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CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m.

INVOCATION
Chris Screen offered an invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes from the October 10, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved.
The Senate went into executive session to approve the minutes of the October executive session minutes. The executive session minutes from October 10, 2013 were unanimously approved.

REPORT FROM CHAIR
Dr. Clark gave the following Chair’s Report:
- President Wildes will attend the December Senate meeting.
- At the October Board of Trustees meeting, Tom Longin from the Association of Governing Boards gave a presentation on the role of the Board, specifically on a strategic level (not managerial). The Board should be involved in things such as approving the budget, and be part of discussions about the mission, vision, educational quality, finance priorities, and planning—not in the sense of getting involved in the creation of the plan, but making sure we have one. The Board members seemed very interested in this level of involvement. John Sebastian and Alice Clark are exploring the idea of creating a series of small informal group discussions between trustees and faculty members.
- Some additional information that Mr. Longin provided that might be of interest to the Senate:
  - Only 15% of students in higher education are of traditional age, therefore Loyola is competing for 15% of the market.
  - Private universities should be seeing a 75-80% graduation rate. Loyola’s six year graduation rate has been below 60% since Hurricane Katrina; that percentage is comparable with LSU.
  - He also reported that 80% of Board work should be taking place during committee meetings. Dr. Clark emphasized the importance of faculty representatives attending the committee meetings they were elected to serve on.

A large portion of the Board meeting was spent on a joint presentation by Roberta Kaskel, Provost Manganaro, and Cissy Petty, Vice President for Student Affairs. One piece of information distributed during the presentation was a preliminary report from Scannell & Kurz. A quote from that report states: “Relationship marketing styles needs to be fused throughout the cycle, not only at the stage of yield.” Dr. Clark interprets that to mean that faculty needs to be more involved throughout the cycle. This has been a high area of focus and efforts continue to be made to increase faculty involvement. During that discussion, a Board member specifically asked about faculty involvement throughout the recruitment process. Drs. Manganaro and Clark and Ms. Kaskel all responded that they are working on ways to get faculty more involved.
- The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board formed two sub-committees, one for student affairs and the other for enrollment management. Some of the trustees recommended creating a third sub-committee on academic affairs. Action was not taken on forming a third committee.
At the Provost’s Council, a series of proposals were presented to change the summer schedule in 2015. One of the proposals being reviewed moves the start date of summer session two weeks later than the current start date. The proposed start date would be June 1, 2015; the second six-week session would end August 6; and the five and ten week sessions would end July 22. The purpose for the proposals is to accommodate out-of-town college students and local high school students. There will also be an opportunity to survey Loyola students about the change and get their feedback. The proposals are being submitted to the Associate Deans’ Council for review and the Provost’s Council will discuss it again in December. An action will need to be taken in spring 2014. Any senators interested in reviewing the proposals should contact Dr. Clark. Senator Robert Gerlich inquired about the impact a change would have on study-abroad programs.

The Student Government Association is working toward having a smoke-free campus. An SGA representative will attend an upcoming Senate meeting for further discussion.

Thom Spence gave a presentation to the Provost’s Council on the Student Satisfaction Inventory that shows some potential areas for concern. The aggregate data from the past three years shows that our mean went from a positive to a negative. That means that the gap between how satisfied our students are compared to the satisfaction of students at other institutions has decreased. They are just beginning to interpret the data and will report back to the Senate.

The retirement incentive plan is underway. The election period begins December 16. There are some concerns about the first-come, first-served process, and discussions are taking place on how to address it. The phased retirement deadline has been extended. The extension applies to those eligible for both plans and allows the time needed to apply for phased retirement if an individual does not receive the retirement incentive. Questions or concerns about either plan can be addressed to Diane Dooley in the Provost’s Office.

The University Budget Committee submitted the proposed 2014-15 budget framework to President Wildes for review. It primarily focused on things like the tuition rate, fees, enrollment and retention benchmarks, and merit pool. President Wildes will submit his recommendation to the Board of Trustees in December.

The Student Success Summit continues to work on the constitution of the standing committee, which will go through normal handbook process and eventually come to the Senate for review. They are also working to create new workgroups on advising, scheduling, campus-wide instructional effectiveness, and online learning which will intersect with existing bodies.

