

University Senate

Minutes of the Meeting of February 1, 2013

Approval Pending

Members Present: Brittany Abraham, Timothy Classen, Shawna Cooper-Gibson, Cass Coughlin, Lisa Gillespie, Tyler Hough, Pamela Johnson, Claudio Katz, Thomas Kelly, Vicki Keough, Muhammed Rizwan Khan, Teri Kilbane, Joyce Knight, Niamh McGuigan, Erin Moriarty, Alice Perlin, Christopher Peterson, Noah Sobe, Anne Sutter, Mary Van Houten, Matthew Razek,

Ex-Officio Members Present: John Pelissero

Members Absent: Dina Berger, Leanne Cribbs, Mary Dominiak, Alanah Fitch, Sarah McDowell, Bren Murphy, David Yellen

Guests: Ariana Lewis, Paul Roberts, Dion Squire,

The meeting was called to order by the chair at 3:08 PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of November 16, 2012 were reviewed. A motion to approve the minutes as amended was passed unanimously.

UNIVERSITY WEB SITE

The chair announced that the University Senate website has gone live. Questions, additions, and/or edits should be brought to the attention of the chair.

PRESENTATION: Provost John Pelissero

The provost discussed Loyola's budget and fiscal outlook for both the remaining fiscal year and implications for the next year.

Enrollment status-Provost Pelissero distributed the Spring 2013 Tenth of Term report for review. Current enrollment of full time students is down about 330 full time students, which is equivalent to being down 2% in students and about 1.3% down in credit hours. Enrollment is down at the graduate levels as well.

Both fall 2012 and spring 2013 enrollment are down below expectation and what was budgeted for this year. The University budgeted for about 500 more students than we have enrolled. Students are exiting the University at a rate higher than they are entering. Graduation rates are up due to change in credits needed (128 down to 120).

The provost explained the meaning and impact of these enrollment events. As a tuition driven, thus enrollment driven University, enrollments have a great impact on available funds. According to University reports, peak enrollment in recent years took place in fall 2011, and

since that time enrollment has dropped off slightly each semester. Some schools such as the School of Education and the School of Business have experienced larger declines. There has been some growth in both graduate and on-line programs.

Impact of enrollment on finances

As a result of decreased enrollment, year end results of operations or profits have been affected. The University planned for \$32 million in profit or surplus to reinvest in the academic programs and scholarships, but is now forecasting about \$16 million in profit for FY13. A good portion of that \$16 million will go to debts for capital projects, and for funding scholarships.

Ways to save money are already underway

The University has explored some ways to save money and generate new revenues. Some are already in place or at least in the works. Some examples follow:

- J-term 2013 added 260 enrollments and made about \$500K
- Current expansion into online enrollment is making about \$500K
- Larger impact strategies are being implemented to increase enrollment, with a goal to raise freshman enrollment to an incoming class of 2200 (+200) and transfers to at least 700 students.
- Exploring and changing strategies in Financial Aid, in order to manage need based aid in more financially sound ways is under way.

Proposed change in merit raises

Provost Pelissero raised another possible money saving move which involves moving merit raises for faculty and staff from July 1 to January 1. The provost explained that this move would allow 6 months savings. In addition, the senior administration proposes permanently shifting the schedule for allocating raises to January 1, giving the University a better idea of Fall enrollment numbers and thus be able to determine more accurately the raise pool that the University can support. In the short run, about \$2-3 million would be saved this year. Raises would take effect January 1, and the determination of the raise pool will take place after fall enrollments are known. The merit pool could be determined in October, with letters of notification going out in November. Raises would be payroll activated in January.

Promotion raises, as a result of promotion and tenure reviews, would not be affected by this plan. This proposal would only affect merit increases.

The immediate impact of this proposal would be that raises slated for July (2013) would be delayed until January 1, 2014.

Questions and concerns

Questions about the timing of evaluations were raised. Thomas Kelly, Vice President of Human Resources and Provost Pelissero offered responses. Discussion on changing evaluations from annual to academic year ensued. It was noted that faculty are on an academic year evaluation, and staff are on a calendar year, or a division based evaluation. Various concerns were raised. No decision was made on the timing of evaluation, but it was determined that this was worth discussing at a later date and would be revisited.

