

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
4 May 2000**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Joe Bobich, Pat Bradley, Clayton Brown, George Brown, Art Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Nowell Donovan, Bruce Elleman, Lynn Flahive, Andy Fort, Sally Fortenberry, Gregg Franzwa, David Grant, David Jenkins, Ed Kolesar, Nadia Lahutsky, George Low, Nancy Meadows, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Ellen Page-Garrison, Roger Pfaffenberger, Sherrie Reynolds, Dick Rinewalt, Bill Ryan, Mike Sacken, Gloria Solomon, Greg Stephens, Carol Stephenson, Peggy Watson, and Ron Watson.

Members absent: Don Nichols, Pat Kinkade, Ernie Couch, and Melissa Young

The meeting was called to order by Chair Roger Pfaffenberger at 3:34 p.m.

The Minutes of the 6 April meeting of the Senate were approved as distributed.

Assistant Secretary Lynn Flahive introduced the newly elected 2000-2001 senators who were in attendance.

Old Business.

Tabled motions from Faculty Governance Committee recommendations. Senator Flahive moved to untable the following motion brought from the Faculty Governance Committee that was tabled at the 6 April meeting:

That the Senate create additional Faculty Senate committees to meet with the following vice chancellors: Administrative Services and University Advancement.

The motion to untable was approved. Senator Clayton Brown, chair of the Faculty Governance Committee suggested that the motion be amended as follows:

That the Senate create one additional Faculty Senate committee to meet with the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and the Vice Chancellor for University Advancement, and that this committee comprise six members, of which at least one be a senator.

Linda Moore moved that the suggested amendment to the motion be adopted, and it was. Senator Reynolds then argued against the amended motion, noting that there were already Senate conversations with these vice chancellors because the chair of the Faculty Senate was now invited to attend the meetings of the Glen Rose Group—the chancellor, the deans, and the vice chancellors. Senator Fort noted that the Senate ought to be proactive and approve this new committee. Senator Flahive worried that the Committee on Committees would have difficulty filling such a committee due to the scarcity of faculty willing to serve on committees. The question was called and the amended motion was defeated.

Senator Flahive moved to remove from the table the following motion made and tabled at the 6 April meeting:

That the Faculty Senate support the current relationship between the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees and state that its expectation is that contact will continue at the present level.

The motion to remove from the table passed. This recommendation was tabled in April so that the Executive Committee could examine whether a request to meet formally with the Board after each Board meeting should be added. Senator Grant reported that the Executive Committee had looked at this motion and did not believe that any such additional meeting was necessary. Chair Pfaffenberger called the question on the original motion and it was approved.

New Business.

Report of the Academic Excellence Committee. Senator George Brown distributed the Final Report of the Academic Excellence Committee (See Appendix A) and highlighted its conclusions. The charge of the committee was to address the question, How excellent are we and how do we improve academics? The committee saw four specific areas that have to be addressed to answer this question—faculty, students, programs, and administration. Improving the excellence of the faculty will involve increasing the number of faculty lines, setting compensation at competitive levels, increasing resources for travel, and providing greater support for the teaching center. Increasing the excellence of our students involves recruiting stronger students and providing increased financial aid packages. Excellent programs means we need to revise the UCR, provide greater support for the Honors Program, improve campus technology, and investigate instituting a first-year college. Excellence in administration will mean improving communications, offering excellent training program for department chairs, and improving our public profile. In closing his report he emphasized that the faculty must take responsibility for the academic program and work to make it excellent.

Chair Pfaffenberger asked that comments on the report should be send to the chair.

Report of the Student Relations Committee. Seantor Ryan made the report. (See Appendix B.) The specific charge of this committee was to look into the question of the relation between Greek social organizations and academic issues, especially regarding the timing of rush. The committee tried to stay away from anecdotal and emotional issues and tried to gather evidence as close to hard data as they could. They viewed the tape of the student/faculty discussion of the issue from the fall. They also looked at the 1989 report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Rush, Bid, and Pledging. They surveyed competitor institutions as well as all full-time TCU faculty. They also surveyed a random sample of 1000 students.

When all is said and done there is no agreement as to what should be done on the timing of rush. There are basically three groups: those who oppose change, those who strongly favor delaying rush until January, and those who don't care.

Of eighteen competitor institutions, about one half have fall rush and the other half has deferred rush, some in late November, others in the spring. One school has eliminated all Greek social organizations.

On the survey of TCU faculty: 41% of faculty responded. 56% were interested or very interested in this issue. 49% believed that Greek organizations detracted from academic achievement. 52% believed that it detracts from diversity. 58% believed that it improved retention. 64% of faculty thought that rush ought to be delayed.

Student survey data. 135 students responded. 68% were Greeks, and a majority of those were sorority members. 2/3 reported that rush neither helped or harmed them. 13% thought rush harmed their college experience. 24% reported that rush helped their experience.

Senator Ryan noted that a couple of principles popped out of the data: Most of the reasons for keeping rush as it is are have to do with its effects on sororities and fraternities. The reasons for deferring rush have to do with academic issues. Ryan indicated that this issue was hotly debated in the committee. The committee believes that all things considered, the best thing would be to delay rush. As a result the committee recommends the following:

That the Faculty Senate forward a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for consideration and submission to the University Administration that calls for:

1. a rush policy that recognizes the primary academic mission of the University and accordingly restricts all rush activities of Greek organizations to the periods falling between academic semesters and terms when no classes or examinations are scheduled,
and

2. a change in the timing of rush that recognizes the primary academic mission of the University and accordingly moves all rush activities of Greek organizations to the period between the end of final examinations in the Fall Semester and the first scheduled classes of the Spring semester.

Senator Fort moved approval of this recommendation. Points in the discussion included the importance of keeping in mind that delaying formal rush would only increase informal rush, the importance of keeping the entering freshman experience as broad as possible, and the symbolic value that a vote to delay rush would have in emphasizing academics. A vote was taken and the motion carried.

