The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University met at 3:35 pm on May 6, 1993 in the Faculty Center, Reed Hall. Chair, Paul E. King presided. Senate members present included: Forrer, Franzwa, Odom, Watson, Becker, McNertney, Tucker, Breyer, Couch, Gorman, Benison, Harris, Potvin, Freeman, Garrison, Solomon, Cagle, Wilson, Dominiak, Hensley, Babitch, Fort, Kucko, Oberkircher, and Stephenson. Absent Senators included: Trachtenberg, Butler, Fortenberry, Fenker, Thomas, Raessler, Gaul, Lamb, Brooks, Lysiak, and Nichols.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of April 1, 1993 were approved with the following correction: p. 1, section on "announcements," paragraph 2, line 7, should read "consulted about this proposed change" instead of "notified about this proposed change."

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Chair King made the following announcements to update Senators about items of interest:

Many of the newly elected and reelected Senators for the 1993-94 academic year are in attendance at today's meeting. Chair King introduced these Senate members to the present Senate (see attached list of newly elected Senators).

Due to many questions from his colleagues, Chair King has completed additional investigation about the amount of financial support for athletics and academics at the University. Monetary support for 1992-93 totals approximately $13 million dollars with the following areas of support: undergraduate ($5.578 million), graduate ($2.681 million), federal assistance ($2.308 million), state assistance ($1.287 million), and student loans ($1.026 million).

Although the Senate accepted motions this Spring to elect all University-wide Councils and College and University Advisory Committees, administration has not supported these motions. Chair King recently sent a letter to Vice-Chancellor Koehler in which he cited that election of
Undergraduate, Graduate, and University Councils would empower faculty. Additionally, Chair King noted that faculty who are elected could be accountable for reviewing proposals prior to the council meetings and therefore, would be appropriately responsible for curricular matters. The Vice-Chancellor responded to Chair King's letter by noting he will refer the matter to Dean Helmick and Dean Garwell who currently chair their respective Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. Dialogue with members of these Councils will occur this fall, and the Senate Executive Committee will be informed of decisions made by those groups.

There will be a retirement reception for Vice-Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, Leigh Secrest, tomorrow in the Faculty Center at 3:30 pm.

2. Assistant Secretary, Fred Oberkircher, announced that the Senate election process this year occurred according to the Handbook for Faculty and University Staff. At the end of the election process, each Dean was notified of those persons in the department/college who ran and those elected to the Senate for next year. Senator Oberkircher noted this notification occurred to increase Dean awareness of the value of Senate service to the University. Senator Becker noted that Senator Oberkircher has improved the language and process of Senate elections and should be commended. Senators applauded Senator Oberkircher for his work this year.

OLD BUSINESS:

Academic Excellence Committee: Explore development of formal evaluation of academic advising. If such a formal evaluation is recommended, outline a procedure.

Motion for consideration: The Academic Excellence Committee recommends that an official University Committee be established to study advising effectiveness at Texas Christian University. This committee's charge should include but not be limited to: 1) studying and determining what currently constitutes advising at TCU through the review of current advising methods utilized by various departments and colleges and surveying the student body; 2) developing standards and recommending changes that will assist in more effective advising; and, 3) establishing methods for evaluating effective advising and rewarding outstanding advisors. It is recommended that the Director of the Center for Academic Services be a member of this Committee, as well as a staff advisor, undergraduate faculty advisors, graduate faculty advisors, and students.

In the absence of Senator Portenberry, Chair of the Academic Excellence Committee, Chair King read the motion. There was no discussion, and the motion passed unanimously.
Academic Excellence Committee: Explores requiring faculty to have a final exam or other learning experience for students scheduled during final examination time.

Motion for consideration (revision of original policy, pp. 32-33, Faculty/Staff Handbook):

FINAL EVALUATIVE EXERCISE POLICY. Faculty members are expected to administer an appropriate final evaluative exercise in all classes. Prior agreement with the appropriate next level administrator is recommended for omitting a final evaluative exercise. Evaluation methods may vary according to course level, objective(s), and instructional methodology.

The five-day periods for final evaluative exercises at the close of the fall and spring semesters are published in the University Calendar. Final evaluative exercises for evening courses are conducted in the regular classrooms during the week of final exercises. If necessary, the final exercise for evening classes meeting twice a week may be scheduled for both of those nights. No final evaluative exercises are to be given before the beginning of the final exercise period (see exception for graduating students).

If the published final evaluative exercise schedule would require a student to take more than two final exercises in a 24-hour period, the student can arrange to take one of the exercises at another time that is mutually agreeable to the student and the professor. A final exercise may not be rescheduled so as to violate the 24-hour rule. Rescheduling arrangements must be made one week prior to the last day of classes. Unless the student is graduating, the final exercise must be taken during final evaluative exercise week. Rescheduling of final evaluative exercises is only permitted only for graduating students and to meet the 24-hour rule.

END OF SEMESTER STUDY PERIOD. The academic calendar provides for a study period between the last day of classes and the beginning of the final evaluative exercise week. This study period is intended to provide maximum uninterrupted study time; hence, it is expected that no classes, laboratories, or examinations of any kind will be scheduled (see exception for graduating students).

EXCEPTION TO FINAL EVALUATIVE EXERCISE AND STUDY DAY POLICIES FOR GRADUATING STUDENTS. Grades for graduating seniors must be submitted to the Registrar at least 72 hours prior to Commencement exercises. In any term in which a commencement is scheduled, study days and Saturday will be
available for faculty to reschedule final evaluative
exercises for graduating students only. Final evaluative
exercises originally scheduled the last three days of final
exercise week must be rescheduled on the corresponding study
days and Saturday at a time mutually agreeable to the
student and instructor.

Assistant Senate Secretary, Fred Oberkircher, presented the
proposal in the absence of Academic Excellence Committee Chair,
Sally Portenberry. Senator Oberkircher also provided a handout
to each Senator detailing "rationale for changes to the existing
final examination policy." Based on the original motion
circulated at the April meeting, Senator Breyer voiced concern
about needing next level administrator approval if faculty chose
to omit a final evaluation exercise. Senator Fort initiated
additional discussion which focused on whether a requirement to
receive such approval infringed upon a faculty's academic
freedom in deciding how to organize a particular class. Senator
Kucko noted that such freedom might be abrogated if course
content was dictated by administration, but not if the course
had to have a final evaluative exercise. Several Senators noted
they felt a final evaluative exercise was valuable in assessing
student knowledge in a course and in outlining for new faculty
their responsibilities in course evaluation. Overall, Senators
agreed that faculty should not refuse to administer such an
exercise simply because they do not want to. Senator Franzwa
noted that the definition of a final evaluative exercise is open
to broad interpretation; faculty could, therefore, define this
experience in very different ways and make interpretation of
implementing this exercise difficult.

Relevant to the concept that final evaluative exercises should
be comprehensive, Chair King noted that this was a request from
Vice Chancellor Koehler and not the Deans. Senator Dominick, a
member of the Academic Excellence Committee, added that the
committee does not favor mandating a final evaluative exercise
nor next level administrator approval. After review of the
original motion and the "rationale for changes to the existing
final examination schedule policy," Senators decided to vote on
the original motion presented in the April meeting. The motion
passed by a hand vote of 13 to 7.

**Academic Excellence Committee:** Explore requiring faculty to
have a final exam or other learning experience for students
scheduled during final examination time.

motion for consideration: The Academic Excellence Committee
recommends that the University Council schedule in the
University Calendar in any term in which a commencement is
planned at least two study days and a Saturday for faculty
to reschedule final evaluative exercises for graduating
students.

The motion was presented and passed unanimously.
Budget and Finance Committee: Secure and distribute data regarding compensation packages at TCU for various ranks for the academic year 1992-93. Compare compensation packages at TCU for various ranks and genders within the university as well as with similar packages at other AAUP Class I research universities.

Senator Hensley, Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, distributed information on this charge to Senators (see attached). Although data specific to gender was not available, Senator Hensley will get this data for publication with the May minutes. There was no discussion on this compensation issue.

Committee on Committees: Survey faculty members to determine individual interests and qualifications for University committee service.

Senator Couch, Chair of the Committee on Committees, distributed a list of members for the 1993-94 University committees. New members and Chairs are printed in bold-face type. Currently, there is a need for a Chair for the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee. The Academic Computing Committee also wishes to change its administrative reporting to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, rather than the current Vice-Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs. Senator Couch explained that all faculty were surveyed early this spring about their present and desired committee memberships, and the Committee on Committees worked hard to assign persons to requested committees. Senators commended Senator Couch’s committee for its work this year.

Committee on Committees: Discussion and voting for election to University Advisory Committee.

Although Senator Tucker was elected by the Senate for a position on the University Advisory Committee, he was ineligible due to his position as a Chair. Senator Couch informed the group that Don Coeber was elected by mail ballot after the April Senate meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

Committee on Committees: Prepare a double slate of candidates for election to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, University Advisory Committee, Senate Audit and Finance Committee, and other appropriate committees in time for the elections.

Senator Couch presented the slate for officers of the Executive Committee of the Senate. Sincere attempts were made to have a double slate for each office but a second candidate for Secretary was not found prior to today’s meeting. The following persons agreed to have their names placed in nomination for the Senate elections: Chair-elect: Sally Portenberry/Greg Franzwa,
Secretary: Carolyn Spence Cagle; Assistant Secretary: Andy Fort; Carol Stephenson; and, Budget and Finance Committee: Joe Babich/Chuck Becker. There were no nominations from the floor for any position. Voting occurred by secret ballot with the following persons elected: Chair elect: Greg Franzwa; Secretary: Carolyn Spence Cagle, Assistant Secretary: Andy Fort; and, Budget and Finance Committee: Chuck Becker.

Committee on Committees: Obtain recommendations from existing University committees regarding suggestions for charges for the next academic year and for changes in size and composition of committees.

