

**Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
2 December 1999**

Members present: Chuck Becker, Peggy Bennett, Joe Bobich, Pat Bradley, Clayton Brown, George Brown, Art Busbey, Carolyn Cagle, Ernie Couch, Nowell Donovan, Bruce Elleman, Andy Fort, David Grant, David Jenkins, Pat Kinkade, Ed Kolesar, George Low, Linda Moore, Alison Moreland, Ellen Page-Garrison, Pat Paulus, Roger Pfaffenberger, Sherrie Reynolds, Bill Ryan, Mike Sacken, Carol Stephenson, Ron Watson, and Melissa Young.

Members absent: Nadia Lahutsky, Peggy Watson, Sally Fortenberry, Dick Rinewalt, Gloria Solomon, Nancy Meadows, Lynn Flahive, Don Nichols, Greg Stephens, and Gregg Franzwa.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Roger Pfaffenberger at 3:35 p.m.

The minutes of the 4 November 1999 meeting were approved as distributed.

Announcements: (1) Chair Pfaffenberger expressed his appreciation to the Committee on Committees for their hard work this year. (2) Chair Pfaffenberger suggested that the topic of the fall faculty assembly be the role that graduate education (particularly Ph.D. programs) plays in the mix of educational programs offerings by TCU. It was the consensus of the group that the best time for this assembly is Wednesday, 8 December, from 4:00 until 5:00 p.m.

Old Business

- *Proposed name change and change in charge for the Undergraduate Admissions Committee.*

The Committee on Committee brought to the floor a recommendation that originated in the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to change the name and charge of that committee.

Current name:	Undergraduate Admissions Committee
Proposed name:	Undergraduate Admissions and Retention Committee
Current charge:	Annually reviews university policies on admission. Is consulted on proposed changes in admissions procedures. Keeps abreast of innovations occurring elsewhere and makes recommendations when such innovations appear relevant to TCU. Annually reviews student retention statistics and recommends changes in admission policies and procedures.
Proposed charge:	Annually reviews undergraduate admission, enrollment, and retention statistics. Facilitates communication between the Admissions Office and other members of the university community, including the Faculty Senate. Serves in a responsive and proactive manner to consider issues concerning admissions and retention, including annual and strategic goals.

Senator Fort moved that the recommendation be approved and the motion was adopted.

• *Policy and process pertaining to the nomination of individuals for honorary degrees.* Chair Pfaffenberger opened the floor for discussion of changes to the existing 1974 Senate policy for nominating individuals for honorary degrees and presented the Executive Committee's suggestions for modifications. After debate and discussion a motion to approve the modified policy as found in Appendix A was made by Pat Bradley and the motion was approved.

New Business

• *Discussion of faculty role in Planning Commission Task Forces.* Chair Pfaffenberger asked the senators if they had heard any comments on the role of faculty in the Planning Commission Task Forces. The question was asked how faculty not on the commissions can get input to the task forces. Faculty can pass questions on to the task force chair, the facilitator, or to Larry Lauer.

• *Chancellor Ferrari's report on the November Board Meeting.* Chancellor Ferrari reported that a board task force set out last spring and summer to examine some basic parameters that would be helpful in thinking about the future of our institution. Four basic issues emerged: 1. What should the size of the university be? 2. What should the pricing be? 3. How much of the endowment should contribute to the operation of the university? And: 4. What ought to be our attitude toward debt? The Chancellor then presented models that this task force had examined as ways of thinking about these four parameters in the future. He shared this with the Senate for the purpose of getting faculty comment on these models.

He began by looking at the current TCU sources of funds. (See Appendix B for the transparencies he used in his presentation.) He then presented what he called the "Stay the Course Model," the "Growth Model," the "Prestige Pricing Model," the "Preserve the Endowment Model," and the "Multiple Factor Model" as ways of thinking about different approaches to the four basic parameters, emphasizing that these models were developed for thinking toward the future and that none had been implemented by the Board. Chancellor Ferrari believes, however, that these models show the need for a new major fund raising initiative in the near future. Chancellor Ferrari then responded to questions and suggestions.

Chair Pfaffenberger adjourned the meeting at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Grant
Secretary

Policy and Procedures for
Solicitation of Recommendations
For Persons to Receive Honorary Degrees

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate solicits recommendations from the general faculty for recipients of honorary degrees to be awarded by the University. Recommendations will be reviewed initially by the Executive Committee and final nominees will be determined in executive session of the Faculty Senate at its regular February meeting. Nominations approved by the Faculty Senate will be submitted to the Board of Trustees in March for approval.

