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 1st and 29th, February 17th, and April 30th. (The Co-chairs are having a follow-up lunch meeting with Brian Gutierrez on May 14th.)

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 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 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 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 Check, 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


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: Carrie Leverenz, Chair, University Evaluation Committee
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.


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 that 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/espotfaq.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

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/espotfaq.asp](http://www.ir.tcu.edu/espotfaq.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 Langauges)
Brent Cooper          Scientist; Animal Researcher (Psychology)
Amanda Hale           Scientist; Animal Researcher (Biology)
Chris Watts           Scientist; Animal Researcher (Communication Sciences & Disorders)
Egenee Daniels        Veterinarian; ex officio
Todd Boling           Non-scientist (Center for Ethical Leadership & Responsible Citizenship); ex officio
Bo Söderbergh         Non-affiliated; ex officio
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 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 non-scientific 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.
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 11a.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.
Training is provided for the Chair-Elect each year and each IRB chair and members participate in on-going training which takes place on the TCU campus or the surrounding Fort Worth or Dallas communities related to IRB operations.

This year, a new Amendment/Modification form was developed and posted on the IRB web site; and a Standard Operating Procedure was developed for use of DEXA X-ray machine in Kinesiology with the assistance of the TCU Radiation Safety Officer. The IRB Chair participated in 2 Responsible Conduct of Research training programs for Graduate Students, Lab Assistants and Research Assistants sponsored by the TCU office of Research and Graduate Studies.

The TCU IRB has been in the process of implementing an online administrative system that will manage all documents related to the protocols submitted by faculty and staff as well as undergraduate students. The beta testing is taking place summer 2014 with hopes of full implementation during spring 2015.
Annual Report of the Instructional Development Committee

Our committee basically meets only one time per year to review requests for Instructional Development Grants. Nonetheless, there is a substantial amount of time involved in reviewing the grants before the meeting. The committee members were conscientious in their reviews of the proposals and the deliberations over the proposals were thoughtful. As reflected in the table below, we received 24 applications for grants and requests totaling $70,663. Of these 17 were awarded.

Here is a breakdown by college that Bonnie Melhart has prepared. She is sharing this with the deans.

<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>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schieffer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci&amp;Engr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have made some revisions to the grant criteria and Bonnie is adding these to the IDG website. These revisions are that funding will not be provided for student travel or for lectures prepared by non-faculty. We are also making a change in the schedule for grant applications. Calls for application will be distributed in September, the application deadline will be in early December, and the committee will review proposals in January. These changes will enable grant recipients to have more lead time such as for making travel arrangements. Links to the guidelines, forms, committee composition, and past recipients are noted below:

- **IDG Guidelines and Application Form**

  This page also links to a fill-in budget form, the evaluation form to be used in assessing applications, and sample applications completed by former recipients of the award.

- **Members of the IDG Committee**

- **Recipients of Last Year’s Awards**
During the 2013-14 school year, the Intellectual Property Review Committee (IPRC) officially met on September 3, December 11, February 3, March 4, and May 5. Much of the committee’s work typically occurs during meetings. This year, however, a significant portion of the committee’s work occurred outside its regular meetings (discussed below). Minutes of the meetings have been made available to committee members, but have not been submitted to the Faculty Senate Secretary.

The committee consists of seven faculty members and one student, which seem to be an appropriate number of members for the committee’s work. Many of the committee members attended meetings and participated appropriately. A liaison from the Office of Sponsored Programs regularly attends and participates in committee meetings. The committee reports to, and frequently meets with, the Associate Provost for Research. The committee considered three invention disclosures submitted by TCU faculty over the course of the year. The committee did not recommend that patent protection be sought for any of these disclosures.

A primary objective of the committee for this school year was to educate the university community about the potential for university assistance with intellectual property protection and commercialization for intellectual property developed at TCU. To this end, the committee conducted several outreach presentations. The groups that the committee met with include the Provost’s Council, the faculty of the College of Science and Engineering, the chairs of the Neeley School of Business, the chairs and faculty of the AddRan College of Liberal Arts, and the chairs of the College of Fine Arts. The committee expects to hold additional meetings with the other academic units in the 2014-15 school year.

Joel Timmer
Chair, IPRC
TO: Arnold Barkman  
FROM: Bonnie Frederick, Chair, Library Committee  
DATE: August 4, 2014

The activities of the Library Committee during the academic year 2013-2014 focused on one major event: the remodeling of the Library. During meetings over the course of the year, the Committee members were highly engaged, providing feedback and input for the Library leadership, especially as the remodeling plans evolved according to budgetary and other concerns. The physical renovations of the building have consequences for how the Library will function, both in the short and long terms, and those consequences formed the basis of our discussions. We raised a wide range of issues, such as security surrounding the entrances at night, the optimum number of group study rooms, and the placement of the café (and shouldn't the Library get a cut of the café's profits?).

