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Guests: Linda Hughes, Dan Williams, Catherine Wehlberg, Melissa Canady, Greg Stephens, Shari Barnes, Richard Durán, Chancellor Boschini.

Chair Nadia Lahutsky called the meeting to order and welcomed guests.

Approval of minutes: The minutes of the October 30 meeting were approved.

Old business:

On behalf of the Senate Academic Excellence Committee, Senator Linda Moore presented a resolution asking that the Senate endorse the Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform developed by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) and distributed to the Senators prior to the meeting. Senator Moore had previously agreed to represent the TCU Senate in the COIA; she explained that the resolution does not ask Senators to agree with every word of the Framework, but asks that it endorse the spirit of the Framework, keeping in mind that suggestions and revisions can be made. By endorsing the Framework we would have the opportunity to suggest changes.

She asked for questions and discussion. Senator Arnie Barkman asked how realistic the resolution is since athletic schedules make it difficult for student athletes to attend classes. Senator Moore agreed that this is one of the issues we need to look at. Many sports other than football, notably baseball, have this problem. She stated that by joining the Coalition, faculty would have a larger voice in dealing with such issues.

She answered Senator Suzy Lockwood’s question concerning the meeting of the Coalition by explaining that it held a meeting during the AAUP conference in October. Senator Moore was unable to attend the meeting, but she has followed the large amount of debate and discussion going on via e-mail. She will share that information with the Senate on a regular basis. The Coalition is now seeking feedback and is attempting to get all NAACP schools to endorse the Coalition.
Discussion continued concerning football bowl games and TCU’s refusal to go to the GMAC Bowl, which has resulted in a lot of publicity, both favorable and unfavorable. Discussion is now shifting toward more concern for academics; debate about academics in the athletic arena is becoming more prevalent. Chair Lahutsky asked about the last item in the Framework regarding over-commercialization. Senator Moore stated that such issues need to be discussed and faculty are now taking part in these discussions.

In response to Senator Rob Garnett’s comment that there have been a lot of positive things going on as far as support for academics among athletes, Senator Moore confirmed that TCU’s graduation rate and support of student athletes is high, the commitment to provide academic support to students is clearly present at TCU.

The Chair reminded Senators that Faculty Senate funds would be used on a regular basis to pay the expenses of its representative (Senator Moore) to participate in the meetings of the coalition. She then called for a vote on the resolution:

“Be it resolved that the TCU Faculty Senate endorse the Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform developed by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) with the recognition that the document is a work in progress that reflects the need for reform in athletics without mandating specific reforms for each school.”

The resolution was approved unanimously.

Core Business:

Chair Lahutsky recalled the discussion and status of the Literary Traditions portion of the new core curriculum from the last Senate meeting. She pointed out that, as a result of those discussions, changes were made to the outcomes. The first outcome now reads “and/or reflects society and the individual.” The second outcome was changed to: “how literature also constructs human cultures.” In action steps 1, 2, and 6, the word “then” was added for clarification.

Since the last Senate meeting, the CIC conducted further discussions with several individuals, including Professors Linda Hughes and Dan Williams about this document. Both agreed that various concerns had been addressed and that the current document meets their approval.

It was proposed and agreed that the expression “appropriate to course focus” be deleted from the first, second and sixth action steps. Discussion ensued concerning the understanding of literature in society and the aesthetic value of literature. It was pointed out that the idea of the value of literature and how the individual responds to it is included in the second action step for the first outcome.

The date of the document should be changed to November 3, 2003. After significant discussion, the Literary Traditions outcomes and actions steps were approved with the above-mentioned changes.

The Chair then introduced the Charter for the HMV&V Committee, which outlines the Committee’s charge and composition. This document was distributed to Senators prior to the meeting. The Chair first reviewed the proposed charter and then called for discussion.

She explained that the CIC proposed this Charter; the Faculty Governance Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee have discussed it.
Senator Moore asked why two members must be from Senate. Senator Ferrandino answered that it is because it is a Senate committee. The question was raised that, if someone were teaching courses that fall in two categories, would they be counted for both categories. It was suggested that there should be a different person for each category so that one person doesn’t serve for two categories. This should be clarified in the document.

