**TCU Faculty Senate Meeting**

**6 December 2018**

**3:30 – 5:00 PM**

**Faculty Senate Chambers**

**Minutes**

**Senators Present:** Allender, Marinda; Atkinson, Sean; Barger, Kat; Bashore, Lisa; Bedford, David; Bentley, Joshua; Bowen, Kendra; Bradley, Layne; Busbey, Art; Canclini, Sharon; Carrión, José; Dastgeer, Shugofa; Flowers, Roma; Frable, Pamela; Friedman, Greg; Fripp, Jessica; Gollaher, Timothy; Grau, Stacy; Hawley, Diane; Helms, Jason; Herzig, Emily; Hokayem, Hayat; Jackson, Lynn; Jones, Clark; Kiani, Morgan; Ledbetter, Andrew; Ledis, Dennis; Legatski, Ted; Lemon, Alex; Loveall, Ian; Lovett, John; Lynch, Laurel; Maas, Penny; McGettigan, Joan; Meyn, Till; Moeller, Thomas; Moessner, David; Moore, Jeff; Nhan, Johnny; Palko, Steve; Quesada, Jan; Ramasesh, Ranga; Sawey, Michael; Sawyer, Chris; Schein, Marie; Scherger, Michael; Schiffer, Adam; Scott, Krista; Spice, Loren; Stephens, Greg; Tomlin, Drew; Williams, Daniel; Wood, Barbara

**Senators Excused:** Esposito, Phil; Harvey, Omar; Havens, Jill; Johnson, Kevin; Meitl, Michele; Quinn, Brandy; Ramirez, Susan; Sandell, David; Walters, Patricia

**Senators Absent:** Marichal, Albert (Fine Arts); Nelson, Karen (Neeley); Piñón, Santiago (AddRan); Watkins, Timothy (Fine Arts)

**Guests Present:** Bob Leone (Intercollegiate Athletics Committee); Claire Sanders (DEI/History); Ariane M. Balizet (DEI/English); Abbey Widick (SGA); Yohna Chambers (VC of HR); Victor Boschini (Chancellor); Susan Weeks (Vice Provost); Joddy Murray (English); Ed McNertney (Dir. of the Core Curriculum); Cameron Law; Orlando Lara (CRES); Diane Snow (Dean, John V. Roach Honors College); Nowell Donovan (Provost)

**Call to Order**

1. Faculty Senate **Chair Greg Stephens** called the meeting to order at 3:30, welcomed Senators and guests, including a large number of students attending in support of the DEI discussion.
2. The minutes of the November 1, 2018, meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as written.

**New Business**

1. **Provost Nowell Donovan** gave a few comments about the upcoming Dean searches—for Graduate Studies and VP of Research, for Harris College, and for the Neeley School of Business. He urged faculty who receive invitations to agree to participate on the search committees and have a role in selecting the next generation of university leadership. He reminded the room that over the next 2 years, TCU academic leadership will experience a 70% turnover.
2. **Bob Leone**, chair of the **Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC),** gave a presentation about his committee’s charge to oversee the academic experience of student athletes. He brought forward the 3rd iteration of a resolution regarding the creation of a **campus-wide testing center** to meet the needs of student athletes, students with accommodations, and students generally. The IAC **recommends the creation of a committee to oversee the planning and implementation of such a space and service**. A motion in favor of this recommendation was made by Dan Williams and seconded by Andrew Ledbetter. **VP Susan Weeks** spoke in support of this resolution, and of the recent Provost’s Council discussion in support of this project. **Marsha Ramsey** was present and has done a lot of work and research relative to such a center. Dan Williams stated that the Senate passed a resolution several years ago (2013) in support of such a center and noted that evening hours for a testing center are essential (esp. for student athletes); another senator spoke to the popularity and usefulness of such a center in the College of Science and Engineering while noting that more flexible hours of availability are crucial for its success, as current testing structures are already booked and over-subscribed. Bob mentioned that accommodations lawsuits are on the horizon if TCU doesn’t provide the testing services that students need. Another senator addressed the need to make this resolution a “**call for action**” in light of the impending arrival of a new Provost, and recommended that the Senate declare this issue to be a high priority. **Past Chair Ted Legatski** made a motion to amend the resolution in support of the IAC recommendation as a “high priority.” **Provost Donovan** reminded the room that this issue is already under consideration in the LEAD ON implementation process & in the repurposing of Sadler Hall.

**Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Resolution on a Campus-Wide Testing Center:**

(November 5, 2018)

*Whereas the Faculty Senate passed a 2013 resolution calling for the establishment of a campus-wide testing; and*

*Whereas the IAC passed its own resolution in November 2016 calling for a campus-wide testing center; and*

*Whereas the IAC continued to endorse previous resolutions in its February 2017 meeting and called for a memorandum to be circulated in support of these resolutions; and*

*Whereas the memorandum was unanimously supported by IAC in February 2017 and then sent to the Provost and Faculty Senate Executive Committee, calling for steps to be taken to discuss a campus-wide testing center; and*

*Whereas no steps were taken, or discussions held;*

*The IAC respectfully requests that discussions concerning a campus-wide testing center be given priority during the 2018-2019 academic year and active steps be taken to consider the feasibility a campus-wide testing center; and*

*further requests that such discussion start by asking the Provost to attend the next IAC meeting and that the IAC also ask to be included on the next Faculty Senate agenda to revisit its 2013 resolution; and*

*finally, requests a formal ad hoc campus-wide committee of relevant stakeholders be formed and sanctioned by the Provost to review, discuss, and draft a final resolution concerning the establishment of a campus-wide testing center.*

Amended motion was called, seconded and approved; the motion passed as amended to emphasize **the Faculty Senate’s view of this testing center as a high priority item**.

1. **Andrew Ledbetter**, chair of the Faculty Relations Committee (FRC), spoke to the Senate about the FRC’s resolution on **“Resolution on TCU Employee Benefits**,” prompted, in part, by the recent decision by Human Resources to recommend the phase-out of the PPO 90 Health Plan. **Chancellor Boschini** spoke up about this plan, which is a popular option chosen by 400+ current employees, being unsustainably expensive. He contended that the decision to phase it out is in the interest of maintaining the affordability of all health plan options.

**Yohna Chambers**, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources (HR), addressed matter of the **Domestic Partners status for TCU benefits** purposes; HR is now modifying how individuals will identify as Domestic Partners in this state. She also spoke to the PPO 90 matter, characterizing it as a very expensive option which will, if kept, drive up the cost of all plans. She was not aware of the 2013 FS resolution (which is not easy to locate) urging the consultation by the Administration with the Faculty Senate in matters relating to TCU faculty and their benefits. Going forward Chambers committed to meet and discuss benefits changes with the FSEC. She reiterated that the rule is now: no new enrollees for PPO 90; however, if you have PPO 90, you can keep it. Greg Stephens stepped in to say that the FS Executive Committee has addressed this issue with HR and agreed that, going forward, we will work with HR in a partner relationship. The **University Compensation Advisory Committee** **(UCAC)** is the official interface for this benefits issue. UCAC needs to communicate more effectively with the FRC. One senator asked about how to operationalize this communication policy. The question was called, and the resolution from FRC passed.