Seeing how beautifully the plans have become reality this summer has produced an unusual sense of satisfaction with our committee service.
Interoffice Memo

To: Amie Barkman, Committee on Committees
From: Gregory K. Stephens, Chair, University Mediator’s Committee
Date: 23 May 2014
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 were 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 2013-2014

End-of-Year Report

Members:
Professor Marinda Allender
Nursing
Dr. Michael Bachmann
Criminal Justice
Dr. Amber Finn (sabbatical)
Communication Studies
Dr. Michael Faggella-Luby (substitute for Dr. Huckaby)
Education
Dr. Andy Fort
Religion
Dr. John Horner (Chair)
Biology

Dr. Fran Huckaby (on leave from RCAF Committee)
Education
Dr. Suzy Lockwood
Nursing
Dr. Jean-Luc Montchamp
Chemistry
Professor Luther Smith
Art
Dr. Ken Stevens
History and Geography
Dr. William Wempe
Accounting

Liaison:
Dr. Bonnie Melhart
Associate Provost & Dean, University Programs
Linda Freed
Director, Sponsored Programs

The RCA Committee met on 6 March 2014 to determine award recipients for the 2013-2014 Research and Creative Activities Fund (RCAF) and Junior Faculty Summer Research Program (JFSRP) awards.

- Sixty-four applications were evaluated (57 RCAF applications, 19 JFSRP applications, and 13 applications for RCAF + JFSRP funds). This was an increase of 30% over the number of proposals during the 2012-2013 academic year.
- $201,346 was requested from RCAF applicants, and $116,932 was awarded (n = 34 awards). The amount requested represented a 55% increase over that requested in the 2012-2013 academic year.
- $192,000 was requested by JFSRP applicants, and $96,000 was awarded (n = 16). The amount requested represented a 10% increase over that requested in the 2012-2013 academic year.

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. Specifically, this year a workshop was held to assist applicants in the RCAF/JFSRP process. Director Freed, Dr. Montchamp, and Dr. Horner led the workshop. The Committee added a new section to the application which requires applicants to explain the outcome of the previous three grants from RCAF. The Committee requests that the Committee on Committee increase the size of the Research and Creative Activities Committee by at least one member. Dr. Melhart’s expertise and advice was invaluable to our Committee, and the input of Director Freed contributed to the smooth functioning of the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

John D. Horner
Chair
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 2013-2014 academic year, 13 formal panel hearings were held.
COMMITTEE CHAIR END-OF-YEAR REPORT 2013-14

Committee: Student Organizations
Chair: Susan B. Kleiser

The Student Organizations Committee (SOC) did not meet formally as a committee this year. No appeals requiring the review of the SOC were made this year. However, the Chair met with Brett Phillips, Director of Student Activities, in both the Fall (October) and Spring (February) semesters to discuss the role of the committee. Mr. Phillips recommended, and Chair agreed, that the role of the SOC should expand beyond Appeals review and enforcement. It was agreed, and communicated to the SOC members via email, that once the Student Handbook is updated (expected in Spring 2014), the committee would meet to discuss how the SOC could expand its role and be of greater service to the Student Activities office. It is anticipated that a meeting with Mr. Phillips will occur in Fall 2014.

Regards,

Susan B. Kleiser
Technology Committee Final Report
May 6, 2014
Submitted by Sue Anderson, Chair

The CAT Committee met once during the 2013-2014 Academic Year and conducted additional business via email. Several members also participated in the field testing of the new faculty/staff network for personal devices on Feb. 21, 2014.

The purpose of our face-to-face meeting on Sept. 26, 2013 was to review a proposal to change the committee name, charge, and composition that was completed by the committee in spring 2013. In addition, Romy Hughes presented information on the future of eCollege, and Bryan Lucas provided information on progress toward implementing network access for faculty and staff personal devices.

The meeting was well attended. As usually happens, it is not possible to find a time when all members can meet. Student members were not present at the meeting. Members present included: Sue Anderson, Jay Iorizzo, Liz Branch, Billy Farmer, Ben Janesko, Igor Prokhorenkov, Ken Richardson, Larry Kitchens, Michael Hanvey, Josh Harmon, Bryan Lucas, Travis Cook, Romy Hughes, Richard Gipson, Kerry Bouchard, Beata Jones.

The primary accomplishment of the committee was to push through the changes to its name, charge, and composition. The chair met with the Committee on Committees on Oct. 10, 2013. The committee did not approve our original proposal, so a revised proposal was discussed via email and then submitted in Jan. 2014. It was approved by the committee in Feb. 2014. The proposal was then approved by the faculty senate in March 2014.

