2012-13 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Magnus Rittby (Chair)  Nonscientist (Physics and Astronomy)
Marinda Allender      Nonscientist (Nursing)
Ron Burns             Nonscientist (Criminal Justice)
Harriet Cohen         Nonscientist (Nursing)
Michael Katovich      Nonscientist (Sociology)
Stephanie Sunico      Nonscientist (School of Geology, Energy & The Environment)
Brent Cooper          Scientist; Animal Researcher (Psychology)
Chris Watts           Scientist; Animal Researcher (Communication Sciences & Disorders)
Egenee Daniels        Veterinarian; ex officio
Cynthia Walsh         Nonscientist (Center for Ethical Leadership & Responsible Citizenship))
Bo Söderbergh         Non-affiliated
Open                  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:

**December 5, 2012**
**April 1, 2013**

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

**September 1, 2012**
**April 1, 2013**

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 bares 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.
• On what dates did you meet?
  1. September 30, 2012
  2. December 14, 2012
  3. March 8, 2013
  4. April 25, 2013

• Did you keep minutes? If so, have you submitted them to the Faculty Senate Secretary?
  1. Yes – minutes were kept and sent to Janis Quesada

• When is the bulk of your work conducted?
  1. The bulk of the work is done during the meetings. It mainly consists of reporting statistics regarding admissions, retention, and related matters.

• Do you have enough/too many members?
  1. The number of members is just right.

• Did faculty attend and participate appropriately?
  1. There was moderate attendance at each meeting. It remains a challenge to find a time to meet that works for all committee members.

• Did staff attend and participate appropriately?
  1. Faculty and staff interacted well with each other.
  2. There were always more staff members present at meetings than there were faculty present at the meetings. Staff members are the one who provide the bulk of the information that is discussed at these meetings.
  3. The members who make this committee happen are the staff members – Ray Brown, Mike Scott, Marsha Ramsey.

• Did students attend and participate appropriately?
  1. Yes – there are three students on this committee. One student, John Cogswell attended 3 meetings. Lauren Poey attended 2 meetings. The other student did not attend any meetings. John was a welcome participant and contributed to discussion.

• What were the notable accomplishments and highlights of the year?
  1. One highlight included participation by Janis Quesada, Faculty Senate Liaison.
  2. Accomplishments included discussion with John-Mark Day regarding how to enhance freshman experience through more activities at Frog Camp aimed to help students become resilient and bounce back from failures or disappointments as they transition into college life. He and his staff plan to create new activities for this summer.
  3. College 101 discussions indicate continued success of this program.
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2. Agendas for the meetings were sent to all members of the committee and to the Committee on Committees for archiving.
3. Much of the work is done outside of the committee with reports to the members and votes on issues. One meeting yearly is devoted to meeting with the Student Athlete Academic Council.
4. The number of members is appropriate but the committee voted to include the Faculty Senate Representative to COIA as a full voting member. This was approved by the Faculty Senate in the Spring, 2012 and the Chancellor for formal appointment in August, 2012.
5. Faculty attended meetings unless classes were scheduled and were very helpful in addressing the agendas. Much of this year's focus was on the challenges of entering the Big 12 and how to support athletes in the transition.
6. Staff members attended meetings and were very helpful in addressing the agendas.
7. Shawn Worthen, the Director of Athletic Academics attended meetings to report academic information and the Chair met with him on several occasions regarding information for and from the committee.
8. Students also attended meetings and this group of students continues to be very conscientious, attending meetings and contributing well.
9. The committee's meeting with the Student Athlete Advisory Committee is always helpful to us as we focus attention of ways to make the educational experience successful for them. The committee continues to work to provide better education to faculty regarding the needs and responsibilities of athletes. The committee will work to address the following issues:
   • Students reported that concerns regarding tutoring and tutor training have been addressed but there are still concerns about tutor preparation. The committee is discussing increasing pay to hire better prepared tutors.
   • Make-up exams are still an issue for athletes travelling to events. Faculty need more clear direction regarding timing and structure, and students need more clear expectations from faculty.
   • Official absence emails are not read by faculty. A Senate proposal to document Official Absences on eCollege was approved by the Senate so this may reduce the problems related to this.
   • Transition from athlete to graduate seeking a career is something the Athletic Department needs to address. Faculty may be helpful
in mentoring during the transition as well as providing information regarding internships. This is an agenda item for next year.

- Labs continue to be scheduled during practice times making it very difficult for athletes to attend. More options would be helpful. The committee is addressing this.

10. The charge of the committee was changed after two years of discussion and approval by the Faculty Senate and Chancellor. The changes reflect the focus of the committee and stronger connection to NCAA language regarding the well-being of student athletes.

11. The committee presented its proposal for a campus-wide Testing Center for make-up exams similar to that in the School of Business. It was endorsed by the Faculty Senate and referred to the Academic Excellence Committee for implementation structure. That committee's work will be presented to the Senate in the 2013-14 academic year.

The committee will continue to emphasize academic excellence and support for student-athletes well-being. Continued communication with the SAAC committee as well as Athletic Department staff will keep us abreast of the issues.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Moore, Chair
Annual Report (2012 – 2013) of the Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee

- On what dates did you meet?
  o Meeting dates: October 23, 2012 and April 22, 2013

- Did you keep minutes? If so, have you submitted them to the Faculty Senate Secretary?
  o Minutes were kept and sent to the Committee on Committee liaison, Julie Baker

- When is the bulk of your work conducted?
  o Meetings are used to share information about University initiatives. This year two committee members volunteered to participate with Human Resources on veterans' issues.

- Do you have enough/too many members?
  o We have sufficient membership.

- Did faculty attend and participate appropriately?
  o Yes. It was difficult (impossible) 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?
  o Yes, staff attended and participated appropriately.

- Did students attend and participate appropriately?
  o No. One student wondered why she received emails about the committee.

- What were the notable accomplishments and highlights of the year?
  o We are participating with HR on veterans' issues. We heard from the SGA Committee on Diversity regarding their findings and recommendations.
Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee Meeting Minutes

October 23, 2012

Attendees: Shari Barnes, Dennis Cheek, Victoria Chen, Lori Diel, Margaret Faust, Ammie Harrison, Mary Kincannon, Ryan McFarland, Dennis Odom, Darron Turner, Tim Watkins, Barbara Wood. Guests: Leigh Holland, Cheryl Taylor

Darron Turner and Shari Barnes provided information about compliance and affirmative action recent activities and future opportunities. Darron said in the past 18 months, TCU’s Affirmative Action plan has been updated because we are considered a Federal contractor due to faculty grants. A law firm has been hired to work on the Affirmative Action plan. Leigh Holland and Cheryl Taylor were brought in to help with administering the plan. Human Resources added personnel to help with the interviewing process. Both faculty and staff are now using the on-line job application program.

Shari reported that there is one outstanding EEOC case which is currently in mediation. One case was closed this summer. During the period from October 2011 through September 2012, there were 901 EEOC complaints brought to Human Resources. Most of the complainants were wanting to raise awareness of a situation without additional action requested. However, 90 of the complaints went to mediation and 2 ended with peer-reviews.

