

October 5, 2001, Friday

Dear Colleague,

After yesterday's Senate discussion, I feel a need to send some comments to you about process and outcomes for our meetings. I clearly value the dialogue that occurred yesterday on the critical issues of academic dishonesty and inclusion of more teaching evidence on the vitae. These are issues important to our role within the Academe and, as our discussion validated, we vary in belief system and approaches that frame the process of Senate activity in these areas. Although I sensed the frustration of Senators throughout the vitae discussion, the dialogue among us seemed to provide further illumination on the meaning and possible variance in that meaning among the Senators about the teacher-scholar model, the focus of the Senate Committees this year. So, the Senate is making progress in some of our charges for the year.

Although our discussions yesterday went longer than I expected (and perhaps you did too?), I believe we gave the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance (TP+G) Committee some ideas about how to reframe the teaching component on the TCU vitae. I heard this group say they wanted feedback yesterday from the Senate, and you were gracious enough to respond. Thank you for your willingness to stay a little later and engage in the "straw voting," a process that provides direction to the TP+G Committee for their meeting October 11th.

Despite the value of our conversations yesterday, I also realize that we must have efficiency in our deliberations to meet our Senate and Senate Committee goals. In the November meeting, you will see some strategies used to keep us moving, to keep us on time, and to allow valuable comments by the Chancellor and announcements important for you to know and communicate to your constituents.

With the lateness of the meeting, I didn't get a chance to make announcements or to properly introduce Paul King, Chair of TP+G, to provide the handout on grievance material. Thanks for reading the following to allow me to cover this content:

1. Yes, the material Paul circulated is very important reading for each of you. The TP+G Committee has been charged to examine the current TCU grievance policy, and your feedback on the circulated document will provide needed information to the Committee as it proposes revisions. Comments to the TP+G Committee can be directed to Paul King (Chair), and other members of the Committee (Ed Kolesar, Ron (Chip) Burns, Bill Vanderhoof, Joe Bobitch, Gregg Franzwa, and Thad Duhigg. Most likely, the Senate will address this issue in November so give your feedback to the Committee before November 1st.
2. Likewise, the TP+G Committee needs your further comment on the vitae revisions related to teaching. If the proposed changes seem to not meet the intent of validating our role as teachers, then what can you suggest to reach that goal?

- Or, do you believe the current vitae structure should not be edited? I am sure feedback to the Committee would be appreciated by October 11th.
3. Mike Sacken, Chair of the University Evaluation Committee, told me yesterday that a proposed new SPOT that is shorter, has core questions that can be used University-wide, and includes discipline-specific questions has been developed. He may be asking for Senator feedback on this form shortly. Tentative plans to use this form in the Spring exist but only after review by many groups to address issues of validity and reliability, etc.
 4. The Senate Executive Committee met this am to discuss “academic priorities” for the University. Dr. Koehler requested our ideas as soon as possible, and plans are underway for the Executive Committee to meet with the Academic Deans who have had the same charge. Any ideas you might have in this area would be welcome (send to me please).
 5. Edd Bivins’ office has asked the Senate to look at a new committee that would seem to focus on environmental safety and similar issues on the campus. I have forwarded this to Dick Rinewalt, Chair of the Committee on Committees, who has made a decision about this for the group’s October 11th meeting (thanks, Dick).
 6. The Provost’s office continues the search for the Director of the Center for Teaching Effectiveness, realizing this is a priority for the University.
 7. The latest UCR (“core”) Committee continues to make progress on a proposal. The Executive Committee understands that a report from that group will be ready in about a month, hopefully laying a foundation for the Fall Assembly.
 8. There have been discussions about moving the May 2002 graduation to the Tarrant County Convention Center due to the large number of expected graduates and their guests. Last May’s crowd filled the stadium, and a larger place seems necessary to meet ceremonial and fire safety needs. The Faculty Senate and the Student House have been involved since May in these discussions with Administration. A recent poll seemed to support faculty wishing to stay on campus and granting limited tickets to each graduate; however, students overwhelming voted to go off-campus to allow a larger number of guests per graduate! As plans progress on this decision, I (or the Chancellor) will let you know.
 9. The first 2001-2002 Faculty Gathering was held on this past Wednesday and was attended by a good number of faculty. Thanks to the Chancellor and Jeanne Chaffee for supporting this collaborative Senate-Chancellor event with snacks, wine, and other drinks!
 10. Thanks to each of you for your hard work in addressing Senate initiatives and in diligent attention to the work of the Senate committees. I understand all groups

are working well together and making nice progress on charges. Please let the Senate liaisons help you in whatever way they can this year.

Again, thanks for your Senate involvement, your connection to your constituents, and the quality things you do for TCU. I look forward to seeing you in the future.

Carolyn Spence Cagle
Chair, Faculty Senate