

**Budget Advisory Committee**  
End of Year Report for 2013-2014

Committee Members: Jan Quesada (Co-chair), Sheri Milhollin (Co-chair), Suzy Lockwood, Patty Warrington, Charlie Sawyer, Cathi Burkham, Kelly Ham, Steve Kintigh, June Koelker, Steve Mann, and Zach Madel (student member)

Meeting Dates: October 1<sup>st</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>, February 17<sup>th</sup>, and April 30<sup>th</sup>. (The Co-chairs are having a follow-up lunch meeting with Brian Gutierrez on May 14<sup>th</sup>.)

Minutes were taken at each meeting and distributed to all members. Copies of minutes and other documentation will be passed in a notebook to incoming co-chairs.

Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) membership numbers were adequate to accomplish committee charges. The majority of members were able to attend the two meetings in October, but attendance was sharply lower in the spring. It would have been wise to have discussed the schedule of the spring meetings in the fall. The committee suffered the loss of Steve Kintigh, who passed away in February. He, as well as his experience and expertise, were sorely missed at our spring meetings.

While Brian Gutierrez, the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration (VCFA), is happy to inform the committee of the financial position and decisions of the university, the committee does not have any real access to the budget or the budgeting process. All budgetary decisions are made at the Cabinet and Trustee level. This situation renders the job of the BAC more formal than substantive. Communication about the budget is certainly valuable, and the BAC does function well as a committee with access to budgetary information, which can then be passed along to the Faculty Senate and the Staff Assembly and their respective constituencies.

Highlights included:

- 1) Met as a committee without the VCFA in early October to introduce ourselves to each other, pose questions to Kenneth Janak and Megan Soyer (associates of VCFA), and express our interest in having some genuine access to budget information (beyond Powerpoint presentations).
- 2) Access in the fall and the spring to the VCFA for questions and answers regarding TCU's financial situation, financial comparisons to comparable institutions, a recognition of our constraints as a tuition-dependent university, the clear need to grow the endowment, as well as information regarding decision by the C.A.R.E.S consortium, of which TCU is a member, to transition the post-65 retiree medical coverage from CARES to a self-directed option with HRA funding. In an effort to help retirees navigate this change, TCU engaged OneExchange, a private exchange

Arnie:

Here is my end-of-year report for the Academic Appeals Committee following the topics you suggested.

• **On what dates did you meet?**

We met on an as-needed basis to respond to student appeals. This year, we had two student appeals that went through the proper channels to reach our committee. There were two other appeals that were sent directly to me as chair of the committee without having completed the necessary appeals process. I counseled those students and faculty to follow the appropriate channels and to resubmit the appeal if appropriate. In both cases, the dispute resolved without reaching the academic appeals committee.

• **Did you keep minutes? If so, have you submitted them to the Faculty Senate Secretary?**

There are no minutes for the committee separate from the findings of the appeals. The appeals letters, containing the final decision of the committee and the rationale for the finding, were submitted to the student, the faculty member, the department chair, the dean, and the provost as called for in the faculty handbook. During the past year, there were two such letters corresponding to the two student appeals that reached the committee.

• **When is the bulk of your work conducted?**

The bulk of the work was conducted upon the receipt of an academic appeal. Appeals are typically initiated at the end of a semester or the beginning of the following semester. This year, both appeals were received during summer 2013. This created a problem since the terms of the committee members ended before the summer and there was no official committee in place to hear the appeals. The appeals could not be postponed since the students who initiated the appeals were in year-round programs and the appeals had to be heard before the student could advance. We were able to find enough members to hold hearings in both cases but the process was more complicated than need be.

• **Do you have enough/too many members?**

The committee had an appropriate number of members given that the number of appeals that might be received during a given year is unpredictable and the 3 time commitment to participate in an appeal is such that it is helpful to spread the work around.

• **Did faculty attend and participate appropriately?**

Yes. The faculty who could participate in the hearings given that they took place in the summer were extremely conscientious and took their responsibilities very seriously.