The Strategic Planning Team is beginning to work on strategic initiatives. Information will be shared to the university community in the near future.

The Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum submitted a proposed protocol revision to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee. It included moving a library faculty member from non-voting to voting status. The proposal was reviewed by the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee, which suggested some further revisions and sent it back to the SCCC for review. The FHRC protocol states that its findings will be submitted to the University Senate, President Wildes and the Board of Trustees, but this seems to refer to completed issues, not ones that are still in process. Dr. Clark reminded senators that at any time if an individual or body who submits a proposed revision to the Handbook Revision Committee is not satisfied with the results, the matter can be brought to the Senate for discussion and review.

Last year the Senate reviewed a non-retaliation policy from the Office of General Counsel. At that time, the Senate had questions about the purpose of the document and how it responds to the Faculty Handbook. Those questions were sent back to Gita Bolt, and Dr. Clark is awaiting a response.
The Ad hoc Committee working on the Criteria for Financial Exigency has submitted a draft document to the Executive Committee and they are currently waiting for feedback from President Wildes. The document is close to being finalized and will probably come to the Senate for review in December.

Faculty from the College of Social Sciences approached Dr. Clark about having a university-wide discussion in the Senate on the identity and future of the college. This has been discussed by the Executive Committee and will be tentatively scheduled for the December meeting.

The deadline for Senate award nominations is November 15th. Emails were sent campus-wide to faculty twice, and one more will be sent. Senators were asked to remind their constituents about the deadline and submit nominations.

REPORTS

Marcus Kondkar, Faculty Ombuds Officer, reported that President Wildes appointed him to the position based on the recommendation of the Senate, effective fall 2013. He reviewed the purpose of the position and the types of cases that are appropriate to be handled in this office. The charter is governed by International Ombuds Association and its Code of Ethics, and it requires that the Ombuds Officer holding the position become certified. The requirements to become certified include one year of practice in the position, taking several workshops and courses throughout the year before being eligible to take an exam.

The creation of a web site is underway and will be linked to the Office of the President once completed. The web site will include a link to the charter as well as a list of resources, and a copy of the Loyola policies. The Ombuds Officer reports directly to the President. A summary report will be provided to the Senate that will include the types of cases and case loads. To date 14-15 cases involving over 20 individuals have been reviewed and most are ongoing. The cases have included faculty from each college.

The policies with regard to confidentiality, neutrality and independence, impartiality, and informality were reviewed.

Senator Glenn Hymel asked how the ombuds position relates to the Conciliation Committee. Dr. Kondkar responded that the individual has to choose what process to take. Once a formal grievance is in place, there are conflicts that arise and the ombuds office cannot be involved.

Senator Joelle Underwood asked if it is possible to add a link to the ombuds page through the Provost’s Office and Human Resources web sites. Dr. Kondkar responded that because of the reporting structure the link will be on the President’s website and the resources will be made available through Academic Affairs.

Senator Ralph Tucci inquired about an alternate in the event Marcus Kondkar is not available, or in the case of a conflict of interest. Dr. Kondkar is working with the Women’s Resource Center as a possible alternate. Senator Alice Clark proposed Cecelia Bennett, Staff Ombuds Officer, as an alternate. Dr. Kondkar responded that is another alternate route he is exploring.

Senator Jon Altschul asked for examples of why an individual would approach Dr. Kondkar instead of the Conciliation Committee or follow a different university procedure. Dr. Kondkar responded that two important aspects of the ombuds office are confidentiality and informality. Because the ombuds office is optional, there is not a process or procedure that must be followed. In many cases, it is very helpful to talk informally, while allowing the individual to maintain control. It also helps to preserves relationships in the long term when things can be worked out informally.

Senator Bob Gerlich inquired about the structure and emphasis: is it between peers, faculty and staff, or faculty and the university? Dr. Kondkar responded that it can be used for conflicts with the university, between peers, chairs/faculty, student /faculty, and staff/ faculty. The purpose is to talk through the problem and provide as many options as possible while allowing the individual to maintain control.
Senator Maurice Brungardt asked if there is a breakdown on the number of cases that may be between chairs/faculty, student/faculty, staff, faculty. Dr. Kondkar responded that he did not have that information with him, but most cases are peer-to-peer interpersonal conflicts.

