

VIA BOARD SYMPOSIUM

Board of Trustees Texas Christian University Minutes of the Meeting – Symposium on *Vision in Action* April 14, 2005

The Board of Trustees of Texas Christian University met at 9:00 a.m., Thursday, April 14, 2005, in the Justin Boardroom of the Dee J. Kelly Alumni and Visitors Center on the campus of Texas Christian University for a symposium regarding *Vision in Action*, the strategic planning process. The following board members were present:

William L. Adams
R. Denny Alexander
Allie Beth Allman
Robert A. Buschman
Brenda A. Cline
Ronald W. Clinkscale
R. Scott Colglazier
Kelly Cox
Lou Hill Davidson
Alan D. Friedman
Mark L. Johnson
Ann M. Jones
J. Luther King, Jr.
G. Malcolm Louden
Kade L. Matthews
Laura S. Miller
Ronald C. Parker
Jerry J. Ray

Amy E. Roach
John V. Roach
Leonard H. Roberts
Joan G. Rogers
Deedie Potter Rose
Billy Rosenthal
Clarence Scharbauer III
Edgar H. Schollmaier
Jan Tucker Scully
Sarah Hales Smith
Roy C. Snodgrass III
Rick L. Wittenbraker

Ex-Officio Member:
Teri O’Glee

Also present were Chancellor Victor J. Boschini, Jr., Provost R. Nowell Donovan, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration Carol N. Campbell, Vice Chancellor for Marketing and Communication Larry D. Lauer, Vice Chancellor for University Advancement Donald J. Whelan, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Donald B. Mills, Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Diversity and Community Cornell Thomas, and Assistant to the Chancellor and Secretary of the Board Karen Baker. Also present were Dr. Leo Munson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Support, and Mrs. Kit Moncrief.

Mr. Roach, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, presided and asked Trustee Sarah Smith to deliver an invocation.

Trustee Smith's Remarks

One thing all of us in this room have in common is that we care deeply about TCU, its past, its present and its future. Right now, we each sit in a position with a different perspective of TCU's future with varying degrees of experience, an array of talents and gifts to offer and a foundation of new leadership sitting at the helm. If fitted well, this board position does not take the posture of superiority but of servitude. If worn correctly, it is one of humble dress of truth, a cornerstone of respect for new leadership and for one another's gifts and contributions.

The season with Dr. Ferrari and Mr. Roach as our leaders with all of the beautiful new buildings and the wonderful contributions made during this time, are yesterday's presents, but they bear fruits for today and for us to build upon for tomorrow. I know, personally speaking, being part of that time and the building of Smith Hall was one of the most beautiful, yet painful seasons of my life. Honestly, I came to the meetings in February thinking my time was over at TCU at the end of my term this year and planned on resigning. But, as I have had to let go of my past and open my heart to the future remembering what I have learned from the struggle to reinvent who I am for today and move into my future, I realize I still have a lot to give to the support to the new vision of TCU.

This epiphany moment, as I called it, came for me as I sat on the Academic Affairs Committee meeting last time in February and sensed the resistance to those wanting to hold on to the past and not embrace the changes Dr. Boschini was asking us to make. I could feel the divisions in the room.

Each of us brings a unique gift to this Board, and we are so afraid of each other to be who we are for fear of what the other will think. Know your gift. Many around you may never discover you if you don't. It will keep us ineffective and divide our power in this new leadership we have. As long as our pride, personal agendas, egos, comparisons, and judgments of one another keep us silent or, yet even worse, silence the voice of another, we will lose power at a time TCU is on the cusp of the greatest years it has ever seen. What Dr. Boschini is asking us to embrace is real; we can have a strong foundation. Everything else is in place for balance. It takes a lot of courage to be real with each other. I am so grateful I don't have to be a financial genius and prepare reports like Brenda Cline or Denny Alexander, or make investments like Luther King or lead a group of divided factions and keep harmony like Mr. Roach. And I'm sure they're equally as thankful their gift is not to have to do what I'm called to do in this life. But we all need each other. How do you know if you're doing what you're supposed to do on this Board? Because it becomes passionate in your heart, it produces good things. If those qualities are not present, maybe you should come face-to-face with yourself on some areas of why you are even here.

