 6.6 percent from 1982-83 to 1983-84, they are still \$1,900 above those at TCU. Among the 11 Category I schools in Texas, TCU compensation ranks eighth. North Texas State University, Texas Women's University and Baylor have lower salaries.

All faculty ranks at TCU are above the 40th percentile of all U.S. Category I schools. Assistant Professors' salaries are above the 60th percentile.

When TCU salaries are contrasted with those of LDU, they are 98 percent of the latter's salaries, or \$1,200 below them.

TCU fringe benefits are above the average of those of all Category I schools in the United States. In 1983-84 they were 20.5 percent of salaries.

Although the gap between the salaries of TCU women and those of Texas Category I schools has narrowed, their salaries are still below those for men. A slight improvement toward closing this gap occurred in 1983-84. The reduction of this gap was not a stated goal of the TCU administration for 1983-84.

The discrepancies between the ranks of faculty salaries continues to exist. If this difference is to be reduced, Professor salaries need to be increased at a higher rate than the increase going to the other ranks. The elimination of this discrepancy was a stated goal of the TCU administration for 1983-84.

Although the primary purpose of this report is to update the salary surveys for the year 1983-84 because TCU data for 1984-85 are available, and the results of a survey by the Chronicle have just been published, a brief review of this information is presented.

In 1984-85 the average TCU faculty salaries increased 5.4 percent while total compensation which includes social security and retirement contributions, increased 5.9 percent. Real income increased by 1.4 percent.

The survey of faculty salaries of Ph.D. granting institutions published by the Chronicle, December, 1984, suggests that U.S. average salaries increased approximately 7.3 percent in 1984-85. Such an increase is almost two percent above that received by TCU faculty. The sampling error of the survey of 1866 faculty members would appear to be about 1 percent. Thus the actual increase in salaries might range from 6.1 to 8.5 percent. Such an increase will reduce some of the gain that occurred at TCU in 1983-84. If TCU salaries are to be competitive with those universities with which TCU would like to be compared, then salary increases must equal or exceed those occurring at Local Distinguished Universities. The evidence suggests that TCU has lost ground. A decline in relative standing has occurred.



Table I

Average Compensation, All Academic Ranks,  
Texas Category I Schools, Selected Years  
(Thousands of Dollars)

School	1970-71	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
Baylor		24.1	26.7	28.0	31.7	34.2	36.3
NTSU	14.7	25.1	26.8	27.6	32.4	34.9	36.4
Rice	17.3	27.1	29.7	32.3	36.8	40.6	44.0
SMU	14.4	23.9	26.1	28.4	32.2	36.6	41.8
TCU	12.5	21.7	22.3	24.4	27.8	32.0	36.9
T - A&M	15.3	25.6	27.9	30.6	36.9	40.0	39.8
TTU	14.6	24.0	24.9	26.5	31.0	36.3	37.5
TWU	14.3	22.1	23.3	25.8	29.2	31.8	33.1
U of H	15.3	24.6	28.6	31.2	35.7	39.1	40.8
UT - Austin	17.2	26.5	28.8	30.6	36.0	39.3	41.1
UT - Dallas					28.5	36.0	38.7
Average (mean)	15.1	23.6	26.0	27.6	31.9	36.4	38.8
Median	14.7	24.05	26.4	27.8	31.95	36.3	38.7
TCU as % of Ave.	83	92	86	88	87	87	95.1
TCU below Ave.				3200	4100	4400	1900

TABLE II

Average Compensation in Current and 1978 Dollars  
For TCU and Texas Category I Schools  
1970/71, 1978/79 - 1983/84

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>TCU</u>		<u>Average Texas Category I Schools</u>	
	<u>Current Dollars</u>	<u>1978 Dollars</u>	<u>Current Dollars</u>	<u>1978 Dollars</u>
1970/71	\$12.5	\$20.2	\$15.1	\$24.5
1978/79	21.7	21.7	23.6	23.6
1979/80	22.3	20.0	26.0	23.4
1980/81	24.4	19.3	27.6	21.9
1981/82	27.8	19.9	31.9	22.9
1982/83	32.0	21.7	36.4	24.6
1983/84	36.9	24.5	38.8	25.5
<hr/>				
% Change 1978/79 thru 1983/84	70.0	12.9	64.4	8.0
<hr/>				

SOURCE: Bureau of Labor Statistics  
AAUP Bulletin

TABLE III

Average Salaries, Texas Category I Schools  
1983/84 (Thousands of Dollars)

<u>School</u>	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Assoc. Prof.</u>	<u>Assis. Prof.</u>	<u>Instr.</u>	<u>AS*</u>	<u>AC**</u>	<u>Order</u>	<u>% 1982/83 1983/84</u>
Rice	45.4	33.3	26.0	23.7	38.1	44.0	1	8.4
SMU	44.7	31.4	25.5	NG	35.1	41.8	2	14.2
UT-Austin	44.0	30.6	26.2	18.4	34.3	41.1	3	4.6
U of Houston	43.3	30.9	25.7	20.4	33.7	40.8	4	4.3
Texas A&M	42.1	33.2	27.5	19.1	33.1	39.8	5	(.5)
UT-Dallas	43.3	31.0	34.8	NG	32.4	38.7	6	7.5
TTU	39.5	30.2	24.6	16.9	31.1	37.5	7	3.3
TCU	40.2	30.5	25.0	21.7	30.6	36.9	8	15.3
NTSU	36.8	29.5	25.4	21.7	30.3	36.4	9	4.3
Baylor	39.6	29.8	25.8	20.3	29.5	36.3	10	6.1
TWU	36.8	30.4	24.1	21.5	27.6	33.1	11	4.1
<hr/>								
Average	41.4	30.94	25.5	20.4	32.4	38.8		6.6
TCU as % of Average	97.1	98.6	98.0	106.4	94.4	95.1		
<hr/>								

