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Guests:
Marc Manganaro, Provost
Elizabeth Kordahl, Exec. Asst. to the Provost
Karen Rosenbecker, Parliamentarian
Thom Spence, Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
Roberta Kaskel, Interim VP for Enrollment Management
Jay Calamia, Vice President for Business and Finance
Melanie McKay, Vice Provost for Faculty Devel.
President Kevin Wm. Wildes, S.J.
CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

INVOCATION
President Wildes offered an invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes from the November 14, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved.

REPORT FROM CHAIR
The Report from the Chair was distributed via email (attached here as Appendix A). There was no discussion or questions about the report.

REPORTS
Board Committees (attached here as Appendix B).
   a. Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board
   b. Finance Committee of the Board

   Senator Marcus Kondkar asked for clarification in the section about Reduction in Force (pasted below). President Wildes responded that if more people apply for voluntary severance and there is not enough money left in the pool that was allocated for this, then he can go to the Board and ask for more. In the last sentence the words “reduction in force” should read “voluntary severance package.”

   A). A proposal to address the Phase II recommendation (beyond the VSP) to eliminate the $7.5 million shortfall requested Board approval to delegate to the BOT Executive Committee the authority to consult with the President and approve the amount needed to fund the Reduction in Force and subsequently withdraw up to that amount from the Endowment.

University Budget Committee (distributed via email as a PDF attachment).

Other Reports – None.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT
President Wildes informed the Senate that the voluntary severance package (VSP) process is almost complete. Once the numbers are calculated, the next step in reducing the deficit will be determined. He intends to continue working with the Vice Presidents, Deans, and leadership of the two senates. He announced that he is not considering any reduction to the retirement contribution this year. Roberta Kaskel was thanked for all of her hard work, and for accepting the position of Interim Vice President of Enrollment Management. She has graciously agreed to continue in the interim position for a second year. She will continue working closely with the consulting firms, and will begin to look at the size of the undergraduate student body and determine what number best suits Loyola. Statistics show there is a national drop in traditional-age students that will continue through 2016. Many of the AJCU schools are experiencing a drop in applications, retention, and enrollment. He feels confident that Loyola will overcome this hard time.
At the December meeting of the Board of Trustees they voted to not increase undergraduate or graduate tuition next year. Senator Bill Walkenhorst asked if there will be an increase in room and board. Provost Manganaro responded that the Board approved a 2.5% increase in room and a 3% increase in board. The University will aggressively advertise that tuition is not being increased. Roberta Kaskel added that an internal and external campaign will be promoted to the entire group of prospective students, the applicant pool, parents, and high school guidance counselors. Loyola must demonstrate that we are holding tuition steady to show our awareness of the cost of higher education in relation to family incomes.

Senator Jon Altschul is pleased to hear there will not be an increase in tuition. He asked if the Jesuits and the Board are doing anything to help raise funds. President Wildes responded that the Board is actively involved in fundraising efforts by either making a personal contribution or soliciting gifts from others. While we are still in the quiet phase of the capital campaign, the Board is very involved. The Jesuits fund a number of scholarships each year. Because their salaries are pooled as a group, the community makes a significant gift to the University each year of which most goes into scholarships and aid.

Two years ago the Board approved a $100 million campaign. To date, they have raised and received gift commitments in the amount of $38 million. The campaign will be launched publicly in April 2014. By that time, they hope to have raised 50% of the campaign goal. The campaign is broken down by priorities and the Vice Presidents have been actively involved. Funding for scholarships is set at $20 million and has been one of the easiest gifts to ask for. Fundraising has changed to be more focused on scholarships and funds to support faculty research.

Senator Jonathan Peterson asked if the success of the campaign will help with the current financial situation. President Wildes responded that initially it will not impact the deficit. Based on the tax law, when a pledge is made an individual has a set amount of time or number of years in which to pay off the pledge. Therefore, most of the funds raised are not immediately available for use. Through discounts and other avenues, Loyola funds a lot of the financial aid that is given to students. By doing this, it frees up internal capital funds that can be used to support other programs that we do not have the money for.

Senator Isabel Medina thanked President Wildes and Provost Manganaro for the level of transparency that has been made available to the University community up to this point and added that she is delighted to hear that Board voted to not increase tuition next year. She asked about the issue of the low graduation rate and what is being done to make it a top priority. President Wildes responded that he does want to make retention and graduation rate top priorities. He is very proud of the fact that a large number of the student population receives need-based aid, and a large number are first-generation students. Now that they are here, we need to keep them here and graduate them. Provost Manganaro added that the graduation retention rate is a high priority for the Strategic Planning Committee. One of the sub-committees specifically identified the 4-5 year graduation rate as a key strategy to work on.

Senator Cathy Rogers inquired about the plan for communication with local media between now and the public launch of the campaign and asked if there are plans to hire anyone who specializes in crisis communication. She is concerned about negative media coverage with regard to the VSP and employees camping out on campus to submit their materials. Roberta Kaskel responded that the Lawlor Group is part of discussions about the future and how we can remain robust in the academic programs we offer and to maintain the quality of what is offered in the classroom. Meredith Hartley is also working with a local firm to prevent media coverage that can be misinterpreted as something negative.
PROVOST’S REPORT
Dr. Manganaro reported that the December Board meeting went very well. The Board is very concerned but also supportive and confident of the direction we are moving toward. The hope is that the steady tuition rate will attract more students and increase revenue, and not reduce revenue by maintaining or seeing a decrease in the number of incoming students and retention.

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board have been working to develop a rough draft of seven strategic initiatives, and submitted a copy to the Board for review. During the spring semester, information will be shared with the deans, faculty, at town hall meetings, and with focus groups that will consist of faculty and staff. They would like to receive feedback from the community and the Board. Another draft will be submitted to the Board in March and a more refined draft in May. If the plan is not complete by May the President has approved for the work to continue until it is complete.

Senator Behrooz Moazami inquired about the process of how the plan is distributed and reviewed. He proposed that the Senate be allowed to review it before it is presented to the Board. He added that faculty should be more entitled to make decisions about the direction of the University before the Board. Provost Manganaro agreed with him and indicated that they are looking for more faculty feedback, but there only two opportunities to present information to the Board in the spring semester.