Other Reports
Senate representatives who serve on Board committees were thanked for serving. The documents distributed to the membership (attached here as Appendix A and B) includes Board committee reports and a separate report from the Finance Committee of the Board. There were no questions or corrections to the reports as distributed.

PROVOST’S REPORT
Dr. Manganaro reported on the following matters:
The Fall Open House will take place Saturday, November 16th. There has been a tremendous amount of interest and investment from deans and faculty. The newly re-designed open house will include much more interaction between prospective students and academic programs and departments. The numbers of responses received to date is slightly higher than last year.

He is working with Roberta Kaskel and Alice Clark to form a faculty committee that will focus on faculty involvement with enrollment and recruitment. This would replace an existing committee that has not been active. It is an important time to get faculty actively involved, as we move towards a strategic enrollment plan that will focus on the type of students we want to recruit, and forms of financial aid that can be offered.

Monroe Hall: The final scaffolding is being removed. In December some faculty will move into the renovated space. Cabinet members and relevant faculty members have also been given a tour of the renovated space. It is anticipated that the renovated space will help with recruitment efforts in the spring.

The Facilities Planning Committee is drafting a resolution for the beautification of the campus. This is especially important during this crucial time in recruitment. In some areas minimal funds will be spent to beautify and clean up the campus.

Student Success Summit: The Steering Committee met this morning and discussed the composition of a standing committee. Almost all of the high priority action plans have been completed. The majority of the time was spent reviewing the long-term action plans and determining which ones will be implemented, and which ones will be consolidated. Smaller focus work groups will also be formed. The Standing Committee will oversee that process and how we should proceed with regard to student success.

The Strategic Planning Team is still in the early planning phases. In December an update will be provided to the Board of Trustees and the University Senate. They hope to have a template draft of a plan to submit to the Board of Trustees at the March meeting, with a final plan submitted in May.

Heidi Davis, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, is working to streamline the effort reporting policy for grants. Any faculty who would like to be involved in that process should contact her at Heidi@loyno.edu or X3086.

The Handbook Revision Committee expressed concerns about the process by which they work with General Counsel on handbook revisions that eventually have to be approved by the Board of Trustees. He advised the committee to create a proposal on how the process should work. It will include recommendations on involving
the General Counsel earlier in the process, and receiving approval before it leaves the Handbook Committee. Provost Manganaro brought the issue to the attention of President Wildes and he referred it to Gita Bolt. He is awaiting a response from her. Alice Clark will also following up with President Wildes next week.

The University Budget Committee submitted a set of recommendations to President Wildes for review that pertain to the tuition rate, room and board, and salary pool. Those recommendations are based on a number of assumptions (i.e., the size of the incoming class, first- to second-year retention rate, and total size of law school population). The recommendations were based on 650 new incoming students; a 75% retention rate; a slightly smaller law class; 2.99% tuition increase for undergraduate students; 2.9% room rate, and 3% board rate (which is tied to the Sodexo contract); 0% tuition increase for all graduate programs and law tuition; 0% contribution to salary pool. President Wildes will make a decision based on these recommendations and submit it to the Board at the December meeting.

The next items that will be discussed by the UBC are how to balance the 2013-14 budget and 2014-15 budget. One major area of discussion is a reduction or suspension of the university contribution to retirement for the 2014-15 academic year. With the assumed numbers mentioned above (i.e., tuition increase, anticipated number of incoming students, etc.), there will still be a 4 million dollar shortfall in 2014-15. The total student body headcount this year is 5% less than what it was last year. If the numbers next year meet the assumed count, the total student body and tuition revenue will be 10% less than the current year. We are budgeting conservatively but marketing aggressively in order to bring in the students we want.