Going forward, TCU will be implementing programs related to veterans and the disabled. New government guidelines are expected after the election but we are going forward with programs prior to issuance of the guidelines.

Shari asked the committee to consider how TCU can help the disabled and veteran population. There was discussion related to working with veterans. TCU is working on preparing training modules to help veterans with resume preparation, interviewing skills, and transitioning from military to civilian life. There are several departments at TCU working on veterans’ issues, including Human Resources, Student Affairs, Registrar, and Financial Aid. The Compliance and Affirmative Action committee can help by providing one or more committee members to serve as a liaison to Human Resources to help formulate plans to implement training modules. Dennis Cheek indicated he is interested in this initiative.

There was discussion about recruiting veterans. Ammie Harrison asked if a military job bank exists. No one knew if this existed but if it did, perhaps TCU could get job posting or application information to the job bank.

Shari also said Human Resources is willing to talk to departments about disability and veteran issues.
Action: If you are interested in working with Human Resources to develop and implement training for veterans, please let me know by Wednesday, November 7. I will forward the names to Shari Barnes and Darron Turner.

Compliance and Affirmative Action Committee Meeting Minutes

April 22, 2013

Attendees: Dennis Cheek, Victoria Chen, Jacquelyn Curry, Lori Diel, Margaret Faust, Josh Harmon, Teresa Hendrix, Mary Kincannon, Ryan McFarland, Dennis Odom, Kathy Smith, Tim Watkins, Barbara Wood

Pearce Edwards and Miles Davis, co-chairs of the SGA Commission on Diversity, presented their findings to the Compliance and Affirmative Action committee. The commission used data sources provided by the University, surveys of students and faculty, research papers, news stories, and other universities’ diversity initiatives to prepare their report. Their conclusion was that TCU can be doing more to increase diversity within the student, faculty, and staff ranks. They provided recommendations regarding initiatives that could improve diversity and inclusiveness. Pearce and Miles are meeting with Chancellor Boschini to discuss their findings and recommendations.

Jacquelyn Curry presented an update on the veterans’ initiatives on behalf of Shari Barnes. TCU is now a federal contractor and thus must meet the requirements set by the OFCCP (Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs). This responsibility falls to HR to ensure that departments are considering, interviewing, and possibly hiring underrepresented groups. One of the main ones targeted groups is veterans. HR is required to keep records of any veterans who have contact with the employment process at TCU.

Here is a summary of her update.

The Center for Applied Psychology (CAP) under the direction of Dr. Tim Barth is combining efforts with Human Resources to address the needs of veterans.

The emphasis is on training. While the greatest needs are still being investigated to determine how we should target our veterans, the group plans to provide resources in the following areas:

1. Employment: Interviewing, Online applications, Resumes, and more coaching for interviews
2. Problem Solving: Goal setting, wellness, transition back to the work place, emotional regulations
Grant funding may be sought for proposed internship/apprenticeships. These vets would work throughout the campus in various departments.

HR will work directly with departments who have open positions to assist with understanding how jobs and skills in the military can translate to jobs on campus.
The main areas of interest that emerged for the University Compensation Advisory Committee this year focused on benefits for retired employees, renewal of the contract for a daycare program, and recommendations for pay increases.

UCAC co-chairs Randy Chambers and Dianna McFarland met during the spring with Jill Laster and other members of the TCU Department of Human Resources (HR). The full committee met during the fall semester on August 30, October 4, and November 28, 2012. Minutes of those meetings are summarized below.

Aug 30: The committee received an overview from Jill Laster of compensation issues normally addressed by UCAC. The committee also received reports on existing retiree benefits from Tracy Thompson, the staff market survey process from Dindy Robinson, and the faculty market survey process and current data from Susan Campbell. Committee member Susan Ramirez reported on website data she had collected to compare retiree benefits between a group of universities and TCU. Dr. Ramirez also brought forward requests from current faculty for UCAC to consider recommending additional benefits for retirees such as network drive space, enforced parking space at the library parking lot, carrel space in the library, and the ability for faculty to teach part-time or to have a phase-out type of retirement.

October 4: The committee discussed the additional retiree benefits that were suggested at the previous meeting. Members from Human Resources provided additional information on compensation, market survey reports (e.g., the Mercer Study) and exempt staff adjustments. Matt Millins, from Human Resources provided an analysis concerning current day care benefits costs and usage; the original three-year contract was coming to an end and the committee needed to make a recommendation regarding renewal. A vote was to be taken at the next meeting.

November 28: Chancellor Victor Boschini attended this meeting, making two announcements. The first news concerns a change in how retirees will receive healthcare benefits. A stipend will be given to each retiree through a Health Reimbursement Arrangement (HRA) account. The second announcement was a request by the Chancellor for committee members to discuss and provide him with a ranking of some type regarding each of the several benefits that employees currently enjoy. He remarked that he was making this request (only) as a proactive move during a time of prosperity, as a safety measure for possible future decisions. The committee voted to discuss and provide the needed information during 2013 given the present meeting was the last meeting of the year (2012).

Additional information then was provided on retiree benefits. Retired employees are welcome to apply for carrel space at the library along with current employees; the parking lot space issue was considered to be outside the duties of UCAC so no action was taken, and the committee decided to continue to consider the provision of network space by researching drive space options for retirees such as providing education on the use of flash drives, exploring possible server space, and considering costs for space on “the Cloud”. Other considerations are the number of retirees who might utilize this benefit, a possible trial period or study, and costs associated with all these aspects.

Then, after hearing final reports from HR regarding suggested merit pool increases for regular staff and faculty, staff compensation adjustment needs for exempt and non-exempt staff, and retiree benefits, the committee voted to forward the following set of recommendations to the Chancellor’s Cabinet.
Recommendation #1: Regular Pay Increase
The committee recommends a 3% merit pool increase for TCU regular staff and faculty which totals $4,822,729 (with benefits).

Recommendation #2: Mercer Study Compensation Adjustments
This recommendation is related to the implementation of the second year of funds allocated for the Mercer Study. The costs this year are to be used for internal alignment adjustments. The total cost, including benefits, is $205,020.

Recommendation #3: Exempt Staff Adjustments
There is a small group of exempt employees (12) who are at 11% or more below our market target of 80% of the market average. The committee recommends increasing their pay to the 80% average and this increase would cost $35,394 (with benefits).

Recommendation #4: Nonexempt Staff Adjustments
An additional group of non-exempt staff (4) are 5% or more below our market target of 80% of the market average. The committee recommends increasing their pay to the 80% average and this increase would cost $1387 (with benefits).