**Resolution on from Faculty Relations Committee on benefits:**

**FRC Resolution on Shared Governance Regarding Employee Benefits (**Draft, 11/12/18)

***Resolution Summary: This resolution reaffirms the 2013 “Resolution on TCU Employee Benefits,” expresses concern that the Faculty Senate was not consulted regarding the recent reductions in benefits, respectfully asks for a meaningful dialogue to consider the restoration of the PPO90 plan and the domestic partner policy, and, in the spirit of shared governance, calls for the involvement of the Faculty Senate representatives in future decision-making discussions on benefits.***

*Whereas the TCU administration, faculty, and staff have strongly supported a campus culture of connection, collaboration, and cooperation; and*

*Whereas shared governance has been widely endorsed as a part of this campus culture; and*

*Whereas the TCU Faculty Senate’s “Resolution on TCU Employee Benefits,” adopted by the Senate on May 2, 2013, resolves that employee compensation and benefits should be maintained at current levels or increased, and reduced only in the case of a severe budget crisis that threatens TCU’s well-being; and*

*Whereas the 2013 resolution states that benefit reductions should occur only after the TCU Faculty Senate has had the opportunity to discuss and make a recommendation concerning proposed reductions and that “designated representatives of the TCU Faculty Senate take part in Cabinet-level discussions” when changes in compensation and benefits are discussed; and*

*Whereas the TCU administration has recently—and without consultation—reduced employee benefits by precluding employees from enrolling in the PPO90 health insurance option and ending access to benefits for domestic partners; and*

*Whereas these reductions in benefits are inconsistent with TCU’s Vision in Action Lead On strategic plan, which calls for strengthening the workforce and emphasizes the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion,*

*Therefore, be it resolved that the TCU Faculty Senate (1) expresses its concern that the Faculty Senate was not consulted in the administrative recent decisions to reduce benefits, and therefore, (2) respectfully asks for a meaningful dialogue with the Chancellor, the Cabinet, and the Retirement and Benefit Plan Committee to consider the restoration of full access to the PPO90 plan and the domestic partner policy, and (3) calls for specific procedures to implement a greater level of shared governance by involving Faculty Senate representatives in all future administrative deliberations on benefits.*

1. Greg Stephens brought forward the **FSEC Resolution on Senate representation on the TCU Board of Trustees**.  The Chancellor explained that this issue will be under consideration at the fall Trustee retreat, which also has received parallel motions from SGA and from the Staff Assembly for their representation. The resolution does not guarantee Board representation for these different bodies, but does establish a basis for the consideration of such representation by the Board. Joshua Bentley moved and Kat Barger seconded this motion, which was approved.

**FSEC Resolution on Senate representation on the TCU Board of Trustees**:

An important part of the “TCU Promise” is a campus culture and structure that promotes and expects shared governance through collaboration, discussion, representation, and decision input. To accomplish the above requires input during (not after) the process of decision-making on issues affecting the faculty of the University. We believe that the TCU community strives to honor and uphold a firm institutional commitment to shared governance and a participatory process that encourages such faculty involvement. A natural extension of that outlook would be faculty representation on the Board of Trustees. Therefore, the TCU Faculty Senate endorses such a policy of faculty representation on the TCU Board of Trustees with full participation in discussions and decision-making.

1. Next, **Claire Sanders** and **Ariane Balizet** gave a presentation on the background for the **DEI Committee**’s origins and their role as **co-chairs of the DEI Curriculum Subcommittee**, comprised of faculty, staff, and students (6 undergrads and 1 grad), all stakeholders. In 2016-17, the subcommittee produced a recommendation to include a DEI component in the TCU Core. The Committee began with consideration of the effectiveness of Cultural Awareness (CA) requirement as the mechanism for bringing a DEI component into the Core; however, they discerned that CA courses are not focused on issues of power and position or skills. Therefore, a revision of CA would compel CA faculty to radically rethink what they were teaching, which is not how TCU works. Last spring, a partnership began between the Senate’s **Academic Excellence Committee (AEC)** and the DEI Curriculum Committee, and the AEC had several meetings centered on the DEI/Core question. Ultimately, a recommendation emerged for a **DEI Essential Competency (EC) overlay**. An EC is a skills based (versus a knowledge-based) course element, and an overlay component is the most flexible and efficient way to incorporate DEI into the Core. Ideally, various colleges and disciplines can find ways to incorporate DEI EC classes into their curricula; **SGA Resolution** supportive of this recommendation passed last week with 82% approval. The Core is a reflection of TCU’s core values. Having a DEI component within the Core will encourage the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students and faculty. **AEC chair Sean Atkinson** gave a brief history of how the AEC approached the consideration of this DEI issue, which was part of the special charges for the AEC this year. It is not yet an official proposal from the AEC; rather, today’s presentation is an opportunity to seek input from the Faculty Senate and guests. He noted that a DEI EC overlay would constitute the first substantial change since the Core was implemented (in 2005-2006). If this proposal is approved this spring (2019), TCU would have a full year to get organized, for the Registrar’s office to get the structures in place, and for the faculty to begin working on proposing courses and getting additional training in order to teach DEI skills effectively.