The voluntary severance package offers were sent out. Although we will not know a final number until it is all said and done, there seems to be a lot of interest, possibly more than expected. If the estimated 30% of faculty and staff accept the severance package, it will only bring the deficit down to $6 million. The current budget will not be affected by faculty who accept it because most of them will teach through the end of the contract period. Staff who accept the plan will leave in January and that will account for a half year’s savings. The university is still looking at an approximate need to reduce the salary budget by $5 million. Most likely, the 2013-14 year will end with an unbalanced budget. It still means that those savings need to be made, but it will not happen this current year. A better number will be known once the severance packages are calculated based on who accepts it. After that the university will consider reduction in staff and cuts to operating budgets when possible. If the university contribution to retirement is suspended for all faculty and staff for one year, it will be a savings of 4 million dollars and will balance the budget. A principal of shared sacrifice is important rather than reducing or eliminating individual positions. The options to balance the budget are limited.

Senator Len Treviño observed that we seem to be looking at issues on a short term basis. What is the viability of our institution 10-20 years from now? Did Loyola overestimate the value of the Jesuit education by trying to increase revenue and raising the tuition too high? Provost Manganaro responded that part of the external problem is that state universities like LSU and UNO that offer TOPS practically gives students a free education. Dr. Treviño would also like to have a better understanding and see data on where are our students become employed after graduation (outcome assessments) compared to job placement from LSU graduates. He would like to look at our viability and market share in 10-20 years; what requirements should we ask from our faculty. Provost Manganaro agreed with Dr. Treviño and added that the university is definitely looking at the long term effects and issues.

Senator Marcus Kondkar would like to know if the Board of Trustees will be asked to approve a drawdown of funds from the endowment if we end the current year with a deficit. Provost Manganaro responded that we generally end the year with a balanced budget with a surplus of $100,000. To zero out a deficit would not necessarily have to go to the Board in the form of an additional draw from the endowment, and it would not
mean that we will have to roll the deficit into next fiscal year. The best conclusion he can draw is that the
deficit will be covered by the accrued surplus funds.

Senator Maurice Brungardt asked for clarification of the numbers. If retirement contributions are suspended for six months or by half for one full year, it will save 2 million dollars. The savings would be $4 million if suspended for one year. If we had met the enrollment figure for this year would we currently have a deficit? Provost Manganaro concurred with Dr. Brungardt’s clarification and added that retirement suspension would be only for one year. If the enrollment numbers had been met, there would not be a deficit.

Senator Mark Grote asked who decides if the retirement contributions will be suspended, or will faculty have input to save junior faculty positions. Provost Manganaro responded that Board of Trustees makes the decision, but he is asking the Senate for feedback. Information will be distributed to the deans and they will bring it to faculty at college assemblies. Alice Clark volunteered to compile a document with feedback from faculty and send it to the Provost.

Senator Craig Senn commented that the perception of law faculty is that the financial situation may not get better in order to reinstitute the retirement contribution. Is there reason to be concerned that there could be closing of programs/departments? Provost Manganaro responded that if the retirement contribution is suspended it can only be for one year. He added that there will have to be salary reductions to avoid having making additional cuts a year from now.

Senator Teri Gallaway asked if the reduction in force will happen after the voluntary severance package only apply to staff or will extraordinary and tenure-track faculty be included. Provost Manganaro responded that it is not the intention to reduce tenure-track faculty positions. Earlier in the year deans were asked to model out 5%, 10%, and 15% budget reductions to help bring down the deficit.

Senator Bob Thomas commented that the talk around campus is that staff and extraordinary faculty positions will be cut. He emphasized the importance of communicating to the campus community that cuts are being made strategically. Provost Manganaro responded that there is a risk of losing some valuable faculty who might accept the voluntary severance package, but it is not correct that all extraordinary will be eliminated.