Recommendation #5: Camp Fire Child Care Program
A recommendation is made that TCU continue to provide childcare resources to its employees through the services currently linked to the Camp Fire Child Care Project. ($10,000.00 per year)

2012-2013 University Compensation and Advisory Committee Staff
Ms. Lisa Aven
Ms. Jeannie Bosillo
Mr. Randy Chambers
Mr. Paul Fox
Ms. Sondra Harris
Ms. Tracy Hull
Ms. DeAnn Jones
Ms. Dorenda Kesler
Mr. Brad Murphy
Ms. Kim Weber

Faculty
Dr. Janice Cobb
Professor Rebecca Dority
Dr. Andrew Fort
Professor Lynnette Howington
Dr. Jane Mackay
Dr. Dianna McFarland
Dr. Susan Ramirez
Professor Amy Roehl
Dr. Frank Thomas
Dr. Chris Watts
Retiree Representative
Ms. Emily Burgwyn

Advisory Liaisons
Ms. Shari Barnes
Ms. Susan Campbell
Ms. Jill Laster
Ms. Dindy Robinson

Special Retiree Report
Ms. Tracy Thompson
MEETINGS:

Oct. 23, 2012:

The meeting was a follow up on the Master Plan work from last year.

- Josh Harmon represented Bryan Lucas, who was pulled away at the last minute on a personal matter. Josh addressed some of the timelines for implementation of various items on the Tech Master Plan.
- He addressed some issues that had been of particular importance to the committee. For instance, after years of pleading, IT was finally hiring a UNIX administrator; we were also promised that faculty would be able to use personal devices on campus by the end of 2013.

April 29, 2013:

- The chair summarized the meager results from the individual subcommittees. The subcommittee initiative is described below in Appendix 1a and 1b.
- This led to a lengthy discussion about the mission and configuration of the committee. The result of that discussion was that the chair drafted a document advocating change in the committee. This document was then distributed by email and members had a couple of weeks to react and make suggestions. The chair submitted this document along with a change of committee form to the CoC. The document is added to this report as Appendix 2. This document is the most significant thing done by the committee this year.

ATTENDANCE:

For each of the meetings, a Doodle survey was used. Then a date was chosen in which the maximum number could attend, while trying to arrange it such that Bryan (IT), Romy (Koehler Center), and Larry (Instructional Tech) could also attend. With or without the latter three, it is impossible to get more than half the committee
together. Who comes and who can't becomes a matter of when the highest percentage can come, not by who might want to serve.

SVPING SUBCOMMITTEE EFFORT:

In Appendix 1a and 1b you will find the chair's attempt to restructure the committee work. The chair's thinking can be summarized thusly: The meetings end up ill attended with then a lot of the time being taken up by cross-examination of Bryan, Romy, and Larry, particularly Bryan, based mainly on the interests of those who happen to attend. Also, the chair felt that the committee really shouldn't be making any decisions about technology on campus without some campus-wide overview. Basically, nobody in a given college seems to know what people in other colleges are doing with technology. Often they don't know what others in the same college are doing. The chair wanted to have the committee create a basic overview and then meet to discuss it. The attempt was a huge failure, the only reports that came in were from two individuals in two colleges who had gotten a basic computer inventory list from IT (also one necessarily short one from Honors). No attempt was made to correlate that list with use or actual people working with technology or what projects. None of the subcommittees even met. There was an attempt in one college, but even that reduced number of people could never agree on a meeting time. Be that as it may, the attempt was a huge failure and the chair accepts responsibility. Perhaps if it had been explained differently or more in person, with each individual member, something more might have come of it.
APPENDIX 1: SUBCOMMITTEE INITIATIVE

I.A Initial Charge
1.B Follow up explanation

1.A: Initial charge

Computer and Telecommunications Committee

Subcommittee Assignment

Spring 2013

After much deliberation, I have decided to alter the typical manner in which the CAT committee functions. We are an exceptionally large and diversified group and it is virtually impossible to gather everyone at the same time. Furthermore, our charge seems both large and yet vague. Therefore, I have split up the committee as a whole into subcommittees with a specific task.

The goal is to gain an overview of the use of technology in each college unit within the university. I am fully aware that there are other important entities on campus, e.g. the library, but for this semester, I want to focus on the colleges. I have also left the University Programs till next year. As it is, we average about 2 people per college.

Each subcommittee should investigate specific points listed for the college(s) assigned and submit a report on each college that follows the scheme below. The committees will email me the reports in the form of a Word document (or RTF). Supporting materials such as Excel spreadsheets may be added but do not replace the report itself. For the enterprising colleagues who want to add images or digital video, they must deliver them in a format easily readable/viewable across platforms. The at large members can help with some of this information. Beyond
that I encourage you to enlist help from others in your college who have a clue. It will ultimately be in the best interest of all colleges to help you out.

Reports are due to me on Friday April 12. I will compile the individual reports into a whole and distribute it. Later I will send out a Doodle to schedule a general meeting during the week of April 22-26.

Each subcommittee consists of a faculty member, staff, and liaisons. I have also assigned the students to subcommittees. Some colleges have no faculty representative on the CAT committee, while Science and Engineering has several. Therefore, I am asking the Science and Engineering group to be responsible for the unrepresented colleges.

A few of us are not on any particular committee, but available as a resource to all subcommittees. Subcommittees are organized by college name, faculty are listed first, then Staff, Liaisons, and Students. The faculty representative should act as "chair" of the subcommittee and I will look to them for the report. In the case of the four Science and Engineering faculty members, you will split up the responsibility among yourselves (see below).

1.B. Follow up explanation

I have received a few questions concerning my email about the subcommittee task. It is often the case that several people have the same questions, but not everyone actually asks. Therefore, I thought it best to answer to the whole group.

The committee's charge, as a reminder, reads as follows:

Computer and Telecommunications.
COMPUTERS AND TELECOMMUNICATION REPORT 2012-2013

1) Reviews policies and procedures related to the application of computer and telecommunications technologies to instruction, research, advising, and administrative functions by students, faculty and staff.
2) Additionally, the committee monitors trends in computing and telecommunications pertinent to the educational enterprise.
3) Furthermore, they may be called upon to review and make recommendations concerning computer and telecommunications equipment acquisition as well as staffing and training needs.

The committee's current mode of operation does not seriously address that charge.

In preparing the Tech Master Plan, Bryan Lucas, to his credit, solicited a lot of feedback from across campus through a series of meetings. We will certainly monitor the implementation of this plan. But that is not the full extent of our charge.

The only current information the committee has at its disposal for making any decisions or recommendations is anecdotal based on who happens to come to a given meeting. Usually no more than half of the committee can meet at any one time. Among the faculty, no one really knows what goes on elsewhere, including from one department to the next even within the same college. Similarly, staff members know about their particular areas without necessarily being familiar with the larger context.

I know we are all very busy, so I probably should have started the last email with an apology of sorts for adding to that burden, but we are all on this committee. There is no expectation that you go around individually with paper, pen, or mobile device to every lab, classroom, and faculty member. Rather, you oversee the collection of the data and the ultimate college report. You know already or can figure out what information best represents your particular college assignment.

For some of it, the members at large can help. For other parts, as the point person(s) in your colleges for CAT related issues, you know the others in your college who are engaged in such activities for research or teaching, run labs or facilities, etc.

