



A-06, 01 B-02



Sister Emmanuel Renner



Father Michael Blecker

The Presidents' Report On Cooperation

The following report which analyzes cooperative agreements and understandings between the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University and which includes specific recommendations by the presidents has been prepared for discussion by the CSB Board of Trustees and the SJU Board of Regents at their joint meeting on February 19. The boards will not act on these recommendations until they have been appropriately reviewed by the two campus communities.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Trustees,
College of St. Benedict
Board of Regents,
St. John's University

FROM: Sister Emmanuel Renner, President
College of St. Benedict
Father Michael Blecker, President
St. John's University

DATE: November 27, 1981

We present to you the attached copy of the joint presidential recommendations for cooperation to govern the relationship between the College of St. Benedict and St. John's University for the decade of the 1980s. We have felt it

necessary to re-examine the policies governing our present relationship and to recommend some changes in those policies for the following reasons:

1. Most of the present policies have been in effect for almost a decade; some of these policies were formally agreed upon and some have evolved and never been formally articulated until the present study. The most recent study of our cooperative endeavor by an external consultant was the "Moseley Report" submitted to the two presidents by Dr. John D. Moseley on March 1, 1981. His report required a response from the presidents.
2. The two institutions, in differing ways, will be making significant commitments to the future of the other institution. The College of St. Benedict is planning a capital campaign; St. John's University will appoint a new president effective June 1, 1982. Therefore, it seems desirable that the present basis of cooperation be examined, in the perspective of such changes, to insure a healthy form of cooperation in the future.
3. The perception held by the two presidents (which they believe is shared by faculty, students, and most of the external constituencies), is

that more effective cooperation will strengthen both institutions and at the same time will lead to greater efficiencies. The success of the joint library is an example of a stronger educational service which has also led to greater efficiency in use of expertise and time by library staff.

4. Adequate planning for the 1980s requires that greater administrative efficiencies be designed now.

It is understood that the two boards will meet jointly to discuss this report. Board action is not expected before the separate boards meet in the summer: the College of St. Benedict on June 4 and St. John's University on July 8-10. In the meantime, the respective academic communities will have time to review this report.

Certain matters, included in the recommendations, are clearly the responsibility of the faculties to initiate. It is not the intention of the presidents to override those faculty rights, but rather to report their own convictions on matters they see as important to the future of the two institutions.

PART ONE

SUMMARY OF CURRENT COOPERATION

Part One of this report is a summary of institution-wide understandings of cooperative agreements between CSB and SJU. Commonality and differences in institutional identity, educational objectives, functions, structures, policies, and procedures are identified. The summary attempts to describe what is, not necessarily what ought to be, in the relationship between the two institutions. It records how the present administrators are cooperating in the four administrative areas.

Part Two analyzes the current mode of cooperation with a view to improving it. Changes which might further cooperation are recommended by the presidents.

INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY

A. Commonality

Essential components of identity for both institutions are: liberal arts education; pre-professional education in selected fields, with an attempt to keep the pre-professional component compatible with liberal learning; Catholic, Benedictine values infusing academic and residential life; attention to the development of the whole person (intellectual, spiritual, social, emotional, and physical); focus upon a residential life in a supportive community environment; cooperative programs with the other institution; "service" orientation of students; and sponsorship by communities of Benedictine men and women.

B. Differences

SJU is one component, along with Saint John's Abbey, Saint John's Preparatory School, and the Liturgical Press, of the corporate structure of the Order of Saint Benedict. The university is governed by a two-tiered board: the Board of Regents and the Executive Governing Board. These, in turn, are governed by the Monastic Chapter and Senior Council, acting as the Board of Directors of the Order of Saint Benedict, Incorporated.

SJU has a graduate School of Theology with a seminary program in addition to the undergraduate School of Arts and Sciences which is the principal concern of this document.

Since 1961 CSB has been separately incorporated from Saint Benedict's Convent. CSB's Board of Trustees has full responsibility for the governance and operation of the college. However, the Corporate Membership (the five officers of the religious community corporation) have ultimate responsibility for and authority over certain restricted matters which assure the Catholic purpose and identity of the college.

Some differences in institutional identity may be a matter of degree of emphasis. Others are more central: CSB emphasizes its role as a women's college, attempting to foster the human development of

its students. CSB intentionally nurtures the career aspirations and leadership ambitions of women students and attempts to prepare women to take their place as equals of men in American society. SJU emphasizes to a lesser degree its role as a single-sex institution. SJU's identity appears to be more meshed with that of the abbey than is CSB's with the convent. However, both seem closely linked to their sponsoring bodies.