Report of the Committee on Committees. Senator Cagle made the report for the Committee on Committees. (See Appendix C.) She pointed to the recommendations on page 3 of the report. Chair Pfaffenberger indicated that this committee's recommendations would be taken under advisement by the Executive Committee for actions at the September meeting of the Senate.

Elections of officers. Nominations for officers were presented to the Senate:

Chair-Elect:	George Brown, Carolyn Cagle
Secretary:	Art Busbey, Dick Rinewalt
Assistant Secretary:	Andy Fort, Peggy Watson

The floor was opened for additional nominations. Nominations for the Budget and Finance Committee opening were also called for. Sonoa Hensley and Rob Garnett were nominated from the floor for this opening. No additional nominations were received for the Senate officers. Ballots for the election were distributed and the following were elected:

Chair-Elect:	Carolyn Cagle
Secretary:	Art Busbey
Assistant Secretary:	Peggy Watson
Budget & Finance:	Sonoa Hensley

Chair Pfaffenberger announced that he was appointing Senator Grant as Parliamentarian for next year.

Senator Sherrie Reynolds presented Chair Pfaffenberger a plaque for his service as Senate Chair this year and Chair Pfaffenberger thanked the Executive Committee for working with him. He presented the gavel and a bottle of Roloids to the new Chair of the Faculty Senate, Nowell Donovan. In his closing words to the Senate, Chair Pfaffenberger said: "We face a very important time next year. We need to emphasize that this faculty process is an open process and we need to encourage our colleagues to participate in the open process. As a Senate we must plot our course wisely. We've had the provost and chancellor in attendance at our meetings this year. We must remember it is our duty as faculty to design the academic programs; it is the duty of the administration to implement them. We need to defend the academy; we need to defend the truth as we know it. I invite all of you as faculty to join with the chancellor, the provost, the students, and others to build further on the foundation that we've begun in this Faculty Senate."

The meeting was adjourned 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant
Secretary

ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE COMMITTEE

Final Report

May 4, 2000

In response to our specific charge, *How excellent are we and how do we improve academics?*, The Academic Excellence Committee of the Faculty Senate, after examining several sources that compare our academic reputation with those of similar and benchmarking universities, submits the following recommendations for improving the academic excellence at TCU.

The focus of these recommendations lies in four key areas: faculty issues, student issues, program issues and administration issues. Committee deliberations were guided with the absolute conviction that **academic excellence is achieved within the dynamic bond between faculty and student in a learning environment thoroughly supported by the administration.**

Recommendations

“Excellent schools have excellent faculty.”

We believe that faculty invested in the discovery and dissemination of new thought are the core of the academic experience. The Academic Excellence Committee therefore submits the following recommendations concerning Faculty issues.

- We recommend an increase in the number of faculty lines for the University to lessen the reliance on occasional faculty and improve TCU's student/faculty ratio by aligning the University competitively with tier one institutions.
- We concur with the Senate Budget and Finance Committee and recommend that compensation levels for current faculty and staff be set at competitive levels to ensure that we retain and attract good people to work at TCU and ensure gender equity.
- We further recommend that the merit increase system serve as an incentive program that truly rewards individuals for exceptional merit and dedication to the University independent of an annual cost-of-living increase.
- We concur with the Chancellor that reasonable and thoughtful risk taking is essential to growth. Reasonable and thoughtful risk taking in regards to research and creative activity is imperative if we are to heighten TCU's academic reputation on a national and international level. We highly recommend the allocation of stronger financial and staff resources to promote and support research and creative activity across the campus. Furthermore, if TCU is to compete in an international marketplace, greater resources must be allocated for travel to allow faculty to present their findings and heighten their involvement nationally and internationally, thereby increasing TCU's national and international profile.
- We recommend instituting a comprehensive and continuous faculty development program to ensure that the faculty is offered the opportunity to develop their skills and talents to the fullest measure possible. The program should offer professional development opportunities including, but are not limited to:

Sabbaticals

Funding to attend professional meetings to explore new research opportunities

Funding to attend teaching effectiveness workshops and conferences

On-site workshops to assist faculty in writing grant proposals

On-site workshops to provide training for faculty to use technology

On-site workshops to enhance teaching effectiveness

Start-up funds for labs to support the teaching and research programs of new faculty

Teaching release time to develop new courses, new research avenues, new teaching technologies or new approaches to teaching, particularly of an interdisciplinary nature.

- To achieve that end, we further recommend that the Center for Teaching Excellence be provided with the necessary funding, personnel and resources to assist the faculty in the improvement of teaching effectiveness and facilitate programs aimed at heightening the academic excellence of the University.
- Finally, as no University or its faculty can be an island isolated from the world of new ideas and innovative thought, we recommend an increase in the number and caliber of visiting professorships, honor chairs and endowed chairs across the University. We believe that bringing individuals of national and international reputation to join with existing Faculty can enhance TCU's academic reputation. The resulting exchange of ideas and collaboration on research and creative activities will heighten the students' academic experience.

“Excellent schools attract and keep excellent students.”

We believe that students who are academically curious, enthusiastic of learning and active in their academic life are an asset to the University and enhance the academic experience for both fellow students and faculty alike. The Academic Excellence Committee therefore submits the following recommendations concerning student issues.

- We strongly recommend developing an active recruitment process aimed at attracting “quality” students whose SAT/ACT scores rise towards the upper percentile of our current SAT/ACT entrance standards and whose High School class ranking falls in the Top 10% of their graduating class. By attracting a greater number of students with higher SAT's, the lower level of our SAT percentile range would be raised, heightening the quality of our students and raising our selectivity classification. Furthermore, by attracting a greater number of students whose High School class ranking falls in the top 10% of their graduating class we would further heighten the quality of our students and raise our selectivity classification.
- We strongly recommend greater support and resources (budgets, personnel, travel, “signing bonuses” etc.) to implement the recruitment process mentioned above.
- We strongly recommend the funding of more competitive financial aid packages to attract and retain quality students including those in under-represented populations.
- We strongly recommend redefining our advertising to attract quality students and promote academics as the centerpiece of the student experience (i.e.: It's about You AND your Education; We're here so you can explore your world; TCU - A place to open your mind and discover a brave new world! etc.)

