

THIRD Meeting of the Villanova University
Senate for Academic Year 2010-2011 in
Bartley Hall, Room 2010 on Friday,
OCTOBER 22, 2010 at 3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dr. Robert Styer, Chairperson; Mr. Bryan Kerns, Executive Secretary;
Dr. Joseph Dellapenna, Parliamentarian

Dr. Chiji Akoma; Ms. Diepiriye Anga; Mr. Andrew Benenati; Mr. Robert Capone '62 ; Dr. Sohail Chaudhry; Dr. Q. Chung; Mr. James Danko; Dr. John Doody; Rev. Kail Ellis, OSA; Dr. M. Louise Fitzpatrick; Mr. Steve Fugale; Dr. Gary Gabriele; Mr. Damien A. Germino; Dr. Christopher Haas; Ms. Bridget Halligan; Dr. Beth Hassel; Ms. Susan Leighton; Dr. Susan Mackey-Kallis; Mr. John Marrah; Ms. Meghan Mogan; Mr. John Murray; Dr. Victoria McWilliams; Ms. Amy Patel; Mr. Harshil Patel; Mrs. Mary Quilter; Mr. Gregory Sleasman; Rev. John Stack, OSA; Mr. Kenneth Valosky; Dr. Barbara Wall; Dr. Maggie Wang; Ms. Lindsey Waters; Dr. Thomas Way; Dr. Joyce Willens; Ms. Selma Koury Wunderlich (representing the President of the Alumni Association)

ABSENT:

Dr. Sarvesh Kulkarni (Notified In Advance -Unable to Attend); Mr. Thomas Carlin; Dr. Adele Lindenmeyr (NIA); Ms. Dorothy Malloy, Esq. (NIA); Mr. Vince Nicastro (NIA); Mr. Phil O'Neill (NIA); Ms. Leighann Reilly(NIA); Dr. Seth Whidden (NIA)

AGENDA:

PLEASE SILENCE ALL CELL PHONES. PLEASE PICK UP YOUR NAMEPLATE.

INVOCATION - Senator Gary Gabriele

- I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE **SEPTEMBER 24, 2010** MEETING
- II. POWER OF INTERPELLATION (if any)
- III. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE
- IV. GUEST SPEAKERS
 - Mr. Bob Morro – Update on the Master Plan and the Pedestrian Experience
 - Mr. John Kelley and Mr. Steve Merritt – Update on the Middle States Evaluation
- V. OVERVIEW OF UNIVERSITY BUDGET FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2010-2011
 - Mr. Ken Valosky, Vice President for Administration and Finance
- VI. PARKING PROPOSAL RESOLUTION
 - Dr. Bernard G. Prusak, Center for Liberal Education

- VII. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND GUEST SPEAKERS
- VIII. NEW BUSINESS
- IX. ADJOURNMENT

PLEASE SILENCE ALL CELL PHONES. PLEASE PICK UP YOUR NAMEPLATE.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. The Invocation was presented by Senator Gary Gabriele:

Let us bow our heads and pray for God's blessing. Lord, we thank you for the blessings of this day and the many blessings you have bestowed on this University. We remember the many people throughout the world that live in poverty and ask that they find comfort in knowing your love for them. We ask you to remember our men and women serving in the armed forces who are risking their lives every day to ensure our security and freedoms. We ask you to continue to bless our students, help them in their studies, and pray that they will become the problem solvers for our most important societal problems. We ask your special blessing on our upcoming symposium on the Global Water Crisis and ask that this symposium inspires our students to use their skills and knowledge to help the almost 900 million people in the world that do not have access to a clean water supply.

We ask for your blessings on the families of Daniel Giletta and Pat DiChiara, and we pray for Pat's quick recovery and return to his studies.

Finally, we ask you to ease the suffering of the Phillies fans this weekend by sending them to the World Series one more time. We ask these things in Jesus' name.

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 24, 2010 MEETING

The minutes were moved for approval and unanimously approved as submitted

II. POWER OF INTERPELLATION (if any)

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

- a) For attendance purposes, it is very important to have your nameplate at your place and then returned at the end of the meeting.
- b) A notice was sent via *Campus Currents* soliciting questions from the Villanova University community as possible topics of discussion for the meeting of the Executive Committee of the University Senate.

- c) Bob Byrnes, President of the Alumni Association, spoke to the Executive Committee regarding his goals for the Alumni Association. They are included in the October minutes of the Executive Committee which will be posted on the Senate web page in November.
- d) In regarding to the football issue, the presidents of the Big East are meeting on November 2nd. Shortly after Father Donohue will organize various avenues addressing the subject.