\*Average Salaries

\*\*Average Compensation

TABLE IV

Compensation and Rank of Compensation in the United States  
of "Local Distinguished Universities"  
i.e., Category I Schools Having Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi  
in Texas and Contiguous States  
1983/84

<u>State</u>	<u>School</u>	<u>Compensation</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>Rank of Comp. in US</u> <sup>b</sup>	<u>Rank Among "LDU"</u>
Arkansas	U. of Arkansas	33.0	146	9
Louisiana	Tulane	37.4	92	4
New Mexico	U. of New Mexico	34.1	134	8
Oklahoma	U. of Oklahoma	36.8	100	6
Texas	Baylor	36.3	108	7
	Rice	44.0	29	1
	SMU	41.8	44	2
	TCU	36.9	97	5
	UT Austin	41.1	50	3
Average		38.1		
Median		36.9		
TCU % of Average		96.9		

<sup>a</sup>Compensation is reported in thousands of dollars

<sup>b</sup>Ranking is among Category I schools in the United States

TABLE V

TCU's Average Salaries as a Percentage of Selected  
Comparison Values for 1970/71, 1981/82, 1982/83 and 1983/84

<u>Comparison Value</u>	<u>Percentage</u>				
	1970/71	1981/82	1982/83	1983/84	
Texas Category I	83	87	87	96	
Top School's Average Compensation, Texas Category I	72	75	78	91	
Average of LDU excluding TCU	85	86	88	98	
Median Compensation, US Category I	--	85	87	95	
Average Compensation, US Category I Church Related	--	88	89	96	
Average Compensation, US Category I having PBK and SX	--	79	83	92	
-----					
	<u>PR</u>	<u>AO</u>	<u>AI</u>	<u>IN</u>	<u>AR</u>
TCU	40.2	30.5	25.0	21.7	30.6
All Category I	41.4	30.1	24.8	18.8	32.7
Category I Church Related	41.7	31.2	25.4	21.7	32.1
-----					
TCU as % of mean of all Category I	70/71	81/82	82/83	83/84	
PR	71	84	90	97	
AO	81	86	91	99	
AI	82	88	92	101	
IN	80	95	101	115	
-----					
TCU as % of mean of all Category I Church Related					
PR			91	96	
AO			90	98	
AI			93	98	
IN			93	100	

TABLE VI

Percentiles of the Distributions of Institutions by Average Salary  
Category I  
1983/84

Rating <sup>1</sup>	1*	1	2	3	4
Percentiles:	95	80	60	40	20
Professor	\$50,350	45,110	41,400	39,130	36,460
Associate	34,830	32,550	30,600	29,290	27,640
Assistant	28,470	25,920	25,040	24,220	23,060
Instructor	23,750	21,560	19,840	18,770	17,320

<sup>1</sup> Interpretation of the Ratings: Compensations lower than the 20th percentile are rated 5; those above the 20th percentile but below the 40th are rated 4, etc. For example, an average salary of \$38,000 for the rank of full professor in a Category I school would be rated 4 because it is greater than the 20th percentile but less than the 40th.

TABLE VII

1983/84 Rating of TCU by Average Salaries

PR	AO	AI	IN
3	3	2	1

TABLE VIII

Benefits as a Percentage of Salary  
 Texas Category I Schools  
 and All US Schools with Professorial Ranks  
 1981/82, 1982/83, 1983/84\*

School	Benefits (% of Salary)			
	<u>Rank</u>	<u>1981/82</u>	<u>1982/83</u>	<u>1983/84</u>
Baylor	1	23	23	23
NTSU	5	20	20	20
Rice	11	15	15	16
SMU	10	14	15	19
Texas A&M	5	20	21	20
TCU	4	18	19.9	20.5
TTU	2	--	23	21
TWU	5	19	21	20
U. of Houston	2	20	20	21
UT--Austin	5	20	20	20
UT--Dallas	5	21	20	20
<hr/>				
Average, Texas Category I		18.8	19.6	20.0
Median, Texas Category I		20.2	20.0	20.0
<hr/>				
All of USA		19.3	19.4	19.9
<hr/>				

\*Due to the change in method by which fringe benefits are computed data presented in this table are not comparable to those appearing in earlier reports.

TABLE IX

Average Salary by Rank for Women Faculty as a Percentage of Average Salary for Men Faculty, for TCU and for Private Independent and Church Related Category I Schools in the United States, 1983/84.

Rank	TCU	TCU	All Category I		Church Related Category I (N = 12)	
	82/83	83/84	82/83	83/84	82/83	83/84
PROFESSOR	90.8	91.1	90.2	91.3	91.3	91.3
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	88.8	89.1	94.0	94.1	91.6	91.5
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	92.6	93.1	92.5	91.8	92.2	92.3



TABLE X

Average Salary by Rank for Women Faculty  
in Texas Category I Schools, 1983/84  
(in Thousands of Dollars)

School	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor
Baylor	36.1	27.3	24.0	23.6
NTSU	36.8	28.8	24.2	--
Rice	40.3	31.6	24.0	--
SMU	41.0	29.4	23.4	--
TLU	37.0	27.8	24.1	--
Texas A&M	38.3	31.0	25.2	17.7
TCU	33.8	28.2	23.3	--
TJU	36.0	29.4	24.3	21.3
University of Houston	41.9	25.8	24.3	--
UT--Austin	41.2	29.4	24.9	18.1
UT--Dallas	--	30.3	24.2	--
Average	38.2	29.0	24.2	20.2
TCU as % of Average, 82/83	90	86	93	--
TCU as % of Average, 83/84	97	96	100	--