Senator Isabel Medina asked if there a formal process where the members of the committee will engage the faculty. Provost Manganaro responded that the Strategic Planning Committee is in the early phases of the plan and are just beginning to deploy it. There will be opportunities for committee members to bring information to their faculty and get feedback.

Senator Behrooz Moazami asked if it will be possible to have a meeting of all faculty and staff to discuss it together. Provost Manganaro responded that there will be town hall meetings for discussion. Alice Clark reminded senators that she represents the Senate on the committee and faculty can email her questions or suggestions at any time.

Senator Robert Gerlich inquired about the process of the plan. Many long-term employees at Loyola have worked on several strategic plans, and sometimes it seems like the long hours spent in meetings and providing feedback were only a dream and never became a reality. He asked at what point in the process of this strategic will it become a reality and not be just a dream. Provost Manganaro responded that today’s situation is different than in the past. The initiatives that have emerged so far are very real challenges that can provide opportunities to improve enrollment management, retention, and the graduation rate.

Senator Mark Grote asked about University’s plan after the December 16th VSP is complete. We are going to lose some good faculty who may not be replaced. If a core faculty member is not replaced, some courses may not be offered. How have the Provost’s Office and deans begun planning to teach the same number of classes with fewer faculty? Provost Manganaro responded that at this time a smaller number of faculty is appropriate because we have a smaller student body. The University has been working on instructional effectiveness for almost two years, and that work will continue.

Senator Isabel Medina asked about the low graduation rate and what is being done to increase it. Provost Manganaro responded that a lot more work needs to be done in that area. Part of it reflects a changing student
body demographic. Roberta Kaskel added that sometimes the numbers can be affected depending on how it is calculated. If a student does not stay at Loyola for eight consecutive semesters, they are taken out of that cohort. She added that surprisingly, families do not ask about the graduation rate during the application process. Thom Spence added that the reasons student leave after their freshman year is very different than leaving in a later year. His office is in the process of studying why many students stay and why some do not.

Progress on Monroe Hall continues. Before the Christmas break, three departments will move into their new space on the fourth and fifth floors.

The Facilities Planning Committee has recently created and unanimously passed a resolution for the beautification of the campus. It was approved by President Wildes and the committee will move forward with implementing it.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

Online course evaluation pilot (attached here as Appendix C), discussion:

- Senator Isabel Medina asked if it was feasible to amend the motion to include the College of Law in the one-year pilot. Thom Spence responded that it can be included if they are able to create their own questions. He is happy to help deploy it and collect the data. Alice Clark asked that the motion not be amended for parliamentary reasons, and that Thom and Isabel work together on the possible inclusion of the College of Law.

- Senator Jonathan Peterson asked if the pilot will be in all courses or a specific set of courses. Thom Spence responded that it will include all undergraduate courses. Dr. Peterson expressed concerns about the impact it can have on untenured faculty. It is important that they get a good response rate on their evaluations and this could potentially impact it. Dr. Spence responded that the response rates are a concern and it is being looked into. The survey can be deployed on PDAs and can also be administered in the classroom. Dr. Clark asked that Dr. Spence make sure that all concern expressed at this meeting is brought back to the committee and taken into consideration in the promotion and tenure process. He is committed to make sure it does not negatively impact tenure-track faculty.

- Senator Mark Grote pointed out that some questions on the current course evaluations do not apply to some disciplines, and it is difficult for the students to interpret the questions. Thom Spence responded that the pilot can be changed to include specific questions that apply to a program.

- Senator Cathy Rogers suggested making the evaluation accessible through mobile phones. Thom Spence responded that it will be mobile phone friendly.

- Senator Frankie Weinburg is concerned about a change in the format or a low response rate affecting the review of a faculty member applying for tenure. Thom Spence responded that the literature shows that the accuracy of the instruments does not change dramatically moving from a paper format to an online format.

- Senator Jon Altschul asked for the positive reasons that we are piloting an online evaluation. Thom Spence responded that an online survey can be set up to include specific questions that are tailored to an individual program or class that will provide valuable feedback. Specific data can also be submitted to SACS for accreditation purposes. Responses will be acquired much faster than the paper format and faculty will be able to use the information for improvement in the subsequent semester. An informative evaluation can also be created for use in mid-semester. Provost Manganaro added that more and more universities and moving toward an online format.
• Senator Meg Frazier expressed concern that questions tailored for individual courses will affect the comparison data and scores. Thom Spence responded that there will be a set of standard questions on all evaluations, and program specific questions will be added at the end.

• Melanie McKay added that there are categories of courses such as Common Curriculum courses, Honors courses, and first-year seminar courses that need special questions so they can be compared and yield comparisons across those courses. Senator Meg Frazier commented that the data Dr. McKay is referring to will be very useful for administration but not so useful for faculty in a tenure review process.

• Cathy Rogers called the question and Connie Rodriguez seconded. The motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS
Faculty Handbook revision (Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum) (attached here as Appendix D).
Connie Rodriguez moved to approve and Meg Frazier seconded. There was no discussion on the motion. It will be on the agenda for a vote in January.

CSS restructuring motion (attached here as Appendix E) Connie Rodriguez moved to approve and Gwen George seconded. Provost Manganaro mentioned that he has discussed the motion with the Executive Committee, and there is no intention of restructuring any of the colleges in the near term. CSS faculty have been discussing the possibility of restructuring their college. Any changes in CSS would impact all of the units and discussions would have to include representatives from all colleges. There will be a vote on the motion in January.

Criteria for financial exigency (attached here as Appendix F). Dr. Clark reviewed the motion and stated that having criteria for financial exigency is a requirement of the Faculty Handbook and must be approved by the Senate. She emphasized that the University is not considering filing for financial exigency. Connie Rodriguez moved to accept the criteria, and Isabel Medina seconded. There was no discussion on the motion. It will be on the agenda for a vote in January.

College of Law motion (attached here as Appendix G) Isabel Medina moved to accept the motion and Joelle Underwood seconded. Marcus Kondkar would like the Senate to have a more involved discussion about the motion at the January meeting. He did point out that in order for the Senate to make a more informed decision about the motion it needs to be known if the suspension of University’s contribution to faculty and staff retirement will solve the problem as opposed to postponing it for a year. If it is going to solve the problem he would speak against the motion. Tenured and tenure-track faculty have job security, if we don’t take some type of reduction it will have to come from somewhere else and will most likely be with faculty and staff who have less job security. But if it just going to postpone a reduction in force then he views it in a different way.