Get as much done as you can by the deadline, anything you turn in will be more than we have currently.

Pursuant to our charges, the information aids in monitoring trends, helps us review policies in an informed fashion, and gives us a more solid basis upon which to make recommendations regarding acquisition, staffing, and training. Surely that works to everyone's advantage.
COMPUTERS AND TELECOMMUNICATION REPORT 2012-2013

Subcommittee Membership

- At-large:
  - Bryan Lucas, Executive Director of Information Technology
  - Romy Hughes, Director of the Koehler Center for Teaching Excellence
  - Larry Kitchens, Director of the Center for Instructional Services
  - Scott Williams, Chair, CAT committee (also responsible for the Honors College report.)

- Education: Sue Anderson, Liz Branch

- Science and Engineering (responsible also for Nursing and Communication):
  James Comer, Benjamin Janesko, Bruce Miller, Ken Richardson, Carlene Coover (IT), Josh Harmon (Administrative Systems), Mike Hanvey (TCU Police), Blake Cluck (student). (I will leave it to the four faculty members to decide which of you will be responsible for Science and Engineering and who for Nursing and Communication. There are also four non-faculty committee members. The subcommittee can decide the exact distribution. Just let me know who is doing what.)

- AddRan: Joddy Murray, Jay Iorizzo (Recreation)

- Fine Arts: Richard Gipson, Kerry Bouchard (Library), Claire Homza (student)

- Business: Beata Jones, Travis Cook (Business Services), Victor Neil (Website Management) Jake Murphy (student)

- Honors: Scott Williams
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Specific Points for the College Reports

Circumstances and conditions will vary with each college. Use good judgment about what to include, keeping in mind that the committee name is "Computer and Telecommunications." No electric pencil sharpeners please. However, there may be major equipment in, for instance, the Sciences that may not fit the narrow definition of "computer / telecommunications" but would be noteworthy nonetheless.

1. Computer labs

- How many?
- Where?
- Number and what kind of computers, printers, etc.
- What special software, besides the standard stuff like Microsoft Office Suite or Virus protection, is installed?
- Is the lab part of a separate center within the college (perhaps affiliated with a department but that maintains its own identity).
- Is the lab used primarily by certain departments (or, if relevant, even mainly by particular individuals)?
- Who is the go-to person in the college or department regarding the lab (this could be faculty or staff)? Regarding for instance what software is installed, scheduling, etc.

2. Other kinds of labs or non-classroom facilities

- How many?
- Where?
- What kind of equipment is in place, etc.
• Is the lab part of a separate center (perhaps affiliated with a department but that maintains its own identity).

• Is the lab used primarily by certain departments (or, if relevant, even mainly by particular individuals)?

• Who is the go-to person in the college or department regarding the lab (this could be faculty or staff)? Regarding, for instance, what software is installed, scheduling, etc.

3. Classrooms

• Although we all theoretically could be assigned a classroom anywhere, please identify the building or buildings in which the bulk of the college's classes are held. Labs are already covered above.

• Most rooms have a standard package of equipment. Identify what that is and then you need only mention which specific rooms vary from that standard package and how.

• Has faculty had special, non-standard software installed in any of these classrooms? If so what and why?

4. Support Staff

• Does the college have technology related support staff assigned to it that work within the college? Examples would be Business with its own IT or a college with its own web designer.

• If so who is it, what are the duties, and what is the chain of command (to whom do they answer)?
5. Workshops and training

- What kind of workshops and training occur within the college or departments (this would be separate from the Koehler Center).
- Who conducts this?

6. Individual faculty

(Although it would be worthwhile to assess how individual faculty members integrate technology into teaching, etc., I want to limit this study to the following points)

- Are there particular CAT technology heavy projects or initiatives undertaken by individual faculty members?
- What are they?
- What equipment or software is used?

7. Special Issues or Circumstances

- Are there other special labs or facilities you wish to address?
- Are there any significant, technology related issues?
- Note also which parts of the recently adopted Technology Master Plan are of particular importance to your college.
APPENDIX 2: CAT COMMITTEE RESTRUCTURING

As approved by the CAT committee this Spring of 2013:
It is the consensus of the committee that significant changes need to be made in the mission, name, and composition of the committee.

Mission and name:
The focus on computers and telecommunications no longer adequately addresses the role of technology use in the university. Furthermore, technology is so pervasive that the committee cannot monitor all uses.

- We propose that the committee focus on "academic" technology, by which we mean technology that directly supports and enhances teaching and research.
- We therefore also suggest the name of the committee be changed to "Committee on Academic Technology." (with the same acronym, "CAT")
- There may be a need for a separate committee that would look at uses of technology in other areas of the university (which could, of course, maintain a dialogue with the CAT).

We also have serious questions about our role:
- The committee is unclear exactly whom we advise. When we produce a report or make a suggestion, to whom precisely should it go and to what extent is that person or those persons obliged to respond and/or act upon our report or suggestion?
- Under what circumstances should the committee's advice or feedback be sought out?
- What is the committee's role vis-à-vis other campus entities, for instance, special task forces concerning technology?
- What should be the committee's role regarding campus plans involving significant use of technology for teaching and research, such as relevant major building initiatives?
• What should be the committee's role in creating a vision for the future use of technology at the university?

Composition:
The *committee is simply too large* and unwieldy. Even getting half the committee together at any one time is nearly impossible. Furthermore, we firmly believe that *each college needs to have a representative* (rather than some colleges having several while others have none).

• Commiserate with the committee's proposed mission, the need for equitable representation, and also the need to reduce the committee to a manageable size:
  o We strongly suggest that there be one representative from each college (but no more than two, and only as needed),
  o the head of Information Technology,
  o the head of Instructional Technology,
  o the head of the Koehler Center for Teaching Excellence, and a student representative
  o (and possibly a representative from the library).
  o a student representative
  o This should be the maximum number of members.

• Other people can always be invited to individual meetings to inform, advise, and consult on specific issues, but they should not be members.
Environmental Health and Safety Committee
Annual Report, 2012-13
Dr. Lisa Vanderlinden, Chair

Committee Members:

Faculty
Dr. Lisa Vanderlinden, Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Dr. Lavonne Adams, Harris College of Nursing & Health Sciences
Dr. Becky L. Johnson, Dept. of Environmental Science
Dr. Paul Witt, Department of Communication Studies

Staff
Ms. Wendy Bell, Harris College of Nursing & Health Sciences
Mr. David Cooper
Ms. Kimberly Gore, Gift Planning
Ms. Laurie Heidemann, Office of Sponsored Research
Ms. Zoanne Hogg, Office of Assessment & Quality Enhancement
Ms. Vicki Lawson, TCU Police

Ex Officio
Mr. Randy Cobb, Director, Department of Safety
Mr. Paul Fox, Risk Management
Mr. Jonathan Roark, Director, Emergency Preparedness & Business Continuity

Students
Ms. Margaret P. Fleming
Mr. Tim S. Klein

Dr. Bruce Carroll, Committee on Committee’s liaison

Meeting dates:
• February 6, 2013
• February 13, 2013, e-meeting
• Minutes were kept and submitted to Faculty Senate Secretary via Dr. Bruce Carroll

EH&S Committee's accomplishments for 2012-13:
• Reviewed and revised TCU’s Cell Phone Usage Guideline—at behest of Randy Cobb and Paul Fox, who were concerned that TCU’s guidelines were outdated and left the institution vulnerable to lawsuits.
• Crafted a new Distracted Driving Policy.
• Status of project: Documents (review of Cell Phone Usage Guidelines and updated Distracted Driving Policy) submitted to Brian Gutierrez for his review. EH&S Committee still awaiting his comments.