“Excellent Schools have and continue to develop excellent programs of study that will challenge and educate excellent students.”

We believe that a student's academic experience and the quality of the academic programs available directly effect student retention and the academic reputation of the University. The Academic Excellence Committee therefore submits the following recommendations concerning program issues.

- We strongly recommend revising the University undergraduate core to develop a more cohesive program of study that offers all the students a stronger Liberal Arts foundation through a series of common broad based interdisciplinary/cross-disciplinary courses. For example, developing a common interdisciplinary natural science course that all students would take, rather than a series of natural science courses in specific disciplines taken randomly by students. (If this is to be the students' only exploration in the sciences, histories, arts, languages, etc., what do we want them to walk away with from that exploration?)

- We recognize the significance of the Honors Program in nurturing and challenging our finest students. We strongly recommend greater funding and support for the Honors Program to allow for growth in the number of students and in the quality of their scholarship.
- We recommend the creation of a "Scholars Program" to nurture and challenge students who are motivated and of above-average ability but who are not quite qualified or who are not interested in participating in the Honors Program.
- We applaud TCU's investment into international study programs and recommend continued support to allow more of our students to participate in this exceptional learning experience.
- We strongly recommend the continued development and investment into teaching technologies and distance education including the creation of a Center for Instructional Technology to assist faculty in developing the use of technology to enhance current courses and to develop distance learning courses.
- We support the Chancellor's initiative to strengthen the Graduate and Doctorate programs and recommend greater support in both financial aid, stipends and support for research and creative activity.

Furthermore, we believe that an excellent school should have a well thought out first year experience. This time should encourage students to begin their university with a focus on academics and life long learning while being supplemented with various support activities to aid in the transition to the university environment. The Academic Excellence Committee therefore submits the following recommendations concerning the Undergraduate first year experience.

- We recommend the creation of a First Year College where all incoming non-transfer students would invest themselves into a common core of courses and designed experiences that would offer a uniform academic experience and aid the student in the transition to the university environment.
- We highly recommend developing a new advising/mentoring process that begins in the students' first year and continues through their academic experience, possibly with students grouped in "circles of colleagues" with a junior or senior student or alumni as a mentoring leader and a faculty member as an advisor.
- We recommend expanding the students' academic experiences into informal social settings by offering informal academic presentations similar to those in the Honors retreat. These presentations should be designed to simulate thought and discussion, or expand the student's horizons through non-traditional events like plays concerts, art exhibits and be made available throughout the students' academic experience.

Finally, we believe that the faculty is responsible for the creation, maintenance, modification and elimination of academic courses and academic programs. This responsibility includes continuous quality assessments and improvements to ensure that excellence is attained in the academic programs offered by the University. We therefore highly recommend that all programs and courses are reviewed by the faculty to ensure that they are a modern, relevant, and cohesive to the student's educational experience and that each and every faculty member strives to develop and deliver each course as an academically stimulating and challenging experience worthy of good students.

“Excellent schools have an administration that supports faculty, students and the academic mission”

As stated above, we believe that the faculty is responsible for the creation, maintenance, modification and elimination of academic courses and academic programs. This responsibility includes continuous quality assessments and improvements to ensure that excellence is attained in the academic programs offered by the University.

Furthermore, we believe that the administration should support the faculty in this endeavor by providing leadership, advice, and resources for the improvement of the academic programs. It is the responsibility of the administration to support an academic environment in which an intellectual community of learners thrives and flourishes. This includes, but is not limited to, insuring that faculty compensation levels are appropriate for retaining and recruiting outstanding faculty members, providing ample resource support for faculty research/creative activity and development, providing ample resource support for teaching excellence among the faculty, attracting and supporting outstanding students, and promoting academic excellence at every opportunity. The Academic Excellence Committee therefore submits the following recommendations concerning administrative issues.

- We highly recommend that the TCU Board of Trustees mandate that the responsibility for academic programs rests with the faculty.
- We highly recommend that members of the faculty should chair Academic Curriculum Committees.

In regards to the Faculty's role in University governance, we recommend the following:

- We applaud the current opportunities for interaction between the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Provost and recommend continued meetings on a monthly basis to discuss academic matters of mutual interest.
- We concur with the Faculty Governance Committee and recommend a new Senate committee be formed for interaction with vice-chancellors in non-academic areas (i.e., Administrative Services, Advancement, and Campus Life.)
- Finally, we applaud the current opportunities for interaction between members of the Faculty Senate and members of the Board of Trustees and highly recommend continuing and advancing this relationship, to the point where eventually the Chair of the Faculty Senate is asked to join the Board of Trustees with full voting rights.

In regards to the Training and Compensation of Department Chair, we recommend the following:

- We concur with the Faculty Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee and recommend that greater resources and training be provided for department chairs (i.e.: issues and procedures concerning legal matters; financial planning and budget responsibilities; faculty and staff job performance assessment; faculty development; and grievance problems) to ensure that they are successful in executing their tasks.
- Furthermore, we concur and recommend that compensation for department chair should be raised and increased annually in alignment with merit increases.

In regards to facilities and equipment to support academic programs we recommend the following:

- We highly recommend that a program be instituted to upgrade classrooms on the campus over a three to five year period, equipping more classrooms with computer/graphics capabilities, updating furniture, equipment and blackboards as needed, and to maintain older, but useful technology.