Provost Manganaro responded that he brought this topic to the Senate for discussion over the past two meetings and it was presented as one of the ways we can reduce a $4 million deficit in 2014-15. Budget problems will persist beyond 2014-15, but this temporary solution would allow for more time to see what the enrollment numbers will be. Roberta Kaskel agreed with what Provost Manganaro said. There are many benefits to not increasing tuition, however, if we are not able to turn the market it does have the potential to increase the deficit moving forward. We need to review the available options in order to make choices that benefit the largest number of people.

Senator Isabel Medina commented that this is the third year we are facing a deficit. In her years of service at Loyola, she has witnessed reductions in many areas such as operating budgets, no salary increases, and reduction in health and other benefits. However, retirement benefits have never been affected. Before the University looks to that option she urges the Senate to think carefully about the impact it can have.
Senator Jai Shanata asked if there a committee that looks at retirement and fringe benefits who can review the motion. Alice Clark responded that there is a fringe benefits committee but they have not met since the fall semester when health benefits were reviewed. She acknowledged that his idea is a good one and worth considering, if needed.

Senator Joelle Underwood asked that when consideration is given to potentially reducing the retirement contributions, that it be done in a humane way. She suggested the possibly of matching up to a specified dollar amount (for example, $50,000 or $30,000), so that the people who do not have job security are still receiving some of the benefit. In terms of long-term financial benefits, losing the retirement contributions is a much greater loss than not receiving a salary increase and needs to be taken into consideration.

Senator Robert Gerlich proposed the idea of offering faculty and staff an option to take a reduction in salary in lieu of the suspension to the retirement contribution.

Provost Manganro reiterated and urged faculty to think about how the motion, if passed, will put a strain on the deficit next year.

Senator Maurice Brungardt clarified that there will be a $4 million deficit in 2014-15 that has must be closed. He has not seen any other proposed ideas that will close the deficit other than the suspension to the retirement contribution.

Print Services motion (attached here as Appendix H): Glenn Hymel moved to accept and Connie Rodriguez seconded. Glenn Hymel asked if there is a possibility that Print Services will be moved to the basement of the Danna Center during the holiday break, before the Senate would have an opportunity to discuss it and take a vote in January. Bret Jacobs responded that renovations to the new space are already underway, but the move would likely take place in March in order for the space to be vacated by May.

Cathy Rogers moved to suspend the rules to allow a vote on the motion. Glenn Hymel seconded. A vote was taken to suspend the rules to take a vote on the motion today. With a total of 43 votes, 30 votes in favor would be necessary to pass the motion with the required 2/3 majority. The motion to suspend the rules failed; the Print Services motion will be voted on in January.

Senator Jon Altschul asked for a better explanation of what the motion is about. Glenn Hymel summarized the purpose of the motion, adding that the appropriateness of the space needed for the equipment is not in dispute. The issue is the appropriateness of storage space and table top space for work flow. Bret Jacobs added that the original design of Monroe Hall incorporated space for print services and eight other departments, but when the plans had to be changed, the only place that could be located to house the equipment was in the basement of the Danna Center. In fact, Student Affairs was very generous in giving up the space for Print Services. He concurred with Dr. Hymel that there will not as much space as Randy has now or as much as he would like to have. Xerox came in and measured the space in the Danna Center and confirmed that the equipment will fit. However, it will change how he orders materials and it will change the amount of storage he has.

Senator Joelle Underwood commented that 80% of the second floor of Monroe Hall was notified that when work begins on the third floor in December, it cannot be guaranteed that their equipment will not be damaged from the work on the floor above.
Senator Jai Shanata asked what the budget is for renovating the space in the Danna Center. If other space was found, would those funds be used to renovate another space? Bret Jacobs responded that the renovations in the Danna Center have already begun.

Senator Daniela Marx gave an overview of the work that Randy provides. He needs the table space in order to do his job effectively.

The discussion will continue in January. Provost Manganaro added that we can begin collecting names of academic programs that are willing to give up their space in Monroe to house Print Services.

**Attachments to agenda:**
Chair’s report (December 2013)
Senate minutes November 2013
Report from UBC December 2013
Senate committee reports (December 2013)
Course evaluation Senate motion
SCCC protocol revision clean
CSS motion (December 2013)
Letter to provost re: CSS reorganization report
Exigency Committee Report
Draft criteria for financial exigency
Motion not to reduce contributions (December 2013)
Print Services motion
Board of Trustees
Thursday morning, before the beginning of the Board meeting proper, we had an informal small-group conversation between a few faculty and a few trustees. This is something John Sebastian, the leader of the Ignatian Faculty Fellows Program, and I have worked with Kristine Lelong to set up, and I hope it will continue. This time John, Lawrence Lewis, and I met with Kevin Poorman, chair of the Board, Paul Soukup, S.J. (Santa Clara University), and Michael Braden, S. J. (Saint Peter’s University). We talked mostly about the various demands on faculty today, with extensive input from the two Jesuits, who are both faculty members in Communications, but there was also time to discuss informally the general concerns of faculty here at this time.

I was also invited to speak to the Mission and Identity Committee of the Board on the role of the faculty in promoting the University’s Jesuit mission. The conversation focused on faculty development in terms of the mission, and on ways to integrate mission-oriented thinking into all aspects of faculty life. This would likely require some rethinking of evaluation and reward structures, which currently give little or no incentive for this kind of work.

Marc Manganaro’s and Roberta Kaskel’s presentations to the Board did not provide much information beyond what they’ve told us in the Senate and elsewhere, but Roberta did report that completed applications are currently down a bit from last year as of the priority deadline of 1 December. Visits are also down from last year. On the other hand, her office is working to send strong financial offers together with admissions offers, and attention now begins to shift toward converting applications to acceptances to deposits. For what it’s worth, since the post-Katrina situation came up during Board discussions, I checked out enrollments immediately after the storm, and I found they went down before going back up again. (We brought in 520 students in fall 2006, 495 in 2007, 690 in 2008 and 796 in 2009.) This would seem to reinforce the cautious approach toward budgeting this year, but it also gives some hope of rebounding in due time, at least to some extent. Also hopeful in that regard are the efforts to begin to reach current high school juniors: about 25% of the attendees at the Fall Open House are part of that cohort. It’s worth keeping in mind that building an applicant pool is a long process, and in many ways this current group of applicants were last year’s prospects.