All of this is about a bigger picture for what I believe is a very special school. I don't know why I'm here. I don't need to know. Life put me here. I didn't even go to school here; my children did. But, I've always seen the unique connectedness between you. In my own unsophisticated, unqualified way, I've stood up for what I see – for the core curriculum to be protected in the areas of faith and family when I served on The Chancellor's Council, in the entrepreneurial center where I have shared my journey of same with students and classes. On parents' council, I learned about the admissions process and all that Dr. Don Mills so masterfully taught me. In the Leadership center, I spent eleven days in Scotland with Dr. Donovan on Isle of Skye at Columba 1400. My daughter-in-law, an honors graduate in the Neeley School of Business, says he's the best professor she ever had at TCU. He's a brilliant scholar, a leader, and a visionary, cares primarily and passionately for the student, but has a heart. He is like a geode. Think on that one awhile.

I want to read to you what I wrote about you in April '98 after my first Parents Council meeting on the day of Dr. Ferrari's inauguration and two years before our gift to the university. I read this at the luncheon of the Entrepreneurial Hall Announcement. After the speech, Laura Miller, when she was the National Alumnae President, quickly snatched it up, copied it and I don't know where it ended up.

After the inauguration, I had “accidentally” gotten on a bus filled with TCU alumnae. Some of you were probably on the bus that day. I wrote:

“On this bus ride, I could feel the connectedness of the alumnae group. I could tell they knew not only the larger sized parts of each other’s lives but some shared the private corners of the soul. I found myself coveting that sense of belonging that they shared and wanted to stand up and scream to the whole bus, “Do you know how blessed you are? Do you realize because you have made the choice to be united in your love for your school and each other, what a difference you could make?” But, they’d think I was just a crazy stranger invading their space.

To make a difference isn’t that what all of us want to do in this life? Life has taught me things that I now have the desire and the compassion to share with others. I have come to believe that we each hold a gift that is to be used for the help and betterment of our fellow man. We all want to belong. We are all affirmed when we put the two together.

I wrote to the alumnae, “You are here for a reason. On the surface your belonging is simply because you each attended TCU. But I dare to say that there are more intrinsic reasons you commit to this group. It is a fertile field of acceptance where you are free to be you and bring with you your seed of contribution. When planted together you have the opportunity to tend a beautiful field of various colors and fragrances. You have the opportunity to touch the lives of all the students with your array of talents and beauty.”

Change means growth and growth is often painful. Perhaps all change is simply a process of releasing something that is familiar and reaching out for something that is new. And maybe that is why change can be so difficult – because in that process there will inevitably be those ‘midair moments’ when the old has been released but the new has not yet been seized, and we are suspended somewhere in the middle.

My prayer for us is that after our time together today, we will seize the new with passion. Thank you for listening.

Chairman Roach called upon Chancellor Boschini who explained the format for the symposium (The schedule is Appendix A.) and introduced Provost Nowell Donovan for a PowerPoint presentation on strategic planning efforts. Three primary areas of emphasis included: holding undergraduate enrollment, defining a residentiality target, and exploring a new graduate framework. Provost Donovan directed trustees to a handout featuring his remarks (The PowerPoint presentation is Appendix B and available upon request.). Provost Donovan recognized Dr. Leo Munson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Support, as co-chair of VIA.

Provost Donovan directed trustees to four different breakout rooms, color-coded to dots on trustee nametags. Group Facilitators were: Dr. Munson, Dr. Bonnie Melhart, Dr. Don Mills, and Ms. Ann Loudon. Recorders for each group respectively were: Mr. Ray Brown, Ms. Tracy Syler-Jones, Vice Chancellor Carol Campbell, and Vice Chancellor Larry Lauer. Serving as spokespersons for each group respectively were: Trustee Ron Parker, Trustee Deedie Rose, Trustee Alan Friedman, and Trustee Rick Wittenbraker. Chancellor Boschini and Provost Donovan visited each group during the group discussions.