Finally, in regards to University visibility, we recommend the following:

- We highly recommend that the University should develop plans for an increased web presence. Regarding academic programs, this implies funding/training to help faculty members develop web pages for themselves and web course pages for their courses.

SUMMATION:

Academic excellence is achieved within the dynamic bond between faculty and student in a learning environment thoroughly supported by the administration. Academic excellence is based on an intricate balance of support and collaboration between faculty, administration and students. Any weakness in any of the four areas: faculty, students, administration and programs; will undermine the effectiveness of the institution to pursue excellence. These recommendations are presented with the understanding that we are actively pursuing one outcome -- an effective and significant educational experience for our students. Excellence must be pursued with thoughtful and reasonable risk-taking, expenditures of energies and monies, and progressive thinking for the benefit of the future.

Academic Excellence Committee 1999 - 2000:

George H. Brown - Chair
Art Busby, Nancy Meadows, Don Nichols, Carol Stephenson, Peggy Watson
Ron Watson, Roger Pfaffenberger, Liaison to the Executive Committee and Chair of the Faculty Senate

**Faculty Senate
Student Relations Committee Report
May 4, 2000**

At the beginning of academic year 1999-2000, the Student Relations Committee (SRC) was given the task of investigating the Greek system and its impact on academics, especially with regard to the issue of timing of rush. During our deliberations, every attempt was made to avoid the emotionality that sometimes accompanies discussions of this issue. We also sought to concentrate on the collection and analysis of empirical data (to the extent possible given the restrictions imposed by limited time and resources) rather than relying on anecdotal information that also seems to be in abundant supply when timing of rush is the topic of discussion. Our overriding concern was to ensure that any recommendation made by the SRC ultimately would be in the best interests of the entire TCU community and in keeping with the mission and goals of TCU. To that end, we examined the question from a variety of perspectives as follows:

- Review of the video tape and written comments from the Faculty Senate/Student Government Association Assembly held on September 28, 1999,
- review of the report submitted by the TCU Ad Hoc Committee on Rush, Bid, and Pledging in November 1989,
- examination of relevant information provided by the office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs,
- survey of a variety of “competitor” institutions,
- survey of all full-time TCU faculty, and
- survey of a random sample of approximately 1000 (20%) full-time undergraduate students.

Not surprisingly, our collective survey findings identified essentially three categories of responses: (1) those who strongly oppose any change in the timing of rush, (2) those who strongly favor delaying rush until sometime in January, and (3) those who have little interest in and/or knowledge about the issue of timing of rush.

Of the 18 “competitor” institutions surveyed, approximately 50% reported rush timing similar to that currently in place at TCU, i.e., at the beginning of fall semester. The remainder of the schools surveyed reported delaying rush to some extent, usually until the end of the fall semester or beginning of spring semester. One school surveyed has recently eliminated all Greek organizations on campus.

The TCU Faculty Survey was sent to 344 full-time faculty and was responded to by 140 individuals (41%). Some of the major findings indicated that over half

(56%) were interested-to-extremely interested in the timing of rush, while the remainder reported being not at all interested-to-somewhat interested. Forty-nine percent of responding faculty believes that sororities and fraternities detract from academic achievement and 52% expressed the opinion that Greek organizations detract from diversity. On the other hand, 58% indicated that sororities and fraternities enhance student retention. Finally, in response to the question of when rush should be held, 64% (including 2% who added the category of “never”) opted for deferment until sometime in January. The Faculty Survey also included a section in which comments were invited. The following examples were chosen as representing the spectrum of responses received:

“The current rush system segregates students before they’ve even gotten started on their college careers. It has a long tradition at TCU but it’s always been a bad idea.”

”With regard to the timing of rush – do this before the start of the semester.”

“As it currently stands, rush interferes with classes at the beginning of the semester. I teach seniors and they miss my class often at the beginning of the fall semester. I don’t care whether they hold rush in the fall or spring, however, it needs to be complete before classes begin.”

“I don’t know enough to respond. I just know that students miss my evening classes the first week of classes in the Fall.”

“My concern with the sorority/fraternity rush system is in their initial timing of when it is to occur. Incoming freshman have so many adjustments to make at the University level that the RUSH agenda would probably be well-suited for them to experience the second semester of their freshman year as opposed to the first semester.”

“I don’t like forced choice questions—I think they have no inherently positive or negative effect on these issues—it all depends on situational factors... I understand that there are good arguments on both sides (fall vs. spring rush).”

“It won’t help much to defer pledging. The first semester of their college experience is when students need a support group.”

“I cannot believe the number of students who have rushed and pledged, who feel that they HAVE to be at Monday meetings before class is out! They will tell me that their sorority DEMANDS that they get there by 5:15

PM, and we have class until 5:20 PM, and they think they MUST be allowed out, early...! This should NOT happen, and even asking it is insulting to professors.”

At the time of this writing, 135 full-time students have responded to the Student Survey. Of those responding, 99 (73%) are female and 92 (68%) are members of a Greek organization. The obvious bias in favor of sorority members in the respondent pool no doubt reflects the heightened interest that would be expected for this group of students. In response to a question dealing with the way in which rush affected academic experience, 78 (63%) students reported that rush neither helped nor harmed their academic experience, while 16 (13%) believed that rush harmed their academic experience. In contrast, 29 (24%) students reported that rush helped their academic experience. In an attempt to determine whether students would participate in rush at times other than at the beginning of Fall semester, the responses were as follows: over the summer before freshman year (38%), 2-3 weeks into the Fall semester (35%), pre-semester in January (39%), and 2-3 weeks into the Spring semester (34%). These data suggest that students would still rush fraternities and sororities if the timing were changed; however, a substantial number of students commented that, at the same time, they were opposed to changing the timing of rush. Again, as in the Faculty Survey, students were given the opportunity to add comments. The following examples are illustrative of the scope of responses received:

“I think it would be better in the spring so freshmen could get to know one another based on personality rather than letters. The people who disagree say they wouldn’t want to have to be fake for the whole semester. My question is – why would you want to be part of something you have to be fake to join in the first place.”