The Board approved a series of small revisions to the budgetary options, such as allowing funds to be moved from one area of the Voluntary Severance Plan to another if a specific group’s cap is not reached. They also approved the president’s recommendation on a new building to house the Benson Jesuit Center, and they agreed to sell a plot of land in Kenner. (The funds of that sale would go into the endowment, since the land itself is currently part of endowment assets.) The most important act of the Board at the December meeting is to vote on the budgetary framework; I will let the president and provost discuss the results of that vote during our meeting Thursday.

Enrollment Management Planning Group
I have been added to this group to represent the faculty. Our last meeting dealt mostly with the recent Fall Open House, with updates on the current state of applications and financial aid planning. This group will meet again Friday 13 December, and it will likely meet biweekly in the spring.

Strategic Planning Team
We are beginning to move toward the creation and articulation of strategic initiatives, as outlined in a message sent by the Provost to the campus community. Please send comments and suggestions to me (as Senate
representative) and/or to your college’s representative. I expect there will be more space to comment as time goes on, and indeed the provost has suggested that he and Bill Locander, who is helping facilitate the planning process, come and speak with the Senate specifically about the plan as it develops in the spring.

**Faculty Handbook Revision Committee**

The committee discussed the question of when it was appropriate to report its activities to the Senate. The members agreed that issues that are still under discussion, or that have been sent to the originating person or body for further input do not require immediate reporting, but that the committee should report on long-term ongoing matters. This can be done, the committee believes, within the process of once-semester reporting currently instituted for all committees with Senate representation.

We are continuing to try to find a way to work with the Office of General Counsel to make that office’s input into the revision process more effective. Joe Berendzen, chair of the committee, has created a flow chart embodying the committee’s strong sense that this input is best made early in the process, before an item has gone to the Senate for approval. Both Joe and I have discussed this process with the Provost, and I have met with both the Provost and President, who agree with the fundamental logic of this principle. I am specifically trying to work with General Counsel to find a solution to the conflict issues inherent in both the current and revised protocols of the University Conciliation Committee.

In other matters, the committee is currently examining handbooks of other institutions for guidance in tackling the extraordinary faculty issue.

**Provost’s Council**

This body has not met since I last reported (our next meeting is tomorrow), but I do want to remind you that at its last meeting several proposed alterations to the Summer 2015 schedule were discussed. That issue will be discussed again at the first meeting of next semester, 21 January. If you have thoughts or suggestions, please contact me or your dean.

**Staff Senate**

These meetings consist mostly of reports from the various committees with staff representation, so there is normally little that goes on here that is not also reported to you elsewhere. At the last meeting, however, the discussion following the report of the Mission and Identity Committee of the Board led to something I at least found interesting: we learned that the Old Library was built in part as a memorial to Loyola students killed in WWII. (This was news to me and many others, but it is discussed in Bernie Cook’s recent book.) As you may recall from the report of our representatives (Lawrence Lewis and John Sebastian), at the October meeting members of the Mission and Identity Committee were asked to weigh in on the question of whether to build a completely new structure for the Benson Jesuit Center or keep at least some architectural elements from the existing building. The members of the Staff Senate seemed to feel, and I agree, that this new information provides a compelling argument to preserve at least elements of the old building, even while it may be most practical to create a new one. I have communicated this information to the President and the Vice President for Mission and Ministry, in the hope that it will help guide decision-making.

**Senate awards**

Nominees have been contacted for supporting materials; awards will be presented at the January President’s Convocation.
I’ll close with a few words about plans for upcoming Senate meetings. Marc Manganaro will be unable to attend our January meeting, because he will be participating in the Chicago Humanities Summit, a one-day event that is associated with the 2014 MLA meeting. Because he won’t be present, the Executive Committee is considering spending much of the January meeting in executive session so that faculty can have a private space to discuss budgetary matters or anything else of import. (We will have other business, of course.) This would push the discussion of the identity and structure of the College of Social Sciences to February, but various people have assured me that won’t be a problem, and indeed the Executive Committee’s proposed motion is meant to keep the issue on the radar in the interim. In the spring we are also expecting a draft revised policy from the Intellectual Property and Rights Committee and a report from the Facilities Planning Committee regarding campus beautification, and Bill Locander, who is facilitating the strategic planning process along with Marc Manganaro, will probably visit as well. We are also planning to ask for regular updates from Roberta Kaskel regarding the enrollment management process.

Please continue to come to me with thoughts or concerns.

Alice V. Clark
Professor of Music History
Chair, University Senate

9 December 2013
Appendix B: Board Committee Reports

To: Alice Clark, President, University Senate
From: Carol Ann MacGregor, Eileen Doll, Senate Representatives
Re: Academic & Student Affairs Committee
Date: December 5th, 2013

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees held a meeting at 1pm on Thursday December 5th, 2013. The meeting began, as is the convention, with a presentation by the Student Government Association President who highlighted some of the SGA’s budget priorities including a reduction to $100 in reimbursement to students for Graduate and Professional school test preparation and software. They are also reviewing the executive board’s compensation, and have begun posting a report of their actions each semester, as opposed to once/year.

The bulk of the meeting, as is normally the case, was taken up by reports. Provost Manganaro spoke about positive developments such as the on-time progress of Monroe Hall, the continued implementation of key initiatives identified during the Student Success Summit, and new program offerings in translation and teaching certification. Provost Manganaro also spoke about the progress of the Strategic Planning Committee, which has circulated a preliminary document to the campus community. The goal is to present a draft of this document in March after consultations with college assemblies, the senate, and at town hall meetings in January 2014. Board members expressed concern about the impact of our budget situation on teaching (a planned 10.6% cut to the salary pool, by college), faculty response to the reduction in force and other cuts, and lively discussion ensued.