TABLE XI

Per Cent Increase in Salary (1983/84 over 1982/83)

	PR	AO	AI	IN
TCU	13.4	16.7	13.2	13.4
All Category I	4.7	5.1	5.4	5.2
Church Related, Category I	7.2	8.0	8.9	8.2
Texas Category I	6.8	7.8	8.0	7.2

Texas Category I  
Per Cent Salary Increase by Rank

SCHOOL	PR	AO	AI	IN
TCU	13.4	16.7	13.2	13.4
Baylor	6.1	6.9	8.3	12.2
NTSU	4.4	5.6	5.1	4.8
Rice*				
SMU	7.5	7.7	7.9	
Texas A&M	4.6	5.3	6.0	5.4
TTU*				
TWU*				
University of Houston*				
UT--Austin	4.7	4.7	5.5	4.8
UT--Dallas	6.1	6.7	7.4	
Average	6.8	7.8	8.0	7.2

\*per cent increase in salaries not reported

TABLE XII

Compensation and Rank in United States of Category I Schools  
1983/84

SCHOOL	Average Compensation	Rank	Phi Beta Sigma Xi	Kappa/
California Institute of Technology	55.8	1		
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	53.8	2	X	
Harvard	53.3	3	X	
Stanford	53.2	4	X	
University of Chicago	50.5	5	X	
University of Pennsylvania	48.7	6	X	
University of California--Berkley	48.3	7	X	
Lehigh University	48.2	8	X	
Princeton University	47.9	9	X	
Johns Hopkins	47.5	10	X	
Claremont Graduate School	47.4	11		
Rensselaer Polytechnical Institute	47.3	12		
Columbia University	47.1	13	X	
New York University	46.9	14.5	X	
S.U.N.Y. at Buffalo	46.9	14.5		
Carnegie-Mellon	46.7	16		
Yale	46.5	17.5	X	
S.U.N.Y.--Stoney Brook	46.5	17.5		
Brown	46.3	19	X	
S.U.N.Y.--Albany	46.1	20	X	
Duke	46.0	21	X	
Northwestern	45.7	22	X	
Cornell (Endowed)	45.4	23	X	
University of Michigan--Ann Arbor	45.3	24	X	
University of California--Los Angeles	45.1	25	X	
Georgetown	45.0	26		
George Washington University	44.8	27	X	
University of California--San Diego	44.5	28		
University of Southern California	44.0	29.5	X	
Rice University	44.0	29.5	X	
University of Connecticut	43.8	31.5	X	
S.U.N.Y.--Binghamton	43.8	31.5	X	
Notre Dame	43.7	33	X	
University of California--Santa Barbara	43.4	34.5	X	
Brandeis	43.4	34.5		
Dartmouth	43.3	36.5	X	
Cornell (Statutory)	43.3	36.5	X	
University of Minnesota	42.9	38.5	X	
University of California--Irving	42.9	38.5		
Ohio State University	42.5	40	X	
University of California--Davis	42.3	41	X	
University of Virginia	42.1	42.5	X	
Tufts University	42.1	42.5	X	
Southern Methodist University	41.8	44	X	
Washington University	41.7	45.5	X	
Rutgers University--New Brunswick	41.7	45.5	X	

SCHOOL	Average Compensation	Rank	Phi Beta Sigma Xi	Kappa/
Case Western Reserve University	41.5	47	X	
University of California--Riverside	41.2	48		
University of Arizona	41.1	50	X	
University of Texas--Austin	41.1	50	X	
University of Wisconsin--Madison	41.1	50	X	
Fordham University	41.0	52	X	
University of California--Santa Cruz	40.9	54		
University of Hawaii--Manoa	40.9	54		
Syracuse University	40.9	54	X	
University of Illinois--Urbana	40.8	56.5	X	
University of Houston	40.8	56.5	X	
Purdue University	40.7	58	X	
Mississippi State University	40.67	59	X	
University of Delaware	40.6	60.5	X	
University of Pittsburg	40.6	60.5	X	
University of Washington	40.5	63.5	X	
Indiana University --Bloomington	40.5	63.5	X	
Michigan State University	40.5	63.5	X	
Boston College	40.5	63.5	X	
Vanderbilt University	40.3	66	X	
Temple University	40.1	67	X	
University of Utah	39.9	68	X	
Texas A&M	39.8	69.5	X	
University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill	39.8	69.5	X	
University of Cincinnati	39.7	71	X	
Illinois Institute of Technology	39.6	72.5		
University of Toledo	39.6	72.5		
University of Iowa	39.5	74	X	
Nova University	39.4	75		
University of Texas--Dallas	38.7	78		
American University	38.7	78		
University of Maryland--College Park	38.7	78		
Wayne State University	38.7	78		
Bryn Mawr College	38.7	78	X	
Boston University	38.4	81.5	X	
Arizona State University	38.4	81.5		
Northeastern University	38.3	83.5		
University of Missouri	38.3	83.5	X	
University of Vermont & St. Augustine Coll.	37.9	85.5		
Adelphi University	37.9	85.5		
University of Oregon	37.6	87.5	X	
Penn State University	37.6	87.5		
Oregon State University	37.5	89.5		
Texas Tech University	37.5	89.5		
Tulane University	37.4	91.5	X	
University of Wyoming	37.4	91.5	X	
University of Akron	37.1	93		
University of Colorado--Boulder	37.0	94.5	X	
Washington State University	37.0	94.5	X	