• **Did staff attend and participate appropriately?**

Academic appeals did not have staff members on a permanent basis. On occasion, staff were called when a student made an appeal on the basis of whether a faculty member met the requirements of a student with learning differences. Staff were extremely helpful and responsive to the committee's requests for assistance.

• **Did students attend and participate appropriately?**

Yes. The student members of the academic appeals committee took their responsibilities very seriously. The only problem that arose was that the terms of the student members ran during the school year and when appeals were received during the summer there were no official student members of the committee. Again, we dealt with this on an ad hoc basis but it was much more complicated than need be.

• **What were the notable accomplishments and highlights of the year?**

- \* Dealt with two appeals in a timely way.
- \* Created an ad hoc committee structure and process to handle appeals that occurred during the summer
- \* Worked with students, faculty, academic administration, and others (such as staff when necessary) to bring appeals to a successful conclusion
- \* Worked with academic administration (especially the Provost's office) to develop a procedure that would allow for timely appeals.
- \* Since policy in the faculty handbook was vague on many issues related to the appeals hearings, worked closely with academic administration to make sure the interests of all parties were respected

Let me know if you need anything else.

Shannon

- health insurance company which specializes in Medicare supplement plans, to provide consulting to each retiree on an individual basis.
- 3) Commitment by Co-chairs to put together a notebook to help guide future Co-chairs and provide them with background information helpful in conducting BAC business in a more efficient manner.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Jan J. Quesada and Sheri Milhollin (Co-chairs)*

**The University Compensation Advisory Committee**  
**2014 Report**

(From January to May 2014)

Submitted by Marie Schein and Aisha Torrey-Sawyer, UCAC Co-Chairs

In the first half of 2014, the University Compensation Advisory Committee concentrated on two crucial tasks:

1. Working with HR and administrators to strengthen and maintain a line of communication with those of our TCU retirees who are extremely upset about their new medical coverage and worried about their ability to access adequate health care and provide a constant flow of information, advice, and insurance products that protects them;

2. Gathering data on overall compensation of staff and faculty and examining gender and salary equity for staff and faculty.

This report documents the progress made by the committee towards completing these tasks. Details of these projects are included in the minutes that the committee compiles after each meeting, a new practice this year.

**Committee Members:**

Provost Nowell Donovan, Vice Chancellor Karen Baker.

Chris Sawyer, Dan Williams, Randy Chambers, Paul King, Laurel Lynch, Andrew Fort, Yuan X. Lu, Jane Mackay, Franck Thomas, Tracy Hull, DeAnn Jones, Dorenda Kessler, James Lutz, Sheri Milhollin, Emily Burgwyn, Paul Hartman, Manfred Reinecke, Susan Campbell, Sandra Waters, Chris Watts, Qiao Zhang, Lisa Aven, Jeannie Bosillo, Paul Fox, Faith Perkins, Dindy Robinson, Megan Soyer, Robin Williamson.

**Meetings Held During the spring of 2014:**

During the spring of 2014, the UCA Committee held three meetings on March 6, April 16, and May 22. In addition, Marie Schein and Aisha Torrey-Sawyer along with Emily Burgwyn, Paul Hartman, and Manfred Reinecke met with Chancellor Boschini and members of the TCU Retirees Association on March 12. Chancellor Boschini held a general meeting on April 24 to provide the retirees with his final decisions concerning the requests made at the March 12 meeting to return to CARES Now.

**Summary of Discussions and Work Accomplished:**

At our first meeting on March 6, Provost Donovan and Karen Baker greeted the committee and gave words of encouragement for the team. The committee discussed the changes in the TCU Retirees health care benefits that had occurred in 2013. The following motion was approved:

*The University Compensation Advisory Committee supports a quick and comprehensive review by Human Resources and the Administration of the retirees' health care benefits in Medicare Part D with a clear process and timeline, taking into consideration the current retirees' survey results as of fall 13.*

On March 12, members of the UCA Committee and the TCU Retirees Association met with Chancellor Boschini. Larry Adams, Paul Hartman, Manfred Reinecke, and Emily

Burgwyn voiced their extreme dissatisfaction and grave concerns with the new retirees health care package, particularly the prescription drugs coverage under Medicare Part D system. They asked the Chancellor and HR to explore all health care possibilities for the retirees, but expressing their ultimate goal of being brought back to CARES Now.