Vice-Provost for Student Affairs Cissy Petty gave a brief overview of her time as President of the Jesuit Association of Student Personnel Administrators and highlighted an upcoming Employ the Pack speaker James Reilly, founder of The Guild Agency. Interim Director of Enrollment Management, Roberta Kaskel, spoke in detail about the “enrollment dashboard” and noted that although campus visits are down, particularly among Louisiana residents, the numbers of requests for information and applications look similar to this time last year.

The Board approved that the full slate of honorary degree candidates put forward by the nominating committee be added to the pool of potential degree recipients. At 2:55 the committee moved into executive session.

To: University Senate
From: Craig S. Hood and Chris Screen (Senate reps to BOT Finance Committee)
Date: December 8, 2013
SUBJ: December 5, 2013 BOT Finance Committee Meeting

The Board of Trustees meeting on December 5, 2013 focused on reviewing the AY 2013-14 budget, the proposed 2014-15 budget and addressing recommendations concerning the budget deficit.

2013-14 Budget (see attachments)
The AY 2013-14 budget outlook has not changed substantially from that reported at the October meeting. Overall, there is a $7.5 M shortfall that is projected to end the fiscal year with an approximated deficit of $4.3 million while maintaining a 5.00% draw on endowment.

Proposed 2014-15 Budget (see attachments)
Each year’s academic budget recommendations are presented and acted upon in two phases. The first phase is presented to the Trustees at the December Board meeting and includes the recommendation of Tuition and Fee rates, Room and Board rates, and Salary pool increases. The Tuition and Fees is especially important as it is needed to prepare and make financial aid
offers to incoming students. The second phase will be presented at the May, 2014 meeting and include the remaining parts of the budget, accompanied by a fine-tuning of revenue and expense projections.

The budget proposal as recommended by the University Budget Committee for fiscal year 2014-2015 is based on an incoming Undergraduate class of 650 new students with an additional 130 transfers and readmits for a total of 780 new/readmits. The retention rate used in the budget is 75%. Law revenue is based on a total of 685 students. Fr. Wildes, upon review of the recommendations from the University Budget Committee, recommended a 2.5% Undergraduate Tuition increase, no increase in Law, no increase in Graduate programs, a 2.5% Room increase, a 3.0% Board increase and no increase in the Salary Merit Pool. There are two fee changes requested, both in the Law School. A Law School Exam Software fee, and an increase in the Student Bar Association Fee. The budget, as presented, results in a surplus of $100 thousand, with the following assumptions: A 5.7% Draw from the Endowment; a $1 million Transfer to the Plant for Deferred Maintenance; and no increase in All Other Operating. A Temporary suspension during 2014-15 of the University’s 8% contribution to the Employee’s Retirement Plan (Approximately $4 million) is being studied and evaluated, but was not proposed or discussed at this Finance Committee meeting. The final budget will be presented in May, 2014 after refinements to both Revenues and Expenditures are made resulting in a balanced budget.

The Finance Committee engaged in an extensive discussion of the proposed budget including especially the proposed tuition increase and number of new students upon which the budget is being based. The “right size” of the university and the “affordability” of Loyola are very important issues to resolve. As presented in attached documents, Loyola’s costs (parsed by tuition and fees, student costs, etc…) show that our costs place us at or above the 50 percentile in most areas. The Finance Committee urged Enrollment Management and the entire campus community to recruit the new students needed (about 715) to balance the budget. Other parts of the budget will be addressed further at the March 2014 Board meeting.

Report on Facilities (from Facilities Subcommittee)
All major construction and renovation projects are proceeding on schedule. It was noted that 4th (in part) and 5th floors of Monroe will be completed and occupied over the Christmas Break.

Report on Endowment (from Endowment Subcommittee)
Updates include that the Endowment continues to perform well.

Voluntary Severance Plan (see attachment) — An action item concerning the VSP was presented to the Finance Committee, seeking two changes from that approved in the October meeting.

A) A proposal to add the faculty currently on the Phased Retirement Program to the Voluntary Severance Program that will require a revision in the Cost Cap for Tenured Faculty to be revised to $4,642,200 (Formerly $4,345,200). Refer to Exhibit I. Therefore, it was also requested that revision the amount drawn from the Endowment to fund these programs to be revised to $6,714,025 (Formerly $6,394,325). Refer to Exhibit I. This addition includes 8 tenured faculty members.

B) A proposal that if the respective caps are not exceeded in any of the 3 categories of employees offered the Voluntary Severance Program, that such funds remaining in any other category can be transferred to the other categories of employees in the event that the respective caps are exceeded. There will be no change in the Endowment Draw of $6,714,025 to fund the program.

The Finance Committee approved both of these proposed changes.

Reduction in Force (to address the Deficit).— An action item concerning the RIF was presented to the Finance Committee.

A) A proposal to address the Phase II recommendation (beyond the VSP) to eliminate the $7.5 million shortfall requested Board approval to delegate to the BOT Executive Committee the authority to consult with the President and approve the amount needed to fund the Reduction in Force and subsequently withdraw up to that amount from the Endowment.
The Finance Committee approved both of these proposed changes.

**The Benson Jesuit Center**
Fr. Wildes requested Board approval of a plan to move forward with fundraising for the Benson Jesuit Center. Because the Center has a religious purpose, the state bond funds cannot be used for this purpose. The proposal includes a plan to build a new building at the site (at about $16 million) that would be a cost savings of $2 million compared with renovating the old library. The Finance Committee approved the plan to go forward with fundraising.

**Kenner Property Sale**
Loyola owns a vacant property in Kenner that has long been on the market. There is a potential buyer and therefore Fr. Wildes requested Board approval to sell the property and deposit the proceeds in the Endowment. It was noted that the property is currently held in the Endowment and it’s assets should returned to that fund. The Finance Committee approved the proposed sale of the property.
Appendix C: Online Course Evaluation Motion

Motion

To charge an ad hoc committee to select and oversee implementation of an online course evaluation system to be piloted in undergraduate courses for one year. The committee will obtain college approval for any changes to questions in the instrument.

Rationale

In October, a committee met to consider transitioning the current paper-based course evaluation system to an online instrument. The committee decided to seek Senate approval before continuing. This initiative is in response to a Student Success Summit action plan to revise the current course evaluation instrument and allow instructors and/or departments to formulate specific or additional questions to supplement common university-wide questions.