Committee Membership:
• Committee members attended meetings and were responsive to resolving our targeted environmental and safety issues.
• Student members did not attend the meetings due to conflicts with class schedules.
• Suggestion made that two of the staff member EH&S Committee appointments should be reserved for (1) staff member at the physical plant (2) staff member at athletics given that health and safety issues are paramount to their workplace issues.

**EH&S central tasks for 2013-14:**
- Improve safety of University Street corridor through campus.
- Improve safety of crosswalks across campus.
- Strategize about potential public awareness campaign regarding texting while driving and walking.

*Environmental Health and Safety Committee*
*Review of TCU's Cell Phone Usage Guidelines While Driving*

The Environmental Health and Safety Committee reviewed the document TCU’s Cell Phone Usage Guidelines While Driving and made the following recommendations:

1. The committee agrees that the guidelines are outdated and suggests broadening these guidelines into a TCU Distracted Driving Policy.

2. The committee suggests the following changes to the policy:
   a. The policy should address hand-held electronic devices (smart phones, tablets, laptops, portable DVD players), not just cell phones.
   b. The policy should be written in a flexible way to attempt to accommodate future devices not yet in use.
   c. The policy should prohibit the use of hand-held devices.
   d. The policy should make a provision for the use of hand-held devices in emergencies.
   e. The policy should provide a reminder that hand-held devices are not the only potential driving distraction—other distractions should also be minimized.
   f. The policy should provide a reminder that laws differ in other municipalities and states on the use of hand-held electronic devices.
   g. The policy should make a provision for law enforcement.
   h. The policy should clarify that the use of installed electronic devices like back-up cameras, GPS devices, satellite radio or blue tooth are allowed.
   i. The policy should make a provision for the use of electronic devices by drivers with disabilities to facilitate their safe driving.

3. The committee suggests the following language as a starting point for the policy:

**Revised TCU Distracted Driving Policy**

TCU drivers are prohibited from using hand-held electronic devices while operating a TCU-owned vehicle, TCU-leased vehicle or while using a TCU-issued hand-held electronic device
while operating a non-TCU vehicle. These devices include, but are not limited to: cell or smart phones, tablets, laptops, portable DVD players, and other similar devices. This prohibition is suspended if the driver is making an emergency call to TCU police or 911 to report incidents such as traffic accidents, medical emergencies, fires, severe road hazards, etc. In such cases, the driver should attempt to pull off of the road prior to initiating the call. If it is not possible to stop the vehicle, the call should be as short as necessary to communicate the nature of the emergency.

Operating a motor vehicle requires the driver’s constant attention. Anything that distracts the operator of a motor vehicle dramatically increases the risk of an accident. In addition to the use of hand-held devices, changing radio stations, reaching for a cup of coffee, or eating also pose risks. As such, attempts should also be made to minimize these and other distractions while driving.

Drivers should also be aware that other municipalities and states may have different laws regulating the use of electronic devices. When travelling please be alert to these.

This prohibition does not apply to law enforcement or emergency vehicles while in the performance of their official duties.

This prohibition does not apply to installed electronic devices such as back-up cameras, GPS devices, satellite radio or blue tooth.

This prohibition does not apply electronic devices used by drivers with disabilities to facilitate their safe driving, including but not limited to hand-held driving controls and hearing aids.
Submitted by Rebecca Sharpless, chair

The University Evaluation Committee met on September 24 and November 15, 2012. Minutes exist for both meetings but have not been submitted to the Faculty Senate Secretary.

The bulk of the committee's actual work was done in the first half of the spring semester.

The size of the committee is about right. All faculty and staff members on the committee attended at least one meeting and participated in the work of the committee as requested. No student was able to attend either meeting.

The notable accomplishments and highlights of the year are threefold:

1. The faculty members on the committee met with each dean to assure that her or his unit of the university is complying with the provost's request for methods of alternative teaching evaluations. The report generated by the visits is attached at the end of this document, without the Harris College, the report for which arrived late. The effectiveness of the request by the provost and the meeting will become evident as each dean does or does not send a report to the provost. The committee has a strong interest in the professional development review procedures throughout the university.

2. Faculty members also queries deans about the methods of evaluating administrators in her or his unit. Administrator evaluation may become a topic of interest for this committee in the future.

3. Validating questions on the new eSPOT. Professors Carol Thompson (Sociology) and Joanne Green (Political Science) evaluated the current set of questions and recommended changes to make the current questions more valid. The questions have been remanded to the Faculty Senate for their approval.

Members of the Faculty Senate Academic Excellence committee have also expressed an interest in validating the questions. In a meeting on February 14, 2013, members of the AEC expressed the following concerns about SPOT:

--Continued education of chairs and deans on the role of SPOTs and how to interpret them.
--They want the background material for SPOTs to be as holistic as possible—for example, how many people dropped the class.
--They want to see how much ratings change as the result of the new format.
--They strongly suggest that some of the psychometricians on the faculty do item analyses.
--They continue to be interested in alternate methods of student evaluation.
--They would like more education on how to personalize their SPOTs, e.g., an on-line tutorial.

In sum, the committee worked on the changes to the SPOT and also ventured into the areas of alternative methods for evaluating teacher effectiveness and administrator evaluation. Next year's committee will have plenty of work to do if it only continues on these projects already begun.

Status Report on Evaluation by College

1. Each faculty committee member will ask the dean how best to ensure that each faculty member has access to the Faculty Senate report, “On the Evaluation of TCU Faculty Teaching,” which I attach again here. The document is also on the Institutional Research web site: http://ir.tcu.edu/zfiles/facsenatespot.pdf.

AddRan. Dean Schoolmaster sent the document from the provost to the chairs and asked them to distribute it to their faculty members.

Communications. This document was emailed to each faculty member three times (from their Provost, Dean, and respective Chair).

Education. Dean Patton was glad to be reminded about the provost's message from last fall. She believed that the College of Education has good awareness of teaching evaluations using multiple methods because of the college's handbook. It has existing policies governing the use of SPOTS, plus encouraging the use of mid-semester evaluations; teaching observation/peer reviews by senior faculty members of non-tenured faculty (and every five years for those with tenure); and inclusion of teaching artifacts and philosophy in faculty dossiers. A reflection is included in the yearly annual report.
Fine Arts. I interviewed Dean Sullivan, who was forthright and helpful. As to bringing awareness of the Faculty Senate document on the evaluation of teaching to all faculty, he has sent it (and suggests all Deans send it) to the chairs, who then are charged to send it to all the faculty in their departments. He said this should be done every year, otherwise people forget or, in case of new faculty, may never learn about it. He asked whether it can be included in the Faculty Handbook.