SCHOOL	Average Compensation	Rank	Phi Beta Sigma Xi	Kappa/
Texas Christian University	36.9	97	X	
University of Kentucky	36.9	97	X	
University of Rhode Island	36.9	97	X	
Kent State University	36.8	100	X	
Western Michigan	36.8	100		
University of Oklahoma	36.8	100	X	
Marquette University	36.7	102		
Miami University at Oxford (Ohio)	36.6	104	X	
University of Kansas	36.6	104		
University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee	36.6	104		
North Texas State University	36.4	106		
Howard	36.3	108	X	
Loyola	36.3	108		
Baylor University	36.3	108	X	
Colorado State University	36.1	110	X	
North Carolina State University	36.0	111.5		
Oklahoma State University	36.0	111.5		
University of Louisville	35.9	113.5		
Clemson	35.9	113.5		
University of Georgia	35.6	115	X	
Bowling Green State University	35.5	116	X	
Virginia Poly Tech State University	35.4	118	X	
Iowa State University	35.4	118		
University of Massachusetts at Amherst	35.4	118	X	
Georgia State University	35.2	120		
College of William and Mary	35.1	121		
Ohio University	34.9	122		
University of Missouri--Columbia	34.8	123		
University of Illinois at Chicago	34.7	125		
University of New Hampshire	34.7	125		
University of South Carolina	34.7	125		
University of St. Louis	34.6	127.5	X	
Utah State University	34.6	127.5		
University of Detroit	34.5	129.5		
University of Florida	34.5	129.5	X	
University of Idaho	34.3	131.5	X	
University of Nevada--Reno	34.3	131.5		
University of Nebraska	34.1	134		
University of Missouri--Kansas City	34.1	134		
University of New Mexico	34.1	134	X	
Penn College of Optometry	33.7	136		
Florida State University	33.6	137	X	
University of Montana	33.5	139		
New Mexico State	33.5	139		
University of Tennessee--Knoxville	33.5	139	X	
University of Denver	33.3	141.5	X	
Drew University	33.3	141.5		
Texas Women's University	33.1	143.5	X	
University of North Carolina--Greensboro	33.1	143.5		

SCHOOL	Average Compensation	Rank	Phi Beta Sigma Xi	Kappa/
University of Alabama	33.0	146	X	
University of Arkansas	33.0	146	X	
Kansas State University	33.0	146		
University of Southern Florida	32.7	148		
Ball State University	32.4	149		
University of Northern Colorado	32.1	150		
University of Alabama--Birmingham	32.0	151		
University of North Dakota	31.9	152	X	
Catholic University of America	31.3	153		
Northern Illinois University	31.0	154		
University of Mississippi	30.5	155		
West Virginia University	30.3	156	X	
Auburn	30.1	157.5		
Illinois State University	30.1	157.5		
Southern Illinois University--Carbondale	30.0	159		
Louisiana State & A&M College	29.6	160.5		
University of Southern Mississippi	29.6	160.5		
Memphis State University	29.5	162		
University of South Dakota	28.1	163		

TABLE XIII

Percentile Ranking of TCU's Compensation  
with U.S. Category I Schools

YEAR	# OF SCHOOLS	RANKING	PERCENTILE
1981	199	197	1
1982	201	182	10
1983	161	142	12
1984	163	97	40



TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY  
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

Faculty Senate

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
December 6, 1984

Present: Newsom, Cole, B. Colquitt, Daniel, Giles-Sims, Jackson, Lawrence, McWhorter, Paulus, Reuter, S. Tucker, Waits, Wortham, Naff, Routt, Dominiak, Southard, Vanderhoof, Hodgson, Jurma, Persky, Curry, Hogstel, Payne, Becker, L. Colquitt, Henley, Hensley, McNertney, Odom, Robinson, Schmidt.

Absent: Forrer, Ludvigson, Gouwens, Murph, Oppenheimer, Miller, Knepper, Smith, Coerver.

Call to order by the Chair, Don Jackson, at 3:35 pm.

The agenda was suspended temporarily to pass a resolution, offered by Ed McNertney, expressing sympathy to the family of Dr. Kurt A. Schember, who died December 3, 1984.

The TCU Community suffered a great loss Monday evening when Dr. Kurt A. Schember died of leukemia.

The Faculty Senate extends its deepest sympathies to Kurt's family and close friends in the Computer Science Department.

Kurt was an inspiration to us all - his courage in the face of terminal illness provides strength to all of us.

We shall miss him.

Services were held at 2:00 P.M. today [December 6] in Arlington at the First Presbyterian Church. A fund has been started for the family and contributions are most welcome. They should be sent to:

Benefit of Kurt Schember family  
% M Bank of Arlington  
P.O. Box 1300  
Arlington, TX 76013  
ATTN: Cindy Carlton

Contributions may also be given to the Leukemia Society in memory of Kurt Schember.

Approval of Minutes of Meeting November 1, 1984, as distributed.





Faculty Senate

## AGENDA

### FACULTY SENATE MEETING 7 February 1985 3:30 p.m. SWR Board Room

1. Approval of minutes of Senate Meeting, 6 December 1984.

The Secretary neglected to distribute the minutes in December. The minutes of the December meeting are attached.