Senator George Gilbert further suggested that there be a limit on the number of members allowed from the same department. He believes that the committee should be divided into smaller ones. Senator Ferrandino explained that the CIC had a philosophical discussion about the possibility of having several smaller committees. This approach was rejected because it was felt that smaller, individual committees wouldn’t be aware of what other committees were doing, if this were the case. In order to insure continuity and communication, the CIC decided that it would be better for the committee to work as a whole body.

Senator Andy Fort pointed out that service on this committee entails a large workload and he asked if there could be release time for committee members. The Chair suggested that this issue be considered; it would be understood that this would be the only committee duty for Senators on this committee.

Further discussion occurred concerning how many courses this would involve and how they would be evaluated in following years. The Chair explained that the University Assessment Committee would be responsible for this. Some of the steps have yet to be written, but they will be developed in the future. The following changes were proposed to the document:

1. Add the sentence: “Broad department representation is desirable.” to the end of the first paragraph under “Membership.”
2. Add the word “other” to the third paragraph under “Membership” so that it reads: “At least two other members must teach …”

With these two changes, the document was approved with one opposing vote.

Report from the Tenure, Promotion, and Grievance Committee

Senator Jack Hill, Chair of the committee, introduced the proposal being brought by the TPG committee and previously distributed to Senators. Continuing work that was done last year, the TPG committee has amended the existing Conflict Resolution policy to include faculty, per its charge for this year. He thanked Senator Mike Sacken and last year’s committee for their work on this issue. The TPG Committee now brings an amended policy to the Senate for its approval and adoption.

Senator Hill explained the need for the amended policy. The Conflict Resolution policy does not supersede the grievance policy for tenure and promotion in the TCU Faculty/Staff Handbook, which is not effective for disputes between individuals that are not related to tenure and promotion. The existing Conflict Resolution policy was developed primarily to resolve work-related problems and disputes among staff and was not written to apply to faculty. The proposed changes would ensure that the policy used by Human Resources would be inclusive of faculty. A large number of disputes have been successfully mediated with this policy. Shari Barnes from the Human Resources Department explained that it has been a highly effective policy. Senator Hill pointed out that only four disputes reached the level of peer review, proving that the Conflict
Resolution policy provides a way to address various problems and disputes before they become larger. The Chair then called for discussion and questions.

Senator Fort confirmed that the more one hears about this procedure, the more favorable and sympathetic toward it one becomes. Shari Barnes pointed out that, even though the policy provides for an ultimate appeal to the Chancellor, one has never been brought that far. Senator Gilbert expressed concern about the rapidity of the schedule of deadlines in the policy, especially during the summer. Shari Barnes explained that the procedure can be flexible but, in mediation situations, it is better to resolve the problem as soon as possible.

Chair Lahutsky called for the vote and the motion to approve the proposed Faculty Conflict Resolution Policy passed. The Senate Executive Committee will take the policy to the Chancellor for approval. Professor Greg Stephens, Chair of the Mediators Committee, announced that there is a need for more mediators. He encouraged Senators and faculty to consider becoming mediators.

New business

Senator Carolyn Cagle from the Faculty Governance Committee addressed the Senate concerning e balloting on various issues. This idea came up for discussion last year in relation to the new core and will come up again this year. Because there are a number of concerns about voting online through e balloting, the FGC would like to know the Senators’ opinions on the issue. On behalf of the committee, Senator Cagle asked for input from the Senators. Chair Lahutsky suggested that Senator Cagle send out specific questions to Senators in order to initiate discussion about the issue.

The Chair introduced Jim Mayne from Information Services. He came to explain the recent e-mail message from his department about security issues on university computers. Information Services has discovered a number of vulnerabilities, which is the reason for the latest request to lock computers and to take other precautions. Information Services is trying to automate the process of sending out patches. They have asked faculty to leave computers on overnight so that patches can be sent out each week. He encouraged faculty to be more vigilant and to be sure their machines are updated for virus protection. If Information Services discovers machines that are infected, these machines will be taken off the network. Non-standard machines will also be scrutinized and/or taken off the network. They will be placed on a sub-network and will be granted access, but they won’t have the special access that others have.