IV. GUEST SPEAKERS

MR. BOB MORRO- UPDATE ON THE MASTER PLAN AND THE
PEDISTRIAN EXPERIENCE

Villanova University Campus Master Plan Update

University Senate

October 22, 2010



Some Key Needs

Academic Space

- Performing Arts Center, faculty offices, classrooms, updated library

Student Residences

- New Beds; improve existing

Administrative Space

- Particularly related to Campus Ministry and student services

System Wide Needs

- Accessibility, Infrastructure, Life Safety, Building Condition

Sustainable and Pedestrian-Friendly Campus

- Campus Landscape, Improved Entrance

Final Recommendations

Alignment with Strategic Plan

First Phase of Implementation

- Build New and Renew Existing Halls
- Renew and Expand Current Academic Space
- Improve Campus Landscape and Accessibility

2009 Projects

Campus Master Plan

- **Fedigan renovation – LEED EB**
- Dougherty Dining Hall
- Improve Campus Ministry
- Improve Admission Plaza, Austin Hall

2010 Projects

Campus Master Plan

- Sheehan and Sullivan Renovation
- Gary Hall Renovation

Summer 2010

- Demo bathrooms & closets, cable TV data, vinyl stair treads, fire alarm
- Refinish terrazzo stairs
- New bathrooms
- Replace room lights (T5), occupancy sensors, cable TV, wired data, wireless, fire alarm
- New furniture
- New sprinkler piping
- Roofing repairs

Summer 2011

- HVAC system
 - Mechanical equipment
 - Start piping in fall
 - 150 ton & 200 ton electric, screw-type chillers in Bartley basement
- Cooling tower on Bartley roof
- Piping to every room
- Fan coil units in every room
- Painting
- Roofing repairs

Garey Hall Renovations



- Academic and student support functions
- Moved the following functions:
 - Career Services
 - Alumni Affairs, Honors
 - Communications Faculty
 - Internat. Global Interdisciplinary Studies
 - Development, major gift officers
 - Library – remote storage
 - Custodial, Engineering Lab, HRD

Pedestrian Experience Improvements

- Following Campus Master Plan recommendations
- Reduces vehicular traffic in campus core
- Will need parking policy changes
- Selected Architect Mark B. Thompson, Stu Appel
- Design underway, alternatives being evaluated



Bob then opened the floor to questions or comments. Senator Hass thanked him for his presentation. He wondered what the objective impact is of the economic slowdown and will it affect our progress in the future? Bob responded by saying that they are very strategic and selective in the projects they choose. As an example, they are now in the process of putting sprinkler systems in all of the dorms. They try to take into consideration which projects deserve top priority. He noted that every project that is presented is in concert with the Campus Master Plan.

Senator Fitzpatrick asked if any thought was given to the interior of Tolentine Hall. Bob answered by pointing out that there are major challenges. One being that it is so heavily used; they do not have much swing space. He noted that it is definitely in the ten year plan. Senator Valosky added that they have been waiting for the cost of transforming the campus landscape and that they anticipate proceeding with the development of Lancaster Avenue. He explained that all of these, along with Sullivan and Sheehan, have been

aligned with the Strategic Plan and that the initial focus is to bring these two amenities to some level to provide the housing so that they may honor the three-year plan commitment. At that point in time, they will assess where they are in terms of the Strategic Plan, what resources are available and would it be appropriate to move into academic facilities. He made it clear that much of what they do will be dependent on fund raising. He added that to take on a project such as Tolentine it would take at least \$85,000,000 to complete.

Senator Mackey-Kallis asked when they are in the process of renovating a building such as Garey Hall, do they perform a parking impact study? Bob said they took into consideration all of the present and future employees in Garey Hall and it seems to work. He commented that there are at least a hundred empty spaces on the upper level. Each year they will address that level. He feels as though the extra parking on Lancaster Avenue will help to ease the parking situation.

Senator Amy Patel asked that since they will be increasing housing space will the university have a vision of accepting more students. Bob replied by saying that in 1990 the Strategic Plan allowed for a certain number of students, so there is no plan to increase the number of students. He added that they must follow the township's regulations as well.

Senator Koury Wunderlich questioned at what point in time they get input from neighboring communities and from the township. Bob explained that they did it twice already with the Master Plan. In 2008-09 they had two rounds of meetings with the neighbors. There are five community groups on the periphery of the campus. They met with each one individually. The turnout of people was very disappointing. He noted that there were three issues that the neighbors had in common. The issues were the traffic on Lancaster Avenue, students who live in town may become disruptive and storm water management.

They are continually looking for ways to address these projects.

The Chair thanked Bob Morro for his presentation.

MR. JOHN KELLY AND MR. STEVE MERRITT
UPDATE ON THE MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES EVALUATION

John Kelley, OPIR, is tri-chair, along with Steve Merritt and Sally Scholz on the Middle States Steering Committee. He noted that the process is supported by a twenty-one person steering committee. John began by reading a quote from the Mission Statement of the Commission on Higher Education of Middle States explaining its purpose.

He observed that an interesting part of this particular work is the self-study and the fact that over 100 colleagues worked hard on this two hundred and twenty-five page report.

The self-study at another level is a peer assessment. On November 1st, the leader of the peer evaluation team, composed of representatives from other institutions, will be here.

