TCU Faculty Senate Meeting
3 November 2011
3:30 – 5:00 PM
The Chambers, Brown-Lupton University Union, Room 3004

MINUTES

Senators Present

Bob Akin, Onofrio Annunziata, Arnie Barkman, David Bedford, Martin Blessinger, Jon Burgess, atherine Coleman, Richard Estes, Lynn Flahive, Greg Friedman, Sarah Fuentes, Misha Galaganov, Jeffrey Geider, Tracy Hanna, Bi Ying Hu, Ted Legatski, Carrie Leverenz, Dianna McFarland, Thomas Moeller, Johnny Nhan, Ed McNertney, Linda Moore, Joddy Murray, Hylda Nugent, Steve Palko, Jan Quesada, Ranga Ramasesh, David Sandell, Michael Sawey, Marie Schein, Krista Scott, Alan Shorter, R. Eric Simpson, Michael Skinner, Gloria Solomon, Gregory Stephens, Angela L. Thompson, David Vanderwerken,
Stephen Weis, Jo Nell Wells, Dan Williams, Scott Williams, Barbara Wood

Senators Excused

Rebecca Dority, Dianne Hawley, Stathis Michaelides, Magnus Rittby, Paul Schrodt, Loren Spice, Michael Strausz, Maggie Thomas

Senators Absent

Ronald Anderson, San-ky Kim, Suzie Lockwood, Chris Sawyer

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Chair Dan Williams at 3:33 PM.

Welcomed Guests

Chair Williams welcomed the following guests: Chancellor Victor Boschini, Provost Nowell Donovan, Vice Chancellor Kathy Cavins-Tull , Chief Technology Officer Bryan Lucas, Campus Police Chief Steve McGee, Dr. Judy Groulx (Chair of the University Evaluation Committee), *Skiff* Reporter Travis Puckett, Assistant Provost Catherine Wehlburg, Assistant Director of Inclusiveness and Intercultural Services April Brown, and SGA Representatives Barrington Hwang and Jennifer Villyard.

Approval of Minutes of October 6, 2011

The minutes were approved as amended.

Comment

Chair Dan Williams stated that there would be adjustments in the order of the agenda to accommodate guests' schedules and other commitments.

Old Business

1. Teaching Evaluation Document Update

Williams reminded the faculty that the Senate had formally endorsed the teaching document at the May, 2011, Faculty Senate meeting. Since then, the document has been going back and forth between Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) and the Provost. Some slight changes are currently being discussed. Once we are all satisfied with the language, the document will be sent out to all deans and chairs as a statement of the Faculty Senate recommendations for Faculty Teaching Evaluation.

2. Plus/Minus System Update

The SGA has sent a resolution to the Faculty Senate asking that we review the system. In consultation with the Provost, the FSEC recommended that an *ad hoc* committee be created to do a review of the system that would 1) talk to students to determine their concerns, 2) poll faculty, and 3)look at the plus/minus system to see how effective it has been over the past four or five years. The committee will consist of three faculty members (David Grant, Andy Fort, and Greg Friedman) and two students (yet to be determined).

New Business

1. Presentation by April Brown, Assistant Director, Inclusiveness and Intercultural Affairs, regarding veterans on campus

After thanking the Senate for the opportunity to speak, April Brown provided background about the veteran task force and the steps that were taken to identify veterans on campus. After discussing ramifications of the GI Bill, Brown spoke of the work the task force has done to support veterans coming from a highly structured environment and trying adjusting to campus life. Her focus then shifted to the challenges that many veterans face, ranging from PTSD to physical challenges. She also wanted the Senate to note that veterans have the extraordinarily high suicide success rate of 25%. She asked the faculty for assistance in helping veterans find the appropriate campus resources and support systems. Faculty should be aware that there is a comprehensive Veteran Services Task Force website (http://www.veteransservices.tcu.edu). Brown asked the Senate to let students know this information. She concluded by outlining the upcoming events on campus that she hoped would "help veterans see you in a different light."

2. Presentation by Steve McGee, Chief of Campus Police (campus security update)

Police Chief Steve McGee introduced himself as a 1977 graduate of TCU and former officer with the Fort Worth Police Department. He gave a brief overview of TCU's police force: three-quarters of TCU's officers are retired Fort Worth police officers; we have one former swat commander, four former commanders, five former sergeants, several detectives, and a crime scene officer.

Referencing April Brown's comments about veteran suicide rates, he stated that most students who attempt suicide do not live on campus and that their only real contact with TCU is the faculty. He asked the TCU community to be cognizant of behavior and, when appropriate, contact Campus Life and the Counseling Center.

McGee then stated that, in terms of security issues and crime, the biggest problem on campus is theft, especially of laptops, i-Phones, and i-Pads. Burglary of motor vehicles has been reduced to a misdemeanor with little punishment; burglars know it. McGee reminded the Senate that members of the TCU community should not to leave anything in their cars, not even computer bags. People will break the windows just to check them out. He recounted there has even been theft of a gym bag.

