

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
5 November 1998**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, Clayton Brown, George Brown, Greg Clemons, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Robert Vigeland, Chuck Williams, Susan White.

Members absent: Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Pamela Marcum, Pat Paulus, Bill Ryan, Bernadette Szajna, Bill Vanderhoof.

- Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:34.
- The Minutes of the 1 October meeting were approved as mailed.
- **Executive Committee Report** was given by Sherrie Reynolds. (See Attachment A)

Nothing in the report required action at this meeting and so no actions were taken.

• **Announcements**

1. Michael Scott, Director of Scholarships and Financial Aid, sent a letter to Chair Reynolds reminding faculty of the requirements for maintaining academic scholarships. A copy of the letter was distributed to the senators.
2. A memo concerning the current process of nominating persons for honorary degrees from Chancellor Ferrari to Chair Reynolds was distributed (See Attachment B). The chancellor has requested that the senate examine the current policy to determine if it is still satisfactory. If there are senators who wish to nominate an individual for an honorary degree, Chair Reynolds asked that letters of nomination be sent to her by 10 January 1999.
3. The provost asks that we look at the proposed Computing Resources Policy (See Attachment C) and bring comments to next meeting.

• **Student Relations Committee Report.**

Linda Moore, chair of the Student Relations Committee, made the report. They have been charged to look at students who don't fit in on the campus. It is a question of retention, but is broader than just retention. The committee has met once with campus constituents and have two more meetings scheduled. Some of the things they've already discussed: The Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee last year worked on retention of

students of color. They found that retention is very much related to size of the minority cohort. Also the First-Year Task Force is discussing many of these same issues.

At the last meeting of the Student Relations Committee John Schuster, of the Counseling Center, Mike Russel, who is in Campus Life, and Andy Fort, who is adviser to the Student Allies on campus, came to discuss this issue of students who don't fit in. Also a student came who last year was thinking about leaving TCU. She surveyed students that she had contact with and reported a few perceptions from those conversations.

Apparently, the Greek influence is overwhelming on this campus. The perception is that everybody must rush, when the reality is that fewer than one half of freshmen rush. The students thought that non-Greek organizations need to be more visible. They also thought that we need to provide opportunity for more faculty contact in and out of class. Faculty involvement was key for some of the students staying on campus. A third issue: diversity. There's not enough on the campus. We market more diversity in the university than we have. Faculty need to be more sensitive to different ways of learning. The advising structure also came up, especially for freshmen. Suggestions were made for an orientation course that would help students adjust to college and for adding service learning opportunities. Also, non-traditional students aren't addressed much in their special needs, such as low cost housing and childcare.

So, these are the recurring themes in their discussions so far: the Greek system, diversity, financial aid, faculty contact. At their upcoming meetings the following people are scheduled to visit: Priscilla Tate, adviser to TCU Triangle, Angie Taylor, who is Director of Drug and Alcohol Education, Kay Higgins, Director of Women's Center, and Darron Turner, Director of Minority Affairs.

• Discussion of Student Relations Committee Report

Chair Reynolds then opened the floor for questions and comments to Senator Moore. Some of the issues raised and comments made by the Senators were:

- What of the problem of the ratio of men to women? Some believe that women leave because the ratio makes it difficult to get dates.
- The advising problem will remain until something is done in the university to reward good advising. Another senator echoed this concern about what is rewarded. The suggestion was made to revise the official TCU vita form to include a section for teaching, which it currently does not have. Yet another senator noted that Peter Seldin, an expert in faculty evaluation, will be on campus in March to discuss diverse ways of evaluating faculty.
- The new faculty this year look very diverse. This is a hopeful sign.
- An article in the *Skiff* today noted how few minorities participate in the international study programs. Perhaps we should find ways to fund international travel for minorities

who can't afford it otherwise. Another senator suggested that there are already limited funds available for International Study.

- A large number of first-year students are pre-majors. Since they don't belong to a department, do they really get adequate faculty attention? Another senator noted that at other universities, all first-year students get attached to a faculty member through a one-hour seminar.
 - A senator noted that most of the retention study has to do with undergraduates. What about graduate retention?
 - Perhaps we should consider deferring rush until the spring semester to give first-year students a chance to identify with the larger campus before "splitting into teams" right up front when they arrive on campus. Another senator suggested a fair, like the major/minor fair, for campus organizations that would help students get involved in organizations.
 - The nursing school has a respectable mix of minorities. It may take more than just a group of cohorts to make diversity successful. We need a plan to encourage diverse groups to engage with each other and not simply relate to those in their cohort.
 - The committee also needs to look into those who don't fit in for academic reasons. Another senator suggested that turnover can be good. If students can't compete academically it's not a bad thing to lose them.
 - Some who leave leave not because there are no activities here, but that the activities that are here aren't meaningful to them. We need to find activities that match the needs of people.
 - Could the data from the various studies of retention that have been done over the past few years be put on the World Wide Web where we could all get a hold of them?
 - We need to remember that someone who is not academically successful during his or her first semester might develop academic proficiency later. Another senator commented that we need to be careful how quickly we are willing to say goodbye to somebody. We ought to do everything once we get someone here to help them stay here.
 - The International House is available for foreign students. Maybe we should get groups of international students to meet with different groups of other students.
 - We need to be sensitive to different learning styles of students.
- The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 by Chair Reynolds.

Respectfully submitted,

David Grant
Secretary

3

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
November 5, 1998

I. Progress report

A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:

- Review of Tenured Faculty

Executive Committee asks that the Chancellor delay taking this to the Board until the Senate has an opportunity to consider its placement in the Handbook.

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" be revised as follows (change indicated in bold print):

"In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. **Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth.** Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted. In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such request to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean."

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- The note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as approved by the Faculty Senate 2/7/91 be revised to read: "This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents."

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- Additions to the "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy" found on page 14 and 15 of 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* to include Professional Ethics.

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- The Faculty Senate voted to accept the procedures for grade appeals (#1-#3) submitted by the Academic Appeals Committee and that procedure #4 be sent back to the Committee for further consideration.

Approved by University Council 9/28/98, effective immediately.

- "The Faculty Senate recommended that the faculty be represented on the committee that develops policies regarding the new computer system as these policies relate to academic matters and advising, and that said faculty report directly to the Senate on proposed policies before implementation. *Proposed committee charge and composition for the new committee (to replace Academic Computing) was sent to the Chancellor/Vice Chancellors for consideration on 10/28/98. This was also sent to the Committee on Committees.*

- One universal form or electronic template should be adopted for all undergraduate curriculum and UCR actions. The same form should be used also for both undergraduate and graduate curriculum actions as well, with a simple blank used to designate undergraduate or graduate actions. *A subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council has revised the current forms per the council's suggestion. These will be reviewed at the meeting on November 20th. In addition Undergraduate Council will consider an attachment to the new forms that will result in a three page form for the Undergraduate Council and the UCR.*

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

Provost has discussed with Deans and will discuss with Executive Committee.

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer. *Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.*

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR -Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council. *Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.*

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee if/when it is created.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee .

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee .

II. Proposals from the Executive Committee

A. Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required. Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

B. As you know, the Executive Committee has asked the Chancellor and the Provost to postpone taking to the Board the proposed addition to the Handbook on Review of Tenured Faculty. We believe that this should not be a part of the tenure policy (which requires Board approval). Faculty evaluation is an important issue and should be addressed, but should not be confused with the granting of tenure. Therefore we suggest a new section be added to the Handbook (in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy". We suggest that this new section on the Professional Review and Development of Faculty should be created for the new policy on review of tenured faculty which was passed by the Senate last spring. A motion to this effect will be presented to the December meeting of the Faculty Senate. A copy of the proposed addition is presented below:

V. Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty

The purpose of a professional peer review of faculty is to provide effective evaluation, beneficial counsel, and timely and positive assistance to ensure

that each faculty member has every opportunity, consistent with departmental, college and university goals, to experience healthy professional development and productivity throughout the faculty members entire career.

1. The review process must not subvert the rights of academic freedom and tenure, nor reduce the faculty members prerogatives of appeal as specified by the *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* (Faculty Grievance Policy, pp. 22-25, 1997-1998 Handbook). *The faculty member always has the prerogative to provide a written response to an action at any stage of the post tenure review process.*

2. Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated at least every five years by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. Faculty members with administrative appointments at the level of Dean and above shall be exempt from this process.

3. The criteria used in the evaluation shall be established by departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. These criteria should clearly state departmental expectations, consistent with departmental, college and university goals, for all areas of evaluation; and should be differentiated by rank and level of seniority as relevant.

4. The initial year for the review of tenured faculty for each faculty member shall be established by the department and the process shall follow a timetable as established by departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. Special situations (e.g., approved leave) may justify an adjustment in the evaluation cycle. Approval for an adjustment in the evaluation cycle is required by the Dean for the department involved.

5. A written report shall be provided to each faculty member undergoing review with a copy to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall transmit the report to the Dean with additional comments as appropriate. The faculty member under review must have the opportunity to see these comments and to offer a rebuttal, if desired. Areas of exceptional contribution, if any, should be noted along with recommendations to the administration for appropriate recognition. The written report must include a faculty development plan that specifies the goals and objectives established by the faculty member in consultation with the review committee for the three year period prior to the next review. The goals and objectives in the faculty development plan must be consistent with department and university goals, and the plan must specify methods for assessing the

achievement of these goals and objectives at the time of the next review.

6. If significant areas of deficiency are identified, the faculty development plan must include a performance improvement plan that addresses the areas of deficiency. This plan, developed in consultation with the faculty member, shall include specific guidance and recommendations to assist the faculty member more fully to meet individual, departmental, college, and university goals. The performance improvement plan must include specific information on a timetable, methods of assessing achievement of objectives, and description of a process for monitoring progress and identification of completion. The Department Chair must provide a written report to the faculty member and to the Dean upon completion of the performance improvement plan.

1 In the event that the unit is not organized into departments (e.g., Harris College of Nursing), substitute Aunit@ for Adepartment@ and Aunit head@ for Adepartment head.@

2 This step is skipped if unit head is the Dean (e.g., Harris College of Nursing).

Attachment B



OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

TO: Sherrie Reynolds
FROM: Michael R. Ferrari
MR Ferrari
RE: Honorary Degrees

An honorary degree is one of the highest forms of recognition that the University can bestow upon an individual for an extraordinary record of achievement in academic or professional life, service to community and society, or contributions to the University.

The Faculty Senate is the primary body charged with soliciting nominations for honorary degrees, evaluating nominees, and recommending to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees those candidates who are judged worthy of this honor.

Process

1. Each fall, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will invite nominations for honorary degrees to be awarded at a commencement ceremony in the subsequent year.
2. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will recommend to the Faculty Senate those candidates who meet the criteria of extraordinary achievement.
3. The Faculty Senate, meeting in Executive Session, will review the recommendation and grant its approval or non-approval of those to be recommended to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.
4. The Chancellor will report to the Committee on Trusteeship of the Board of Trustees the recommendations of the Senate, and the Board of Trustees will act on the recommendations at its April meeting.
5. The Chancellor will inform the Faculty Senate of the action of the Trustees. The Chancellor will contact persons approved for the honorary degree and invite them to attend a commencement ceremony in the following year for the degree presentation.



Other:

1. Generally, individuals currently holding elected political office will not be considered for an honorary degree.
2. Should unusual circumstances warrant the consideration of an individual for an honorary degree outside of the regular cycle of review, the Chancellor will consult with the Faculty Senate and if the Faculty Senate concurs, a special meeting will be held for such review and action. If approved by the Faculty Senate, the candidate will be presented to the Executive Committee of the Trustees.
3. Generally, no more than three honorary degrees will be granted in an academic year.
4. Under no circumstances will the University award an honorary degree for the promise or expectation of a financial contribution to the University by a nominee or candidate.
5. The recipient of an honorary degree will be expected to be present at a commencement ceremony or other major University convocation to receive the degree.

Attachment C

TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY COMPUTING RESOURCES POLICY

This policy is applicable to all University students, faculty and staff and to others granted use of university computing resources as defined in this policy. This policy refers to all university computing resources, whether individually controlled or shared, stand-alone or networked. It applies to all computer and computer communication facilities owned, leased, operated or contracted by the University. This includes word processing facilities, personal computers, networks, workstations, mainframes, minicomputers, and associated peripherals and software, regardless of whether used for administration, research, teaching or other purposes ("collectively, university computing resources"). It is the responsibility of every person who uses university computing resources to read and abide by these policies.

University Regulations Regarding the Use of Computers and Networks

Individuals provided access to university computing resources assume responsibility for their appropriate use. The University expects all such persons to be careful, honest, responsible, and civil in the use of computers and networks. Individuals using wide-area networks (such as the Internet) to communicate with individuals or to connect to computers at other institutions are expected to abide by the rules for the remote systems and networks as well as those for TCU's systems. In addition to violations of University rules, certain computer misconduct is prohibited under federal and state laws, and is, therefore, subject to criminal penalties. Such misconduct includes, without limitation, the following:

- Using university computing resources for illegal activity, for material that publicly advocates illegal activity, or for discussion of illegal activities with the intent to commit them.
- Participating in unauthorized reproduction, storage, or distribution of copyrighted software or other materials (e.g., text, audio, graphics, video) or illegally obtained software.
- Accessing, copying, transporting (to another person or site), modifying, or destroying programs, records, or data belonging to the University or another user without authorization, whether such data is in transit or storage.
- Sharing an account, providing passwords to another person, using another person's password or e-mail address, attempting to breach the security of another user's account, or depriving another user of access to the University's computer resources.
- Using university computing resources to harass, defame, abuse, or threaten others.
- Using university computing resources for any unauthorized non-University related activity.

- Falsely obtaining electronic services or data without payment of required charges.

Privacy of Information

Information stored on a computer system or sent electronically over a network is the property of the individual who created it. Examination of that information without authorization from the owner is a violation of the owner's rights to control his or her own property. Systems administrators, however, may gain access to user's files when it is necessary to maintain or prevent damage to systems or to ensure compliance with other University rules.

Computer systems and networks provide mechanisms for the protection of private information from examination. These mechanisms are necessarily imperfect and any attempt to circumvent them in order to gain unauthorized access to private information (including both stored computer files and messages transmitted over network) will be treated as a violation of privacy and may subject a violator to disciplinary action.

In general, information that the owner would reasonably regard as private must be treated as private by other users. Examples include the contents of electronic mail boxes, the private file storage areas of individual users, and information stored in other areas that are not public. That measures have not been taken to protect such information does not make it permissible for others to inspect it.

On shared and networked computer systems certain information about users and their activities is visible to others. Users are cautioned that certain accounting and directory information (for example, user names and electronic mail addresses), certain records of file names and executed commands, and information stored in public areas, are not private. Nonetheless, such unsecured information about other users must not be manipulated in ways that they might reasonably find intrusive; for example, eavesdropping by computer and systematic monitoring of the behavior of others are likely to be considered invasions of privacy that would be cause for disciplinary action.

Use of Facilities

Computer and network facilities are provided to authorized persons for their personal use. These facilities have tangible value. Consequently, attempts to circumvent accounting systems, to use the computer accounts of others, or to duplicate, use, or distribute software without authorization, will be treated as forms of attempted theft.

A user may not attempt to damage or degrade the performance of TCU's computers and networks and should not disrupt the work of other users. Each individual user assumes individual responsibility for the use of his or her accounts. Consequently, users may not disclose their passwords or otherwise make TCU's facilities available to unauthorized individuals (including family or friends). Use of TCU's computers and networks for commercial purposes without authorization is prohibited.

Electronic Communication

TCU neither sanctions nor censors individual expression of opinion on its systems. The same standards of behavior, however, are expected in the use of electronic mail as in the use of telephones and written and oral communication. Therefore, electronic mail, like telephone messages, must be neither obscene nor harassing. Similarly, messages must not misrepresent the identity of the sender. Messages should not be sent as "chain letters" or "broadcast" indiscriminately.

Plagiarism

Computer programs/other electronic data and documents should be regarded as individual creations and subject to the same standards of misrepresentation of copied work.

Additional Policies

Security and Privacy

- Users understand that timesharing and network-based system activity is automatically logged on a continuous basis. These logs do not include private user text, mail contents, or personal data, but do include a record of user processes that may be examined by authorized system administrators.
- TCU considers user accounts to be the private property of those who have opened them, and as a result will never ask users to reveal their passwords. However, users who request assistance from Computer Services give the staff implicit permission to view specific data in their accounts that is necessary to investigate, diagnose, or correct the problem.

Use of Facilities and the Network

- Physical theft, rearrangement, or damage to any University computer or network equipment, facilities, or property is strictly prohibited, and will be reported to the police. This includes all public computer labs, network hubs, wiring, and links. Users may not "plug-in" personal computers or peripheral devices in
- public computer labs or onto the University Network without prior authorization.
- Data packets on the network are like voice signals on a telephone line. Just as phone taps are prohibited, so too are attempts to monitor, analyze, or tamper with network data packets.

Electronic Communication and Bulletin Boards

- TCU neither sanctions nor censors individual expressions of opinion on its systems. However, obscene or harassing electronic communication (e.g.,

electronic mail) is prohibited, as are computer messages that actively target individuals in a threatening manner.

- Users who make use of bulletin board systems and other network communication utilities (e.g., Gopher, Newsgroups, the Web, list servers) do so voluntarily, with the understanding that they may encounter material they deem offensive. Students who subscribe, post messages, or simply browse through such utilities must abide by the rules governing each in addition to TCU's rules governing computing on campus.
- Although commercial work is prohibited on TCU systems and networks, some bulletin board systems (BBS) available over the network do make provisions for posting job opportunities and personal items for sale. Such activity is permissible within the constraints of policies specific to each BBS. The staff of Information Services takes no responsibility for any fraud or misrepresentation users may encounter (caveat emptor).

Cases of Misconduct

- The University's designated computer security officer shall be the primary contact for the interpretation, enforcement and monitoring of this policy and the resolution of problems concerning it. Any legal issues concerning the policy shall be referred to the appropriate officials for advice.
- If system administrators have persuasive evidence of misuse by a user of University computing resources, the University's designated computer security officer shall have authority to inspect files, diskettes, tapes and/or other computer-accessible storage media.
- By accessing and using the university's computing resources, each system user expressly consents to and acknowledges the University's right, when necessary as a function of responsible system management:
 - 1) to monitor any and all aspects of university computing resources (including, but not limited to, individual user login sessions to determine if a user is acting in violation of University policies or the law);
 - 2) to inspect all electronic files and other electronically recorded information within the university's computing resources; and
 - 3) to intercept, access, disclose and use electronic communications of any user, whether in transit or storage.
- Only the University's designated computer security officer can authorize the monitoring, inspection, interceptions, access, disclosure or use of such electronic data (including, without limitation, electronic mail) when there is reasonable cause to suspect improper use of university computing resources.

- Whenever a case of computer misconduct is suspected or reported, TCU reserves the right to deny system access to any user who violates the rules set forth in this statement. This includes the ability to terminate processes that threaten system security or performance.
- Students will be held to the same standard of conduct (in electronic communication) with faculty, officers and staff of the University. Threatening or harassing correspondence will be reported to the appropriate authority.

Student Rights and Responsibilities

- TCU must ensure that academic work takes precedence at all times over other computing activities in its facilities. In situations of high user demand which may strain available computer resources, TCU reserves the right to restrict (e.g., to specific times of day) or prohibit computer activities such as game playing.
- Mutual cooperation is essential to sustain the free flow of information fostered by campus computers and networks while protecting the integrity and privacy of personal data. Since computer systems and networks are imperfect, users are strongly requested to report any bugs or security holes to the staff of Information Services. Likewise, users should not disseminate to others any information that serves to jeopardize, circumvent, or degrade system security or integrity. Users should also be aware that certain types of computer misuse (including indirect participation) are illegal under federal and state law.
- Users recognize that systems and networks are imperfect and waive any responsibility for lost work or time that may arise from their use. TCU cannot compensate users for degradation or loss of personal data, software, or hardware as a result of their use of University-owned systems or networks, or as a result of assistance they may seek from Information Services staff.

Approved by Chancellor's Cabinet 9/22/98

Fm: Faculty Senate
TCU Box 297240
To: William H Koehler
VC Academic Affairs
TCU Box 297040

Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
1 October 1998

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, George Brown, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Greg Clemons, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Bernadette Szajna, Robert Vigeland, Chuck Williams.

Members absent: Clayton Brown, David Jenkins, Nadia Lahutsky, Pat Paulus, Gene Smith, Susan White.

Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:33.

She introduced Carolyn Cagle, a new representative from nursing, and Shana Lawler, president of the Student Government Association. She also announced that Mary Patton, of Education, resigned and that there will be an election for her replacement.

Two corrections to the minutes of the 3 September 1998 meeting were made: Ernest Couch and Alison Moreland were present although they were marked absent in the minutes. The minutes were approved as corrected.

• **Executive Committee Report.**

Chair Reynolds went over Part I of the "Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate, October 1, 1998" (See Attachment A), noting the status of previously passed Senate legislation.

Chair Reynolds brought four motions forward from the Executive Committee for action:

Motion 1: That the time period for Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty be modified from three years to five years, the specific language of the change to be incorporated in the Post Tenure Review Policy adopted by the Senate on 30 April 1998 as follows (changes indicated in **bold**):

Current policy: "Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated triennially by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty."

Proposed revision: "Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated **at least every five years** by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedure for review of tenured faculty."

OCT 26 1998

**TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
AGENDA
5 November 1998
3:30 p.m.
SID W. RICHARDSON BOARD ROOM**

- Call to order
- Approval of minutes as mailed
- Report from the Executive Committee
- New Business
 - Student Relations Committee
- Announcements
- Adjournment

Reminder: Please plan to attend the Joint Meeting of Faculty and Students sponsored by the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association.

29 October 1998
3:30 - 5:00 p.m.
Student Center Ballroom

From: Faculty Senate
TCU Box 297240
To: William R. Keebler
VC Academic Affairs
TCU Box 297040

Senator Pfaffenberger responded to a question as to why the Executive Committee recommends the change from three years to five years. He indicated that there was strong sentiment among the faculty who attended the Faculty Assembly last spring that flexibility be given to departments to schedule these reviews in light of the differing time frames for research in different disciplines. The motion was approved, 27-0.

Motion 2: That maternity leave be incorporated into the existing "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as follows (additions indicated in **bold**):

"In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non-tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. **Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth. Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted.** In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean."

Discussion of the motion: Senator George Brown asked the relation of this new policy to the FMLA. Chair Reynolds indicated that this was being addressed separately. Senator Bobich suggested that the proposed policy was discriminatory in that it gave an extension to female faculty members but not to males who become fathers. Senator Hughes expressed concern about the male's role but noted that there are physiological pressures on women in pregnancy. Provost Koehler indicated that we don't know what impact this policy will have, but it is proposed as a way of responding to a perceived need. Senator Pfaffenberger noted that the FMLA addresses the procedure for granting leave time to fathers who need it. Senator Keen-Payne noted that we don't know if such a policy will be often used, but it can be a significant recruiting tool for new female faculty.

Senator Fortenberry called the question. The motion to call the question was approved.

The motion to add the maternity policy to the Statement of Tenure Probationary period was approved, 23-3.

Motion 3: That the note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period," passed by the Faculty Senate on 2/7/91 and which currently reads:

"This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents and is verbally announced by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the new faculty briefing each year."

be amended to read:

“This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents.”

Chair Reynolds indicated that, because this was published now in all department and college documents, there was no longer a need to announce it verbally. The motion was approved, 29-0.

Motion 4: That the Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy be amended to include as a sixth criteria for appointment, reappointment, and tenure the following: “Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics” (See Attachment B for the proposed amended Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy).

Senator Bobich spoke in favor of the motion. No one spoke against it.

The motion was approved, 28-0.

• **Discussion of the 1998–99 University Goals**

Chair Reynolds then asked Senators to comment on or ask questions about the draft of 1988-99 University Goals that Chancellor Ferrari distributed at the September Senate meeting. Chancellor Ferrari received informal comments and questions from the Senators.

• **Announcements**

Chair Reynolds made the following announcements.

1. Provost Koehler has invited the entire Faculty Senate to join him at a future date to repel at the repelling tower near the Amon Carter Stadium. The Senate Executive Committee joined him last week to repel with the Army ROTC.
2. Our fall joint meeting of the Student House and Faculty Senate will be held on 29 October from 3–5 in the Student Center Ballroom. The topic is a discussion of the question, “What is an educated person?” Letters to administrators will invite them to come listen to the discussion.
3. The Senate Roster is not yet ready due to pending elections to replace recently resigned members.

Chair Reynolds adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant
Secretary

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
October 1, 1998

I. Progress report

A. Items passed by the Senate in 1997-98 which are still in process:

- "The Faculty Senate recommended that the faculty be represented on the committee that develops policies regarding the new computer system as these policies relate to academic matters and advising, and that said faculty report directly to the Senate on proposed policies before implementation.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee if/when it is created.

- The Faculty Senate voted to accept the procedures for grade appeals (#1-#3) submitted by the Academic Appeals Committee and that procedure #4 be sent back to the Committee for further consideration.

The Grade Appeal Document was looked at by the Academic Excellence Committee, sent back to the Grade Appeals Committee and then a compromise document was accepted by the Senate (see 30 April minutes, p. 6). This document is to be presented to the University Council for final approval.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.
Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.

- The Senate endorsed in principal the proposal of the RIB Committee related to retirement benefits for the general staff.

Addressed by Chancellor Ferrari at convocation.

- Recommendation to form a Diversity Council.

Addressed by Chancellor Ferrari at convocation.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR (Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- One universal form or electronic template should be adopted for all undergraduate curriculum and UCR actions. The same form should be used also for both undergraduate and graduate curriculum actions as well, with a simple blank used to designate undergraduate or graduate actions.

Provost will take to Deans.

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

Dean Garwell asked the Undergraduate Council at its meeting on Friday, 18 September, about having a faculty co-chair. The Council did not think this was necessary and expressed a concern about the work load and secretarial help that faculty chairing or co-chairing would involve. The importance of the symbolism of a faculty co-chair did not override the practical concerns of finding a faculty member willing to do the job and finding clerical support for that faculty member. Provost will take to Deans and Graduate Council.

- Chair Fortenberry presented the proposed Non-discrimination Policy to the Senate. The Executive Committee moved to recommend that this policy be accepted.

Policy is in the Bulletin.

- The Senate passed a resolution which supports the formation of a task force to study retirement opportunities and

incentives to faculty (Related to the RIB committee report on Faculty Phase-Out Early Retirement Plan).

Ken Morgan and Greg Franzwa met with the attorney and Ed Bivins. They discovered that exceptions can not be currently made to the retirement policy (Total of age (minimum 55) + service (minimum 10 years) \geq 75). Ed Bivins and the Provost are looking into changing eligibility requirements.

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee is gathering information and have asked the Center for the Support of Teaching to bring in someone to assist faculty in understanding the possibilities and issues which should be considered. This will be followed by a discussion in a subsequent Senate meeting.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee if/when it is created.

- Tenure Promotion and Grievance Committee recommended:
"The TPG Committee conduct a research study in the 1998-99 academic year to determine (1) the concordance of review processes used by departments with the policy statement placed in the *Handbook* and (2) the concordance of the review processes used by departments with 'best practices' used in reviews at other universities."

This charge has been added to the charges to the TPG committee.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- Academic Excellence Recommendations for Evaluation of the UCR.
- Continuing Review of Tenured Faculty

- FMLA

II. Motions from the Executive Committee

- Revision of the time period for Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance committee report to the Senate generated quite a bit of discussion about the time period for these reviews. This discussion mirrored the concern expressed by some faculty members at the spring Assembly. In light of that concern, which appeared to fall along disciplinary lines, the Executive Committee decided to re-think the time period. Our suggestion is that at the University level only the upper limit should be specified, leaving the specification of the particular time period to the College, School or Department level. The academic Deans and the Provost are amenable to this change. Therefore the Executive Committee proposes that the statement:

"Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated triennially by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty" be revised to read (changed portion indicated in bold print)

"Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated **at least every five years** by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty"

- Maternity Leave

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee recommended that "The issue of extending the tenure clock for persons in their probationary period who receive FMLA leaves requires additional study. Further, a recommendation on extending the tenure clock for FMLA leaves should be linked with a policy to provide extensions for maternity leaves."

The Academic Deans have recommended and the Executive Committee has agreed and proposes to you that the "Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" be revised as follows (change indicated in bold print):

"In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. **Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth. Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted.** In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member

may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such request to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean."

- Announcement of statement at the new faculty briefing

The note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as approved by the Faculty Senate 2/7/91 includes the note:

"This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents and is verbally announced by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the new faculty briefing each year."

The Executive Committee recommends that the note be revised to read:

"This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents."

- Statement on professional ethics:

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance committee recommended last year that "Collegiality should not be considered as an explicit factor in tenure decisions. The statements regarding tenure policy in the 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* (which makes no reference to collegiality) should stand." The Executive Committee agreed at the April meeting of the Senate to draft a proposal to address the issue of professional ethics in tenure decisions.

The Executive Committee believes that this issue can best be addressed by including ethical conduct (as defined by the "Statement on Professional Ethics" adopted by the Senate and found in the 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* on p. 16.

The Executive Committee proposes additions to the "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy" found on page 14 and 15 of 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* as indicated in the attached.

ATTACHMENT B

*Changes to the Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy
Approved by the Faculty Senate, 1 October 1998
(Additions to the policy are double underlined)*

Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy
(Revised by Faculty Senate, 1 October 1998)

Advancement in rank is made by the Board on recommendation of the Chancellor.

I. General Criteria

The following general criteria shall apply in consideration of recommendation for reappointment and promotion. Departmental and/or college documents identify specific criteria and emphases used to determine if faculty have met these general criteria. They are readily available to the University community and specifically reported to each nontenured, tenure track faculty member on an annual basis.