Neeley. - Dean Erekson sent an email to the faculty, as well as, asked department chairs to address the report in their respective departmental meetings.

Science and Engineering: Aware of the provost's memo but hasn't acted on it.

2. Each faculty committee member will ask the dean what is being planned to comply with the October 2 message from Provost Donovan, stipulating that each department will have a plan for assessing teaching: "I challenge and expect each Department and College to react to the Senate Report and by the end of this academic year present me with clear recommendations as to how they will evaluate teaching." As Carrie observed, we don’t want to be the compliance police; we just want to make sure it doesn’t drop through the cracks.

AddRan. AddRan has been working on teaching evaluations for several years. Rob Garnett served as an administrative fellow in 2011-12 to work on the issue of teaching evaluations, using a model from Eastern Kentucky University. All faculty members will have peer review as part of professional development review and will have at least two different courses evaluated. Dean Schoolmaster intends to have these plans in place by May 2013.

Communications. Dean Whillock called a college-wide meeting with all faculty, except for the Deans, for ideas on evaluating teaching. In October 2012, the Dean charged his Associate Dean and three Chairs to come up with three ways to evaluate teaching. This can include a variety of options such as: materials documents (syllabus, etc.), peer review trends (looking for pairing mentors outside of chairs), a teaching portfolio menu (selection of E-SPOTS, style of teaching, etc.).

Education. I believe Dean Patton will use the existing policies of the college (it doesn't have departments, but program areas) as evidence of a fully developed plan for the evaluation of teaching.

Fine Arts. As to implementing the policy on teaching evaluation, each Department has its own policy and the College has not intervened. Fine Arts has the advantage of the jury system. Students are auditioned to get into the programs, so they are all capable. In music, for example, all the voice faculty (and probably some others) listen to the jury presentation of each vocalist and evaluate the performance. If all a given faculty member’s students are performing well, that means the person teaches well. If the students perform consistently poorly (not one student but
the faculty member's students as a group), that means something else. So there is a built-in
system with a long successful record of evaluating faculty. Conversely, SPOTs mean very little
or are not even used in individual music lessons. The same is true for theater and art. SPOTs are
an issue only in traditional courses, such as art history or music appreciation. As for the
programs in Design, outside professionals are brought in to review and critique the students' portfolios. This provides the same sort of scrutiny that juries do for performances.

Neeley- The Business School created a committee two years ago called the "teaching
effectiveness committee". In addition to other activities, the committee has drafted a teaching evaluation plan in response to the Provost's charge. The plan has been approved by the department heads, but is awaiting approval from the faculty. Evaluation of teaching includes eSPOTs, peer evaluations, service, and self-evaluations. This appears to be a great model for other schools.

Science and Engineering
At a September Chairs' meeting, Phil indicated he would "take a stab" at generating a document over the Christmas/New Year semester break. He intended to craft a document, to take it to the departments in Science and Engineering, to have them discuss it, and then to move forward accordingly. He confesses that this original plan has not materialized. And he knows he needs to "get on it."

Candidly, serving as Interim Dean has made Phil reluctant to craft and then introduce policies that may or may not coincide with the vision of the person who succeeds him. This reluctance to seem heavy-handed applies to admin (staff) as well as to faculty; thus, nothing is in place to evaluate staff.

While there is a post-tenure review in place, and Phil revealed this has been the occasion for some "recent pain" for one faculty member, it's not something that departments engage on a fully consistent basis. Again, he knows something needs to change.

3. Each faculty committee member will ask what how administrators are evaluated in her or his college.

AddRan chairs and the dean are evaluated annually. The policies are on the website:
http://www.addran.tcu.edu/documents/EvaluationofChairs.pdf and
http://www.addran.tcu.edu/documents/EvaluationoftheDean.pdf. Associate deans are evaluated face-to-face. The directors of centers and institutes are evaluated through informal face-to-face conversations and through the annual reports of the units.

Communications. The Provost evaluates the Dean and meets with Chairs and then with the Dean to discuss his goals. Chairs are evaluated at the end of the academic year. They are asked to provide a written report to Dean Whillock that compares their goals with how they have or have not met the goals. This report also includes goals for the upcoming year. If a Chair would like re-appointment at the end of their term, Dean Whillock has a detailed meeting with each faculty in the respective department before deciding whether or not to re-appoint the Chair.
**Education.** Dean Patton doesn't think the deans were evaluated until the upcoming SACS visit was on the calendar. She and other deans were evaluated in 2012 by the provost, based on a Qualtrics survey that was given to her faculty members based on eight parts of her job description. It sounded like he presented her with the quantitative data from that; she also provided goals to the provost during this conversation. Both the provost and chancellor asked her to evaluate them, by sending them ideas, suggestions and concerns in an reply email message.

**Fine Arts.** Concerning evaluation of the chairs, there is a review every three years. Faculty submit their input to the Dean. The Dean is evaluated every four years in a process carried out by the College Advisory Committee. The report is passed on to the Provost.

**Neeley.** I didn't catch who is charged with the task, but apparently a draft of this has been circulated to the department heads. Dean Erekson indicated he would email the draft to me at a later date.

**Science and Engineering.** Deans are evaluated by the Provost, as we know, but Phil indicates there is nothing in place, at least in Science and Engineering, for the evaluation of Chairs and the Dean (by S&E faculty). Phil asked after "best practices" in AddRan and in Religion; I talked from my department and AddRan Advisory experience, and Phil asked me if I thought it would be wise to contact Dean Schoolmaster for some advice — I said I thought it would.
Date: May 28, 2013

To: Arnold Barkman

From: Ann George, Chair of Instructional Development Committee

Re: Year End Committee Report

The Instructional Development Committee meets once a year to allocate grants to faculty to develop new courses or improve existing ones. The committee’s work typically extends from the grant proposal deadline (this year, March 22) to the annual meeting (this year, April 12). During that time, committee members read and score proposals; scores are collected and collated before the meeting and then are used as the basis of our discussion.

The size and make-up of the committee is generally effective. Because so many of the proposals concern Study Abroad courses, this year we added Jane Kucko, Director of the Center for International Studies, to the committee; her feedback was invaluable. However, I suggest some aspects of the committee makeup be reconsidered:

1. undergraduate student representatives: in theory, having student representatives could provide an important perspective to the committee’s deliberations. But the students are often unsure how they get on the committee or what the committee does, so over the past few years, their participation has steadily declined. This year, one of the students canceled a few days before the meeting because he needed to study for an exam rather than read the grant proposals; the second student came but hadn’t read the material and left early to go to a fraternity dance.

2. the ex-officio member (in the past, Larry Kitchens) to provide feedback on technology requests: this year, Kitchens’s office referred me to IT staff for responses to proposals. Bryan Lucas, IT Chief Technology Officer, gave me a fast, thoughtful, and detailed response, so perhaps he or someone else from IT could be added as an ex-officio member.