2. Old Business

Senate Committee on Student Relations (Pat Paulus). The Committee will seek approval of the Senate for the attached proposal. Representatives from the Student House of Representatives and from the Student Life Office will be present to answer questions. (Attachment)

Senate Committee on Academic Excellence (Frank Reuter). Discussion of the Committee's report on the proposed core curriculum revision distributed at the meeting of December 6, 1984, tabled until the February meeting.

3. New Business

Participation by University Staff members in university convocations and academic processions.

Senators are encouraged to submit nominations for honorary degrees to Don Jackson by 15 February for consideration at the 7 March meeting.

### Committee Reports

Committee on Committees, Steve Cole reporting. Jackson explained that the faculty representation on the Advisory Committee on Planning consists of the current Chair and the Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty Senate and two members nominated by the Faculty Senate and appointed by the Chancellor. Nominations should be offered so as to distribute the membership among the schools and colleges of the university. The Senate nominated Ted Klein (Philosophy) and Manfred Reinecke (Chemistry) at its November meeting. The nominations would have resulted in having all faculty members on the committee represent AddRan.

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.

Committee on Academic Excellence, Frank Reuter reporting. Reuter distributed a committee report on the proposed revision of the university core curriculum and summarized its main points. The Senate Committee on Academic Excellence supports the "Preliminary Report of the University Core Revision Committee" as reinforcing the liberal arts basis of undergraduate education at TCU. It feels the core proposal lacks specific detail and therefore agrees with the recommendation that a Core Curriculum Oversight Committee be established--not a subcommittee of the University's Courses of Study Committee.

The Committee on Academic Excellence supports the provision that all students should share the same core and that it should provide a solid liberal arts background. The committee agrees that all disciplines share the responsibility for promoting writing skills and requests that the Core Curriculum make more specific provisions for proficiency examinations in composition. The Committee on Academic Excellence affirms that the core provisions as spelled out by the Core Revision Committee do not increase degree requirements unnecessarily. The report ends with a strong recommendation that at least one year of a second language be included in the core.

Reuter moved that the report of the Committee on Academic Excellence be accepted and forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (seconded by Wortham). In discussion of the motion and of the committee's report it was brought out that the administration's response to the report of the Core Revision Committee will be available at the beginning of the spring semester. The core curriculum will be discussed broadly within the university community and will eventually go to the Courses of Study Committee for action, probably not before the next academic year.

Steve Cole moved that Senate action on the report of the Committee on Academic Excellence be tabled until the February meeting of the Senate (seconded by Odom). The motion carried on a voice vote; the report will be placed on the agenda for further discussion on February 7, 1985.

Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance, Betsy Colquitt reporting. Colquitt referred to the proposal, attached to the agenda announcement, increasing the membership of the University Advisory Committee from six to eight, so as to allow representation from all colleges and the three divisions of AddRan. Colquitt moved the adoption of the change (seconded by Dominiak). The motion carried by a voice vote.

#### Announcements

Don Jackson forwarded to the Senate members an invitation from Captain Knowles of the Army ROTC to attend a Retreat ceremony at the flag pole at 5:00 p.m.

Pat Paulus announced that the issue of a fall semester break is still alive in the Student House of Representatives. The students are preparing a new proposal to present to the Faculty Senate and to the Administration.

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. The results:

Total ballots cast	111
For all amendments	97 (87%)
Dissenting votes (14 ballots)	
against Amendment 1	9
against Amendment 2	7
against Amendment 3	4
against Amendment 4	2

John Wortham asked the Senate to welcome as a visitor, Professor Comer Clay, retired member of the Political Science Department and former Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Geraldine Dominiak reported that the Faculty Budget Committee has discovered an apparent miscalculation in the figures the university reported to AAUP for compensation in academic 1983-84. The committee is awaiting clarification.

Adjournment, 4:45 p.m.

Neil Daniel, Secretary

TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Faculty Senate Student Relations Committee  
DATE: January 25, 1985

The attached page summarizes three proposals for changes in the academic calendar. The Senate is asked to consider these proposals and make a recommendation at the February meeting. Significant features include:

1. Beginning the semester immediately following registration on Wednesday evening. This allows Wednesday evening classes to be dismissed the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. (Plans I, II, III).
2. Allow for a fall semester break. (II in mid-October; III on Wednesday before Thanksgiving).
3. Preserve one (I, II) or two (III) study days.
4. Conclude final examinations on Thursday to provide more time for grading so that grades can be submitted the following Monday morning. (I, II, III)

Plan I also proposes the conversion from a Monday-Wednesday-Friday and Tuesday-Thursday arrangement to a Monday-Thursday and Tuesday-Friday schedule of classes. Both sequences would have regular class meeting times of:

8:00 - 9:15  
9:30 - 10:45  
11:00 - 12:15  
12:30 - 1:45  
2:00 - 3:15  
3:30 - 4:45

Wednesday evening classes would be scheduled as usual, but the daytime hours would be generally unscheduled to allow for such activities as student study and research, faculty research, committee and departmental meetings, recitals, guest lectures, university convocations, cooperative research projects and so on. This plan which allows for a regular weekly opportunity for enrichment and the discretionary use of time should alleviate the need for two study days and a mid-semester break while providing the benefits and opportunities already indicated.

For these reasons the Faculty Senate Student Relations Committee strongly recommends Plan I. We feel that the difficulties in converting Monday-Wednesday-Friday classes to a format identical to our current Tuesday-Thursday format as well as the difficulties encountered in planning the use of facilities are more than outweighed by the benefits.

While we have no major objections to Plan II, we have a significant concern about Plan III. Plan III gives an additional holiday on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. We feel that this is too late in the semester to provide the benefits that were the goal of a mid-semester fall break. Further, since only one session of any course would be held in that week, we are concerned that a significant number of students would be willing to cut each course only once in order to get four extra days of vacation and would leave campus the previous Friday.