Group discussions focused upon prepared questions (A copy is Appendix C.).

Trustees returned to the Justin Boardroom at 11:20 a.m. and each group's trustee spokesperson reported (A copy of responses by group is Appendix D.).

At noon, Chancellor Boschini directed all participants to the dining room for lunch at which time Dr. Munson facilitated a wrap-up session.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Karen Baker
Secretary

**VIA TRUSTEE SYMPOSIUM
THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 2005**

- 8:30 – 9:00 a.m. Continental Breakfast (Monroe Room)**
- 9:00 a.m. Symposium Begins (Justin Boardroom)
Chancellor welcome**
- 9:00– 9:10 a.m. Invocation by Trustee Sarah Smith**
- 9:10 a.m. Chancellor introduction of Provost Nowell Donovan**
- 9:10 – 9:50 a.m. Presentation by Provost Donovan**
- *Holding Undergraduate Enrollment*
 - *Defining a Residentiality Target*
 - *Exploring a new Graduate Framework*
- 9:50 – 10:00 a.m. Move to breakout rooms**
- 10:00 – 11:20 a.m. Group discussions**
- 11:20 – 11:25 a.m. Break and return to Justin Boardroom**
- 11:25 a.m. – Noon Group observations (Justin Boardroom)**
- Noon – 12:10 p.m. Break and move to Cox Dining Room C**
- 12:10 – 1:15 p.m. Lunch (Cox Dining Room C): Wrap-up and Feedback**

[NOTE: Academic Affairs Committee meets 12:45 – 1:15 p.m. in Justin Boardroom.]

- 1:30 p.m. Committee Meetings begin at various locations**
- 5:00 p.m. Completion of all committee meetings**
- 6:30 p.m. Cocktails for Roach Dinner**
- 7:00 p.m. Dinner**

Discussion Questions for Trustee Symposium

Holding Undergraduate Enrollment

- How does enrollment (size of the undergraduate population) affect quality of student experience (the TCU promise)?
- How does enrollment (size) affect TCU's financial future? Given that the tuition costs do not fully cover the cost of a student's education at TCU, what happens when we bring in additional students? How do we handle the increased student body in terms of class size, faculty-student ratio, etc?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of holding undergraduate enrollment?
- What are the possibilities if you decide to hold the undergraduate enrollment?

Defining a Residentiality Target

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of our residentiality target?
- What are the consequences if we don't meet this target?
- Do you think that having an increased number of students living on campus would increase attendance at events? Would this increase the safety of students?
- Do you think that this could enhance the intellectual climate of TCU?
- Should we have both freshman and sophomore residency requirements?

Increasing Graduate Enrollment

- What is the role of graduate education at TCU?
- Do we want to grow graduate education?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of increasing graduate enrollment?
- What graduate programs should we consider?
- What issues do you see that still need to be discussed on the issue of graduate programs and graduate education?
- Should we determine the needs of the community with regard to graduate education? How should we respond to the community needs?
- Are additional student services that should be implemented as graduate programming grows? What might these be?

***VISION IN ACTION:
Pursuing Our Preferred Future***

*Texas Christian University
Trustee Symposium
April 14, 2005*

Synopsis of the presentation and discussion

A. Introduction

Texas Christian University is a well-respected university that continues to grow with confidence, offering a positive educational experience that should engender considerable pride in the hearts and minds of those who have helped along the way. The Vision in Action team acknowledges their great debt to past leadership.

The Preferred Future of TCU emphasizes that the University ethos will embrace

- High Quality
- Brave Visions
- High Purposes

In practical terms this means that the University will assume an increasing role in national leadership. This involves an accelerating commitment to

- an expansion of the boundaries of knowledge,
- a literate response to the solving of problems and engagement with possibilities,
- an assumption of responsibility.
- a commitment to ethical standards
- a deep respect for human dignity and human rights and
- a commitment to the development of the full potential of all members of the University.

At the same time the University will constantly reference a heritage that is both firmly rooted in academic tradition and is rich in personal history. In effect TCU will embrace a Vision that **“Connects our Origins to our Future”**.

