

Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
4 October, 2001

Members present: Charles Becker, Joe Bobich, George Brown, Melissa Burns, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Spence-Cagle, Nowell Donovan, Sharon Fairchild, Lynn Flahive, Ron Flowers, Andy Fort, Pam Frable, Gregg Franzwa, Rob Garnett, Ellen Garrison, Phil Hadlock, Sanoa Hensley, Jennifer Higa, Paul King, Ed Kolesar, Derek Kompare, George Low, Joan McGettigan, Don Nichols, Dick Rinewalt, Mike Sacken, Gene Smith, Elizabeth Taylor, Jeffrey Todd, Bill Vanderhoof, Peggy Watson, Ron Watson, Ralph Woodward, Melissa Young.

Members absent: Ron Burns, Thad Duhigg, Sally Fortenberry, Nancy Meadows, Magnus Rittby.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Carolyn Spence-Cagle at 3:32 p.m.

The minutes for the September meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as circulated.

New Business

Chair Cagle asked if the members would mind if the published agenda was reordered so that a brief presentation on the United Way Campaign could be given. The reordering was approved.

United Way Presentation

Dennis and Mary commented that because of the 9/11/01 disaster there will most likely be economic problems for many individuals and employers for the next few quarters. United Way is now under pressure because of reduced giving. Senators were asked to keep this in mind when considering giving. The Senate was asked to remember that United Way also supports organizations that are here all the time. These include, but are not limited to, Big Brother and Big Sisters, Disaster Relief and Boys and Girls Clubs. The Campus Campaign begins Monday, October 8th. This year eDonations online are supported. Last year there was 57% TCU participation resulting in \$104K in contributions. This year we hope to increase participation to 60% and our giving a total amount of \$108K.

Academic Dishonesty and Discipline

The Chair noted that, in light of the reformulation of the Quasi Judicial committee reorganization involved concerns about academic dishonesty on campus. Thus, she has invited Vice Chancellor Don Mills and Mike Russel (Dean of Campus Life) to speak to the senate on this issue. She noted that when their presentation was completed, the Faculty Senate would move into a discussion of the *ad hoc* committee motions.

VC Mills (Vice Chancellor for Student affairs) noted that in his office there have long been discussions on discipline. Interest in academic integrity issues is growing at TCU and across the country. Duke's Center of Academic Integrity compiled national data that clearly show that student cheating is on the rise. The study indicates students learn how to cheat in high school. The Internet has made it more difficult to ascertain what cheating is occurring.

VC Mill's concern is two-fold:

- 1) Most students think they cheat only if they copy from someone else on a test and they don't think of plagiarism and help as cheating. TCU needs to clearly make our expectations known in these areas.
- 2) Faculty member responses to cheating are wildly inconsistent. At TCU faculty members make the decision about what to do in a case of cheating. Responses can range from nothing being done to having a student leave the course. Once a decision is made, the student can appeal. The difficulty comes when Faculty Member A gives an F and Faculty Member B just says please don't do it again.

VC Mills has two suggestions: -

- 1) TCU should have a significant campus-wide discussion about academic integrity and cheating. What do the faculty mean when we talk about academic integrity and why is it important? Philosophical issues evident to faculty are not obvious to students. The Faculty need to share their values with the students.
- 2) TCU should spend some time evaluating the whole issue of adjudication or discipline related to academic dishonesty. TCU should have some consistency across campus in this evaluation.

This discussion is part of a larger question about the Student Bill of Rights and Quasi-Judicial committees (QJCs). The QJCs were set up to function as policy and discipline committees. Over the years two things are evident – the QJCs don't do much work and they run into problems because the system asks policy makers to also serve as judges and juries. VC Mill's view is that we can do some consolidation and constrain the committee job to be policy makers and overseers. The Committee should be provided data to evoke insight to make policy recommendations. In terms of discipline hearings, the VC's recommendations are that we have a panel of approximately 25 trained faculty, staff and students trained so that when a student faces needed discipline a panel of 3 to 4 trained people is convened to render a decision. With this procedure the student has a fair hearing that operates more along the lines of separation of legislative and judicial branches. Most current discipline is handled along mediation lines – The Dean of Campus Life talks to students about what they did. When there is a more serious problem, such as sexual assault, TCU must have a trained panel that knows how to hear such a case.

Senator Sacken noted that if we wanted a centralized model the same people who make up policy could be judges.

Senator Melissa Burns asked how the model mentioned above works?