On April 14, the committee revisited the discussion held between the chancellor and representatives of the TCU Retirees Association of March 12 and listened to a presentation by Dindy Robinson on overall compensations for TCU staff.

The last spring meeting was held on May 22. Vice Chancellor Karen Baker offered a detailed account of the decision to not return TCU retirees to CARES. We also discussed the possibility of an emergency compensation fund to help retirees cope with catastrophic conditions. An ad-hoc committee was formed to investigate the option. Members are Chris Sawyer, Robin Williamson, and Jean Walbridge.

Susan Campbell presented a comparative study of faculty salaries across the departments and explained how market in some disciplines drives the salaries. Paul King offered that such an argument would continue to create inequities in salaries earned by women.

**Work To Be continued in the fall of 2014:**

The UCA Committee will continue to work with HR and the administration to find answers to retirees' concerns about their health care coverage and further explore salary and gender equity as new data is made available.

Annual Report (2012 – 2013) of the Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee

- On what dates did you meet?
  - Meeting dates: October 15, 2013 and March 21, 2014
- Did you keep minutes? If so, have you submitted them to the Faculty Senate Secretary?
  - Minutes were kept and sent to the Committee on Committee liaison, Sandy Waters
- When is the bulk of your work conducted?
  - Meetings are used to share information about University initiatives. We have served primarily by providing input regarding the key issues this academic year: initiatives regarding veterans and employees with disabilities.
- Do you have enough/too many members?
  - We have sufficient membership.
- Did faculty attend and participate appropriately?
  - Yes. It was difficult to find meeting days and times that met all faculty and staff schedules but the dates were selected to meet most members' schedules.
- Did staff attend and participate appropriately?
  - Yes, staff attended and participated appropriately.
- Did students attend and participate appropriately?
  - One student attended the meeting in October. Another student was unable to attend since he was studying abroad in Fall 2013.
- What were the notable accomplishments and highlights of the year?
  - We provided information to HR and the office of the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs regarding other resources to consider when establishing programs to meet the requirements regarding veteran issues and Americans with Disabilities Act. The committee members were also asked to encourage TCU employees to self-identify as veterans on the personal information page on my.tcu.edu.

## Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

4 – 5 pm; Tandy 120

Present: Shari Barnes, Margaret Faust, Teresa Miles Hendrix, David Luczak, Cheryl Taylor, Tim Barth, Jacquelyn Curry, Marsha Ramsey; Sparkle Greenhaw

Absent: Dennis Cheek, Lori Diel, Kristina Riddlesperger, Tim Watkins, Victoria Chen, Josh Harmon, Ammie Harrison, Ryan McFarland, Kathy Smith, Payton Anderson, Emily Walden, Darron Turner

Shari Barnes said the guidelines for employment of disabled workers and protected veterans were issued this semester. There is a committee in place to help with programs. Protected veterans are those who have a disability or a campaign badge from one of the wars (from Vietnam to present day).

Tim Barth has been meeting with student veterans on campus to understand issues they have experienced in the workplace. He is planning on developing training workshops to potentially integrate veterans into the TCU workforce and to educate and train campus personnel who will work with veterans. The goal of the programs is to ensure veterans can be successful in the workplace. He is also working on workshops for hiring managers and will be asking student veterans to help develop the program.

Tim said that some of the issues students have expressed included difficulty developing relationships based on trust. Many veterans have problems feeling that authority figures are trustworthy.

Most of the accommodations TCU will need to provide to the veterans are either no cost or low cost so budget is not a big issue in implementing the guidelines.