Senator McFarland asked if the thefts were by students or non-students. McGee responded that they really don't know, but in one incident, it was discovered that the same individuals had stolen from TCU, UNT, SMU, and UTA. Following another question from Senator Friedman, McGee suggested that the safest place to keep valuables (if they must be in your car) is in the trunk. He also stated, "If you see anybody suspicious in your building, please call us … don't take anything for granted … these people try to blend in."

McGee also addressed issues of sexual assault, stating that none had been reported recently. If these crimes do occur, the Crime Alert system will be used to inform the campus community. Chair Dan Williams asked what percentage of these crimes has had alcohol involved. McGee's response: "In terms of assault, 100%." He added that, on a personal note, he wished that we had a lot of classes on Friday because Thursday is a big part night." When asked who is on the alert system, he responded "pretty close to every student, but faculty are voluntary. We are working to have internal, external, email, and text notification."

Senator Akins thanked McGee for the job he is doing, stating that TCU is a safe place and that we have a good police presence on campus. Senator Barkman brought up the issue of faculty not having the ability to lock classrooms in the event of an incident. McGee's response: there are pros and cons to this. If a student is alone in a classroom and it can be locked, help may not be able to get to that student.

3. **Presentation by Bryan Lucas, Chief Technology Officer (campus wireless capacity issues)**

After thanking the Senate for the opportunity to speak, Bryan Lucas acknowledged that the primary reason he was asked to appear was to address the issue of personal wireless devices. Before jumping into that, Lucas wanted people to know that there is a technology master plan process going on right now and that eventually the Senate will be informed by either Chairman Dan Williams or Secretary Alan Shorter. The Senate's input, as well as that of other faculty, will be consolidated into the plan.

In terms of personal devices, Lucas is looking at different options to solve the issue of access. The first option is to build a larger "guest" network on campus. AT&T has also been approached about the possibility of outsourcing it. There are cost implications to both of those options and that is currently being examined. Lucas stated that a lot of that work has already been done with TCU administration.

For the sake of the time constraints, Lucas asked to delay questions until the end of his presentation so that he could cover all the material he wished to present. He proceeded to share some of the concerns about internet access and the rationale behind the current policies. Stating that he did not see any of the current concerns as insurmountable, he began by addressing network capacity, stating that people have an assumption and expectation they will have internet access on campus and the number of people as trying to use the guest network continues to increase. Using a PowerPoint presentation, Lucas proceeded to talk about issues of stability, shared infrastructure, security issues and abuse. Money can address some of the challenges, he stated, but not all of them. One concern about faculty

devices is that faculty members have access to much more sensitive material than students do, especially through PeopleSoft. If faculty credentials get compromised, others can get access to that same sensitive information.

In addition to dealing with "bugs" that may try to infiltrate TCU's structure, there are security issues, copyright issues, and a responsibility to respond to illegal activity. Citing an easily-obtainable computer program that pulls out usernames and passwords, Lucas stated that TCU feels the obligation to be secure when a personal device is used through the campus portal for banking and other sensitive activities. Other HR, legal "discovery," and preservation notice issues also arise from full access. Additionally complicating the situation is the fact that some legal issues are still unclear.

Another challenge that arises is the tech support needed with an increased number of devices being added to the network. Lucas said that perhaps TCU would not *have* to worry about support for them, but if the devices are being used for teaching, he is afraid *not* to have tech support available. Lucas hears that the tech support at TCU is good, but "it just comes too slow." Adding iPads, iPhones, smartphones, and additional laptops, reconfiguring email and so forth, opens up a support challenge.

Lucas stated a final item, not as a concern, but an identification of a trend: "the consumerization of IT." More and more people own personal devices and bring them to the workplace, devices that are not TCU-provisioned. People expect to use their own devices to do their job. It's a difficult trend. There are some answers on how to deal with this on the back end and with other concerns, but Lucas is not sure that this is something that can be ignored anymore. It also cannot be assumed that the alternatives currently in place are adequate. The thought used to be that TCU provides classrooms with computers and faculty with laptops, and that should meet the need. Lucas provided other examples of presumptions that are being challenged, ultimately underscoring the point of "the consumerization of IT."

In summation, Lucas stated that the budget argument has been put together and they are trying to get the funding to make access happen for the faculty. Lucas continued that what he needed from the Faculty Senate, and included in the minutes, was help understanding the demand, the rationale, and the benefits faculty would have or realize if personal devices were allowed on the TCU network.

Senator Legatski responded by bringing up the fact that he uses a lot of video clips in class. He has to do this work at home because he has purchased the software and the license, and none of these programs are on his TCU office computer. This means that he has to do the work at home in the evening when it could actually be done during the workday in his office. Using a personal computer at work would be much more convenient.