B. Principals that will guide planning at TCU

The following five principles form a template against which strategic planning at TCU can be evaluated.

TCU will:

1. Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff who can achieve their full potential at TCU.
2. Design a vibrant learning community characterized by distinctive curricular, co-curricular and residential programs.
3. Sustain an environment in which rich personal interaction is enhanced by outstanding facilities and appropriate technology.

4. Accelerate our connection with the greater community: Fort Worth, Texas, the nation, and the world.
5. Couple wise financial stewardship with a well-planned entrepreneurial approach to academic opportunities.

C. Strategic discussions

The symposium centered on three initial strategic recommendations that the VIA team saw as an essential precedent to specific college- and unit-based planning.

- Holding Undergraduate Enrollment steady,
- Defining a residential target, and,
- Increasing Graduate enrollment.

Recommendation One: Holding Undergraduate Enrollment steady.

The VIA team proposed holding Undergraduate enrollment at 7,200 through 2009-2010; currently it is 7,154.

TCU is obligated to its various constituencies to maintain and improve the quality of the educational experience that it offers and must, in consequence, practice sound and flexible academic management.

The rationale that drives this recommendation is that the academic space capacity of the campus has been stretched close to its limits; further increases in enrollment will jeopardize implementation of the “TCU Promise”.

The TCU Promise encompasses the character of the relationships that exist between all members of the TCU community: students and faculty, administration and staff, athletes and coaches, trustees, parents and alumni. It is the recognition that, if we are each to reach our full potential, then each of us must fulfill our commitments in a way that honors the spirit of those commitments.

Part of the TCU Promise to Undergraduates includes a personalized educational experience in which students can strive to reach their full potential. This means:

- Easily Accessible Faculty,
- A Low Faculty to Student Ratio with Small Class Size,
- High Quality Comprehensive Advising,
- Innovative Learning Experiences Sustained Through Four Years,
- An Opportunity to Conduct Individualized Creative Activity/Research,
- A Stimulating and Safe Residential Environment,

and,

- On graduation, a Degree of Greater Value, as Measured in Terms of:

Academic Quality
Reputation and Career Promise
Satisfied New Alumni and Parents

What does this mean in practical terms?

In order to meet our commitment to the Promise we need to make strategic investment in such areas as:

- Expanding Faculty and Supporting Facilities

- Refreshing Academic Programs
- Advising and Mentoring
- Enhancing Co-curricular Opportunities
- Greater Residential Capacity.

Informative Analytical Data show that:

1. The undergraduate population of TCU has risen by 26% since 1989.
2. The student to faculty ratio during the same time has fluctuated somewhat but is the same today as it was in 1989 (~14.7:1)
3. TCU attracts undergraduate mostly from Texas (78%) and surrounding states, with outliers in California and Tennessee, indicating that, at the moment, the appeal of the University is regional rather than national.
4. Comparative measures of quality used by the U.S. News and World suggest that, if TCU wants to achieve greater national prominence, it should:
 - Decrease the faculty to student ratio,
 - Improve student retention, and
 - Become more selective.

Fortunately, at the present time demographic considerations, in particular likely high school graduation rates indicate that we can be flexible in our strategic thinking. Holding our undergraduate programs at 7,200 for the next 5 years will enable us to enhance the quality of the educational experience that we offer in the ways discussed previously.

In this context, the most important structural project, presently underway, will be the linked construction of our new student center, new housing and a comprehensive refurbishment of the Brown Lupton Center as Academic space.

Recommendation Two: Defining a residential target

The VIA team recommend that TCU house two thirds (4,800) of undergraduates (7,200) in University-owned or University-authorized housing. Currently 3,240 undergraduates are so housed.

Why 4800 Campus Beds?

In part to reflect the residential heritage of the campus, but also to improve the quality of the holistic undergraduate experience.

In the former context it is important to realize that, until the rapid growth of the last 15 years, TCU was a “residential” institution. The last net beds were added in 1989, while (as noted previously) enrollment has increased 26% in the past 15 years. The residential experience of modern undergraduates may well differ considerably from that enjoyed by their older peers.