The Chair next entertained a motion from Senator Gilbert. He requested that a letter he drafted be sent to Athletic Director Eric Hyman, football Coach Gary Patterson, Provost Koehler, and Chancellor Boschini, with the Senate’s endorsement. The letter commends TCU’s decision to give priority to students’ academic work during final exam week by refusing to accept the invitation to the GMAC Bowl game. The complete text of the letter is found in the addendum to these minutes. The Senate moved to pass the motion.

Chancellor Boschini addressed the Senate on a number of issues. He first offered an update on the search for a new Provost. He explained that the Search Committee would be interviewing candidates at an airport this weekend. Out of this group of 70 to
80 people, some will be brought to campus in early January. Further information can be obtained from Chair Lahutsky, a member of the search committee.

The Chancellor next explained the status of the search for a new Dean of the Business School. He has purposely waited on this search because the person hired will want to know who the new Provost will be. Therefore, the search for the Dean has been delayed until the new Provost has been named.

Regarding the budget, Chancellor Boschini identified certain ideas upon which he is predicing next year’s budget. He emphasized that hiring faculty will be a priority. He would like to provide ten to twelve new faculty lines for next year. Although he does not know if that will be possible, it will be his goal for next year. He asks faculty to support this approach and to understand that we cannot hire additional staff members while there is a need for more faculty. He further noted that this would most likely involve a tuition hike.

Finally, the Chancellor explained the Strategic Planning project that he has put in motion. He wants broad based participation in developing the plan. Leo Munson and Nowell Donovan are heading up the initiative. Even though specific individuals will chair the various committees, others are invited and encouraged to participate. The subjects of these committees will be: academics, the size of TCU, the “residentiality” of TCU, the role of athletics, the connection to the community, etc.

Senator Cagle asked the Chancellor to explain his position on enrollment. The Chancellor stated that he feels that we owe ourselves a discussion on this subject. He pointed out that two major differences between TCU and its comparable institutions such as Tulane, SMU, and Baylor, is that they have larger enrollments and more graduate programs, notably law schools, dental programs, and more highly developed graduate programs. He denied that his goal is to have a larger enrollment at TCU, but that he is interested in seeing more alums spreading the word about the university.

Chair Lahutsky encouraged faculty to contact the individuals involved in the Strategic Planning process and to address their questions and concerns to them, cautioning Senators not to give in to cynically believing that decisions have already been made. The plan is to produce position papers, which are not end goals, but a beginning for discussion. Senator Lockwood asked if students would be involved; the Chancellor confirmed that they would. Outsiders will also be involved, but he felt it was important to have faculty and staff start the process and to write the position papers. Senators Fort and Donovan both expressed approval of the open approach to decision-making and the hope that it will continue. Discussion ensued concerning the role and position of the Provost. The Chancellor confirmed that he is interested in finding someone who will have influence and ideas, not power.

The Chair thanked the Chancellor and adjourned the meeting.

Addendum

Motion: The Faculty Senate will send the following letter to Athletic Director Eric Hyman and Head Football Coach, Gary Patterson, with “carbons” to Provost Koehler and Chancellor Boschini.
December 4, 2003

Dear Mr. Hyman and Coach Patterson,

The Faculty Senate commends your decision to give the highest priority to the academic endeavors of student-athletes and other students during final examinations, one of the most important times of the academic year. You have sent out a powerful message, both within the TCU community and at the national level.

No doubt it is somewhat disappointing not to be able to make a special out-of-town trip to a bowl game after a tremendously successful football season. Hopefully, the crowd at the Plains Capital Fort Worth Bowl will still make this a memorable occasion for the football team and everyone else who is a part of the football program at TCU.

Sincerely,

Nadia Lahutsky, Chair 2003-2004,  
on behalf of the Faculty Senate

cc: Dr. Koehler, Dr. Boschini

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon L. Fairchild