An electronic instrument from eXplorance has been identified that will potentially provide the desired flexibility. This electronic system is comparable in cost to the printing charges for the current paper system. This system is also used by a number of fellow AJCU institutions including Boston College, Loyola Marymount, and the University of San Francisco. Indeed, eXplorance currently offers a discount to AJCU institutions.

Several studies have shown that transitioning to online course evaluation systems does not bias or alter the accuracy of student evaluations. However, a reduction in response rate is a concern. The committee will explore ways to incentivize participation in course evaluations including allowing students who complete online surveys to view their grades before the end of the official grading period. It should be noted that the electronic system under consideration can be accessed by personal electronic devices, including smart phones, and would allow faculty members to continue to administer course evaluations in-class, a best practice that increases response rates.

The committee will reach out to colleges to develop questions for the assessment instrument, pilot the new system, and establish performance expectations including response rates, turn-around times, and overall cost. If the system meets performance expectations, the committee would seek approval to permanently adopt the electronic system.

Ad-Hoc committee on on-line course evaluations:
Mary Brazier, Cynthia Collins, Mark Fernandez, Sandford Hiderlie, Angela Hoffer, Carol Ann MacGregor, Brad Petitfils, Thomas Spence, Nathanael Straight, Victoria Vega,
Appendix D: Faculty Handbook revision (Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum)

Description of Revisions:

The primary changes to the SCCC protocol involve changes to the membership. The representative from the First Year Seminar Program is removed. The Library faculty member is moved from non-voting to voting status. And all voting faculty representatives are now stipulated to be ordinary faculty.

Changes have also been made to the protocol to reflect the existence of/role of the newly created Director of the Common Curriculum position. Also, a quorum policy has been added.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE COMMON CURRICULUM

Chairperson: A member selected by the committee
Secretary: Appointed by the Provost
Director of the Common Curriculum: Appointed by the Provost, serves as the voting member representing his or her college or division according to the membership structure outlined below. The Director cannot serve as the Chairperson of the Committee.

Voting Members:
1. Two Ordinary Faculty members from the Humanities divisional faculty of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences
2. Two Ordinary Faculty members from the Natural Sciences divisional faculty of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences
3. Two Ordinary Faculty members from the College of Social Sciences
4. One Ordinary Faculty member from the College of Social Sciences representing the non-traditional/evening program from the College of Social Sciences
5. One Ordinary Faculty member from the College of Music and Fine Arts
6. One Ordinary Faculty member from the College of Business
7. One Ordinary Faculty member from the University Library

Non-voting Members:
1. One faculty member from the Loyola Jesuit Community
2. One representative from the Deans’ Council
3. One Student Government Association representative

Terms:
1. Faculty member terms are for three years, staggered and renewable, as determined by each college’s protocols/elections.
2. The Director of the Common Curriculum will be appointed by the Provost and serve a three-year, renewable term.
3. Student Government Association representative may be the Student Government Association President or appointed by the Student Government Association to serve an annual term (may be renewed).
4. Term of Deans’ Council representative will be determined by the Deans’ Council.

Quorum:
The presence of six voting members constitutes a quorum for matters requiring committee approval or other official voting. In the absence of quorum, the membership present may still deliberate and discuss matters on the agenda for the official record. In cases where a quorum is met, motions require a simple majority of votes cast to be in favor of the motion.

Purpose:
This committee reviews Common Curriculum course proposals and provides oversight of the Common Curriculum. This committee is also responsible for conducting a formal, ongoing, and routine review and evaluation of the Common Curriculum.

Duties:
1. It shall serve as the review body for approval of all Common Curriculum course proposals; course approvals shall require a two-thirds vote by the SCCC for approval.
2. It shall, in collaboration with the Director of the Common Curriculum, provide oversight of the Common Curriculum program.
3. It shall evaluate the effectiveness of the Common Curriculum, as well as the effectiveness, composition, and processes of the SCCC, beginning three years after implementation and every five years thereafter, and report to the Provost, the Deans’ Council, the University Courses and Curriculum Committee, the Standing Council for Academic Planning, and the College faculty assemblies.
4. It shall serve as the review board for reconciliation of conflicting requirements with degree programs across all colleges and majors, including professional and continuing studies (non-traditional/evening) programs. Reconciliation of conflicting requirements must be approved by the University Courses and Curriculum Committee.
5. It shall ensure that the Common Curriculum embodies the Ignatian vision of education and values.
6. It shall revise, as necessary, criteria that govern Common Curriculum course approval, course evaluation, course development, and course implementation. Revisions to criteria must be approved by the University Courses and Curriculum Committee.
Appendix E: CSS Restructuring Motion

That the provost hold off considering any restructuring of the College of Social Sciences (or any other college) before the Senate has sufficient time to discuss the impact of voluntary severance and/or reductions in force on the colleges.

attachment: letter to provost re: CSS reorganization report

November 7, 2013

Dr. Marc Manganaro Vice President and Provost Academic Affairs

Re: CSS Ad Hoc Committee's Report on the CSS Reorganization

Dear Marc,

The CSS Ad Hoc Committee on the CSS Reorganization held its last meeting on Monday, November 4, 2013. The results of that meeting were presented to faculty on Tuesday, November 5th at the third and final faculty assembly of the fall term.

It was motioned, seconded and approved by 90% of the vote that the CSS Reorganization Report be forwarded to you for review with the following resolution:

The CSS faculty are unable to meet the directive for a college restructuring plan for failure of a concrete directive and coherent vision of the University's expectation and without a discussion that incorporates the larger Loyola community.

You will find that the attached CSS Reorganization Report reflects a summary of each unit's position of how it would like to fall within a proposed reorganization of the CSS.

The CSS faculty looks forward to their discussion with you at the first assembly of the new year, Tuesday, February 11, 2014, Monroe Library Multi-media Room 2.

Sincerely,

Roger White
Interim Dean, College of Social Sciences

Celebrating our Past, Embracing the Future
Introduction: The Ad Hoc Committee on the CSS Reorganization held its last meeting on Monday, November 4, 2013 at noon. It was concluded that at this juncture the CSS is not ready to vote on specific models for the College restructuring. The College is able to offer in the alternative, a summary of each unit's vote of how it prefers to be structured.