In the latter context, a Residential Campus engages students. Thus a Residential Campus:

- Allows us to develop The TCU Promise by influencing the quality of the student experience,
- Allows us to ensure that students are engaged with TCU and Fort Worth,
- Offers a safer environment for students,
- Makes it more likely that students will attend events, e.g., Athletics and Fine Arts,

- Is a pedestrian campus.

In summary, a residential campus is a lively place where students can better rise to their full potential, both as scholars and as responsible citizens.

Current plans are helping our move to a more residential campus. Thus the Berry Street project will add 624 beds and the current Brown Lupton Student Union project will add 300 to 400 beds.

Comparative measures of quality used by the U.S. News and World suggest that, if TCU wants to achieve greater national prominence, it should increase the number of students who enjoy the advantages of a residential campus.

Recommendation Three: Defining graduate programs

The VIA team suggest that TCU incrementally grow Graduate Programs over the next decade. Currently there are 1,478 graduate students, including Brite Divinity College students; 2,000 probably represents a ceiling over 10 years.

The principal reason for this recommendation is that well run and maintained graduate programs are not only of great value in their own right but also act as creative catalysts. In short they help us to be of greater national value. In addition comparative measures of quality used by the U.S. News and World suggest that a more effective graduate presence, would allow TCU to achieve greater national prominence,

In order to succeed in this endeavor we must implement a new approach to graduate education. Graduate programs can be expensive; hence we must develop affordable models.

- We need to establish Internal performance standards and External expectations for all programs
- Where appropriate, we must have an expectation that External support enhance programs, as appropriate, by the application of sound management principles.

Thoughtful implementation of new graduate strategies, tailored to our facilities and societal aspirations, will enable us to play a greater role on the world stage.

What will come next in VIA 2005/6?

A dynamic new core curriculum

A robust program to ensure Successful Graduation

A Commitment to Undergraduate Creative Activity

In Summary what is the Preferred Future Of TCU?

TCU will be an increasingly Important National Private University. It will be obtained

- In addition, we must evaluate our existing Graduate Programs and add, delete or

**BREAKOUT GROUP—BLUE
VIA BOARD SYMPOSIUM—APRIL 14, 2005**

Facilitator: Don Mills
 Place: Cox B
 Notetaker: Carol Campbell
 Trustee Spokesperson: Alan Friedman
 Staff: Karen Baker

Trustees:	Malcolm Louden	Len Roberts
	Allie Beth Allman	Billy Rosenthal
	Mark Johnson	Ed Schollmaier
	Kit Moncrief	Amy Roach

Hold Undergraduate Enrollment at 7,200 through 2009-2010

- Experience is similar around a range of 7,200.
- Need to consider undergraduate and graduate together – can't isolate.
- Need more information about the impact on individual schools and programs before making “macro” decisions.
- Quality can continue to improve if quantity holds.
- Need “finer” level of planning by college/school within 7,200 limit.
- “Quality” measures need to catch up to current quantity.
- Colleges/program planning must be coordinated – not done in isolation.
- Blindly agree with 7,200

**House two thirds (4,800) of undergraduates (7,200) in
University-owned or authorized housing**

- Agree that students on campus is desirable. **Very High Priority**
- Need to add housing that students want.

- Demand for additional housing exists.
- Non-TCU controlled housing has both advantages and disadvantage, as no control.

Incrementally Grow Graduate Programs Over the Next Decade
(Currently 1,478 – Target 2,000)

- New programs must be:
 - Innovative (non-duplicate)
 - Cost-effective/feasible
- Is “national prominence” sufficient reason to grow graduate programs?
 - Need TCU – specific reasons
 - Graduate programs benefit undergraduates as well.
- Board wants to be provided with much more information/analysis of college/school planning and priorities a next step.
- Graduate programs must also be quality programs.
- Grow graduate programs very strategically:
 - Slowly – What are the next 50?
 - Targeted

BREAKOUT GROUP—GREEN
VIA BOARD SYMPOSIUM—APRIL 14, 2005

Facilitator: Leo Munson
 Place: Parrish Conference Room
 Notetaker: Ray Brown
 Trustee Spokesperson: Ron Parker
 Staff: Don Whelan

Trustees:	Ron Clinkscale	John Roach
	Kelly Cox	Jan Scully
	Ann Jones	Sara Smith

Hold Undergraduate Enrollment at 7,200 through 2009-2010

Q: How does this question compare in importance to the other two?