Roberta Kaskel discussed the model of an entering class of 650 new incoming first-time freshmen. This year’s class was 620. We have a budget responsibility to be realistic with the numbers. The data that has been reviewed is reflecting that we would not have brought in a class of 850 students despite the very generous financial aid package that Loyola offers. Admissions counselors are very optimistic and are working very hard to bring in more than 650 new students. A Strategic Enrollment Steering Committee was formed last summer and they continue to meet on a regular basis. The handout that was distributed shows one piece of what is presented to the committee weekly. Deans are asked for feedback on what is happening in specific programs. Open house is Saturday, November 16th, and RSVPs are higher than last year. Private invitations were sent to the homes of local Catholic high school juniors. During the open house there will be twelve mini-sessions to demonstrate to prospective students and their parents very early on what the faculty do best and how they interact with students. Fewer than 3% of the prospective students who RSVPd for open house have submitted an application to Loyola, so this is our opportunity to really sell ourselves and recruit students. There is a lot of excitement about the upcoming open house, but campus visits are down. Visits are usually the first indicator of a commitment to an institution. A new messaging and outreach campaign to high school students in the south has begun. Provost Manganaro added that he cannot overemphasize the benefits we are already getting from the enrollment management firms.
Senator Jon Altschul inquired about the plans for the law school next year given the low Bar passage rate in Louisiana. Provost Manganaro responded that the law school budgeted for 175 new students and ended up accepting 220. Loyola was one of the very few universities to have an increased enrollment. The law school leadership is being very conservative in accepting a reasonable number of students.

Senator Gwen George asked if the budget beyond 2014-15 is being looked at. Roberta Kaskel responded that future years are being reviewed and it needs to be built incrementally. Although the fall 2013 incoming class is smaller, it cost the university more to get them here. We are graduating students who cost less. The university also needs to be cautious to not give out too more financial aid than is needed.

Senator Mark Grote asked if any of the consultant’s suggestions have been implemented. Roberta Kaskel responded that many of their recommendations have already been implemented. There are new print materials, we are almost ready to launch a brand and identity study that will show us how the market views the university. The Lawlor Group will be on campus during Open House and will speak with parents and prospective students. A lot of information will be available in December. The goal is to include merit aid information in the acceptance letters that are mailed at the end of January and not weeks latter.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
University Faculty Handbook Committee revision (attached here as Appendix C). This motion was presented and seconded at the October meeting. There was no discussion at the November meeting. Marcus Kondkar called the question. The vote in favor of passing the motion was unanimous.

NEW BUSINESS
On-line course evaluation motion (attached here as Appendix D). The motion presented is 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.
Joelle Underwood moved to accept and Connie Rodriguez seconded. The motion will be on the agenda for discussion and a vote in December.

Attachments to agenda:
Senate minutes October 2013 (2 documents)
Senate committee reports (November 2013)
Finance Committee Report October 2013 (and attachment)
Faculty Handbook revisions (September 2013)
Course evaluation Senate motion
Appendix A: Senate Committee Reports (1 November 2013)

Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board (Carol Ann MacGregor and Eileen Doll)
The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees held a meeting at 1pm on Thursday, October 11, 2013. The meeting began, as it has for the past couple of years, with a presentation by the Student Government Association President about SGA priorities and initiatives. One priority of the SGA is to discourage smoking on campus. The bulk of the meeting, as is normally the case, was taken up by reports. Provost Manganaro, Vice-Provost for Student Affairs Cissy Petty and Interim Director of Enrollment Management, Roberta Kaskel, spoke in detail about the Retention and Student Success taskforce and subcommittees and provided the Board and trustees with the detailed action plans and updated information about implementation. There was much emphasis on how Loyola’s first to second year retention rate has improved to roughly 80% and that the overall decline in enrollment at the end of September when numbers from graduate and Law programs are included is 4.3% not the 25% reported by the media this summer. Manganaro, Petty, and Kaskel emphasized that new practices are in place, including much better communication between their offices including weekly meetings of a Strategic Enrollment Team. There was also discussion of the efforts and anticipated timeline of the two consulting firms hired to address enrollment management and marketing. Full reports from these firms are expected before the next meeting of the Board in December. At 2:55 the committee moved into executive session.

Finance Committee of the Board (Craig Hood and Chris Screen)
(distributed separately in pdf format)

Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board (Cathy Rogers)
Bill Bishop, VP of Institutional Advancement, gave a recap of FY 2013. In terms of supporting Loyola 2012, Bishop pointed to: improvement of our U.S. News & World Report peer perception rating, 9% increase of total number of alumni donors from 5,887 to 6,398, and an undergraduate alumni participation rate of 8.8%. The goal was 12%. By the end of the Faith in the Future campaign, the goal is 20%.