The leader is the president of Georgetown University, Dr Jack DeGioia. He will be joined on March 28th, 29th and 30th by seven or so colleagues with special skills in many areas. This team will interview many of us at Villanova including students. They will look to verify the information in our report and may make recommendations. The last day of their visit, they will present a summary of their findings.

John indicated that this process is lengthy. It is now in its twenty-fourth month. Villanova opted to assess and evaluate all dimensions of the University. He remarked that assessment is very important. They will not only be assessing the quality of the institution but the assessment of learning outcomes as well. He noted that this could only be accomplished by the dedication of several working teams involving faculty, staff, students and administration. The depth and commitment of the participation is overwhelming.

Steve Merritt explained that the report is available on the web through the My Nova portal. There are also copies of it in the library and in Peace and Justice Center. People have been notified of this through email and Campus Currents. He stated that the Communications office has a communication plan for the Middle States process to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to understand the report. In regard to commenting on the report one may write directly to John Kelly, Steve Merritt or Sally Scholz via email or in the section for comments on the My Nova report. They want people to comment as often as they would care to do. The report has been distributed to the entire Villanova community, including the Alumni Board and the Parent's Committee.

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees has taken an interest in this project so that they may inform the greater boards of our progress. He noted that they have received many responses already.

Steve noted that the summary of recommendations was given out before the meeting today. They are as follows:

Institutional Self-Study Summary of Recommendations

Excerpted from
DRAFT for Community Review
September 27, 2010

NOTE: Examples that follow, highlighted in yellow, are identified for presentation purposes only. These noted examples **do not** represent a prioritization of any kind. Each item is followed by a page and line reference in parenthesis.

Chapter 1A: Mission and Goals

Recommendations

1. In the next University-wide Climate Survey, scheduled for administration in Fall 2011 emphasize reactions to the role of the Mission in planning and decision making at all levels, and assess the influence that Mission has in the daily activity of the University community as well as academic integration in the classroom. (Page 12/ Line 306)
2. Allocate additional resources to the Center for Multicultural Affairs in order to develop new workshops and other opportunities to assist the University community with regard to the varied issues of diversity in all aspects of University life.
3. Develop an evaluative tool that will assist all members of the Villanova Community to assess the effectiveness of the Mission in the decision making, activities, and attitudes of all Villanova constituents.
4. Study, create, update, and implement a new family leave policy for faculty and staff.

Chapter 1B: Integrity

Recommendations

1. Develop a more effective way of informing our students, faculty, and administration of Academic Freedom issues at Villanova.

Chapter 2A: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

Recommendations

1. Employ the upcoming Campus Community Climate Survey to ascertain, among other things, whether University faculty and staff believe that communication, information sharing, and decision-making have become more open, inclusive and transparent at the University.
2. Given Villanova's dependency on tuition, the size of the University's endowment, and limited opportunities to increase revenues in the current global economic environment, the University should regularly review its operations and expense budgets to identify ways to become more cost effective, ensure prudent stewardship of its resources, and maximize the amount of funds available for strategic initiatives.
3. Assess whether the budgeting assumptions and parameters that appear to have served the University well over the past few decades (e.g., planned savings, budget carry-forward program, entrepreneurial programs, fiscal prudence, etc.) will continue to serve us well moving forward. (44/1148)
4. Monitor the economic climate and reprioritize, if necessary, the order of initiatives of both the Campus Master and Strategic Plans to help ensure that the plans continue to move forward despite unfortunate harsh economic realities.

Chapter 2B: Institutional Resources

Recommendations

1. The University must enhance its fundraising efforts to increase long-term resources (i.e., endowment) and to reduce dependency on tuition.
2. Future fundraising targets, including goals for a new Capital Campaign, will need to be established at particularly aggressive levels, if the University hopes to close the significant gap that exists between the size of the endowment and the size of the endowments at the overlap institutions.
3. Villanova should continue to maintain strong margins and operating cash flow in order to provide funding for capital projects without significantly increasing the University's debt burden. Setting specific targets for these and other financial measures should be considered, as is done in other organizations.
4. The University should develop additional incentives for departments and individual employees to identify significant cost-reduction opportunities for the organization, as opportunities to increase revenue other than fundraising will likely be limited. (67/1746)
5. As the Campus Master and Strategic Plans emphasize, Villanova should continue to focus on enhancing the living-learning environment for students and faculty alike. This would include improving and, perhaps, increasing residential space in order to meet the University's commitment to underclassmen, and potentially offering seniors the opportunity to live on campus and enhancing and expanding academic classroom and office space while improving and increasing space dedicated to intellectual and artistic pursuits outside of the traditional classroom setting.