A senator expressed gratitude and support for the DEI committee’s work; another seconded his appreciation and also expressed his concerns and the concerns from his college—regarding degree plan impacts and proper implementation. Another senator suggested that a DEI EC will add credit hours to already tightly structured degree plans; will delay graduation for some students (esp. transfer students); more data was requested; one senator who wants it to really work worried that “squeezing DEI into existing courses” won’t achieve the desired learning outcome; another senator suggested that the timeline may be too aggressive; still another noted the need to hear from all units on campus.

**Claire Sanders** responded that success is the DEI sub-committee’s highest priority as well, and that **the course vetting process is the best mechanism for assuring that the DEI courses will achieve a rigorous verification of the DEI dimensions of approved courses**. She noted that numerous courses already approved could also conceivably include DEI. **She made a pitch for faculty to be willing to help (with their expertise) make this Core revision work.** Sean responded that what is envisioned and proposed will be a multi-year scaled up effort to implement the DEI component. Opportunities for faculty training is an on-going work. Another DEI committee is addressing the faculty training element.

**Ariane Balizet** stressed that failure is not an option; more people need to be supportive and be involved in implementing this DEI Core. We, the faculty, are here to serve the needs of all our students. We need to think holistically about our students.

Training is imperative, another senator said. Training is needed to equip faculty who want to help but don’t feel like they know how. Best practices needed to be understood and implemented. Aisha Torrey-Sawyer spoke to this concern and reassured FS that all hands are on deck to provide proper training.

Sean reminded the room that the curriculum is the charge of the faculty and the FS.

**Loren Spice** read a statement from **CSE Associate Dean Dick Rinewalt**, who sees the DEI EC proposal as an undue burden on students in the College of Science and Engineering. Another senator posed a question about the difference between knowledge and skill set, while another senator noted that this sort of skill set is difficult to teach.

**Abbey Widick, SGA President,** made a strong statement in support of student sentiment and of the feasibility of a DEI addition to Core. Of the five cultural courses in the current Core, she said, only one of them needs to also have a Diversity and Inclusion component.

Another senator noted that many other schools are undertaking this DEI emphasis and selling it; TCU needs to step up and seriously engage DEI as well.

Another of the students spoke to the need for a DEI course to prepare TCU students in all fields. She stated that diversity and identities are important to every major. Skills are needed –such as the ability of students to communicate with others who are already in their own community and who are different.

**Joddy Murray** spoke as the past chair of AEC and pointed out that research shows that DEI skills lead to academic excellence—it is hard but important work. Another senator spoke up about his unresolved questions—asked for sample syllabi and more details on precisely how this new addition to the Core will work.

A **DEI Campus Conversation #2: Teach—inclusive of all interested faculty, students, administrators, and staff—is planned for January 29th, 5-7 p.m. in the BLUU Ballrooms A & B. Please mark your calendars for this event as we deepen the discussion on adding a DEI Essential Competency component to the TCU Core Curriculum.**

1. The meeting was adjourned at 5:03.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan Jaynes Quesada, Secretary

TCU Faculty Senate