System Policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure. The Texas A&M University System General Counsel sent the TAMU Faculty Senate proposed revisions to the System policy on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (SAFRT). The Faculty Senate distributed copies to TAMU faculty, other System Faculty Senates, Texas Faculty Association, and the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors. An ad hoc committee was formed to review the proposed revisions and receive comments from these groups. The ad hoc committee’s recommendations were approved by the TAMU Faculty Senate at its December 10, 2001 meeting. The Senate’s version has been discussed with System General Counsel and subsequent changes are being prepared and will be shared with System Faculty Senates at the March 2002 TCFS meeting. It will also be on the TAMU Faculty Senate March 18 meeting agenda for approval of forwarding to President Bowen.

CAFRT Review Committee. Texas A&M University established procedures for investigating allegations of scholarly misconduct which include an in-depth investigation by an Investigating Committee (IC), chaired by a Research Standards Officer. The IC report is sent to the President of the University, who then renders a decision. In some circumstances, the President’s decision may be appealed to the Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure (CAFRT). A recent case revealed some confusion as to what the role of CAFRT should be in these cases, and, in particular, how the IC report should relate to the CAFRT proceedings. To resolve these issues, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has established an ad hoc committee to review existing procedures and practices, and to recommend any changes that might clarify the relationship between the IC and CAFRT.

Provost’s Allocation of Funds to Support Speaker of the Faculty Senate Provost Douglas has generously allocated $10,000 to support the activities of the Speaker of the Faculty Senate. Service as Speaker of the Faculty Senate puts a significant burden on the teaching and scholarly activities of the Speaker, not only during the term of office, but also for a year or more after his or her term has ended. The purpose of these funds is to support the teaching and scholarly activities of the Speaker during and after his or her term of office.

Resolution on Graduate Student Tuition. The TAMU Faculty Senate passed a resolution in support creating endowments in the yearly Capital Campaign dedicated to graduate student fellowships to provide tuition relief and stipend increase for graduate students.

University Community Initiative Committee (UCIC). This subcommittee was formed to identify action items that could be taken toward improving communication between the B/CS community and TAMU community. Some possible activities might include: (1) Joint community/University event held on campus; (2) Holiday related program that focuses on different holiday traditions; (3) Public School Open House where a single grade level would be invited to campus and provided with information about TAMU programs as they relate to career choices; (4) Task force to determine the feasibility of B/CS and TAMU hosting a major minority event.
**Approval of Courses Satisfying the International and Cultural Diversity Requirements.** The Core Curriculum Council recommended courses which will satisfy the international and cultural diversity requirement as recommended by the Report of the Core Curriculum Review Committee. For reasons of history, convenience, and criteria for inclusion, the courses were presented on two lists (International and U.S. Cultures). The Faculty Senate approved these two lists at the November 2001 meeting.

**Establish Deans Evaluation Task Force.** The Faculty Senate approved at its February 2002 meeting establishing a Deans Evaluation Task Force to review and revise evaluation instruments used to evaluate Deans and Department Heads. One of the issues that arose in the Faculty Senate Officers’ annual visits with the deans during the fall term was the perennial problem of faculty evaluations of deans and department heads. Faculty see little evidence that the evaluations are useful instruments of change and participation is generally low, while deans and department heads often find little in the evaluations that can be put to constructive use. Much the same applies to evaluations of department heads. A set of evaluation instruments is needed that produces meaningful results. Two related problems that came to light in the course of discussions were (1) that the roles of deans vary widely from college to college, and (2) that many (perhaps most) faculty have no clear idea what they should expect from their dean – i.e., how the activities of their dean should affect them.