A: Each is key to the overall planning process.

Quality—if a key metric—is key to this discussion.

If, at 7,200, will we achieve the quality we seek?

Increase in enrollment has helped the bottom line, or has it been the increase in tuition charges.

Q: Will we achieve the national recognition we seek?

A: Smaller schools are often the most prestigious. Profile issues (Sat, class rank, gpa's) can be impacted significantly by this decision.

Q: Do you try to get better students, or students who can and will pay more?

Q: At 7,200, can we create the type of culture, the type of atmosphere in this changing demographic?

Q: Will we be the type of school those who are seeking a broad, “global” experience will want?

Infrastructure issues re: facilities and faculty are key outcomes of this decision.

We must not materially change the positive pieces of what TCU has been in the past. Seeing an ever-increasing Academic Profile carries with it a significant cost as well.

Q: What are the causes of our attrition?

A: Variety of reasons. Academic, personal, advising, lack of fit.

**House two thirds (4,800) of undergraduates (7,200) in
University-owned or authorized housing**

- Q: What are issues surrounding the quality of the residential halls?
Kids are different—they're from families where each child has his/her own room (& bathroom) and will all amenities.
Definition of "dormitory" has changed.
- Q: Are there other activities that will keep kids on campus?
We're already full and have a waiting list for beds.
- Q: However, if we build new halls, can we fill those halls?
- Q: How will new housing compare in price to the Ft. Worth market?
- Q: What about adding a second year requirement to live on campus?
Could enhance the experience.
Could help fulfill "The Promise."
Might drive some prospective students away.

This issue, though several years away from implementation, is worthy of planning for now.

Concern voiced re: Funding new Residential Halls will be unlikely.

What if a perception flourishes that "TCU is hot, but not a place where you want to live?"

We must be mindful for a carefully planned, integrated approach to this type of growth.

We must be aware of food service issues with respect to quality and variety and size (seating capacity) of dining facilities.

**Incrementally Grow Graduate Programs Over the Next Decade
(Currently 1,478 – Target 2,000)**

We're weak compared to peer group presented.

When Brite's Numbers are factored out, we're even more anemic.

Faculty argues that lack of doctoral programs inhibits faculty recruitment. It is argued that graduate and professional schools significantly enhance reputation.

We should continue to enhance existing schools/programs (i.e., School of Business).

We have had some success with Nurse Anesthetist Program.

Some existing PhD programs could enroll more students w/o added cost.

Brite's 300 students and 5 PhDs (annually) will soon be eliminated from statistics—fueled by SACS (& Brite?)

If growth will continue, we need new professional programs.

Should continue to promote “Steeple of Excellence.” Must be sensitive to those who aren't steepled.

We need to get better (at Graduation education) or get out of the business. This discussion has gone on for many years.

We must define; identify the areas where growth can occur.

Q: What about building relationships with industry?

A: What natural links might exist?
EMBA programs are logical outlets for these collaborations.

BREAKOUT GROUP—RED
VIA BOARD SYMPOSIUM—APRIL 14, 2005

Facilitator: Ann Louden
 Place: Justin Board Room
 Notetaker: Larry Lauer
 Trustee Spokesperson: Rick Wittenbraker
 Staff: Cornell Thomas

Trustees: Brenda Cline Joan Rogers
 Bob Buschman Clarence Scharbauer
 Laura Miller Roy Snodgrass
 Kade Matthews

Hold Undergraduate Enrollment at 7,200 through 2009-2010

(Should we grow at all?)

There is a reason why we are going to 7200 instead of staying where we are at 7,154. What is it?