# PROPOSED ACADEMIC CALENDARS, FALL 1986

	I	II	III
Registration	Tues., Aug. 26 and Wed., Aug. 27	Tues., Aug. 26 and Wed., Aug. 27	Tues., Aug. 26 and Wed., Aug. 27
Classes Begin	Wed., Aug. 27 (5:00 p.m.)	Wed., Aug. 27 (5:00 p.m.)	Wed., Aug. 27 (4:00 p.m.)
Labor Day Holiday	Mon., Sept. 1	Mon., Sept. 1	Mon., Sept. 1
Fall Semester Break		Fri., Oct. 17 (approx)	(see Thanksgiving Holiday)
Thanksgiving Holiday			
Classes Recess	Wed., Nov. 26, 5:00 p.m.	Wed., Nov. 26, 5:00 p.m.	Tues., Nov. 25, 10:00 p.m.
Classes Resume	Mon., Dec. 1, 8:00 a.m.	Mon., Dec. 1, 8:00 a.m.	Mon., Dec. 1, 8:00 a.m.
Classes End	Wed., Dec. 10, 10:00 p.m.	Wed., Dec. 10, 10:00 p.m.	Tues., Dec. 9, 10:00 p.m.
Study Day(s)	Thur., Dec. 11	Thur., Dec. 11	Wed., Dec. 10 and Thur., Dec 11
Final Examinations	Fri., Dec. 12 Mon., Dec. 15 - Thur., Dec. 18	Fri., Dec. 12 Mon., Dec. 15 - Thur., Dec. 18	Fri., Dec. 12 Mon., Dec. 15 - Thur., Dec. 18



MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
November 1, 1984

Present: Newsom, Cole, Giles-Sims, Jackson, Lawrence, McWhorter, Paulus, Reuter, S. Tucker, Waits, Wortham, Gouwens, Naff, Routt, Dominiak, Miller, Southard, Hodgson, Knepper, Smith, Curry, Hogstel, Payne, L. Colquitt, Henley, Hensley, McNertney, Robinson, Schmidt.

Absent: B. Colquitt, Daniel, Forrer, Ludvigson, Murph, Becker, Oppenheimer, Vanderhoof, Jurma, Persky, Coerver, Odom.

Call to order by Chair Jackson at 3:31 P.M.

Minutes of the October 4 meeting approved as distributed.

Old Business

Daryl Schmidt, Chair of the Senate Committee on the Role and Function of the Senate, reported on last year's survey on faculty attitudes toward the Faculty Senate. 116 people returned the questionnaire, with a strong majority affirming the necessity of the Senate. A majority also see the Senate playing a meaningful and active role in University governance. The main strengths of the Senate were that it serves as a forum for debate on issues and that it is representative of the Faculty. The main weaknesses were perceived to be the Senate's lack of real power and that it has no real means of holding administrators accountable for their actions.

Daryl indicated that the image of the Senate appears to be a problem, and commented that there seemed to be little perception as to the role of the Senate committees.

Daryl, in response to a question from Don Jackson, said that the Committee is not likely to propose a term limit for Senators. He also indicated, in response to a comment from Doug Newsom, that the Committee is going to gather data on the proportion of the faculty willing to stand for election to the Senate.

A question from Glenn Routt elicited a response from Jackson that service is an element of the evaluation of faculty.

Don Jackson reminded the Senate about the creation of the Advisory Committee on Planning. Its composition is to be: The current Chair of the Faculty

Senate; The immediate past chair of the Senate; Two other faculty designated by the Senate - 3 year terms; President and Vice President of the Student House of Representatives; Two University Staff persons - 3 year terms; One General Staff person - 3 year term; Ann Sewell - ex-officio. The Chair of the Committee will be Vice Chancellor Secrest.

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.

Don Jackson mentioned that the Chronicle of Higher Education has been running a series about higher education. In particular, he called attention to an item which recommends that all bachelor's degrees should have 2 years of general education, even if it means extending the length of time necessary to obtain professional degrees beyond 4 years. He thought that this item might be relevant to the core revision currently being undertaken.

Frank Reuter reported on the activities of the Academic Excellence Committee. The Committee decided to give top priority to its response to the document from the Core-Revision Committee. A final report will be forthcoming at the December Senate meeting.

#### New Business

Don Jackson reported on several items.

1. The final exam schedule is going to be revised to incorporate the Senate's desire to extend an exam period's length beyond 2 hours and to rotate final exams. The details are still being worked out between Acting Registrar Marvin Keith and Vice Chancellor Koehler.

2. Vice Chancellor Koehler has some suggestions about the revision of the Grievance Policy. A meeting between Don, Vice Chancellor Koehler, Betsy Colquitt and Neil Daniel to iron out the differences is going to take place.

3. The committee to study the feasibility of converting the Faculty Lounge to a Faculty Club has been named. Its members are: Susan Batchelor, Beverly Blount, John Butler, Jim Farrar, Jim Henley, and Richard Lysiak.

4. Several ad hoc committees have been created:

Professor Ray Drenner has agreed to serve on a Library Automation committee.

The search committee for the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs consists of Nadia Lahutsky, Sara Smith - President of the Student House, Kay Higgins, Charles Beneze, Beverly Blount, Chancellor Tucker (Chair).



Minutes, November 1, 1984

Page 3

The search committee for the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services consists of Fred Oberkircher, Wayne Watson - Vice President of the Student House, Charles Thomas, Lois Banta, Charles Falk, Ann Sewell, Chancellor Tucker (Chair).