Academic Units

Counseling: Counseling faculty are in majority agreement (2 abstained from responding, the others agree) on the need to have an office of graduate education, that reports directly to the provost and will support grad programs, with a voice at the important committees such as UCCC, UBC, UPC, etc. At the college level, the faculty majority agreement (2 abstained from responding, the others agree) that we would like to be either in a ROBUST CSS, including all of the social sciences, or return to the way it was before pathways, if a robust CSS is not an option. Faculty do not want to be in a college that is just the "leftovers" of CSS.

Criminal Justice: Majority agreement with 1 abstention that the "Re-org" effort is absent strategic direction and vision with respect to how the social sciences fit into the plan for the university moving forward; therefore, we move to not change the structure of the college and instead keep the college as is and focus on a long term solution for a dean.

Loyola Institute for Ministry: 100% in favor of staying in a robust and viable CSS. LIM is also open to exploring the possibility of linking to the Department of Religious Studies perhaps to form a School of Religion and Ministry.

School of Mass Communication: 100% support to become an independent operating unit.

School of Nursing: 78% support to become an independent operating unit; also support for staying as part of CSS, with CSS emphasizing development of ROBUST CSS; against becoming a part of HUNS.

Political Science: 1) A majority of faculty would desire a robust CSS that incorporated other traditional social sciences. 2) If that is not feasible, the faculty is split with 50% wishing to become a part of HUNS and 50% wishing to remain a part of the CSS.

Sociology: Does not have a unified departmental preference. Some faculty are opposed to returning to HUNS, others are open to that possibility, and some are agnostic.

Centers and Institutes

Center for the Study of New Orleans: Abstains from taking a position at this time.

Environmental Communications: 100% support to continue as part of SMC.

Donnelley Center: 100% support to continue as part of SMC.

Institute for Quality and Equity in Education: Director on sabbatical.

Jesuit Social Research Institute: 100% support to remain part of a robust and viable CSS.

Lindy Boggs Literacy Center: 100% support to remain part of a robust and viable CSS.

Twomey Center: 100% support to remain part of a robust and viable CSS.
Appendix F: Criteria for financial exigency

The essential function and mission of Loyola University is teaching and research. This essential function is served primarily by tenured and tenure track faculty. The state of financial exigency is important to articulate because it marks a state where tenure loses some of its protective value. Even when the University declares a state of financial exigency, tenured faculty are entitled to a number of substantive and procedural protections provided in Chapter 9 of the Faculty Handbook. FH, Chapter 9, §F.

The Faculty Handbook provides that the University Senate, with the University administration, shall formulate criteria for identifying a bona fide state of financial exigency and determining the proper institutional response to such a condition. UH 9-10. The Faculty Handbook defines financial exigency as a “demonstrably bona fide imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by less drastic means.” FH, Chapter 9, §A, ¶ 10.

In determining whether a state of financial exigency exists at the University, the factors described below should be considered and evaluated in the context of the University’s financial position over the course of several years. At the core of the institutional mission is instruction and research; thus, financial exigency must not be the result of a shift in resources from teaching and research towards administration costs and capital expenditures. No one factor or criteria is determinative, but consideration of all or a majority of factors should lead the Exigency Planning Committee, FH, Chapter 9, § F, to determine whether a specific financial crisis in fact threatens the survival of the institution as a whole, that cannot be alleviated by less drastic means than declaration of financial exigency.

The Committee should consider:

1. Whether the budgetary conditions that have given rise to the financial crisis are chronic or ongoing—that is, not a temporary shortfall in enrollment, unanticipated increase in costs, etc.-- and whether the University’s actual budgetary and economic conditions over the long-term (a minimum of two consecutive academic years, but more appropriately three to five years) suggest a likelihood that the conditions will continue into the future;

2. Whether tuition revenue has fallen short of budgeted expectations by at least 25-30% for two or more consecutive budget years (as calculated on 1 October of each year);

3. The extent to which the financial crisis has resulted from a shift in resources from teaching and research towards administration costs and capital expenditures (factors that should be considered in determining whether the financial crisis has resulted from a shift in resources include the extent to which resources that directly support instruction and faculty scholarship have been significantly reduced and diverted to nonacademic expenditures like sports programs, residential halls, development and other nonacademic programs or costs);

4. Whether alternatives to declaring a state of financial exigency have been pursued such as expenditure of one-time money or reserves as bridge funding, deferred-compensation plans, early-retirement packages, deferral of nonessential capital expenditures, and cuts to non-educational programs and services, including expenses for administration;
whether examination of the institution’s financial condition through the composite financial index (CFI) currently used by the University warrants a finding that the institution is in a state of financial exigency. The composite index uses ratios to incorporate institutional debt level and reserves along with other data to come up with a composite score to assess and establish institutional financial health. The Committee should consider in particular two of the ratios used to determine the CFI:

(a) the viability ratio that measures the ratio of reserves to the institution’s long-term debt (the ratio of expendable net assets to long-term debt). The Committee should consider in particular whether the viability ratio has fallen below the minimum recommended by the external benchmark of 1, currently set by KPMG; Prager, Sealy & Co. LLC and Bearing Point, STRATEGIC FINANCIAL ANALYSIS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, 6th ed.; and

(b) the primary reserve ratio measuring the ratio of reserves (expendable net assets) to operating expenses plus interest on capital-asset related debt, to show how many months an institution could continue its operations even if it had no sources of revenue (the ratio of reserves to total expenses). The Committee should consider in particular whether the primary reserve ratio has fallen below the minimum recommended by the external benchmark of 0.4, set by KPMG; Prager, Sealy & Co. LLC and Bearing Point, STRATEGIC FINANCIAL ANALYSIS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, 6th ed.;

(6) Whether Moody’s or Standard & Poor’s have downgraded the institution’s bond rating;

(7) Whether the city’s infrastructure has been compromised to the extent that it cannot support the University over the long-term (at least two semesters).