The honorary degree nominees must be persons who have distinguished themselves nationally or internationally in their field, or persons who have contributed significantly to the University's development and progress by their substantial involvement and giving of their time, talent, or resources to strengthen the intellectual vitality and general health of the University.

The following guidelines are offered for consideration of the faculty in submitting recommendations for honorary degrees.

1. Persons considered for an honorary degree normally will be classified in one or more of the following categories:
 - a. National figure whom TCU would like to honor
 - b. An individual with renown in their field
 - c. TCU alumnus and/or emeritus faculty member
 - d. Individuals who have made significant contributions to the University. The nominees may be alumni, former faculty or staff, or leaders in a range of fields but should have strong ties to TCU.
2. Persons currently active in political life (sitting politicians) are not eligible for honorary degrees.
3. TCU will award no more than six honorary degrees each twelve months.
4. Recommendation and nomination of an individual is conducted on a confidential basis.
5. A person recommended one year but who did not receive an honorary degree may be considered in succeeding years.

6. In rare circumstances when a distinguished guest is invited to campus for a major address, the Senate may convene in Executive Session to consider whether the awarding of a degree would be appropriate or desirable.
7. Recommendations may be made by individual faculty or by TCU departments or schools. The form for submission of recommendations is attached. All completed recommendations must be received by the Secretary of the Faculty Senate by January 21.

Recommendation for Honorary Degree

1. Name
2. Current address
3. Date and place of birth (if known)
4. Honorary degree recommended (e.g., Doctor of Law, Doctor of Divinity, Doctor of Science, Doctors of Letters)
5. Education
6. Career history
7. Publications (if any)
8. Community, State, and National Service
9. Awards
10. Recommended by
11. Please include a one-page exposition not to exceed 150 words which gives the major qualitative reasons the individual is being recommended for an Honorary Degree from Texas Christian University.

Approved by the Faculty Senate
2 December 1999

APPENDIX B

Transparencies from Chancellor Ferrari's Senate Presentation, 12/2/99, p. 1

TCU SOURCES OF FUNDS (Projected) 1999 -2000 (000's)	<u>Stay the Course Model</u>
Tuition and fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuition increases at approx. 5 % per yr. • Housing income increases at 6 % per yr. • Endowment payout held at 5.8 % • Annual fund growth at 2.5 % per yr. • Auxiliary sales at inflation to 5 % per yr. • Compensation levels comparable to past few years • Increased financial aid at 5 % per yr. • Goods and services increased at inflation levels • Debt service tied to current commitments • Slight growth in faculty and staff <p><u>Result over next five years:</u></p> <p>Balanced budget through 2002, deficits 2003-2005</p>
\$79,450	
Housing income	
8,850	
Endowment and mineral income	
42,590	
Annual fund support	
3,700	
Contracts and grants	
7,000	
Auxiliary sales	
11,850	
Other income	
<u>2,600</u>	
\$156,040	

<u>Growth Model</u>	<u>Prestige Pricing Model</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1000 more students by 2005 • Increased financial aid • Growth in faculty and staff • Additional classrooms and new dormitory needed • All other factors held constant <p><u>Results over next five years:</u></p> <p>High uncertainty in meeting faculty and staff needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300 fewer students • 10%+ increases in tuition • 20% increases in financial aid • Stable faculty and staff <p><u>Result over next five years:</u></p> <p>Substantial deficits beginning in year 3.</p>

APPENDIX B

Transparencies from Chancellor Ferrari's Senate Presentation, 12/2/99, p. 2

Preserve Endowment Model

- Stable enrollments
- Inflationary tuition increases
- 4 to 4.5 % compensation increases
- Reduce spending payout from 5.8 to 5 %
- Relatively stable faculty/staff size

Result over next five years:

Major deficits beginning in year 2

Multiple Factor Model

- Moderate, controlled enrollment growth (30 UG, 15 Master's, 10 Ph.D)
- Tuition increases (inflation plus 3 % per year)
- Full residence hall occupancy
- Gradual decline in spending payout from 5.8 % to 5.5 %
- Increase in annual fund (5%/yr.)
- Increased auxiliary/athletic income (5 %/yr.)
- Compensation pool (Inflation plus)
- 23 new faculty and staff (maintain 15:1 S/F ratio)
- 12.5 % increase per yr. in student financial aid
- Inflationary adjustments to operating budgets
- Technology (replacement only)
- Debt service increases for new facilities

Result over next five years:

Slight (0.5 to 0.75 %) surpluses for special initiatives/contingencies

Conclusions

- Multiple Factor Model seems most promising to maintain momentum while planning for next major fund raising campaign.
- Need to keep in mind that this is not a budget plan, but rather general guideline for budget planning.