The guidelines suggest targets for employing the disabled and veterans. For the disabled, the target is 7% of each group can be classified as disabled. There is a problem getting employees to self-identify themselves as disabled. The target for veterans is 8 percent. Self-identifying this group is not a problem. There are between 200 – 400 faculty and staff that are veterans. We may need to add information on application for veterans to identify themselves as such.

TCU is also looking at skills development for the veterans, specifically transferable skills from the military environment to the civilian workplace. The possible programs include interview training, apprenticeship or journeyman positions in various areas of the university (Physical Plan is an obvious place for this development). The apprenticeships would be used as a training opportunity, not as a guarantee for future hire at TCU.

Teresa Miles Hendrix asked if TCU was working with the Texas Development Board on any of our initiatives. Shari Barnes said we are not at this time. Teresa suggested contacting other universities that have successful programs to see what they are doing.

Implementation of the guidelines is set for March 24, 2014. TCU doesn't need to have a full program in place at that time but we will need to have policies in place for working with veterans. Some changes will be language changes in applications and changes to our websites.

Margaret Faust asked if we will have an assessment of needs for counseling services, workshops, or other campus services.

Ammie Harrison was unable to attend the meeting due to illness but submitted the following questions (answers provided in parentheses).

- Status of programs that were initiated since last meeting and how she can be of service (The meeting discussion encompassed the status and service opportunities).
- Contacts for students and faculty/staff with questions about aid for veterans or disabled (For students, Marsha Ramsey is the contact for ADA issues; April Brown is the contact for veteran issues. For faculty/staff, Shari Barnes is the contact for ADA; there is no designated contact for veteran issues).

Shari said that the Compliance and Affirmative Action committee can help by:

- Sharing ideas for programming with her or Darron Turner
- Helping with programming
- Being available to assist when Shari or Darron request assistance. They will contact me when these opportunities arise and I will forward the requests to the committee members.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Wood



## Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, March 21, 2014

1:30 pm; Tandy 120

Present: Victoria Chen, Lori Diel, Sparkle Greenhaw, Josh Harmon, Faith Perkins, Marsha Ramsey, Kathy Smith, Cheryl Taylor, Darron Turner, Tim Watkins, Barbara Wood

Absent: Payton Anderson, Dennis Cheek, Margaret Faust, Ammie Harrison, Teresa Hendrix, David Luczak, Ryan McFarland, Kristina Riddlesperger, Emily Walden

Darron Turner reported that the government targets for protected veteran employment is 8% across the workforce, and for employees with disabilities 7% per hiring group (e.g., administrative assistants would be a hiring group). We need to demonstrate a good faith effort in hiring practices towards meeting these goals. Towards that end, Darron informed us that TCU has paid to advertise on websites that target these groups so if there is a job opening, advertising on one of these sites would not cost the hiring department additional funds.

Faith Perkins said that getting employees to self-identify as a veteran or disabled person would be helpful. Employees can self-identify as a veteran in the Employee Center under Personal Information Summary on my.tcu.edu. HR is considering using the Open Enrollment period to encourage employees to verify and update personal information including veteran status on my.tcu.edu.

There is no similar way to self-identify as a person with disabilities. Also, there are privacy issues with asking a person if he/she is disabled so TCU is trying to determine how to gather that information without overstepping privacy concerns.

Faith said that TCU has a very robust program for working with employees with disabilities. She said that we need to expand the way we recruit disabled persons. But because TCU has such a low turnover rate, we are more limited in the ability to hire disabled persons to meet the targets.

Sparkle asked if there are targets for hiring minorities. Darron said there are no targets but TCU must make good faith efforts towards making our employee population more diverse.

Darron and Cheryl reported that Tim Barth is moving forward with a grant application to provide services to veterans to acclimate them back into civilian life.

Faith and Darron discussed the establishment of a list of Community Partners. Community Partners are groups in the area with which we interact (for example, tutoring) that provide TCU exposure, especially regarding TCU as a place of employment. HR has a preliminary list of about 200 community partners. We need to document interaction we have with these (and possibly other) groups. HR is planning on soliciting information from the TCU community semi-annually to document the interactions that have occurred.