3. faculty representatives: this year, the committee seemed a bit unbalanced in terms of representation of various colleges, so increased attention to committee makeup would be welcome. However, given that the majority of proposals are submitted by faculty in Addran and Fine Arts, it seems logical that those colleges might have extra representation.
This year, the committee faced the difficult and unusual task of having many more proposals than could be funded within our current budget ($45,000). We had 23 proposals with total requests of $76,758.00. We funded 15 of those proposals, awarding $41,181.00. Though the deliberation was often hard and lengthy, Bonnie Melhart and I were extremely pleased with the committee’s final decisions. Faculty, staff, and graduate student committee members were uniformly well prepared and took the committee’s function very seriously. The thoughtful and lively discussion of proposals reaffirmed the value of this committee’s work.

Below, I’ve included Bonnie’s summary table for this years IDG awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th># applied</th>
<th># awarded</th>
<th>% awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AddRan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci&amp;Engr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Biosafety Committee

Year-end Report
8-6-13

The IBC did not meet during the period under consideration. It did however review new forms and three proposals during this period.

Action items

Completed:
1) A Pathogen Safety Plan was created for the TCU Biosafety Manual.
2) A recombinant DNA (rDNA) proposal was reviewed by the committee and approved.
3) Two pathogen safety plans were reviewed and approved by the committee.

In Progress

Conversion and updating of the University Biosafety Manual from the template provided by the Biosafety Committee of UNT HSC.

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

Sincerely,
Giri Akkaraju

Giridhar Akkaraju
Associate Professor
Department of Biology.
Intellectual Property Committee

April 21, 2013

During the 2012-13 school year, the IPRC officially met on September 11, November 13, December 11, February 4, April 1, and May 6. The bulk of the committee's work occurs during its meetings, though some decisions are handled by email. Minutes of the meetings have been made available to committee members, but have not been submitted to the Faculty Senate Secretary.

Eight faculty members and one student, which seem to be an appropriate number of members for the committee's work, all attended and participated appropriately during the year. In January, Susan Layne stepped down as chair of the committee. At that time, Joel Timmer assumed the chair position.

The primary work of the committee has been to make recommendations on Invention Disclosures, after they have been evaluated by Tremonti Consulting for patentability and marketability. The committee recommended that provisional patent protection be sought for two disclosures and that patent rights be returned to the inventors for two other disclosures. The committee expects to make a recommendation on one additional disclosure at its final meeting of the year on May 6.

The committee also worked on significant revisions to the University's Intellectual Property Policies and Procedures and to the Invention Disclosure Form. The revisions were primarily intended to make the policies and form easier for faculty and others to use and understand, not to make significant substantive changes.

Joel Timmer
Chair, IPRC
International Students Committee (ISC)
Year End Report AY 2012-2013

Submitted by Raúl Prezas, Assistant Professor in COSD – ISC Chair

On what dates did you meet?

  October 23, 2012
  April 11, 2013

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

  No.

When is the bulk of your work conducted?

  The bulk of the workload is during ISC meetings with the committee as a whole as well as during international student orientation in August.

Do you have enough/too many members?

  The ISC has enough members.

Did faculty attend and participate appropriately?

  Yes – There were some schedule conflicts; however, everyone informed me if and when they could attend.

Did staff attend and participate appropriately?

  Yes – There were some schedule conflicts; however, everyone informed me if and when they could attend.

Did students attend and participate appropriately?

  Yes – students attended and participated regularly. The students who did attend made effective contributions. Some did not/could not attend meetings even though times rotated according to ISC members’ availability. Students who could not attend made an effort to contact the ISC Chair via email.
What were the notable accomplishments and highlights of the year?

This year, the ISC continued a plan to improve services provided to international students as they initially arrive to campus (i.e., international student orientation). As agreed during committee meetings the previous year, faculty members who served on the committee played a more active role during August 2012 orientation. Faculty met with students and families during orientation, providing workshop-like presentations.

The ISC continued a program for international student and US student exchange. The ISC reached out to faculty members asking them if they would be willing to open up their courses (i.e., reserve a small number of seats in courses that are geared toward international study in some way) so that both international students and US students can have an exchange of ideas and dialogue. In conjunction with willing campus faculty/departments, core interdisciplinary courses were identified and selected. A small number of seats in these courses were held for a group of incoming first-year international students so that they would be able to register for those classes.

The ISC made a commitment this year to focus on academic concerns related to international students. Academic support was identified as an important need by the committee. Some of the topics discussed during the meetings were related to course enrollment/registration, student advising, development of student-led focus groups, and faculty/student mentors for international first-year students. It was decided that course enrollment/registration support would continue for next year. The ISC proposed that student advising may be achieved by the coordination of faculty and/or student mentors. Faculty would be contacted to participate and only interested faculty would be selected. The primary (and only) requirement would be that faculty assist students during their first semester at TCU (identified as a critical semester for international students). Student mentors would consist of international students with senior standing. Additional requirement would include high GPA and a willingness to work with other students. The ISC will need to identify other criteria and procedures in the coming academic year. In order to further identify additional academic needs, the ISC would like to coordinate student-led focus groups. These groups would contain approximately 10 students and one faculty member from the ISC. Questions related to academic support and other potential needs will be discussed. The ISC will need to develop procedures for the focus group in the coming academic year.

Other discussions of the ISC included recommendations for changes to committee member representation, meeting time designation, and ISC student representation. Those recommendations are listed below as recommendations for the ISC:

1. Anyone who wants to join the committee may join
2. Ideally, one faculty per school for voting
3. Committee meeting times be determined prior to sign-up, so that by signing up a member is "defacto" stating his/her availability (John Singleton will determine the day/time slot for academic year 2013-2014.

4. One spot held for the following groups:
   a. International Student Association
   b. International graduate student
   c. SGA Officer
   d. International Athlete

5. International Office sits on committee as "ex officio" and does not vote
YEAR-END REPORT FOR THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE
Submitted by Bonnie Frederick, Chair

The Library Committee met twice during the 2012-2013 academic year, on October 19 and February 8. Both times, there was only one topic: the renovations of the library. Dean Koelker kept us informed about the process and also sought our views on various matters. These are the most important issues we discussed:

- budget allocations and what could be achieved —and not achieved— with them.
- using the new space for both efficiency and comfort; for example, how much study space should there be? Graduate student carrels?
- what to do with infrequently consulted books and journals. Which ones should be stored off-site? Policies concerning storage at the Bolt Street warehouse.
- what to do about outmoded media, such as VHS tapes; how best to preserve current media, such as DVDs; possibilities offered by new and on-the-horizon media.
- finding a balance between new research techniques (such as online title scanning) and traditional ones (such as physically visiting a shelf area to look at books and flip through them).
- dividing our resources effectively between hard copy texts and online texts.
- the role of classroom space in the library, and how that space should be configured.