I would recommend we state strongly that enrollment should not exceed 7200 and if we are less than 7200, far better.

*** Faculty/Staff Ratio Discussion**

15:1 Faculty ratio is okay – but there are too many large classes.

Keep in mind that we are competing with the mega universities (like UT, A&M, etc.) where the faculty student ratios are not as good. Where we have a problem is in the freshman seminar classes.

Some large classes are very good.

In some programs the classes, even for seniors, are too large. One area of particular concern is in the Neeley School.

*** Academic Advising Discussion**

Academic advising has to improve. In particular, freshman advising has to be better.

We promise faculty accessibility and yet in advising, we can't or don't deliver in this area.

I was amazed that the faculty member who advised my daughter almost kept her from graduating on time. If we hadn't gotten involved, she would not have had enough hours.

This is an area where we do the least good job and too many faculty are not enthusiastic about it. In some schools, like education, however, advising is actually a very official part of the way faculty interact positively with students.

The internal auditor is focused on reviewing this and improving the tool kit that allows students to better control their destinies with advising.

We have to get away from the notion that it is the student's responsibility; it is the institution's responsibility.

***Retention Discussion**

Must focus on retention improvement. We have opportunities to do better.

What happens with freshmen – must be positive. Frog Camp is a great experience.

***Selectivity Discussion**

Must continue to improve selectivity...target 1200 to 1300 SATS

TCU is a hot school – need a more precise understanding of why!

Use honors program effectively – market it differently to appeal to a broader mix outside of liberal arts.

Support the admissions operation to the level needed to make selectivity possible.

Financial aid needs to be involved to make sure those who are admitted can afford to come.

House two thirds (4,800) of undergraduates (7,200) in University-owned or authorized housing

Is 2/3 enough? (Probably will have to be...)

Disadvantages

- How to pay for it. We have reached our debt limit.
- Recognize that when partnering with other companies, like with Phoenix project, there is not as much control as TCU might want.
- Recognize that residence halls do not make good fund-raising projects for outside donors.

Advantages

- It is expected at our price to have housing with market appeal and comparable to what students have at home.
- Must have housing with appeal – now a “rite of passage” to move to apartment at the junior year.
- More projects like Berry Street housing underway on other campuses.

Incrementally Grow Graduate Programs Over the Next Decade
(Currently 1,478 – Target 2,000)

(Grow in size?)

Advantages

- Perception of reputation is important.
- Who are our star faculty and in what programs?
- Must identify areas where we are the best and this showcases those areas. This may mean eliminating some programs.

Disadvantages – group is skeptical about ability to achieve this.

- No obvious academic target areas for growth to reach the projected numbers.
- Cannot compete financially.
- Would not want this to be our emphasis to the exclusion of first two recommendations.
- Law studied before...but maybe conditions will change. It will take a professional school to get to these recommended numbers.
- It is exhausting and impossible to think about adding ten graduate students across the board in each program. Will never be successful.
- Group felt this recommendation was the most expensive and least developed and that they needed to see a more well thought out plan.

Is an addition of 522 graduate students realistic? (The group doubts it.)

- Will have to leverage on existing programs.
- Cannot do it adding 10 at a time in many different disciplines.
- Will have to revisit something like law.
- Consider weekend/flexible programs.
- Less priority than I.& II.
- Want to keep doctoral I. status.

BREAKOUT GROUP—YELLOW
VIA BOARD SYMPOSIUM—APRIL 14, 2005

Facilitator: Bonnie Melhart
 Place: Cox A
 Notetaker: Tracy Syler-Jones
 Trustee Spokesperson: Deedie Rose

Trustees:	Denny Alexander	Roger King
	Bill Adams	Teri O’Glee
	Lou Hill Davidson	Jerry Ray
	Luther King	