5. The membership of the Faculty Budget Committee has been completed. The Chancellor's appointments are Chere Lohr and Joe Helmick. Wayne Ludvigson will serve as chair. *Cherie*

Finally, Don announced that the Faculty Assembly will take place on November 29 at 4 P.M. in Room 141N of the Moudy Building.

Adjournment: 4:24 P.M.

Edward M. McNertney, Vice Chair  
and Acting Secretary *EMM*



TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY  
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

Faculty Senate

<<<<

1984

Dr William H Koehler  
Academic Affairs, VC  
30788

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
October 4, 1984

Present: Cole, B. Colquitt, Daniel, Forrer, Giles-Simms, Ludvigson, McWhorter, Paulus, Reuter, S. Tucker, Wortham, Gouwens, Naff, Routt, Dominiak, Murph, Oppenheimer, Miller, Southard, Vanderhoof, Hodgson, Knepper, Persky, Smith, Curry, Hogstel, Payne, Becker, Coerver, L. Colquitt, Henley, Hensley, McNertney, Odom, Robinson, Schmidt, Newsom.

Absent: Jackson, Lawrence, Waits.

Call to order by Vice Chairman Ed McNertney, 3:30 p.m.

Minutes of the September 6 meeting approved as distributed.

At the invitation of the Senate Executive Committee, Vice Chancellor William Koehler addressed the Senate to explain his intention to create a new administrative unit in charge of Enrollment Management. To be made up of the unit heads of Admissions, the Registrar's Office, Financial Aid, Continuing Education, and Pre-Major and Freshman Advising, this administrative group will concern itself with maintaining a stable enrollment by close attention to recruitment, retention, analysis of markets, and related matters. The head of the new unit, with the title Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, will be chosen from within the university and will take on the duties as an extension of present duties and responsibilities. The new Office of Enrollment Management will report to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; it will not make policy.

Old Business

Pat Paulus, Chair of the Senate Committee on Student Relations, brought forward a resolution of the Student House of Representatives, urging the adoption of a fall semester break. Wortham moved the adoption of the students' proposal. The motion failed on a voice vote.

New Business

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.

Amendment 1: to change the office of Vice Chairman to "Chair Elect." S. Tucker moved adoption. The motion carried on a voice vote.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

S. Tucker moved that the four amendments go to the faculty as a single amendment, to be approved on a single vote. The motion failed on a show of hands, a tie vote being broken by the Chair.

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.

Candidates for Senate election to the Faculty Budget Committee were presented by the Chair. The Executive Committees nominees were Wayne Ludvigson (Psychology) and Geraldine Dominiak (Accounting). Sanoa Hensley was nominated from the floor but declined the nomination. Ludvigson and Dominial were elected by a unanimous voice vote.

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.

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.

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.

Don Coerver moved that the Executive Committee draw up a time schedule for each meeting, allotting a specified time for each agenda item, and that the Chair limit the time for discussion and action on each agenda item according to the announced schedule. The motion was defeated on a voice vote.

Charles Becker raised the issue of the reciprocal tuition arrangement between TCU and Baylor and SMU. Although the reciprocal tuition arrangement remains in force and is announced in the Administrators' Handbook (available in the Library), all mention of the arrangement has been removed from the TCU Faculty/Staff Handbook. Henley recommended that the Executive Committee take the matter up in its next regular meeting the the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. McNertney agreed to do so. No action was taken.

Adjournment, 5:15.

Neil Daniel, Secretary



Attachment: Faculty Senate Resolution in Support of the 1984  
Hunger Project, Passed October 4, 1984

## Faculty Senate Resolution in Support of the 1984 Hunger Project

### Background:

Hunger Week as a campus-wide, fund-raising and educational function began two years ago (1982) at the initiative of a Faculty Senate resolution. This week of activities, held annually in November, received the name the "TCU Hunger Project" from its first year Steering Committee. (The Steering Committee is made up of any student, faculty or staff member who wants to be on it. Each year a written request is sent to every campus student organization to appoint a member to act as a liaison.) Over the past two years, the Hunger Project Steering Committee has coordinated the efforts of many different groups and individuals on campus to raise a total of over \$15,000, which has been distributed among five different international hunger relief and development organizations.

As the thinking of Hunger Project "veterans" has evolved, we are coming increasingly to view it not simply as a mechanism for helping people "out there," but also as a structure that should lie at the heart of the institution known as Texas Christian University. It is one means by which the University actualizes its philosophy of enhancing individuals' gifts in a way that "contributes to the integration of the self and to the enrichment of the community and of humankind." It also enables the fulfillment of the particular goal of promoting "the development of mature individuals who respect others, who cherish a free and just society, and who are prepared to act as responsible citizens. . . ."

The following resolution is proposed:

Whereas approximately 15 million people die of starvation and hunger-related causes each year; and

whereas Texas Christian University, both as a social institution and as an assembly of individual human beings, will by its decisions choose either to stand or not to stand in solidarity with those who starve; and

whereas the TCU Hunger Project provides an opportunity both to express this personal and institutional commitment and, at the same time, to actualize the philosophy and goals of the University,

be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the 1984 TCU Hunger Project as an expression of its own commitment both to the University and to humankind,

and be it further resolved that its members will encourage the support of their colleagues and students for Hunger Week activities and fund-raising during the week of November 10-18.