Separate institutional identities are being preserved or perpetuated through the following practices: separate catalogues (except for departmental portion); separate academic offices; separate mission statements; separate faculties and faculty workshops and meetings; separate personnel policies; and separate core curriculum requirements.

EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

A. Commonality

Both colleges offer a liberal arts education in a Catholic, Benedictine environment; both offer selected pre-professional programs; both emphasize a core curriculum; and both attempt to foster individual human growth through community living outside the classroom. CSB seeks to attain these goals by a program based on a specific developmental theory. SJU seeks the same objectives by emphasizing Benedictine values inherent in its tradition, such as concern for personal growth, respect for persons, stewardship of common property, and care of the environment.

B. Differences

The requirements for the core curriculums differ. They were developed at different times, with differently defined goals and approaches. The educational philosophies of the core curriculums agree in large part but differ in emphasis and structure. In addition, the educational goals of men and women students have differed, particularly in the past. Historically, the percent of graduates of SJU entering graduate school and the professions has been higher than that of CSB graduates.

The educational objectives of SJU's graduate School of Theology are not a part of this comparison.

FUNCTIONS

The functions or kinds of activities carried on by various departments to accomplish the goals and objectives of the colleges are listed below as they would ordinarily be located in administrative structures. Though particular functions are sometimes located under different administrative structures on these two campuses, most functions are found on both campuses. A few functions are found on only one or the other campus.

Academic Functions	Found at SJU	Found at CSB
1. Staffing of faculty (hiring, promoting, tenuring, dismissing, appointing chairs, assigning staff)	X	X

2. Long- and short term planning and budgeting for maintenance and development of academic programs and departments	X	X
3. Evaluation of academic personnel and programs	X	X
4. Managing and supervising of departments, support services such as Registrar's Office and Library, and of outreach programs such as overseas semester and Bahamian program	X (joint)	X
5. Academic leadership of faculty and chairs	X	X
6. Communication through committees	X	X
7. International programs	X (joint)	X
8. Continuing education, including adult program in Bahamas		X
9. Academic advising	X	X
10. Human Life Center	X	
11. Hill Monastic Manuscript Library	X	
12. Spirituality Institute	X	
13. University Archives	X	
14. Graduate School	X	
a) Master's degree		
b) Seminary program		

Student Development/ Affairs Functions	Found at SJU	Found at CSB
1. Academic tutoring	X	X
2. Athletics: Intercollegiate Intramural	X	X
3. Campus ministry	X	X
4. Career planning (career counseling internships, experiential learning, academic advising)	X	X
5. Counseling	X	X
6. Foreign and minority affairs	X	X
7. Health and wellness programs	X	X
8. Housing assignments	X	X
9. Orientation	X	X
10. Placement	X	X
11. Residential programs	X	X
12. Student activities	X	X
13. Student government	X	X
14. Student judicial system	X	X
15. Student organizations	X	X
16. Student publications	X	X
17. Volunteer services	X	X
18. Student assessment programs	X	X
19. KSJU radio	X	
20. Ministry preparation	X	
21. Life safety services	X	

Institutional Advancement Functions

1. Admissions	X	X
2. Public relations	X	X
3. Cultural events	X	X
4. Community relations	X	X
5. Public information	X	X
6. Publications	X	X
7. Alumni relations	X	X
8. Government relations	X	X
9. Parent relations	X	X
10. Fundraising	X	X
11. Annual fund	X	X
12. Capital fund	X	X
13. Deferred giving	X	X
14. Foundations and grants	X	X
15. Research and support services	X	X

C. Institutional advancement policies regarding cooperation are very few: Admissions has similar stated policies regarding admissions requirements. There are no written policies to ensure cooperative activities of admissions staffs. Informal understandings do exist regarding the avoidance of duplicating visits to some high schools.

Public relations' only written policy guides the public information offices when news releases mention the other school.

Alumni relations has no policies governing cooperation. They have similar policies regarding the use or distribution of mailing lists.

Parent relations has no policies governing cooperation.

Government relations has no policies governing cooperation.

Fundraising has two informal policies governing cooperation: There is a tacit understanding that the staffs of both schools will work together in those instances where a prospective donor desires to contribute to both institutions. There is another unwritten agreement that the staffs will cooperate closely on requests of foundations for funds affecting both institutions.

