

Minutes
TCU Faculty Senate
February, 2002

Members present: Charles Becker, Joe Bobich, George Brown, Ron Burns, Arthur Busbey, Carolyn Spence-Cagle, Nowell Donovan, Thad Duhigg, Sharon Fairchild, Lynn Flahive, Ron Flowers, Andy Fort, Sally Fortenberry, Pam Frable, Gregg Franzwa, Rob Garnett, Ellen Garrison, Phil Hadlock, Sanoa Hensley, Paul King, Ed Kolesar, Derek Kompare, Joan McGettigan, Don Nichols, Dick Rinewalt, Mike Sacken, Gene Smith, Bill Vanderhoof, Peggy Watson, Ron Watson, Ralph Woodward, Melissa Young.

Members absent: Melissa Burns, Jennifer Higa, George Low, Nancy Meadows, Magnus Rittby, Elizabeth Taylor, Jeffrey Todd.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Carolyn Spence-Cagle at 3:32 p.m.

The Faculty Senate approved the December 6 minutes

The Faculty Senate approved a change in the Agenda to accommodate a presentation by Don Mills and the wish to have discussion on the proposed core. This change is reflected in the modified agenda posted on the faculty senate web page.

Presentation on Budget by Vice Chancellor Carol Campbell

VC Campbell noted that our tuition was up almost 15% last year for freshman and proceeded to compare our fees versus those at other institutions. 70% of students in higher education go to public institutions (that have the lowest tuitions). TCU belongs to the group of private institutions that the other 30% attend. TCU tuition was 20% below the average of twelve hundred 4 year private colleges last year. After our increase for next year, we are 12.4% below the average. TCU compares very well with private schools for tuition and fees as well as the combined fees for food and dorm.

A few years ago we had no debt, but TCU now has now reached the debt capacity at its credit rating.

In terms of revenue assumptions she has tried to work with an 8% increase to \$16,200 and added a \$100 recreation center fee. There is an 8.7% increase in total with flat fee for freshman and a 9% increase for students who entered before this fall and are on a lower credit hour rate.

We have had a 6% housing increase. TCU is now down to a 5.7% endowment spending rate for next year. There was \$5.4 million in mineral income and \$660,000 of gifts to TCU was allocated to fund the Capital Campaign.

We are seeking steady state enrollment at TCU, and, therefore, we have a smaller number of freshman entering this year but the enrollment will be up for two years until we come back down again and even out.

TCU's total operating revenue increased \$15 million last year.

Senator Hensley asked if the 182 million for next year just included spending. Carol said this is operating budget only and does not include loss on the endowment from the last year.

There are more students this year so TCU has an extra \$2 million in the budget giving us \$17 million available in budget.

Senator Ron Watson asked how much revenue was from athletics. Carol said TCU has budgeted \$2.8 million for next year (gate only), though this year between the Pigskin Classic and bowl game we made considerably more. There are additional gifts to athletics.

Senator Becker asked about the composition of common stock versus bonds in the TCU portfolio. Carol said we can't pull that information out right now because this is done on a fiscal year basis and our calendar year numbers aren't done. The Trustees will get the budget on Feb 21st.

The endowment is at \$875 million now. In fiscal year 2001 it lost 15%.

Senator Franzwa asked if we had any Enron stock. Carol said we have virtually none.

Health and Safety Committee

Senator King moved to revive the tabled motion on the proposed Health and Safety Committee and the motion passed.

Senator Rinewalt reminded us that the motion from the last meeting was to approve this new Health and Safety Committee. The COC contacted 7 faculty who would serve on the committee so the COC feels there is support for the committee and urges approval. There was no further discussion.

The motion to appoint the committee passed with 3 opposing votes.

Senator Donovan noted that we changed the distributed agenda and asked the Co-Curricular Committee to postpone its report and they have. Discussion moved onto a report from VC Mills concerning a program of evaluation of what our students think about TCU.

VC Mills described the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) that is not a survey of opinion or satisfaction, but a survey asking students what they do and what they experience at a university. There are many results and he only presented a summary. He had presented these results to a committee of trustees in 45 minutes and so produced a shorter version for the Faculty Senate presentation.

[Don's PowerPoint presentation is available for download on the February 2002 Faculty Senate minutes page and should be referenced for details.](#)

The purpose of the survey was to refocus conversations about quality in undergraduate education. The widely referenced *US News and World Report* survey didn't measure outputs so an additional survey was needed, thus the NSSE report.

450 TCU students participated in a survey that included 500 universities from 49 states and more than 105,000 first year students. The NSSE survey uses benchmarks of effective educational practice.

TCU is only in 4th percentile for incoming freshman for question related to rigor of studies.

Senator Nichols asked if we could compare TCU to other schools directly?

VC Mills introduced Ms. Angela Taylor who attended a conference where they looked at the NSSE data. Ms. Taylor said that because of limitations information for other universities cannot be extracted for comparison. The University of Indiana, however, is looking at possibly implementing this ability. The University of Indiana is also looking at the possibility of a faculty survey that is similar to the NSSE survey. This survey would evaluate faculty expectations and look at the gap (if present) between faculty and student expectations and performance.