“I think that deferred rush is really a bad thing, because the premise behind it is falacious (sic). I believe it to be a pay me now or pay me later type thing. I felt that part of my whole reason for staying at TCU was because of being in a fraternity and the closeness that I gained from being with a group of guys. Not only did it help me become more involved, but it also motivated me to work harder the next semester, and was able to receive help to pull my grades up.”

“The timing of rush is very important. But a more serious question is whether you are asking if rush actually hurts grades or if pledging does. If you are trying to find a way to push pledging back because it might hurt grades, that is another question. Rush in itself does not help nor hinder a student’s academic performance.”

“I chose not to participate in rush because it was too early. I had plenty of other things going on at this time and rush would’ve been just one more thing to deal with. Also, choosing a greek organization is a big decision and I knew nothing about TCU’s greek life. One week is certainly not enough time to get to know all the frat’s and see which type of people best suit you. In other words, I would have rushed if TCU had a deferred rush system.”

“I feel very strongly that you should leave rush as it is. Being a Greek member I feel that I can speak for the rest of the Greeks in saying that it would be detrimental to all incoming freshmen considering to rush if it was in the Spring. The reasoning being that they would not be themselves the entire fall semester but instead would be trying to impress the prospective fraternities/sororities. It would also place an extra burden on the fraternities and sororities because they would have to be constantly rushing for the fall semester.”

“I did not participate in Rush. I think it’s a silly tradition-I don’t support greek.”

“As a student who’s been involved in several programs that help freshmen, I’ve seen many new students get overly stressed about fall rush, and I’ve even seen a couple transfer when things didn’t turn out like they wanted. It’s my opinion that we should all have the opportunity to be Horned Frogs for a semester before students are given the opportunity to make more informed choices on whether to rush or not. However, I’m concerned that postponing rush would in essence extend it through the entire fall semester.”

From the foregoing, it should be obvious that no clear-cut solution presented itself to the SRC. However, a careful analysis of our findings indicated that much of the case for not deferring rush seems to be based on non-academic issues such as the potential for “dirty rush,” fears that the entire fall semester would be consumed by rush activities, financial penalties to the sororities and fraternities, etc. On the other hand, the case for deferring rush is primarily based on academic concerns in conjunction with what might be called social issues, i.e., students not having time to make informed decisions, the effects on students who are not selected by a Greek organization, etc. In keeping with our original purpose, then, the SRC believes that the total TCU community and TCU’s mission and goals would be best served if rush activities were deferred until after the end of the fall semester, but before the beginning of spring semester in January.

The SRC takes the position that academic activities are not a high priority during rush and that rush is by its nature a distraction from academics. Therefore, rush would be unacceptable at any time during the academic term. Further, the Committee believes that policies and procedures already in place should be enforced to ensure that the focus during the semester remains on academics. Many of the feared negative consequences of deferring rush voiced primarily by members of Greek organizations are actually under the control of the organizations themselves. So-called dirty rush is an activity that can occur only with the complicity of one or more sororities/fraternities.

Based on the foregoing, the members of the SRC would like to submit our recommendations for deferring rush in the form of a motion(s) to the Faculty Senate as follows:

The Faculty Senate will forward a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for consideration and submission to the University Administration that calls for:

1. a rush policy that recognizes the primary academic mission of the University and accordingly restricts all rush activities of Greek organizations to the periods falling between academic semesters and terms when no classes or examinations are scheduled, and
2. a change in the timing of rush that recognizes the primary academic mission of the University and accordingly moves all rush activities of Greek organizations to the period between the end of final examinations in the Fall Semester and the first scheduled classes of the Spring Semester

We would also like to request that this report be forwarded to the Chancellor's Task Force on the Undergraduate Experience which is studying various aspects of sororities and fraternities as part of its mission.

SRC Members:

Bill Ryan, Chair
Pat Bradley
George Low
Pat Paulus *
Melissa Young

* Extenuating circumstances prevented Dr. Paulus from participating in the discussion and preparation of this final report.

**Committee on Committees
Faculty Senate
ANNUAL REPORT 1999-2000**

Members of Committee: Carolyn Spence Cagle (Chair), David Jenkins, Pat Kinkade, Nadia Lahutsky, Dick Rinewalt, and Gloria Solomon. Peggy Bennett served on Committee until her resignation from TCU in March 2000.

Meetings held: 7 (September-April).

Charges/Progress toward Charges

#1: Represent interests of the faculty in the structure, functions, and membership of University committees (standing charge)

- reviewed membership of all University Committees at September 9th meeting; four replacements for vacancies suggested and later approved by Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chancellor
- dialogued with Joseph Petraglia (English) for several months about need for “Committee on Campus Culture,” a group that would focus on producing a “more diverse-thinking, intellectually-simulated, and global-minded student body”; COC decided to not support an additional University Committee for this focus; Dr. Petraglia referred to resources already available on campus, and he later initiated International Film Series, February 2000 with help of several other departments
- appointed new Honors Council Chair and Committee member due to resignation of Chair in October.
- considered two replacements for faculty and student resignations on Traffic Regulations and Appeals Committee in February; Chair of the Committee noted no need for additional members due to work already efficiently assigned
- entertained idea of surveying other similar sized universities about role of Committee on Committees in their Senate structure; based on Executive Committee feedback and faculty commitments on other committees, activity in this area will be recommended for next year (RECOMMENDATION #1)

#2: Review University Committees to determine if (1) existing committees are necessary; (2) their charges, membership, and administrative oversight are appropriate; and, (3) new committees are needed (standing charge)