These criteria are:

- A. Teaching
- B. Scholarship, creativity and its equivalentents
- C. Service to the University and the profession
- D. Advising and related activities
- E. Professional development
- F. Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics

Teaching and scholarship are the central considerations in reappointment and promotion. Service to the University and the profession, advising, professional development, and professional ethics are also important considerations but will not serve as substitutes for teaching and scholarship

A. Teaching.

The instruction of students is the first purpose of the University and the prime responsibility of every faculty member. Therefore, Texas Christian University expects each member of the faculty to have knowledge of his or her subject commensurate with the teaching assignment, to maintain awareness of developments in his or her discipline, and to communicate to students both knowledge of and interest in his or her discipline. The faculty member should encourage students in responsible and careful inquiry, in appreciation of the interrelation of various disciplines, and in recognition of the uses of learning and the value of the educated mind. The University affirms that teaching effectiveness can be assessed; the procedures and results of such assessment to be a part of considerations for reappointment and promotion.

38 B. Scholarship, Creativity and Their Equivalents.

39 Texas Christian University expects that each member of the faculty will
40 provide evidence of his or her professional competence through scholarship, re-
41 search and other creative activities appropriate to the discipline, with such activi-
42 ties presented in the proper professional forums and reflected in the classes con-
43 ducted by the faculty member. Such activities must be measured by quality, not
44 merely by quantity, and, at the time of consideration for reappointment and
45 promotion, the criteria expressed in Section II of this document shall be applied.

46
47 C. Service to the University and the Profession.

48 Service to the University and to the Profession are integral aspects of faculty
49 responsibility.

50 1. University service. The faculty member should perform well in committee
51 and other nonteaching University assignments.

52 2. Professional service. The faculty member should participate in profes-
53 sional and community organizations related to his or her discipline.

54
55 D. Advising and Related Activities.

56 Advising is an important faculty function which encompasses academic as
57 well as other activities such as career counseling which may be considered appropri-
ately related to advising by academic units.

58
59
60 E. Professional Development.

61 Faculty members are expected to actively maintain professional knowledge
62 and skills, and be aware of developments within their discipline and fields of
63 specialization. They should pursue programs of study and self-development related
64 to their academic discipline and should continue to cultivate their academic
65 interests and professional competencies throughout their careers.

66
67 F. Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics

68 Faculty members are expected to comply with the Statement on Professional
69 Ethics adopted by the Faculty Senate on 4 February 1993.

70
71 ***II. Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion***

72
73 The following should be regarded as firm but not absolute criteria because
74 unusual circumstances and qualifications may justify special procedures. Profes-
75 sional credentials of the faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor or higher
76 are understood to include the appropriate terminal academic degree or the earned
77 professional equivalents. For such degrees and equivalents, teaching experience is
78 not an allowable substitute. The terms of appointment to any academic rank will
79 be stated in writing by the appropriate administrative officer of the University at

80 the time appointment is made and in accordance with procedures described in the
81 *Faculty/University Staff Handbook*.

82 The criteria here stated are not to affect adversely the ranks held by mem-
83 bers of the faculty of Texas Christian University at the time of the adoption of this
84 policy, but following its adoption the policy will apply to all decisions regarding
85 reappointment and promotion.

86
87 A. The Junior Faculty Ranks

88 1. Lecturer. This title is reserved for individuals holding temporary appoint-
89 ments.

90 2. Instructor. The rank is most commonly assigned to persons filling
91 temporary appointments and to those lacking the appropriate terminal academic
92 credentials.

93 3. Tenure Track Instructor. The position is tenurable with evaluation based
94 upon the following criteria: teaching, service to the University and the profes-
95 sion, advising and related activities, professional development, professional
96 ethics.

97 4. Assistant Professor. The candidate for an assistant professorship is
98 expected to demonstrate an increasing knowledge of his or her discipline, and
99 growing competency in teaching and scholarship. As a general rule, five years of
100 service in this rank are expected before consideration for promotion to an
101 associate professorship.

102
103 B. The Senior Faculty Ranks. The faculty member appointed, reappointed, or
104 promoted to either of the senior ranks is so assigned with the expectation that he or
105 she will continue to contribute germanely to his or her profession. Such assignment
106 should be made only after careful consideration of the professional abilities and
107 prospects of the candidate. The criteria for appointment, reappointment, and
108 promotion to an associate professorship differ from those of a professorship in
109 degree rather than in kind.

110 1. Associate Professor. It is expected that the candidate for this rank will
111 demonstrate his or her professional competence through teaching, scholarship,
112 research, publication, and/or other creative activities appropriate to the disci-
113 pline, with such activities presented in the proper professional forum. The
114 candidate for associate professor should demonstrate his or her general under-
115 standing of a large part of the discipline, willingness to continue study in his or
116 her subject, and concern to improve teaching. As a general rule, more than five
117 years of service in this rank are expected before consideration for promotion to a
118 full professorship.

119 2. Professor. The candidates for this rank will by their reputation within the
120 University and beyond manifest the teaching, scholarship, and professional
121 achievements of the University faculty. In addition, such faculty should provide

122 leadership in the University and by their activities should define the best
123 character of Texas Christian University,
124

125 **III. Access to Records**

126
127 All documents related to the appointment, reappointment and promotion
128 process are part of the faculty member's personnel file and are accessible to that
129 person according to State and Federal law.
130

131 **IV. Nondiscrimination**

132
133 A. All appointments, promotions, renewals, and non-renewals of appoint-
134 ments shall be made without discrimination with regard to gender, sexual orienta-
135 tion, religion, handicap, race, national origin, political affiliation, or veteran status.

136 B. All departmental committees and administrative officials will adhere to
137 the Affirmative Action program of the University.
138
139

140 **Statement on** 141 **Professional Ethics**

143 On February 4, 1993, the TCU Faculty Senate adopted as its policy on
144 professional ethics the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. The statement is
145 reproduced from the AAUP, *American Association of University Professors, Policy*
146 *Documents & Reports*, 1990 Edition.
147

148 **The Statement**

149
150 I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the
151 advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them.
152 Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they
153 see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving
154 their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-
155 discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They
156 practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests,
157 these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of
158 inquiry.

159 II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their
160 students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their
161 discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to
162 their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every
163 reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their

164 evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confiden-
165 tial nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any
166 exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowl-
167 edge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their
168 academic freedom.

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

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

184 V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obliga-
185 tions of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the
186 light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession,
187 and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid
188 creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As
189 citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and
190 integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free
191 inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
1 October 1998**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, George Brown, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Greg Clemons, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Bernadette Szajna, Robert Vigeland, Chuck Williams.

Members absent: Clayton Brown, David Jenkins, Nadia Lahutsky, Pat Paulus, Gene Smith, Susan White.

Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:33.

She introduced Carolyn Cagle, a new representative from nursing, and Shana Lawler, president of the Student Government Association. She also announced that Mary Patton, of Education, resigned and that there will be an election for her replacement.

Two corrections to the minutes of the 3 September 1998 meeting were made: Ernest Couch and Alison Moreland were present although they were marked absent in the minutes. The minutes were approved as corrected.

• **Executive Committee Report.**

Chair Reynolds went over Part I of the "Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate, October 1, 1998" (See Attachment A), noting the status of previously passed Senate legislation.

Chair Reynolds brought four motions forward from the Executive Committee for action:

Motion 1: That the time period for Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty be modified from three years to five years, the specific language of the change to be incorporated in the Post Tenure Review Policy adopted by the Senate on 30 April 1998 as follows (changes indicated in **bold**):

Current policy: "Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated triennially by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty."

Proposed revision: "Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated **at least every five years** by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedure for review of tenured faculty."

**TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
AGENDA
5 November 1998
3:30 p.m.
SID W. RICHARDSON BOARD ROOM**

- Call to order
- Approval of minutes as mailed
- Report from the Executive Committee
- New Business
 - Student Relations Committee
- Announcements
- Adjournment

Reminder: Please plan to attend the Joint Meeting of Faculty and Students sponsored by the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association.

29 October 1998
3:30 - 5:00 p.m.
Student Center Ballroom

FROM:
Faculty Senate Box 297240
TO:
Becky Roach Box 297040

Senator Pfaffenberger responded to a question as to why the Executive Committee recommends the change from three years to five years. He indicated that there was strong sentiment among the faculty who attended the Faculty Assembly last spring that flexibility be given to departments to schedule these reviews in light of the differing time frames for research in different disciplines. The motion was approved, 27-0.

Motion 2: That maternity leave be incorporated into the existing "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as follows (additions indicated in **bold**):

"In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non-tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. **Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth. Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted.** In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean."

Discussion of the motion: Senator George Brown asked the relation of this new policy to the FMLA. Chair Reynolds indicated that this was being addressed separately. Senator Bobich suggested that the proposed policy was discriminatory in that it gave an extension to female faculty members but not to males who become fathers. Senator Hughes expressed concern about the male's role but noted that there are physiological pressures on women in pregnancy. Provost Koehler indicated that we don't know what impact this policy will have, but it is proposed as a way of responding to a perceived need. Senator Pfaffenberger noted that the FMLA addresses the procedure for granting leave time to fathers who need it. Senator Keen-Payne noted that we don't know if such a policy will be often used, but it can be a significant recruiting tool for new female faculty.

Senator Fortenberry called the question. The motion to call the question was approved.

The motion to add the maternity policy to the Statement of Tenure Probationary period was approved, 23-3.

Motion 3: That the note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period," passed by the Faculty Senate on 2/7/91 and which currently reads:

"This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents and is verbally announced by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the new faculty briefing each year."

be amended to read:

“This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents.”

Chair Reynolds indicated that, because this was published now in all department and college documents, there was no longer a need to announce it verbally. The motion was approved, 29-0.

Motion 4: That the Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy be amended to include as a sixth criteria for appointment, reappointment, and tenure the following: “Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics” (See Attachment B for the proposed amended Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy).

Senator Bobich spoke in favor of the motion. No one spoke against it.

The motion was approved, 28-0.

• **Discussion of the 1998–99 University Goals**

Chair Reynolds then asked Senators to comment on or ask questions about the draft of 1988-99 University Goals that Chancellor Ferrari distributed at the September Senate meeting. Chancellor Ferrari received informal comments and questions from the Senators.

• **Announcements**

Chair Reynolds made the following announcements.

1. Provost Koehler has invited the entire Faculty Senate to join him at a future date to repel at the repelling tower near the Amon Carter Stadium. The Senate Executive Committee joined him last week to repel with the Army ROTC.
2. Our fall joint meeting of the Student House and Faculty Senate will be held on 29 October from 3–5 in the Student Center Ballroom. The topic is a discussion of the question, “What is an educated person?” Letters to administrators will invite them to come listen to the discussion.
3. The Senate Roster is not yet ready due to pending elections to replace recently resigned members.

Chair Reynolds adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant
Secretary

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate October 1, 1998

I. Progress report

A. Items passed by the Senate in 1997-98 which are still in process:

- "The Faculty Senate recommended that the faculty be represented on the committee that develops policies regarding the new computer system as these policies relate to academic matters and advising, and that said faculty report directly to the Senate on proposed policies before implementation.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee if/when it is created.

- The Faculty Senate voted to accept the procedures for grade appeals (#1-#3) submitted by the Academic Appeals Committee and that procedure #4 be sent back to the Committee for further consideration.

The Grade Appeal Document was looked at by the Academic Excellence Committee, sent back to the Grade Appeals Committee and then a compromise document was accepted by the Senate (see 30 April minutes, p. 6). This document is to be presented to the University Council for final approval.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.
Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.

- The Senate endorsed in principal the proposal of the RIB Committee related to retirement benefits for the general staff.

Addressed by Chancellor Ferrari at convocation.

- Recommendation to form a Diversity Council.

Addressed by Chancellor Ferrari at convocation.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR (Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- One universal form or electronic template should be adopted for all undergraduate curriculum and UCR actions. The same form should be used also for both undergraduate and graduate curriculum actions as well, with a simple blank used to designate undergraduate or graduate actions.

Provost will take to Deans.

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

Dean Garwell asked the Undergraduate Council at its meeting on Friday, 18 September, about having a faculty co-chair. The Council did not think this was necessary and expressed a concern about the work load and secretarial help that faculty chairing or co-chairing would involve. The importance of the symbolism of a faculty co-chair did not override the practical concerns of finding a faculty member willing to do the job and finding clerical support for that faculty member. Provost will take to Deans and Graduate Council.

- Chair Fortenberry presented the proposed Non-discrimination Policy to the Senate. The Executive Committee moved to recommend that this policy be accepted.

Policy is in the Bulletin.

- The Senate passed a resolution which supports the formation of a task force to study retirement opportunities and

incentives to faculty (Related to the RIB committee report on Faculty Phase-Out Early Retirement Plan).

Ken Morgan and Greg Franzwa met with the attorney and Ed Bivins. They discovered that exceptions can not be currently made to the retirement policy (Total of age (minimum 55) + service (minimum 10 years) \geq 75). Ed Bivins and the Provost are looking into changing eligibility requirements.

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee is gathering information and have asked the Center for the Support of Teaching to bring in someone to assist faculty in understanding the possibilities and issues which should be considered. This will be followed by a discussion in a subsequent Senate meeting.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee if/when it is created.

- Tenure Promotion and Grievance Committee recommended:
"The TPG Committee conduct a research study in the 1998-99 academic year to determine (1) the concordance of review processes used by departments with the policy statement placed in the *Handbook* and (2) the concordance of the review processes used by departments with 'best practices' used in reviews at other universities."

This charge has been added to the charges to the TPG committee.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- Academic Excellence Recommendations for Evaluation of the UCR.
- Continuing Review of Tenured Faculty

- FMLA

II. Motions from the Executive Committee

- Revision of the time period for Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance committee report to the Senate generated quite a bit of discussion about the time period for these reviews. This discussion mirrored the concern expressed by some faculty members at the spring Assembly. In light of that concern, which appeared to fall along disciplinary lines, the Executive Committee decided to re-think the time period. Our suggestion is that at the University level only the upper limit should be specified, leaving the specification of the particular time period to the College, School or Department level. The academic Deans and the Provost are amenable to this change. Therefore the Executive Committee proposes that the statement:

"Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated triennially by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty" be revised to read (changed portion indicated in bold print)

"Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated **at least every five years** by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty"

- Maternity Leave

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee recommended that "The issue of extending the tenure clock for persons in their probationary period who receive FMLA leaves requires additional study. Further, a recommendation on extending the tenure clock for FMLA leaves should be linked with a policy to provide extensions for maternity leaves."

The Academic Deans have recommended and the Executive Committee has agreed and proposes to you that the "Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" be revised as follows (change indicated in bold print):

"In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. **Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth. Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted.** In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member

may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such request to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean."

- Announcement of statement at the new faculty briefing

The note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as approved by the Faculty Senate 2/7/91 includes the note:

"This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents and is verbally announced by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the new faculty briefing each year."

The Executive Committee recommends that the note be revised to read:

"This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents."

- Statement on professional ethics:

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance committee recommended last year that "Collegiality should not be considered as an explicit factor in tenure decisions. The statements regarding tenure policy in the 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* (which makes no reference to collegiality) should stand." The Executive Committee agreed at the April meeting of the Senate to draft a proposal to address the issue of professional ethics in tenure decisions.

The Executive Committee believes that this issue can best be addressed by including ethical conduct (as defined by the "Statement on Professional Ethics" adopted by the Senate and found in the 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* on p. 16.

The Executive Committee proposes additions to the "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy" found on page 14 and 15 of 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* as indicated in the attached.

ATTACHMENT B

Changes to the Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy Approved by the Faculty Senate, 1 October 1998 (Additions to the policy are double underlined)

Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy (Revised by Faculty Senate, 1 October 1998)

Advancement in rank is made by the Board on recommendation of the Chancellor.

I. General Criteria

The following general criteria shall apply in consideration of recommendation for reappointment and promotion. Departmental and/or college documents identify specific criteria and emphases used to determine if faculty have met these general criteria. They are readily available to the University community and specifically reported to each nontenured, tenure track faculty member on an annual basis.

These criteria are:

- A. Teaching
- B. Scholarship, creativity and its equivalents
- C. Service to the University and the profession
- D. Advising and related activities
- E. Professional development
- F. Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics

Teaching and scholarship are the central considerations in reappointment and promotion. Service to the University and the profession, advising, professional development, and professional ethics are also important considerations but will not serve as substitutes for teaching and scholarship

A. Teaching.

The instruction of students is the first purpose of the University and the prime responsibility of every faculty member. Therefore, Texas Christian University expects each member of the faculty to have knowledge of his or her subject commensurate with the teaching assignment, to maintain awareness of developments in his or her discipline, and to communicate to students both knowledge of and interest in his or her discipline. The faculty member should encourage students in responsible and careful inquiry, in appreciation of the interrelation of various disciplines, and in recognition of the uses of learning and the value of the educated mind. The University affirms that teaching effectiveness can be assessed; the procedures and results of such assessment to be a part of considerations for reappointment and promotion.

38 B. Scholarship, Creativity and Their Equivalents.

39 Texas Christian University expects that each member of the faculty will
40 provide evidence of his or her professional competence through scholarship, re-
41 search and other creative activities appropriate to the discipline, with such activi-
42 ties presented in the proper professional forums and reflected in the classes con-
43 ducted by the faculty member. Such activities must be measured by quality, not
44 merely by quantity, and, at the time of consideration for reappointment and
45 promotion, the criteria expressed in Section II of this document shall be applied.
46

47 C. Service to the University and the Profession.

48 Service to the University and to the Profession are integral aspects of faculty
49 responsibility.

50 1. University service. The faculty member should perform well in committee
51 and other nonteaching University assignments.

52 2. Professional service. The faculty member should participate in profes-
53 sional and community organizations related to his or her discipline.
54

55 D. Advising and Related Activities.

56 Advising is an important faculty function which encompasses academic as
57 well as other activities such as career counseling which may be considered appropri-
58 ately related to advising by academic units.
59

60 E. Professional Development.

61 Faculty members are expected to actively maintain professional knowledge
62 and skills, and be aware of developments within their discipline and fields of
63 specialization. They should pursue programs of study and self-development related
64 to their academic discipline and should continue to cultivate their academic
65 interests and professional competencies throughout their careers.
66

67 F. Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics

68 Faculty members are expected to comply with the Statement on Professional
69 Ethics adopted by the Faculty Senate on 4 February 1993.
70

71 ***II. Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion***

72
73 The following should be regarded as firm but not absolute criteria because
74 unusual circumstances and qualifications may justify special procedures. Profes-
75 sional credentials of the faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor or higher
76 are understood to include the appropriate terminal academic degree or the earned
77 professional equivalents. For such degrees and equivalents, teaching experience is
78 not an allowable substitute. The terms of appointment to any academic rank will
79 be stated in writing by the appropriate administrative officer of the University at

80 the time appointment is made and in accordance with procedures described in the
81 *Faculty/University Staff Handbook*.

82 The criteria here stated are not to affect adversely the ranks held by mem-
83 bers of the faculty of Texas Christian University at the time of the adoption of this
84 policy, but following its adoption the policy will apply to all decisions regarding
85 reappointment and promotion.

86
87 A. The Junior Faculty Ranks

88 1. Lecturer. This title is reserved for individuals holding temporary appoint-
89 ments.

90 2. Instructor. The rank is most commonly assigned to persons filling
91 temporary appointments and to those lacking the appropriate terminal academic
92 credentials.

93 3. Tenure Track Instructor. The position is tenurable with evaluation based
94 upon the following criteria: teaching, service to the University and the profes-
95 sion, advising and related activities, professional development, professional
96 ethics.

97 4. Assistant Professor. The candidate for an assistant professorship is
98 expected to demonstrate an increasing knowledge of his or her discipline, and
99 growing competency in teaching and scholarship. As a general rule, five years of
100 service in this rank are expected before consideration for promotion to an
101 associate professorship.

102
103 B. The Senior Faculty Ranks. The faculty member appointed, reappointed, or
104 promoted to either of the senior ranks is so assigned with the expectation that he or
105 she will continue to contribute germanely to his or her profession. Such assignment
106 should be made only after careful consideration of the professional abilities and
107 prospects of the candidate. The criteria for appointment, reappointment, and
108 promotion to an associate professorship differ from those of a professorship in
109 degree rather than in kind.

110 1. Associate Professor. It is expected that the candidate for this rank will
111 demonstrate his or her professional competence through teaching, scholarship,
112 research, publication, and/or other creative activities appropriate to the disci-
113 pline, with such activities presented in the proper professional forum. The
114 candidate for associate professor should demonstrate his or her general under-
115 standing of a large part of the discipline, willingness to continue study in his or
116 her subject, and concern to improve teaching. As a general rule, more than five
117 years of service in this rank are expected before consideration for promotion to a
118 full professorship.

119 2. Professor. The candidates for this rank will by their reputation within the
120 University and beyond manifest the teaching, scholarship, and professional
121 achievements of the University faculty. In addition, such faculty should provide

122 leadership in the University and by their activities should define the best
123 character of Texas Christian University,
124

125 **III. Access to Records**
126

127 All documents related to the appointment, reappointment and promotion
128 process are part of the faculty member's personnel file and are accessible to that
129 person according to State and Federal law.
130

131 **IV. Nondiscrimination**
132

133 A. All appointments, promotions, renewals, and non-renewals of appoint-
134 ments shall be made without discrimination with regard to gender, sexual orienta-
135 tion, religion, handicap, race, national origin, political affiliation, or veteran status.

136 B. All departmental committees and administrative officials will adhere to
137 the Affirmative Action program of the University.
138
139

140 **Statement on**
141 **Professional Ethics**
142

143 On February 4, 1993, the TCU Faculty Senate adopted as its policy on
144 professional ethics the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. The statement is
145 reproduced from the *AAUP, American Association of University Professors, Policy*
146 *Documents & Reports*, 1990 Edition.
147

148 The Statement
149

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

159 II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their
160 students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their
161 discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to
162 their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every
163 reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their

164 evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confiden-
165 tial nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any
166 exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowl-
167 edge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their
168 academic freedom.

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

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

184 V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obliga-
185 tions of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the
186 light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession,
187 and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid
188 creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As
189 citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and
190 integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free
191 inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

*file in
Binder*

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
3 September 1998**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, George Brown, Arthur Busbey, Greg Clemons, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Pamela Marcum, Linda Moore, Don Nichols, Mary Patton, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinwalt, Bill Ryan, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Bernadette Szajna, Robert Vigeland, Susan White, Chuck Williams, and Curt Wilson

Members absent: Pat Bradley, Clayton Brown, Ernie Couch, Alison Moreland, Pat Paulus, Roger Pfaffenberger, and Gene Smith

Sherrie Reynolds called meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. and then introduced Todd Shriber, *Skiff* reporter, Chancellor Ferrari, and Senate webmaster Vince Carpenter. She announced that Vince Carpenter will help senators update their browsers to the 4.0 browser level, which will be required to view the Senate web pages. Contact him if you need help to get this set up.

Chair Reynolds thanked Bernadette Szajna for refreshments and reminded senators that the list is available for other senators to sign up to bring refreshments to future meetings.

Chair Reynolds asked for a motion to approve the minutes as mailed. Two pages were missing from the minutes as mailed. Those pages were distributed by Secretary Grant. Senator Clemons moved to accept the minutes as corrected. Chair Reynolds hearing no further corrections declared the minutes approved. Chair Reynolds asked if there were individuals or departments who did not receive the minutes. Geology and Education said they did not.

Chair Reynolds gave the report from the Executive Committee (see attached). The four proposals in that report will be acted on at the October meeting.

In addition to the Senate committee charges distributed at the May meeting, the Executive Committee has added an additional charge to the Budget and Finance Committee: "Develop and recommend a procedure to insure that needed repairs, refurbishing, building and equipping of instructional and research space is reviewed annually and considered during the budget process."

A report from the Committee on Committees was made by Senator Reinecke. The job of the Committee on Committees is to monitor the university committees and to nominate faculty representatives for those committees. The Committee on Committees also nominates senate executive officers. The Committee on Committees's report from last year is in the minutes of the 30 April 1998 meeting. There are three committees that the Committee on Committees is looking at closely for effectiveness, efficiency, and whether the faculty has meaningful input. The first is the Admissions Committee. The Committee on Committees will meet next week with the chair of the Admissions Committee, Jennifer Watson, to talk about what it has and hasn't been doing and

**TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
AGENDA
1 OCTOBER 1998
3:30 P.M.
SID W. RICHARDSON BOARD ROOM**

- Call to order
- Approval of minutes as mailed
- New Business
- Report from the Executive Committee
- Executive Committee proposal to include standards of professional ethics as tenure criteria
- Executive Committee proposal to revise document on continuing review of faculty
- Executive Committee proposal to include maternity leave in the Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period
- Discussion of 1998-1999 University Goals
- Announcements
- Adjournment

why. The second is the Athletic Committee, Jim Riddlesperger, chair. This has been on the Committee on Committees's watch list for several years. The third is one that the Committee on Committees did not make much progress on last year, the Judicial Committees. The problem is that there are several committees that deal with various judicial issues. The Committee on Committees found that some committees have no business at all, and that other committees are loaded down with materials. Last year an ad hoc committee was appointed, chaired by Vice Chancellor Don Mills. But the Committee on Committees didn't get their report until the day before the 30 April 1998 Senate meeting. That report was included in the minutes from the 30 April 1998 meeting, though the Committee on Committees has not looked into this report yet. As for the nominations for University committees made by the Committee on Committees, those went from the Committee on Committees to the Provost, and from the Provost to the Chancellor; and there were no changes in the nominations that the Committee on Committees made except for those in which a faculty appointee had left the university or had his/her status changed.

Chair Reynolds turned the meeting over to Chancellor Ferrari. Chancellor Ferrari reported on his meeting with the Board of Trustees Executive Committee in August. At that meeting it was reported that the University ended the 1997-98 budget year in the black. Plans for new Brite/TCU housing were announced in the Sandage area, and progress on the Tom Brown/Pete Wright Residential Complex was discussed. An architect was selected for the Tucker Technology Center. The Chancellor also reported that the campus master plan was under review and invited Senate input to these discussions.

Chancellor Ferrari distributed copies of a draft of 1998-1999 University Goals which he had shared with the Executive Committee of the Board (attached). These goals were the result of a two-day workshop he held with the vice chancellors, associate vice chancellors, and deans. He wants faculty input on this draft of goals, especially if there is something missing or poorly stated. He hopes to distill these goals into a manageable number to guide planning for the coming year. He seeks suggestions from the Senate on these goals.

The Chancellor announced a new policy regarding alcohol consumption on campus and distributed copies to the Senators. The change involves the addition of one paragraph to the existing alcohol policy:

Except for certain specified areas in University residence halls approved by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and for specific events authorized by the Chancellor or Provost in the Dee J. Kelly Alumni and Visitors Center or other buildings, the consumption, sale, or use of alcoholic beverages is prohibited on the campus. The consumption of alcohol is permissible for persons of legal drinking age in parking lots immediately adjacent to Amon Carter Stadium from two hours before until two hours after TCU home football games. Alcohol is not permitted in the Stadium at any time.

A form will be available in the Chancellor's Office to be used by faculty or staff sponsors of events to request permission to serve alcohol under this policy.

Chancellor Ferrari then answered questions from senators about this policy.

Chair Reynolds asked the senators to look over the goals that the Chancellor distributed and e-mail any responses they might have to her. The goals will be discussed at the October meeting. Chancellor Ferrari indicated that senators should feel free to copy these goals and distribute them to their constituents.

Chair Reynolds reminded senators about the upcoming lectures by Chaim Potok.

Provost Koehler reminded the senators that they were hosting the reception for new faculty that is about to begin at 4:30. Chair Reynolds encouraged senators to attend.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 by Chair Reynolds.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant
Secretary

This page and the following page were left out of the Minutes from 30 April 1998. They should be inserted prior to the last page in the minutes that were mailed.

13. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES [REINECKE]: increased funding available, but effort to increase distribution, quality and quantity of research or creative activity in all disciplines should continue by providing encouragement and feedback.

14. RETIREMENT, INSURANCE AND BENEFITS [BECKER]: effective; current chair [K.Morgan] agreed to be renominated.

15. SAFEGUARDS IN HUMAN RESEARCH [L.SMITH]: mandated; no problems

16. SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL AID [BRADLEY]: appeals body; no problems.

*17. STUDENT CONDUCT AND GRIEVANCE [BECKER]: appeals body with little business; future uncertain pending "Mill's committee" findings.

*18. STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS [CURRY]: No change except in charge to clarify judiciary role pending "Mill's committee" findings.

19. STUDENT PUBLICATIONS [L.SMITH]: no problems

*20. TRAFFIC REGULATIONS AND APPEALS [SLOAN]: fine as is except that duties may need to be reorganized pending "Mill's committee" findings.

*21. UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS [BRADLEY]: Committee suggested
New Name: Undergraduate Admissions and Retention and a
New Charge: Annually reviews undergraduate enrollment and retention statistics. Facilitates communication between the Admissions Office and other members of the university community, including the Faculty Senate. Serves in a responsive and proactive manner to issues concerning admissions.

This proposed changes warrant discussion by next year's COC and/or Senate to ascertain the proper role of the faculty in determining Admissions policy and decisions, especially since this is bound to be a major factor in retention.

*22. UNIVERSITY COURT [FLAHIVE]: mandated appeals body which has never met; reorganization suggested by "Mill's committee" findings.

Committee on Committees

Chuck Becker	ECO
Pat Bradley	NURS
Linda Curry	NURS
Lynn Flahive	SPPA, ex officio
David Gouwens	BRITE [resigned as of 1/98]
Nadia Lahutsky	REL
Manfred Reinecke	CHEM. chair
Luther Smith	ART

University Judicial System

Report

The Faculty Senate asked that the Campus Judicial System be reviewed to determine whether there is a need to continue with the system as now constituted, whether the system can be consolidated, or whether a new system should be implemented. The University judicial system has the following components:

University Court: Reviews the procedures used by other judicial groups to assure fair play and hears student appeals of decisions made at other levels. No appeal has been made to the University Court in the last twenty years.