The undergraduate student representatives were not able to attend the sessions, but the graduate students and the faculty were active participants in the conversations, as these issues have a direct impact on their scholarship.

Next year, as the renovations progress, we anticipate continued discussion of these matters as well as new issues that arise during the course of the renovations.
To: Arnie Barkman, Committee on Committees
From: Gregory K. Stephens, Chair, University Mediator's Committee
Date: 23 May 2013
RE: Year end committee report

The University Mediator's Committee has not found occasion to meet as a group during this academic year. Virtually all of our work is done as individuals (assisting with the preparation of grievance documents) or partners (mediating disputes), and there were no disputes for which we could have been called upon to help. Therefore we saw little reason to meet as a group. For that reason, there are also no meeting minutes to be filed.

If you have any questions regarding my report, please feel free to contact me.

Best regards,

Gregory K. Stephens, Ph.D.
Chair, University Mediator's Committee
(817) 257-7548
Research and Creative Activities (RCAF) Committee 2012-2013

End of Year Report

Members:

Dr. Kathy Baker, Chair
Nursing

Dr. Michael Bachmann
Criminal Justice

Dr. Carolyn Cagle
Nursing

Dr. Amber Finn
Communication Studies

Dr. Jack Hill
Religion

Liaison:

Dr. Bonnie Melhart
Associate Provost & Dean, University Programs

Dr. John Horner
Biology

Dr. Fran Huckaby
Education

Dr. Jean-Luc Montchamp
Chemistry

Dr. Luther Smith
Art

Dr. William Wempe
Accounting

Linda Freed
Director, Sponsored Programs

The RCAF Committee met on February 26, 2013 to determine award recipients for the 2013-2014 RCAF and Junior Faculty Summer Research Program (JFSRP) awards.

- Forty nine applications were evaluated, 41 RCAF and 29 JFSRP applications.
- $129,492 was requested from RCAF applicants, and $92,167 was awarded (n = 26 plus 2 additional "off cycle" awards for a total of 28 awards).
- $174,000 was requested by JFSRP applicants, and $96,000 was awarded (n = 16).

All committee members participated actively in the evaluation and selection of award winners. Improvements in the application and review process continue to be incorporated from year-to-year. In particular, the committee recommended a Fall 2013 workshop to assist applicants in the RCAF/JFSRP process. Dr. Melhart's expertise and advice was invaluable to our committee. We look forward to working with Director Freed in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy A. Baker, PhD, RN, ACNS-BC, FAAN
Chair
Dear Provost Donovan,

I am pleased to present you with the 2012-13 year-end report for the Scholarships Advisory Committee. I appreciate your patience in waiting for this document. The majority of our activities occur over the summer, after the May 1\textsuperscript{st} deadline for year-end reports.

The Committee met twice over the summer, on June 7\textsuperscript{th}, 2013 and July 31\textsuperscript{st}, 2013. Maricia Reeves compiled minutes for both meetings, and these have been sent to the appropriate contacts. We considered 169 appeals in total. 69 were denied, 50 approved, 45 provisionally approved, and 5 required more information or had other circumstances which affected the outcome. On the following page, you will find tables detailing the results from each meeting as well as the total for all summer appeals.

Despite the inherent difficulties of organizing meetings over the summer, I believe we have had adequate faculty and staff participation to achieve our charges. In each meeting, the committee functioned well, established broad consensus, and held to fair and consistent guidelines for addressing student appeals. While we do have student members of the committee, due to the sensitive and confidential nature of scholarship appeals, they do not typically attend these meetings. The student members are, however, welcome to attend any meetings during the semester in which we discuss general policies and procedures, rather than specific student issues.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve the university community. I look forward to continuing my role as Committee Chair in the 2013-14 academic year.

Martin Blessinger
Associate Professor of Music
Committee Chair, Scholarships Advisory Committee
### June 7, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### July 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013 Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This committee meets only when needed. Glory Robinson, University Disciplinary Officer/Associate Dean, convenes a hearing panel when a student chooses a formal hearing, appeals a sanction resulting from an informal hearing, or the incident warrants the formal process.

During the 2011-2012 academic year, 7 formal panel hearings were held.
COMMITTEE CHAIR END-OF-YEAR REPORT

2012-2013

Committee: Student Organizations
Chair: R. Eric Simpson

The Student Organizations Committee met once during the 2012 academic year. Summary of the meeting is as follows:

Date of last meeting: 27 Sep 2012
Date of next meeting: To Be Determined

Action Items Completed:

- Review of Appeals to organization status
- Results as follows:
- The SOC reviewed the 15 appeals by student organizations that did not complete the renewal process for the 2012 - 2013 academic year. There were 3 groupings that organizations were placed in based on the deliberation by the SOC, those were as follows
  - Appeal with Merit (7): These organizations will go through Risk Management training ASAP and will be granted recognition upon the completion of that training.
  - Appeal with Sanction (4): These organizations will go through Risk Management training, but this training will be delayed until the week after homecoming.
  - Appeal with No Merit (4): These organizations have been denied recognition for the remainder of the Fall 2012 semester. They may reapply for recognition for the Spring of 2013.
- Information regarding these decisions was delivered to the pertinent organizations. At least one of the organizations designated "Appeal with No Merit" was restored to active status by a staff-member/administrator in the Student Affairs division. No notification of this reversal was given to the committee. (Chair was notified by Jared Cobb, then-Director of Student Organizations, in personal conversation.)

Brett Phillips assumed the post of Director of Student Activities in late fall 2012. Mr. Phillips met with Chair on 18 Jan 2013--It was agreed that Student Organizations should serve in an advisory, not enforcement, role. No subsequent meetings were held.

Sincerely,

R. Eric Simpson

-- END OF REPORT--
Almost all of the work of the traffic appeals committee consists of listening to or reading student appeals for traffic and parking tickets, deciding guilt and whether to reduce the fine. Each subcommittee hearing or reading appeals consists of at least two faculty members and usually one student representative. The police department reserves a room at the BLUU for the hearings at 4 pm on Tuesday or Wednesday. This past year the hearings were held on September 11, 19, 25, October 3, 10, 16, 24, 30, November 7, 13, 28, December 4 in the Fall and January 16, 22, 30, February 5, 13, 19, 27, March 5, 20, 26 and April 3, 9, 23 this spring.

The Committee consisted of 10 faculty, 6 staff, and 5 students for a total of 21 total members. This seems to be about the right number for the committee, as each person heard (or read) appeals 3-4 times per semester. The participation was excellent, with the exception of a few student absences. In the spring there was some scheduling difficulty because only two student members could attend the personal hearings. In the end we recruited two more through the student union to cover those bases. One set of tickets was dismissed because a faculty member failed to show up for the hearings. In the future we'll make sure that the police have the schedule to avoid this.

Over the course of this academic year our committee heard or read a total of 538 appeals. Of these, 496 were determined to be guilty and 180 had their fines reduced. The detailed are included in the Appeals Tally spread sheet that I’ve included with this report, categorized by month and parking sticker type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>WH</th>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guilty</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>Reduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>