Chapter 3A: Leadership

Recommendations

1. OPIR, as planned, should administer another Community Climate Survey in Fall 2011 to obtain a more current view of how the community perceives leadership, governing bodies, and factors such as an environment that encourages change and innovation.
2. The University should conduct a formal evaluation of the operational mission and structure of the University Senate with special attention to structural changes that might improve its functioning such as the University Forum noted in text.
3. The University should conduct a formal evaluation of the structure of the Student Government Association with attention to their Constitution and By-laws, the roles of officers, the integration of Student Senators into SGA, and improved communication between the SGA and the entire student body. (80/207)

Chapter 3B: Administration

Recommendations

1. A study of faculty research support across colleges should be conducted. Each college appears to approach supporting scholarship differently and might benefit from sharing the results of studying the impact of individual college research support on faculty productivity.
2. The OPIR planned Community Climate Survey in Fall 2011 should include items to measure the impact of reported increased opportunity for personal and professional development among staff members.
3. The OPIR planned Community Climate Survey in Fall 2011 should include items to measure the perceived impact of governance; that is, how well do the various University constituencies feel their representative vehicles (Faculty Congress, University Staff Council, Student Government Association) hear and serve their needs.

Chapter 4: Faculty

Recommendations

1. Building on the comprehensive criteria articulated in the University Rank and Tenure policy for evaluating faculty performance in teaching and student learning, the University administration should reiterate that all department chairs should assess and evaluate that there is a uniform and systematic implementation of the faculty evaluation process that ensures the employment of a variety of factors and tools in addition to CATS, and that utilizes both qualitative and quantitative data.
2. Establish a development fund for full-time non-tenure track faculty that will support their research efforts. Within that vein, develop more flexible systems of course scheduling and sabbatical arrangements that would be beneficial to all faculty pursuing research agendas.
3. Study ways to increase predictable course scheduling for adjunct faculty. In addition, develop a system for offering adjunct faculty professional development in enhancing their pedagogy.
4. Accelerate efforts to attract, recruit, and increase the number of women and minority faculty, and in doing so expand its notions of diversity in relation to the creation of a community that is reflective of the world in which we live as a whole, and that best serves our students to engage that world. Administrators at all levels of the University must work with faculty in the creation of a community that is welcoming of a fully diverse faculty. (98/ 2562)
5. Reemphasize the role of service in the creation and sustenance of community by all faculty, and ensure that all departmental and college policies offer a clear rubric as to how service will be evaluated and recognized, particularly in the tenure and promotion process and in considerations of merit increments. All departmental and college policies should be in accordance with the expectations for teaching, research and service published in the University Rank and Tenure policy.
6. Investigate ways to create formal, University-wide protocols that promote joint faculty-student research; that bring that research into the classroom as an essential pedagogical tool; and that in this way, help to bridge the perceived gap between research and teaching.

Chapter 5A: Educational Offerings

Recommendations

1. Enhance support for centers and institutes by targeting funding and hiring tenure-track faculty aligned with the goals of existing centers and institutes as well as new ones.
2. Investigate creating University standards that would guide the assessment of graduate program quality across the four colleges.
3. Conduct a study to determine graduate student satisfaction in academic and co-curricular areas as well as specifically assessing the facilities needs of graduate programs (e.g. laboratories, offices, Falvey Library), the need for further support for graduate students and the need for additional faculty lines. (123/ 3214)
4. Study allowing students to earn majors across colleges without having to complete the entire core curriculum required by the college offering the major.
5. Improve procedures governing the creation of new Academic Programs, Curricula, Degrees, Majors, Minors, and Concentrations by: (a) clarifying how budget, space and other considerations should be assessed by administrators and (b) improving communication among the signatories by creating a means to request an in-person meeting of all signatories to review complex/innovative proposals.

Chapter 5B: General Education

Recommendations

1. Eliminate over-redundant assignments and coordinate the selection of topics by faculty in ACS 1000, ACS 1001, Ethics 2050, PHI 1050, and THL 1050/1051 in order to better align these courses regarding the Augustinian Mission, the Catholic intellectual tradition, the Western intellectual tradition and the dialogue between faith and reason.
2. Adopt a formal University core based on the *de facto* core of liberal arts and sciences courses all students complete and create an identity/name for the university core that clearly reflects Villanova's Mission.
3. Expand the Learning Communities available for first-year students, include more freshmen in LCs, and consider the creation of additional Learning Communities for sophomores. (135/3549)

Chapter 5C: Related Educational Activities

Recommendations

1. Each college should review advising practices in order to identify practices that produce increased student satisfaction and share these practices with the other Colleges and Career Services for possible adoption in order to increase student satisfaction across the University.

2. Continue to increase the number of faculty using technology to manage and deliver course content to students.
3. Identify funding for the library to develop new models of collaboration that build scholarly communication networks and promote the dissemination and evaluation of information among peers and with the wider world by means of technology.
4. **Identify and document the space needs for the Writing Center and MLRC.** (138 & 141/3645 & 3709)

Chapter 6A: Student Admission and Retention

Recommendations

1. While retention rates remain high, the University should engage in developing a formal exit interview process and a comprehensive retention program to better understand the reasons that students depart the institution before graduation while also attempting to normalize retention and graduation rates across all undergraduate racial and ethnic groups.
2. The University should seek to fully fund and implement data driven strategies for attracting a high-achieving and diverse populations as described in the recently approved Strategic Plan.