- assigned each member of the Committee on Committees to serve as liaison to 3-4 University Committees; each member requested feedback from the chairs of Committees served related to committee charges, membership activity, administrative

oversight, and effectiveness and efficiency of committee; in some cases, Committee on Committee member went to actual meetings of groups for which they served as liaison; if liaison member could not attend committee meeting, attempts made to collect minutes from University Committee, although minutes sometimes not available or not freely shared (RECOMMENDATIONS #2, #3)

- based on a proposal from Committee on Committees of 1997-98, recommended to the Faculty Senate that the Undergraduate Admissions Committee name and charge be changed; Faculty Senate approved both recommendations in December; new name and charge to be effective Fall 2000
- recognized through liaison process that the Animal Care and Use and Institutional Safety Committee (a result of merging of several committees 2 years ago) wishes to have separate committees focused on safety, radiation, animal use, and animal care
- drafted a letter to the quasi-judicial committees (Student Conduct and Grievance, Student Organizations, Traffic Regulations and Appeals, and University Court) requesting that each committee's last year and current chair meet to discuss overlap, duplication of efforts, and inefficiency of these committees; letter also requested group to propose ways to better organize the committees to improve distribution of workload of these committees; due to vast amount of University committee work this year, group did not meet; need to request again next year (RECOMMENDATION #4)

#3: *Working jointly with the Executive Committee, nominate candidates for Senate offices with the goal of providing more than one candidate for each position (standing charge)*

- process delayed from original timeline due to complexity involved in determining number of Senators from new structure of Colleges within University
- sought out potential nominees after Senator elections completed mid-April; involved in discussions with Executive Committees about potential nominees for ballot to be placed before Senators May 4

#4: *Nominate the membership of University Committees*

- circulated to all full-time and tenure/tenure-track faculty a University Committee Preference Form on February 11th; forms returned by 120 faculty by February 28th (due date)
- placed University faculty on chosen or appropriate committee based on suggestions in 1998-99 University Committee Guidelines; these tentative decisions are subject to approval by both the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor before

implementation for next year (DRAFT DOCUMENT GIVEN AT SENATE MEETING MAY 4) (RECOMMENDATION #5)

#5: Investigate and recommend ways in which the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee can fulfill its charges more effectively and efficiently (specific charge)

- reviewed Committee's functioning throughout year; liaison from Senate also member of Committee (Gloria Solomon); Committee met 2-3 times with more faculty influence this time than in past years
- need to continue to evaluate ways to make Committee more effective; new Chair of Committee next year may help

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Committee on Committees recommends to the Faculty Senate the following:

#1: A survey be conducted by the Committee on Committees during Fall 2000 to collect data about the functioning and role of a similar committee in universities consistent with TCU in size and philosophical beliefs; this survey would provide ideas for strengthening current roles of the TCU Senate's Committee on Committees

#2: A request be directed to all Chairs and members of University Committees to keep at a minimum a record of their meetings and documentation that addresses actions of the Committee, member representation, effectiveness of Committee, and suggestions for improved functioning of the Committee; these comments would be contained in an Annual Report delivered to the Committee on Committees by June 1 of each academic year.

#3: Continued liaison activity between the Committee on Committees and University Committees should occur to insure communication between these groups; particular attention should be paid to Intercollegiate Athletics and the Evaluation Committees, groups that seemed to experience difficulties in process and outcomes during 1999-2000.

#4: A followup request be made to past and current Chairs of the quasi-judicial University Committees (Student Conduct and Grievance, Student Organizations, Traffic Regulations and Appeals, and University Court) to meet with the appropriate University officials next year in order to propose adjustments to those committees for improved functioning and meeting of established charges.

#5: That the Faculty Senate explore the value of faculty service as a function of the role of University faculty and the relevancy of such service to various ranks within the professorial ranks.

Executive Committee Report to the Faculty Senate May 4, 2000

Faculty Senate Activities and Actions 1999-2000 Academic Year

Executive Committee

1. Met with the Provost and Chancellor in June and July regarding the academic restructuring of the University (splitting AddRan into two units and splitting Fine Arts and Communications into two units). Urged the Chancellor to meet with the faculty in late August to discuss organizational changes with the faculty.

Chancellor held a Faculty Assembly on August 25, 1999 to discuss the academic restructuring of the University.

New structure with two additional units will become effective on June 1, 2000.

2. Met with the Provost and Chancellor in early September to discuss the composition of the four search committees for new deans. Encouraged the Provost and Chancellor to follow the dean search guidelines established by the Faculty Senate on March 3, 1988.

Provost and Chancellor agreed to follow the guidelines. As a result, each search committee was chaired by a faculty member and the majority of the committee members were faculty members, consistent with the March 3, 1988 Senate dean search policy statement.

3. Met with Larry Lauer and Bill Moncrief, Chair of the Marketing Task Force, to discuss process for nominating and recruiting faculty to participate in focus groups on TCU's strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities, as a part of the Planning Commission process.

Senators Donovan and Pfaffenberger arranged and supervised the focus groups which involved 27 faculty participants. A report summarizing the results of the focus group sessions was sent to Larry Lauer for use by Planning Commission task forces.

4. Met with Larry Lauer in October to discuss the faculty representation on the 17 task forces comprising the Planning Commission. Suggestions were made regarding faculty members to be appointed to these task forces.

The Executive Committee recommendations for faculty members to be appointed to the 17 task forces were accepted and implemented with few exceptions.

5. The Executive Committee responded to a request by the Chancellor to recommend a new faculty representative to the WAC and to the NCAA in late October.

The Chancellor appointed Professor Rhonda Hatcher as the NCAA faculty representative on the basis of recommendations made by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

6. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate met with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees during the November Board of Trustees Board meeting. The Chair of the Faculty Senate made a 15 minute presentation to the Academic Affairs Committee on what will be required academically to take TCU to the next level. The content of the presentation was largely based on the work by the Faculty Senate Academic Excellence Committee in addressing its charge to assess the degree of academic excellence at TCU, and to make recommendations for how TCU can move to the next level academically.
7. Met with the Provost in February to discuss the relationship between TCU and Brite Divinity with specific attention given to Faculty Senate participation by Brite Divinity faculty. Currently, there are three Senate seats allocated to Brite, but they have not been filled in two years.