Student Conduct Committee: Hears disciplinary cases that are either appeals of decisions made by the Campus Life office or are referred directly to the committee by the Campus Life office. The Student Conduct committee hears cases infrequently, but is especially valuable when cases of sexual assault or serious violations of the Code of Student Conduct occur. The committee was involved in two cases this year

Student Organizations Committee: Hears cases involving the violation of university regulations by student organizations. Typically, the committee will be involved in disciplinary procedures only once or twice a year, but each case will consume a large amount of time in a concentrated period. The committee also approves organizations for university recognition and approves the regulations governing student organizations. The Committee heard one case involving a student organization this year (approximately 15 hours of meeting time to hear and adjudicate the case)

Traffic Regulations and Appeals Committee: Hears appeals from students who have received citations for the violation of TCU traffic regulations. The committee also makes recommendations for the regulations for parking and traffic on the TCU campus. This committee spends far more time on individual student appeals than on developing policy. Each member of the committee spends approximately 12 hours per academic year hearing appeals.

The University Court met early in the semester to examine the possibility of consolidation and to discuss the procedures in place for the committees listed above. The Student Organizations Committee was asked to review its procedures and report back to the committee. Due to the workload of the committee, this has not yet occurred. Generally, there was some consensus that some streamlining could occur.

Personally, I have a concern that faculty be included in all policy making situations. There is value, it seems to me, to have consistent input and review from the most

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate September 3, 1998

Progress report on items passed by the Senate in 1997-98 which are still in process:

- Academic Excellence Recommendations for Evaluation of the UCR.

On 28 October 1997, Provost Koehler called a joint meeting of the Academic Excellence Committee, the Undergraduate Council, the UCR Advisory Committee, and the University Council to discuss the recommendations made by the Academic Excellence Committee. At that meeting, it was decided to give the Undergraduate Council the task of evaluating the UCR, starting with the question, what are the objectives of the UCR?

The Undergraduate Council began to work on this task in January 1998 but was hampered by the press of its ongoing work and Dean Garwell's illness in the spring. The Council is scheduled to meet in June to continue with the task of defining objectives for the UCR, but not much progress was made during this academic year."

The Council did meet in June and sent the Provost a list of UCR objectives as he requested. That's where the issue lies at this point.

- Procedures for Grade Appeals

This was under consideration last year by the Senate, the academic Deans, and the Academic Appeals Committee. It has been sent to University Council for final approval.

- Continuing Review of Tenured Faculty

The recommendations of the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee, approved by the Senate, were forwarded to the Provost. Since this is part of tenure policy, it requires action by the Board of Trustees and will be presented to them at their fall meeting.

- FMLA

Action on this was deferred by the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance committee because neither the committee nor Academic Deans have been able to find a way to resolve the relationship between FMLA and the tenure probationary period. This will be handled on a case by case basis until case law develops or someone finds a better way to handle it.

The Executive Committee presents the following four proposals to be considered for action at the October meeting:

- Revision of the time period for Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance committee report to the Senate generated quite a bit of discussion about the time period for these reviews. This discussion mirrored the concern expressed by some faculty members at the spring Assembly. In light of that concern, which appeared to fall along disciplinary lines, the Executive Committee decided to re-think the time period. Our suggestion is that at the University level only the upper limit should be specified, leaving the specification of the particular time period to the College, School or Department level. The academic Deans and the Provost are amenable to this change. Therefore the Executive Committee proposes that the statement:

"Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated triennially by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty" be revised to read (changed portion indicated in bold print)

"Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated **at least every five years** by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty"

- Maternity Leave

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee recommended that "The issue of extending the tenure clock for persons in their probationary period who receive FMLA leaves requires additional study. Further, a recommendation on extending the tenure clock for FMLA leaves should be linked with a policy to provide extensions for maternity leaves."

The Academic Deans have recommended and the Executive Committee has agreed and proposes to you that the "Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" be revised as follows (change indicated in bold print):

"In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. **Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth.** Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted. In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such request to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for

decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean."

- Announcement of statement at the new faculty briefing

The note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as approved by the Faculty Senate 2/7/91 includes the note:

"This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents and is verbally announced by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the new faculty briefing each year."

The Executive Committee recommends that the note be revised to read:

"This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents."

- Statement on professional ethics:

The Tenure, Promotion and Grievance committee recommended last year that "Collegiality should not be considered as an explicit factor in tenure decisions. The statements regarding tenure policy in the 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* (which makes no reference to collegiality) should stand." The Executive Committee agreed at the April meeting of the Senate to draft a proposal to address the issue of professional ethics in tenure decisions.

The Executive Committee believes that this issue can best be addressed by including ethical conduct (as defined by the "Statement on Professional Ethics" adopted by the Senate and found in the 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* on p. 16.

The Executive Committee proposes additions to the "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy" found on page 14 and 15 of 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* as indicated in the attached.

*The Executive Committee Recommends the Following Modifications to the
Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy
(Additions are double underlined)
August 1998*

Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy
(Revised by Faculty Senate, April 3, 1997)

Advancement in rank is made by the Board on recommendation of the Chancellor.

I. General Criteria

The following general criteria shall apply in consideration of recommendation for reappointment and promotion. Departmental and/or college documents identify specific criteria and emphases used to determine if faculty have met these general criteria. They are readily available to the University community and specifically reported to each nontenured, tenure track faculty member on an annual basis. These criteria are:

- A. Teaching
- B. Scholarship, creativity and its equivalents
- C. Service to the University and the profession
- D. Advising and related activities
- E. Professional development
- F. Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics

Teaching and scholarship are the central considerations in reappointment and promotion. Service to the University and the profession, advising, professional development, and professional ethics are also important considerations but will not serve as substitutes for teaching and scholarship

A. Teaching.

The instruction of students is the first purpose of the University and the prime responsibility of every faculty member. Therefore, Texas Christian University expects each member of the faculty to have knowledge of his or her subject commensurate with the teaching assignment, to maintain awareness of developments in his or her discipline, and to communicate to students both knowledge of and interest in his or her discipline. The faculty member should encourage students in responsible and careful inquiry, in appreciation of the interrelation of various disciplines, and in recognition of the uses of learning and the value of the educated mind. The University affirms that teaching effectiveness can be assessed; the procedures and results of such assessment to be a part of considerations for reappointment and promotion.

38 B. Scholarship, Creativity and Their Equivalents.

39 Texas Christian University expects that each member of the faculty will
40 provide evidence of his or her professional competence through scholarship,
41 research and other creative activities appropriate to the discipline, with such
42 activities presented in the proper professional forums and reflected in the classes
43 conducted by the faculty member. Such activities must be measured by quality, not
44 merely by quantity, and, at the time of consideration for reappointment and
45 promotion, the criteria expressed in Section II of this document shall be applied.

46
47 C. Service to the University and the Profession.

48 Service to the University and to the Profession are integral aspects of faculty
49 responsibility.

50 1. University service. The faculty member should perform well in committee
51 and other nonteaching University assignments.

52 2. Professional service. The faculty member should participate in profes-
53 sional and community organizations related to his or her discipline.

54
55 D. Advising and Related Activities.

56 Advising is an important faculty function which encompasses academic as
57 well as other activities such as career counseling which may be considered appro-
58 priately related to advising by academic units.

59
60 E. Professional Development.

61 Faculty members are expected to actively maintain professional knowledge
62 and skills, and be aware of developments within their discipline and fields of
63 specialization. They should pursue programs of study and self-development related
64 to their academic discipline and should continue to cultivate their academic
65 interests and professional competencies throughout their careers.

66
67 F. Conduct in accord with the Statement on Professional Ethics

68 Faculty members are expected to comply with the Statement on Professional
69 Ethics adopted by the Faculty Senate on 4 February 1993.

70
71 *II. Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion*

72
73 The following should be regarded as firm but not absolute criteria because
74 unusual circumstances and qualifications may justify special procedures. Profes-
75 sional credentials of the faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor or higher
76 are understood to include the appropriate terminal academic degree or the earned
77 professional equivalents. For such degrees and equivalents, teaching experience is
78 not an allowable substitute. The terms of appointment to any academic rank will
79 be stated in writing by the appropriate administrative officer of the University at

80 the time appointment is made and in accordance with procedures described in the
81 *Faculty/University Staff Handbook*.

82 The criteria here stated are not to affect adversely the ranks held by mem-
83 bers of the faculty of Texas Christian University at the time of the adoption of this
84 policy, but following its adoption the policy will apply to all decisions regarding
85 reappointment and promotion.

86
87 A. The Junior Faculty Ranks

88 1. Lecturer. This title is reserved for individuals holding temporary appoint-
89 ments.

90 2. Instructor. The rank is most commonly assigned to persons filling
91 temporary appointments and to those lacking the appropriate terminal academic
92 credentials.

93 3. Tenure Track Instructor. The position is tenurable with evaluation based
94 upon the following criteria: teaching, service to the University and the profes-
95 sion, advising and related activities, professional development, professional
96 ethics.

97 4. Assistant Professor. The candidate for an assistant professorship is
98 expected to demonstrate an increasing knowledge of his or her discipline, and
99 growing competency in teaching and scholarship. As a general rule, five years of
100 service in this rank are expected before consideration for promotion to an
101 associate professorship.

102
103 B. The Senior Faculty Ranks. The faculty member appointed, reappointed, or
104 promoted to either of the senior ranks is so assigned with the expectation that he or
105 she will continue to contribute germanely to his or her profession. Such assignment
106 should be made only after careful consideration of the professional abilities and
107 prospects of the candidate. The criteria for appointment, reappointment, and
108 promotion to an associate professorship differ from those of a professorship in
109 degree rather than in kind.

110 1. Associate Professor. It is expected that the candidate for this rank will
111 demonstrate his or her professional competence through teaching, scholarship,
112 research, publication, and/or other creative activities appropriate to the disci-
113 pline, with such activities presented in the proper professional forum. The
114 candidate for associate professor should demonstrate his or her general under-
115 standing of a large part of the discipline, willingness to continue study in his or
116 her subject, and concern to improve teaching. As a general rule, more than five
117 years of service in this rank are expected before consideration for promotion to a
118 full professorship.

119 2. Professor. The candidates for this rank will by their reputation within
120 the University and beyond manifest the teaching, scholarship, and professional
121 achievements of the University faculty. In addition, such faculty should provide

122 leadership in the University and by their activities should define the best
123 character of Texas Christian University,
124

125 **III. Access to Records**

126
127 All documents related to the appointment, reappointment and promotion
128 process are part of the faculty member's personnel file and are accessible to that
129 person according to State and Federal law.
130

131 **IV. Nondiscrimination**

132
133 A. All appointments, promotions, renewals, and non-renewals of appoint-
134 ments shall be made without discrimination with regard to gender, sexual orienta-
135 tion, religion, handicap, race, national origin, political affiliation, or veteran status.

136 B. All departmental committees and administrative officials will adhere to
137 the Affirmative Action program of the University.
138
139

140 **Statement on** 141 **Professional Ethics**

142
143 On February 4, 1993, the TCU Faculty Senate adopted as its policy on
144 professional ethics the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. The statement is
145 reproduced from the *AAUP, American Association of University Professors, Policy*
146 *Documents & Reports*, 1990 Edition.
147

148 **The Statement**

149
150 I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the
151 advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them.
152 Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they
153 see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving
154 their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-
155 discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They
156 practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests,
157 these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of
158 inquiry.

159 II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their
160 students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their
161 discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere
162 to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every
163 reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their
4 evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confiden-

165 tial nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any
166 exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowl-
167 edge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their
168 academic freedom.

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

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

184 V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obliga-
185 tions of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the
186 light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession,
187 and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid
188 creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As
189 citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and
190 integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free
191 inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

DRAFT

1998-1999 UNIVERSITY GOALS

September 1, 1998

- Develop a comprehensive strategic planning process involving key constituents and stakeholders that results in a clear and concise mission statement and a bold vision and blueprint for increasing the academic stature and national visibility of TCU during the next five years.
- Develop a strong action plan to strengthen TCU's commitment to diversity and a greater sense of community.
- Plan for the continuing improvement in compensation and in the working environment for faculty and staff; address equity and morale issues.
- Complete the installation and initial phases of implementation of the new integrated software systems (PeopleSoft) in human resource, finance and student administration.
- Foster an institutional culture and strengthen resources that result in the generation of new knowledge through research and creative activity.
- Assess the role of graduate education at TCU and the potential for increased visibility and prestige in this arena.
- Move forward in the planning, construction and fund raising for currently approved facility improvements:
 - * Complete renovations now in progress to the Student Center for student use
 - * Begin construction of housing on the east campus for Brite and TCU
 - * Continue strong fund-raising efforts for the Tucker Technology Center with completion in 2000
 - * Initiate planning for improvements to the Student Center and Rickel building
 - * Initiate a review of the Campus Master Plan
 - * Establish a plan for the continual renovation of and improvements to classrooms, laboratories and studios.
- Announce a major initiative in athletics that reflects the University's mission and its aspirations at the NCAA Division I level.
- Focus the University's research and assessment efforts with respect to the changing needs of students, learning outcomes related to TCU's mission, student retention, enrollment management and institutional aspirations.

- Plan, coordinate and focus the University's outreach to our neighborhoods and the region through strategic initiatives, including instructional programs and research activities and partnerships targeted to community and regional needs, such as offering courses over the Internet and taking an active role in the Alliance complex in North Texas.
- Strengthen campus safety and security measures.
- Promote health and wellness programs for faculty, staff and students.
- Review and revise the Technology Master Plan, developed in 1996, to establish a comprehensive technology agenda which positions TCU as a leader in the southwest in the uses of information technology for teaching and learning as well as in university administrative operations.
- Encourage and recognize increased participation and involvement in the life of the University by trustees, alumni and other friends.
- Implement a vigorous integrated marketing effort to support TCU's desire to move to another level of distinction in American private higher education.
- Actively continue TCU's efforts to become a global university with international programs, strategic alliances and faculty and student exchanges.
- Strengthen the intellectual vitality of the University, and support and promote current and emerging academic centers of excellence that have the capability of greater national and international prominence.
- Establish a university-wide task force on distance education to assess current efforts at TCU, as well as regionally and nationally, and propose directions at TCU for the coming decade.

Highly Important and Moderately Urgent University Goals

- Review TCU's relationship with and expectations for fraternities and sororities
- Review the general education requirements and the first year experience of TCU undergraduates
- Review the tuition pricing policy
- Review the student alcohol policy
- Begin planning for the next comprehensive fundraising campaign
- Respond to accreditation mandates for improved assessment of student learning and more integrated planning and budgeting processes and systems
- **OTHER:**

Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
4 February 1999

Members present: Chuck Becker, Joseph Bobich, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Gregg Franzwa, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Pamela Marcum, Alison Moreland, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Gloria Solomon, and Greg Stephens.

Members absent: Peggy Bennett, Clayton Brown, George Brown, Greg Clemons, Sally Fortenberry, Ellen Page Garrison, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Don Nichols, Pat Paulus, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Bernadette Szajna, Bill Vanderhoof, Robert Vigeland, Susan White, and Chuck Williams.

The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m. by Chair Reynolds after a quorum was made. She announced that many Senators were attending the called meeting of department chairs.

The Minutes of the 3 December 1999 Senate meeting were approved with the following corrections: Add Pamela Marcum to the list of Senators absent and Bill Vanderhoof to the list of those present.

Report from the Executive Committee. Chair Reynolds gave the report of the Executive Committee (See Attachment A).

Report from the Student Relations Committee. Alison Moreland gave Student Relations report on behalf of Linda Moore who was at the Department Chairs' meeting. (See Attachment B).

Report from the Committee on Committees. Manny Reinecke noted that they plan next week for the Admission Committee to report on trends in enrollment. The new Computer and Telecommunications Committee is being organized and as soon as that committee is in place we will need to disband the Academic Computing Committee.

Report from the Assistant Secretary. Lynn Flahive asked senators whose terms were expiring this semester to e-mail her if they want to run for re-election. She still needs candidates from Education and Business for the ballot, as well as from Brite Divinity School.

Report from the Inauguration Committee. Chair Reynolds, who serves on the Chancellor's Inauguration Committee reported on plans for the event, scheduled for 10 a.m. on 26 February. The committee wants a faculty member of each college to carry the banner for that college. The following volunteered: AddRan, Pamela Marcum; Education, Gloria Solomon; Harris College, Alison Moreland; Fine Arts, Lynn Flahive. Roger Pfaffenberger is to get someone from the Neeley School and inform Bob Seals, who is chair of the Inauguration Committee. Rehearsal for the ceremony will be held on Thursday afternoon 25 February

Announcements. Chair Reynolds reported that the rappelling opportunity for senators originally scheduled for 25 February will have to be rescheduled due to the inauguration rehearsal.

Executive Session. There being no further regular business, Chair Reynolds convened the Senate in Executive Session to discuss nominations for honorary degrees.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. David Grant", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

C. David Grant
Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate February 4, 1999

I. Progress report

A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:

- At the December meeting, the Senate passed a motion recommending that a new section be added to the Handbook (in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy") that contains the material "Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty" approved by the Senate on 30 April 1998 and amended by the Senate on 1 October 1998.

This is in the Provost's file to be added to the next handbook.

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" revision.
Discussed with Faculty Relations Committee. The Faculty Relations Committee recommends addition of statements addressing the FMLA. Provost and Executive Committee are preparing a formal proposal for the Faculty Relations Committee meeting in March.

- One universal form or electronic template should be adopted for all undergraduate curriculum and UCR actions. The same form should be used also for both undergraduate and graduate curriculum actions as well, with a simple blank used to designate undergraduate or graduate actions.

Undergraduate Council has produced new forms combining UCR and Undergraduate curriculum proposals. They also tried to make the form easier to use. These will be in use in Fall 1999.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

Provost has discussed with Deans and will discuss with Executive Committee.

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR -Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee, which has now been formed.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

- Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

ATTACHMENT B

Student Relations Committee Report to the Faculty Senate 2/4/99

As a result of the discussions over the past semester, the Student Relations Committee has some preliminary recommendations for discussion and feedback. The committee will be meeting with Ben Alexander, President of Student Government Association and other students to discuss our findings and our recommendations. Below are our preliminary recommendations:

Because TCU advertises as a welcoming university, it must commit resources to allow us to be exactly that including:

- + More faculty lines so that faculty are less stretched and more available to students
- + Student recreational facilities to attract students and stimulate interaction
- + Rewards for service/involvement on the part of faculty and staff
- + A General Studies major
- + Opportunities/requirements for service learning for all students to join students with faculty and to provide opportunity for social interaction
- + Recognition of and training about the changing student characteristics and the broad-based cultural change being reflected in the student population to avoid educational expectations which block creativity and expression of learning styles

The committee wants to try to identify factors which actually have an impact on student choices to remain or to leave TCU but recognizes that much information is anecdotal and data are hard to obtain.

Any feedback regarding these or other issues is appreciated.

STUDENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE, FACULTY SENATE

Based on the discussions in the three meetings during the Fall, 1998 semester with campus representatives and a meeting with the Faculty Senate, the following themes emerged relevant to the charge of the committee:

The Greek system is a support system to those who join. For others it is exclusionary, snobbish, and negative. There is concern that the members of the Greek system have resources not available to other organizations. Other concerns include the use of alcohol within the system which affects other problems such as depression and mental health issues.

The lack of diversity was mentioned often. There appears to be a lack of awareness of difference, ignorance, and little attention to learning about difference. Diversity is not characterized by just ethnic differences but social class, intellectual, geographic, ability, and age differences.

The lack of social and intellectual stimulation on the campus was cited often. The campus was described as boring, not intellectually challenging, lacking in **critical thinking**, lacking in social activities, and too conservative.

Financial issues were a concern. The perception is that it is difficult to get scholarships, to keep scholarships after entering TCU, and to find enough financial aid to afford the education.

Affiliation is a problem for many students. Beyond the Greek system, there are many sub-groups but often they appear on the fringes rather than as supported groups. Some examples include returning students, international students, smokers, minorities, gays and lesbians, and punk rockers.

Faculty involvement is a positive characteristic. There is a sense that the faculty and staff are open and friendly and provide support. Teaching is good and co-curricular staff reach out to students. More faculty contact would enrich the experience.

Advising was mentioned as possibly problematic but specifically for premajors. There is high satisfaction with advising in the major. Data do not indicate major problems.

Several suggestions were offered and include the following:

- ◆ Better facilities to encourage interaction both socially and intellectually (e.g. theater, bowling alley, pool hall, video game area, dance hall)
- ◆ Resources to support education (e.g. child care center, housing for married students and students with children, financial aid beyond academic scholarships)
- ◆ Resources for non-Greek organizations
- ◆ More opportunity for involvement for athletes
- ◆ More opportunities for faculty involvement in academic and social life of students
- ◆ Mentors for premajors, academically at risk, freshmen, minority students
- ◆ More information dissemination regarding campus resources, the community, and techniques for social and academic success
 - Orientation course
 - More information at Orientation about options for a variety of students
 - Web page for information
- ◆ More opportunity for service learning and linkage with the community

FR: Faculty Senate
TO: 101 Box 22710
101 Box 22710
TO: 11111
101 Box 22710
101 Box 22710

Lynn Flahive
Chair
2/4/99

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
4 February 1999**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Joseph Bobich, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Gregg Franzwa, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Pamela Marcum, Alison Moreland, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Gloria Solomon, and Greg Stephens.

Members absent: Peggy Bennett, Clayton Brown, George Brown, Greg Clemons, Sally Fortenberry, Ellen Page Garrison, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Don Nichols, Pat Paulus, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Bernadette Szajna, Bill Vanderhoof, Robert Vigeland, Susan White, and Chuck Williams.

The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m. by Chair Reynolds after a quorum was made. She announced that many Senators were attending the called meeting of department chairs.

The Minutes of the 3 December 1999 Senate meeting were approved with the following corrections: Add Pamela Marcum to the list of Senators absent and Bill Vanderhoof to the list of those present.

Report from the Executive Committee. Chair Reynolds gave the report of the Executive Committee (See Attachment A).

Report from the Student Relations Committee. Alison Moreland gave Student Relations report on behalf of Linda Moore who was at the Department Chairs' meeting. (See Attachment B).

Report from the Committee on Committees. Manny Reinecke noted that they plan next week for the Admission Committee to report on trends in enrollment. The new Computer and Telecommunications Committee is being organized and as soon as that committee is in place we will need to disband the Academic Computing Committee.

Report from the Assistant Secretary. Lynn Flahive asked senators whose terms were expiring this semester to e-mail her if they want to run for re-election. She still needs candidates from Education and Business for the ballot, as well as from Brite Divinity School.

Report from the Inauguration Committee. Chair Reynolds, who serves on the Chancellor's Inauguration Committee reported on plans for the event, scheduled for 10 a.m. on 26 February. The committee wants a faculty member of each college to carry the banner for that college. The following volunteered: AddRan, Pamela Marcum; Education, Gloria Solomon; Harris College, Alison Moreland; Fine Arts, Lynn Flahive. Roger Pfaffenberger is to get someone from the Neeley School and inform Bob Seals, who is chair of the Inauguration Committee. Rehearsal for the ceremony will be held on Thursday afternoon 25 February.

Announcements. Chair Reynolds reported that the rappelling opportunity for senators originally scheduled for 25 February will have to be rescheduled due to the inauguration rehearsal.

Executive Session. There being no further regular business, Chair Reynolds convened the Senate in Executive Session to discuss nominations for honorary degrees.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. David Grant", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

C. David Grant
Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate February 4, 1999

I. Progress report

A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:

- At the December meeting, the Senate passed a motion recommending that a new section be added to the Handbook (in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy") that contains the material "Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty" approved by the Senate on 30 April 1998 and amended by the Senate on 1 October 1998.

This is in the Provost's file to be added to the next handbook.

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" revision.
Discussed with Faculty Relations Committee. The Faculty Relations Committee recommends addition of statements addressing the FMLA. Provost and Executive Committee are preparing a formal proposal for the Faculty Relations Committee meeting in March.

- One universal form or electronic template should be adopted for all undergraduate curriculum and UCR actions. The same form should be used also for both undergraduate and graduate curriculum actions as well, with a simple blank used to designate undergraduate or graduate actions.

Undergraduate Council has produced new forms combining UCR and Undergraduate curriculum proposals. They also tried to make the form easier to use. These will be in use in Fall 1999.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

Provost has discussed with Deans and will discuss with Executive Committee.

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR -Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee, which has now been formed.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

- Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

ATTACHMENT B

Student Relations Committee Report to the Faculty Senate 2/4/99

As a result of the discussions over the past semester, the Student Relations Committee has some preliminary recommendations for discussion and feedback. The committee will be meeting with Ben Alexander, President of Student Government Association and other students to discuss our findings and our recommendations. Below are our preliminary recommendations:

Because TCU advertises as a welcoming university, it must commit resources to allow us to be exactly that including:

- + More faculty lines so that faculty are less stretched and more available to students
- + Student recreational facilities to attract students and stimulate interaction
- + Rewards for service/involvement on the part of faculty and staff
- + A General Studies major
- + Opportunities/requirements for service learning for all students to join students with faculty and to provide opportunity for social interaction
- + Recognition of and training about the changing student characteristics and the broad-based cultural change being reflected in the student population to avoid educational expectations which block creativity and expression of learning styles

The committee wants to try to identify factors which actually have an impact on student choices to remain or to leave TCU but recognizes that much information is anecdotal and data are hard to obtain.

Any feedback regarding these or other issues is appreciated.

STUDENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE, FACULTY SENATE

Based on the discussions in the three meetings during the Fall, 1998 semester with campus representatives and a meeting with the Faculty Senate, the following themes emerged relevant to the charge of the committee:

The Greek system is a support system to those who join. For others it is exclusionary, snobbish, and negative. There is concern that the members of the Greek system have resources not available to other organizations. Other concerns include the use of alcohol within the system which affects other problems such as depression and mental health issues.

The lack of diversity was mentioned often. There appears to be a lack of awareness of difference, ignorance, and little attention to learning about difference. Diversity is not characterized by just ethnic differences but social class, intellectual, geographic, ability, and age differences.

The lack of social and intellectual stimulation on the campus was cited often. The campus was described as boring, not intellectually challenging, lacking in **critical thinking**, **lacking** in social activities, and too conservative.

Financial issues were a concern. The perception is that it is difficult to get scholarships, to keep scholarships after entering TCU, and to find enough financial aid to afford the education.

Affiliation is a problem for many students. Beyond the Greek system, there are many sub-groups but often they appear on the fringes rather than as supported groups. Some examples include returning students, international students, smokers, minorities, gays and lesbians, and punk rockers.

Faculty involvement is a positive characteristic. There is a sense that the faculty and staff are open and friendly and provide support. Teaching is good and co-curricular staff reach out to students. More faculty contact would enrich the experience.

Advising was mentioned as possibly problematic but specifically for premajors. There is high satisfaction with advising in the major. Data do not indicate major problems.

Several suggestions were offered and include the following:

- ◆ Better facilities to encourage interaction both socially and intellectually (e.g. theater, bowling alley, pool hall, video game area, dance hall)
- ◆ Resources to support education (e.g. child care center, housing for married students and students with children, financial aid beyond academic scholarships)
- ◆ Resources for non-Greek organizations
- ◆ More opportunity for involvement for athletes
- ◆ More opportunities for faculty involvement in academic and social life of students
- ◆ Mentors for premajors, academically at risk, freshmen, minority students
- ◆ More information dissemination regarding campus resources, the community, and techniques for social and academic success
 - Orientation course
 - More information at Orientation about options for a variety of students
 - Web page for information
- ◆ More opportunity for service learning and linkage with the community

FROM:
Faculty Senate Box 297240
TO:
Becky Roach Box 297040

11/11/98

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
3 December 1998**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, George Brown, Clayton Brown, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Greg Clemons, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Bernadette Szajna, Robert Vigeland, and Susan White.

Members absent: Sally Fortenberry, Pat Paulus, Ellen Page Garrison, Pamela Marcum, Joseph Bobich, Gregg Franzwa, Chuck Williams, and Mike Sacken.

Senate Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

The Minutes of the 4 November 1998 meeting were corrected to reflect that Ernest Couch was in attendance and approved as corrected.

Executive Committee Report. Chair Reynolds gave the report of the Executive Committee (See Attachment A). The Executive Committee recommended that a new section be added to the Handbook (in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy") that contains the material "Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty" approved by the Senate on 30 April 1998 and amended by the Senate on 1 October 1998. Senator Reinecke moved this recommendation. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Old Business. (1) Procedures for nominating honorary degree recipients. At the November meeting a memo from Chancellor Ferrari to Chair Reynolds that outlined a suggested procedure for nominating honorary degree candidates was distributed, and senators were asked to bring any comments and suggestions for changes to that procedure to this meeting. Chair Reynolds asked if there were comments or suggestions for changes, but there were none. Chair Reynolds reminded the senators to make nominations by early January. She indicated that, since we have not given honorary degrees in recent years we should think of people who are meritorious because of their academic qualifications as opposed to their civic or political qualifications.

(2) Computing Resources Policy. Also distributed at the November meeting was a draft of a Computing Resources Policy that Provost Koehler asked the Senate to comment on. Chair Reynolds asked if there were comments. Senator Rinewalt: The first bulleted point on the first page of the policy, which defines misconduct as "using university computing resources for illegal activity, for material that publicly advocates illegal activity, or for the discussion of illegal activities with the intent to commit them" is too broad. Secondly this applies a restriction on computer speech. This document mentions a computer security person but no where names that person. They are given broad powers in this document.

Senator Busby: Under "Uses of the Facilities and the Network." This is broad and vague. Who are users? What are personal computers? This is broadly worded. Who gives that authorization?

Senator George Brown raised the issue of whether there was faculty representation in the creation of this policy. Senator Vigeland indicated that there was, in that the document arose in the Academic Computing Committee.

Senator Rinewalt inquired what happened to the Web page policy that was under discussion a few years ago. Does this new policy supercede that policy? Chair Reynolds indicated that she didn't think that earlier policy had been adopted.

Senator Busby: Still under the section, "Use of Facilities and the Network": The statement about data packets is incorrect. Monitoring and analyzing data packets is very important in some departments. Senator Pfaffenberger: I suggest that the senators write down their concerns to pass on to the Provost.