Chapter 6B: Student Support Services

Recommendations

1. The University should review its staffing and sources of funding in light of the increasing number of students with disabilities enrolling at Villanova.
2. The University should evaluate and consider the establishment or expansion of programs designed to enhance students' cultural competence and understanding.
3. The University should evaluate increased opportunities for collaboration with regard to community service and leadership development programs, with strong consideration given to the establishment of a centralized center for service.
4. The University should actively seek to improve satisfaction ratings (as described in the Senior Survey) with financial aid packages for current undergraduate students. (174/4583)
5. **The University should review the reasons behind the low "sense of community" ratings of its African American students as described in the Senior Survey.** (169/4460)

Chapter 7A: Institutional assessment

Recommendations

1. Each critical area should have a formal, systematic assessment plan for analysis and utilization of assessment data from its own area and pertinent other data (e.g., cross-University OPIR Reports). Said assessment plan should address, on a regular cycle, gathering additional data as needed as well as review, planning, and implementation. These plans should be revised annually and housed in a central electronic repository, thereby

facilitating cross-plan, meta-analyses that can identify economies of scale and interrelationships.

2. A formal, influential mechanism(s), such as re-establishing the former cross-functional Data Utilization Team, needs to be created to inter-relate assessment findings that have high-level impact and /or an impact on more than one area of institutional life at Villanova. (195/5174)
3. OPIR should take the lead in improving communication and dissemination of assessment data and their impact on both academic and non-academic university functions to the entire Villanova community. This would foster not only greater awareness of our progress as a University, but also a deeper sense of ownership and investment in our communal identity and mission.
4. The creation of a formal mechanism for coordinating and monitoring accountability for assessment activities throughout the University.
5. Assessment undertaken to meet external standards and/or using standardized instruments for comparison purpose should be routinely balanced by assessment related to institutional and internal departmental goals that are distinctive and specific to Villanova.
6. As metrics are developed for the strategic plan, particularly for imperatives related to academics, care should be taken to ensure they stimulate a reflective process and in-depth thinking about the plan and its outcomes.
7. In order to further enhance institutional assessment activities at Villanova, formal consideration should be given to allocating dedicated resources, both funding and personnel, within selected individual units.

Chapter 7B: Assessment of Learning

Recommendations

1. Improve the data sharing across departments and divisions, including establishing or strengthening a structure to facilitate and encourage regular information exchange throughout the University
2. Formulate and implement an integrated assessment plan featuring collaboration across colleges, relevant departments, and co-curricular areas on: (a) student learning outcomes, (b) assessment methods and efforts, and (c) evidence-guided enrichment of our academic mission.
3. The Colleges of Engineering and Liberal Arts and Sciences should consider developing formal assessment systems at the graduate level.
4. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences should continue its work in implementing a comprehensive and systematic framework for identifying and documenting learning assessment in all departments and programs. In particular, the Committee should:
 - place special emphasis upon increasing the adoption of direct measures of student learning so that each and every department, by the beginning of AY 2012-13 uses at least one direct measure; and

- assist in establishing, for each department within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, a mechanism to apply assessment findings to influence the development of a formal model for the integration of learning assessment findings into program evaluation and curriculum revision by using the approaches in place in the Colleges of Engineering and Nursing.
5. Test the efficacy of inviting subject specialist librarians to attend curriculum meetings in each college and offer their input as a means of bringing about a more systematic assessment program on the part of Falvey Library.

Steve emphasized that this presentation was merely to inform us about the report. He remarked that this meeting format is not designed to debate recommendations. He stated, however, that if there are some issues in the report that are of particular interest that you may think need changes or emphasis, please send this in writing to the Tri-Chairs. They will present them back to those who wrote the report to see if they have validity to move forward to the ultimate visit in March when Dr. DeGioia and his team join us with their three-day visit.

The chair opened the floor to any questions or comments.

Senator Wunderlich asked if anywhere in the assessment did they look at data of alumni and the type of positions that they have within the last 5 years. John Kelley responded by acknowledging that the report data is tied directly to the Alumni Survey which OPIR systematically collects approximately every 3 to 5 years.

Senator Morris asked if they could speak briefly about the actual make-up of these committees and what part will the students have in this. John explained that the seven Middle States working committees were systematically composed to include faculty, staff and students on each committee. At least two students served on each committee.

Senator Styer reminded the Senate that on there is a link regarding the Middle States evaluation process under MY NOVA, Office of the President.

