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Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
December 13, 2010; 11 a.m.
St. Mary’s Hall Room 113B

Present: Judith Huacuja, Andrea Seielstad, Heidi G Gauder, Paul Benson, Leno M Pedrotti, Rebecca Wells, Antonio Mari

Guests: Tom Burkhardt, James Ferrelly

Opening Meditation: Judith Huacuja opened the meeting with a meditation.

Minutes: The minutes of the December 6, 2010 meeting were approved.

Announcements:

The APC will assist in appointments to the CAP leadership team. It will work with the recruitment committee to establish the team that will work with the Assistant Provost.

New Business:

University Financial Report. T. Burkhart reported the university’s 2011 and 2012 financial projections. He indicated that government and private grants are less than where we were for the fiscal year that ended in June, so the financial situation is down even a little even though we have more students this year. However, the overall projections for financial health were positive. Key enrollment indicators suggest that applications are doing well for the next academic year. The university has changed how we do acceptances and will do them all at one date this year in mid-January instead of on a rolling basis, the idea being there it will be possible to do better modeling. Campus visits are the same as a year ago, which is promising since the university generally does well once people visit.

With respect to budgeting and planning, the board will look at across the board at athletics, housing, food services, and academics. The presentation to ECAS was only about the academic budget.

With respect to total-cost-to-attend comparisons for 2012, UD is in the middle of our peer institutions. Our tuition increase of 4.4% was in the middle also. UD is in the middle of the group of peer institutions. Generally, those in the high end of cost, like Fordham and Lehigh made the lower increases, and those at the bottom like Miami and University of Cincinnati had the higher increases. Different schools have taken different approaches for net pricing. Some like Villanova, for example, give more scholarship money to fewer students (Villanova gives an average of $21,000 to 52% of its students) while others, like UD, give less money to more students (UD funds 99% of its students at an average amount of $10,000 -- our highest discount rate is 50% of tuition). Those that fund fewer students tend to achieve a higher net revenue.
However, the method selected is partly driven by the reputation of each school and is a matter of confidence about reaching academic profile goals. There is some fear that relying on more full-paying students at UD will lower the academic profile of the entering classes. However, this is an issue that requires ongoing consideration.

Another issue is how to recruit a big enough class to support a budget. UD is also trying to make improvements in diversity and improve academic quality. It is trying to achieve balance in each class between male to female as well as regional and area diversity beyond Ohio. It is wrestling with the issue of getting the right number of students for arts and science, business, engineering. The enrollment management folks juggle a lot of things. If you lower tuition, you reduce the modeling power of the class and get who applies to you and agrees to come. As we recruit more in the west and east, their tuitions are generally higher and we can get more full-paying customers.

Another consideration for the board will be the UD “sticker price.” We have been pretty aggressive in raising tuition in recent years. The next increase, however, will take us into the $30,000’s, and if you add room and board it will take the total prices into the $40,000’s. At the same time, our discount rate (i.e., from scholarships) has increased from 25% to 43%. This means that a tuition raise of 5 or 6% may not necessarily bring in more money.

As measured by AAUP salaries, UD faculty salaries by rank places UD 17th among 26 peer institutions. However, if adjusted for cost-of-living differences, we go to number 3.

In summary, this year “the 5% is not a 5% problem” is affecting us. The senior class has a lower financial aid factor than the group coming in and that is going to affect us. But what is in our favor is that the large freshman class will be sophomores and the large junior class will be seniors. If we recruit 1800 students for the incoming class, we will stay about the same in student count. The areas where we are looking to invest money will be compensation increases, special increases in equity (between males and females and different areas of the university), special performance in academic areas, salaries of people that get promoted, and the CAP program. UD is continuing to fund debt funding (putting more money away for debt in recent years for building projects) from sources other than endowment. There are discussions about making some changes in the retirement plan, perhaps to require employees to invest money in 403B plans at a level that the university is willing to match such that they will be able to retire at a suitable time.

Engineering Representative. It was announced that the runner-up from the last engineering elections was Margie Pinnell. However, she was appointed as assistant dean so she cannot take the seat. There was no clear 3rd place runner up; seven people had one vote each. A discussion was held about how to choose the replacement. J. Huacuja questioned whether ECAS should sponsor an electronic vote this week for the position rather than having a coin toss for one of the seven remaining persons. However, after further discussion it was determined that it was not uncommon for a large number of people to have only 1 or 2 votes and that it would be impractical to run an election at this late date in the semester when final
examinations are already underway. Members voted on the issue of using a tiebreaker approach to select the representative with 6 favoring the method and one abstaining. Motion carried.

Senate Agenda Approved. The following agenda was planned for the January 15 Senate meeting:

(1) Report engineering representative;
(2) Have elections to determine the ECAS member of engineering.
(3) Have elections to elect a vice president to replace B. Duncan;
(4) The Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs will report to the Senate on the revised maternity leave policy. He is ready to announce how certain parts will be implemented. Full-time non-tenure-track faculty will be covered. The review board consisting of 3 faculty members plus the Associate Provost and Director of the Women’s Center will be created and begin reporting to the Senate. However, the summer baby component was NOT approved.

It was agreed that the Senate Voting rights proposal should be put off until February.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25.

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Seielstad