The new name of the committee is simply the “Technology Committee.” The new charge is:

Reviews policies and procedures related to the application of technology to instruction, research, advising and administrative functions by students, faculty and staff. Monitors technology trends pertinent to the university and makes recommendations to appropriate administrators (e.g., Provost, Chief Technology Officer) concerning technology acquisitions as well as staffing and training needs. Participates in planning and decision-making with regard to campus technology initiatives.

The change in the committee’s composition reduced the number of faculty on the committee from nine to seven and required, to the extent possible, that there be a representative from each college (Business, Communication, Education, Fine Arts, Liberal Arts, Nursing and Health Sciences, Science and Engineering) on the committee.

The chair submitted a request to the Provost in May for reduction in the number of liaison and ex-officio members from 7 to 4. Since our committee is one of the largest on campus,
Traffic Regulations and Appeals Committee
Report for the 2013-2014 academic year
Prepared by Scott Nollet, Committee Chair

Most 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
the appeals consists of two faculty members and often a student
representative. The police department reserves in advance a room at
the BLUU for the hearings at 4 pm on Tuesday or Wednesday.
This past year the hearings were held on September 11,17,25,
October 1,9,15,23,29, November 6,12,20, December 3 in the fall and
January 15,21,29, February 4,12,18,26, March 4,19,25 and April
2,8,16,22 and 30 this spring. The readings are done at a time and place
of convenience to the subcommittee involved.

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 hears (or reads) appeals 3-4 times per
semester. The participation was excellent, with the exception of a few
student absences and 2-3 last second faculty replacements. In the spring
we replaced Kirstinia Jurovich with Luke Erwin because Kirstinia was
studying abroad during the semester. This year the police had each
semester's schedule in their possession – next year I suggest that we
include office locations of the faculty so that this information does not to
be relayed redundantly each week.

Over the course of this academic year our committee heard or read a
total of 630 appeals (up from 538 of last year). Of the 630, 611 were
found guilty and of those 219 had their fines reduced. The details are
included in the Appeals Tally spread sheet that I've included with this
report, categorized by month and parking sticker type.
Year-End Report  
Admissions/Retention Committee  
Chair – Anne VanBeber  
May 21, 2014

- On what dates did you meet?
  1. February 19, 2014
  2. May 1, 2014

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

- 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. Attendance was good this spring. Good participation. Breakfast meetings seem to be the best time to meet.
  2. Faculty who attend always have appropriate and timely comments and suggestions.

- Did staff attend and participate appropriately?
  1. Faculty and staff interacted well with each other.
  2. 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. Courtney Poey attended 2 meetings. The other student did not attend any meetings. John and Courtney were welcome participants and contributed to discussion.

- What were the notable accomplishments and highlights of the year?
  1. Applications continue to be submitted at a high rate. Efforts to attract students of color and males continue.
  2. Retention efforts continue to improve retention rate from freshman to sophomore year.
  3. College 101 discussions indicate continued success of this program.
Dear Provost Donovan,

I am pleased to present you with the 2013-14 year-end report for the Scholarships and Financial Aid Committee. I appreciate your patience in waiting for this document. The majority of our activities occur over the summer, after the May 1st deadline for year-end reports.

The Committee met twice over the summer, on June 24th, 2014 and August 5th, 2014. Maricia Reeves compiled minutes for both meetings, and these have been sent to the appropriate contacts. We considered 185 appeals in total. 90 were denied, 62 approved, 32 provisionally approved, and 1 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 this year.

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.

One lingering issue for the committee is the term of service for committee members. Since one of the primary charges of the Scholarships and Financial Aid Committee is to read and decide on student appeals, and since the vast majority of these arrive during the summer months, it would be helpful to clarify the responsibilities of committee members by stipulating a full calendar year of service. Currently, members are assigned to a nine-month term of service (August through May), which does not cover the active summer months. This issue has already been raised through the Committee on Committees to the Faculty Senate in the April 2014 meeting, but action was deferred due to a number of issues that were raised, including asking faculty on nine-month contracts to serve for twelve months, additional summer-month compensation, and how summer-month service would count towards tenure and promotion. The Scholarship and Financial Aid Committee has functioned well for many years despite this logistical fog, but I welcome any clarity that the Faculty Senate and administration can provide on this issue.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve the university community. I look forward to continuing my role as Committee Chair in the 2014-15 academic year.

Martin Blessinger
Associate Professor of Music
Committee Chair, Scholarships and Financial Aid
June 24, 2014

125 Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August 5, 2014

60 Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014 Total

185 Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>