Darron also reported that TCU needs to inform our contractors and subcontractors that TCU follows Affirmative Action guidelines. There are 17,000 contractors/subcontractors at TCU. The current plan is to send out a statement in the next payment. TCU does not have to ensure that the contractors/subcontractors comply with Affirmative Action guidelines but needs to make them aware that we do follow them and expect them to follow the guidelines. If we discovered non-compliance by a contractor/subcontractor, TCU would ask them to comply first, and then consider whether the business relationship could continue.

Darron said that his department has table clothes and signage that could be used at conferences/meetings where TCU has a table. Contact him if you need to borrow the items.

Teresa Hendrix has volunteered to be the Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee chair beginning in Fall 2014.

Action items for Committee members:

1. If you know that someone at TCU is a veteran, ask them to be sure to identify themselves as such in my.tcu.edu.
2. If you are aware of TCU involvement with community groups (whether on the Community Partners list or not), please send that information to Faith Perkins. Include the name of the group, the contact for the group, the activity that occurred and date of the activity.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Wood

TO:  
FROM: Carrie Leverenz, Chair, University Evaluation Committee  
RE: Report on Activities 2013-14  
DATE: June 4, 2014

The Evaluation Committee spent most of its time this year considering how to maximize the effectiveness of eSPOTs.

The committee met on Oct. 23, Dec. 2, Feb. 10, and Apr. 14.

Prior to the first meeting, committee members were asked to solicit comments from their departments and/or constituencies regarding continued concerns about eSPOTs. The greatest concerns expressed continued to be 1) lower response rates than with paper SPOT, 2) the possibility that responses would be skewed when students completed them out-of-class and potentially in the company of others and 3) that administrators and evaluation committees might not be fully informed about how best to interpret eSPOT.

To address these concerns, the Evaluation Committee considered several options 1) conducting a survey of students about their attitudes toward eSPOT 2) surveying existing research on the validity of eSPOT-type evaluations in relation to teaching effectiveness and 3) provide recommendations to administrators and faculty about how to interpret eSPOT based on existing research.

Early in the spring semester, it was suggested that student focus groups would be more beneficial than surveys. We ultimately decided that surveying or meeting with students would be of limited benefit this early in the process and before we knew whether faculty concerns were justified. We also decided that any test of the instrument's validity should take place later after adequate resources for developing an instrument and analyzing the results could be secured.

We did, however, suggest several improvements in the eSPOT reports, which were completed by Lee-Ann McKay in Institutional Resources. Subsequently, we drafted an email to faculty with brief suggestions for improving response rates (based on research conducted at other institutions). We also drafted some guidelines for interpreting the eSPOT reports themselves that were sent to faculty the week that spring semester eSPOTs became available. Close analysis of the eSPOT reports and feedback from faculty made clear that the eSPOTs are hard to interpret, making it even more important that the committee follow-up in the fall with advice regarding how eSPOTs should be used in the evaluation of teaching. Although in 2012-2013, the Evaluation Committee met with Deans to investigate their procedures for evaluation teaching to include more measures than eSPOT, it has yet to be determined whether all departments and colleges are using multiple measures in all cases where evaluations are being conducted, including annual reviews.

Attached below are copies of the two emails sent to faculty in late spring of 2014.

Dear TCU Colleague:

I am writing to update you on some of the work the University Evaluation Committee has been doing this year to make the administration and reporting of eSPOTs as effective as possible. Research suggests the following strategies can contribute to high response rates:

- Explain to students how you use eSPOT feedback. Give specific examples of changes you've made in the present class based on feedback students have provided in the past.
- Set aside time in class for students to complete eSPOTs. If computers are not available in your classroom, ask students to bring their laptops, tablets, or smartphones. Step out of the room as students are completing the eSPOTs.
- Schedule class in a computer classroom if one is available.

Additionally, **the office of Institutional Research, which manages the distribution of eSPOTs, will be offering students an incentive to participate:** students who complete all their eSPOTs will be entered into a drawing for one of 25 American Express gift cards. This is a recently approved program, so remind students to READ THEIR EMAILS about eSPOTs for more information.