The Provost and the Executive Committee agreed that the Senate Chair should approach the Dean or President of Brite Divinity about TCU Senate participation, perhaps in an ex officio manner. As of May, 2000, this remains a work in progress.

8. In early March, responded to Chancellor Ferrari's request for recommendations for Chief Marshall.

Professor Linda Hughes, one of the faculty members recommended to the Chancellor, was appointed for a three-year term as Chief Marshall on March 27, 2000.

9. In late March, met with Provost Koehler to discuss revising the composition of the University Advisory Committee to reflect the restructuring of academic units effective June 1, 2000.

The Executive Committee recommendation for the revision of University Advisor Committee membership was accepted and implemented by the Provost. The specific recommendation was: (1) Jennifer Watson would serve out her term and next year represent Health Sciences and Human Services; (2) A new representative is needed in the College of Communication; and (3) A new representative is needed in the College of Science and Engineering.

The Executive Committee met monthly with the Provost, and more regularly if needed, to discuss matters of mutual interest.

Senate Sponsored Activities (Assemblies, Meetings, Initiatives)

1. Faculty/Student Assembly held on Tuesday, September 28, 7:30 PM to 9:00 PM, Student Center Ballroom.

An assembly cosponsored by the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association was held on 9/28/99 to discuss the Frog Finder, scheduling of courses during noon on MWF, revising the final exam schedule, and delaying rush until the Spring semester.

Development on the Frog Finder begin late in the Fall semester, and currently is in “beta testing” with an anticipated summer completion date. Deans were to instruct Department Chairs to attempt to schedule fewer sections for the Spring semester for the MWF noon time slot. The SGA passed a resolution in May, 2000 to support changing the final exam schedule. No action on this matter was taken by the Senate. The Student Relations Committee of the Senate recommended in its May 4, 2000 committee report to delay rush until the beginning of the Spring semester.

2. Faculty Assembly on Graduate Education held on December 8, 1999 from 4:00 PM to 5:30 PM in SWR Lecture Hall #3.

The Chair of the Faculty Senate called a Faculty Assembly on graduate programs and graduate education at TCU.

A report on the comments made by faculty members attending the Faculty Assembly was prepared and placed on the Faculty Senate web page. In addition, the report was sent to the Planning Commission Task Force on Graduate Education, chaired by Alan Shepard.

3. Faculty Assembly on The Importance of the Undergraduate Liberal Arts Education Remaining Central to the Academic Mission in Taking TCU to the Next Level, held on Tuesday, May 2, 2000 in SWR Lecture Hall #3 from 4:00 PM to 5:15 PM.

The Chair of the Faculty Senate called a Faculty Assembly on revisiting the UCR and on the academic experience of students during their first two years at TCU.

A report summarizing the comments made on these issues by faculty members attending the Faculty Assembly will be prepared and distributed to the Chancellor, Provost, and other interested individuals. A copy of the report will be placed on the Faculty Senate web page.

4. Meeting with city officials in mid-February to consider ways to improve safety on University Drive.

The Chair of the Faculty Senate and others met with Randy Burkett and Joe Ternus in the Department of Transportation and Public Works to discuss ways in which pedestrian crossings on University Drive as it bisects the campus can be made more safe.

The City of Fort Worth is working on a proposal to improve safety for pedestrians crossing this section of University Drive. Measures under consideration are (1) making this section of University Drive a 20 mpg school zone, (2) not permitting left turns onto University Drive along the section that bisects campus, and (3) extending medians to better protect pedestrians as they cross University Drive.

Senate Meeting Activities and Actions

1. May 6, 1999 meeting

- a. The Senate motion to support a resolution from the SGA for the development of the “Frog Finder” was approved. The Frog Finder would permit students to access information about specific courses (e.g., syllabus, expectations, grading system) on the registrar’s course listing for advance registration.

A prototype of the Frog Finder was developed in January 2000 for beta testing. Progress on its development was slowed in February and March due to the need to upgrade the PeopleSoft software system and the requirement that faculty members must be issued accounts and passwords to protect the content placed on Frog Finder. Work will continue on Frog Finder in May, 2000.

- b. Committee reports were presented by: (1) the Committee on Committees; (2) the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee; (3) the Student Relations Committee; and (4) the Executive Committee.

2. September 2, 1999 meeting

- a. Executive briefings were presented by: (1) Bob Seal, University Librarian; and (2) Cornell Thomas, Special Assistant to the Chancellor.
- b. Senator Fort introduced a motion to change the name of freshman seminars to first-year seminars.

After some discussion, the motion was tabled.

- c. Chancellor Ferrari discussed the possibility of TCU joining Conference USA.

3. October 7, 1999 meeting

- a. Senator Fort's motion was brought back to the table.

The motion to change the name of freshman seminars to first-year seminars was approved. This information was sent to the Provost for action.

- b. The following motion was introduced by Senator Becker: That (1) the Chair-elect of the Staff Assembly be appointed Co-Chair of the Retirement, Insurance, and Benefits (RIB) Committee; and (2) the Chair of the Staff Assembly Policy Review Committee also be added as a member of the RIB Committee.

The motion was adopted by the Senate. In the April 2000 Senate meeting, at the request of the Staff Assembly Executive Committee, a motion to change (1) allowing for the Co-Chair to be a member of the Staff Assembly, not necessarily the Chair-elect, and for the term of the Co-Chair to be five years, was approved by the Senate. These changes will be implemented beginning June 1, 2000.