Senator Couch announced that all University committee members were surveyed this spring about committee functioning, size, charges, and ways to make the committee more efficient. Several comments were received and will be considered for future alterations to committees.

Committee on Committees: Recommend to the Faculty Senate names of faculty members for appointment to University committees.

Senator Couch noted this charge was addressed under "old business" for the Committee on Committees.

Report from Assistant Secretary of the Senate, Fred Oberkircher.

Motion for consideration: The Assistant Secretary of the Senate recommends that the above changes be made to the Handbook for Faculty and University Staff.

Senator Oberkircher provided copies of the proposed changes to those Senators who did not receive a copy at the April meeting. He emphasized that the intent of the motion is to eliminate the process of a nomination election conducted by the Senate each spring. The revision would allow faculty who are willing to serve in the Senate to be on a ballot for possible election to the Senate. The question was called and passed unanimously.

Academic Excellence Committee: Update on Code being developed by Academic Affair, Student House of Representatives.

This report was not delivered due to the absence of Academic Excellence.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Chair King summarized the actions of the Senate this year to demonstrate the significant impact of this group on University affairs. Senators are to be commended on the following activities of the Senate: changing the timetable for
indicating withdrawals (Nw) on student transcripts; changing the policy on evaluation of first-year faculty; deciding not to sponsor the NERI survey; adopting the AAUP 1987 Statement on Professional Ethics as a guideline for faculty along with procedures for disseminating the information; supporting Dr. Heath's proposal for electronic access to library journals; approving seven procedural changes for enhancing communication between Senators and their constituencies; approving a merited leave of absence policy proposal for nontenured faculty; approving the additions to the 1993-94 nontenured progress, tenure, and promotion calendar; approving several changes to Senate election procedures; and endorsing several resolutions on matters of significance to the University. Two activities (completion of administrator evaluation above the next level and election of University-wide Councils) will continue to be focus of the Senate next year.

A particularly significant area of Senate involvement this year was in the 50th percentile salary issue of faculty. Chair King noted there will continue to be dialogue with administration on this issue as well as on salary differentials related to specialty areas and whether TCU salary structures reflect market demands. Based on this issue and appropriate wording of a resolution, Senator Babitch offered the following resolution to reflect Senate perceptions:

The Faculty Senate recommends the Chancellor for his pledge to raise and maintain faculty salaries to the 50th percentile of AAUP Class " research universities. We expect that this will apply separately to divisions of the University (e.g., colleges and schools).

The resolution was presented and passed unanimously.

Further discussion focused on concerns with a new classification structure used this year to determine general staff salaries. Chair King commented that this group had a 4% average raise this year (the same as faculty), and there were incremental monies to realign low salaries. The Executive Committee of the Senate met with the Chancellor today about concerns with the classification system, and the Chancellor assured the Committee the situation would be corrected as soon as possible. Senator Tucker stated that university staff is not represented by any University body and indicated his desire that the Budget and Finance Committee examine this salary issue by proposing the following motion:

It is recommended that the Faculty Budget and Finance Committee investigate salary levels for general staff at TCU in order to promote adequate salary structure for those whose loyalty and service so benefit the faculty.

The motion was presented and passed unanimously.

2. Chair King responded to Senator Becker about the latter's
concern about University support for a faculty involved in litigation due to peer review involvement. If a faculty is involved in a policy that TCU mandates, that faculty would be legally covered by the University.

3. The position of Vice-Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs remains open, according to Chair King. The process of filling that position will proceed into the summer.

4. Senator Breyer, Chair-elect, commended Chair King on his leadership of the Senate this past year and presented a plaque attesting to Chair King's commitment to the position.

5. As the incoming Chair, Senator Breyer noted some of this goals for next year to include the following: defining more clearly the role of the Faculty Senate as part of the intellectual life of the University, facilitating greater Senate committee involvement in defining charges, and determining the role of faculty service in overall faculty evaluation and in efficient functioning of the University. Senator Breyer stated that committee charges defined by committees will be examined by the Executive Committee by the end of the summer, and charges for each committee will be in place by the time of the first Senate meeting in the fall.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm. The next scheduled meeting will be

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Secretary
TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 1, 1993

The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University met at 3:30 pm on April 1, 1993 in the Faculty Center, Reed Hall. Chair, Paul E. King presided. A quorum of Senators was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of March 4, 1993 were approved with the following corrections: p. 3, section on Student Relations Committee investigation of University's commitment to recruit National Merit Scholars should read "1045 academic scholarships last year" instead of 1400 such scholarships. Senator Trachtenberg also attended the March 4 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Chair King made the following announcements to update Senators on issues of interest:

Many faculty demonstrated interest in University issues by attending the Faculty Assembly on March 26, 1993. At that meeting, Chancellor Tucker announced that $150,000 has been budgeted to attract minority faculty and students to TCU as part of a five year $750,000 program to attain a more diverse University community. At least 10 more "role model" faculty/professional staff will be hired in the future to meet this goal. The Chancellor also announced an initiative to maintain faculty salaries at a minimum of the 50th percentile based on AAUP figures for doctoral-granting institutions. Senators expressed interest in continuing dialogue with the Chancellor about the salary issue.

Dr. Koehler, currently Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, has been named Provost of the University effective June 1st and given additional responsibilities in his new role. The Chancellor will have new demands on his time due to fund-raising needs of the University. Senator Fort inquired whether the Executive Committee of the Senate had been notified about this proposed change before it was announced. Chair King responded that the Executive Committee had discussed the issue in two confidential meetings with the Chancellor. The Committee discussed potential concerns, and the Chancellor provided reassurance that great care and thought had gone into the proposal.
The Senate Executive Committee and the Budget Committee have been involved in interviewing candidates for the Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs. Currently three candidates have been seen. Six faculty members are on the Search Committee for this position, according to Senator Breyer.

The Executive Committee attended the Faculty Relations Committee of the Board of Trustees' meeting on March 25. At the meeting, Dr. Alpert presented an overview of the Self-Study process and outcomes, Dr. Alice Gaul reported on the work of the Select Committee on Teaching Effectiveness, and Dr. King summarized this year's work in the Senate. The Trustees seemed very interested in all these reports.

The HERI Faculty Survey has not been approved by the TCU Human Safeguards Committee due to several concerns. Chair King has responded by letter to the Committee about these issues. Senators agreed to honor the Committee's decision.

2. Senator Oberkircher, Assistant Secretary of the Senate, has proposed changes to the current Faculty Senate election procedure. He circulated material detailing these changes to each Senator and will present a motion on this topic in the May meeting (see agenda for May 6, 1993 meeting).

OLD BUSINESS:

Proposed Additions to the 1993-94 Nontenured Progress, Tenure, and Promotion Calendar and Procedures

Senators received a copy of this at the March meeting and had perused for reaction in this meeting. The question was called to approve the document, and it passed unanimously.

Merited Leave of Absence Program for Non-tenured Faculty

A copy of this document was also circulated to all Senators at the April meeting. The question was called, and it passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

Committee on Committees: Explore with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate ways to increase the efficiency of University service of faculty.

motion for consideration: The Committee on Committees recommends the following to improve the procedure for election of Faculty Senate officers:
a. at the March meeting each year, it will be announced that nominations from the floor for Senate offices will be take place at the April meeting.

b. Senate officers will be nominated from the floor at the April meeting.

c. Campaign statements may be included with the agenda for the May meeting.

d. Discussion and voting will take place in the May meeting.

Senator Couch, Chair of Committee on Committees, presented the motion. Discussion focused on the rationale for requiring or not requiring campaign statements from those persons on the slate for election. Senators decided to leave the motion as stated at least for the present year to evaluate its impact on the election process. Senator Gaul stated concern about nominations being offered from the floor today when it is not known who will be re-elected or who will be new Senators for next year. After agreement that only those persons who are re-elected will appear on the ballot, the motion as proposed by the Committee on Committees was presented and passed.

Nominations from the floor for 1993-94 officers were taken with the following results: Chair-elect: Greg Franzwa/Sally Fortenberry; Secretary: John Freeman/Carolyn Spence Cagle; Assistant Secretary: Carol Stephenson/Andy Fort. Don Nichols and Stan Block were also placed on the ballot for election to the Budget and Finance Committee since either Senator Hensley or Senator McNertney is in their final year. Senator Couch will check with Senator Freeman and Dr. Block about interest in being on the ballot. The other nominees agreed to be placed on the ballot.

Discussion and voting for election to University Advisory Committee

Senator Couch also proposed a ballot composed of Senator Dominiak and Senator Tucker for election to the University Advisory Committee. Senator voting by secret ballot elected Senator Tucker to this position. Although Senator Couch requested nominations from Business, Fine Arts/Communication, or Social Sciences for University Advisory Committee, Senators offered no recommendations.

Survey faculty members to determine individual interests and qualifications for University committee service.

Senator Couch noted this project is ongoing, and a report will be delivered in the May meeting.
Report from Budget and Finance Committee: Secure and distribute data regarding compensation packages at TCU for various ranks for the academic year 1992-93; compare compensation packages at TCU for various ranks and genders within the University as well as with similar packages at other AAUP Class I research universities.

Senator Fort, member of the Budget and Finance Committee, noted that data for these charges is being collected at present, and a report will be given in May. Senator Gorman expressed an interest in obtaining compensation data relevant to gender because of a request she recently received about compensation in her department. The TCU Fact Book, according to Senator Hensley (also a member of the Budget and Finance Committee), has some of this data.

Report from the Academic Excellence Committee: Explore requiring faculty to have a final exam or other learning experience for students scheduled during final examination time.

Senator Fortenberry, Chair of the Academic Excellence Committee, expressed appreciation to the Committee for its perseverance in dealing with this issue and in drafting two relevant motions circulated to Senators today. She expressed appreciation to Senators Dominak and Stephenson for editing the motions for clarity. These motions will be voted on in the May meeting after Senators have had a chance to talk to their constituents.