In the Leadership Phase of the Faith in the Future Campaign, the OIA has secured more than $11.7M in gift income, the largest amount in more than 20 years. Regarding FY 2013 OIA goals for unrestricted and budget relief, their goal of $1.9M was exceeded by $1.54M. He also said the OIA successfully executed Loyola’s centennial year-long activities with a record number of alumni contacts.

OIA FY2014 goals: continue support of Loyola 2012, complete Leadership Phase and execute launch of the public phase of the Faith in the Future Campaign, participate in formulation of next strategic plan and adapt resources to the priorities of the comprehensive fundraising plan and to the economic realities of the next strategic plan.

The Committee also approved a policy to count Louisiana Board of Regents matching funds in campaign attainment figures because these funds would not be available without the match from private donors. The income from these endowed funds may be counted in the overall attainment figures, if the campaign’s priorities include scholarship support for 1st generation students and the establishment of endowed professorships and chairs. Ordinarily, government funds are not included in totals, but as one trustee said, Louisiana’s BOR funds are a “nuance that other states don’t have.” The State of Louisiana created the BOR funds for royalties received from oil and gas, and technically the “matching” funds are not government funds.
Terrell Fisher reported on the Marketing/Communication activities of her 20-person team. In reply to a trustee’s question about the University’s top marketing problem, she replied, “not enough staff. The average marketing staff at Jesuit universities is 19; it ranges from 5 to 43.” Another concern is that “we are not mobile.” She said her budget is inadequate to cover video production, that her staff lacks video production and social media expertise, and that social media is outsourced. She also expressed concern about the extent of “back end maintenance” required for the website and the lack of budget for paid search.

Bishop said Fisher’s team is supporting the Lawlor Group and the enrollment management consultants in the short term, but in the long term, they likely will be “changing the way they work and perhaps where they sit.” He ended the meeting with the announcement of changes to the 1912 Society Dinner and Integritas Vitae Award presentation.

Mission and Identity Committee of the Board (Lawrence Lewis and John T. Sebastian)
Tom Benson Jesuit Center Presentation by Holly & Smith Architects
   Discussed two possible plans for the new Jesuit Center. One design preserves much of the original old library building and adds a new chapel, office space, meeting rooms and other gathering areas. The south side of the building would require a rebuild for the chapel.
   An alternative design would involving demolishing the old library altogether. This new building would allow for a more flexible design, a more distinct chapel space, and more square footage, including an additional floor. Some architectural elements from the building might be preserved and incorporated into a new design. The cost of a new building is estimated to be significantly cheaper than renovating the existing structure.

Promoting the Mission Through Marketing & Communications (Terri Fisher, Marketing/Communications)
   Summarized the intentional incorporation of Jesuit language and themes in university publications, web communications, and publicity, where possible.

SPARK (Joe Deegan, Mission & Ministry)
   The SPARK service program for first year students welcomed 40 incoming freshman one-week prior to the first day of classes, allowing the students to participate in service activities while getting to know the city of New Orleans as well as their new classmates. During their week of service the students painted and repaired the pavilions and benches at Lakeshore Drive, a park located on the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain right outside the city, as well as donated food to Second Harvest Food Bank. The SPARKERS also attended dinners sponsored by both the CLC and the LUCAP program.

University Ministry report highlights
   Faculty and staff development, particularly the Ignatian Faculty Fellows Program and the Ignatian Staff Fellows Program
   International immersion programs
   Loyola Week programs
   Christian Life Communities and small-group faith formation
Appendix B: Finance Committee Report (and attachment)

To: University Senate  
From: Craig S. Hood and Chris Screen (Senate reps to BOT Finance Committee)  
Date: November 1, 2013  
SUBJ: October 17, 2013 BOT Finance Committee Meeting

For the Board of Trustees meeting on October 17, 2013 focused on reviewing the AY 2012-13 final fiscal report, the endowment, the current projected AY 2013-14 budget, and recommendations for addressing the budget deficit.

2012-13 Final Year End Report (see attached spreadsheet)
The university’s operations for the fiscal year 2012-13 resulted in a surplus of $411,000. This is a budget surplus of $100,000 compared with that projected at the last Board meeting.