Senator Cagle asked where this policy originated. Senator Busby indicated that the Academic Computing Committee was asked to draw up a policy last year on misuse of the network system. The Chancellor deemed that statement inadequate so this policy that is before us was drafted by the University's lawyers and has nothing to do with the faculty who drafted the policy last year. The Academic Computing Committee has not seen this document. Chair Reynolds will pass these comments on to the Provost.

New Business. Report of the Academic Excellence Committee. Report made by Senator Donovan. Donovan went over each of the standing charges of the Academic Excellence Committee, commenting on each (See Attachment B). He also discussed the specific charge made to the Committee this year. Highlights of his report:

Senator Donovan thinks there are a lot of committees that are exploring similar issues, but they don't know about what the others are doing. We need to do a better job coordinating committees across the University.

The specific charge of the committee is unbelievably broad. But the committee has begun to brainstorm qualities and has come up with a list of general qualities that we would hope undergraduates develop, including a passion for the intellect, the diversity of that passion, an inquisitive nature, the capacity to devise solutions to problems that are characterized by (i) their ethical integrity, and (ii) their insight and quality, an appreciation for the value of knowledge and its acquisition, an appreciation for the value of creative activity, a sense of balance, and an appreciation of the worldview that is the shared vision of the academy (in its broadest sense).

The committee also asks three questions that must be explored in light of their charge: (1) To what extent are the "transcendental ideas" part of an educated person's repertoire? (2) From the perspective of a university education, what is the desired balance between Depth and Breadth?

(3) Is an educated person active or passive? In other words, what is the balance between a knowledge base, the ability to enquire critically and the capacity to solve problems?

Senator Donovan used the new Honors Intellectual Traditions course as an example of a course that exemplifies some of the qualities the committee discussed. He further suggested that in his own mind the term "creative iconoclast" is a helpful focus to discuss what we want from an educated person. He defined an educated person as "one who combines reason, passion and freedom to access the corpus of knowledge, to celebrate creative skills, to challenge inconsistency and ignorance, and to solve problems creatively and ethically."

Senator Donovan indicated that this is about as far as the committee has got. They do not have any concrete suggestions at this point. He does want to have more students involved in the process in the future.

Senator Donovan invited the senators to join in their discussion by posting to the Academic Excellence Committee discussion list, excellence@geocx.geo.tcu.edu.

Announcements. Chair Reynolds announced that a date has been set for Chancellor Ferrari's inauguration. It will be February 26, 1999, at 10 a.m. in Daniel Meyer Coliseum.

Chair Reynolds invited Chancellor Ferrari to comment to the senators. He reported on the excellent recent meeting of the Board of Trustees and commented that he hopes our board will experience the richness of the faculty. He detailed the major decisions made by the board and concluded by commenting that he hopes his inauguration will not be about himself but will be about TCU.

The Chancellor then fielded questions from the faculty on various topics, including the hope for a Sun Bowl invitation, the possibility of apartments being built between the campus and McCart, the budget process, the size of the graduate student population, hopes for new degree programs, the growth of the applicant pool, and the first meetings of the Diversity Council.

Chair Reynolds adjourned the meeting at 4:45.

**Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
December 3, 1998**

I. Progress report

A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:

- Review of Tenured Faculty

See part II of this report.

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" revision.

Discussed with Faculty Relations Committee. The Faculty Relations Committee recommends addition of statements addressing the FMLA. Provost will address this and Chancellor will take formal proposal to the Board in March

- The note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as approved by the Faculty Senate 2/7/91 be revised to read: "This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents."

Change will be reflected in 1999-2000 handbook.

- Additions to the "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy" found on page 14 and 15 of 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* to include Professional Ethics.

Change will be reflected in 1999-2000 handbook.

- One universal form or electronic template should be adopted for all undergraduate curriculum and UCR actions. The same form should be used also for both undergraduate and graduate curriculum actions as well, with a simple blank used to designate undergraduate or graduate actions.

They are being rewritten now and the new forms will be considered at the next meeting of Undergraduate Council.

- "The Faculty Senate recommended that the faculty be represented on the committee that develops policies regarding the new computer system as these policies relate to academic matters and advising, and that said faculty report directly to the Senate on proposed policies before implementation.

New committee has been formed.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.
Provost has discussed with Deans and will discuss with Executive Committee.

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.
Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR - Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.
Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.
Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee .

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.
Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee .

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.
Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee .

- Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required.
Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

II. Proposal from the Executive Committee

The Executive Committee asked the Chancellor and the Provost to postpone taking to the Board the proposed addition to the Handbook on Review of Tenured Faculty. Placement of the addition was discussed with the Faculty Relations Committee and as a result of that discussion, the Provost and the Executive Committee agree that it should not be made part of the tenure policy, but should be placed in a separate section of the handbook.

There are **three possible outcomes** for your consideration:

1. Contrary to the advice of the Executive Committee and Provost you may decide that it should be part of the tenure policy. In this case it will have to be approved by the Board of Trustees and will go to them in the March meeting. Any subsequent changes to the policy would also henceforth have to be approved by the Board. This is not recommended by the Executive Committee because it confounds the process of tenure with faculty evaluation and requires Board action every time a change is made in the faculty evaluation and development process.
2. A new section for review of **all faculty** added to the Handbook in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy". This would require Board approval to move the section on evaluation of non-tenured faculty from its current position as part of the tenure policy to the new section, but subsequent modifications of the policy will not require Board approval. This is not recommended by the Executive Committee because it confounds the process of tenure with faculty evaluation.
3. A new section for **review of tenured faculty** added to the Handbook in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy". This separates evaluation of tenured faculty from issues of tenure and does not require approval by the Board of Trustees. This is recommended by the Executive Committee.

MOTION: The Executive Committee moves that a new section be added to the Handbook (in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy") for review of tenured faculty.

Attachment B

Charges of the Academic Excellence Committee

• Standing Charges

1. To maintain interest in and awareness of all policies, procedures, programs and goals that affect the academic excellence of the university.
2. Study and advise the Faculty Senate on requests concerning academic matters forwarded by the Student House of Representatives.
3. In conjunction with the University Library Committee, monitor the status of library resources.
4. Meet with the Student House of Representatives' Academic Excellence Committee at least annually to trace issues of concern for the University.

• Specific Charge

What habits of mind, sensitivities, intellectual dispositions and knowledge should an undergraduate have developed by the end of his/her experience at TCU?

What general knowledge should he/she have acquired?

This study should create a multifaceted view of this question, and strive to reveal the diversity and complexity of views, rather than narrowing it to a few conclusions or objectives.

FROM: Faculty Senate Box 297240
TO: Becky Roach Box 297040



**TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
AGENDA
3 December 1998
3:30 p.m.
SID W. RICHARDSON BOARD ROOM**

- Call to order
- Approval of minutes as mailed
- Report from the Executive Committee
- Old Business
 - Procedures for nominating honorary degree recipients
 - Computing Resources Policy
- New Business
 - Academic Excellence Committee
- Announcements
- Adjournment

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
5 November 1998**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, Clayton Brown, George Brown, Greg Clemons, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Robert Vigeland, Chuck Williams, Susan White.

Members absent: Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Pamela Marcum, Pat Paulus, Bill Ryan, Bernadette Szajna, Bill Vanderhoof.

- Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:34.
- The Minutes of the 1 October meeting were approved as mailed.
- **Executive Committee Report** was given by Sherrie Reynolds. (See Attachment A)

Nothing in the report required action at this meeting and so no actions were taken.

• **Announcements**

1. Michael Scott, Director of Scholarships and Financial Aid, sent a letter to Chair Reynolds reminding faculty of the requirements for maintaining academic scholarships. A copy of the letter was distributed to the senators.

2. A memo concerning the current process of nominating persons for honorary degrees from Chancellor Ferrari to Chair Reynolds was distributed (See Attachment B). The chancellor has requested that the senate examine the current policy to determine if it is still satisfactory. If there are senators who wish to nominate an individual for an honorary degree, Chair Reynolds asked that letters of nomination be sent to her by 10 January 1999.

3. The provost asks that we look at the proposed Computing Resources Policy (See Attachment C) and bring comments to next meeting.

• **Student Relations Committee Report.**

Linda Moore, chair of the Student Relations Committee, made the report. They have been charged to look at students who don't fit in on the campus. It is a question of retention, but is broader than just retention. The committee has met once with campus constituents and have two more meetings scheduled. Some of the things they've already discussed: The Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee last year worked on retention of

students of color. They found that retention is very much related to size of the minority cohort. Also the First-Year Task Force is discussing many of these same issues.

At the last meeting of the Student Relations Committee John Schuster, of the Counseling Center, Mike Russel, who is in Campus Life, and Andy Fort, who is adviser to the Student Allies on campus, came to discuss this issue of students who don't fit in. Also a student came who last year was thinking about leaving TCU. She surveyed students that she had contact with and reported a few perceptions from those conversations. Apparently, the Greek influence is overwhelming on this campus. The perception is that everybody must rush, when the reality is that fewer than one half of freshmen rush. The students thought that non-Greek organizations need to be more visible. They also thought that we need to provide opportunity for more faculty contact in and out of class. Faculty involvement was key for some of the students staying on campus. A third issue: diversity. There's not enough on the campus. We market more diversity in the university than we have. Faculty need to be more sensitive to different ways of learning. The advising structure also came up, especially for freshmen. Suggestions were made for an orientation course that would help students adjust to college and for adding service learning opportunities. Also, non-traditional students aren't addressed much in their special needs, such as low cost housing and childcare.

So, these are the recurring themes in their discussions so far: the Greek system, diversity, financial aid, faculty contact. At their upcoming meetings the following people are scheduled to visit: Priscilla Tate, adviser to TCU Triangle, Angie Taylor, who is Director of Drug and Alcohol Education, Kay Higgins, Director of Women's Center, and Darron Turner, Director of Minority Affairs.

• Discussion of Student Relations Committee Report

Chair Reynolds then opened the floor for questions and comments to Senator Moore. Some of the issues raised and comments made by the Senators were:

- What of the problem of the ratio of men to women? Some believe that women leave because the ratio makes it difficult to get dates.
- The advising problem will remain until something is done in the university to reward good advising. Another senator echoed this concern about what is rewarded. The suggestion was made to revise the official TCU vita form to include a section for teaching, which it currently does not have. Yet another senator noted that Peter Seldin, an expert in faculty evaluation, will be on campus in March to discuss diverse ways of evaluating faculty.
- The new faculty this year look very diverse. This is a hopeful sign.
- An article in the *Skiff* today noted how few minorities participate in the international study programs. Perhaps we should find ways to fund international travel for minorities

who can't afford it otherwise. Another senator suggested that there are already limited funds available for International Study.

- A large number of first-year students are pre-majors. Since they don't belong to a department, do they really get adequate faculty attention? Another senator noted that at other universities, all first-year students get attached to a faculty member through a one-hour seminar.
 - A senator noted that most of the retention study has to do with undergraduates. What about graduate retention?
 - Perhaps we should consider deferring rush until the spring semester to give first-year students a chance to identify with the larger campus before "splitting into teams" right up front when they arrive on campus. Another senator suggested a fair, like the major/minor fair, for campus organizations that would help students get involved in organizations.
 - The nursing school has a respectable mix of minorities. It may take more than just a group of cohorts to make diversity successful. We need a plan to encourage diverse groups to engage with each other and not simply relate to those in their cohort.
 - The committee also needs to look into those who don't fit in for academic reasons. Another senator suggested that turnover can be good. If students can't compete academically it's not a bad thing to lose them.
 - Some who leave leave not because there are no activities here, but that the activities that are here aren't meaningful to them. We need to find activities that match the needs of people.
 - Could the data from the various studies of retention that have been done over the past few years be put on the World Wide Web where we could all get a hold of them?
 - We need to remember that someone who is not academically successful during his or her first semester might develop academic proficiency later. Another senator commented that we need to be careful how quickly we are willing to say goodbye to somebody. We ought to do everything once we get someone here to help them stay here.
 - The International House is available for foreign students. Maybe we should get groups of international students to meet with different groups of other students.
 - We need to be sensitive to different learning styles of students.
- The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 by Chair Reynolds.

Respectfully submitted,

David Grant
Secretary

③

Attachment A

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate November 5, 1998

I. Progress report

A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:

- Review of Tenured Faculty

Executive Committee asks that the Chancellor delay taking this to the Board until the Senate has an opportunity to consider its placement in the Handbook.

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" be revised as follows (change indicated in bold print):

"In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. **Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth. Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted.** In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such request to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean."

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- The note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as approved by the Faculty Senate 2/7/91 be revised to read: "This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents."

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- Additions to the "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy" found on page 14 and 15 of 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* to include Professional Ethics.

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- The Faculty Senate voted to accept the procedures for grade appeals (#1-#3) submitted by the Academic Appeals Committee and that procedure #4 be sent back to the Committee for further consideration.

Approved by University Council 9/28/98, effective immediately.

- "The Faculty Senate recommended that the faculty be represented on the committee that develops policies regarding the new computer system as these policies relate to academic matters and advising, and that said faculty report directly to the Senate on proposed policies before implementation.

Proposed committee charge and composition for the new committee (to replace Academic Computing) was sent to the Chancellor/Vice Chancellors for consideration on 10/28/98. This was also sent to the Committee on Committees.

- One universal form or electronic template should be adopted for all undergraduate curriculum and UCR actions. The same form should be used also for both undergraduate and graduate curriculum actions as well, with a simple blank used to designate undergraduate or graduate actions.

A subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council has revised the current forms per the council's suggestion. These will be reviewed at the meeting on November 20th. In addition Undergraduate Council will consider an attachment to the new forms that will result in a three page form for the Undergraduate Council and the UCR.

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

Provost has discussed with Deans and will discuss with Executive Committee.

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR -Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee if/when it is created.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee .

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee .

II. Proposals from the Executive Committee

A. Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required. Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

B. As you know, the Executive Committee has asked the Chancellor and the Provost to postpone taking to the Board the proposed addition to the Handbook on Review of Tenured Faculty. We believe that this should not be a part of the tenure policy (which requires Board approval). Faculty evaluation is an important issue and should be addressed, but should not be confused with the granting of tenure. Therefore we suggest a new section be added to the Handbook (in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy". We suggest that this new section on the Professional Review and Development of Faculty should be created for the new policy on review of tenured faculty which was passed by the Senate last spring. A motion to this effect will be presented to the December meeting of the Faculty Senate. A copy of the proposed addition is presented below:

V. Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty

The purpose of a professional peer review of faculty is to provide effective evaluation, beneficial counsel, and timely and positive assistance to ensure

that each faculty member has every opportunity, consistent with departmental, college and university goals, to experience healthy professional development and productivity throughout the faculty members entire career.

1. The review process must not subvert the rights of academic freedom and tenure, nor reduce the faculty members prerogatives of appeal as specified by the *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* (Faculty Grievance Policy, pp. 22-25, 1997-1998 *Handbook*). *The faculty member always has the prerogative to provide a written response to an action at any stage of the post tenure review process.*

2. Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated at least every five years by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. Faculty members with administrative appointments at the level of Dean and above shall be exempt from this process.

3. The criteria used in the evaluation shall be established by departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. These criteria should clearly state departmental expectations, consistent with departmental, college and university goals, for all areas of evaluation; and should be differentiated by rank and level of seniority as relevant.

4. The initial year for the review of tenured faculty for each faculty member shall be established by the department and the process shall follow a timetable as established by departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. Special situations (e.g., approved leave) may justify an adjustment in the evaluation cycle. Approval for an adjustment in the evaluation cycle is required by the Dean for the department involved.

5. A written report shall be provided to each faculty member undergoing review with a copy to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall transmit the report to the Dean with additional comments as appropriate. The faculty member under review must have the opportunity to see these comments and to offer a rebuttal, if desired. Areas of exceptional contribution, if any, should be noted along with recommendations to the administration for appropriate recognition. The written report must include a faculty development plan that specifies the goals and objectives established by the faculty member in consultation with the review committee for the three year period prior to the next review. The goals and objectives in the faculty development plan must be consistent with department and university goals, and the plan must specify methods for assessing the

achievement of these goals and objectives at the time of the next review.

6. If significant areas of deficiency are identified, the faculty development plan must include a performance improvement plan that addresses the areas of deficiency. This plan, developed in consultation with the faculty member, shall include specific guidance and recommendations to assist the faculty member more fully to meet individual, departmental, college, and university goals. The performance improvement plan must include specific information on a timetable, methods of assessing achievement of objectives, and description of a process for monitoring progress and identification of completion. The Department Chair must provide a written report to the faculty member and to the Dean upon completion of the performance improvement plan.

1 In the event that the unit is not organized into departments (e.g., Harris College of Nursing), substitute Aunit@ for Adepartment@ and Aunit head@ for Adepartment head.@"

2 This step is skipped if unit head is the Dean (e.g., Harris College of Nursing).



OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

TO: Sherrie Reynolds
FROM: Michael R. Ferrari
MR Ferrari
RE: Honorary Degrees

An honorary degree is one of the highest forms of recognition that the University can bestow upon an individual for an extraordinary record of achievement in academic or professional life, service to community and society, or contributions to the University.

The Faculty Senate is the primary body charged with soliciting nominations for honorary degrees, evaluating nominees, and recommending to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees those candidates who are judged worthy of this honor.

Process

1. Each fall, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will invite nominations for honorary degrees to be awarded at a commencement ceremony in the subsequent year.
2. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will recommend to the Faculty Senate those candidates who meet the criteria of extraordinary achievement.
3. The Faculty Senate, meeting in Executive Session, will review the recommendation and grant its approval or non-approval of those to be recommended to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.
4. The Chancellor will report to the Committee on Trusteeship of the Board of Trustees the recommendations of the Senate, and the Board of Trustees will act on the recommendations at its April meeting.
5. The Chancellor will inform the Faculty Senate of the action of the Trustees. The Chancellor will contact persons approved for the honorary degree and invite them to attend a commencement ceremony in the following year for the degree presentation.

Other:

1. Generally, individuals currently holding elected political office will not be considered for an honorary degree.
2. Should unusual circumstances warrant the consideration of an individual for an honorary degree outside of the regular cycle of review, the Chancellor will consult with the Faculty Senate and if the Faculty Senate concurs, a special meeting will be held for such review and action. If approved by the Faculty Senate, the candidate will be presented to the Executive Committee of the Trustees.
3. Generally, no more than three honorary degrees will be granted in an academic year.
4. Under no circumstances will the University award an honorary degree for the promise or expectation of a financial contribution to the University by a nominee or candidate.
5. The recipient of an honorary degree will be expected to be present at a commencement ceremony or other major University convocation to receive the degree.

Attachment C

TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY COMPUTING RESOURCES POLICY

This policy is applicable to all University students, faculty and staff and to others granted use of university computing resources as defined in this policy. This policy refers to all university computing resources, whether individually controlled or shared, stand-alone or networked. It applies to all computer and computer communication facilities owned, leased, operated or contracted by the University. This includes word processing facilities, personal computers, networks, workstations, mainframes, minicomputers, and associated peripherals and software, regardless of whether used for administration, research, teaching or other purposes ("collectively, university computing resources"). It is the responsibility of every person who uses university computing resources to read and abide by these policies.

University Regulations Regarding the Use of Computers and Networks

Individuals provided access to university computing resources assume responsibility for their appropriate use. The University expects all such persons to be careful, honest, responsible, and civil in the use of computers and networks. Individuals using wide-area networks (such as the Internet) to communicate with individuals or to connect to computers at other institutions are expected to abide by the rules for the remote systems and networks as well as those for TCU's systems. In addition to violations of University rules, certain computer misconduct is prohibited under federal and state laws, and is, therefore, subject to criminal penalties. Such misconduct includes, without limitation, the following:

- Using university computing resources for illegal activity, for material that publicly advocates illegal activity, or for discussion of illegal activities with the intent to commit them.
- Participating in unauthorized reproduction, storage, or distribution of copyrighted software or other materials (e.g., text, audio, graphics, video) or illegally obtained software.
- Accessing, copying, transporting (to another person or site), modifying, or destroying programs, records, or data belonging to the University or another user without authorization, whether such data is in transit or storage.
- Sharing an account, providing passwords to another person, using another person's password or e-mail address, attempting to breach the security of another user's account, or depriving another user of access to the University's computer resources.
- Using university computing resources to harass, defame, abuse, or threaten others.
- Using university computing resources for any unauthorized non-University related activity.



- Falsely obtaining electronic services or data without payment of required charges.

Privacy of Information

Information stored on a computer system or sent electronically over a network is the property of the individual who created it. Examination of that information without authorization from the owner is a violation of the owner's rights to control his or her own property. Systems administrators, however, may gain access to user's files when it is necessary to maintain or prevent damage to systems or to ensure compliance with other University rules.

Computer systems and networks provide mechanisms for the protection of private information from examination. These mechanisms are necessarily imperfect and any attempt to circumvent them in order to gain unauthorized access to private information (including both stored computer files and messages transmitted over network) will be treated as a violation of privacy and may subject a violator to disciplinary action.

In general, information that the owner would reasonably regard as private must be treated as private by other users. Examples include the contents of electronic mail boxes, the private file storage areas of individual users, and information stored in other areas that are not public. That measures have not been taken to protect such information does not make it permissible for others to inspect it.

On shared and networked computer systems certain information about users and their activities is visible to others. Users are cautioned that certain accounting and directory information (for example, user names and electronic mail addresses), certain records of file names and executed commands, and information stored in public areas, are not private. Nonetheless, such unsecured information about other users must not be manipulated in ways that they might reasonably find intrusive; for example, eavesdropping by computer and systematic monitoring of the behavior of others are likely to be considered invasions of privacy that would be cause for disciplinary action.

Use of Facilities

Computer and network facilities are provided to authorized persons for their personal use. These facilities have tangible value. Consequently, attempts to circumvent accounting systems, to use the computer accounts of others, or to duplicate, use, or distribute software without authorization, will be treated as forms of attempted theft.

A user may not attempt to damage or degrade the performance of TCU's computers and networks and should not disrupt the work of other users. Each individual user assumes individual responsibility for the use of his or her accounts. Consequently, users may not disclose their passwords or otherwise make TCU's facilities available to unauthorized individuals (including family or friends). Use of TCU's computers and networks for commercial purposes without authorization is prohibited.

Electronic Communication

TCU neither sanctions nor censors individual expression of opinion on its systems. The same standards of behavior, however, are expected in the use of electronic mail as in the use of telephones and written and oral communication. Therefore, electronic mail, like telephone messages, must be neither obscene nor harassing. Similarly, messages must not misrepresent the identity of the sender. Messages should not be sent as "chain letters" or "broadcast" indiscriminately.

Plagiarism

Computer programs/other electronic data and documents should be regarded as individual creations and subject to the same standards of misrepresentation of copied work.

Additional Policies

Security and Privacy

- Users understand that timesharing and network-based system activity is automatically logged on a continuous basis. These logs do not include private user text, mail contents, or personal data, but do include a record of user processes that may be examined by authorized system administrators.
- TCU considers user accounts to be the private property of those who have opened them, and as a result will never ask users to reveal their passwords. However, users who request assistance from Computer Services give the staff implicit permission to view specific data in their accounts that is necessary to investigate, diagnose, or correct the problem.

Use of Facilities and the Network

- Physical theft, rearrangement, or damage to any University computer or network equipment, facilities, or property is strictly prohibited, and will be reported to the police. This includes all public computer labs, network hubs, wiring, and links. Users may not "plug-in" personal computers or peripheral devices in
- public computer labs or onto the University Network without prior authorization.
- Data packets on the network are like voice signals on a telephone line. Just as phone taps are prohibited, so too are attempts to monitor, analyze, or tamper with network data packets.

Electronic Communication and Bulletin Boards

- TCU neither sanctions nor censors individual expressions of opinion on its systems. However, obscene or harassing electronic communication (e.g.,

electronic mail) is prohibited, as are computer messages that actively target individuals in a threatening manner.

- Users who make use of bulletin board systems and other network communication utilities (e.g., Gopher, Newsgroups, the Web, list servers) do so voluntarily, with the understanding that they may encounter material they deem offensive. Students who subscribe, post messages, or simply browse through such utilities must abide by the rules governing each in addition to TCU's rules governing computing on campus.
- Although commercial work is prohibited on TCU systems and networks, some bulletin board systems (BBS) available over the network do make provisions for posting job opportunities and personal items for sale. Such activity is permissible within the constraints of policies specific to each BBS. The staff of Information Services takes no responsibility for any fraud or misrepresentation users may encounter (caveat emptor).

Cases of Misconduct

- The University's designated computer security officer shall be the primary contact for the interpretation, enforcement and monitoring of this policy and the resolution of problems concerning it. Any legal issues concerning the policy shall be referred to the appropriate officials for advice.
- If system administrators have persuasive evidence of misuse by a user of University computing resources, the University's designated computer security officer shall have authority to inspect files, diskettes, tapes and/or other computer-accessible storage media.
- By accessing and using the university's computing resources, each system user expressly consents to and acknowledges the University's right, when necessary as a function of responsible system management:
 - 1) to monitor any and all aspects of university computing resources (including, but not limited to, individual user login sessions to determine if a user is acting in violation of University policies or the law);
 - 2) to inspect all electronic files and other electronically recorded information within the university's computing resources; and
 - 3) to intercept, access, disclose and use electronic communications of any user, whether in transit or storage.
- Only the University's designated computer security officer can authorize the monitoring, inspection, interceptions, access, disclosure or use of such electronic data (including, without limitation, electronic mail) when there is reasonable cause to suspect improper use of university computing resources.

- Whenever a case of computer misconduct is suspected or reported, TCU reserves the right to deny system access to any user who violates the rules set forth in this statement. This includes the ability to terminate processes that threaten system security or performance.
- Students will be held to the same standard of conduct (in electronic communication) with faculty, officers and staff of the University. Threatening or harassing correspondence will be reported to the appropriate authority.

Student Rights and Responsibilities

- TCU must ensure that academic work takes precedence at all times over other computing activities in its facilities. In situations of high user demand which may strain available computer resources, TCU reserves the right to restrict (e.g., to specific times of day) or prohibit computer activities such as game playing.
- Mutual cooperation is essential to sustain the free flow of information fostered by campus computers and networks while protecting the integrity and privacy of personal data. Since computer systems and networks are imperfect, users are strongly requested to report any bugs or security holes to the staff of Information Services. Likewise, users should not disseminate to others any information that serves to jeopardize, circumvent, or degrade system security or integrity. Users should also be aware that certain types of computer misuse (including indirect participation) are illegal under federal and state law.
- Users recognize that systems and networks are imperfect and waive any responsibility for lost work or time that may arise from their use. TCU cannot compensate users for degradation or loss of personal data, software, or hardware as a result of their use of University-owned systems or networks, or as a result of assistance they may seek from Information Services staff.

Approved by Chancellor's Cabinet 9/22/98

FROM:
Faculty Senate Box 297240
TO:
Becky Roach Box 297040

file binder

Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
5 November 1998

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, Clayton Brown, George Brown, Greg Clemons, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Robert Vigeland, Chuck Williams, Susan White.

Members absent: Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Pamela Marcum, Pat Paulus, Bill Ryan, Bernadette Szajna, Bill Vanderhoof.

- Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:34.
- The Minutes of the 1 October meeting were approved as mailed.
- **Executive Committee Report** was given by Sherrie Reynolds. (See Attachment A)

Nothing in the report required action at this meeting and so no actions were taken.

• **Announcements**

1. Michael Scott, Director of Scholarships and Financial Aid, sent a letter to Chair Reynolds reminding faculty of the requirements for maintaining academic scholarships. A copy of the letter was distributed to the senators.
2. A memo concerning the current process of nominating persons for honorary degrees from Chancellor Ferrari to Chair Reynolds was distributed (See Attachment B). The chancellor has requested that the senate examine the current policy to determine if it is still satisfactory. If there are senators who wish to nominate an individual for an honorary degree, Chair Reynolds asked that letters of nomination be sent to her by 10 January 1999.
3. The provost asks that we look at the proposed Computing Resources Policy (See Attachment C) and bring comments to next meeting.

• **Student Relations Committee Report.**

Linda Moore, chair of the Student Relations Committee, made the report. They have been charged to look at students who don't fit in on the campus. It is a question of retention, but is broader than just retention. The committee has met once with campus constituents and have two more meetings scheduled. Some of the things they've already discussed: The Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee last year worked on retention of

students of color. They found that retention is very much related to size of the minority cohort. Also the First-Year Task Force is discussing many of these same issues.

At the last meeting of the Student Relations Committee John Schuster, of the Counseling Center, Mike Russel, who is in Campus Life, and Andy Fort, who is adviser to the Student Allies on campus, came to discuss this issue of students who don't fit in. Also a student came who last year was thinking about leaving TCU. She surveyed students that she had contact with and reported a few perceptions from those conversations. Apparently, the Greek influence is overwhelming on this campus. The perception is that everybody must rush, when the reality is that fewer than one half of freshmen rush. The students thought that non-Greek organizations need to be more visible. They also thought that we need to provide opportunity for more faculty contact in and out of class. Faculty involvement was key for some of the students staying on campus. A third issue: diversity. There's not enough on the campus. We market more diversity in the university than we have. Faculty need to be more sensitive to different ways of learning. The advising structure also came up, especially for freshmen. Suggestions were made for an orientation course that would help students adjust to college and for adding service learning opportunities. Also, non-traditional students aren't addressed much in their special needs, such as low cost housing and childcare.

So, these are the recurring themes in their discussions so far: the Greek system, diversity, financial aid, faculty contact. At their upcoming meetings the following people are scheduled to visit: Priscilla Tate, adviser to TCU Triangle, Angie Taylor, who is Director of Drug and Alcohol Education, Kay Higgins, Director of Women's Center, and Darron Turner, Director of Minority Affairs.