Initial discussion about the motions ensued. To prepare the motions, the committee met with Vice-Chancellor Koehler. According to Senator Fortenberry, Dr. Koehler believes the word "expected" is an appropriate word to describe faculty accountability for the administration of final examinations or final evaluation exercises. Dr. Koehler has noted he desires each department/college to specifically define faculty expectations/responsibilities on this issue. Based on the Vice-Chancellor's feedback, the need for graduating students to have greater flexibility in scheduling final evaluations, and the need of the Registrar to have grades at least 72 hours prior to graduation, the Academic Excellence Committee formulated the two motions. These motions would impact the University calendar, so an additional motion has been proposed specific to the University Council. Senator Breyer expressed concern about having to receive administrator approval for omitting a final evaluative exercise (in a proposed motion), and Senator Lamb discussed the need for more flexibility in the time blocks scheduled for finals (currently 2.5 hrs and not addressed in the motion). Further discussion of the motions will occur in the May meeting.
Report from the Academic Excellence Committee: Explore development of formal evaluation of academic advising. If such a formal evaluation is recommended, outline a procedure.

Senator Fortenberry and her committee have collected much data on this issue both from the Center for Academic Services and faculty comments on the Self-Study instrument. Dr. Koehler has expressed interest in how faculty advising affects institutional effectiveness. He desires a University committee and not a task force to focus on identifying and assisting faculty in this role. This would be a standing committee. Chair King expressed concern that the charges as listed in the motion are short-term and seem inconsistent with a standing committee. Senator Fortenberry responded that the Academic Excellence Committee attempted to propose charges similar to those of other standing committees in the Faculty/Staff Handbook. Other Senators suggested that the motion should read "encourage advising effectiveness" or "develop/institute advising effectiveness."

Further discussion dealt with the standing vs. ad hoc status of the proposed committee. These and other responses to the motion will be presented at the May meeting.

Motion by Senator Tucker: It is the sense of the Senate that University service is a part of faculty duties and we urge, pending a study of the whole service issue by the Senate next year, that Chairs and Deans consider University service an important component of faculty evaluation.

Chair King presented the motion which passed unanimously. In response to Senator Raessler's question, the motion will become a specific charge to a Senate committee next year.

Motion by Senator Fort: It is recommended that an appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate examine self-study documents relevant to faculty comments about academic administrator performance and report recommendations to the Senate.

Chair King responded that all Senate committees had as their charge this year to examine relevant Self-Study documents. The motion was presented, and it passed unanimously.

Resolution by Senator Potvin: Resolved: That the Senate expresses its appreciation to our many colleagues who provided crucial and significant service to TCU through the University Self-Study and Program Review Committees.

After its reading, the resolution was endorsed unanimously.
OTHER DISCUSSIONS:

1. Senator Becker raised concern about faculty liability and University support for faculty who are sued in the process of completing peer evaluation. This process has apparently been recently instituted in the School of Business. General discussion focused on the fact that the Harris College of Nursing has utilized peer evaluation for some time without problems, recent articles in the Wall Street Journal addressing litigation based on slander and wrongful termination of employees, and SACS criteria for periodic evaluation of all faculty. Senator Dominiak noted that the SACS criteria do not specify peer evaluation per se. Due to the perception by several Senators that the Vice-Chancellor has requested each department/college to develop a peer-review process for faculty evaluation, the Executive Committee will clarify this process with Dr. Koehler.

2. Based on a question by Senator Solomon, Senators agreed that the University Advisory Committee can only act on agreeing with or disagreeing with a tenure or promotion decision made by the College Advisory committee, and that this recommendation must be written to do so.

3. Senator Babitch requested continued examination of the 50th percentile issue and readjusting salaries to an equitable level based on content areas. Senator Breyer noted the Vice-Chancellor's office is already looking at this issue and has sought Executive Committee input about salary readjustments over the past several months. Senator Breyer commended Chair King for his role in bringing the issue to administration and in presenting the Senate's concern to the Faculty Relations' Committee of the Board of Trustees last November. Chair King responded that the Budget and Finance Committee also deserves credit in presenting the issue and proposing changes in salary compensation.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm. The next scheduled meeting will be May 6, 1993.

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Secretary
PLATFORM FOR CHAIR-ELECT

SALLY FORTENBERRY

I have been a member of the TCU Faculty Senate for the past three and a half years during which time I served on the Academic Excellence Committee. During the 1992-1993 term I served as the chair of this committee. Throughout this time, I have endeavored to do my best to be a contributing member of the Senate. I have worked hard to solicit information and advice from my colleagues about issues that the Senate considers. I have tried to represent my constituents and not use the Faculty Senate to politicize my own personal agenda. I am forthright and speak what I believe to be true. If elected to the position of Chair-Elect, I will continue to work hard to gather all of the facts, communicate these facts to the faculty at large, request feedback, and encourage cooperative decision making for the good of all faculty at TCU. I believe that more can be accomplished by the faculty and for the faculty if more faculty view the Faculty Senate as an effective mechanism for perpetuating change.

GREGG FRANZWA

Membership on the senate executive committee is a difficult and often thankless job. My willingness to serve on the committee is premised on three things. First, I probably do not yet understand just how difficult and thankless it can get. Second, I believe the faculty have an obligation to do such service when possible. And third, there is a set of issues that I would like to be involved in addressing with the executive committee and the senate at large.

Many of those issues involve the need for greater communication and participation by the faculty in certain decision-making contexts, especially those with direct bearing on instructional quality, research and faculty service. Included would be budgeting contexts such as those dealing with staffing needs, research funding, salary issues, scholarships and special academic programs. In addition would be contexts of personnel decisions, including teaching and advising loads, class sizes, use and treatment of occasional faculty, and standards of faculty evaluation.
Such increased participation will require first that the senate reach a consensus about the specific issues it wishes to tackle, and second, that it present suggestions to the appropriate administrators about the content and forum for a series of discussions of those issues. Of course the faculty senate is not in a position to unilaterally dictate such policies for the university. But neither, I believe, are administrators. Policies of the sorts mentioned above are traditionally the legitimate subjects of open debate and discussion in a university, to be shared in by all its members. That some those members are charged with making certain sorts of final decisions should not undercut that discussion.

Certain ideas strike me as self-evident: the members of the university community from the students to the trustees are all partners to the project: none of us is the university; none of us owns it; none of our individual contributions to it is inherently worthier than the next. Further, we are not organized around the profit motive, with stockholders and customers. We are rather a voluntary non-profit community whose final ends are not financial. Our joint mission is success in teaching, research and service. The faculty, the administration, the board of trustees, the physical plant, the endowment, and all the rest are means to those larger ends.

Like most philosophers, I have a natural inclination to the long view. Things such as ultimate goals, purposes, and meanings often elbow their way to the front of my thoughts about the university. But I’m a philosopher with an MBA. I was trained in the ways of corporations. Perhaps this somewhat odd combination of inclination and experience could be useful on the senate executive committee.

G. Franzwa
PLATFORM FOR SECRETARY

CAROLYN SPENCE CAGLE

My position on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate this past year has provided me with new insights into the strength of the TCU faculty in initiating change in the academic environment. Some of this change has evolved from faculty and administrator communication on issues of mutual concern and from a commitment by faculty for an optimal learning environment for staff, faculty, students, and the community. I believe this commitment to a variety of issues relevant to academic life has been reflected well in the minutes of this year's Faculty Senate. If reelected to the position of Secretary, I will continue to report the activities of the Faculty Senate in a timely and accurate manner, to represent Senators and total faculty in Executive Committee deliberations with administration, and to track issues of concern to Senators until these are resolved to the benefit of the persons involved.

PLATFORM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY

ANDY FORT

According to the Self-Study, many faculty feel that there is insufficient communication with upper-level administrators, and that when consulted, the faculty's input about academic issues is insufficiently heeded. If elected, I will address the faculty's concerns about disenfranchisement and lack of communication, and I will be an advocate for the primacy of the intellectual and humanistic values underlying academic life.
FR: FACULTY SENATE
P.O. BOX 32899

TO: WILLIAM H KOHLER
P.O. BOX 30788
The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University met at 3:30 pm on March 4, 1993 in the Faculty Center, Reed Hall. Chair, Paul E. King presided. Senate members present included: Forrer, Franzwa, Fortenberry, Tucker, Breyer, Couch, Fenker, Gorman, Harris, Garrison, Freeman, Potvin, Solomon, Raessler, Cagle, Gaul, Dominiak, Hensley, Brooks, Babitch, Fort, Lysiak, Nichols, and Stephenson. Absent Senators included: Watson, Odom, McNertney, Becker, Butler, Benison, Thomas, Wilson, Lamb, and Kucko.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of February 4, 1993 were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Jennifer Scott will be the Skiff reporter today.

2. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate met with the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs on March 2 and discussed the following items:

   a. faculty salaries and the 40th percentile issue
   b. merited LOA policy for nontenured faculty (handout given for discussion at April meeting)
   c. proposed addition to the 1993-94 Nontenured Progress, Tenure and Promotion Calendar and Procedures document (handout given for discussion at April meeting)
   d. agenda items for the Board of Trustees meeting March 25-26
   e. Senate Budget Committee meeting with Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Vice-Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs
   f. tenure process
   g. issue of mandatory final exams
   h. representation of various colleges/schools on TCU committees
   i. issue of communication between administration and University committees

3. A Faculty Assembly has been scheduled for Friday, March 26 at 3:30 pm for the Chancellor to discuss his response to the Task Force on Minority Affairs report, outcomes of the TCU budget process, Board of Trustees matters, and faculty concerns. All faculty are encouraged to be present for this forum.
4. There have been four resignations from the Senate in the past several months due to personal reasons. Due to the lateness of the semester, an election for replacements will not be held.

NEW BUSINESS:

Report from Mary Anne Gorman, Chair. University Evaluation Committee; Larry Kitchens. Director, Center for Instructional Services on status of administrator evaluations.

