

**Minutes**  
TCU Faculty Senate  
2 May, 2002

**Members present:** Charles Becker, Joe Bobich, George Brown, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Spence-Cagle, Nowell Donovan, Sharon Fairchild, Lynn Flahive, Ron Flowers, Andy Fort, Sally Fortenberry, Pam Frable, Gregg Franzwa, Rob Garnett, Phil Hadlock, Sanoa Hensley, Jennifer Higa, Paul King, Ed Kolesar, Derek Kompare, Don Nichols, Dick Rinewalt, Magnus Rittby, Bill Vanderhoof, Peggy Watson, Ron Watson, Ralph Woodward

**Members absent:** Melissa Burns, Ron Burns, George Low, Thad Duhigg, Joan McGettigan, Nancy Meadows, Mike Sacken, Ellen Page Shelton, Gene Smith, Elizabeth Taylor, Jeffrey Todd, Melissa Young

Chair Carolyn Spence-Cagle called the meeting to order at 3:38.

The Chair asked for approval of a modified agenda and received it. Minutes were approved with corrections. New senators were introduced and outgoing senators were thanked.

**New Business – Presentation of Committee Reports**

Senator Fairchild summarized the work of the Student Affairs Committee. Important points include:

- Dropping the charge of changing the final exam schedule since students don't seem to be that interested.
- Came up with questions about teacher scholar model and had focus groups with students. Information included on the emailed report. Sharon summarized a few high points of the results of the questions.
- “Teacher-Scholar” should be better defined.
- Students did not think that research detracted from teaching.
- Major concerns of the executive committee of the SGA include:
  - Online course evaluations
  - Return to a printed course bulletin
  - They dislike some unclear portions of the CUE, including ethics and global roles.

Senator Higa presented the report of the Faculty Governance Committee. Important results are summarized below (based a 60% response rate):

50% of the faculty said the FS was somewhat visible  
48% said the FS was somewhat effective  
48% though the FS has some influence

Twenty of thirty six chairs responded to a question about their expectations of faculty service for tenured and non-tenured faculty. Results include:

- Service is important and expected of all faculty

- Departmental Chairs have a broad range of expectations.
- Chairs rank service for tenure and tenure-track faculty. For tenure track faculty service to university and professions is ranked the same and higher than TCU service. Tenured faculty have about the same expectations but with an emphasis on departmental service.

The survey also asked how faculty how expectations were communicated to them. In general, expectations were transmitted through annual reviews, informal venues, handbooks and tenure and promotion documents at the department and college levels.

In general service seems to be rated at a 20% across the university. Most said that failure to be engaged in service is rare. When problems arise consequences may include reduced pay raises, increased teaching load or internal departmental dissension.

Sixty five percent of the faculty supported incentives for service, including additional research funds, course reductions, service awards and student assistants (in order of preference).

In conclusion, service is important but does not replace teaching and research. Most departments have some incentives to foster service.

Finally the committee noted the importance of looking at possible committee overlap and for ways to control the need for additional committees, noting the need to be as efficient as possible.

Senator Kompare noted that we should access institutional memory to keep abreast of previous initiatives.

Senator Franzwa started a focused discussion on senate visibility. He noted that faculty, in general, see each other as individuals rather than as a group and as long as they are this way the Senate won't be taken seriously. The Senate needs to convince faculty that they are actively presenting faculty interests in straightforward and practical ways. There are many common interests, but frequently they are not perceived by faculty, especially younger faculty. Young faculty are told to do research and teach classes and do only a little service. We have the charge of creating a community consciousness.

Senator Rinewalt presented the report of the Committee on Committees.

#### **Discussion of the TP&G Document.**

Senator King discussed the issue of calendar versus academic days. He strongly suggested that we should use academic days, which are practically better when it comes to holiday periods.

**Senator King made a motion that we reinsert academic days in the TP&G grievance document. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **New Business**

### **Vote for 2002-2003 FS officers**

Senator Peggy Watson was unopposed for Chair-elect and Art Busbey was unopposed for Secretary. Candidates for Assistant Secretary were Melissa Young and Andy Fort. With the vote tallied, Senator Fort became the Assistant Secretary for 2002-2003.

### **Other Discussion**

Senator Hensley said we now have a very big finance committee and suggested the FS needs to rethink the committee because it really doesn't currently exist. To do so would require a bylaw change.

### **The Overlay Committee**

A document was passed around, reflecting the changes made in the Overlay Committee document from April and providing information on the number of students in each college. It was suggested that the number of faculty on the Overlay Committee be a function of the number of students enrolled in a college.

Senator Fort said that degree faculty participation (at the college level) in the Core should be taken into consideration when considering Committee composition. Senator Franzwa also supported this notion.

Senator Kompare suggested an amendment, where we reduce 3 to 2 for each large college and then add 1 ethicist back to committee. Senator Frable supports Senator Kompare. The general question of how an ethicist would be selected appeared and it was suggested that this person could be elected from the senate.

Senators were requested to submit nominations for Committee members. We agreed that Colleges could submit names in a manner that was up to the individual colleges, though it was suggested that senators from a college could submit nominees.

**The motion to accept the Overlay Committee proposal was passed with 2 nay votes.**

The last Faculty Senate meeting of the 2001-2002 academic year ended at 5:30 PM.

Respectively submitted,

Arthur B. Busbey, Secretary