

UNIVERSITY SENATE  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
October 23, 2012

Members Present: Brittany Abraham, Dina Berger, Timothy Classen, Shawna Cooper-Gibson, Cass Coughlin, Leanne Cribbs, Mary Dominiak, Alanah Fitch, Lisa Gillespie, Tyler Hough, Claudio Katz, Thomas Kelly, Vicki Keough, Muhammed Rizwan Khan, Teri Kilbane, Joyce Knight, Sarah McDowell, Niamh McGuigan, Erin Moriarty, Bren Murphy, John Pelissero, Noah Sobe, Alice Perlin, Matthew Razek, Anne Sutter, David Yellen

Ex-Officio Members Present: John Pelissero

Guests: Marian Allen Claffey, William Laird, David Prasse

The meeting was called to order at 6:08 p.m. by the co-chair, Dr. Sutter. The members introduced themselves to one another and the guests.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of September 25<sup>th</sup> were reviewed. A motion to approve the minutes was passed unanimously.

#### GUEST PRESENTATIONS

**Mr. William Laird**, Senior Vice President and CEO discussed the university budget, status and challenges. Mr. Laird focused his presentation on Profit and Loss (P&L), and on a recent report which explores where Loyola makes and loses money. He cited some examples of how internal decisions can make an impact on profit and loss including the decision, some years ago, to move the School of Education to Water tower, and the more recent and successful endeavor to raise enrollment.

Some other ways the university has been able to be financially sound was investing in and paying for new buildings and renovations rather than re-financing, and paying for those building with other sources of revenue rather than tuition dollars. In general, the University went from refinancing debt to paying off debt, saving and investing, and stopped investing tuition monies solely in the stock market. Currently, monies are being saved and set aside for future repairs so future generations are not penalized by financing these with higher tuition dollars.

The sale of the hospital increased the University's credit standing, with more than 780 million of liability being lifted off of the budget. With the increase in credit rating, the University was able to purchase and build buildings at an affordable rate. In addition, some of the funds were available to advance the medical school. Mr. Laird stated that the University's concerns with the mission were lessened since another Catholic hospital system, with a similar mission, bought the hospital.

Mr. Laird discussed financial aid as the largest challenge the University faces today. Loyola grants internal financial aid to 34% of the students, while other schools are only at 20%. Concern about waning government monies is something the University must watch. Of the endowment, 40% of the funds belong to the hospital and 60% belongs to schools. As far as funding goes, 25% goes to financial aid, about 15% to buildings and utilities, about 50% to faculty and staff salaries. In order to continue to address the needs of those who need financial aid, the university is looking to have more need-based scholarship, and thus is looking for more donors willing to finance these scholarships. Other initiatives to bring in more revenue and balance the financial aid needs include bringing in more half time students, non-traditional aged students, international students, and students from distance and online courses. Efforts to ensure that students graduate in four years have cut the debt for students and for the university.

New freshmen will pay 5% more in tuition in Fall of 2013; however, this cost will not be passed on to continuing students. The University hopes to keep the rises in tuition a little closer to cost of living but, even now, Loyola is about 4K below what comparable universities charge. In conclusion, Mr. Laird stated that Loyola's finances are in good shape.

**Dr. David Prasse**, Dean of the School of Education, reported on the new course and teacher evaluation tool, the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA). (<http://www.theideacenter.org>) He expressed that the new tool addresses two needs: Informed Instruction and Teacher review.

#### Key Features of the IDEA Evaluation System

- Over 35 yrs operation. University-based. Non-profit.
- It has both a student and faculty form. It allows faculty to identify what they emphasized in the course and therefore weights items to which students respond.
- Beyond standard items (important and essential) it has a bank of additional items (or unit can develop own) for annual review purposes and online or hybrid courses.
- It can be used as a paper or online assessment or both.
- The processing of paper forms takes 10 business days excluding shipping time.
- IDEA allows for a pilot phase of the instrument at no cost for a limited number of courses.
- Current response rates for this instrument average at 78% for paper-based forms and 55% for the online format. SOE response rates exceed 90%
- The system has a long and short form of the student survey with evidence that there is no survey fatigue with the long form.
- Results are reported as t-scores in both a raw and adjusted format. Adjusted scores accommodate several factors such as: required, year of student (undergrad/grad etc.), previous exp teaching course, etc.
- IDEA Comparisons – classes rated, ≤ 10 students excluded, 122 institutions, 44k + classes, no one institution comprises more than 5% data base.

- Discipline Comparisons – approximately 90, updated annual, most recent 5 yrs data, minimum 400 classes, excludes classes no objectives
- Institutional Comparisons – update annually, most recent 5 yrs data, minimum 400 classes, excludes classes with no objectives.
- Faculty feedback – positive (best we have ever used), value the Improving Teacher Effectiveness section, tailoring to specific course objectives, distinguishing essential from important, creating school-wide items.

#### What We Have Learned

- PD for faculty important
- Heavy front end load (i.e. organizing, preparing forms, etc.) This can be addressed with an integrated system-wide approach
- Prompt faculty conversation around results within and between discipline/program areas.
- Increase N by openly valuing the process
- Use the data formatively (instructional reflection) and summatively (instructional evaluation)

Discussion ensued about being able to tailor the inventory towards faculty needs. Dr. Prasse stated that the tool can identify questions as essential or non essential. It is not possible to add items, but one can set what must be answered as opposed to what is optional. In the case of multiple sections of the same course, most of the questions will be standard. The rationale is that each course should have a standard set of outcomes. The tool also allows for qualitative commenting. Questions about the School of Education's 90% response rate were posed. Dr. Prasse stated that the schools will need to explore "carrot and stick" (Reward or Punish) methods. He recommended looking at "carrot" ways first, offering incentives such as access to early grades. Dr. Prasse stated that moving forward, the tool will be introduced in Fall 2013. It has not yet been determined if the tool will be used university wide, or if a few more units might pilot it before it is fully rolled out to all divisions. Dr. Prasse stated that there is documented evidence that IDEA improves teaching and that the tool is seen as an annual discussion about growth in teaching

**Provost Pelissero's** presentation on the University rankings was tabled.

#### SENATE BUSINESS

##### Committee Assignments

Committee assignment sheets were given out. Co-chair Anne Sutter attempted to give senators their first choice but was mindful to have representation of all member groups on all.

### Mission of the Senate

Discussion ensued about the mission of the Senate and the charge of the committees. Provost Pelissero reminded the Senate that our task would be that of recommending or not recommending various solutions of university wide issues. Some ideas about pending university wide issues included implementation of Sakai, online teaching and its role, recruitment and its issues. As a newly formed group, it was suggested that it would be helpful for committees to be key in contacting Staff & Faculty councils and Student Government to see what their top concerns are.

Amended bylaws- This item was tabled for the next meeting.

### Next meeting and prospective agenda items

The next meeting will be Friday November 16 from 3-5 PM. Room TBA

It was recommended by the chair that meetings alternate between Lake Shore Campus and Water tower. A suggestion that tele-conferencing might be useful for those unable to make the meetings, especially for those at the Medical Center. Members from the Medical Center expressed their eagerness to host a meeting on their campus. This option will be explored. Prospective agenda items include Sakai implementation, and discussion of the "Position Loyola for the Future" Document.

The motion to adjourn the meeting carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

October 27, 2012

Joyce D. Knight

Assistant Dean, Advising CAS

Secretary, University Senate