• Discussion of Student Relations Committee Report

Chair Reynolds then opened the floor for questions and comments to Senator Moore. Some of the issues raised and comments made by the Senators were:

- What of the problem of the ratio of men to women? Some believe that women leave because the ratio makes it difficult to get dates.
- The advising problem will remain until something is done in the university to reward good advising. Another senator echoed this concern about what is rewarded. The suggestion was made to revise the official TCU vita form to include a section for teaching, which it currently does not have. Yet another senator noted that Peter Seldin, an expert in faculty evaluation, will be on campus in March to discuss diverse ways of evaluating faculty.
- The new faculty this year look very diverse. This is a hopeful sign.
- An article in the *Skiff* today noted how few minorities participate in the international study programs. Perhaps we should find ways to fund international travel for minorities

who can't afford it otherwise. Another senator suggested that there are already limited funds available for International Study.

- A large number of first-year students are pre-majors. Since they don't belong to a department, do they really get adequate faculty attention? Another senator noted that at other universities, all first-year students get attached to a faculty member through a one-hour seminar.
 - A senator noted that most of the retention study has to do with undergraduates. What about graduate retention?
 - Perhaps we should consider deferring rush until the spring semester to give first-year students a chance to identify with the larger campus before "splitting into teams" right up front when they arrive on campus. Another senator suggested a fair, like the major/minor fair, for campus organizations that would help students get involved in organizations.
 - The nursing school has a respectable mix of minorities. It may take more than just a group of cohorts to make diversity successful. We need a plan to encourage diverse groups to engage with each other and not simply relate to those in their cohort.
 - The committee also needs to look into those who don't fit in for academic reasons. Another senator suggested that turnover can be good. If students can't compete academically it's not a bad thing to lose them.
 - Some who leave leave not because there are no activities here, but that the activities that are here aren't meaningful to them. We need to find activities that match the needs of people.
 - Could the data from the various studies of retention that have been done over the past few years be put on the World Wide Web where we could all get a hold of them?
 - We need to remember that someone who is not academically successful during his or her first semester might develop academic proficiency later. Another senator commented that we need to be careful how quickly we are willing to say goodbye to somebody. We ought to do everything once we get someone here to help them stay here.
 - The International House is available for foreign students. Maybe we should get groups of international students to meet with different groups of other students.
 - We need to be sensitive to different learning styles of students.
- The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 by Chair Reynolds.

Respectfully submitted,

David Grant
Secretary

3

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
November 5, 1998

I. Progress report

A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:

- Review of Tenured Faculty

Executive Committee asks that the Chancellor delay taking this to the Board until the Senate has an opportunity to consider its placement in the Handbook.

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" be revised as follows (change indicated in bold print):

"In the case of an extraordinary experience or event beyond the individual's control that affects a non tenured faculty member's performance, the faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period. **Additionally, a female faculty member may request an extension of the probationary period in the case of uncomplicated pregnancy and subsequent childbirth.** Such a request should be timely, but no later than one year after the event of consequence or the date of delivery, and in no case after the tenure materials have been submitted. In making request for an extension of the probationary period, the faculty member relinquishes any and all claims to *de facto* tenure. A faculty member may address such a request directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or to the Dean or Department Chair who will forward such request to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for decision. Prior to rendering a decision, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Dean."

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- The note to the "Statement on Extension of Tenure Probationary Period" as approved by the Faculty Senate 2/7/91 be revised to read: "This statement is included in the department and/or school/college Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase Criteria documents."

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- Additions to the "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy" found on page 14 and 15 of 1997-98 *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* to include Professional Ethics.

Chancellor will take to the Board in November

- The Faculty Senate voted to accept the procedures for grade appeals (#1-#3) submitted by the Academic Appeals Committee and that procedure #4 be sent back to the Committee for further consideration.

Approved by University Council 9/28/98, effective immediately.

- "The Faculty Senate recommended that the faculty be represented on the committee that develops policies regarding the new computer system as these policies relate to academic matters and advising, and that said faculty report directly to the Senate on proposed policies before implementation. *Proposed committee charge and composition for the new committee (to replace Academic Computing) was sent to the Chancellor/Vice Chancellors for consideration on 10/28/98. This was also sent to the Committee on Committees.*

- One universal form or electronic template should be adopted for all undergraduate curriculum and UCR actions. The same form should be used also for both undergraduate and graduate curriculum actions as well, with a simple blank used to designate undergraduate or graduate actions. *A subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council has revised the current forms per the council's suggestion. These will be reviewed at the meeting on November 20th. In addition Undergraduate Council will consider an attachment to the new forms that will result in a three page form for the Undergraduate Council and the UCR.*

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

Provost has discussed with Deans and will discuss with Executive Committee.

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer. *Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.*

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR -Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council. *Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.*

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee if/when it is created.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee .

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee .

II. Proposals from the Executive Committee

A. Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required. Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

B. As you know, the Executive Committee has asked the Chancellor and the Provost to postpone taking to the Board the proposed addition to the Handbook on Review of Tenured Faculty. We believe that this should not be a part of the tenure policy (which requires Board approval). Faculty evaluation is an important issue and should be addressed, but should not be confused with the granting of tenure. Therefore we suggest a new section be added to the Handbook (in the section called "Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Policy". We suggest that this new section on the Professional Review and Development of Faculty should be created for the new policy on review of tenured faculty which was passed by the Senate last spring. A motion to this effect will be presented to the December meeting of the Faculty Senate. A copy of the proposed addition is presented below:

V. Professional Review and Development of Tenured Faculty

The purpose of a professional peer review of faculty is to provide effective evaluation, beneficial counsel, and timely and positive assistance to ensure

that each faculty member has every opportunity, consistent with departmental, college and university goals, to experience healthy professional development and productivity throughout the faculty members entire career.

1. The review process must not subvert the rights of academic freedom and tenure, nor reduce the faculty members prerogatives of appeal as specified by the *Handbook for Faculty and University Staff* (Faculty Grievance Policy, pp. 22-25, 1997-1998 *Handbook*). *The faculty member always has the prerogative to provide a written response to an action at any stage of the post tenure review process.*

2. Each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated at least every five years by a faculty review committee established in accordance with departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. Faculty members with administrative appointments at the level of Dean and above shall be exempt from this process.

3. The criteria used in the evaluation shall be established by departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. These criteria should clearly state departmental expectations, consistent with departmental, college and university goals, for all areas of evaluation; and should be differentiated by rank and level of seniority as relevant.

4. The initial year for the review of tenured faculty for each faculty member shall be established by the department and the process shall follow a timetable as established by departmental policies and procedures for review of tenured faculty. Special situations (e.g., approved leave) may justify an adjustment in the evaluation cycle. Approval for an adjustment in the evaluation cycle is required by the Dean for the department involved.

5. A written report shall be provided to each faculty member undergoing review with a copy to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall transmit the report to the Dean with additional comments as appropriate. The faculty member under review must have the opportunity to see these comments and to offer a rebuttal, if desired. Areas of exceptional contribution, if any, should be noted along with recommendations to the administration for appropriate recognition. The written report must include a faculty development plan that specifies the goals and objectives established by the faculty member in consultation with the review committee for the three year period prior to the next review. The goals and objectives in the faculty development plan must be consistent with department and university goals, and the plan must specify methods for assessing the

achievement of these goals and objectives at the time of the next review.

6. If significant areas of deficiency are identified, the faculty development plan must include a performance improvement plan that addresses the areas of deficiency. This plan, developed in consultation with the faculty member, shall include specific guidance and recommendations to assist the faculty member more fully to meet individual, departmental, college, and university goals. The performance improvement plan must include specific information on a timetable, methods of assessing achievement of objectives, and description of a process for monitoring progress and identification of completion. The Department Chair must provide a written report to the faculty member and to the Dean upon completion of the performance improvement plan.

1 In the event that the unit is not organized into departments (e.g., Harris College of Nursing), substitute Aunit@ for Adepartment@ and Aunit head@ for Adepartment head.@

2 This step is skipped if unit head is the Dean (e.g., Harris College of Nursing).

Attachment B



OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

TO: Sherrie Reynolds
FROM: Michael R. Ferrari
MR Ferrari
RE: Honorary Degrees

An honorary degree is one of the highest forms of recognition that the University can bestow upon an individual for an extraordinary record of achievement in academic or professional life, service to community and society, or contributions to the University.

The Faculty Senate is the primary body charged with soliciting nominations for honorary degrees, evaluating nominees, and recommending to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees those candidates who are judged worthy of this honor.

Process

1. Each fall, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will invite nominations for honorary degrees to be awarded at a commencement ceremony in the subsequent year.
2. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will recommend to the Faculty Senate those candidates who meet the criteria of extraordinary achievement.
3. The Faculty Senate, meeting in Executive Session, will review the recommendation and grant its approval or non-approval of those to be recommended to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees.
4. The Chancellor will report to the Committee on Trusteeship of the Board of Trustees the recommendations of the Senate, and the Board of Trustees will act on the recommendations at its April meeting.
5. The Chancellor will inform the Faculty Senate of the action of the Trustees. The Chancellor will contact persons approved for the honorary degree and invite them to attend a commencement ceremony in the following year for the degree presentation.

7

Other:

1. Generally, individuals currently holding elected political office will not be considered for an honorary degree.
2. Should unusual circumstances warrant the consideration of an individual for an honorary degree outside of the regular cycle of review, the Chancellor will consult with the Faculty Senate and if the Faculty Senate concurs, a special meeting will be held for such review and action. If approved by the Faculty Senate, the candidate will be presented to the Executive Committee of the Trustees.
3. Generally, no more than three honorary degrees will be granted in an academic year.
4. Under no circumstances will the University award an honorary degree for the promise or expectation of a financial contribution to the University by a nominee or candidate.
5. The recipient of an honorary degree will be expected to be present at a commencement ceremony or other major University convocation to receive the degree.

Attachment C

TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY COMPUTING RESOURCES POLICY

This policy is applicable to all University students, faculty and staff and to others granted use of university computing resources as defined in this policy. This policy refers to all university computing resources, whether individually controlled or shared, stand-alone or networked. It applies to all computer and computer communication facilities owned, leased, operated or contracted by the University. This includes word processing facilities, personal computers, networks, workstations, mainframes, minicomputers, and associated peripherals and software, regardless of whether used for administration, research, teaching or other purposes ("collectively, university computing resources"). It is the responsibility of every person who uses university computing resources to read and abide by these policies.

University Regulations Regarding the Use of Computers and Networks

Individuals provided access to university computing resources assume responsibility for their appropriate use. The University expects all such persons to be careful, honest, responsible, and civil in the use of computers and networks. Individuals using wide-area networks (such as the Internet) to communicate with individuals or to connect to computers at other institutions are expected to abide by the rules for the remote systems and networks as well as those for TCU's systems. In addition to violations of University rules, certain computer misconduct is prohibited under federal and state laws, and is, therefore, subject to criminal penalties. Such misconduct includes, without limitation, the following:

- Using university computing resources for illegal activity, for material that publicly advocates illegal activity, or for discussion of illegal activities with the intent to commit them.
- Participating in unauthorized reproduction, storage, or distribution of copyrighted software or other materials (e.g., text, audio, graphics, video) or illegally obtained software.
- Accessing, copying, transporting (to another person or site), modifying, or destroying programs, records, or data belonging to the University or another user without authorization, whether such data is in transit or storage.
- Sharing an account, providing passwords to another person, using another person's password or e-mail address, attempting to breach the security of another user's account, or depriving another user of access to the University's computer resources.
- Using university computing resources to harass, defame, abuse, or threaten others.
- Using university computing resources for any unauthorized non-University related activity.

- Falsely obtaining electronic services or data without payment of required charges.

Privacy of Information

Information stored on a computer system or sent electronically over a network is the property of the individual who created it. Examination of that information without authorization from the owner is a violation of the owner's rights to control his or her own property. Systems administrators, however, may gain access to user's files when it is necessary to maintain or prevent damage to systems or to ensure compliance with other University rules.

Computer systems and networks provide mechanisms for the protection of private information from examination. These mechanisms are necessarily imperfect and any attempt to circumvent them in order to gain unauthorized access to private information (including both stored computer files and messages transmitted over network) will be treated as a violation of privacy and may subject a violator to disciplinary action.

In general, information that the owner would reasonably regard as private must be treated as private by other users. Examples include the contents of electronic mail boxes, the private file storage areas of individual users, and information stored in other areas that are not public. That measures have not been taken to protect such information does not make it permissible for others to inspect it.

On shared and networked computer systems certain information about users and their activities is visible to others. Users are cautioned that certain accounting and directory information (for example, user names and electronic mail addresses), certain records of file names and executed commands, and information stored in public areas, are not private. Nonetheless, such unsecured information about other users must not be manipulated in ways that they might reasonably find intrusive; for example, eavesdropping by computer and systematic monitoring of the behavior of others are likely to be considered invasions of privacy that would be cause for disciplinary action.

Use of Facilities

Computer and network facilities are provided to authorized persons for their personal use. These facilities have tangible value. Consequently, attempts to circumvent accounting systems, to use the computer accounts of others, or to duplicate, use, or distribute software without authorization, will be treated as forms of attempted theft.

A user may not attempt to damage or degrade the performance of TCU's computers and networks and should not disrupt the work of other users. Each individual user assumes individual responsibility for the use of his or her accounts. Consequently, users may not disclose their passwords or otherwise make TCU's facilities available to unauthorized individuals (including family or friends). Use of TCU's computers and networks for commercial purposes without authorization is prohibited.

Electronic Communication

TCU neither sanctions nor censors individual expression of opinion on its systems. The same standards of behavior, however, are expected in the use of electronic mail as in the use of telephones and written and oral communication. Therefore, electronic mail, like telephone messages, must be neither obscene nor harassing. Similarly, messages must not misrepresent the identity of the sender. Messages should not be sent as "chain letters" or "broadcast" indiscriminately.

Plagiarism

Computer programs/other electronic data and documents should be regarded as individual creations and subject to the same standards of misrepresentation of copied work.

Additional Policies

Security and Privacy

- Users understand that timesharing and network-based system activity is automatically logged on a continuous basis. These logs do not include private user text, mail contents, or personal data, but do include a record of user processes that may be examined by authorized system administrators.
- TCU considers user accounts to be the private property of those who have opened them, and as a result will never ask users to reveal their passwords. However, users who request assistance from Computer Services give the staff implicit permission to view specific data in their accounts that is necessary to investigate, diagnose, or correct the problem.

Use of Facilities and the Network

- Physical theft, rearrangement, or damage to any University computer or network equipment, facilities, or property is strictly prohibited, and will be reported to the police. This includes all public computer labs, network hubs, wiring, and links. Users may not "plug-in" personal computers or peripheral devices in
- public computer labs or onto the University Network without prior authorization.
- Data packets on the network are like voice signals on a telephone line. Just as phone taps are prohibited, so too are attempts to monitor, analyze, or tamper with network data packets.

Electronic Communication and Bulletin Boards

- TCU neither sanctions nor censors individual expressions of opinion on its systems. However, obscene or harassing electronic communication (e.g.,

electronic mail) is prohibited, as are computer messages that actively target individuals in a threatening manner.

- Users who make use of bulletin board systems and other network communication utilities (e.g., Gopher, Newsgroups, the Web, list servers) do so voluntarily, with the understanding that they may encounter material they deem offensive. Students who subscribe, post messages, or simply browse through such utilities must abide by the rules governing each in addition to TCU's rules governing computing on campus.
- Although commercial work is prohibited on TCU systems and networks, some bulletin board systems (BBS) available over the network do make provisions for posting job opportunities and personal items for sale. Such activity is permissible within the constraints of policies specific to each BBS. The staff of Information Services takes no responsibility for any fraud or misrepresentation users may encounter (caveat emptor).

Cases of Misconduct

- The University's designated computer security officer shall be the primary contact for the interpretation, enforcement and monitoring of this policy and the resolution of problems concerning it. Any legal issues concerning the policy shall be referred to the appropriate officials for advice.
- If system administrators have persuasive evidence of misuse by a user of University computing resources, the University's designated computer security officer shall have authority to inspect files, diskettes, tapes and/or other computer-accessible storage media.
- By accessing and using the university's computing resources, each system user expressly consents to and acknowledges the University's right, when necessary as a function of responsible system management:
 - 1) to monitor any and all aspects of university computing resources (including, but not limited to, individual user login sessions to determine if a user is acting in violation of University policies or the law);
 - 2) to inspect all electronic files and other electronically recorded information within the university's computing resources; and
 - 3) to intercept, access, disclose and use electronic communications of any user, whether in transit or storage.
- Only the University's designated computer security officer can authorize the monitoring, inspection, interceptions, access, disclosure or use of such electronic data (including, without limitation, electronic mail) when there is reasonable cause to suspect improper use of university computing resources.

- Whenever a case of computer misconduct is suspected or reported, TCU reserves the right to deny system access to any user who violates the rules set forth in this statement. This includes the ability to terminate processes that threaten system security or performance.
- Students will be held to the same standard of conduct (in electronic communication) with faculty, officers and staff of the University. Threatening or harassing correspondence will be reported to the appropriate authority.

Student Rights and Responsibilities

- TCU must ensure that academic work takes precedence at all times over other computing activities in its facilities. In situations of high user demand which may strain available computer resources, TCU reserves the right to restrict (e.g., to specific times of day) or prohibit computer activities such as game playing.
- Mutual cooperation is essential to sustain the free flow of information fostered by campus computers and networks while protecting the integrity and privacy of personal data. Since computer systems and networks are imperfect, users are strongly requested to report any bugs or security holes to the staff of Information Services. Likewise, users should not disseminate to others any information that serves to jeopardize, circumvent, or degrade system security or integrity. Users should also be aware that certain types of computer misuse (including indirect participation) are illegal under federal and state law.
- Users recognize that systems and networks are imperfect and waive any responsibility for lost work or time that may arise from their use. TCU cannot compensate users for degradation or loss of personal data, software, or hardware as a result of their use of University-owned systems or networks, or as a result of assistance they may seek from Information Services staff.

Approved by Chancellor's Cabinet 9/22/98

Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
6 May 1999

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, George Brown, Clayton Brown, Arthur Busbey, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, and Robert Vigeland.

Members absent: Gene Smith, Pat Paulus, Susan White, Bill Vanderhoof, Carolyn Cagle, Alison Moreland, Greg Clemons, Bernadette Szajna, Pamela Marcum, and Chuck Williams,

Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

The minutes of the 1 April 1999 meeting were approved as distributed.

New Senators for 1999-2000 were introduced by Assistant Secretary Lynn Flahive: Peggy Watson, Bruce Ellerman, Ed Kolesar, Nancy Meadows, Pat Bradley, Ron Watson, and George Low. Reelected to another term are Chuck Becker, Linda Moore, Nowell Donovan, Ellen Page-Garrison, Roger Pfaffenberger Andy Fort, Carol Stephenson, and Melissa Young were elected to at-large positions. No one from Brite stood for election, so that position remains vacant. She also announced the following Senators whose terms are over and thanked them for their service: Linda Hughes, Gene Smith, David Sloan, Bill Vanderhoof, Rhonda Keen-Payne, George Brown, Bob Vigeland, Bernadette Szajna, Pam Marcum, and Manny Reinecke.

New Business:

Report of the Committee on Committees. Senator Reinecke made the report (see Attachment A.). Senator Reinecke highlighted items in the report, specifically regarding three committees: the Admissions Committee, the new Information Technology Committee, and the quasi-judicial committees. The Committee also made nominations to all university committees. The Admissions Committee also submitted a report in response to inquiries made by the Committee on Committees (see Attachment B).

Student House of Representatives Resolution 99-6. Chair Reynolds introduced Sara Donaldson from the Student Government Association to present a resolution concerning the resurrection of the Frog Finder. Joe Bobitch moved that the Senate support this resolution:

“Whereas: Registration for classes can be a stressful process, and
Whereas: The Frog Finder . . . is a consistent way to provide better service and more information about courses to the students, and
Whereas: The Professors Web Page . . . would be the easiest way for professors to provide this information to the students.

Let it be resolved: That the House of Student Representatives requests that the Office of the Registrar resurrect the Frog Finder as a web page linked to the class scheduling web pages.

Respectfully submitted:
Academic Affairs Committee'

The motion to support this resolution from the SGA was approved.

Report from Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee. Senator Rhonda Keen-Payne made the report (see Attachment C). The recommendations that conclude the report will be voted on next September meeting.

Report from the Student Relations Committee. Report made by Senator Linda Moore (see Attachment D).

Other reports. Reports from the Academic Excellence Committee (Attachment E) and the Executive Committee (Attachment F) were also received by the Secretary.

Election of Officers. Chair Reynolds conducted elections for officers for next year. The following were elected:

Chair Elect: Nowell Donovan
Secretary: David Grant
Assistant Secretary: Lynn Flahive

An election was also held for a faculty representative to the Budget Committee. Andy Fort was elected.

Chair Reynolds turned the gavel over to Roger Pfaffenberger, Chair of the Faculty Senate for 1999-2000.

Senator Vigeland presented a plaque to outgoing Chair Reynolds in appreciation for her service this year.

Chair Reynolds then declared the Senate to be in Executive Session for the purpose of discussing a resolution regarding Larry Calloway's service to the university.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant
Secretary

ATTACHMENT A
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
FACULTY SENATE OF TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
May 6, 1999

The COC met 8 times this year including one meeting with the chair of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee. That meeting resulted in a request that the chair and the Director of Admissions meet with the Senate to discuss the specific items noted below [#21]. This thrice delayed meeting is now scheduled to take place in the Fall.

Another major COC activity was to oversee the transformation of the Academic Computing Committee into the INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY Committee [#2].

The COC continued to discuss with VC Mills the duplication, overlap and uneven distribution of effort among several quasi-judicial committees [#17, #18, #20, #22] without resolution. The COC suggests that the UNIVERSITY COURT [#22] take it upon itself to take the lead in resolving this problem in keeping with operative legal constraints.

Among its normal activities the COC filled several openings on UC's due to resignations or medical leaves, surveyed the faculty for their committee preferences, monitored the activity of the UC's through their chairs, members and overseers and selected nominees for the UC's as indicated below. A copy of the GUIDELINES used by the COC in performing these functions is attached to this report.

Due to several changes in the membership of the COC during the course of the year and the need to operate with less than a full complement of members, in spite of the able assistance of the EC liaison, Lynn Flahive, it was not possible to complete the specific charge of the Senate EC to take "a clean slate look at the structure of university committees."

The following nominations were approved by the COC and verified by the nominees. The specific names are available orally on request and a complete list was given to the Executive Committee to be forwarded to the Provost and Chancellor. The COC prefers not to release a written list of nominees to avoid the embarrassment of individuals or confusion of nomination with appointment.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS

COMMITTEE: #1. ACADEMIC APPEALS [LIAISON: Bennett]

CHAIR: D. Rinewalt

NOMINATED AND TERMS: two [2004], S. Weeks [2003] replaced Benefield 9/98

REMOVED AND REASONS:

J. Allman leaving TCU

L. Benefield administrative appt 9/98

J. Riddlesperger LOA

COMMENTS: considered two appeals this year; requested rotation of chair

COMMITTEE: #2. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY [LIAISON: Williams/Reinecke]

CHAIR: Busbey

NOMINATED AND TERMS: NONE

REMOVED AND REASONS: NONE

COMMENTS: Mid-year reorganized remnant of ACADEMIC COMPUTING; no changes needed except that members of former UC not included on this smaller UC [Mazzoleni, B. Miller] should be informed of meetings so they may attend, comment and receive minutes.

COMMITTEE: #3. ANIMAL CARE, USE & INSTITUTIONAL BIOSAFETY [LIAISON: Reinecke]

CHAIR: Papini

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS: J. Bobich [LOA]

COMMENTS: no problems; mandated committee

COMMITTEE: #4. COMPLIANCE AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION [LIAISON: Cagle]

CHAIR: Fort

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS: C. Y. Thompson [term expired]

COMMENTS: no problems; determining role vis a via Diversity Council

COMMITTEE: #5. EVALUATION [LIAISON: Bennett]

CHAIR: Sacken

NOMINATED AND TERMS: two [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

E. Miller [term expired]

T. Klein [switch to #14]

COMMENTS: awaiting administrative response to Fall report on Evaluation of Teaching before beginning similar study on Evaluation of Advising

COMMITTEE: #6. HONORS COUNCIL [LIAISON: Vanderhoof]

CHAIR: Becker

NOMINATED AND TERMS: three [2004]

K. Riddlesperger [2000] replaced Benefield 9/98

REMOVED AND REASONS:

L. Benefield [2000] administrative appt 9/98

Doran [term expired]

Franzwa [term expired]

Whillock LOA

COMMENTS: Lahutsky LOA in residence & willing to discharge duties

COMMITTEE: #7. HONORS WEEK [LIAISON: Cagle]

CHAIR: Paquet

NOMINATED AND TERMS: two [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

Doran [term expired]

K. Stevens [2001] LOA

COMMENTS: no problems

COMMITTEE: #8 INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE [LIAISON: Bennett]

CHAIR: Peters

NOMINATED AND TERMS: two [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

Vanderhoof [term expired]

Aker [term expired]

COMMENTS: no problems

COMMITTEE: #9. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS [LIAISON: Reinecke]

CHAIR: W. Watson

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2003], two [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

M. Butler [term expired]

R. Pfaffenberger [term expired]

J. Riddlesperger LOA

COMMENTS: last chance to see if this UC serves a meaningful role

COMMITTEE: #10. INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS [LIAISON: Vanderhoof]

CHAIR: Keitges

NOMINATED AND TERMS: three [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

Bond [term expired]

Douglas-Roberts LOA

G. Solomon moved to another UC

COMMENTS: no problems

COMMITTEE: #11. LIBRARY [LIAISON: Lahutsky]

CHAIR: Gouwens

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2003], two [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS: Britton, [term expired]; Flowers [LOA]

COMMENTS: no problems

COMMITTEE: #12. MEDIATORS [LIAISON: Lahutsky]

CHAIR: Coerver

NOMINATED AND TERMS: none

REMOVED AND REASONS: none

COMMENTS: no problems

COMMITTEE: #13. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES [LIAISON: Reinecke]

CHAIR: J. Coffey

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2004]

STANDBY NOMINEE: one [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS: G. Smith LOA

COMMENTS: Quarles LOA in residence & willing to discharge duties;

COMMITTEE: #14. RETIREMENT, INSURANCE AND BENEFITS [LIAISON: Cagle]

CHAIR: Morgan

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2003], two [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

Clegg [term expired]

Nichols [term expired]

Sloan [retiring]

COMMENTS: no problems

COMMITTEE: #15. SAFEGUARDS IN HUMAN RESEARCH [LIAISON: Vanderhoof]

CHAIR: Curry

NOMINATED AND TERMS: two [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

Pope [term expired]

Jones [requests removal]

COMMENTS: no problems

COMMITTEE: #16. SCHOLARSHIP AND FINANCIAL AID [LIAISON: Lahutsky]

CHAIR: Hatcher

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS: Burton [term expired]

COMMENTS: consider becoming solely an appeals body

COMMITTEE: # 17. STUDENT CONDUCT & GRIEVANCE [LIAISON: Sloan]

CHAIR: Flahive

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2003], three [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

Allender LOA

M.R.Butler [term expired]

Hensley [term expired]

G. Solomon [switch to another UC]

COMMENTS: no problems, but see #22

COMMITTEE: #18. STUDENT ORGANIZATION [LIAISON: Sloan]

CHAIR: Kinkade

NOMINATED AND TERMS: two [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS: B. Anderson [retiring], L. Caldwell [LOA]

COMMENTS: no problems, but see #22

COMMITTEE: #19. STUDENT PUBLICATIONS [LIAISON: Vanderhoof]

CHAIR: Donovan

NOMINATED AND TERMS: none

REMOVED AND REASONS: none

COMMENTS: no problems

COMMITTEE: #20 TRAFFIC REGULATIONS & APPEALS [LIAISON: Sloan]

CHAIR: Oberkircher

NOMINATED AND TERMS: one [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS: Dietz [term expired]

COMMENTS: no problems, but see #22

COMMITTEE: #21. UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS [LIAISON: Flahive]

CHAIR: Camp

NOMINATED AND TERMS: two [2002], one [2003], three [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

Hartman [switch to another UC]

Infantino LOA

Greer [term expired]

C. Thomas no longer faculty

J. Solomon [term expired]

J. Watson [switch to another UC]

COMMENTS: The following suggestions were offered for the consideration of the Admissions committee, with the expressed support of the CoC based on our meeting with the chair on 9/98.

1. Facilitate dialogue between the faculty and the Admissions Office about the importance of retention, clarify the relationship between who is admitted and who can succeed, and assert the serious dangers involved when the subtle and insidious pressure to graduate unqualified students becomes pervasive in an institution concerned about moving into the upper tier of universities.

2. Study enrollment and retention statistics over the last 10 years from the Admissions Office including test scores, rank in class, diversity data, etc. This information should be reported to the Faculty Senate and/or posted on the WEB to initiate discussion about the issues.

3. Determine how the Admissions Office identifies its annual and strategic goals? Include "steadily improve the academic strength of entering classes" into its goals.

4. CoC supports a revised "charge" which includes retention.

COMMITTEE: #22 UNIVERSITY COURT [LIAISON: FLAHIVE/Sloan]

CHAIR: Mills

NOMINATED AND TERMS: three [2004]

REMOVED AND REASONS:

Hensley [switch to another UC]

Flahive [switch to another UC]

COMMENTS: drop to 3 members and take the lead with VC Mills to delineate and balance the role and effort of all quasi-judicial UC's [#17, #18, #20] in keeping with legal restraints.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy Bennett
Carolyn Spence Cagle
Lynn Flahive, EC liaison
Nadia Lahutsky, Secretary
Manny Reinecke, chair
David Sloan
William Vanderhoof
Chuck Williams, fall 1998

1998-9 UC GUIDELINES

A. NOMINATION PROCEDURE

1. Faculty should be polled for their interest in serving, not serving or continuing to serve on particular committees. The absence of a response should indicate a willingness to serve as needed.
2. Chairs and administrative overseers should be polled for suggestions as to nominees.
3. Overseers, chairs or the Senate [via the COC] should be able to remove a member of the UC for dereliction of duty, illness, leave, retirement, etc.
4. If the Administration finds a COC recommendation unacceptable, it should be returned to the COC, via the EC if during the summer, with suggested replacements and/or a request for another nominee.
5. Appointed members of non-UC Committee should be selected by a two-step process involving the COC.