At the request of Chair King, Mr. Kitchens provided an overview of the history of administrator evaluation at TCU. Although discussion of this type of evaluation occurred in 1989, it was not until Spring 1991 that a decision to begin academic administrator evaluation was made. The Evaluation Committee decided then to use a pilot evaluation form for at least two years and to provide a format to allow evaluation of one's immediate supervisor. The second year ended with the current semester with 336 faculty and administrators participating (see attached Summary of 1993 Academic Administrator Evaluations).

Mr. Kitchens collected faculty comments during the evaluation process. Several faculty indicated that additional items are needed on the forms or that a different process needs to be in place to evaluate academic administrators. Although a motion to extend the evaluation of administrators more than one level up was approved by the Evaluation Committee last Fall, Senator Gorman and Mr. Kitchens noted the Committee is advisory and cannot make policy to implement the motion. Additional discussion focused on the reliability and validity of the instrument, whether variant forms could be developed for evaluation of non-academic administrators, and the value of evaluation if the data may not be used by those evaluated. Senator Fort verbalized concern about possible nonuse of such data. He noted that the Self-Study Report filed by the Faculty Subcommittee of Educational Programs identified problems in communication between faculty and administrators which may have been reflected on administrator evaluation forms.

Mr. Kitchens and Senator Gorman noted that, although administration has accepted in principle administrator evaluation beyond the immediate level, belief exists that only perceptions of the administrator should be measured. Measurement of perceptions would occur when a faculty member has infrequent contact with the administrator being evaluated. Senators were encouraged to send further comments/concerns to either Senator Gorman, Mr. Kitchens or other members of the Evaluation Committee to help improve the process and content of administrator evaluation.
OLD BUSINESS:

**Academic Excellence Committee:** Explore development of formal evaluation of academic advising. If such formal evaluation is recommended, outline a procedure.

Senator Fortenberry, Chair of this Committee, stated that she will report on this charge and that of the final exam in the April meeting.

**Student Relations Committee:** Examine the Self-Study documents relevant to student comments about faculty performance and report recommendations to the Senate.

Senator Franzwa, Chair of Student Relations, commented that in reviewing Self-Study documents, undergraduate and graduate students rated faculty positively. Students were most upset about the campus parking situation, the food service, and campus security. Students also had concerns about faculty advising and the use of student evaluations by faculty. Senator Franzwa stated that faculty workshops might deal with the first problem, and that perhaps students need to be aware of departmental policies on the use of student evaluations of instruction to improve teaching. A few students commented that they felt that a few faculty were incompetent and expressed concerns about University tolerance of such faculty. Discussion ensued with Senators agreeing that dealing with poorly performing faculty is a departmental issue with chairs needing to utilize resources and personnel management skills to deal with the problem. There was general agreement that students need to know about tenure/promotion/merit documents which allow for evaluation of faculty performance.

**Student Relations Committee:** Investigate the University's commitment to recruiting National Merit Scholars in view of the fact that there are fewer of these students at TCU as compared to some other Southwest Conference Schools.

Senator Franzwa updated the Senate on information he has recently collected on this charge. According to the Financial Aid office, slightly more than $2.8 million was devoted to 250 athletic scholarships compared to slightly more than $1.8 million devoted to 1400 academic scholarships last year. Senators expressed concern about the imbalance in funding for students involved in these two programs.

NEW BUSINESS:

**Student Relations Committee:** Examine the potential of developing a University-wide voluntary test file and a bank of course syllabi and new courses proposals to be housed in a central University place.
Senator Franzwa reported that his committee felt no compelling reason to do this and, in fact, a survey of constituents indicated much opposition to such a file/bank. This file/bank would need constant updating, could be misleading, and might not have consistent participation by faculty. Senators agreed that students need to communicate with their faculty about course information needs. Perhaps a new course currently being considered by the Deans ("The University Experience") could cover this type of information.

Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee: Explore the advisability of the development of individualized weighting of evaluative criteria for faculty and make recommendations. Consider the model of the Political Science Department.

Chair King, in the absence of Senator Wilson, noted that the committee has looked at the Political Science model in which faculty must be rated satisfactory in all five areas but must make a unique contribution in one area mutually chosen by the department and the faculty member. The committee noted that the existence of such a model indicates its availability to other departments.

Role and Function of the Senate Committee: Explore means of communication between Senators and their constituencies and make recommendations.

Motion for consideration: The Role and Function Committee recommends the following be adopted by the TCU Faculty Senate in an effort to both facilitate and improve communication between Senators and their constituencies:

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall write a synopsis of each meeting and forward it to University Relations for publication in the next issue of the Faculty Bulletin.

2. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall prepare an annual report that briefly details the activities and outcomes of the Faculty Senate for the previous academic year. This report shall be distributed to all faculty with the September Faculty Senate agenda and should provide both information and a mind set for the upcoming year.

3. A list of Senators and their constituencies should be distributed with the agenda for the September meeting of the Faculty Senate.

4. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall request the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs to direct the Deans and Chairs to ask Senators to report at each faculty meeting.
5. At all general faculty assemblies, the Chair of the Faculty Senate will report the activities of the Senate to those present. In addition, at least one meeting in an academic year of the Faculty Assembly will be held in a town hall format so that all faculty may voice opinions and concerns pertaining to TCU.

6. Each Senator will be requested to send a letter to his/her constituency informing them of meeting dates and asking for agenda items.

7. During the opening luncheon, the Chair of the Faculty Senate is encouraged to be more forceful in requesting that all faculty members attend and use the Senate.

Senator Raessler, Chair of the Role and Function Committee, introduced the motion. It was agreed by the Senate to change the wording in #7 to read "encouraged to be forceful. . . ." After discussion about the items, the seven recommendations were voted on as a block. The motion passed with 2 votes in opposition.

Motion for consideration: The Role and Function Committee recommends that the Chair of the Faculty Senate explore the Senators' opinions regarding the taping of the meeting by the Skiff reporter and going on record with the results of the survey.

Senator Raessler noted that in the past, some Senators have not wanted the meetings taped, but a formal vote on this issue has never been taken to reflect the wishes of the total Senate. Senators agreed to add "and the Senate Secretary" to the motion and to clarify that taping would be audiotaping. The motion, therefore, would read "audiotaping of the meeting by the Skiff reporter and the Senate Secretary and . . . ." The question was called and passed.

Committee on Committees: Survey faculty to determine individual interests and qualifications for University committee service.

Senator Couch, Chair of Committee on Committees, submitted a motion to be voted on in the April meeting which proposes to clarify the current election procedure for Faculty Senate officers (on 4/1 agenda). Senators agreed that campaign statements may be included with the agenda for the May Senate meeting.

Faculty responses to the Committee on Committees' survey requesting faculty committee choices are currently being returned. According to Senator Couch, an average of 54% of faculty did not serve on any University committee during 1991-2. Several Senators commented that University service
should be part of the faculty role and is, in fact, stated as an expectation in the recently approved AAUP statement on professional ethics. Senator Breyer stated that most departments and the University do not seem to value service activities for promotion and tenure. It was suggested that the Senate needs to raise the consciousness of the Deans, Chairs, and other administrators about the value of Faculty Senate and other University service. Senator Tucker formulated a motion for the Senate to examine the service issue next year. This motion will be voted on in the April meeting.

Motion proposed by Senator Babitch: Resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to Chancellor Tucker for providing the 1993-94 financial planning document and cover letter dated 1/15/93. We are gratified that the administration is rapidly complying with the Self-Study suggestions regarding budgetary input from the faculty.

This motion passed unanimously. Chair King reminded Senators to feel free to submit resolutions commending positive things going on in the University.

On a similar note, Senator Fort commended Senator Franzwa on his report about student perceptions of faculty based on the Self-Study survey. Senator Fort will formulate a similar motion to examine faculty perceptions of academic administrators based on the same survey. This will appear on the April agenda.

Senator Gaul reported that the Senate Select Committee on Teaching Effectiveness plans an open forum for faculty on March 29 to discuss their work on defining quality teaching.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm. The next scheduled meeting will be April 1, 1993.

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Secretary

FR: FACULTY SENATE
P.O. BOX 32899

TO: WILLIAM H KCEHLER
P.O. BOX 30788
The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University met at 3:35 pm on February 4, 1993 in the Faculty Center, Reed Hall. Chair, Paul E. King presided. Senate members present included: Franzwa, Trachtenberg, Odom, McNertney, Becker, Butler, Fortenberry, Tucker, Couch, Gorman, Benison, Harris, Thomas, Garrison, Freeman, Potvin, Solomon, Raessler, Cagle, Gaul, Wilson, Dominiak, Lamb, Hensley, Brooks, Kucko, Babitch, Fort, Lysiak, and Oberkircher. Absent Senators included: Forrer, Watson, Breyer, Fenker, Nichols, Payne, and Stephenson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of December 3, 1992 were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

The Southern Association of Schools and Colleges Reaccreditation Team completed their visit on campus yesterday and have left a draft report of their findings and recommendations. A final report will be issued soon.

OLD BUSINESS:

Budget and Finance Committee: Investigate discrepancies between the Business School and other schools/departments related to the relative percentiles and sources of information used to determine faculty compensation.

Linda Moore, Chair of this committee, requested the input of the Senate on specific issues related to this charge. Discussion about concerns included the following: administrators at TCU seem to be increasing in number and in compensation; faculty have not experienced a similar increase in numbers nor in compensation; there is a need for greater faculty voice in resource allocation of the University; the definition of success at TCU seems to be related to the growth of the endowment rather than in support of human capital (faculty and staff); and, there is a lack of faculty empowerment when faculty raises are not tied to University success.

Moore noted that an attempt to compare administrative salaries at TCU to comparable positions at similar universities has been difficult due to nonequivalent positions at the various
5. Report from Mary Anne Gorman, Chair, University Evaluation Committee; Larry Kitchens, Director, Center for Instructional Services on status of administrator evaluations.