VC Mills said this only works if a student wishes to appeal to a judicial body.

Senator Brown asked if TCU had any records of past actions on the part of faculty or hearing panels. The Senate was told that the records aren't complete. Such records may be letters about discipline issues sent by a faculty member to Campus Life. Senator Sacken and VC Mills noted that letters are not required from faculty members and faculty usually do not call about dishonesty because they don't know who to call. Problems aren't identified, records are not kept up to date and a pattern of student offences cannot be identified.

Senator Woodward said that dealing with cheating incidents should not be responsibility of instructors, who should only gather evidence. All cases should go before a board and should be removed from the instructor's hands.

Senator Bobich noted that his understanding was that proposed changes to the QJDs grew out of problem in getting faculty members to serve on committees. This is why several committees were being consolidated. He wished to know how the creation of the proposed new committee and hearing panels to address academic dishonesty would deal with that problem.

VC Mills said that Faculty only want to serve if they are useful. He thinks enough faculty and staff are interested in student issues that would be addressed in a new QJC structure.

Senator Flahive noted that any motions coming from the summer's *ad hoc* committee might need to be amended, since there is no statement of staff involvement. However, the general senate consensus was that we don't have to reformulate the motion.

Senator Rinewalt noted concerns about a new academic dishonesty hearing panel might not work. He is opposed to taking determination of dishonesty out of individual faculty member's hands and giving it to a panel to decide whether a student is guilty of such an offence. Senator Rinewalt told of massive cheating in Computer Science years ago.

VC Mills notes we still do not know about the level of academic dishonesty on campus. He has had conversations with juniors and they did not share our value systems and definition of academic dishonesty. The topic needs to be brought out in the open and students, faculty and staff need to understand the definition of academic integrity.

Senator Nichols said that campus-wide discussion is important. Students need to understand this and it has nothing to do with the QJC. We need to know the scope of dishonesty and how consistent communication is established. He doesn't see that a committee is an answer to this problem.

VC Mills noted that a hearing panel is not a committee. All they do is hear and judge the case. They do not do set policy or generate reports. They would function in very difficult discipline cases, especially sexual assault, where trained people are required. He said that TCU is mandated by the law to have a disciplinary hearing.

Senator Becker agreed with Senator Rinewalt that there is much cheating.

VC Mills noted that the potential for lawsuits is high but that the potential for the University loosing such suits is low if faculty member is fair.

Senator Sacken noted that he has had an opportunity to be involved in hearings across all categories. He says that the Faculty's ability to perform procedural justice is not good. Hearing bodies protect us as an institution. It is critical to understand that Faculty would be covered under the University umbrella policy for litigation if they served as part of a hearing panel.

The VC said that faculty should not step back from their traditional role. They should challenge students to do their best work and remind them of the importance of academic integrity.

Senator Donovan supported the notion that cheating comes out of high schools. He suggested, as an initial start when a students arrives, that we should give them a document or CD or something that would inform them of our expected academic standards. Students should know what we think academic integrity is. He proposed the formulation of a committee made from the various colleges that would define academic integrity for the students. Faculty also need to spell out the consequences of violating academic integrity policies.

Senator Becker followed up on Senator Donovan's discussion. He suggested that students sign a statement they have been informed about academic integrity.

Old Business

Senator Flahive recommended deleting the discussion on academic dishonesty from printed motion #1. This issue has been placed under the charge of the Academic Excellence Committee this year

Senator King asked how many members would serve on a panel. We were told that the number would probably be 3 to 5. He then asked if anyone had any idea of the number of cases that would be heard each year. Mike Russel said he was not really sure, but he thinks 3 to 4 cases a year. He asked if this changed the administrative process any way. Senator Flahive and Mike Russel said this is nonacademic so it doesn't involve department level issues. Also still have student bill of rights.

Senator Brown asked what kinds of cases would be involved. Mike Russel said this would include cases such as fraternity hazing, sexual assault and assault.

Motion 1 - Passed unanimously

Motion 2 - Passed unanimously

TP&G Discussion

Senator Franzwa presented Appendix B of the TP&G report. This is text on revisions to the TCU Vitae to include additional teaching information (see Appendix B of the TP&G report of 5/8/01)

Senator Franzwa noted that information for evaluation of teaching varies widely. Some chairs require detailed evaluation while others do not. Therefore, it can be very difficult to compare different cases even in same department. The evaluation of teaching is often up to the discretion of a Chair who may not address this area at all. This is a problem since different standards are being applied.