The Evaluation Committee is also drafting guidelines for interpreting eSPOTs as a measure of teaching effectiveness, to be distributed at the end of the semester when eSPOT reports become available. We hope these guidelines will be helpful not only to instructors but also to those charged with evaluating others' teaching. For example, in response to concerns about eSPOT response rates, the Evaluation Committee has requested that response rates now appear on the summary report.

As you know, the Faculty Senate adopted recommendations that eSPOTs be just one means of evaluating teaching (See the full Faculty Senate Statement on Teaching Evaluation at <http://www.ir.tcu.edu/spotfaq.asp>). Nevertheless, as faculty, we want to ensure that student responses to our teaching are as helpful as possible.

If you have any questions about eSPOTs or the evaluation of teaching at TCU, feel free to contact me.

Carrie Leverenz  
Chair, University Evaluation Committee

Dear Colleagues:

In our continuing effort to maximize the effectiveness of eSPOTs as one means of evaluating teaching, the University Evaluation Committee is offering some helpful tips for interpreting eSPOT reports. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns. More detailed information about eSPOTs along with the Faculty Senate's recommendations regarding the use of eSPOTs in evaluating teaching can be found on the eSPOT FAQ page located at <http://www.ir.tcu.edu/spotfaq.asp>.

#### **How to access eSPOTs**

In addition to clicking on the link sent via email by the Office of Institutional Research, eSPOTs can be accessed at any time using these steps:

Log onto **my.tcu.edu**

Select **Main Menu** and use the drop down box to select **> Faculty > SPOT**

Reports are organized with the most recent term on top. Click on the report you'd like to access.

Once you open the preferred report, you can export it for saving or printing by clicking on the Excel icon in the upper left corner of the report and choosing the preferred file type. Saving the report as a pdf will allow you to preserve both data and charts.

\*\*If you need access to student evaluations prior to Fall 2012, contact Lee-Ann McKay in Institutional Research: [l.mckay@tcu.edu](mailto:l.mckay@tcu.edu)

#### **Kinds of eSPOT Reports Available**

The **Custom Report** is the default report that provides summaries of numerical results, graphs of selected questions, and student comments.

The **Comments** report allows you to view student comments only.

The **Individual Evaluations** tab allows you to view each student response separately.

The **MyFocus Report** provides a cumulative assessment of instructors' scores for all semesters in which eSPOTs have been completed in comparison to all other faculty's cumulative scores. The MyFocus Report is Intended to help faculty identify overall areas of excellence (in green) and areas for improvement (in pink). Scores from 0-100 reflect broad comparisons to others' scores, not percentage of achievement.

#### **Some Tips for Interpreting eSPOTs**

The **Custom Report** now includes both the number of students who responded (N) and the response rate (RR)

Please note that **questions 1-5** (e.g. #3 Prepared, #4 Interested) describe students, not instructors.

The measure "**Discriminate Overall**" refers to the tendency of a student to provide evaluations that differ from course to course, taking into consideration all of that student's eSPOTs.

The measure "**Rating Tendency Overall**" refers to the tendency of a student to give generally high (Very Easy Grader) to generally low scores (Very Hard Grader), taking into consideration all

of that student's eSPOTs. References to "Grader" on this measure apply to students, not instructors.

Beginning in spring 2014, the questions graphed on the **bar charts** have changed to those deemed most helpful in evaluating teaching. When interpreting these graphs, please pay special attention to the questions they represent. Graphs in reports prior to spring 2014 should not be compared to those beginning in spring 2014.

In the Comments section of the Custom Report, "**Student Disposition**" refers to a student's overall tendency to be Satisfied or Dissatisfied with a course based on all eSPOTs in the system. Thus, a positive comment from a student who is generally Dissatisfied is especially positive.

The **Word Cloud** is a visual representation of the words appearing in students' comments about your course. The bigger the word, the more often it appears in the comments.