B. PREFERRED MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

1. Full-time, tenured or tenure-eligible
2. NOT on leave either semester of the academic year; those already on a UC should resign unless they certify they will be in residence and will discharge their committee responsibilities.
3. Interested or requested faculty with expertise, tenure and/or higher rank.
4. Limit duties to only one UC except in cases of exceptional need.

C. COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

1. UC's should send COC meeting notices, minutes and/or a brief annual summary of their work.
2. Liaisons should interview chairs, overseers and selected members to assess UC effectiveness.

D. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

1. Limit the use of ad hoc Committees infringing on UC duties.

ATTACHMENT B

Report of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee May 6, 1999

This report summarizes the discussions and activities of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee for 1998-99 and addresses the topics raised by the Committee on Committees in September 1998. At the end of the report, recommendations are offered to direct the future activities and efforts of this committee and the TCU community.

Committee Name and Charge

Members of the committee recommend that the committee's name and charge be modified as follows:

Current Name: Undergraduate Admissions Committee

New Name: Undergraduate Admissions and Retention Committee

Current Charge:

Annually reviews university policies. Is consulted on proposed changes in admissions procedures. Keeps abreast of innovations occurring elsewhere and makes recommendations when such innovations appear relevant to TCU. Annually reviews student retention statistics and recommends needed changes in admission policies and procedures.

New Charge:

Annually reviews undergraduate admission, enrollment and retention statistics. Facilitates communication between the Admissions Office and other members of the university community, including the Faculty Senate. Serves in a responsive and proactive manner to consider issues concerning admissions, including annual and strategic goals.

Enrollment and Retention Statistics: A Decade Review

Enrollment and retention statistics from 1989 to 1998 have been collected and reviewed (a copy of this information can be found on reserve in the library). Attached to this report are summary tables of four sets of data: 1) ranges of applications, accepted, enrolled and yield for 1989 – 1998; 2) high and low percentile rankings of freshmen from public and private high schools from 1989 - 1998; 3) distribution of freshmen by ethnicity from fall 1989 – 1998; and 4) status of entering freshmen from year-to-year as of fall 1998. It should be noted that *it is difficult to interpret the meaningfulness of these descriptive data without additional analyses*. That is, whether or not a change in number is significant cannot be determined without further analyses. In addition to these institutional statistics, committee members have visited with Sandy Ware, Dean of Admissions, and Patrick Miller, Registrar and Director of Enrollment Management. The following observations are made from these data and conversations:

- The numbers of applications (n=4829) and accepted freshmen (n=3738) were highest in 1998, with the yield being the lowest (37.4%).
- The high school percentile rankings of freshmen ranging between 1 and 10 percent was highest in 1998 (and 1996), suggesting a higher quality of entering freshmen class.
- Over the past ten years, the percentages of freshmen that were white ranged from 81% (in 1994 and 1996) to 88% (in 1990 and 1991). In 1998, there was a decrease in the percentage of freshmen that represent ethnic minorities. The percentage of American Indian, Asian, Black, and Hispanic freshmen decreased from 14% in 1997 to a little less than 9% in 1998.
- TCU's five-year graduation rate is 63%. In general, 10% of freshmen do not return at the end of their first semester at TCU and another 10% do not return after the second semester.
- According to analyses completed by the Director of Enrollment Management, gender and SAT scores are stronger predictors of retention than are activities completed once the student is on campus (e.g., Frog Camp, Greek affiliation, small classes). This report suggests a strong relationship between the admission process and retention.

Admission Goal Setting

Although a comprehensive and systematic plan for goal setting in admissions and retention may be in place, members of the committee continue to be unclear about the nature and substance of a such a plan.

Recommendations

Based on the year of discussions and review, the following recommendations are offered future activities of the committee and the TCU community:

- Develop mechanisms to increase communication and coordinated efforts across campus in addressing the following:
 1. Increasing student diversity.
 2. Increasing the enrollment and retention of the highest quality student. Activities may involve Financial Aid, Admissions, Diversity Council, Academic Excellence Committee, and Enrollment Management.
- Increase faculty understanding of retention and related issues, by reviewing retention study outcomes and communicating with the Director of Enrollment.
- Determine the significance of enrollment patterns presented in institutional reports, including how such patterns match projected and/or desired

outcomes or goals.

Table 1
Admissions Statistics: 1989 – 1998
Ranges for Applications, Accepted, Enrolled and Yield

	Freshmen	Transfer	Total*
Applications	3520 – 4829 (89) (98)	707 – 801 (94) (98)	
Accepted	2820 – 3738 (89) (98)	518 – 577 (94) (95)	
Enrolled	1140 – 1463 (90) (97)	310 – 420 (94) (91)	1765 – 2068 (94) (97)
Yield	37.4% - 42.9% (98) (95)	58.5% - 69.4% (98) (91)	

*TOTAL includes Freshmen, Transfer, Readmits, and CE Non-degree students.

Table 2
Percentile Rankings of Freshmen from
Public and Private High Schools

1-10%	27.1% - 34% (90) (96,98)
Below 50%	7% - 12.6% (94,98) (91)

Table 3
Distribution of Freshmen By Ethnicity
Fall 1998 – Fall 1989

	F 98	F 97	F 96	F 95	F 94	F 93	F 92	F 91	F 90	F89
American Indian	*	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	*	*	*	*
Asian	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Black	2%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%
Hispanic	4%	6%	6%	7%	9%	7%	5%	5%	5%	4%
White	87%	82%	81%	83%	81%	83%	86%	88%	88%	87%
Unknown	2%	1%	2%	*	*	+	+	+	+	+
Nonresident	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	3%

* = Less than 1%. + = Not available.

Table 4
Status of Entering Freshmen from Year-To-Year as of Fall 1998

	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	Cum. Aver.
Second Year Returning	77%	74%	73%	71%	77%	79%	78%	81%	78%	82%	80%	77%
Third Year Returning	67%	64%	65%	64%	67%	69%	70%	70%	71%	72%		67%
Graduated in 2 yrs.	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-		*
Fourth Year Returning	61%	59%	62%	61%	64%	65%	66%	68%	67%			64%
Graduated in 3 yrs.	*	1%	*	*	1%	1%	*	*	1%			1%
Fifth Year Returning	10%	19%	24%	21%	27%	24%	27%	26%				22%
Graduated in 4 yrs.	42%	38%	36%	39%	38%	40%	39%	42%				39%
Sixth Year Returning	3%	2%	4%	5%	4%	3%	4%					4%
Graduated in 5 yrs.	57%	56%	56%	58%	60%	61%	62%					59%
Seventh Year Returning	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%						1%
Graduated in 6 yrs.	60%	59%	60%	59%	63%	63%						61%

* = Less than 1%.

(Adapted from *Texas Christian University Fall 1998 Fact Book*, Institutional Research, p.14.)

ATTACHMENT C

Report of the Senate Committee on
Tenure, Promotion, & Grievance
6 May 1999

Committee: Charles Becker, Greg Clemons, Gregg Franzwa, David Jenkins, Pam Marcum,
Rhonda Keen-Payne, Chairperson, Roger Pfaffenberger, Liaison

Six focus groups met to discuss the processes of tenure, promotion, and grievance. Possible group members and facilitators were identified by the committee and asked to participate. Those willing to participate did so in groups organized by rank or position, e.g., professors, faculty in their first year of employment, assistant/ associate professors, deans and chairpersons. The provost was interviewed.

Although each group focused on different questions, the responses of each group were similar and are noted below according to question. In some cases, a single or few faculty held strong views which were not those of the majority. These are so noted. The facilitators, faculty members, and administrators who participated consistently voiced commitment to and concern for the academic enterprise and the life of the University. Recommendations are noted at the end of the document.

1. *We offer tenure to no one at the time of hiring. What is the effect of this policy on recruitment?*

Almost everyone agreed that we should modify this policy to provide flexibility at the department level, allowing departments to recommend hiring a senior faculty member with tenure. The particular positions of concern are department chairpersons, endowed professorships and chairs, and senior associate professors. If this change occurs, some departments will need to conduct more thorough interviews. A few faculty members believed that if tenure were not granted at hiring, departments should be able to recommend some candidates for tenure at the end of a semester or year. One group noted that the best policy would be one that allowed departments to recommend candidates for tenure when they were ready, whether that was one month, two years, or six years. (see Recommendation 1).

2. *We give candidates credit for years in a tenure-track position whether the candidates want credit or not. What is the effect of this policy?*

Everyone agreed that we should modify this policy to provide flexibility for the department and the candidate, allowing the decision to be made at the department level. This policy and that in question #1 were discussed in two groups as examples of an adversarial posture between faculty and administration that may be communicated during hiring. These two policies were also examples of most groups' belief that the best decision is the one made as close as possible to the candidate and department (see Recommendation 2).

3. *The quality and quantity of communication between the tenured faculty, the chairperson, and the candidate may be the most significant factor in facilitating smooth and productive reviews that result in good decisions. What is the quality of our communication?*

Everyone agreed that most people in the process have good intentions regarding communication. The quality of communication is a function of two factors: the commitment of department's faculty members to the review process and the chairperson. The best review is one in which everyone takes the job seriously, data are examined thoroughly, and judgments are communicated honestly and respectfully. The quality of communication varies widely by department. Anecdotal evidence of quality extremes was offered. The tenured faculty and the chairperson guide and review candidates. The chairperson assumes the responsibility for assisting the faculty in all parts of the review, which includes communicating clearly and consistently (see Recommendation 3).

4. *The chairperson role in these processes is critical, and requires training, support, guidance, and time. What specific mechanisms are available to help chairpersons? What safeguards in the system protect the candidate when the chairperson rotates?*

Although some groups believed the chairpersons needed little additional support, almost everyone noted wide variation in the quality of support available to chairpersons. This was linked, in many people's minds, to the quality and consistency of reviews of candidates for tenure. Anecdotes supported the wide level of training and preparation offered chairpersons, and included such activities as attendance at national workshops, receiving the key to the office, on-the-job training, and asking former chairpersons or dean. One chairperson had attended a TCU daylong workshop for chairs, which was useful. This workshop has not been available for many years. The chairpersons' group was representative of the varied levels of perceived support, training, and guidance in the role. They led other groups in desiring an assessment of the chairperson role including preparation, training, and support. (see Recommendation 3)

5. *How does our system protect against an unfair review? Grievance procedures are limited to problems of process, not the merit of the decision. Is this system sufficient to insure fairness?*

Almost every group agreed that the grievance system is best left as it is. Most believed that a grievance procedure that examined merit would be one more of many merit reviews, and best left to the judicial system outside the University.

One group identified a potential problem that is peculiar to small departments. If a department has only two tenured faculty members, plus a chairperson, the candidate's decision rests with only two persons, and the potential for an unfair decision may be magnified. A possible solution is to allow the dissenting member of the advisory committee, although only 50% rather than a majority, to file a dissenting report with the next level which would result in a review on the merit of the case.

6. *Is teaching sufficiently valued and evaluated? Is it true that the tenure decision is too heavily weighted by research because quality in teaching is difficult to measure?*

Most groups believed that the balance between scholarship and teaching was about right, although at any one time, the emphasis may be stronger on one than another. One group offered a unique interpretation of how teaching and research are valued at TCU. This group perceived that the University values teaching more than research, and that the department values research more than teaching. Thus, the tension is due to competing messages of value. One department emphasizes quality in teaching in the first two years of reviews. As a result, the latter years may seem to overvalue research because persons in their third and subsequent years have demonstrated an adequate level of quality in their teaching. Some groups identified inconsistencies related to teaching loads, the casual review of research as compared to teaching, and conflicting advice offered by tenured faculty members and chairpersons. Some groups clearly articulated the investment that many tenured faculty feel in the University, and thus in the success of younger faculty members in both teaching and research. The groups generated several specific suggestions related to the evaluation of teaching. These comments have been forwarded to the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Recommendations:

1. Because flexibility at the time of hiring is a key element in the recruitment of high quality faculty, we recommend that departments be able to negotiate with faculty candidates on the granting of tenure at hiring.
2. Because flexibility at the time of hiring is a key element in the recruitment of high quality faculty, we recommend that the decision to count prior service in a tenure-track position toward the probationary period at TCU be the choice of the candidate, within AAUP guidelines.
3. Because the management of the academic mission is dependent on the chairperson role and because the faculty and administration value the faculty chairperson role, we recommend that an assessment of the chairperson role be conducted in the fall semester of 1999, and support mechanisms identified as necessary be instituted in the following year.

ATTACHMENT D

FACULTY SENATE STUDENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE 1998-99 Year End Report

Standing Charges:

1. Represent the Faculty Senate on matters involving student concerns
2. Meet with the officers of the Student House of Representatives at least annually to track issues of concern to the student community of the University

Specific Charge:

Study the students who have trouble finding a place at TCU. Find out who they are and how we are addressing their needs. Gather information which will allow you to recommend how we may better meet the needs of these students.

Committee activities:

The committee met with Mr. Ben Alexander, President of the Student Government Association; Dr. John Schuster, Counseling Center; Ms. Angie Taylor, Director, Alcohol and Drug Education; Dr. Priscilla Tate, Advisor to Triangle; Dr. Andy Fort, Advisor to Student Allies; Mr. Al Mladenka, International Student Services; Yumi Keitges, President of International Students Association; Darron Turner, Director of Minority Affairs; Dr. Kay Higgins, Director of Orientation and the Women's Resource Center; Rev. John Butler, Minister to the University; and students considering leaving the university.

The meetings were based on the following agenda:

"We want to look the many life domains of students to determine what helps students fit and what hinders that process. Can you differentiate among:
Emotional, Social, Career/intellectual, Physical
Do you find that any of the following issues may affect retention?
Scheduling/flexibility, Class size, Faculty contact, or
Expectations regarding TCU (are we marketing appropriately)
Can you suggest what works and what doesn't in your experience?"

The Faculty Senate also discussed the themes arising from discussion with these representatives and that discussion is reflected in Senate minutes.

The following report is the result of all these discussions.

Issues:

The Greek system is a support system to those who join. For others it is exclusionary, snobbish, and negative. There is concern that the members of the Greek system have resources not available to other organizations. Other concerns include the use of alcohol within the system which affects other problems such as depression and mental health.

The lack of diversity was mentioned often. There appears to be a lack of **acceptance** of

difference, ignorance, and little attention to learning about difference. Diversity is not characterized by just ethnic differences but social class, intellectual, geographic, ability, and age differences as well as sexual identity/orientation, religion, and political differences.

The lack of social and intellectual stimulation on the campus was cited often. The campus was described as boring, not intellectually challenging, lacking in critical thinking, lacking in social activities, and too conservative.

Financial issues were a concern. The perception is that it is difficult to get scholarships, to keep scholarships after entering TCU, and to find enough financial aid to afford the education.

Affiliation is a problem for many students. Beyond the Greek system, there are many sub-groups but often they appear on the fringes rather than as supported groups. Some examples include returning students, international students, smokers, minorities, gays and lesbians, and punk rockers, non-Christians and athletes. It appears that the international students in Brachman Hall are ghettoized and kept separate. There seems to be a breaking down of support for minority groups such as Legacy and the Minority Council. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues are veiled, under the surface but still issues. There is a lot of intolerance among some of the religious groups on campus.

Faculty involvement is a positive characteristic. There is a sense that the faculty and staff are open and friendly and provide support. Teaching is good and co-curricular staff reach out to students. More faculty contact would enrich the experience. Students are very supportive of faculty involvement and efforts are being made to include faculty more often.

Advising was mentioned as possibly problematic specifically for premajors. There is high satisfaction with advising in the major. Data do not indicate major problems but there are anecdotal complaints about mistakes on schedules and lack of awareness of the variety of majors and their requirements.

Suggestions:

- ◆ Better facilities to encourage interaction both socially and intellectually (e.g. theater, bowling alley, pool hall, video game area, dance hall) Students need facilities for interaction. The Rickel Building promotes interaction so a system that combines the functions of Rickel and the Student Center seems like a good one. This is presently under study and progress should be monitored by the committee.
- ◆ Resources to support education (e.g. child care center, housing for married students and students with children, financial aid beyond academic scholarships). It appears that there are not many scholarships for continuing students and the perception is that the resources are concentrated on recruitment and not retention.
- ◆ Resources for non-Greek organizations
- ◆ More opportunities for faculty involvement in academic and social life of students It should be considered a part of teaching and service to the university must be valued. Ideas included retreats with faculty and students around specific topics and more interdisciplinary courses.

- ◆ Mentors for premajors, academically at risk, freshmen, minority students The Trio office is working on this and SGA may present a bill to support this.
- ◆ More information dissemination regarding campus resources, the community, and techniques for social and academic success
 - Orientation course
 - More information at Orientation about options for a variety of students
 - Web page for information
- ◆ More opportunity for service learning and linkage with the community
- ◆ Request to the Student Government Association to provide programming at more varied times so that athletes and others can be involved

Actions requested:

- ◆ Several issues arising from diversity need to be addressed by the Chancellor's Council on Diversity to avoid overlap of efforts. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that council and receive information from that group.
- ◆ A committee on service learning is established and developing a report. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that committee and receive information from that group.
- ◆ The Committee on the First Year Experience has met all year and is developing recommendations many of which mirror this committee's report. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that committee and receive information from that group.
- ◆ A listing of organizations with contact persons **and** phone numbers should be placed in Frog Calls.

Charges:

The following issues should be considered as charges for the Student Relations Committee for the 1999-2000 academic year:

- ◆ Faculty involvement in academic and social life of students should be considered a part of teaching and service to the university. It must be valued and strategies for recognition and reward must be developed so that annual reports include it and merit increases reflect such contributions.
- ◆ The issue of financial aid beyond academic scholarships needs further study. It appears that there are not many scholarships for continuing students and the perception is that the resources are concentrated on recruitment and not retention. The Student Relations Committee should attempt to receive information on this issue next year.
- ◆ Ongoing meetings with representatives of SGA should be held.

- ◆ Student discussion in groups and forums should be held early next year in conjunction with the Student Relations Committee. The SGA wants to join the discussion and help solve the problem. A Faculty Assembly may also be included.
- ◆ Study the issue of athletes' opportunity for involvement in campus activities
- ◆ The Student Relations Committee should examine retention strategies next year and assess what is being done on campus.

Recommendations:

- ◆ Commend the Chancellor and other administrators for recommending ongoing financial aid in the budget for the next academic year.
- ◆ Commend the Chancellor and other administrators for beginning the process of developing and/or renovating facilities for students' recreation and interaction.

ATTACHMENT E

1

ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE COMMITTEE: Report to the Faculty Senate May 1999

Standing charges

1. To maintain interest in and awareness of all policies, procedures, programs and goals that affect the academic excellence of the university.
2. Study and advise the Faculty Senate on requests concerning academic matters forwarded by the Student House of Representatives.
3. In conjunction with the University Library Committee, monitor the status of library resources.
4. Meet with the Student House of Representatives' Academic Excellence Committee at least annually to trace issues of concern for the University.

Specific Charge

What habits of mind, sensitivities, intellectual dispositions and knowledge should an undergraduate have developed by the the end of his/her experience at TCU? What general knowledge should he/she have acquired? This study should create a multi-faceted view of this question, and strive to reveal the diversity and complexity of views, rather than narrowing it to a few conclusions or objectives.

Response of the Committee

Standing Charge one

This is a very broad charge: in a sense it is the most important charge of all, emphasizing as it does the paramountcy of the faculty in designing the academic mission of the university. In the fall we became aware of other committees on campus that are charged with overlapping responsibilities. There is a need for communication between various branches of the University. In general plans are afoot in various parts of campus to redesign/modify components of the core (eg., Dean McCracken has instituted a committee to evaluate the effectiveness of that part of the core concerned with the Natural Science requirement). Other committee work, deriving from the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, is concerned with the quality of the learning environment at TCU. However, our general impression is that things are quietly ticking along prior to the complete review of our operations that the Chancellor is planning for the very near future.

Standing Charge two

No requests were forwarded from the Student House of Representatives. [However see Specific Charge below]

Standing Charge three

The Committee received a generally satisfactory account of progress from the Head Librarian.

- Funding is generally keeping pace with inflation: the allotted budget is seen as satisfactory for this year
- The main floor computer lab is "wildly successful"
- The new software is working and the students seem to like it
- The staff have enhanced their efforts to create an atmosphere that is inviting and comfortable to users
- Plans are to have 50 laptop hookups working soon; at the moment there is a shortage of plugs.

Long term trends and problems

- Space may be critical in three to five years. At present we are contemplating off-site storage at

~\$45,000/ year.

- We are adding and expanding our commitment to electronic journals
- Digitizing of the Special Collections will continue (at present about 10% are digitized).
- Funding of databases is a problem we have core DBs but are not comprehensive.
- There is a need for two or three new staff (in the last 5 years the library has lost two or three positions).
- The library staff is poorly paid by comparison to other similar situations in the Metroplex.
- There is a compelling to ensure that all library users are literate in the use of the technology needed to acquire information.

We recommend that the Senate keep abreast of the long term plans of the library for necessary expansion of space and growing needs for technology, supporting such changes whenever the Librarian perceives a need for such support.

Standing Charge Four

The Committee joined with the Student House of Representatives' Academic Excellence Committee in hosting a debate for faculty/ students and administration in the fall. About 120 people attended the debate, including both Chancellor and Provost. Shana Lawlor & Nowell Donovan hosted the debate which posed the question of the specific charge:

What habits of mind, sensitivities, intellectual dispositions and knowledge should an undergraduate have developed by the the end of his/her experience at TCU? What general knowledge should he/she have acquired? This study should create a multi-faceted view of this question, and strive to reveal the diversity and complexity of views, rather than narrowing it to a few conclusions or objectives.

The debate was well received and the students would like more! Appendix A offers two sets of views about the question. First is Delia Pitts' response to the debate and secondly Linda Hughes has collated the views of several of her students.

The Specific Charge

This a complex and comprehensive charge - so general in its tenor that we needed to structure our approach with care. Our investigations went in two directions: one attempted to answer the multi-faceted nature of the charge, the other looked at the performance of the academy at TCU.

Thus our discussions touched upon:

- a. the need to develop a passion for the intellect in our students,
- b. the need for our recognition of the diversity of that passion,
- c. the need to develop and develop an inquisitive nature,
- d. the need to develop a capacity to devise solutions to problems that are characterized by;
 - i. their ethical integrity, and
 - ii. their insight and quality,
- e. the need to develop an appreciation for the acquisition of knowledge (this in turn depends upon the delivery of a first class knowledge base by the faculty).
- f. the need to develop an appreciation for the value of creative activity, (this in turn depends upon the delivery of a first class example by the faculty),
- g. the need to be able to balance eclectic and specialized viewpoints and
- h. the need to appreciate the world view that is the shared vision of the academy (in its broadest sense.)

In short we saw our task as ensuring the development of creative iconoclasts.

3

Some problems that we saw as moving counter to these needs are;

- a. the "Lost Years" i.e., the first two years of college, when many students appear to lack focus, and
- b. a conflict between the social and academic calendars of university life.

Some useful studies to measure our success might include;

- a. ascertaining the intellectual character of incoming students,
- b. discovering the views of selected accomplished undergraduates of recent vintage (Appendix B),
- c. determining the impact of the learning environment created by individual departments on student development,
- d. incorporating an element of research into the undergraduate experience [this might involve specific additions to the budget],
- e. evaluating the impact of the freshman seminar and
- f. considering the potential value of a required senior seminar, independent of the major.

We felt the need to develop a mechanism to present the great themes and ideas to all of our students. In the particular, it seems inconceivable that they can graduate without exposure to such fundamentals as the origins of the Periodic Table of the Elements or Beethoven's *Missa Solemnis*. In the abstract, if they cannot appreciate, for example, the roles of Order, Purpose and Change, if they cannot debate the possibility of Consilience, then we've failed.

Clearly the core is the mechanism that is meant to deliver the ideas. How well does it do so? We recommend a revision of the core that starts at ground zero and pays homage to the great themes of our civilization.

We touched on some issues of importance in an earlier presentation to the Senate:

- To what extent are the "transcendental ideas" part of an educated persons repertoire?
- From the point of view of a university education, what is the desired balance between breadth and depth?
- Is an educated person active or passive?
- In other words what is the balance between a knowledge base, the ability to enquire critically and the capacity to solve problems.

One critical intellectual skill that we highlighted is the ability to see linkages between apparently discrete lines of thought. Another is an appreciation of the power of liberating thoughts. A third strand of thought is that we should strive to produce students who can identify and have the courage to face the really big question, such as First Causes, Nature versus Nurture . and consilience.

We finally concluded that life is just one great big differential equation.

APPENDIX A

Responses to the questions posed during the Academic Excellence/Student House of Representatives debate

Nowell:

As requested, here are my summary notes on the subject symposium:

Various speakers asserted that the "educated person" needs to be multi-lingual, "everyone needs to speak more than one language;" Several emphasized that international study can be life-changing, revising intellectual and personal perspectives. TCU should give more rhetorical emphasis and significantly increased financial support to international study through increased scholarships and transferability of financial aid to all study abroad programs. Lack of funds was cited as the most significant deterrent to study abroad.

Diversity of the campus community contributes to the common education of everyone. But how to tackle this issue, in curricular changes, co-curricular activities, student/faculty recruitment efforts?

Consideration of the core requirements generated divided opinion, with some arguing for fewer distribution requirements and more options to take what one "liked or found relevant." Other students argued for more core requirements saying that they learned more from courses they would never have chosen without the prodding of the requirement.

One speaker offered the following as three key elements of the educated person: learning various means of expression, perception, and experience. The educated person, in this view, learns how to learn through these three optics.

Should the educated person be able to master or at least comprehend transcendental issues, information, and values in the humanities, sciences, social sciences, and the arts? What of competencies that enable a person to self-educate beyond the limits of the received canon of western civilization? These competencies would include critical thinking, comparative thinking, thinking by analogy, writing and oral skills, creativity, and ethics.

Several speakers felt more attention should be given in the core curriculum to the role of technology in modern society, learning how to use computers and how to evaluate their impact on our lives.

I perceived a yawning gap between the desires of students and the interests of professors as follows:

Students = relevance, comfort, work-oriented, core of professional knowledge, self-discovery, self-expression

Professors = cross-disciplinary, conceptual, core of basic knowledge, liberal arts, learning for sake of learning

Nowell, I hope this helps in the on-going discussion of these important ideas.

Delia Pitts

WHAT CONSTITUTES AN EDUCATED PERSON?

1. Travis Browning

An educated person is one who has read, studied, debated, and discussed any field at any topic of any scope of human knowledge. The most recognized knowledge is that of scholastic circles, but knowledge of any kind is the basis of an educated person. However, possessing an education in more than one (or better yet, more than a few) fields of human knowledge is what defines a scholar.

2. Dennis Eligado

5

- An educated person is one who attempts to continue to learn. Also is willing to listen to others opinions with an open mind. One who thinks then actually chooses.
3. Stefanie Hallman
Someone who understands a variety of things and can discuss those various topics. Having the ability to communicate ideas with success.
 4. Kelly Stanbary
A well rounded individual who has a background in a variety of areas.
 5. Win Noble
Someone who has learned in a particular area and an ample background in other things.
 6. Kelly Woodard
Someone who avidly seeks and can wisely use various areas of knowledge is an educated person.
 7. Jonathan Gratch
Someone who can speak intelligently about things and who has experiences with what they are talking about.
 8. Charles Youngblood
Well read, and capable of expressing their own opinion.
 9. Pam Woodhead
One who knows enough about various topics to be able to talk about them and has a definite area of expertise.
 10. Wade Atwood
Not just intelligence or knowledge about a subject but passion and experience.
 11. Justin Hensley
Someone who has the information to function in daily life but also seeks to improve themselves and increase their realm of knowledge and influence.
 12. Erin Atwood
A person who knows a variety of information regardless of the amount of time they spent in school.
 13. Caroline Strange
Someone who is well-read, has common sense, logical thinking, and aware.
 14. Jennifer Mazza
Being able to find and provide resources. To be aware of surroundings and to be able to communicate.
 15. Karina Walters
Not how much school you've had. Take the time to find things out for yourself, don't block yourself off from ideas that are without finding out more about them. Someone who questions.
 16. Claire Morris
Open-minded person who doesn't eliminate others reasonable arguments, even if they don't argue. Read a wide variety of material, willing to take intellectual risks and experience all kinds of things.
 17. Kyle Williams
Someone you can gain knowledge about a certain subject.
 18. Michael Bryan Bush
Knowledgeable in a wide range of subjects, converse with others about the subjects, be willing to make further judgment.
 19. Lara Maerz

- You've had a formal education.
20. Michael Newberry
You can be intelligent, but not educated. Educated people have had schooling.
21. Chris Delgrego
Someone who is a critical thinker who can analyze and come to their own conclusion.
22. Marissa McCarthy
Not about GPA, but one who loves to learn and uses insights with in their life.
23. Diana Pope
Somebody who has a well-rounded knowledge in a variety of subjects and knows how to apply it in the "real world."
24. Heath Driver
A person with experience: book, formal, educational, practical or otherwise.
Someone who is able to think for themselves.
25. Hilary Hayes
Someone who is not only well read but also someone who has experienced what they know. To not only read and learn, but to touch, feel, and see.

7

APPENDIX B

A recent Alumni Survey conducted by Institutional Research

In a recent survey, 214 alumni rated 21 “abilities” in order of (i) their importance in college and (ii) their importance now.