Questions about enrollment initiatives were raised. Paul Roberts, Associate Provost, Enrollment Management and Erin Moriarty, Associate Director of Admissions fielded questions. The University currently has about 19,000 applications and 10,150 admits towards the 2200 we hope to enroll. The new goal would remain at 2200 new freshmen starting Fall 2014.

Questions about running J-term classes with lower enrollments and initiatives for a "May-mester" were raised. Provost Pelissero fielded the questions. J-term classes can run with a smaller number. Only a few cancellations were made in J-term 2013 due to low enrollment. There will not be a short spring term or "May-mester". Adjustments in the current summer calendar will give students more options. The University had looked at the possibilities for having an August short term, but student interest in this was very low. Visiting students have helped to add to the "bottom line".

Questions about the extent that the capital building program is affecting the university's fiscal health were raised. Provost Pelissero fielded the questions. The provost explained that the residence halls are paid by student fees. Other buildings have been paid in bonds with a 7 years pay off plan.

Questions about why the University is not looking at lowering the merit pool amount and just giving a lower raise now. The provost explained that it is not a fiscally wise decision to look at a pool amount now, but it would be better to make decisions on expenditures when we have a solid budget, which we will be able to have once enrollments are determined.

Questions regarding if other costs, such as parking could be frozen. The concern that many staff rely on raises to offset some of those costs was raised. Senior Vice President & CHRO, Thomas Kelly responded that the University could look into this, but it was important that no extra costs be added to tuition.

As a final comment, the provost asked the senate and visitors to remember that our fiscal concerns are not unique to Loyola, but are the same concerns that are affecting all universities. In short, he stated that this is a national problem that we have to try to work with. The chair of the University Senate, Claudio Katz, and Provost Pelissero recommended that it would be helpful to get a sense of how the Senate feels about the idea of delaying merit raises. Although there are several concerns from members of the Senate, much would need to be worked out, and other alternatives need to be considered, the Senate decided to render a *Sense of the Senate Resolution*.

The chair explained the *Sense of the Senate Resolution*. This Resolution is non-binding, and will express an opinion of the Senate. This opinion will be based on the information we have at hand. The co-chair of the Senate, Anne Sutter, proposed that we vote to support or not to support the resolution, and that our minutes would serve as a record of some of our concerns that the administration could review and use for further dialogue.

Because the Senate had not come to a conclusion regarding timing of evaluations and performance reviews, it was decided that this matter would not be a part of the resolution.

However, Senate members felt that this topic is of great importance and merits meaningful review.

Sense of the Senate Resolution:

It is the sense of the Senate that it is reasonable to change the allocation of merit raises from July 1 to Jan 1, effective fiscal year 2014. We recognize that as a result of this change the University will eliminate merit raises for 6 months this year. At this time we are not yet voicing our opinions regarding the cycle of faculty and staff evaluations.

Those supporting: 17

Those opposed: 1

Abstain: 3

DIVERSITY TASK FORCE

A proposal for a chief diversity officer by USGA has been introduced to the Senate for consideration. A recent study determined that Loyola "can do a better job" in regards to diversity, and recommended that a chief diversity officer be hired. Dr. Claudio Katz, Chair of the University Senate, was asked by the President, to help create a task force to address this issue. Names of individuals recommended to serve on this task force have been submitted to the President's office and include students, faculty and staff. Dr. Darryl Wheeler, Dean of the School of Social Work, has been asked to lead the task force.

Dr. Katz submitted a proposal regarding the Diversity Task Force's relationship to the Senate. Dr. Katz expressed his thoughts that the Senate should oversee this as its' own initiative and with the task force reporting to the Senate. The task force will be required to produce an annual report. After the initial work ends in May, it was recommended that the task force become a part of the Senate and one of our committees.

Dr. Katz made the following motion regarding the Task Force on Diversity.

1. The task force will report to Senate
2. The Senate will make recommendations to the President
3. Sunset laws will need to be set for the task force
4. The Senate may create a diversity subcommittee if recommended by the Task Force.

The motion was seconded, and voted upon.

The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to adjourn passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Joyce D. Knight

Secretary, University Senate