### **Using eSPOTs to Evaluate Teaching**

As a reminder, eSPOTs are to be only one measure for evaluating teaching. Consult your Chair or Dean for policies on additional means of evaluating teaching in your department or college. As noted above, recommendations for best practices in evaluating teaching can be found in the Faculty Senate Statement on Teaching Evaluation, located at <http://www.ir.tcu.edu/spotfaq.asp>

For evaluative purposes such as merit, tenure, and promotion review, use the Custom Report only and not the MyFocus Report since "scores" on the latter are relative in comparison with all other instructors' scores and thus do not provide an objective measure of teaching performance. (Scores can fluctuate due not only to differences in an individual instructors' performance but differences in all instructors' performances.)

eSPOTs (SmartEvals), first implemented in Fall 2012, cannot be compared to earlier student evaluations. The different evaluation instruments have different score ranges and different questions.

Because students' expectations about a course affect their evaluation of it, be sure to consider factors such as whether a course is required, whether departments impose grading curves, whether an instructor is trying a new pedagogical approach, and so on. Judgments about teaching effectiveness should never be made on the basis of eSPOTs alone.

**Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee  
IACUC Report for the Academic year 2013-14  
Prepared by: Magnus Rittby, IACUC Chair**

**2013-14 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Magnus Rittby (Chair)	Nonscientist (Physics and Astronomy)
Ron Burns	Nonscientist (Criminal Justice)
Michael Katovich	Nonscientist (Sociology)
Robin Wright	Nonscientist (Modern Languages)
Brent Cooper	Scientist; Animal Researcher (Psychology)
Amanda Hale	Scientist; Animal Researcher (Biology)
Chris Watts	Scientist; Animal Researcher (Communication Sciences & Disorders)
Egenee Daniels	Veterinarian; <i>ex officio</i>
Todd Boling	Non-scientist (Center for Ethical Leadership & Responsible Citizenship); <i>ex officio</i>
Bo Söderbergh	Non-affiliated; <i>ex officio</i>
Teresa Hendrix	Liaison to TCU Research

**ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT**

Bonnie Melhart                      Administrative oversight

**CHARGE**

Institutional Animal Care and Use develops standards and reviews proposed projects to insure compliance with Federal and University policies to the humane care and use of laboratory animals in research.

**SUMMARY**

The TCU IACUC is well functioning with committee members dedicated to addressing the charge to the committee. The committee has a sufficient number of members allowing for compliance with federal regulations of IACUC operations (see below).

## **MEETINGS**

The IACUC met on the following dates to review Animal Use Protocol Applications:

**September 9, 2013**

**November 5, 2013**

**January 15, 2014**

**March 5, 2014**

**May 7, 2014**

The IACUC met on the following dates to perform a program review and animal facilities inspection:

**September 9, 2013**

**March 5, 2014**

## **NOTES ON COMMITTEE CONSTITUTION**

### **Procedure for Chair Selection**

The Chair is appointed by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, who is the institutional officer who bears the reporting responsibility to the Federal Government regarding animal use issues.

### **Membership Criteria including but not limited to the following:**

- Minimum and/or maximum years of service
- Composition of committee including number of faculty, staff and students
- Skills or expertise required if applicable
- Balance of discipline, college, tenured vs. non-tenured, and other demographic considerations

The IACUC has to fulfill the federal mandates with respect to its constitution. The IACUC must have a minimum of five members, including people with the following backgrounds:

- A veterinarian with experience in laboratory animal science and medicine, who has direct or delegated authority and responsibility for activities involving animals at the institution.
- A practicing scientist experienced in research with animals.
- A person whose primary concerns are in a nonscientific area, e.g. and ethicist, lawyer, or member of the clergy.
- A person not affiliated with the institution who represents community interests and who is not a laboratory animal user.



# TCU Institutional Biosafety Committee

---

## Year-end Report

6-25-2014

Committee membership: Giridhar Akkaraju (Chair), John Fanchi, Youngha Ryu, Dean Williams, Linda Freed and Phil Hartman

The IBC did not meet during the period under consideration.