The abilities and their ranking in the two questions were:	(i)	(ii)
Function Independently	[1]	[1]
Gain in-depth knowledge in Field	[2]	[11]
Understand own abilities	[3]	[9]
Acquire new skills/knowledge on own	[4]	[3]
Write effectively	[5]	[8]
Identify problems/select solutions	[6]	[4]
Think analytically/logically	[7]	[5]
Function effectively as a team member	[8]	[5]
Communicate orally	[9]	[2]
Broaden perceptions of the world	[10]	[15]
Formulate creative ideas	[11]	[7]
Lead or supervise a group	[11]	[14]
Understand the inter-relationships among areas of study	[13]	[17]
Identify moral and ethical issues	[14]	[13]
Read Efficiently	[15]	[10]
Use quantitative tools (maths, statistics, computers)	[15]	[16]
Develop an understanding of art, music, drama & literature	[17]	[20]
Place current events in perspective	[18]	[18]
Relate to people from different backgrounds	[18]	[11]
Understand the nature of science and technology	[20]	[19]
Read or speak a foreign language	[21]	[21]

Synopsis of Comments

The alumni survey indicates that our students place little value on several of the mantras of higher education - leadership, breadth of perception, quantitative technology, the sciences, the arts appear to be of less value “out there” than we suppose. Others, eg., the ability to communicate orally, to formulate creative ideas, to read efficiently, and to relate to people from different backgrounds are less valued at TCU.

ATTACHMENT F

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate May 6, 1999

I. Progress report

Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.
Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.
- Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required.
Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.
- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR (Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.
Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.
- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.
Referred by the Provost to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee, which has now been formed.
- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.
Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.
- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.
Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
1 April 1999

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Gregg Franzwa, David Grant, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Bill Vanderhoof, and Robert Vigeland.

Members absent: Clayton Brown, George Brown, Greg Clemons, Sally Fortenberry, Ellen Page Garrison, Linda Hughes, Pamela Marcum, Don Nichols, Pat Paulus, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Bernadette Szajna, Susan White, Chuck Williams, and Mike Sacken.

Call to order. Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes. There were no corrections to the minutes of the 4 March 1999 Senate meeting. They stand approved as mailed.

Announcements. Chair Reynolds introduced Sara Donaldson, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Student Government Association, who brought the report "A Resolution to Resurrect the Frog Finder" for the senators to read and discuss on the FACSSEN Listserv. Chair Reynolds also distributed the Executive Committee Report (See Attachment A) and asked the senators to look it over. Most of the still pending matters are in the hands of faculty, not administrators.

Chair Reynolds announced the procedure to be followed next year for the nomination of honorary degrees. "In the fall, the Senate will invite nominations from a broad base of constituents, internal and external. In the late fall, the Senate will review and by early winter will make recommendation to the chancellor and the Committee on Trusteeship. In March there will be Board action followed by invitation to those recipients for the 2000-2001 commencement." This procedure is from the chancellor. The only actual change is that the Senate will begin the process in the fall and will solicit input from a broad constituency.

Chair Reynolds commended the chancellor and provost for 21 new faculty positions recently authorized by the Board of Trustees.

Old Business.

Faculty Governance Committee Recommendation 1 (distributed at the March meeting in the Faculty Governance Committee Report). The following motion was made by the Faculty Governance Committee:

The "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" be amended with the following additional paragraph in Article II, Section 1B:

3. Except in emergencies, all significant decisions and plans of the administration that affect academic affairs should be submitted to the Faculty Senate for an expression of views prior to implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The views expressed by the Faculty Senate should be transmitted, along with the administration's proposals, to the Board of Trustees when these plans and decisions are considered by the Board of Trustees.

Senator Bobich, a committee member, spoke for the motion. They found this idea at Duke University and thought it to be a way of improving communication. Secretary Grant raised a point of order: since this is an amendment to the Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate, it must be voted on by the entire faculty assembly. Chair Reynolds acknowledged the further procedure but noted that the resolution must first pass the Senate before coming before the Faculty Assembly. Chancellor Ferrari commented that he appreciated the intent and direction of the resolution but thought the language was constraining and would be difficult to implement. There is much open to interpretation as to what decisions that "affect academic affairs" ought to come first to the Senate. Virtually everything that the Board recently implemented at its spring meeting could be said to affect academic affairs. Provost Koehler asked if this could be interpreted to mean that, say, the academic budget should be submitted to the Senate before going to the trustees, and if so, this usurps the authority of the trustees. This could also be read to mean that all promotion and tenure decisions should be submitted to the Senate. Senator Bobich commented that this resolution preserves the exact wording used at Duke and the committee thought that if it were good enough for them and we were trying to move in Duke's direction, it would be good enough for us. The details could be worked out. Senator Rinewalt noted that we are happy with the way things are going right now in terms of the administration's openness; we just want to codify it for the future. Senator Reinecke suggested that the proposal be modified to exclude personnel decisions. Provost Koehler raised the question of how this proposal plays against certain structures already in place. For example, doesn't this preempt the process for academic program approval already in place that utilizes the Undergraduate Council? Chancellor Ferrari suggested that the word *all* is troublesome. He thinks it would be very difficult to live up to such as restrictive policy. Other senators raised questions about what teeth such a policy would have and other senators questioned whether such a policy is needed. Another senator reminded her colleagues that the Senate is not the only place that faculty have input.

Given the many concerns raised, Senator Moore moved to postpone the motion until a future meeting, which will give the Faculty Governance Committee time to work out some of the details raised today by the senators and administrators. The motion carried.

Faculty Governance Recommendation 2: A second recommendation was placed on the floor by the Faculty Governance Committee:

Article II, Section 2A of the "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" be amended by replacing italicized text with the text shown in brackets:

1. Only full-time faculty members with the academic rank of *Assistant Professor*

[Instructor] or higher who are eligible to vote and whose duties include more than half-time teaching and/or research shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Rinewalt reported for the committee that they noticed that Instructors are eligible for membership in the Faculty Assembly but not for the Faculty Senate. This motion was to redress that inconsistency. Senator Franzwa suggested that this is a step that further builds the non-tenured track Instructor into the structure of the university. Senator Flahive noted that some departments have had instructors who are tenure track. Senator Lahutsky raised a concern about an unintended consequence that this would further increase the proportion of junior faculty to senior faculty on university committees. The motion was approved and will be sent to the Faculty Assembly for action.

Report from Academic Excellence Committee. Senator Donovan led the discussion of two items on which Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express opinion: (1) faculty involvement in distance learning; and (2) whether the university should require a syllabus in every course.

Should faculty be required to prepare and distribute a syllabus? The consensus of the Senators was that courses certainly ought to have syllabi. A majority of those expressing an opinion however did not think it ought to be required at the University level but should be handled at the departmental and college levels.

The other question concerned the involvement of faculty in long-distance learning. Senator Donovan thought this issue involves a conflict of interest and conflict of ethics. The question was raised as to who owns course content. Provost Koehler replied that there is a committee working on this now. Another question arose as to teaching at other universities during the summer, especially as this might involve international calendars in which there might be conflicts between the summer schedule at the other institution and the TCU semester. Senator Franzwa: I can't imagine a person abandoning a class to leave early to teach at another institution. I should think this should only be permissible in exceptional circumstances. Senator Pfaffenberger: What about the a faculty who teaches at another institution during the summer the same course with the same notes? Senator Franzwa: The rubric ought to be that the problem arises when you start cutting time from your own students. No action was taken on either issue.

Report of the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee. Senator Keen-Payne distributed the report (See Attachment B). They are going to use a focus group method to evaluate the processes of tenure, promotion, merit review, and grievance, starting with the brand new first year faculty. The deans met in a focus group yesterday, facilitated by Bob Greer.

Senator Moore distributed the report from the Student Relations Committee (See Attachment C) and asked the group to look over the report for discussion at the next meeting.

There being no further business, Chair Reynolds adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant, Secretary

ATTACHMENT A
Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
April 1, 1999

I. Progress report

A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" revision.

Will be in 99-00 handbook.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.

- Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR - Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee, which has now been formed.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

ATTACHMENT B
Initial Report to the Senate
Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance
1 April 1999

Committee members: Chuck Becker, Greg Clemmons, Gregg Franzwa, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Chairperson, Pam Marcum, Roger Pfaffenberger, Liaison

Charge: Our charge for the year is to evaluate the processes of tenure, promotion, merit review, and grievance and make necessary recommendations based on the findings of the evaluation.

Method: We are using a focus group method, assess several groups of faculty, including the following groups: first year, not tenured, recently tenured, associates, professors, chairpersons, and deans. We have also interviewed the Provost. The committee identified leaders and participants.

The questions used to guide the groups are noted below. The groups will meet in March and April. Responses will be summarized into a written report, including recommendations, and will be forwarded to the Senate by the May 1999 meeting.

Examples of questions:

1. Describe your ideal of a tenure and promotion system. How does our system vary from the ideal? What changes would you recommend?
2. What suggestions do you have to improve communication at all levels of review?
3. Evaluate the effect in your department of the following specific policies: (1) requiring prior service to count against the tenure clock and (2) withholding immediate tenure for endowed chair-holders, experienced associate professors, chairpersons.
4. Are there any procedural rules or implementation methods that have the potential to inhibit our efforts to promote diversity?
5. The chairperson is a key player in all these processes. Discuss the preparation and support of the chairperson for this job.
6. We promote departmental flexibility in criteria. What is the effect of this inconsistency across the University?

**ATTACHMENT C
FACULTY SENATE
STUDENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE
1998-99 Year End Report**

Standing Charges:

1. Represent the Faculty Senate on matters involving student concerns
2. Meet with the officers of the Student House of Representatives at least annually to track issues of concern to the student community of the University

Specific Charge:

Study the students who have trouble finding a place at TCU. Find out who they are and how we are addressing their needs. Gather information which will allow you to recommend how we may better meet the needs of these students.

Committee activities:

The committee met with Mr. Ben Alexander, President of the Student Government Association; Dr. John Schuster, Counseling Center; Ms. Angie Taylor, Director, Alcohol and Drug Education; Dr. Priscilla Tate, Advisor to Triangle; Dr. Andy Fort, Advisor to Student Allies; Mr. Al Mladenka, International Student Services; Yumi Keitges, President of International Students Association; Darron Turner, Director of Minority Affairs; Dr. Kay Higgins, Director of Orientation and the Women's Resource Center; Rev. John Butler, Minister to the University; and students considering leaving the university.

The meetings were based on the following agenda:

"We want to look the many life domains of students to determine what helps students fit and what hinders that process. Can you differentiate among:
Emotional, Social, Career/intellectual, Physical
Do you find that any of the following issues may affect retention?
Scheduling/flexibility, Class size, Faculty contact, or
Expectations regarding TCU (are we marketing appropriately)
Can you suggest what works and what doesn't in your experience?"

The Faculty Senate also discussed the themes arising from discussion with these representatives and that discussion is reflected in Senate minutes.

The following report is the result of all these discussions.

Issues:

The Greek system is a support system to those who join. For others it is exclusionary, snobbish, and negative. There is concern that the members of the Greek system have resources not available to other organizations. Other concerns include the use of alcohol within the system which affects other problems such as depression and mental health.

The lack of diversity was mentioned often. There appears to be a lack of **acceptance** of difference, ignorance, and little attention to learning about difference. Diversity is not

characterized by just ethnic differences but social class, intellectual, geographic, ability, and age differences as well as sexual identity/orientation, religion, and political differences.

The lack of social and intellectual stimulation on the campus was cited often. The campus was described as boring, not intellectually challenging, lacking in critical thinking, lacking in social activities, and too conservative.

Financial issues were a concern. The perception is that it is difficult to get scholarships, to keep scholarships after entering TCU, and to find enough financial aid to afford the education.

Affiliation is a problem for many students. Beyond the Greek system, there are many sub-groups but often they appear on the fringes rather than as supported groups. Some examples include returning students, international students, smokers, minorities, gays and lesbians, and punk rockers, non-Christians and athletes. It appears that the international students in Brachman Hall are ghettoized and kept separate. There seems to be a breaking down of support for minority groups such as Legacy and the Minority Council. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues are veiled, under the surface but still issues. There is a lot of intolerance among some of the religious groups on campus.

Faculty involvement is a positive characteristic. There is a sense that the faculty and staff are open and friendly and provide support. Teaching is good and co-curricular staff reach out to students. More faculty contact would enrich the experience. Students are very supportive of faculty involvement and efforts are being made to include faculty more often.

Advising was mentioned as possibly problematic specifically for premajors. There is high satisfaction with advising in the major. Data do not indicate major problems but there are anecdotal complaints about mistakes on schedules and lack of awareness of the variety of majors and their requirements.

Suggestions:

- ◆ Better facilities to encourage interaction both socially and intellectually (e.g. theater, bowling alley, pool hall, video game area, dance hall) Students need facilities for interaction. The Rickel Building promotes interaction so a system that combines the functions of Rickel and the Student Center seems like a good one.
- ◆ Resources to support education (e.g. child care center, housing for married students and students with children, financial aid beyond academic scholarships). It appears that there are not many scholarships for continuing students and the perception is that the resources are concentrated on recruitment and not retention.
- ◆ Resources for non-Greek organizations
- ◆ More opportunity for involvement for athletes
- ◆ More opportunities for faculty involvement in academic and social life of students It should be considered a part of teaching and service to the university must be

- valued. Ideas included retreats with faculty and students around specific topics and more interdisciplinary courses.
- ◆ Mentors for premajors, academically at risk, freshmen, minority students The Trio office is working on this and SGA may present a bill to support this.
 - ◆ More information dissemination regarding campus resources, the community, and techniques for social and academic success
 - Orientation course
 - More information at Orientation about options for a variety of students
 - Web page for information
 - ◆ More opportunity for service learning and linkage with the community

Actions requested:

- ◆ Several issues arising from diversity need to be addressed by the Chancellor's Council on Diversity to avoid overlap of efforts. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that council and receive information from that group.
- ◆ A committee on service learning is established and developing a report. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that committee and receive information from that group.
- ◆ The Committee on the First Year Experience has met all year and is developing recommendations many of which mirror this committee's report. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that committee and receive information from that group.
- ◆ The issue of financial aid beyond academic scholarships needs further study. It appears that there are not many scholarships for continuing students and the perception is that the resources are concentrated on recruitment and not retention. The Student Relations Committee should attempt to receive information on this issue next year.
- ◆ The SGA wants to join the discussion and help solve the problem. More student discussion in groups and forums should be held early next year in conjunction with the Student Relations Committee.
- ◆ A listing of organizations with contact persons and phone numbers should be placed in Frog Calls.
- ◆ The Student Relations Committee should focus on retention strategies next year and assess what is being done on campus.

Recommendations:

- ◆ Faculty and students should be involved in plans for developing and/or renovating facilities for students' recreation and interaction.
- ◆ Faculty involvement in academic and social life of students should be considered a part of teaching and service to the university. It must be valued and strategies for recognition and reward must be developed so that annual reports include it and merit increases reflect such contributions.

Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
1 April 1999

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joseph Bobich, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Lynn Flahive, Gregg Franzwa, David Grant, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Bill Vanderhoof, and Robert Vigeland.

Members absent: Clayton Brown, George Brown, Greg Clemons, Sally Fortenberry, Ellen Page Garrison, Linda Hughes, Pamela Marcum, Don Nichols, Pat Paulus, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Bernadette Szajna, Susan White, Chuck Williams, and Mike Sacken.

Call to order. Chair Sherrie Reynolds called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes. There were no corrections to the minutes of the 4 March 1999 Senate meeting. They stand approved as mailed.

Announcements. Chair Reynolds introduced Sara Donaldson, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Student Government Association, who brought the report "A Resolution to Resurrect the Frog Finder" for the senators to read and discuss on the FACSSEN Listserv. Chair Reynolds also distributed the Executive Committee Report (See Attachment A) and asked the senators to look it over. Most of the still pending matters are in the hands of faculty, not administrators.

Chair Reynolds announced the procedure to be followed next year for the nomination of honorary degrees. "In the fall, the Senate will invite nominations from a broad base of constituents, internal and external. In the late fall, the Senate will review and by early winter will make recommendation to the chancellor and the Committee on Trusteeship. In March there will be Board action followed by invitation to those recipients for the 2000-2001 commencement." This procedure is from the chancellor. The only actual change is that the Senate will begin the process in the fall and will solicit input from a broad constituency.

Chair Reynolds commended the chancellor and provost for 21 new faculty positions recently authorized by the Board of Trustees.

Old Business.

Faculty Governance Committee Recommendation 1 (distributed at the March meeting in the Faculty Governance Committee Report). The following motion was made by the Faculty Governance Committee:

The "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" be amended with the following additional paragraph in Article II, Section 1B:

3. Except in emergencies, all significant decisions and plans of the administration that affect academic affairs should be submitted to the Faculty Senate for an expression of views prior to implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The views expressed by the Faculty Senate should be transmitted, along with the administration's proposals, to the Board of Trustees when these plans and decisions are considered by the Board of Trustees.

Senator Bobich, a committee member, spoke for the motion. They found this idea at Duke University and thought it to be a way of improving communication. Secretary Grant raised a point of order: since this is an amendment to the Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate, it must be voted on by the entire faculty assembly. Chair Reynolds acknowledged the further procedure but noted that the resolution must first pass the Senate before coming before the Faculty Assembly. Chancellor Ferrari commented that he appreciated the intent and direction of the resolution but thought the language was constraining and would be difficult to implement. There is much open to interpretation as to what decisions that "affect academic affairs" ought to come first to the Senate. Virtually everything that the Board recently implemented at its spring meeting could be said to affect academic affairs. Provost Koehler asked if this could be interpreted to mean that, say, the academic budget should be submitted to the Senate before going to the trustees, and if so, this usurps the authority of the trustees. This could also be read to mean that all promotion and tenure decisions should be submitted to the Senate. Senator Bobich commented that this resolution preserves the exact wording used at Duke and the committee thought that if it were good enough for them and we were trying to move in Duke's direction, it would be good enough for us. The details could be worked out. Senator Rinewalt noted that we are happy with the way things are going right now in terms of the administration's openness; we just want to codify it for the future. Senator Reinecke suggested that the proposal be modified to exclude personnel decisions. Provost Koehler raised the question of how this proposal plays against certain structures already in place. For example, doesn't this preempt the process for academic program approval already in place that utilizes the Undergraduate Council? Chancellor Ferrari suggested that the word *all* is troublesome. He thinks it would be very difficult to live up to such as restrictive policy. Other senators raised questions about what teeth such a policy would have and other senators questioned whether such a policy is needed. Another senator reminded her colleagues that the Senate is not the only place that faculty have input.

Given the many concerns raised, Senator Moore moved to postpone the motion until a future meeting, which will give the Faculty Governance Committee time to work out some of the details raised today by the senators and administrators. The motion carried.

Faculty Governance Recommendation 2: A second recommendation was placed on the floor by the Faculty Governance Committee:

Article II, Section 2A of the "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" be amended by replacing italicized text with the text shown in brackets:

1. Only full-time faculty members with the academic rank of *Assistant Professor*

[Instructor] or higher who are eligible to vote and whose duties include more than half-time teaching and/or research shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Rinewalt reported for the committee that they noticed that Instructors are eligible for membership in the Faculty Assembly but not for the Faculty Senate. This motion was to redress that inconsistency. Senator Franzwa suggested that this is a step that further builds the non-tenured track Instructor into the structure of the university. Senator Flahive noted that some departments have had instructors who are tenure track. Senator Lahutsky raised a concern about an unintended consequence that this would further increase the proportion of junior faculty to senior faculty on university committees. The motion was approved and will be sent to the Faculty Assembly for action.

Report from Academic Excellence Committee. Senator Donovan led the discussion of two items on which Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express opinion: (1) faculty involvement in distance learning; and (2) whether the university should require a syllabus in every course.

Should faculty be required to prepare and distribute a syllabus? The consensus of the Senators was that courses certainly ought to have syllabi. A majority of those expressing an opinion however did not think it ought to be required at the University level but should be handled at the departmental and college levels.

The other question concerned the involvement of faculty in long-distance learning. Senator Donovan thought this issue involves a conflict of interest and conflict of ethics. The question was raised as to who owns course content. Provost Koehler replied that there is a committee working on this now. Another question arose as to teaching at other universities during the summer, especially as this might involve international calendars in which there might be conflicts between the summer schedule at the other institution and the TCU semester. Senator Franzwa: I can't imagine a person abandoning a class to leave early to teach at another institution. I should think this should only be permissible in exceptional circumstances. Senator Pfaffenberger: What about the a faculty who teaches at another institution during the summer the same course with the same notes? Senator Franzwa: The rubric ought to be that the problem arises when you start cutting time from your own students. No action was taken on either issue.

Report of the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee. Senator Keen-Payne distributed the report (See Attachment B). They are going to use a focus group method to evaluate the processes of tenure, promotion, merit review, and grievance, starting with the brand new first year faculty. The deans met in a focus group yesterday, facilitated by Bob Greer.

Senator Moore distributed the report from the Student Relations Committee (See Attachment C) and asked the group to look over the report for discussion at the next meeting.

There being no further business, Chair Reynolds adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant, Secretary

ATTACHMENT A
Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
April 1, 1999

I. Progress report

A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" revision.

Will be in 99-00 handbook.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.

- Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR - Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/Telecommunications committee, which has now been formed.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

ATTACHMENT B
Initial Report to the Senate
Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance
1 April 1999

Committee members: Chuck Becker, Greg Clemmons, Gregg Franzwa, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Chairperson, Pam Marcum, Roger Pfaffenberger, Liaison

Charge: Our charge for the year is to evaluate the processes of tenure, promotion, merit review, and grievance and make necessary recommendations based on the findings of the evaluation.

Method: We are using a focus group method, assess several groups of faculty, including the following groups: first year, not tenured, recently tenured, associates, professors, chairpersons, and deans. We have also interviewed the Provost. The committee identified leaders and participants.

The questions used to guide the groups are noted below. The groups will meet in March and April. Responses will be summarized into a written report, including recommendations, and will be forwarded to the Senate by the May 1999 meeting.

Examples of questions:

1. Describe your ideal of a tenure and promotion system. How does our system vary from the ideal? What changes would you recommend?
2. What suggestions do you have to improve communication at all levels of review?
3. Evaluate the effect in your department of the following specific policies: (1) requiring prior service to count against the tenure clock and (2) withholding immediate tenure for endowed chair-holders, experienced associate professors, chairpersons.
4. Are there any procedural rules or implementation methods that have the potential to inhibit our efforts to promote diversity?
5. The chairperson is a key player in all these processes. Discuss the preparation and support of the chairperson for this job.
6. We promote departmental flexibility in criteria. What is the effect of this inconsistency across the University?

**ATTACHMENT C
FACULTY SENATE
STUDENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE
1998-99 Year End Report**

Standing Charges:

1. Represent the Faculty Senate on matters involving student concerns
2. Meet with the officers of the Student House of Representatives at least annually to track issues of concern to the student community of the University

Specific Charge:

Study the students who have trouble finding a place at TCU. Find out who they are and how we are addressing their needs. Gather information which will allow you to recommend how we may better meet the needs of these students.

Committee activities:

The committee met with Mr. Ben Alexander, President of the Student Government Association; Dr. John Schuster, Counseling Center; Ms. Angie Taylor, Director, Alcohol and Drug Education; Dr. Priscilla Tate, Advisor to Triangle; Dr. Andy Fort, Advisor to Student Allies; Mr. Al Mladenka, International Student Services; Yumi Keitges, President of International Students Association; Darron Turner, Director of Minority Affairs; Dr. Kay Higgins, Director of Orientation and the Women's Resource Center; Rev. John Butler, Minister to the University; and students considering leaving the university.

The meetings were based on the following agenda:

"We want to look the many life domains of students to determine what helps students fit and what hinders that process. Can you differentiate among:
Emotional, Social, Career/intellectual, Physical
Do you find that any of the following issues may affect retention?
Scheduling/flexibility, Class size, Faculty contact, or
Expectations regarding TCU (are we marketing appropriately)
Can you suggest what works and what doesn't in your experience?"

The Faculty Senate also discussed the themes arising from discussion with these representatives and that discussion is reflected in Senate minutes.

The following report is the result of all these discussions.

Issues:

The Greek system is a support system to those who join. For others it is exclusionary, snobbish, and negative. There is concern that the members of the Greek system have resources not available to other organizations. Other concerns include the use of alcohol within the system which affects other problems such as depression and mental health.

The lack of diversity was mentioned often. There appears to be a lack of **acceptance** of difference, ignorance, and little attention to learning about difference. Diversity is not

characterized by just ethnic differences but social class, intellectual, geographic, ability, and age differences as well as sexual identity/orientation, religion, and political differences.

The lack of social and intellectual stimulation on the campus was cited often. The campus was described as boring, not intellectually challenging, lacking in critical thinking, lacking in social activities, and too conservative.

Financial issues were a concern. The perception is that it is difficult to get scholarships, to keep scholarships after entering TCU, and to find enough financial aid to afford the education.

Affiliation is a problem for many students. Beyond the Greek system, there are many sub-groups but often they appear on the fringes rather than as supported groups. Some examples include returning students, international students, smokers, minorities, gays and lesbians, and punk rockers, non-Christians and athletes. It appears that the international students in Brachman Hall are ghettoized and kept separate. There seems to be a breaking down of support for minority groups such as Legacy and the Minority Council. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues are veiled, under the surface but still issues. There is a lot of intolerance among some of the religious groups on campus.

Faculty involvement is a positive characteristic. There is a sense that the faculty and staff are open and friendly and provide support. Teaching is good and co-curricular staff reach out to students. More faculty contact would enrich the experience. Students are very supportive of faculty involvement and efforts are being made to include faculty more often.

Advising was mentioned as possibly problematic specifically for premajors. There is high satisfaction with advising in the major. Data do not indicate major problems but there are anecdotal complaints about mistakes on schedules and lack of awareness of the variety of majors and their requirements.

Suggestions:

- ◆ Better facilities to encourage interaction both socially and intellectually (e.g. theater, bowling alley, pool hall, video game area, dance hall) Students need facilities for interaction. The Rickel Building promotes interaction so a system that combines the functions of Rickel and the Student Center seems like a good one.
- ◆ Resources to support education (e.g. child care center, housing for married students and students with children, financial aid beyond academic scholarships). It appears that there are not many scholarships for continuing students and the perception is that the resources are concentrated on recruitment and not retention.
- ◆ Resources for non-Greek organizations
- ◆ More opportunity for involvement for athletes
- ◆ More opportunities for faculty involvement in academic and social life of students It should be considered a part of teaching and service to the university must be

- valued. Ideas included retreats with faculty and students around specific topics and more interdisciplinary courses.
- ◆ Mentors for premajors, academically at risk, freshmen, minority students The Trio office is working on this and SGA may present a bill to support this.
 - ◆ More information dissemination regarding campus resources, the community, and techniques for social and academic success
 - Orientation course
 - More information at Orientation about options for a variety of students
 - Web page for information
 - ◆ More opportunity for service learning and linkage with the community

Actions requested:

- ◆ Several issues arising from diversity need to be addressed by the Chancellor's Council on Diversity to avoid overlap of efforts. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that council and receive information from that group.
- ◆ A committee on service learning is established and developing a report. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that committee and receive information from that group.
- ◆ The Committee on the First Year Experience has met all year and is developing recommendations many of which mirror this committee's report. The Student Relations Committee should present their report to that committee and receive information from that group.
- ◆ The issue of financial aid beyond academic scholarships needs further study. It appears that there are not many scholarships for continuing students and the perception is that the resources are concentrated on recruitment and not retention. The Student Relations Committee should attempt to receive information on this issue next year.
- ◆ The SGA wants to join the discussion and help solve the problem. More student discussion in groups and forums should be held early next year in conjunction with the Student Relations Committee.
- ◆ A listing of organizations with contact persons and phone numbers should be placed in Frog Calls.
- ◆ The Student Relations Committee should focus on retention strategies next year and assess what is being done on campus.

Recommendations:

- ◆ Faculty and students should be involved in plans for developing and/or renovating facilities for students' recreation and interaction.
- ◆ Faculty involvement in academic and social life of students should be considered a part of teaching and service to the university. It must be valued and strategies for recognition and reward must be developed so that annual reports include it and merit increases reflect such contributions.

Minutes 12/1/99

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
4 March 1999**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Joseph Bobich, George Brown, Clayton Brown, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Nowell Donovan, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Bill Ryan, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Bill Vanderhoof, and Robert Vigeland.

Members absent: Peggy Bennett, Greg Clemons, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Pamela Marcum, Pat Paulus, Dick Rinewalt, Bernadette Szajna, Susan White, and Chuck Williams.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Sherrie Reynolds at 3:33 p.m..

Approval of minutes. Senator Reinecke indicated that the report of the Committee on Committees should be amended to read that the Admissions Committee is to report at the next Senate meeting, not that they are to report to the next meeting of the Committee on Committees. The minutes were approved with this one correction.

Chair Reynold introduced guests: Ben Alexander, Pam Woodhead, *Skiff* reporter, and the members of Task Force on University Mission.

Report from the Assistant Secretary. Senator Flahive was unable to attend, so Chair Reynolds gave Flahive's report. There are still candidate vacancies that need to be filled before Senate elections. Brite has three of its positions open and no one has volunteered to run. Education has one opening, but no one is running. Nursing has one opening with one person running. Business has two openings, but only one person running. Senators need to encourage their colleagues to run for the Senate.

Report from Budget and Finance Committee, by Senator Vigeland. He noted that the committee changed its method of operation this year. They met in the fall with Chancellor Ferrari and expressed interest in having more faculty input in the budget process. They suggested that they ought to work directly with Provost Koehler to support the academic mission of university. The Chancellor agreed, so they met with Koehler to find out where they might have the most likely impact in the budget process. Senator Vigeland then distributed the budget recommendations that the committee made (see Attachment A). The Chancellor asked two things of the committee: 1. What sorts of assumptions about budget parameters should be made going into the process? The committee decided that since this is a transition year, the parameters should be those of the status quo. They, however, expect significant changes in next year's recommendations in light of the planning process. 2. What are our priorities? What should we spend our money on? These are reflected in the recommendations: addition of faculty, compensation levels for faculty and staff, and academic facilities. The committee also

recommends a study of our academic facilities, laboratories, and faculty offices. They expect that out of that study some rather glaring deficiencies will be identified. They also recommend additional resources for PeopleSoft training and more resources in Information Services. Senator Vigeland reports that the committee has had more input in the budget process than in the past and that faculty have made positive strides in getting faculty representation in this process.

Senator Bobich asked if it is true that Duke is backing out of PeopleSoft? Senator Vigeland had heard no such thing. Chancellor Ferrari then said he has heard rumors of some schools taking such action, but he wasn't aware if these rumors had to do with Duke. He indicated that we can't back out, because the university has committed to the transition to PeopleSoft.