Prepared by Ad Hoc Committee to Determine Criteria for when a state of financial exigency exists (Isabel Medina, Chair, Alice Clark, Joe Berendzen, Joelle Underwood, Thom Spence) Reviewed by Rev. Kevin Wildes, S.J., Marc Manganaro, Jay Calamia and Leon Mathes.
Appendix G: College of Law motion

Motion proposed by M. Isabel Medina (Law):

The University Faculty Senate joins the College of Law Faculty in urging the President and the Board of Trustees not to reduce University contributions to faculty and staff retirement accounts. Moreover, the Senate and College of Law Faculty urge the President to cease across-the-board budget cuts because they undermine and ultimately are destructive of Loyola’s essential academic mission. Instead, the Senate and College of Law Faculty urge the President to work with the Provost, the other vice-presidents and the Senate’s Ad-hoc Committee on the Administrative Structure of the Institution to identify appropriate areas where budget expenses may be reduced, as has been already undertaken at the College of Law.

Motion passed by the College of Law, 19 November 2013: The College of Law Faculty urges the President and the Board of Trustees not to reduce University contributions to faculty and staff retirement accounts. Moreover, the College of Law Faculty urges the President to cease across-the-board budget cuts because they undermine and ultimately are destructive of Loyola’s essential academic mission. Instead, the College of Law Faculty urges the President to work with the Provost, the other vice-presidents and the Senate’s Ad-hoc Committee on the Administrative Structure of the Institution to identify appropriate areas where budget expenses may be reduced, as has been already undertaken at the College of Law.
Appendix H: Print shop motion:
Print Services motion (submitted by E. L. Beard)

Resolved: that the Loyola University Senate support finding adequate, functional space in Monroe Hall or a building near the front of the campus to house Print Services.

from E. L. Beard, 26 November 2013:
Randy Laumann runs the Loyola Print shop singlehandedly and the service he provides is extraordinary in the quality of work, the competence of the output, the exceptional accommodation made to the administration, faculty, and student organizations he serves. He turns out bound manuals for the Board of Trustees Meetings, Lab Manuals for Science courses, gorgeous event programs and posters of all kinds through the year. He does work that I know nothing about but we faculty ask him to turn out multiple copies of exams, class notes, instructional materials of all kinds - we are forever asking/begging for his help at the last minute, and he responds in great good humor and kindness by getting our work done accurately and on time.

The Monroe Hall renovations require Print Services to move in May 2014 from its present quarters in Monroe Hall to a space in the Danna Center Basement. Randy has informed his supervisors and his customers that, for many reasons, he cannot accept this space, and that it will make it impossible for him to remain as Print Services Manager. (Please see his letter, reproduced below, for the detailed reasons behind his position.)

The Provost mentioned that having the print shop in the Danna Center would make it more accessible to students, but Print Services' primary purpose is to serve the higher-volume needs of university faculty, staff and organizations, and it is not designed to produce small jobs right away which students typically need.

This motion asks that the Loyola University Senate support finding adequate, functional space in Monroe Hall or a building near the front of the campus to house Print Services.

We will never be able to replace the exceptional service that Randy Laumann provides Loyola.

Thanks so much for your help- Tish Beard

+++++++

from R. Laumann (forwarded by E. L. Beard, included with permission):
Dear Print Services Customers,

On Friday, October 11, 2013, I was notified that Loyola has officially decided to move forward with plans to relocate Print Services to the Danna Center basement as part of the current Monroe Hall renovation and to begin the process of preparing that space for the May 2014 move from Monroe Hall.

Because the Danna Center (DC) location is not an adequate, functional space for Print Services, I have informed my supervisor that I cannot accept it, and that relocation to this space will make it impossible for me to remain as manager of this department.

The Print Services 2010 allocation in the renovated Monroe Hall was 1520 square feet. My calculations indicate that Print Services' minimum space requirement is 1000 square feet. The Danna Center basement space is only 665 square feet.

The DC location's reduced size prohibits items essential to workflow (table surface work area will be reduced by 74%) and reduces storage capacity significantly (shelf area by 75%, floor area by 55%); this will prevent economical purchasing of supplies (resulting in higher prices) and make it impossible to provide the existing range of printing options and services. The DC location's floor plan will result in a dysfunctional and inefficient workflow; this will make it impossible to maintain the existing level of productivity and quality. Other concerns about this location include decreased convenience for most customers, confidentiality risk, and basement moisture.
As the sole worker managing a print shop that serves a full spectrum of university needs, I cannot afford to move into a space that will prevent me from delivering quality services in a timely and efficient way.

My goal has always been to avoid this crisis. I made appeals to my supervisor, Leon Mathes, and to his supervisor, Jay Calamia, VP for Finance and Administration. They both made appeals on my behalf to find suitable space for Print Services, but were unable to change the outcome.

I do not know if this outcome can be changed, but if Loyola can find adequate, functional space for Print Services, I would be grateful to remain as manager of this department. If it is important to you to have a functional Print Services as well as one managed by me—as I have done for 21 years—now is the time to express your thoughts. I have been told that Bret Jacobs would be the appropriate person to whom your concerns should be addressed; Leon Mathes and Jay Calamia may also be CC’d.

I do not want anyone to feel obligated to act on my behalf. I will only ask that you act in your best interest as one who depends on my services to fulfill the needs and mission of the university.

Thank you! If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Randy Laumann
Print Services Manager
Loyola University New Orleans

***APPENDIX***

**ITEMS THAT WILL NOT FIT:**

*PS Existing = Print Services in current Monroe location*

*DC = Danna Center*

**SHELF STORAGE SPACE (Multi-Level Shelving, represented in linear inches)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS Existing Shelves (Linear)</th>
<th>1,198”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC Location Shelves (Linear)</td>
<td>298”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>900”   (will not fit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE SURFACE WORK SPACE (SQ IN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS Existing (10 tables)</th>
<th>12,232 sq in (84.95 sq ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC Location (2 tables will fit)</td>
<td>3,096 sq in (21.5 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,136 sq in (63.45 sq ft) (will not fit)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

—Eight tables: 30x48, 30x48, 24x36, 20x32, 18x48, 33x48, 33x48, 20x36

**FLOOR SPACE FOR STACKED PAPER BOXES (UNOPENED):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS Existing</th>
<th>2592 sq in (18 sq ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC Location</td>
<td>1152 sq in (8 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit</strong></td>
<td><strong>1440 sq in (10 sq ft) (will not fit)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>