Concerning Revenues, the Total revenues were under budget approximately $3.8 million. This included decreased Undergraduate revenue of $3.9 million due to fewer students enrolled than budgeted. The entering freshman class was approximately 30 students short of the budgeted 900 entering freshman as well as less than expected retention rates across all student classifications. Graduate revenues of $2.6 million were due to fewer students enrolled than budgeted in the Nursing program and the Institute for Ministry program. However, increases in revenues included increased recovery of Government Grants and Contracts of $.4 million due to more programs in which we are able to recover direct costs as well as an increase in recovery of administrative costs associated with federal loan programs, increased Gifts of $1.5 million is due to additional Comprehensive Campaign giving, and increased Law revenue of $.4 million due to more students enrolled than projected.

Concerning Expenditures, the Total expenditures of $161.9 million are under budget by $4.1 million. This included increased expenditures in Fringe Benefits of $.3 million due to Medical Insurance and Tuition Remissions. Employees switching to Loyola’s medical insurance plan from that previously provided by their spouse and more employees’ and their dependents are taking advantage of the tuition remission benefit. Undergraduate Financial Aid of $1.7 million is due to lower awarded students leaving the university while higher awarded students are staying at higher rates. There was an over award of 8 Ignatian scholarships.

Decreases in expenditures included decreased Salaries of $.8 million is due to a delay in filling vacancies throughout the University by all Vice Presidents, decreased Law Financial Aid of $.7 million due to better leveraging, decreased Utilities of $.7 million due to another mild winter, and decreased All Other of $3.8 million is due to budget reductions in all areas to balance the budget.

It was noted that in the 2012-13 fiscal year, due to renovations, Cabra Hall was offline and would have produced $.8 million in revenue. The university ended the fiscal year with a $411 thousand surplus while maintaining a 5% draw on endowment.

Report on Facilities (from Facilities Subcommittee)
All major construction and renovation projects are proceeding on schedule. It was noted that the newly re-opened Cabra Hall and parts of Monroe which will open in Spring 2014, should start to improve recruitment and retention of students. Committee members urged the Provost to ensure that effective communication of the renovated facilities be developed as soon as possible.

Report on Endowment (from Endowment Subcommittee)
It was reported that overall, the 2013 fiscal year was a good year for Loyola’s Endowment. The Unrestricted and Restricted Pools returned 13.1% and 25.8% respectively, surpassing the majority of our benchmarks. The market value for the Unrestricted Pool was $174.6 million as of July 31, 2013, whereas the value of the Restricted Pool stood at $101.3 million at fiscal year-end.

As of July 2013, the Loyola Unrestricted Pool was invested as follows: 66% in Equities, 31% in Cash/Fixed Income and 2% in Alternatives. The Restricted Pool is currently invested in a balanced mutual fund which maintains a blend of approximately 73% Equities and 27% Bonds.
During the fiscal year, the Endowment Committee spent considerable time working with Loyola’s investment consultant to select several new investment managers. In light of today’s low yield environment and the heightened potential for rising interest rates in the years ahead, the Committee funded three new Fixed Income managers to reduce U.S. interest rate risk within Loyola’s portfolio. Two new International Equity managers were funded to both replace an underperforming incumbent manager and gain selective exposure to Emerging Markets. Finally, the Committee approved several new managers to fill out approved Hedged Equity and Real Estate targets, which represent relatively new asset classes for Loyola. Loyola staff has been working with their custodian and investment consultant to effectively allow for the commingling of the Unrestricted and Restricted Pools for investment purposes. These efforts are expected to improve diversification within the Restricted Pool and result in significant cost savings for the university while still maintaining compliance with required guidelines set forth by the Louisiana Board of Regents.

2013-14 Projected Budget (see attached spreadsheet)

It was reported that the university’s operations for the fiscal year 2013-14 are calculated to result in a budget deficit of $7.5 million. Offsets to this deficit are being recommended in two phases to the Trustees. At this October meeting, Fr. Wildes presented his initial recommendations for approval – a Voluntary Severance Plan (VSP) – discussed below. Based on the savings realized from the VSP, additional recommendations to reduce the shortfall will be recommended to the Trustees at its December 2013 meeting. At this point, because projected savings involve a voluntary severance program for Ordinary faculty, it is believed that most tenured faculty will elect to participate when their 2013-14 contract expires; thus these savings would occur August 1, 2014. The VSP associated with staff and extraordinary faculty would take place midyear, thus half of their current budgeted salaries would produce savings in this AY budget. With the above in mind, there is a projected deficit of $4.3 million for 2013-14 with a 5% Endowment draw to support current operations.