Discussion of University Mission Statement. Chair Reynolds turned the meeting over to Chancellor Ferrari to discuss the draft of the University Mission Statement. Before proceeding to this topic, the Chancellor thanked the faculty for the plaque given to him at commencement.

The Chancellor passed out the current draft of the university mission statement (See Attachment B). He said, "We've had a group over the past few months working on a statement, a crucial conceptual piece that will provide a great deal of structure and will be the foundation of our planning. The task force has been meeting over the past few months. Chair Reynolds served on it, Larry Lauer, Delia Pitts, Rich Enos, Suzi Adams, Bob Seal. We had a few students on the committee, representatives of the general staff and Dean McCracken. We went through a number of versions to get where we are today. We think we're getting real, real close. You may not think so, but the committee thinks so! This is a difficult task. We wanted to prepare a concise and compelling statement of the principle purpose of TCU. We wanted to speak to our core reasons for being, we wanted it to be outcome oriented, and we wanted to be in touch with our heritage and founding. We wanted it to have some kind of passion, to be a statement of who we are, and what we stand for. This statement should speak to everyone throughout the university. This is the driving spirit that we want to capture in a mission statement. We want a statement that will be helpful in setting priorities for the institution, and it ought to say what differentiates us from other institutions. We want it to have staying power, to last for the foreseeable future. We want to be able to assess our performance and be able to answer, How we are doing? How do we know we doing. Accrediting agencies will want to see this. We wanted one sentence, maybe two. We wanted to capture the essence of TCU in a relatively short statement. This was very tricky. The work is not done, but we want it to be done soon. The committee thinks we've done as much as we can do, so we need to see what others think. We benefitted from advice from a number of individuals. The Administrative Council and the Parents' Council has looked at it."

The Chancellor then went through the statement, line by line. And then opened the floor for the comments of Senators and asked for their honest, candid reaction. Among the suggestions made by the Senators were the following:

- A number of senators have been discussing this statement on the FACSSEN Listserv and commented how little the task force's statement reflects this discussion. Senator Bobich offered an alternative that has been discussed on the discussion list: "Texas

- Christian University's mission is to educate people to learn and think, to empower them to contribute and serve, and equip them to guide and lead."
- There are too many adjectives and the Task Force's statement needs more active verbs. One senator said it is mushy. Another said it needed to be more concise. If it is to be more memorable, then it needs to get to the point: "The mission of Texas Christian University is to . . ."
 - On the heritage clause. Ferrari asked how many think the heritage clause is not needed? One senator said don't put the heritage between dashes but keep it. Another suggested that since we say "Texas Christian University" maybe we don't need the heritage clause. Another suggested that heritage means more than our TCU heritage. Heritage can also mean the wider cultural heritage. Another thought "Christian" in Texas Christian can be misleading to prospective students and others, and therefore we should go with "TCU." If the reference to "inclusive" in the statement is a reference to our co-educational roots, then why not say that in a preamble and leave it out of the mission statement. Still other senators thought the heritage ought to be in the statement itself.
 - This statement looks back, but a mission statement should look forward. Also what about Fine Arts? "Scholarship" doesn't describe well what they do.
 - Maybe the statement needs a preamble that could better cover the heritage issue.
 - One senator suggested that we ought to look at an honor system for the school.
 - On the notion of leaders. What do we mean by *global leaders*? Are we going to measure ourselves on whether we're really putting people in global leadership positions? The statement conveys that they are to be leaders at the global level. Maybe the notion of *citizen*, in the classical Greek sense, would be better than *leaders*.
 - Is ethical education really a simple matter. Are we trying to teach ethics as a subject matter across the curriculum? Is that implied by the statement? A committee member indicated that the reference to ethical leaders was trying to point to our wanting people to be leaders in the world community in the sense of having a concern to address the problems we all face. The basic concerns of compassion and social concern are part of our heritage.
 - Strike the word *complex*. Also, take out the word *responsible*.
 - This statement points to a product. What we do, however, is go through a process. We can't point to a product that we want all of our students to become. They will be a very diverse group of people. We want them to think as best they can, but how can we really point and say that they're all going to be leaders? Moreover, the concept of

leader doesn't have to be one who is in authority. One can be a leader without being in authority, for example, Mother Teresa. Maybe we could say "try to develop" ethical leaders. But can we really develop ethical leaders? And isn't the notion of ethical relative to cultures?

- The statement is far too self-congratulatory. "A vibrant community of scholars." Ferrari asked if it were accurate. A member of the task force said that we are far too self-effacing. We are a very unique university.
- Another alternative statement is suggested: "The mission of Texas Christian University is to encourage people to think." This is short and brief. It is also memorable. But, another suggests that there are a lot of people in the world who have thought a lot but done nothing.
- Chair Reynolds clarified that the FACSSEN listserv is for our internal discussion and that she doesn't automatically forward our discussions to the administration.

Report from the Faculty Governance Committee. Senator Page-Garrison made the report for Senator Rinewalt, who was unable to be at the meeting (see Attachment C). The recommendations in this report will be voted on at our next meeting.

Discussion of Faculty Senate Listserv. It was decided to keep the FACSSEN listserv set so that replies go to all members of the discussion list.

Announcements. Senator Sacken: A new ad-hoc committee focusing on intellectual property issues has been formed by Provost Koehler and will be seeking input from faculty. Senator Donovan mentions that the Academic Excellence Committee is also looking at these issues.

Announcements were also made concerning upcoming dance and orchestra concerts.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant
Secretary

ATTACHMENT A
REPORT OF THE BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Dear Mick:

On behalf of the Budget and Finance Committee, I am pleased to provide you with our input regarding budget assumptions and priorities for the 1999-2000 budget. We have met with Bill Koehler to discuss these issues and have solicited input from the members of the Faculty Senate.

Assumptions:

We recognize that a new mission statement for the university is currently being developed and a new integrated planning and budgeting process will be developed later this year. While these crucial initiatives are underway, it is not advisable to suggest any fundamental changes in the operation of the university. We fully expect that recommendations for fundamental changes in the university will result from these initiatives and that these changes will have major long-term budgetary implications. However, until the new planning process has had a chance to work, we recommend assumptions based on the status quo.

- We explicitly assume that the university desires to maintain the quality of its programs in the near-term. This implies no increase in the size of the student body without a commensurate increase in the size of the full-time, tenure-track faculty.

We assume there will be no fundamental changes in the pricing of a TCU education - no fundamental changes in tuition and fees or financial aid except those dictated by cost increases.

- We assume there will be no significant change in the student retention rates nor any change in the percentage spending limit on the university endowment.

Priorities:

1. Add full-time tenure-track faculty to (1) reduce the reliance on occasional faculty and (2) reduce class sizes that have resulted from the large freshman class sizes the past two years. While it is unlikely that we will be able to achieve this in a single year, we recommend a return to TCU's previously stated goal of having no more than 15 percent of the student credit hours generated by occasional faculty. Three to five years is probably a reasonable time frame to achieve this goal.
2. Set compensation levels for current faculty and staff at competitive levels to ensure that we can retain and attract good people to work at TCU and ensure gender equity.
3. Commission a comprehensive study of our academic facilities - classrooms, laboratories, faculty offices, and meeting spaces - to assess (1) their condition and need for maintenance and repairs, (2) whether they offer adequate capacity for our current and near-term needs, and (3) whether they are adequately configured and equipped to meet our academic mission. We hope that this effort will lead to the development of an integrated plan for academic facilities and an on-going process for monitoring facilities and setting priorities on expenditures for academic plant and equipment with broad representation across departments
4. Provide training on the use of the Peoplesoft® administrative software system. This training should provide (1) each budgetary unit with at least one individual who is well versed in the operation of the financial system and (2) each faculty advisor with the capability to use the student system to provide improved advising services for our students.
5. Add staff in information services to allow for a higher quality of service to faculty, staff, and students using the university's computing resources.

We look forward to discussing these issues with you further.

ATTACHMENT B

DRAFT

OUR MISSION.

TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY— A VIBRANT COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS EMBRACING AN INCLUSIVE AND SELF-RELIANT HERITAGE—ADVANCES SCHOLARSHIP AND DEVELOPS ETHICAL AND RESPONSIBLE LEADERS FOR THE COMPLEX GLOBAL SOCIETY OF THE 21st CENTURY.

This mission statement will lead to the formulation of ***OUR VISION*** which speaks to our distinct standing in American private and independent higher education and our aspirations for the future.

The vision statement will then lead to the formulation of ***OUR STRATEGIES*** which describe our pathway to the fulfillment of our mission and vision.

February 22, 1999

Task Force on University Mission

ATTACHMENT C

Preliminary Report of the Faculty Governance Committee

Standing Charge:

Gather information about the structure and functions of the Faculty Senate and Senate committees and recommend changes that will improve their effectiveness in University Governance.

Specific Charge:

Gather information about the structure of Faculty Senates at other universities and how those structures are working. Share the results with faculty and gather feedback about changes, if any, indicated for the structure of TCU's Faculty Senate.

The Committee gathered information from the following colleges and universities

Baylor University	Rice University
Drake University	Southern Methodist University
Duke University	Trinity University
Emory University	Tufts University
Evergreen State College	Tulane University
Northwestern University	Vanderbilt University
Pepperdine University	

We obtained documents from these institutions and spoke with faculty leaders at most of them. While TCU's Faculty Senate appears to be more active and better organized than the faculty governance organization at many of these institutions, we feel that one component of the faculty governance structure at Duke University is appropriate for TCU. The Academic Council at Duke is the equivalent of our Faculty Senate. The following excerpt is taken from the web site <http://www.duke.edu/web/acouncil/acintro.htm>

In 1972 a committee chaired by Prof. George Christie of the School of Law fine-tuned the Academic Council in a series of reforms. ... The Christie Report also codified a practice already recognized within the Council leadership, henceforth known as the "Christie Rule". That Rule is as follows: "except in emergencies, all major decisions and plans of the administration that significantly affect academic affairs should be submitted to the Academic Council for an expression of views prior to implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The views expressed by the Academic Council should be transmitted, along with the Administration's proposals, to the Board of Trustees when these plans and decisions are considered by the Board of Trustees." That Rule succinctly defines the role of faculty governance at Duke University. The Academic Council is only to a very limited extent a legislature. Its primary role is advisory, but it asserts the right of being heard in that advice and of having it considered, under a "Rule" that requires constant and vigilant tending.

The functions and duties of the Faculty Senate at TCU are enumerated in the "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" in Article II, Section 1B [*Handbook for Faculty and University Staff 1998-1999*, p. 64]

1. The Faculty Senate shall have the power to review and evaluate the educational policies, degree requirements, curricula, questions on academic freedom, student-faculty relations, faculty-administration relations, and practices of the University and may make recommendations concerning them through the appropriate channels.

2. The Faculty Senate may review admissions policies, research contracts policies, student behaviors policies, athletic policies, and broad financial policies and make recommendations to the Administration, University Council, House of Student Representatives, and under unusual circumstances, to the Board of Trustees.

Our situation seems similar to that described at Duke University. Thus, the Faculty Governance Committee recommends that recent practice be codified by amending the Constitution.

Recommendation 1: The "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" be amended with the following additional paragraph in Article II, Section 1B

3. Except in emergencies, all significant decisions and plans of the administration that affect academic affairs should be submitted to the Faculty Senate for an expression of views prior to implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The views expressed by the Faculty Senate should be transmitted, along with the administration's proposals, to the Board of Trustees when these plans and decisions are considered by the Board of Trustees.

Our second recommendation concerns eligibility requirements for senators. Full-time faculty with the rank of Instructor are voting members of the Faculty Assembly but are not eligible for election to the Senate. According the *TCU Fact Book*, there are currently 332 faculty, 19 of which hold the rank of Instructor. Since "service to the university" is a component of the evaluation of Instructors and since Instructors are stakeholders in the academic affairs of the university, we believe that Senate membership should be open to them.

Recommendation 2: Article II, Section 2A of the "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" be amended by replacing italicized text with the text shown in brackets:

1. Only full-time faculty members with the academic rank of *Assistant Professor* [Instructor] or higher who are eligible to vote and whose duties include more than half-time teaching and/or research shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate.

Other items that we noticed are listed below in the form of observations.

- Deans meet as a group with all department chairs, and chairs meet without the deans before/after for extra interaction.
- Deans serve 3-4 years terms that are once renewable.
- The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is a non-senator. At Duke, the secretary “is an emeritus or near-emeritus member of the faculty and is modestly paid.” At another university, the Assistant Registrar is responsible for producing minutes of Senate meetings.

ATTACHMENT D**Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
March 4, 1999**

I. Progress report**A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:**

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" revision.
Discussed with Faculty Relations Committee. The Faculty Relations Committee recommends addition of statements addressing the FMLA. Provost and Executive Committee are preparing a formal proposal for the Faculty Relations Committee meeting in March.

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

The Undergraduate Council decided they do not wish to make this change.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.

- Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR -Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/ Telecommunications committee, which has now been formed.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

100
100

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
4 March 1999**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Joseph Bobich, George Brown, Clayton Brown, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Nowell Donovan, Gregg Franzwa, Ellen Page Garrison, David Grant, Linda Hughes, David Jenkins, Rhonda Keen-Payne, Nadia Lahutsky, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Don Nichols, Roger Pfaffenberger, Manfred Reinecke, Sherrie Reynolds, Bill Ryan, Mike Sacken, David Sloan, Gene Smith, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Bill Vanderhoof, and Robert Vigeland.

Members absent: Peggy Bennett, Greg Clemons, Lynn Flahive, Sally Fortenberry, Pamela Marcum, Pat Paulus, Dick Rinewalt, Bernadette Szajna, Susan White, and Chuck Williams.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Sherrie Reynolds at 3:33 p.m..

Approval of minutes. Senator Reinecke indicated that the report of the Committee on Committees should be amended to read that the Admissions Committee is to report at the next Senate meeting, not that they are to report to the next meeting of the Committee on Committees. The minutes were approved with this one correction.

Chair Reynold introduced guests: Ben Alexander, Pam Woodhead, *Skiff* reporter, and the members of Task Force on University Mission.

Report from the Assistant Secretary. Senator Flahive was unable to attend, so Chair Reynolds gave Flahive's report. There are still candidate vacancies that need to be filled before Senate elections. Brite has three of its positions open and no one has volunteered to run. Education has one opening, but no one is running. Nursing has one opening with one person running. Business has two openings, but only one person running. Senators need to encourage their colleagues to run for the Senate.

Report from Budget and Finance Committee, by Senator Vigeland. He noted that the committee changed its method of operation this year. They met in the fall with Chancellor Ferrari and expressed interest in having more faculty input in the budget process. They suggested that they ought to work directly with Provost Koehler to support the academic mission of university. The Chancellor agreed, so they met with Koehler to find out where they might have the most likely impact in the budget process. Senator Vigeland then distributed the budget recommendations that the committee made (see Attachment A). The Chancellor asked two things of the committee: 1. What sorts of assumptions about budget parameters should be made going into the process? The committee decided that since this is a transition year, the parameters should be those of the status quo. They, however, expect significant changes in next year's recommendations in light of the planning process. 2. What are our priorities? What should we spend our money on? These are reflected in the recommendations: addition of faculty, compensation levels for faculty and staff, and academic facilities. The committee also

recommends a study of our academic facilities, laboratories, and faculty offices. They expect that out of that study some rather glaring deficiencies will be identified. They also recommend additional resources for PeopleSoft training and more resources in Information Services. Senator Vigeland reports that the committee has had more input in the budget process than in the past and that faculty have made positive strides in getting faculty representation in this process.

Senator Bobich asked if it is true that Duke is backing out of PeopleSoft? Senator Vigeland had heard no such thing. Chancellor Ferrari then said he has heard rumors of some schools taking such action, but he wasn't aware if these rumors had to do with Duke. He indicated that we can't back out, because the university has committed to the transition to PeopleSoft.

Discussion of University Mission Statement. Chair Reynolds turned the meeting over to Chancellor Ferarri to discuss the draft of the University Mission Statement. Before proceeding to this topic, the Chancellor thanked the faculty for the plaque given to him at commencement.

The Chancellor passed out the current draft of the university mission statement (See Attachment B). He said, "We've had a group over the past few months working on a statement, a crucial conceptual piece that will provide a great deal of structure and will be the foundation of our planning. The task force has been meeting over the past few months. Chair Reynolds served on it, Larry Lauer, Delia Pitts, Rich Enos, Suzi Adams, Bob Seal. We had a few students on the committee, representatives of the general staff and Dean McCracken. We went through a number of versions to get where we are today. We think we're getting real, real close. You may not think so, but the committee thinks so! This is a difficult task. We wanted to prepare a concise and compelling statement of the principle purpose of TCU. We wanted to speak to our core reasons for being, we wanted it to be outcome oriented, and we wanted to be in touch with our heritage and founding. We wanted it to have some kind of passion, to be a statement of who we are, and what we stand for. This statement should speak to everyone throughout the university. This is the driving spirit that we want to capture in a mission statement. We want a statement that will be helpful in setting priorities for the institution, and it ought to say what differentiates us from other institutions. We want it to have staying power, to last for the foreseeable future. We want to be able to assess our performance and be able to answer, How we are doing? How do we know we doing. Accrediting agencies will want to see this. We wanted one sentence, maybe two. We wanted to capture the essence of TCU in a relatively short statement. This was very tricky. The work is not done, but we want it to be done soon. The committee thinks we've done as much as we can do, so we need to see what others think. We benefitted from advice from a number of individuals. The Administrative Council and the Parents' Council has looked at it."

The Chancellor then went through the statement, line by line. And then opened the floor for the comments of Senators and asked for their honest, candid reaction. Among the suggestions made by the Senators were the following:

- A number of senators have been discussing this statement on the FACSSEN Listserv and commented how little the task force's statement reflects this discussion. Senator Bobich offered an alternative that has been discussed on the discussion list: "Texas

Christian University's mission is to educate people to learn and think, to empower them to contribute and serve, and equip them to guide and lead."

- There are too many adjectives and the Task Force's statement needs more active verbs. One senator said it is mushy. Another said it needed to be more concise. If it is to be more memorable, then it needs to get to the point: "The mission of Texas Christian University is to . . ."
- On the heritage clause. Ferrari asked how many think the heritage clause is not needed? One senator said don't put the heritage between dashes but keep it. Another suggested that since we say "Texas Christian University" maybe we don't need the heritage clause. Another suggested that heritage means more than our TCU heritage. Heritage can also mean the wider cultural heritage. Another thought "Christian" in Texas Christian can be misleading to prospective students and others, and therefore we should go with "TCU." If the reference to "inclusive" in the statement is a reference to our co-educational roots, then why not say that in a preamble and leave it out of the mission statement. Still other senators thought the heritage ought to be in the statement itself.
- This statement looks back, but a mission statement should look forward. Also what about Fine Arts? "Scholarship" doesn't describe well what they do.
- Maybe the statement needs a preamble that could better cover the heritage issue.
- One senator suggested that we ought to look at an honor system for the school.
- On the notion of leaders. What do we mean by *global leaders*? Are we going to measure ourselves on whether we're really putting people in global leadership positions? The statement conveys that they are to be leaders at the global level. Maybe the notion of *citizen*, in the classical Greek sense, would be better than *leaders*.
- Is ethical education really a simple matter. Are we trying to teach ethics as a subject matter across the curriculum? Is that implied by the statement? A committee member indicated that the reference to ethical leaders was trying to point to our wanting people to be leaders in the world community in the sense of having a concern to address the problems we all face. The basic concerns of compassion and social concern are part of our heritage.
- Strike the word *complex*. Also, take out the word *responsible*.
- This statement points to a product. What we do, however, is go through a process. We can't point to a product that we want all of our students to become. They will be a very diverse group of people. We want them to think as best they can, but how can we really point and say that they're all going to be leaders? Moreover, the concept of

leader doesn't have to be one who is in authority. One can be a leader without being in authority, for example, Mother Teresa. Maybe we could say "try to develop" ethical leaders. But can we really develop ethical leaders? And isn't the notion of ethical relative to cultures?

- The statement is far too self-congratulatory. "A vibrant community of scholars." Ferrari asked if it were accurate. A member of the task force said that we are far too self-effacing. We are a very unique university.
- Another alternative statement is suggested: "The mission of Texas Christian University is to encourage people to think." This is short and brief. It is also memorable. But, another suggests that there are a lot of people in the world who have thought a lot but done nothing.
- Chair Reynolds clarified that the FACSSEN listserv is for our internal discussion and that she doesn't automatically forward our discussions to the administration.

Report from the Faculty Governance Committee. Senator Page-Garrison made the report for Senator Rinewalt, who was unable to be at the meeting (see Attachment C). The recommendations in this report will be voted on at our next meeting.

Discussion of Faculty Senate Listserv. It was decided to keep the FACSSEN listserv set so that replies go to all members of the discussion list.

Announcements. Senator Sacken: A new ad-hoc committee focusing on intellectual property issues has been formed by Provost Koehler and will be seeking input from faculty. Senator Donovan mentions that the Academic Excellence Committee is also looking at these issues.

Announcements were also made concerning upcoming dance and orchestra concerts.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant
Secretary

ATTACHMENT A
REPORT OF THE BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Dear Mick:

On behalf of the Budget and Finance Committee, I am pleased to provide you with our input regarding budget assumptions and priorities for the 1999-2000 budget. We have met with Bill Koehler to discuss these issues and have solicited input from the members of the Faculty Senate.

Assumptions:

We recognize that a new mission statement for the university is currently being developed and a new integrated planning and budgeting process will be developed later this year. While these crucial initiatives are underway, it is not advisable to suggest any fundamental changes in the operation of the university. We fully expect that recommendations for fundamental changes in the university will result from these initiatives and that these changes will have major long-term budgetary implications. However, until the new planning process has had a chance to work, we recommend assumptions based on the status quo.

- We explicitly assume that the university desires to maintain the quality of its programs in the near-term. This implies no increase in the size of the student body without a commensurate increase in the size of the full-time, tenure-track faculty.

We assume there will be no fundamental changes in the pricing of a TCU education - no fundamental changes in tuition and fees or financial aid except those dictated by cost increases.

- We assume there will be no significant change in the student retention rates nor any change in the percentage spending limit on the university endowment.

Priorities:

1. Add full-time tenure-track faculty to (1) reduce the reliance on occasional faculty and (2) reduce class sizes that have resulted from the large freshman class sizes the past two years. While it is unlikely that we will be able to achieve this in a single year, we recommend a return to TCU's previously stated goal of having no more than 15 percent of the student credit hours generated by occasional faculty. Three to five years is probably a reasonable time frame to achieve this goal.
2. Set compensation levels for current faculty and staff at competitive levels to ensure that we can retain and attract good people to work at TCU and ensure gender equity.
3. Commission a comprehensive study of our academic facilities - classrooms, laboratories, faculty offices, and meeting spaces - to assess (1) their condition and need for maintenance and repairs, (2) whether they offer adequate capacity for our current and near-term needs, and (3) whether they are adequately configured and equipped to meet our academic mission. We hope that this effort will lead to the development of an integrated plan for academic facilities and an on-going process for monitoring facilities and setting priorities on expenditures for academic plant and equipment with broad representation across departments
4. Provide training on the use of the Peoplesoft® administrative software system. This training should provide (1) each budgetary unit with at least one individual who is well versed in the operation of the financial system and (2) each faculty advisor with the capability to use the student system to provide improved advising services for our students.
5. Add staff in information services to allow for a higher quality of service to faculty, staff, and students using the university's computing resources.

We look forward to discussing these issues with you further.

ATTACHMENT B

DRAFT

OUR MISSION.

TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY— A VIBRANT COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS EMBRACING AN INCLUSIVE AND SELF-RELIANT HERITAGE—ADVANCES SCHOLARSHIP AND DEVELOPS ETHICAL AND RESPONSIBLE LEADERS FOR THE COMPLEX GLOBAL SOCIETY OF THE 21st CENTURY.

This mission statement will lead to the formulation of ***OUR VISION*** which speaks to our distinct standing in American private and independent higher education and our aspirations for the future.

The vision statement will then lead to the formulation of ***OUR STRATEGIES*** which describe our pathway to the fulfillment of our mission and vision.

February 22, 1999

Task Force on University Mission

ATTACHMENT C

Preliminary Report of the Faculty Governance Committee

Standing Charge:

Gather information about the structure and functions of the Faculty Senate and Senate committees and recommend changes that will improve their effectiveness in University Governance.

Specific Charge:

Gather information about the structure of Faculty Senates at other universities and how those structures are working. Share the results with faculty and gather feedback about changes, if any, indicated for the structure of TCU's Faculty Senate.

The Committee gathered information from the following colleges and universities

Baylor University	Rice University
Drake University	Southern Methodist University
Duke University	Trinity University
Emory University	Tufts University
Evergreen State College	Tulane University
Northwestern University	Vanderbilt University
Pepperdine University	

We obtained documents from these institutions and spoke with faculty leaders at most of them. While TCU's Faculty Senate appears to be more active and better organized than the faculty governance organization at many of these institutions, we feel that one component of the faculty governance structure at Duke University is appropriate for TCU. The Academic Council at Duke is the equivalent of our Faculty Senate. The following excerpt is taken from the web site <http://www.duke.edu/web/acouncil/acintro.htm>

In 1972 a committee chaired by Prof. George Christie of the School of Law fine-tuned the Academic Council in a series of reforms. ... The Christie Report also codified a practice already recognized within the Council leadership, henceforth known as the "Christie Rule". That Rule is as follows: "except in emergencies, all major decisions and plans of the administration that significantly affect academic affairs should be submitted to the Academic Council for an expression of views prior to implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The views expressed by the Academic Council should be transmitted, along with the Administration's proposals, to the Board of Trustees when these plans and decisions are considered by the Board of Trustees." That Rule succinctly defines the role of faculty governance at Duke University. The Academic Council is only to a very limited extent a legislature. Its primary role is advisory, but it asserts the right of being heard in that advice and of having it considered, under a "Rule" that requires constant and vigilant tending.

The functions and duties of the Faculty Senate at TCU are enumerated in the "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" in Article II, Section 1B [*Handbook for Faculty and University Staff 1998-1999*, p. 64]

1. The Faculty Senate shall have the power to review and evaluate the educational policies, degree requirements, curricula, questions on academic freedom, student-faculty relations, faculty-administration relations, and practices of the University and may make recommendations concerning them through the appropriate channels.

2. The Faculty Senate may review admissions policies, research contracts policies, student behaviors policies, athletic policies, and broad financial policies and make recommendations to the Administration, University Council, House of Student Representatives, and under unusual circumstances, to the Board of Trustees.

Our situation seems similar to that described at Duke University. Thus, the Faculty Governance Committee recommends that recent practice be codified by amending the Constitution.

Recommendation 1: The "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" be amended with the following additional paragraph in Article II, Section 1B

3. Except in emergencies, all significant decisions and plans of the administration that affect academic affairs should be submitted to the Faculty Senate for an expression of views prior to implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The views expressed by the Faculty Senate should be transmitted, along with the administration's proposals, to the Board of Trustees when these plans and decisions are considered by the Board of Trustees.

Our second recommendation concerns eligibility requirements for senators. Full-time faculty with the rank of Instructor are voting members of the Faculty Assembly but are not eligible for election to the Senate. According the *TCU Fact Book*, there are currently 332 faculty, 19 of which hold the rank of Instructor. Since "service to the university" is a component of the evaluation of Instructors and since Instructors are stakeholders in the academic affairs of the university, we believe that Senate membership should be open to them.

Recommendation 2: Article II, Section 2A of the "Constitution of the Faculty Assembly and Faculty Senate" be amended by replacing italicized text with the text shown in brackets:

1. Only full-time faculty members with the academic rank of *Assistant Professor* [Instructor] or higher who are eligible to vote and whose duties include more than half-time teaching and/or research shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate.

Other items that we noticed are listed below in the form of observations.

- Deans meet as a group with all department chairs, and chairs meet without the deans before/after for extra interaction.
- Deans serve 3-4 years terms that are once renewable.
- The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is a non-senator. At Duke, the secretary “is an emeritus or near-emeritus member of the faculty and is modestly paid.” At another university, the Assistant Registrar is responsible for producing minutes of Senate meetings.

ATTACHMENT D**Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
March 4, 1999**

I. Progress report**A. Motions passed by the Senate in 1998-99 which are still in process:**

- Statement on Extension of tenure Probationary Period" revision.
Discussed with Faculty Relations Committee. The Faculty Relations Committee recommends addition of statements addressing the FMLA. Provost and Executive Committee are preparing a formal proposal for the Faculty Relations Committee meeting in March.

- A tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, should chair the Undergraduate Council on a rotating cycle of two years. An alternative would be to have a tenured faculty member, elected by the Faculty Senate, and a dean co-chair the Undergraduate Council with the dean providing staff support.

The Undergraduate Council decided they do not wish to make this change.

B. Items passed by the Senate which were reported previously and whose status is unchanged:

- Provost Koehler asked the Senate to express a position on TCU faculty participation in distance learning programs for other universities or teaching at other universities during the summer.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee in October to look into this.

- Provost asked the Senate to look into whether faculty should be required (at least in undergraduate courses) to prepare and distribute a syllabus. This is not currently required.

Executive Committee asked the Academic Excellence Committee to investigate.

- The university committees dealing with undergraduate curriculum or the UCR -Undergraduate Council and University Curriculum Committee) should be combined into the existing Undergraduate Council.

Since this is related to the UCR which is currently under review, Provost wants to address it after the curriculum review is completed.

- Student Relations Committee recommends that Senate should be involved in policies regarding the implementation of the PeopleSoft software as it relates to academic matters and advising.

Provost says this will be referred to the new Technology/ Telecommunications committee, which has now been formed.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration be encouraged to mandate formal advising training for all new faculty advisors through the Center for Academic Services.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.

- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration formally investigate national evaluation of advising programs and that the Faculty Senate consider the selection and implementation of the use of the one most appropriate to our educational situation.

Sent by Provost to Evaluation Committee in June.- no new information has been received from the committee.