[PASSED: October 4, 1984]



TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY  
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

Faculty Senate

Q00005611

Dr William H Koehler  
Academic Affairs, VC  
30788  
00000

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
September 6, 1984

Present: W. Tucker, Koehler, Newsom, Cole, B. Colquitt, Daniel, Forrer, Giles-Simms, Jackson, Lawrence, Ludvigson, McWhorter, Paulus, S. Tucker, Waits, Wortham, Gouwens, Naff, Routt, Dominiak, Murph, Oppenheimer, Miller, Southard, Vanderhoof, Hodgson, Jurma, Knepper, Persky, Curry, Hogstel, Payne, Becker, Coerver, L. Colquitt, Henley, Hensley, McNertney, Odom, Robinson, Schmidt.

Absent: Reuter, Smith.

Call to order by Chairman Don Jackson, 3:30 pm.

Because it was the year's first meeting, Jackson asked for a roll call of the Senate.

Chairman Jackson distributed a list of Senate committees and their special charges. There are two new features to this presentation of committee charges: (1) the charges are made known to the whole senate and will be distributed to the faculty, and (2) the reporting dates for the committees are announced with the various charges. Jackson directed the Senate's attention to particular charges, presenting the background of some. He asked Senators to pay particular attention to the reporting dates. Jackson directed the Secretary to distribute the list of special charges with the minutes of the meeting (attachment).

Old Business

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.

Resolution 1: that the Senate reaffirm the concept that the university final examination schedule should be observed as published and not be violated.

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).

Resolution 2: that the examination schedule be expanded from two-hour to two-and-one-half-hour periods beginning with spring 1985.

S. Cole questioned the need for longer examinations. 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.

Resolution passed (voice vote).

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.

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.

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.

Resolution passed (voice vote, Henley dissenting).

#### New Business

Chancellor Tucker and Vice Chancellor Koehler had been invited to report on the academic implications of the 1990s Report and recommendations of the University Self Study. Chairman Jackson introduced the documents and yielded the floor to Chancellor Tucker.

Tucker described the 1990s Project, saying the TCU administration was pledged to take the recommendations of the 1990s Commission seriously but not literally. Tucker talked about planning at TCU and announced the intended formation of an Advisory Committee for Planning. He said a formal announcement of the Advisory Committee for Planning, including its membership, will be made later this month.

Vice Chancellor Koehler discussed the recommendations of the University Self Study, describing the process by which the 324

recommendations of the Self Study have been reduced to 49 recommendation now being considered for action by the Deans. Koehler also talked about the 1990s Project, making it clear that the issues considered by the 1990s Commission were issues already under consideration at TCU and in various stages of planning and implementation.

Koehler talked about the Interim Report of the Core Revision Committee. In describing his response to the report, he said he reacted positively to the division of the core into core proficiencies and core studies, to the recommendation of a proficiency examination in composition, and to the creation of an oversight committee to determine which courses fit the core. He said he was concerned about the increase in the number of hours in the core, about the language requirement, about the absence of any proficiency requirement in mathematics, and about the report's failure to mention reading and oral communication skills. Koehler reported that the Deans have been considering the core report and that he hopes to return the report with the Deans' suggestions to the Core Revision Committee. Koehler does not believe it is realistic to expect closure and action on the university core this academic year.

Adjournment, 5:15 pm.

Neil Daniel, Secretary

Attachment: Committee Charges



FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES, 1984-85  
Special Charges

Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Excellence

Frank Reuter, Chair. L. Colquitt, S. Hensley, P. Hodgson, K. Lawrence, K. Odom, R. Payne. Liaison, Ed McNertney.

Special charges and tentative report dates:

1. Study and make recommendations regarding the report of the University Core Revision Committee (February).
2. Study and make recommendations regarding the report of the 1990s Commission (December).
3. Study and report on the application and consequences of TCU's criteria for graduate faculty members (April).
4. Study and make recommendations regarding procedures for evaluation of teaching at TCU (November).
5. Consider a policy whereby TCU would enforce a university-wide requirement of a 2.0 or higher GPA in a student's major field.
6. Consider a policy whereby TCU would require students to take at TCU some minimum percentage of hours in a student's major field.

Faculty Senate Committee on Committees

Steve Cole, Chair. D. Coerver, M. Hogstel, N. Knepper, M. McWhorter, H. Oppenheimer, B. Vanderhoof. Liaison, Bill Jurma.

No special charges.

Faculty Senate Committee on Role and Function of the Senate

Daryl Schmidt, Chair. G. Dominiak, J. Henley, J. Persky, D. Southard, S. Tucker. Liaison, Doug Newsom.

Special charges and tentative report dates:

1. Consider revision of the Senate Constitution to provide for the election of a Chair-Elect (October).
2. Study the ex-officio membership of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the Faculty Senate (April).
3. Examine the consequences of Senators' being able to serve unlimited consecutive terms (February).
4. Study and make recommendations based on the recent survey of faculty attitudes toward the Faculty Senate (November).

Faculty Senate Committee on Student Relations

Pat Paulus, Chair. C. Becker, E. Miller, F. Murph, W. Naff, N. Robinson, G. Routt, E. Smith. Liaison, Don Jackson.

Special charge and report date:

Study and make recommendations regarding procedures for evaluation of teaching at TCU (November).

FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE CHARGES/2

Faculty Senate Committee on Tenure, Promotion & Grievance

Betsy Colquitt, Chair. L. Curry, R. Forrer, J. Giles-Sims,  
D. Gouwens, W. Ludvigson, D. Waits. Liaison, Neil Daniel.

Special charge and report date:

Study and make recommendations regarding the application of  
standards and criteria for promotion and tenure at TCU (February).

Senators are encouraged to submit additional matters for consideration  
by the Senate as a whole or for reference to Senate committees.