Senator Mackey-Kallis commented that under “Leadership”, the second recommendation states that the University should conduct a formal evaluation on the operation and structure of the University Senate with special attention to structural changes that might improve its functioning such as the University Forum noted in the text. She recommended that UNIT should wait to consider adding on the recommendation after the Middle States gives its final report. John responded by explaining what the process is for these recommendations. First of all, the recommendations from the working groups have come through rather unvarnished. They have not been edited by any individual or policy making groups at the university. There is a certain purity and pure democracy involved in that. Each recommendation will, however, ultimately be closely evaluated. The last time, each recommendation was categorized in terms of whether it was strategic or operational and then sent to the decision making person/body. There will also be a plan so that the status of the recommendations can be routinely reported to the community.

Senator Quilter noted, on page twenty-one under Human Resources, it states *that the Pennsylvania State minimum wage was \$7.15 per hour*, Villanova raised its minimum wage to \$10.50. This impacted approximately 20 % of the university staff. She wondered why the student's wage was not raised to \$10.50. Steve asked that Senator Quilter please put that in writing and they will go back and research the issue.

The Chair thanked both Mr. Merritt and Dr. Kelley for their presentation.

V. OVERVIEW OF UNIVESITY BUDGET FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2010-2011

MR. KENNETH VALOSKY, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Senator Valosky began by discussing how the university weathered the recent economy and our working budget. He stated that Father Peter's goals were to be able to address financial situations that our students might face. Father wanted to avoid lay-offs at all costs and lifted the hiring freeze while adding new positions. He seeks to make measured progress with regard to the Campus Master and Strategic Plans.

We have increased our allocation to financial aid and special circumstances by our students. He expressed his appreciation to Enrolment Management for the time and effort in attempting to work though any difficult any economic situation with the students and their families.

In terms of the Campus Master Plan, we moved forward with Sullivan and Sheehan. In regard to the Strategic Plan the financial aid allocation has been increased dramatically. They have increased a number of faculty positions as well.

Senator Valosky stated that Moody's Investor Services, who are responsible for rating the credit strength of not only colleges and universities as well as corporations throughout the world, have asked that they be able to highlight Villanova's excellent financial performance during this difficult time.

He did stress that we are not entirely out of the woods yet. In regard to the Budget assumptions for 2012, he felt it was important to give some context to the economy that we are in. He remarked that at a recent Board meeting our investment advisors, Cambridge Associates, gave an overview of where the economy is headed. They anticipate a modest US recovery facing headwinds from the tail of the stimulus. He commented that they stated that since 1950 the average monthly jobs that have been created in the United States were about 200,000 new jobs a month. Since 1980 it has been about half of that number. Since 1990 it has dropped to about 85,000 new jobs a month. Since 2000 there has been negative job growth. It looks as though the unemployment rate will remain high for some time. It will be a symptom of a jobless recovery. His concern is looking at our budget assumptions going forward. He feels as though we must remain cautious on how we move forward.

The major budget assumptions such as tuition, while work closely with Enrollment Management will be what they consider a modest 3% tuition increase for next year.

Their one major area of concern is health insurance. They budgeted this year that we would have a 10% increase. It came in at 18%. This, in comparison to others, is favorable. At the moment, we have in the budget a 20 % increase.

He also noted that while salaries might increase over a five year period by approximately fifty million dollars, we will see benefit and health insurance costs rise to thirty million dollars. This does give them great cause for concern. He told the Senate that they will continue to move forward to increase financial aid with providing support for the new faculty positions. Senator Valosky remarked that the President has asked what dollars we can free up for him so that he can direct to all of these initiatives. He stated that the Budget Office is working closely with the Senate Budget Committee and that they are to be commended for the dedication that they provide. He said they will be meeting with the Senate Budget Committee and will return in February with the final budget for consideration by the entire University Senate.

Senator Mackey-Kallis asked Ken to comment on the status of the Benefits Review. He stated that, based on the study, we would increase the share of the university's portion of health insurance. Over a three year period, the university will pay more of the health insurance premium. He suggested that perhaps Ellen LaCorte address this issue to the Senate including the Faculty Congress.

Senator Harshil Patel asked, given all the issues Villanova has to deal with financially, how do they prioritize them with the idea of going to the Big East? Ken replied that is exactly the type of analysis that is occurring at the moment. Vince Nicastro, the Athletic Director, has a presentation that lays out the pros and cons of the university moving forward. A main concern would be the financial impact with that type of move. They have been working very closely with the Athletic Department. The analysis is not complete. The President has asked for a very in-depth analysis that does not solely focus on football. He wants to make sure that we are looking at the entire athletic portfolio and if there is any other anticipated increases. After gathering all of the components they make sure what pieces are subject to fluctuation. For example, attendance at a game might be subject to differences of opinion. They want to make sure that they go into this with their eyes wide open and that it does not take resources away from other initiatives.

Senator Styer thanked Senator Valosky for his presentation.