VC Mills said that Deans asked if TCU could compare college to college, but the data is not broken out that way so we can't do that.

Senator Fort said he does not like the low level of academic challenge and asked if that was a function of class size. VC Mills said the survey controls for class size in the sense that it is more difficult, with large classes, to have lots of papers. Senator Fort then asked if it was a matter of not having sufficient staff to deliver content or were students saying that they are not being challenged like students are at other universities. VC Mills said he think the later interpretation is a legitimate.

Senator Nichols asked the Vice Chancellor's interpretation of the 4th percentile ranking on academic rigor. VC Mills said we should be concerned. He said this measure gives us an opportunity to "get inside" the experience for the students. It may be that faculty and students are not viewing things the same way. He said we should also recognize that a truly great university is going to have better scores on all 5 of the survey areas (see Powerpoint presentation for details). The quality of the experience depends on all of these areas; the areas are not mutually exclusive but are interrelated.

Provost Koehler asked if the measures used were really an indication of academic rigor. VC Mills said he didn't know and referred to Ms. Taylor. She noted that the study was founded on research on academic rigor. This included factors such as number of papers, number of texts and time spent preparing; these are all measures indicative of academic rigor. She also said that before the TCU community draws conclusions from just this single data point, we need to see additional data as might be supplied by SACS and other focus groups. With multiple data points we can then look for global themes. VC Mills then noted that this process is now moving to the assessment office for next year since we now have an assessment officer.

Senator King asked what that 4% meant on a statistical basis. Does it mean that 96% of the institutions were better? Based on the interpretation it is a percentile of difference between expected and achieved scores, a percentile of deviation. The score is standardized, the standardized residual.

Senator Becker noted that the members of a particular sorority had recently received a cumulative GPA of 3.19. He asked if our admissions profile allowed for this kind of high achievement level.

VC Mills said this does have something to do with our discussion and with sorority culture, where they all have a high grade cut off for acceptance from high school. Dealing with some of the better students. Also in sororities much work done to assist students to do well academically.

The Faculty Senate acknowledged the help of Angela Taylor.

Executive Session

An Executive session was held to discuss honorary degree applications.

Proposed core discussions

Senator Donovan introduced Ms. Michelle Miller from Student House of Representatives, Academic Affairs Committee. This committee is a bridge between the Faculty Senate and Student House. They have a focus on the CUE and would like to have some input. The SGA has a report of their perceptions on the CUE and it will be posted. Students are concerned that we need a better way to evaluate courses to make sure we balance new curriculum and rigor of the classes.

Senator Donovan reminded us that the Faculty Senate has responsibility for work on the CUE, but the Faculty itself can overrule the Faculty Senate. He also reminded us that the Faculty Senate is an advisory body. He presented an overhead with a process flow chart and talked about the importance of keeping the process moving. The overhead also provided some questions we should consider. He said it might be awkward to let it go into the summer. He suggested that Senators focus their efforts on departments and colleges and 'areas of commonality' such as humanities versus social sciences.

Senator Busbey asked about ways to present the core proposal to faculty and after some discussion it was eventually decided to use a threaded discussion structured on the CUE content areas. Senators Rinewalt and McGettigan supported the idea of a threaded discussion venue.

Senator Fort interjected that he was still worried about time lines. He said that trying to hold to a time line is 'wrong headed' and that we are in trouble because we were using a time line. He asked if we want to use a timeline or if we wanted to ask questions (and should one of the questions be one of process) and move along.

Senator Donovan asked if the two (timelines and questions) were mutually exclusive?

Senator Fort responded that they were not. But he noted that the faculty member in Religion who came up with process questions was rushed and the whole matter seemed rushed in all the departments he knew of.

Senator Becker asked if we could clarify TCU's position with the CUE proposal relative to SACs and to any risks in delaying the decision. He asked the Chancellor and Provost to comment on the need for a timely resolution.

Provost Koehler said we had problems with the previous SACS study and he felt we needed to do something by next February. He is concerned that we have already done much good work involving the time and thoughts of many faculty members in many committees, and said that we should not just start over. He asked if the Faculty Senate could take the best thinking of the previous committees, discuss what was done and then come to some closure.

Senator Bobich said we need a timeline or we will spend the rest of our lives whining about the process so far, complaining about whose area of interest is more important and going around in circles. He said the Senate needs to wrap it up and accomplish something and a timeline helps with that.

Senator Woodward asserted that we should come to an agreement on process today and that the Senate Executive Committee should identify and assemble these questions based on input. He asked why the Senate wasn't being presented with questions. Senator Donovan showed questions for consideration, on an overhead, and Senator Brown brought the discussion back to the original question from Senator Busbey about methods to handle the discussion electronically. The decision was to use threaded discussions based on questions.

Senator Donovan asked if we should meet the third Thursday of each month that was open to faculty. Should we have special sessions?

Senator Garrison said she had a problem on the same day each time because of commitments and asked if the meeting could be held some other day of the week.