6. Consideration of the following resolution proposed by Senator Babitch:

Resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to Chancellor Tucker for providing the 1993-94 financial planning document and cover letter dated 1/15/93. We are gratified that the administration is rapidly complying with the Self-Study suggestions regarding budgetary input from the faculty.
universities. Some universities also do not release data about administrative salaries, so comparisons cannot be made with other universities. The Senate generally agreed they would be interested in comparing administrator (Dean and upper level) salaries of TCU to similar positions and salaries at other universities much like TCU. Chair Moore requested that individual Senators address their specific concerns about the salary issue to her or members of the Budget and Finance Committee after the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

Role and Function of the Senate Committee: develop a statement of ethical guidelines for faculty performance.

Motion for consideration: The Role and Function Committee proposes that the Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University adopt the 1987 American Association of University Professors Statement of Professional Ethics and that a statement affirming thus be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

Senator Raessler, Chair of this committee, presented the motion. He noted that after review of several statements on this issue, the AAUP one appeared to best reflect critical areas of advancement of knowledge, academic freedom, concern for faculty governance, the right of faculty to seek change, and a guarantee of faculty rights. Senator Raessler also presented the following further action for the recommended motion:

a. copy of the statement should be attached to the agenda and the resulting minutes of the Senate Meeting when this is passed.

b. every new and part-time faculty from this day forward should received copies of the adopted statement.

c. that the administration and the Board of Trustees be informed of this adoption and encouraged to read same.

d. the Executive Committee of the Senate should be encouraged to use this adoption to guarantee, in the future, the right and security of the academic freedom which this document advocates to all members of the academic community of Texas Christian University.

The motion with further actions was presented and passed unanimously.

Committee on Committees: Represent the interests of the faculty in the structure, functions, and membership of University committees/explore with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate ways to increase the efficacy of University service of faculty.
Motion for consideration: The Committee on Committees proposes that College and University Advisory Committees will be elected by the appropriate faculty member constituencies. The number and composition will be determined by the divisions within the respective colleges. The University Advisory Committee will be composed of 9 members: 3 from AddRan (one from each division), 2 from Fine Arts and Communication (one from each division), and one each from Business, Nursing, Education, and Brite.

Senator Couch, Chair of this committee, affirmed that the intent of the motion is to increase faculty input into advisory committees at the college and University level. Considerable discussion focused on whether the proposal might actually decrease representation of some departments. Senator Couch responded the Committee on Committees is not proposing a change to the process, the number of faculty elected to these groups, or the input of departments into the college advisory process. Senator Franzwa noted that the motion is ambiguous; the statement could be interpreted as meaning that colleges would work out their own advisory committee structure according to the Handbook but that the University Advisory Committee would be more structured. The motion was called and by hand vote passed by 15 to 13.

Academic Excellence Committee: explore requiring faculty to have a final exam or other learning experience for students scheduled during final examination time.

Senator Fortenberry, Chair of AEC, reported on her group’s discussion on this issue. The AEC would like to go on record as not recommending a requirement for final exams or final evaluative exercises. This is because the the Faculty Handbook 1992-93 states "faculty members are expected to administer final examinations or an appropriate final evaluative exercise in all classes." The AEC recommends that the word expected be clarified because currently many faculty believe such exams are required. The AEC believes also that a final exam or final evaluative exercise will be given only during the final exam period due to the Handbook statement.

Considerable discussion on the issue of required final exams ensued. Various Senators responded they had received information from their Deans that such exams were required and not just expected. Others felt such a requirement infringed on academic freedom of faculty. The Executive Committee will seek clarification from Dr. Koehler about whether final examinations are required or expected and whether a final exercise may substitute for a final examination.
Academic Excellence Committee: monitor progress toward availability of a women’s studies program as a major or minor (report delayed from December meeting).

According to Senator Payne, the committee under the leadership of Priscella Tate has met three times and will be presenting a proposal for a women’s studies program to the AddRan Curriculum Committee this Spring.

Academic Excellence Committee: study and advise the Faculty Senate on requests concerning academic matters forwarded by the Student House of Representatives.

Kristen Turner, Chair of the Student Academic Affairs Committee, has worked with members of the AEC and Senate over the past three months in refining a draft of the proposed Honor Code. Senator Freeman of the AEC has agreed to work with students regarding the wording and organization of the proposal. He has obtained examples of other honor codes from other colleges throughout the country.

Academic Excellence Committee: in conjunction with the University Library Committee, monitor the status of library resources.

Dr. Heath, Director of the Library, attended the Senate meeting in December. Senator Freeman is a member of the University Library Committee and updates the AEC members on the status of library resources.

Academic Excellence Committee: explore development of formal evaluation of academic advising. If such formal evaluation is recommended, outline a procedure.

This report was delayed until next month.

Student Relations Committee: Examine Self-Study documents relevant to student comments about faculty performance and report recommendations to the Senate.

This report was deferred to the March meeting.

Executive Committee of the Senate Report from the Vice-Chancellor:

Chair King reported that, based on conversations with the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the recently approved motion by the Senate on election of councils has not been accepted. The Vice-Chancellor is not aware of any current problems mandating a change to elected councils.
Chair King also provided a followup on the "speaker's forum" issue recently discussed by the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs is not aware of any campus group which would evaluate a speaker for the Distinguished Speakers' Forum. Senator Babitch, originator of the motion on this issue, concurred that TCU only maintained a veto capability in the selection of speakers. The motion was not removed from the table.

Senator Fort: recommend that all Senate votes be recorded as voted and that the appropriate terminology such as "unanimous," and numbers of hand votes cast be delineated as relevant in minutes of meetings.

After consensus, the motion was presented and passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm. The next scheduled meeting will be March 4, 1993.

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Secretary
The statement that follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council as Association policy, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting in June 1987.

I. Introduction

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to assure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession, the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, or the applicable provisions of the Association's Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

II. The Statement

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.
The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University met at 3:35 pm on December 3, 1992 in the Faculty Center, Reed Hall. Chair, Paul E. King presided. Senate members present included: Pranzwa, Trachtenberg, Odom, McNertney, Becker, Butler, Tucker, Breyer, Couch, Rowell, Trimiew, Benison, Harris, Garrison, Freeman, Solomon, Raessler, Cagle, Gaul, Wilson, Dominiak, Hensley, Brooks, Kucko, Babitch, Fort, Nichols, Oberkircher, Keen-Payne, and Stephenson. Absent Senators included: Forrer, Watson, Fortenberry, Fenker, Gorman, Thomas, Potvin, Lamb, and Lysiak.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of November 5, 1992 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. The Board of Trustees, Faculty Relations Committee, responded positively to Chair King's report November 19. This committee desires followup in the Spring about issues raised in the report.

2. Due to the number of remaining motions from the November meeting (OLD BUSINESS on today's agenda), Senators decided to discuss all issues on the agenda after Dr. Fred Heath's presentation scheduled for today.

NEW BUSINESS:

Report from Dr. Fred Heath, Library Director, on the status of the library budget and possible changes in the acquisition of periodicals.

Through an audiovisual presentation, Dr. Heath sought the support of the Faculty Senate for an increase in the library budget. This increase would allow maintenance of present programs and support of campus research despite escalating costs of periodicals. Citing an requested increase of $200,000 in the materials budget, Dr. Heath noted that the cost of journals are expected to increase 16.8% in the next year. This increase will make continued purchase of current periodical subscriptions,
especially costly European journals, quite expensive. However, approximately 46% of current faculty feel that periodical holdings are inadequate, and cutting of journal subscriptions on the basis of expense would not further faculty and student research at the University. After detailing the annual budget for colleges in the University, Dr. Heath noted that TCU doctoral programs require the same journals as larger universities (a concept described as "non-linear and non-elastic"). In fact, the current doctoral programs in AddRan consume the greatest amount in library acquisition monies.

To meet the challenge of retaining current periodical use and staying within budgetary restraints, Dr. Heath proposed switching to electronic access for some scientific journals. Noting that approximately $60,000 worth of periodical collections are currently rarely used, Dr. Heath commented these journal subscriptions could be cancelled based on collaborative decision-making of the College/Department and the Library. However, through electronic access and the current InterNET, these journal table of contents could be scanned, relevant journal articles requested, and copies of the article usually faxed within 24 hours to an interested party (much faster than inter-library loan). This process has been used by approximately 38 faculty this year and seems to be working well. Adoption of electronic periodical access would allow updating of current periodicals which are used frequently. Dr. Heath noted that electronic access would allow individual faculty accounts for resource acquisition, would improve journal mix and number, and help control costs.

Some Senators expressed concern about supporting the proposal for funds to improve electronic access for the library. Concern revolved around several areas: currently FAX (electronic access) provides poor quality photos, and it may prove difficult to evaluate the content of an article and justify payment for copying it merely by reading the title of the article in a table of contents.

Various Senators expressed appreciation to Dr. Heath for his working in improving library resources at TCU. Dr. Heath responded that he would appreciate the support of his proposal by the Senate today due to the budget deadline. After discussion and agreement that the Senate could vote on an unpublished motion relevant to this issue, Chair King read a letter from the University Library Committee which endorsed Dr. Heath's proposal for increased library funding. Senator Fort moved, and Senator Odom seconded the motion to endorse the University Library Committee statement. The motion passed unanimously.
Based on a concern expressed by Senator Dominiak about whether the quasi-endowment had been considered to support further library funding, Senator Gaul made a motion to investigate the source of incremental funding for the project. Senator Tucker seconded the motion. Senator Dominiak stated it was time for faculty and administration to have discussions about money taken out of University programs and placed in the quasi-endowment. Senator Breyer requested an administrator or knowledgeable faculty (e.g., Senator Hensley, Budget and Finance Committee) to address the Senate about the quasi-endowment. Senators decided by consensus to refer the issue of incremental funding/quasi-endowment to the Senate Budget and Finance Committee with direction from the Executive Committee of the Senate.