VI. PARKING PROPOSAL RESOLUTION

Dr. Bernard G. Prusak, Center for Liberal Education

SENATE COMMITTEE ON MISSION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE RESOLUTION ON

Progressive Tiered Parking Fee Structure for Faculty and Staff

WHEREAS Villanova University as a Catholic, Augustinian institution affirms Catholic social teachings on both the dignity of work and the rights of workers, on the one hand, and environmental protection, on the other; [1]

WHEREAS a common fee structure for parking permits places a greater economic burden on the lowest paid Villanova employees;

WHEREAS parking policies at Villanova have an impact on the environment through their effects on automobile usage;

WHEREAS the revenue generated by the current parking fee structure far exceeds the direct costs to the University of maintaining the parking system, even including the costs of the Villanova Shuttle; [2]

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate of Villanova University ask the University

- (1) To create a tiered system of parking fees on a sliding scale with the highest paid employees paying proportionately more for parking than the lowest paid employees;
- (2) That net revenue from parking fees, if it is not to be decreased, at least not be increased;
- (3) That incentives be instituted to reward carpooling and driving energy efficient vehicles, whether through special designated parking areas or reduced parking fees;
- (4) That some portion of profits from parking revenues (e.g., 20 percent) be used to give added support to employees choosing to use public transportation. (The University might explore, for example, SEPTA's "Commuter's Choice" program, providing transit discounts for employees. See www2.septa.org/choice/.)

Notes

[1] Catholic social teaching on the environment will require, in the words of the United States Catholic Conference, "changes in public policy, as well as in life-style..., to arrest, reverse, and prevent environmental decay." At the same time, though "saving the planet will demand long and sometimes sacrificial commitment," the Conference also insists that these "painful adjustments...must not diminish our sensitivity to the needs of the poor.... Environmental progress cannot come at the expense of workers and their rights. Solutions must be found that do not force us to choose between a decent environment and a decent life for workers." See *An Invitation to Reflection and Action on Environment in Light of Catholic Social Teaching: A Pastoral Statement of the United States Catholic Conference*, November 14, 1991, available at <http://usccb.org/sdwp/ejp/bishopsstatement.shtml>.

[2] We recognize, however, that this revenue forms part of the general fund supporting a variety of educational purposes.

The Chair then introduced Dr. Bernard G. Prusak, the Chair of the Mission and Social Justice (MSJ) Committee. He asked Dr. Prusak to speak briefly to the motion.

Dr. Prusak began by saying that this topic came to the MSJ committee last year. It was also presented to the Senate two years ago. He stated that the proposal concerns two issues. First, economic justice: the focus here is making sure that lower paid employees do not have to pay an onerous fee. Parking is a common good for all on campus. The simple premise of this proposal, with respect to economic justice, is that those who can contribute more to the maintenance of this common good should do so, certainly within reason at the same time.

The second focus is on environmental stewardship. When MSJ was approached with the topic, it was framed in terms of economic justice. The committee members also thought this was a good occasion for Villanova to think about environmental stewardship. Dr. Prusak pointed out that resolutions three and four could have some impact on the environment.

Senator Styer noted that the vote is not for a particular set of numbers. The MSJ committee did, however, present two models, with numbers, for how the proposal might be implemented. (These models were only examples meant to show that the proposal is feasible.)

Dr. Mary Angela Papalaskari explained that, on one model, the lowest cost for parking in the main lot would be for those making under \$30,000 yearly. They would pay \$30.00. There are 226 people in that category. Those who are making over \$150,000 yearly would be able to park in the main lot for \$75.00. She emphasized that this is just one way of working the numbers. Dr. Prusak explained that their primary goal is those that are making very little money should pay, at most, \$30.00 or, better yet, nothing at all.

Senator Mackey-Kallis asked what net revenue the parking fees now generate. Dr. Papalaskari said that the total is approximately \$700,000, but from staff and faculty alone (so excluding students) the net revenue per year is somewhere around \$206,000.

Senator Amy Patel asked whether the net revenue would remain the same in the proposed system or whether there would be another option such as a cap. Dr. Prusak stated that the MSJ committee was not against decreasing the net revenue. Apparently, when this issue was presented to the Senate two years ago, it was noted that the money generated by the university is used for other purposes. There was concern that this money would be reduced. He noted that, given the financial climate, the committee's idea with this proposal was to keep the revenue more or less neutral.

Senator Dellapenna asked if this was just directed toward employees, not students. Dr. Prusak confirmed that it was just for employees.

Senator McWilliams asked whether the proposal put a cap on the amount that the highest paid employee could potentially pay to park. She feels that we are voting on the system that could potentially give those in charge the opportunity to charge the highest paid individual a very large number to park. Dr. Prusak answered by saying that the committee

had to work with a number of assumptions in order to put together the numbers. It seemed unlikely that whoever the parking authority is would set the fees outrageously high.

Senator Wall stated that she had a problem with the fact that employees who need to be at many different sites throughout the university, because of the nature of their work would have to pay more for a tag allowing them to park anywhere. This would mean that you are paying extra for a necessity that is related to your work. She wanted to know if that meant that those who were paid higher would have to subsidize those who were paid less. She asked if there were other options. Is there a way of reducing the money of those who are earning below \$30,000 without taxing others? Dr. Prusak agreed, but if the proposal needs to be neutral, then there is no way to do such a thing. If the university decides that it is willing to make less money through parking in order to insure that lower paid employees pay less, then that is another matter.