Senator Kolesar asked if we can we consider suspending subcommittee work. Senator Donovan said still lots of work that has been done and needs to be finished so we won't suspend the work at least at this point.

Discussion seemed to suggest that the second Thursday was better because this was already blocked out

Senator Brown made a motion to hold a special meeting of the Faculty Ssenate on Thursday (2/14/2002) The motion passed.¹

Senator Donovan noted that faculty have not been assessing courses from an outcomes viewpoint. He said SACS wants assessment and it is going to happen; there is specific language about how courses should be accessed.

Senator Donovan then reminded the senate that some questions were posted on the overhead and asked for consideration of the posted question. Senator Brown mentioned the questions and asked Senator Donovan about what was displayed. Senator Donovan proposed that the first question be on the size of the core.

Senator McGettican asked about presenting all the questions that had been received. Senator Brown asked the Senate if we wanted all questions or a synthesis of the questions. Senators agreed that they want a synthesis.

Senator Flahive asked why this process seemed to be going out of control. She said that if there were not some real basic foci we would be working on the core for years. The Senator suggested that we go back to Seal report to see what outcomes we want accomplished. She said we should look at this report, and the others, with the Seal report as the starting point and then see if the CUE document meets those outcomes. Endless discussion is not a productive use of our time.

Provost Koehler asked the Senators to consider how to discuss, envision and talk about a curriculum experience that differs from new current one. He asked how many hours we wanted in a core. Koehler said that if Senators agree that outcomes are important, then there is less pressure about the number of hours in the core, because there is a pro-

¹ Because of subsequent scheduling problems the special meeting was moved to 2/21/2002.

hibition of courses counting for core and majors. If outcomes are used, then it doesn't matter if an outcome is served in the major or in another area. He said it doesn't matter where it happens and that outcomes may not be represented by seat time. Koehler asked how we get beyond 3 hour courses and noted that there are fewer bounds on us in the proposed CUE document than in the current UCR.

Senator Bobich said the core should be large enough to provide students with the knowledge that we agree they need to know. It seems to him that half of this exercise is to get us to move up to the 'next level'. He asked that if we are not challenging students now, then how will we challenge better students if we get them. The Faculty have got to decide what students at first tier schools need to know and then determine how we can provide students with that knowledge.

Senator Franzwa inquired as to the central purpose of the core exercise and said there were two questions he had. The first question was what TCU was trying to accomplish by this whole process. He said we have heard various possible answers but he says that nothing has been put forward as the focusing reason; perhaps the next level is the focus. But he observed that 'next level' has always been a foggy concept to him. His second question, one he said that hasn't come up, is the possibility of accessing the current core. He said he didn't know how this was skipped over, but that if we are committed to outcomes assessment and we have a core, then accessing the current core would be a step towards fixing it, if it is broken, or coming up with a new core that accesses better. To his knowledge we haven't done this, so trying to come up with something better when we don't know what is wrong with the current core makes the process difficult.

Provost Koehler, in response to Senator Franzwa, noted that we must test the current core against the mission statement and said there is a relationship between the curriculum and the university mission. He noted that Senator Kolesar's committee took outcomes and tried to align them to the old core with a fair amount of success. But he reminded us that the current core was made up before the current mission statement.

Senator Brown noted that if we are to use the other reports can we also ask people to compare current core with the Seal committee report and then see if current core can do will work.

Senator Fort again said that he thinks for us to put timeline first, rather than a set of questions, is 'wrong headed'. He said academics have a tendency to talk things to death, but that might not be the case here. He said we should find the right questions and let them drive us forward and hope the timeline matches. He asserted that if one accessed our procedure so far it was not complimentary. He said that SACs would not like the way we have carried this out so far. Senator Fort said that we should have had access to the existing reports a long time ago He wanted to know why we did not have previous access to allow longer parallel discussions and said we haven't had the time to absorb the other reports nor have the discussions.

Senator Bobich asked if one of the focus questions could be, "What will better students than ours need to know in the future"?

Senator Brown noted that there is an issue of time. He asked if we wished to have a vote about time or if we should continue the discussion.

Senator Bobich said he hoped that we could get on in a collegial manner and try to accomplish as much as possible as in the time we have. He agreed with Senator Fort that the prior process was flawed, but noted this is in the past, and said we needed to get over it, work on it and progress and 'stop whining'.

Senator Garrison agreed with Senator Fort, but she also agreed about the need to work within a time line. She said we need some parameters, but will have much work and little time in which to do it. She would also like to look at the current UCR and the committee reports and see if we could develop an assessment procedure.

Senator Brown noted that eventually the entire Faculty will vote on a core revision and we are trying to come with a date that is an end target for our discussions.

Senator Kompare noted that if we can get questions up and discussions going, we can see how this all develops. He said that since we will meet frequently the process can shape itself. He thinks there should be something by May 2 so that we have something solid that can be put up and looked at again in September.

Senator Brown said that between this meeting and the next, the Executive Committee would hone the questions into a more concise group. He said we need to make sure all faculty are engaged. He noted that at the next meeting we will also review the cue and core.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:19PM.