OLD BUSINESS:

Motion for consideration: The Faculty Senate calls upon the administration to either (a) make sure both sides of the political spectrum are equally represented by speakers at the Distinguished Speakers Forum, or (b) rename the series the Distinguished Right Wing Speakers Forum, or (c) withdraw from all participation and association with the forum.

Senator Babitch, originator of the motion, provided background to the motion. Senator Becker spoke against the original motion and noted that future TCU donors might be affected with approval of the motion. Senator Breyer stated that it is inappropriate for the Senate to be involved in personal politics, and it would be best for the Senate to avoid issues relevant to the Forum sponsored by TeamBank. Discussion focused on whether to make the original motion less caustic by editing it to include Faculty Senate encouragement to the bank to sponsor speakers with broad views. Senator Babitch reiterated his concern that TCU's name is affiliated with the Forum; this gives the impression that TCU supports the philosophies of these speakers. Senator King noted his impression that TCU merely provides the hall for the presentation. The Senate accepted a motion to table the original motion until at least the February meeting to allow the Executive Committee more time to investigate this issue.

Motion for consideration: The Faculty Senate calls upon the administration to cooperate in developing a mechanism for the open, rational, and equitable allocation of resources when grants for general improvements such as purchase of computers for faculty are applied for and/or received.

Senator Babitch addressed his concern that the recent process of computer allocation was not equitable and varied among colleges and departments. The motion was called, and failed by a hand vote of 23 to 8.
NEW BUSINESS:

Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee: Reconsider the issue of fair treatment of first year faculty (tabled from last year).

Motion for consideration: The Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee recommends the following statement be substituted for the current tenure policy, section IIB, 4b, p. 11 of the Faculty Handbook: The progress of faculty will be reviewed by the department chairperson and tenured faculty within their department as early as possible in their first year of employment. The first year faculty will be informed in writing of the results of the review no later than February 15. If the faculty member wishes to respond to the review, he or she should request a conference.

Senator Garrison, member of the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee presented the motion and the proposed changes in the Handbook. Senator McNertney asked what "as early as possible" meant. Senator Wilson, Chair of the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee, responded that the committee believed review of first year faculty should occur as early as possible but clearly by February 15. The intent of the committee was to insure that first year faculty are evaluated and that this evaluation occurs early enough for faculty to know about problems. The motion was presented, and it passed.

Role and Function Committee: Review the 1992 HERI Faculty Survey and reach consensus to advise Senate (and the University) that we favor/oppose utilization of the instrument at TCU.

Senator Raessler, Chair of the Role and Function Committee, presented his group's report. After review of the instrument, the group decided to reserve judgment on this recommendation until the instrument has gone through a human safeguards review.

Role and Function Committee: Reach a consensus on a recommendation to the Senate concerning the feasibility of reducing the size of the Faculty Senate.

Senator Raessler noted the size of the Faculty Senate should remain the same for the following reasons: present numbers are sufficient to provide depth and breadth of representation; a smaller Senate might not reflect a true cross section of the faculty; necessary absences from meetings already reduce the size of the Senate body; and, a larger Senate provides for a
greater diversity of views on any given issue. The group also noted that if there is difficulty now in recruiting candidates for the Senate, the problem lies elsewhere than size.

**Student Relations Committee:** Investigate the University's commitment to recruiting National Merit Scholars in view of the fact that there are few of these students at TCU as compared to other Southwest Conference schools.

Senator Franzwa, Chair of this committee, presented the group's report. According to Sandy Ware (Admissions) and David Grant (Honors Program), there are fewer such students at TCU. This apparently revolves around a decision made approximately five years ago by TCU to look at a student's total record (i.e., academic, service, etc.) to make decisions about financial support (scholarships for National Merit are based only on SAT scores). At present, 11 students hold full Chancellor's Scholarships. In response to several Senators, the Student Relations Committee will look into the numbers of full athletic scholarships at TCU.

**Student Relations Committee:** In cooperation with the Student House of Representatives, continue investigation of the establishment of an Honor Code.

Senator Franzwa noted there is continuing dialogue and work with the Student Relations Committee of the Student House on this issue. The students are committed to completion of this project, and Senator Franzwa stated he thinks a second draft will be ready for review soon.

**Budget and Finance Committee:** Investigate discrepancies between the Business School and other schools/departments related to the relative percentiles and sources of information used to determine faculty compensation.

This report was deferred to the February meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm. The next scheduled meeting will be February 4, 1993.

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Secretary
Professional Ethics

The statement that follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Council as Association policy, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting in June 1987.

INTRODUCTION

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to assure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, or the applicable provisions of the Association’s Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

THE STATEMENT

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant and not scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.
The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University met at 3:35 pm on November 5, 1992 in the Faculty Center. Chair, Paul E. King presided. Senate members present included: Forrer, Franzwa, Trachtenberg, Odom, McNertney, Becker, Butler, Fortenberry, Tucker, Breyer, Couch, Gorman, Rowell, Benison, Harris, Thomas, Garrison, Freeman, Potvin, Solomon, Raessler, Cagle, Gaul, Wilson, Dominiak, Hensley, Kucko, Babitch, Fortenberry, Oberkircher, Keen-Payne, and Stephenson. Absent Senators included: Watson, Fenker, Trimiew, Lamb, and Nichols.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of October 1, 1992 were approved with the following insertion offered by Senator Babitch: p. 2, line 8: The Vice-Chancellor noted that the 50% number was perceived as a goal and not as a mandatory number for each academic unit to attain.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Senator Trachtenberg, a new Senator from AddRan Humanities, was introduced to the Senate.

2. Jennifer Willingham was introduced as the new Skiff reporter covering the Senate during the Fall semester.

3. Senators were encouraged to sign cards circulating around the room for nominees/recipients of the Chancellor's Award for Distinguished Teaching. Chair King noted that one of the goals of the Faculty Senate is to encourage excellence in teaching. Acknowledgment by the Senate of the individuals chosen by their colleagues as quality teachers helps reaffirm that Senate goal.

4. The topic of the Faculty Assembly scheduled for December 1 at 3:30 pm will be the Self-Study. The Director of the Self-Study, Gene Alpert, will present recommendations and the summary report of the study which should be available at that time. Senators expressed interest in having this information at least a week prior to the Assembly to allow interchange with Dr. Alpert. Concern was expressed by several Senators that the recommendations of the study will need to be addressed in the context of the larger report, and they hope Dr. Alpert can provide that discussion. Senators will need to share the summary reports with their colleagues as soon as that information is available.
Approval of minutes from November 5, 1992

Announcements

Old Business

1. Two pending motions proposed by Senator Babitch and not acted upon in the November 5, 1992 meeting (see November agenda)

New Business

1. Report from the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee (see attached motion printed by committee for agenda)

2. Report from the Role and Function of the Senate Committee

3. Report from the Student Relations Committee

4. Report from the Budget and Finance Committee

5. Report from Dr. Fred Heath, Library Director, on the status of the library budget and possible changes in the acquisition of periodicals
5. Senator King noted that in review of Senate minutes over the past several years, the Senate has not taken a position on mandatory final exams. This question has been raised by several Senators in the recent past. Senator King remarked that any Senator can look at these minutes further if interested.

6. Deans (and Departmental Chairs) have received information from the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs that a process occurring at least every three years for review of all faculty must be in place by May 1993. This process is intended to review tenured faculty performance and not maintenance of tenure. Current SACS criteria state that all faculty must be reviewed at intervals, according to Senator Dominiak.

7. Senator King will be addressing the Faculty Relations Committee of the TCU Board of Trustees on November 19th. He will speak about the Teaching Effectiveness Select Committee and about faculty salaries relevant to the 40th percentile issue. Senator Fort and Dominiak asked that Senator King look at the Self-Study and speak to the Budget and Finance Committee to better understand the salary issue before the Board meeting. Although Senator King stated he will not speak to administrator/staff salaries, he will address the issue of equity with salary distribution with the Trustees.

NEW BUSINESS:

Academic Excellence Committee: Investigate the feasibility of having faculty evaluate (or complete instruments assessing perceptions of) Deans, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor (in addition to Department Chairs) during the next round of administrative evaluation.

Motion for consideration: The Academic Excellence Committee moves to extent the existing faculty evaluation procedure in the following manner: That faculty, annually, evaluate their Chair, Dean, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor. That Chairs, annually, evaluate their Dean, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor. And that, annually, Deans evaluate the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor.

Senator Fortenberry, Chair of the AEC, presented the motion as outlined in the November meeting agenda. According to the AEC Chair, the motion reflects the spirit of a similar motion presented to the Senate last year. Senator Fortenberry and Senator Gorman, Chair of the University Evaluation Committee responded to several questions which included: what forms would be used (currently under development or refinement), how will one have access to data (still undetermined), and will the forms relate to perceptions (yes). Senate acceptance of the motion will allow referral to the University Evaluation Committee which
will implement the concept, Senator Gorman noted. The Evaluation Committee has discussed the process and endorses the AEC motion. Evaluations this year will be similar to those used last year with addition of a question concerning whether the evaluator has direct or indirect contact with the person evaluated. It remains unclear who will use the data from the evaluations.

Senator Babitch questioned whether the Senate would be notified of the process of administrator evaluation once it is in place. Discussion also focused on whether non-academic administrators should also be evaluated (e.g., Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs) since faculty have interactions with these individuals as well. Senator Fortenberry commented that the charge to the AEC was only for the administrators stated in the motion. An amendment by Senator Becker to change the original motion to "... that faculty, annually, evaluate at least their Chair..." failed. The original motion was then passed.

Senators were given copies of a proposed Honor Code by the Student House of Representatives, Student Affairs Academic Affairs Committee. Senators were encouraged to read the code and provide feedback to Kristen Turner either at Box 30939 or at the Student House.