Senator Benenati asked if lower paid employees specifically requested a tiered parking system. Dr. Prusak said that they have not asked, but given the brief of the MSJ committee it makes sense to think about this issue.

Senator Mackey-Kallis said that she felt uncomfortable voting on this proposal in its current form because she does not know the maximum that higher paid employees would pay in a system such as this. She would feel better about a proposal that states that the top amount that is currently paid by the employees would not change. She noted that she supports a tiered system and that this should not be a major source of revenue for an institution. Her view is that we do not raise the pot, but we tier the system. Dr. Prusak acknowledged that this is a difficult financial climate and is aware that the money is used for various purposes.

Senator Halligan remarked that the students came to the consensus that they felt that this was a good thing because of the things they were taught at Villanova regarding Catholic Social Teaching.

Senator Akoma said that it is necessary to look at the essence of this proposal—economic justice and environmental stewardship. What the details of the new system should be. What the fees should be can be worked out later.

Senator Marrah said he felt that this proposal has beautiful intentions and that much of it makes sense. But he also felt that, if the proposal meant the university would have less money for the general fund, it would fall to the students to pay that portion of revenue that was lost.

Senator Wall stated that she was absolutely committed to Catholic Social Teaching. However, she finds the proposal unclear in some ways. She focused on those who earn less than \$30,000. Are there other ways to address the socio-economic issues that they experience than reducing parking fees? She noted that many of our employees are illiterate. What do we do to provide literacy training? Dr. Prusak replied that this is not

MSJ's only business this year; this was just one topic that was raised. Dr. Wall objected to taxing some people to assist others. She wanted to know if there were other ways to assist what he says is a need. Her second point was that she wanted to know where we stop. In particular, should we tax students based on their family income for parking? Dr. Prusak suggested that perhaps the issue is that MSJ is not insisting that the revenue decrease in this proposal.

Senator Leighton spoke as both an employee and a former student at Villanova. She is also a parent of three Villanova students who also pay for parking. When she started out at a lower salary, it was a significant cost to pay. She felt that it does seem rather harsh for someone who makes substantially lower than most. She would gladly park on main campus for a lower amount. She is also concerned about the handicapped. She wondered if they would have to pay the highest amount to park close to their building.

Senator Wall wondered if those who do earn \$30,000 or less could have their parking subsidized by the university.

Senator Quilter added that one of her constituents agreed that parking should be subsidized for lower paid employees. Dr. Prusak replied that, in principle, MSJ would be very happy with that idea.

Senator Mackey-Kallis remarked that there are less than 250 full-time employees who make less than \$30,000 in the university. She did not feel that eliminating parking fees for these people would be a huge loss to the university, and she added that doing so might make a difference for these people.

Senator Styer explained to the Senate that we have three options regarding this proposal. They are as follows:

- We can call the question and vote on it now.
- We can table it to the next meeting.
- We can remand it back to the committee to be re-worded.

He asked for someone to make a motion in regard to these choices. Senator Wall made a motion to remand it back to the committee. Senator Halligan seconded that motion. Dr. Prusak asked that if it were to be remanded, would the Senate please remand to a different committee. He also asked, failing that, for some specific directions.

A vote was taken as to whether to remand the motion back to the Mission and Social Justice Committee.

ALL IN FAVOR 22

OPPOSED 4

ABSTAIN 3

Senator Mackey-Kallis asked if it would be valuable to the Mission and Social Justice Committee for the Senate to take a straw poll, which would be non-binding, on the recommendation that those making less than \$30,000 pay parking at a reduced fee. Senator Styer stated that was essentially the motion two years ago, and it was voted

down.

Senator Dellapenna commented that he has very mixed feelings about this proposal in that he thinks it does not address several issues. One is that by raising the fees you would be discouraging those who drive to work from doing so. The concern about the environment is a good thing. He noted that public transportation is not utilized as much as it might be. Perhaps we could encourage people to use public transportation. He suggested doing a survey. For example, how many of those who make less than \$30,000 a year have a realistic option of taking public transportation? There is a premium on housing that is near the SEPTA line or the Norristown High Speed Line. It may well be that employees making less than \$30,000 can't substitute public transportation. There are also questions about relative cost. If you are paying \$100 a year for parking plus discretionary costs, how does that compare to paying the \$60 a month to SEPTA? It could be that public transportation is far more expensive and far more of a burden for lower paid people. He felt that these questions should be explored further.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

The last scheduled meeting for the Academic Year 2010-2011 is:

**FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2010 in DRISCOLL HALL,
ROOM 132 at 3:30 p.m.
(President's Annual Address to the Senate)**

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no new business, Senator Styer asked for a motion to adjourn. Senator Wall motioned for the meeting to be adjourned. Senator Koury Wunderlich seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bryan Kerns
Executive Secretary
VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY SENATE

BK/hh