Hold Undergraduate Enrollment at 7,200 through 2009-2010

- Consider option of lowering enrollment – positive (better education)/negative(lose dollars)
- Shrinking School – from outside world bad
 - Some may want to – grow school, but strains facilities
 - Current number important for infrastructure (facilities, faculty, living)
 - Increase size means putting in more dollars from sources outside of tuition revenue.
- Adding 200-300 students will stress resources
 - Mindset to slightly reduce instead of slightly increasing – where does slight increase stop?
- Cap should be 7,200, but okay if we don’t hit target
- Option to reduce instead of slightly growing
 - Prioritize quality – retention/grades high priority, holding enrollment bottom line, but what are other factors that impact quality?
- Direct correlation between SAT and retention.
- Smarter kids are easier to retain.
- Do the last 200 students have ability to add to retention? If not, is it worth investment?
- Another variable – transfer students – could change numbers by restricting transfer students.
- Improve the selectivity, but don’t try to be like a Duke, etc. to get there.

- Some on board want to maintain selectivity.

CONCLUSIONS:

- Group feels @ present hold to current numbers; enable us to meet needs.
- Is 7,200 accurate numbers?
- Some want to consider option of reducing numbers until we can achieve other quality indicators (residentially, retention, etc...).
- Support (\$) from endowed scholarships to make up for less dollars from fewer students.

House two thirds (4,800) of undergraduates (7,200) in University-owned or authorized housing

(no debate on merits)

- Increased academic (intellectual) environment.
- Never realized 5 years ago, as enrollment numbers grew, impact on housing.
- Networking of living together is a plus.
- If we build it, will they come?
 - We do turn students away currently.
 - Our job to get them interested in living on campus.
 - Fraternity/Sorority have to pay regardless of number of students in their dorms.
- Only positives, but also has educational positives for students – encourage them back on campus.
- Consider requiring other classes (soph., etc...) to live on campus.
 - Requirement of upper classmen may slightly change retention.
- Build more residence halls like Tom Brown/Pete Wright to attract older students back to campus.
- Geographic diversity enriches undergraduate experience (other schools w/geographic division also have more residential living).
 - Does Texas & Christian impact our geographic recruitment of students? Perception outside of Texas can be negative.
 - TCU's reputation is becoming greater than its name (Christian).
- Other diversity needs to be addressed in residentially issues and others (recruitment).

- Tuition discounting impacts ethnic diversity (we need this), whether students of color stay or leave.
 - Can't be oblivious to these trends.

Incrementally Grow Graduate Programs Over the Next Decade
(Currently 1,478 – Target 2,000)

- Manage growth where resources are available.
- TCU's MBA program is impressive, but MBA enrollment declining across the nation.
- Why go to graduate school when you've already got job you want?
- 30-45% decline in Business school enrollment also impacts selectivity ranking.
- What schools have good argument for higher numbers in graduate programs?
 - Education (teacher shortage) – math, science, technology.
 - Areas that partner with MBA: sciences, engineering (East Asia and Australia competition in science areas).
- 9/11 has made it harder to recruit students from other countries. (at least increased perception among potential applicants)
- If education is possibility, improve facility.
- TCU researcher (Dr. Karyn Purvis) from psychology presented at conference – international folks in attendance – very impressed.
 - Need support for program (Hope Connection).
- Areas of graduate enrollment to increase.
 - Health (nursing)
 - Business school and other areas (environmental/engineering/professional programs).
- Possibility – Business/arts administration.
- Graduate level programs - degree and certificate programs.
 - Certificate programs where graduate presence is already established is desired.
 - Students in Ranch Management have degree – don't count as graduate student.
 - >Offer graduate certificate to these students (TCU goal).
 - >Many issues related to making Ranch Management a degree program.
- Collaboration is key in graduate programs.
- Intense evaluation – shut down if not performing.

- Address issues needed in community and worldwide.
- Nurse Anesthesia – student double salary when they graduate. Program is very successful.
- Areas in place, like Starpoint/Nurse Anesthesia, build on these programs.
- Quality vs. quantity is also important.
- Endowed chairs needed? (often yes, sometimes no)
 - Critical for more traditional program.
 - Graduates get attracted to star faculty.
 - Correlation between outstanding graduate programs and endowed chairs.
- Do we increase graduate numbers to 2,000?
 - Who?
 - Why?
 - Where?
 - Need more information