Committee on Committees: Represent the interests of the faculty in structure, functions, and membership of University committees/explore with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate ways to increase the efficacy of University service of faculty.

Motion for consideration: The Committee on Committees recommends that all University-wide councils, and College and University Advisory Committee members be elected by the faculty.

Senator Couch, Chair of the Committee on Committees, stated the intent of this motion is to reduce the total number of people on these committees and to give faculty a direct voice into membership of the councils. Smaller committee size, Senator Couch suggested, would also increase committee efficiency. Reduction in size would occur by eliminating appointed positions. Since the original motion did not include a change to committee size, Senator King asked that the original motion be split to allow discussion of the proposed elective process of University-wide councils separate from College and University Advisory Committees. Discussion focused on whether fewer committee members would actually increase committee efficiency. Various Senators expressed concern about the process of equitably distributing elected members from various schools/colleges across the proposed committees. Senator Couch stated he would consider any feedback about this concern. The question was called for the part of the motion related to University-wide councils, and it passed by voice vote.
The second part of the original motion dealing with College and University Advisory Committee members was discussed with some concern about the impact of junior faculty serving on these committees dealing with personnel issues. The question was called, and it failed to pass.

Motion for consideration: The Committee on Committees recommends that the Senate sponsor at least one Faculty Assembly per year that would be for the faculty alone. This Assembly would exclude administrators from the rank of Departmental Chairperson up. The purpose of such an Assembly would be to encourage faculty input and discussions on such matters as disparities in pay, improvement in vertical communications, and increasing faculty input into major funding decisions.

Senators responded to this by noting that the Faculty Assembly is a group of all faculty who communicate with various people within the University (see Faculty/Staff Handbook, 1992-93, p. 59). Concern was expressed that by eliminating administrators, particularly Chairs, essential communication between faculty and administrators would not occur. Senator King noted that he could not attend as Chair of the Faculty Assembly because he is currently a Departmental Chair. Several Senators felt the motion or a similar one should come from the Role and Function of the Senate Committee and not the Committee on Committees. Senator Babitch responded this issue relates to one of the charges of the latter committee ("explore ways . . . increase the efficiency of University service of faculty"). However, several faculty agreed that to exclude administrators would be a violation of the Texas Open Meetings Act. The question was called and failed.

Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee: Reconsider the issue of fair treatment of first year faculty (tabled from last year).

Motion for consideration: The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee recommends the following statement be substituted for the current tenure policy, section IIB, 5a, p. 11 of Faculty Handbook: the progress of first year faculty will be reviewed by the departmental chairperson and tenured faculty within the department as early as possible in the first year of employment. The first year faculty and the appropriate Dean will be informed in writing of the results of the review no later than February 15. If the faculty member wishes to challenge the findings of the review, he or she should request a conference with the departmental chairperson and tenured faculty within two weeks of receipt of the written notification.

Senator Wilson, Chair of the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee, addressed the proposed change related to faculty notification of nonreappointment from March 1st (current statement in Handbook) to February 15th. Senators questioned
whether the effects of the proposed two week earlier notification would be significant to mandate a change in the Handbook. Other Senators noted that current AAUP guidelines state dismissal of first year faculty may occur without cause. Due to confusion about what portion of the Handbook would change with the proposal, the motion was tabled until the December meeting.

Senator Babitch:

Motion for consideration: The Faculty Senate calls upon the administration to adjust pay so that all groups in the University (administration, faculty, and staff) achieve the same relative compensation levels based upon percentages of national compensation levels for their respective groups.

Senator Babitch addressed the group and, based on feedback from colleagues, agreed to clarify the motion to read "relevant compensation levels." Discussion focused on how this motion relates to the Senate charge to the Budget and Finance Committee to investigate appropriate faculty compensation. Concern was also expressed about examining salaries of faculty as a group rather than examining separate ranks of faculty. There was general Faculty Senate support for the idea in the motion. However, it was suggested that the Budget and Finance Committee is the appropriate Senate committee to look at this issue. Therefore, Senator Babitch withdrew his motion.

Motion for consideration: The Faculty Senate calls upon the administration to either (a) make sure that both sides of the political spectrum are equally represented by speakers at the Distinguished Speakers' Forum, or (b) rename the series the Distinguished Right Wing Speakers' Forum, or (c) withdraw from all participation and association with the Forum.

After presentation of his motion, Senator Babitch accepted Senator Becker's amendment to the motion which read "(a) make sure that all sides be represented by all speakers who come to campus for the Distinguished Speaker's Forum." The amendment was called and was defeated by the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT:

Due to lack of a quorum to continue discussion of the last motion under consideration, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Secretary
Report from the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee:

Motion for consideration: Addition for Handbook for Faculty and University Staff p. 11

As it exits:
4a. The institution will normally notify faculty members in writing of the terms and conditions of their renewals by March 15, but in no case will such information be later than April 15.

b. After the first year the chairperson and tenured faculty members will review annually the progress of the nontenured faculty within their department. The non-tenured faculty member and the appropriate dean will be informed in writing of the results of this review. If the faculty members wishes to challenge the findings of the review he or she may request a conference with the chairperson and the tenured faculty.

Suggested revision:
4a. as is

4b. (new)
The progress of faculty will be reviewed by the department chairperson and tenured faculty within their department as early as possible in their first year of employment. The first year faculty will be informed in writing of the results of the review no later than February 15. If the faculty member wishes to respond to the review, he or she should request a conference.

4c. will be the current 4b.

4d. will be the current 4c.
FR: FACULTY SENATE
P O BOX 30791

TO: WILLIAM H KOEHLER
P.O. BOX 30788
TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
October 1, 1992

The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University met at 3:30 pm on October 1, 1992 in the Faculty Center. In the absence of the Chair, Chair-elect John Breyer presided. Senate members present included: Forrer, Franzwa, Watson, Odom, McNertney, Becker, Butler, Fortenberry, Tucker, Couch, Fenker, Gorman, Benison, Harris, Freeman, Raessler, Cagle, Gaul, Wilson, Dominiak, Lamb, Hensley, Brooks, Kucko, Babitch, Fort, Nichols, Oberkircher, and Stephenson. Senate members absent included: Rowell, Trimiew, Thomas, Garrison, Potvin, King, Solomon, Lysiak, and Keen-Payne.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of September 3, 1992 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Marjorie Lewis, Senator from AddRan, Humanities, has resigned from her current Senate position. Activity is underway to find a replacement for her.

2. Due to the resignation of Marjorie, Susan Wilson has agreed to assume the position of Chair of the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee of the Faculty Senate for this year.

INVITED REPORT:

Based on a request from the Executive Committee, Vice-Chancellor Koehler attended the meeting and responded to questions about recent University plans to modify class schedules out of prime-time hours. According to the Vice-Chancellor, there has been concern since last summer about the difficulty of scheduling classes for incoming students and meeting faculty requests for instructional rooms. Based on an analysis of several factors, the Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor decided that moving some sections of UCR to non-prime time would increase choices in class offerings and allow for more efficient use of classroom space.

Analysis of the scheduling of the Fall 1992 UCR showed that 56% of sections were placed into 37% of available timing options (see attachments for specifics of section scheduling). There
Discussion ensued about the impact of course rescheduling to meet the non-prime time goal. Senator Dominiak stated that many students work early and late in the day to support academic plans and, therefore, need courses during the middle of the day. She questioned whether the original proposal heard by faculty included mandatory rescheduling of at least 50% of faculty classes (especially UCRs) outside prime time in Fall 1993. If the original proposal was true, how is it consistent with the Vice-Chancellor's statement that only 20 of more than 300 classes would need to be moved to ameliorate the problem? Senator Babitch asked if all departments will need to meet the 50% criterion. The Vice-Chancellor noted that some departments will need to teach at least 50% of their courses at non-prime time hours to meet curriculum needs but that other departments might not meet the 50% level each semester due to various factors. Concern about faculty meeting credit hour production goals when the rescheduling plan becomes effective was also voiced by Senator Raessler. Although the Vice-Chancellor stated he did not perceive a problem, faculty expressed concern that faculty teaching at non-prime test hours may not be able to attain credit hour production goals due to fewer students enrolling in these classes.

Senator Fort questioned whether the real issue with rescheduling is with the number of available classrooms and not with the timing of courses. The Vice-Chancellor agreed that lack of sufficient instructional space is a problem. Senator Fort noted that students include reasons such as personal safety for avoiding classes in non-prime time periods. Although the Vice-Chancellor commented that all Deans were notified early this fall about the scheduling change and collectively came to an agreement about the change, Senator Fort questioned whether individual departmental chairs received a clear communication about the change from their relevant Dean.

Both Senator Nichols and Franzwa voiced concern about moving UCR into non-prime time hours particularly with the high number of TCU students who have credit commitments such as band, chorus, etc. A master list of scheduled student activities could be used as a foundation for scheduling of classes. The Executive Committee will look into this since no one seemed to know of such a list. The Committee will also compile a list of
extracurricular courses (band, etc.) which satisfy course requirements and circulate to Senators.

Senator Franzwa also inquired whether there is a problem of small classes being held in large rooms. The Vice-Chancellor noted that about 14% of rooms with a capacity of 50-100 chairs have that number of students in them. The Vice-Chancellor agreed effective utilization of instructional space on campus is an issue needing attention. Overall, location, size of room, faculty accessibility to classroom, and time of class are all factors considered by the Registrar in deciding class scheduling.

The Vice-Chancellor discussed that unit Chairs and their respective Deans will collaborate to produce a schedule by November 1 which meets unit, college, and university needs and meets non-prime time considerations. Various Senators noted concern about the needs of individual units being blocked by other units within the same College. Schedules will go to the Registrar for review and, if needed, returned to the Deans for modification by December 1. The intent is to schedule classes one year in advance from now on.

NEW BUSINESS:

Academic Excellence Committee: Investigate the policy of indicating a "W" on student transcripts after only one week of student enrollment.