- c. Executive briefings were presented by: (1) Dr. Jim Atwood, who discussed admissions policies and procedures; (2) Larry Lauer, who discussed the charges for the Planning Commission Task Forces; and (3) Will Stalworth, who discussed building and renovation plans for classrooms and offices.

3. November 4, 1999 meeting

- a. Progress reports were heard from the Academic Excellence Committee, the Faculty Governance Committee, the Student Relations Committee, the Promotion, Tenure and Grievance Committee, and the Budget and Finance Committee.
- b. The Faculty Senate policy for awarding honorary degrees was discussed.
- c. Chancellor Ferrari reported on the response to the Planning Commission initiative, on his recommendation to the Board of Trustees to meet three times per year, rather than twice per year, and on other matters.

4. December 2, 1999 meeting

- a. A motion to change the name of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to the Undergraduate Admissions and Retention Committee, and to change the charge of the Committee to: "Annually reviews undergraduate admission, enrollment, and retention statistics. Facilitates communications 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 and retention, including annual and strategic goals,” was approved.

This change will be placed in the Faculty and University Staff Handbook for the 2000-2001 academic year.

- b. A motion to approve modifications to the Policy and Procedures for Solicitation of Recommendations for Persons to Receive Honorary Degrees was approved.

The revised policy statement, dated December 2, 1999, became operative as of that date and was used for the process of recommending persons to receive honorary degrees for the 1999-2000 academic year.

- c. Chancellor Ferrari reported on the November meeting of the Board of Trustees.

5. February 3, 2000 meeting

- a. A motion was introduced to change the Faculty Senate Bylaws to bring the Bylaws into conformity to the new University structure of academic units.

Motion was tabled to provide additional time for the Executive Committee to insure that the language describing the four new academic units was correct and accurately reflected the changes in the restructuring of academic units.

- b. A resolution introduced by Senator Bobich to improve pedestrian safety on University Drive was introduced and adopted.

The Chair of the Faculty Senate met with Fort Worth City officials during the second week of February. The City of Fort Worth is preparing a proposal to improve pedestrian safety along the section of University Drive that bisects campus and expects to have the proposal ready for discussion by May 2000.

- d. Vice Chancellor Bivin discussed the changes in the TCU health care plan.
- e. Chancellor Ferrari reported on the January meeting with the Board of Trustees.
- f. The Senate in Executive Session nominated two individuals for honorary degrees.

The two individuals nominated for honorary degrees were approved by the Board of Trustees at its March meeting. Provided the individuals agree to accepting honorary degrees, the degrees will be awarded at the May 2001 commencement.

6. March 2, 2000 meeting

- a. The following motion was introduced to change the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate concerning the allocation of Senate positions to academic units:
ARTICLE II. THE FACULTY SENATE

Section 2. Membership and Elections

A. Members representing the several academic units comprising TCU. These academic units are: Addran College of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Science and Engineering, M.J. Neeley School of Business, College of Health Sciences and Human Services, College of Fine Arts, College of Communication, and School of Education. Each academic unit is allocated one member in the Faculty Senate for every eleven full-time members in that unit, with an additional seat allocated when there are six or more full-time faculty beyond multiples of eleven. No academic unit, or division of Addran College of Humanities and Social Sciences, shall be allocated fewer than three members, with at least one member elected at each regular interval.

This motion was approved and the appropriate change in the Faculty and University Staff Handbook for the 2000-2001 academic year will be made.

- b. The Finance and Budget Committee report was presented by Senator Sacken, Chair of the Committee.
- c. Mike Scott gave an executive briefing on the impact of the Hopwood decision on decisions concerning allocations of financial aid to TCU students.
- d. Senator Moore introduced a motion to make the Chief Marshall position a fixed four year term. The motion passed.

The appointment of Linda Hughes as Chief Marshall is for a four-year term, consistent with the passage of this motion.

7. April 6, 2000 meeting

- a. Report from the Faculty Governance Committee, presented by Senator Clayton Brown, Committee Chair

The Committee made three recommendations:

1. To charge the Senate Student Relations Committee with meeting each semester with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and to report at the end of the semester its activities in this regard.

The motion was approved. This change in the Student Relations Committee standing charge will be made effective with the 2000-2001 academic year.

2. To create additional Faculty Senate committees to meet with the other VC's on a regular basis.

The motion was tabled until the May Senate meeting due to a belief that perhaps one additional committee would be sufficient to meet with the VC's in Advancement, Marketing, and Administrative Services.

3. The Faculty Senate should pass a resolution supporting the current relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees.

The motion was tabled to allow the Executive Committee additional time to consider whether or not a follow-up meeting with the Board of Trustees after each Board meeting is needed.

- b. Report from the Promotion, Tenure and Grievance Committee, presented by Senator Fortenberry, Committee Chair. The recommendations made by the PTG committee led to considerable discussion which resulted in the following motion introduced by Senator Fort: The Senate ask the administration to entertain consideration of these recommendations. This motion passed.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will work with the Provost in exploring the feasibility of implementing the recommendations made by the PTG Committee in its report.

- c. The following motion was introduced by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate:

“That (1) the Staff Assembly Committee on Committees elect for a five-year term the Co-chair of the Retirement, Insurance and Benefits Committee with the current faculty Co-chair; and (2) the Chair of the Staff Assembly Policy Review Committee also be added as a member of the RIB Committee.”

This motion was approved.

The Staff Assembly incorporated these changes into its Bylaws at its May meeting.

- d. Chancellor Ferrari reported on the March Board of Trustees meeting.

8. May 4, 2000 meeting

- a. Committee reports were made by the chairs of the Academic Excellence Committee, the Student Relations Committee, and the Committee on Committees.
- b. Motions were introduced from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate regarding recommendations (2) and (3) made by the Faculty Governance Committee at the April 2000 Senate meeting.
- c. New senators for the 2000-2001 academic year were introduced.
- d. Elections were held for new officers.