Senator Shorter gave an example of needing to have access to CDs, DVDs, videotape, Internet, and PowerPoint presentations all in the same class period. He does not imbed material into the PowerPoints because it changes frequently. Having to go back to a single computer with a single screen really slows the process of integrating all the material in the classroom.

Senator Skinner spoke of the unique situation in the Department of Theatre – that computers are used to run the sound programs for the productions and the theatre light and sound boards are all computer controlled. The software must be continually updated and those computers do not have Internet connection. When laptops with Wi-Fi aren't allowed, this requires going all the way back to their offices to download updates, then transfer them, then bringing them back into the theatre and uploading them

onto the boards. It would be very nice to be able to download it off the Internet onto a laptop and put it directly into the boards.

Senator Shorter also spoke about the "paperless process" used in faculty searches. As all the material submitted by a candidate is to be referred to online, it is very difficult (especially given the Greentree software) to compare any two documents quickly and easily relying on a single computer in a smart classroom. Individual laptops could be far more efficient in this process.

Other comments were made about using various classroom computers that don't always work the same. It becomes difficult when juggling audio, video, and other formats in front of 180 students. It's difficult to ask them just to wait. Senator Palko said that in the field of educational computing, things are really exploding and Internet-driven. In planning for the future, we really do need this Internet access. If we don't have it, we are keeping new and innovative technologies out of the classroom.

Senator Murray stated that he teaches classes that not only use technology, they actually produce technology that students make. When one is asking students to consider the writing and design processes of the newest kinds of technology, often you need to use that technology. There are pedagogical reasons to have access.

In summation, Bryan Lucas stated that there is a cost with all of this and he wanted to get into the minutes the Senate's priority of this issue. In the budgeting process, solutions compete for funding. Is the faculty willing to give up other things in the upcoming budget cycle to address faculty Internet access? When asked what kind of money was needed, Lucas said, "In the range of $100,000 to $120,000." Lucas conceded that it is hard to say what the tradeoffs would be without knowing specifically what wouldn't be funded – but determining those tradeoffs will be a struggle.

Chair Williams thanked Bryan Lucas for his presentation and called on Senator Legatski to bring forward the resolution put forward by SGA.

4. **Presentation by Professor Ted Legatski, Chair of the Student Relations Committee (wireless resolution)**

Senator Legatski began by stating that the Student Relations Committee is charged with being the liaison between the Faculty Senate and student government (and students in general). Consistent across meetings with both the past and current presidents of SGA have been concerns about access to computers, particularly that our system appears to be PC-centric and Mac users are put at a significant disadvantage.   A few weeks ago Senator Legatski received a very supportive letter from the Vice President of Internal Affairs for SGA acknowledging that Bryan Lucas and other IT people are working on this issue, but wondering if there any way the faculty could get on board with this, too. Legatski had spoken with Chair Williams and the Student Relations Committee about it and presented a resolution from SGA (distributed with the agenda for this meeting) to the Faculty Senate. The bottom line, Legatski explained, is that it asks the Faculty Senate to support the resolution addressing concerns about reliable student access to TCU networks, access by TCU faculty and support staff to the Internet (as well as IT support), and equal treatment for Mac and PC users. It urges the Faculty Senate to make this a very high priority. This is not adversarial in any way, Legatski stated, but expresses the position that this is a high priority for students and ought to be a high priority for faculty, even if it isn't a high priority for faculty personally.

Legatski then asked for questions. Bryan Lucas stated that he would love an opportunity to address the Student Relations Committee and give an update on where they are on those issues.

On behalf of the Student Relations Committee, Legatski moved for the adoption of the SGA resolution. The motion was seconded. With no further discussion, the resolution was unanimously and formally adopted.

5. **Presentation by Professor Judy Groulx, Chair of the University Evaluation Committee (eSPOT update)**

Prof. Groulx announced that the University Evaluation Committee has found better software for the administration of SPOTs. They are about to try a simulation of the new software and could use faculty volunteers to pretend that they are students. The new software, Groulx stated, will allow student anonymity, be compatible with PeopleSoft, and provide more options for feedback than the current software. Email Catherine Wehlburg if you wish to be involved in the simulation.

A pilot was run this past summer. Everyone teaching summer classes tried online administration of SPOTs. There were some successes. Other individuals were not as happy with it. However, Groulx stated, it did show that the system can work and that it didn't have the bugs that appeared in the 2007 administration of online SPOTs. A lot depends on whether the faculty member and students work hard to get high student response.

Some faculty members have also tried the midterm option. Groulx asked the Senators who had tried it for their response. Feedback was mixed. For one senator, it didn't work and none of his students received it. Senator Friedman said that his worked well and he obtained good feedback.