Senator Fortenberry, Chair of the Academic Excellence Committee, (AEC) presented the committee members (Senators Dominiak, Fenker, Forrer, Freeman, Stephenson, and Oberkircher) and provided an overview of the current University policy of issuing a grade of "W" on a student's transcript and student concern about the policy. Students believe that the "W" may incorrectly infer that a student withdrew from a class because of a failing grade, and this may affect future employment decisions. Student concern focuses also on the short time for a withdrawal decision because, in many instances, students do not have sufficient time to evaluate a class. Relevant to policy, the University currently issues a "W" on a transcript when a student withdraws from a course after the first five class days of enrollment (prior to this time, no "W" appears on the transcript). This policy, according to Registrar Pat Miller, is in compliance with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers' Handbook, Academic Record and Transcript Guide.

Variation in the starting day of classes throughout the past several semesters has created problems with the length of time students have had to evaluate continuance in a class. For example, in the Fall 1992 semester, students with a Tuesday night class had not met their class even once before the
withdrawal date since University classes started on a Wednesday. Senators agreed that students should have the opportunity to evaluate a class at least once before making the decision to withdraw from it. Additional discussion focused on the financial implications of issuing a "W" in a course which a student has never attended due to scheduling (an issue which the AEC agreed to address later), whether TCU would be out of compliance with the association used for decisions in this area if a change was made (probably not), and the need for consistency from semester to semester for withdrawal periods. After considering the issue, the following motion was presented by the AEC and seconded by Senator Babitch:

The Committee moves to extend the "pre-W" period from five class days to fourteen calendar days from the starting day of the semester. The Committee defines "pre-W" as that period of time during which a student can withdraw from a class with no W appearing on the transcript.

The question was called, and the motion passed unanimously.

\[\text{AEC of Academic Deans: Investigate the feasibility of extending the pre-W period to four weeks.}\]

Senatorot: that after considerable consultation with the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor during the next round of Senate's Committee on Committees.

Committee on Committees.

Ernie Couch, Chair of this committee, stated a desire by his group to streamline the current Senate election process. The committee would like suggestions from other Senators about a process to allow more people to be placed on the Senate Officer election ballot and to allow the process to occur earlier in the spring. Any suggestions for how to refine the election process need to be given to Senator Couch.

United Way Contributions.

Senator Breyer called the Senate's attention to the fact that he has had conversation with several constituents who have been asked to write letters to their Deans explaining the reasons for
their lack of participation in the United Way campaign. Discussion centered around perceived pressures on faculty/departments choosing to not be part of this community drive. The Executive Committee was charged with investigating this matter further.

**Good Friday Holiday.**

Senator Fort asked for additional clarification about why TCU still honors the Good Friday holiday since there appeared to be no closure on this issue when presented in the Senate last year. The Executive Committee will look into this further.

**Voice Mail Capability of Present Phone System.**

Senator Lamb brought a question from his constituents about the ability of the present phone system to handle voice mail. The University wants "people" to answer phones and, yet, often phones go unanswered. Senators felt some departments had this capability for voice mail, but due to economics, other departments did not. Relevant to the issue of equipment discrepancies between parts of the University, Senator Freeman voiced his department's inability to get a FAX machine. The Executive Committee will examine these phone and FAX issues further.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, the Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Secretary
TO: WILLIAM H KOEHLER
P.O. BOX 30788

FR: FACULTY SENATE
P.O. BOX 30791
The Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University met at 3:30 pm on September 3, 1992 in the Woodson Room 209 of the Student Center following a Senate-hosted reception for all University faculty. Chair, Paul E. King presided. Senate members present included: Forrer, Franzwa, Watson, Odom, McNertney, Becker, Butler, Butler, Fortenberry, Tucker, Breyer, Couch, Gorman, Rowell, Trimiew, Benison, Harris, Thomas, Garrison, Freeman, Potvin, Solomon, Cagle, Gaul, Wilson, Dominiak, Lamb, Hensley, Brooks, Kucko, Babitch, Fort, Lysiak, Nichols, Oberkircher, Keen-Payne, and Stephenson. Senate members absent included: Fenker, Pittman, and Raessler.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of May 7, 1992 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Senate Reception

The Chair outlined the intent of the reception held for all University faculty prior to the Senate meeting. The reception was intended to promote interest in Senate activities as well as to respond to a recommendation made by the Role and Function Committee of the Senate last year. This recommendation consisted of having Senators "establish channels for effectively communicating with their respective constituencies." The Chair noted his disappointment with the small turnout at the reception by non-Senate faculty and requested input from the Senators about ideas to increase total University faculty involvement with Senate activities.

Summer Activities of the Executive Committee

The Chair reported that the Executive Committee was involved in the following activities:

1. developing committee charges for the six Senate committees. The Chair noted that the general charges for the committees are of equal or greater importance than the specific charges. Senators were encouraged to be aware of campus issues which may arise during the course of the academic year and which fall within the scope of Senate committee responsibilities.
TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

FACULTY CENTER, Reed Hall

OCTOBER 1, 1992, 3:30 P.M.

Meeting Agenda

Approval of minutes from September 3, 1992 Faculty Senate Meeting

Announcements

Invited Report

Report from Vice-Chancellor Koehler on class schedules and the "prime time" hours

New Business

Report from the Academic Excellence Committee:

Investigate the policy for indicating a "W" on student transcripts after only one week of student enrollment and make recommendations.

Motion for Consideration: The committee moves to extend the "pre-W" period from five class days to two calendar weeks. The committee defines "pre-W" as that period of time during which a student can withdraw from a class with no W appearing on the transcript.

Investigate the feasibility of having faculty evaluate (or complete instruments assessing perceptions of) Deans, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor (in addition to Department Chairs) during the next round of administrative evaluation.
2. Finalizing Senate recommendations for faculty to serve on University committees.

3. Attending regular meetings with the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) and the Chancellor. As a result of meeting with the Chancellor, tentative topics for the Fall Faculty Assembly are being considered (capital campaign, University response to the Minority Task Force, and Self-Study). Faculty lunches with the Chancellor will continue this year due to mutual interest of faculty and the Chancellor. The VCAA has agreed to fund a survey of faculty attitudes on teaching, research, and administrative support via of an instrument developed by HERI (Higher Education Research Institute) if the Senate wishes to sponsor the survey. The Chair referred to matter to the Role and Function Committee of the Senate for a recommendation. The Chair also commented that the Chancellor's home is being remodeled supported by the Chancellor's personal funds to improve security of the residence.

4. Exploring the Senate resolution passed on May 7, 1992 on administrative salaries. The Chair provided an overview of the Skiff article which prompted Senate activity on this matter. The Chair noted that the Executive Committee had met with John Roach, Chair of the Board of Trustees, shortly after the resolution was passed. At that time, it was learned that an endowment supplements the Chancellor's base salary, although stipulations to the endowment do not allow the base salary of the Chancellor to be affected. The donors felt strongly that the Chancellor of the University should be compensated sufficiently to guarantee strong leadership. The Chair also stated that, based on published documents, Bill and Jean Tucker have given more than a half million dollars to TCU.

The Chair noted in summary that the real issue here is administrative salaries in general and not just the Chancellor's salary. In a June meeting, Dr. Koehler shared a cross-section of administrative salaries with the Executive Committee. Since this information was shared in confidence, it was not recorded, and no averages were calculated. Using the standard administrative salary figures published by the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA), the Chair reported that, while the top salaries published in the Skiff were at or above the 80th percentile, most administrative salaries which he was aware of appeared to be at or below the 50th percentile. The Chair emphasized that this information was anecdotal. Senator Odom suggested that any discrepancy between administrative and faculty salary averages should be a source of genuine concern to the Senate. Additional discussion ensued.
Formation of the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness

The Chair noted this committee will consist of the following faculty: Michael Brooks, Mike Dodson, Andy Fort, Bob Frye, Ellen Page Garrison, Alice Gaul, Donna Hall, Sanoa Hensley, Larry Kitchens, Kathleen Martin, and Mark Thistlethwaite (chair). The group will meet September 9.

NEW BUSINESS:

1992-93 Committee Assignments and Charges

A packet of information about the Senate committee charges and assignments was circulated to all Senators. The Chair reminded Senators that the second Thursday of the month is normally reserved for committee meetings, the first Thursday for Senate meetings, and the third and fourth Thursdays for Executive Committee business. Senators were encouraged to contact their committee chair after the meeting to establish meeting dates and place.

Class Scheduling

The Chair suggested that there are discussions underway dealing with class scheduling. Effective Fall 1993, faculty will need to teach approximately 50% of their classes, particularly UCR classes, outside prime time (9-1 pm MWF; 930-145 pm TR). Room availability and the difficulty experienced by students to enroll in needed classes to meet their UCR requirements appear to be driving this change in class scheduling. Several Senators felt UCR classes were already held outside prime time, and there seemed to be confusion as to whether faculty would have input into operationalizing this change, whether it will be mandatory for all schools, and the impact on credit hour production per faculty/school. The Senate will continue to follow this issue.

Image of TCU Faculty Senate

Senator Fort informed Senators that the University Self-Study Subcommittee on Faculty chaired by Gere Dominiak this past academic year uncovered some negative feeling among faculty about the Faculty Senate. This impression arose from review of comments made on the Faculty/Staff Survey used for the Self-Study. Senator Fort conveyed his concern that the faculty do not see the Senate as a credible body for change in the University. He offered that the report by the Subcommittee could be made available to Senators so that they could develop ideas of how perhaps the Senate could be perceived more positively by total faculty. However, Senator Domoniak noted that the report cannot be distributed until the Self-Study Committee approves such action; if she can get such permission, she will attempt to
place copies of the report in the Faculty Senate Office, Faculty Center. The Chair stated that the office is open from 1200 onward on all days except Friday. Nancy Griffin and Traci Rumble will staff the office as work-study students.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 420 pm.

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Secretary