The vita form used for T&P and teaching and research awards is important in considering university level teaching awards and the standard TCU vita contains little reference to teaching. The TP&G Committee meant to inject a set of issues about teaching that will turn up in T&P cases, seeking uniformity of information from candidates about teaching performance. That is the whole point of this discussion, according to Senator Franzwa.

The Committee has tried to devise measures of teaching. Senator Franzwa says there are many ways to measure teaching. For example, in the current vitae there is no statement about the number of classes and the number of students per class. TP&G proposes to add (item 11 of the TP&G report) a listing of courses taught and the number of students and the number of credit hours. They would also record whether a course was off campus or internet. The Committee would also like to include the number of new course preparations and how a course has changed through time. Honors thesis and grade reports would be included.

Section 14 concerns a problematic issue and suggests recording the high and low letter grades and average grade awarded for a class. Senator Franzwa doesn't care about how this is expressed. He thinks this is important for two reasons:

- 1) If, over time, someone gives grades different from everyone else in a department then this may need looking into,
- 2) For many years we have heard that grade inflation is a bad thing, but we have done nothing about it. We only talked about it a few times and the problem is still here and is worse. We have a 'Lake Wobegone' situation.

Should the grades be private or should they be divulged in evaluation documents? If a person will not change their behavior this is a way to find that.

There is also an issue about the number of non-contact hours spent by instructors. Some spend much time in informal contact and this should be recognized. This contact is voluntary, it is important and it should be noted. It is important that the private hours spent in class preparation be known because some people spend vast amounts of time and others don't spend much time at all. For example there are enormous amounts of time spent in performance and rehearsal classes. If one doesn't list the time then a record of the effort is lost.

The TP&G Committee met in September and discussed making item 15 into a qualitative measure to eliminate estimation of numbers. They suggest describing the listing the context in which informal time is spent. This still leaves hours to be calculated in item 16 and they are open for advice on that point. The Committee feels that estimating class time shouldn't be that difficult. Such estimates could be falsified, but anything can be falsified.

Senator Brown noted that ultimately it comes to a question of individual efficiency. We don't all accomplish the same tasks in the same amount of time. He noted that if a slower person takes longer to accomplish the same task they aren't necessarily inferior to a faster person. Senator Franzwa said there would still be a balance of time versus number of things accomplished. He feels it should come out in the wash and that expectations aren't the same depending on the class.

Senator Melissa Burns noted there is no mention of SPOT. Senator Franzwa said that the Committee had discussed this and that they decided against using SPOT after long discussions about the difficulty in comparing numbers between individuals. There are 17 different SPOT forms with many different questions, so that the numbers are useless outside of their own context.

Senator Woodward noted that concerns about time spent in research aren't important because the ultimate expression of success in research is published papers.

Senator Fairchild asked why this information should be in the vita when it isn't in the annual report. She would feel much more comfortable if this data was in the annual report but not in the vita. Senator Franzwa said that the annual reports not used uniformly, but the Vita goes forward in all circumstances. Senator Kolesar said that the CV is condensed whereas annual reports frequently repeat information. The Vita is supposed to summarize a whole career and not annual detail. Senator Fairchild asked about the time frame for the CV and Senator Koelsar said that it depends and had not been set.

Senator King noted that the Vita is used for many faculty evaluations and is used differently in different departments.

Senator Flahive commented on item15, saying that it would devalue the time spent in academic advising..

Lacking a formal motion from the TP&G Committee on the suggested edits, Senator Brown suggested the Senate discuss and "straw" vote on the five recommended item changes. This will allow the Committee to see which proposed changes are supported by the Senate and help them with future motions. The Senate agreed to vote on the 5 changes in red on the revised document that was circulated via email. Each vote below is referenced to the item number.

11. No discussion. Aye 19 Nay 8. Motion supported.
12. No discussion. Aye 23 Nay 4. Motion supported.

14. Questions were raised about the method of grade calculation, if this was to be grandfathered and if there would be differences in application for untenured versus tenured faculty. Aye 9 Nay 16. Motion not supported.
15. Objections were raised about a qualitative list of what you do that others would not know. Aye 13 Nay 13. Motion not supported.
16. No discussion. Aye 1 Nay 18. Motion not supported.

Senator King handed out a document for Senators to read and discuss with their constituents prior to the November meeting. This document addresses pro and compositions for filing a grievance for “cause” and not just for lack of adherence to “process” (the current policy).

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Arthur Busbey, Secretary