### Action items

#### Completed:

1. Training: The Chair of the Biosafety Committee conducted a classroom Biosafety Training for students, staff and faculty in the Fall of 2013.
2. Training: A biosafety training tutorial has been created and is administered online via the TCU Science and Engineering Chemical Safety Office. Students and staff working with potentially hazardous biological substances are required to review the tutorial and take a quiz following that. Classroom training will no longer be required.
3. A Pathogen Safety Plan and Protocol for the use of recombinant DNA (rDNA) forms were created for the TCU Biosafety Manual.
4. Reviews: Over the summer of 2013, the IBC reviewed a Pathogen Safety Plan and a Protocol Application for Research Involving rDNA, submitted by Dr. Shauna McGillivray of the Department of Biology. Both applications were approved.

#### In Progress

1. A TCU specific Biosafety manual needs to be created. Currently we are using a Biosafety Manual created by the University of North Texas Health Science Center in Fort Worth.
2. The Biosafety forms created need to be uploaded to the IBC web page in a downloadable format.

If you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,  
Giri Akkaraju

Giridhar Akkaraju  
Associate Professor  
Department of Biology.

# TCU Institutional Review Board Final Report for 2013-2014

Chair: Dr. Sally L. Fortenberry; Co-Chair: Dr. Tim Barth

Research Integrity Officer and Administrative Oversight: Dr. Bonnie Melhart

Committee Members:

## **Fall 2013**

Dr. Dan Southard, Chair-Elect, Kinesiology

Dr. David Cross, Past chair, Psychology

Dr. Anna Petursdottir, Psychology

Dr. Sherrie Reynolds, Education

Dr. Meena Shah, Kinesiology

Dr. Charles Walker, Nursing

Dr. Eric Yorkston, Marketing

## **Spring 2014**

Dr. Morri Wong filled in for Dr. Anna Petursdottir during Anna's spring sabbatical

Dr. Lindy Crawford replaced Dr. Sherrie Reynolds during her illness and ultimately her untimely death

## **Liaison**

Linda Freed, Director of Sponsored Research

Laurie Heidemann, Administrative Assistant, Office of Sponsored Research, IRB Secretary

## **Ex-Officio**

Laurie Jagielski, non-TCU affiliated member

Dr. Matt Johnson, TCU Mental Health Services

## **Alternates**

Stacy Pickett, non-TCU affiliated member, prisoner advocate

Rodney Thompson, non-TCU affiliated member, prisoner advocate

Mary Spijkerman, non-TCU affiliated member

## **Meeting Dates:**

Fall 2013 Semester, 9a.m. till 11 a.m., Wright Board Room, Sadler

September 6, October 4, November 1 and December 6

Spring 2014, 10a.m. till 12noon, Sadler Conference Room and Wright Board Room, Sadler

January 10, February 7, March 4, April 4, May 2

Summer 2014, 10a.m. till noon, Wright Board Room, Sadler

June 25

Attendance is mandated in order to meet a quorum. All meetings took place as scheduled with a full quorum as well as the needed non-TCU affiliated members required in attendance. All meeting minutes are taken by Laurie Heidemann, Administrative Assistant for Research and Sponsored Projects. Minutes are filed on the IRB SharePoint site for IRB members to access.

From September 1, 2013 till July 31, 2014, 86 original protocols submitted by TCU Faculty or Staff were reviewed either by the full board of the IRB or Expedited by the Chair of the IRB. Of this number only one protocol was not approved by the board because of risk to the human subjects involved and one was withdrawn because of the health of the PI. Additionally, during that same time, 51 protocols, submitted either for Continuing Review or for Modification/Amendments, were reviewed and approved. All Protocols, original, continuing or amended are filed on the SharePoint site for all IRB members to have access.

The TCU IRB works year round to ensure that the research of the faculty and staff involving human subjects are reviewed in a timely manner and approved when each meets the requirements of the United States Federal Guidelines outlined in the Health and Human Services Office of Human Research Protections.