Paper spots will still be distributed, although some departments have elected to try using the electronic version. It is now up to the faculty and students to work together to get a good response rate.

Groulx continue by informing the Senate that the committee has been working on the instrument itself. She pointed out that they are trying to get the SPOTs to do two things at once, but it isn't always good thing to have an instrument do both: "to have the SPOTs work for summative, bottom-line, high-stakes decision making at the same time as we are also trying to use them to gain coaching and … informal feedback from our students on how to improve our instruction." She stated that she was pleased that there is the option to write one's own items for some of the formative purposes, but that there were also items one can feel safe to use in these other summative decisions.

Stakeholders all have different concerns, some similar, some conflicting. Students, Groulx put forth, need to be anonymous and cited anecdotal evidence of students who have experienced retaliation for their responses. Students also might not understand all the things that might occur as a result of SPOTs results. Faculty, meanwhile, are worried about students not responding (or responding thoughtfully) and that only certain sub-populations of students respond (making it a biased survey). There are also concerns about the content of the survey, whether it is informative and fair, the way in which this information is used by decision makers, and the shortcomings ("supposedly") of student perceptions as indicators of teaching quality. Groulx stated, "Who else can tell us about our teaching better than our students … really? But it is not a validated device that is an absolute evaluation instrument." She continued by stating that administrators need to find out what's going on between students and instructors in the classroom.

Senator Stephens stated that he thought that there are people who can tell us better about our teaching than students – our colleagues. The big issue he sees, and has seen, is construct validity, to which Groulx agreed. He continued by saying that this is a survey and if the measurement testing isn't done, there are concerns. Groulx stated that the new instrument is trying to address some of those concerns and a motivating factor for the statistical testing they are currently pursuing.

According to Groulx, the concerns of the faculty have been put into a grid with a) the concern, b) what the committee has done to address that concern, and c) what remains to be done. This information has been forwarded to Provost Donovan who has already responded to her committee.

Citing the Faculty Senate's concern of instances when SPOTs were 100% of an instructor's evaluation, the resulting Evaluation of Teaching Document that was endorsed by the Senate, and other concerns voiced in preparation of that document, there has been a session with the department chairs about interpreting statistics. Addressing additional concerns, Groulx stated that once we begin to use an online system, we can begin to test the reliability. In response to Senator Bedford's question regarding how the validity and reliability will be established and his comment regarding educating people that this is ordinal data, Groulx responded that that is what they tried to do in the chairs' meeting. Senator Friedman stated that understanding was mixed and that this is an ongoing process.

Dr. Groulx stress that what gets students to respond to online SPOTs is the request from the faculty member. She also urged people with concerns about online SPOTs not to make them a self-fulfilling prophesy. If the faculty doesn't seem to care, students pick up on it.

Groulx's final point was regarding response rates. Faculty members that decide to move SPOTs online need to be reassured that their chairs take response rates into consideration. She also stressed that we will need to work with SGA in any way we can to create a culture that embraces online SPOTs.

Senator Friedman, though not officially on Groulx's committee, stated that he is on the Academic Excellence Committee and has been involved in this process. He is willing to field questions that individual senators may have.

6. **Presentation by Professor Ed McNertney, Director of the Core (Writing Committee Charter)**

Referencing his last appearance before the Faculty Senate, Professor Ed McNertney stated that he had gone through the procedure for a writing committee charter and that it was now time to formally constitute the committee. McNertney moved that the Writing Committee Charter (distributed with the agenda for this meeting) be officially adopted. The motion was seconded.

Senator Moore asked how this was different from what was current practice. McNertney said that there really was nothing different, that the Senate would just be "constituting this." There had been a committee, but it turned into a committee that vetted courses; however, it wasn't ever officially constituted.

When asked by Senator Murray why this needed to a Senate committee, McNertney stated that since the faculty "owns the core curriculum," it makes the most sense to house it in the Senate.

After a short discussion, the motion was voted upon and passed. The Writing Committee Charter was formally adopted.

7. **Presentation by Professor Linda Moore, from the Faculty Governance Committee (PPP document and Inclusivity resolution)**

As the allotted time for the Faculty Senate meeting was drawing quickly to a close, Prof. Linda Moore offered to give her presentation at the December meeting. The offer was accepted by Chair Dan Williams.

Announcements

Williams reminded the Senate **that the December Faculty Senate meeting will be held in the Board Room of the Kelly Center.** There will be refreshments, so Senators and guests should feel free to come early and enjoy.

Williams also stated that Provost Donovan wishes to present the academic master plan to the Faculty Senate and that will happen at a later date.

An item placed on the Open Forum list asked the question: "Who owns faculty work? " It was Williams' opinion that this was an important question and should be upgraded to an agenda item for a future Faculty Senate meeting.

There was a motion to adjourn; it was seconded. Following a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.