Voluntary Severance Plan.— The VSP was submitted to the Committee, which included:

Voluntary Severance Program for Tenured Faculty
The severance amount recommended is one and a half year’s salary, paid in a lump sum, with no extended benefits. There are 94 faculty that are age 55+ with 10+ years of service. This program would be effective January 2, 2014 or August 1, 2014. Faculty would have a choice to leave before their 2013-14 contract expired, January 2, 2014, however, they would not be paid their remaining portion of the 13-14 contract.

Voluntary Severance Program for Extraordinary Faculty
The severance amount recommended is one year’s salary, paid in a lump sum, with no extended benefits. There are 9 faculty that are age 55+ with 10+ years of service. This program would be effective January 2, 2014 or August 1, 2014. Faculty would have a choice to leave before their 2013-14 contract expired, January 2, 2014, however, they would not be paid their remaining portion of the 13-14 contract.

Voluntary Severance Program for Full Time Staff
The severance amount recommended is one year’s salary, paid in a lump sum, with no extended benefits. There are 82 full time staff that are age 55+ with 10+ years of service. This program would be effective January 2, 2014.

Budget Savings (see attached Exhibit III)
Based on experiences from other universities, budget savings were calculated on the basis of a 30% participation in each category of faculty/staff with the assumption that none of the Ordinary Faculty would begin the plan until the end of the current AY.

Discussion
There was extended discussion of the plan, with emphasis placed on ensuring that the plan be voluntary. Concern was expressed that some departments or programs might have several faculty/staff members electing to participate in the plan, and immediate replacement of some positions to ensure that the work of those programs was not compromised would be needed. Depending on the number of faculty/staff who elect to participate (and
thus the amount of savings to the current AY budget), the President will propose further deficit reduction plans at the December Finance Committee meeting. However, as shown in Exhibit III, 30% participation will only contribute about $1.2 million in savings, thus a substantial deficit will remain this AY. The future “size” of Loyola’s student body was noted as an important piece of the near-term and longer-term budget planning for the university.

The Finance Committee approved the proposed Voluntary Severance Plan, which will be addressed by the full Board of Trustees in the full Board meeting on October 18th.
Appendix C: University Faculty Handbook Committee revision

[Introduction for Senate: This revision was approved by the FHRC on 2 October 2013. There are two categories of changes here. First, the chair and secretary are specified as Senate representatives—that is, ordinary faculty rather than administrators. This was done because the committee believes that its leadership should come from the faculty, since the Handbook outlines faculty rights and responsibilities. Second, the faculty representatives are required to be tenured; this was done because the members of the committee believe that its issues are serious enough to warrant a requirement that its members have the protection of tenure to allow them to speak freely.]

UNIVERSITY FACULTY HANDBOOK REVISION COMMITTEE

Chairperson: One of the faculty members elected by the University Senate, selected by the Committee
Secretary: One of the faculty members elected by the University Senate, selected by the Committee

Voting Members:
1. Three tenured members of the Ordinary Faculty elected by the members of the University Senate.
2. Three members of the University administration appointed by the President.

Terms:
Three-year staggered terms.

Purpose:
This Committee shall be responsible for negotiating such changes to the Faculty Handbook as are proposed to it under the provisions of Chapter 14.

Duties:
1. It shall determine whether the proposed changes lie within the purview of negotiation by the Committee.
2. It shall promptly distribute its findings and conclusions to the University Board of Trustees, the President, and the University Senate.
3. It shall assure that all of the provisions and limitations as set forth in Chapter 14 are duly met.
4. It shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.
5. The first meeting of the academic year shall be called by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs no later than October 1 of each year.
6. It shall report to the President of the University and the University Senate.

Updated text by BOT on May 20, 2011
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Appendix D: 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,