D. Administrative services has articulated a number of very specific policies to govern cooperation as well as a few tacitly understood guidelines for cooperation:

Financial policies which govern cooperation concern:

1. The use of a single billing system for both campuses, even when fees originate on the other campus.
2. The end-of-year money exchange concerning:
 - a) Registrar's Office expense;
 - b) credit hour imbalance exchange to reimburse the school whose faculty produced more credit hours than its students consumed;
 - c) student employment exchange;
 - d) student food exchange;
 - e) joint department expenses;
 - f) sharing of salary of forum director;
 - g) sharing of joint library operating budget;
 - h) shared use of computer facilities and programmer expertise.
3. The annual review of tuition charges and consequent recommendation of changes in tuition.
4. The attempt to coordinate deadlines, forms, and guidelines of budget process.

Physical plant has no policies governing cooperation.

Auxiliary enterprises policies which govern cooperation concern:

1. An understanding that students may use either campus cafeteria for any meal.
2. An understood ongoing agreement to review areas where cooperation might further the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the services of both institutions.

Other administrative services policies which govern cooperation concern:

1. In personnel, the need for both presidents to review staff positions to determine whether a cooperative arrangement is possible before advertising.
2. In financial aid, the coordination of deadlines and the use of common definitions of terms in awarding grants as a first step toward determining whether or not to design a joint policy statement.
3. In computer use, in addition to shared expenses, the sharing of programmer expertise.

PROCEDURES

The actions to be taken to accomplish intended goals under the guidelines of established or tacitly understood policies are spelled out in varying degrees of specificity in the four administrative areas of the college:

A. Academic area procedures which further cooperation include: weekly meetings of academic administrators of both campuses; deliberations of joint faculty agenda; deliberations of Joint Calendar Committee; deliberations of combined Educational Policy Committee and Academic Affairs Advising Council to consider new courses; preliminary review of requests for tenure, leaves, and promotions by both sets of academic administrators; and submission of a single budget in joint departments.

B. Student development/affairs area procedures which are cooperative include:

1. Regular meetings between vice presidents and between the counterparts on their staffs.
2. Regular consultation between vice presidents before changing policies or procedures.
3. Regular exchange of printed materials concerning student development activities (e.g., campus ministry newsletters; career planning newsletter [a joint publication]; Record; Cable).
4. Joint training of resident assistants, faculty residents, staff residents, and orientation assistants regarding such issues, for example, as residence management, rape, alcohol abuse, medical emergency training, joint liturgies, social justice activities, and Volunteers In Service To Others (VISTO).
5. Encouragement of joint planning of student activities (e.g., brother-sister floor activities, coed intramural sports, Joint Events Council [JEC]).
6. Coordination of freshmen orientation and registration.
7. Consultation between staffs concerning appropriate action to be taken with students who develop serious problems.

Student development/affairs procedures which differ in a way which

seems to make cooperation more difficult are:

1. Differing criteria for the selection of residential staffs, which result in a different composition of that body on each campus. (For the most part, SJU's residential staff holds academic degrees, while CSB's holds counseling degrees.)
2. Differing interpretation of common policies.

C. Institutional advancement procedures which govern cooperation are:

In admissions, the hiring of a counselor, jointly supported by CSB and SJU, to work in the Chicago area; the cooperative representation agreement which controls or avoids some duplication of efforts at career programs and high school visits in North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and other places, (i.e., CSB and SJU staffs represent each other in certain places); the completely cooperative efforts of CSB and SJU in working with the Private College Council's Cooperative Admissions Program which attempts to influence high school counselors and prospective students in favor of private education; a joint orientation program for new counselors; and joint recruitment for the freshmen Bahamian program.

In public relations, a cooperative understanding to avoid duplicating attendance at professional meetings and conferences when appropriate.

In alumni relations, a joint dinner for alumni at SJU's Homecoming; another joint summer retreat being planned; a slide presentation of both colleges being designed for faculty and staff to use when visiting alumni chapters; and data bases being designed to acquire data from the Registrar's Office to go directly to both alumni offices.

In fundraising, similar gift club characteristics being designed.

D. Administrative services procedures which govern cooperation are:

In financial offices, charges are made to students on either campus for the sale of goods and services.

In physical plant, there are no procedures.

In auxiliary enterprises, managers of parallel enterprises are encouraged to discuss possibilities for cooperation.

To accomplish food service exchange, SJU students may use their Validine I.D. cards at CSB's cafeteria to purchase breakfasts at \$2.75, lunches at \$3.50, and evening meals at \$3.75. Cash is paid for meals which exceed these prices. CSB students use a coupon book (which is part of their minimum food contract) at SJU's cafeteria to purchase meals for the prices listed above. The exchange agreement does not include use of the Loft for SJU students or Mary Hall Cafe for CSB students.

In personnel, presidents sign a search form before administrative departments begin a search for persons to fill a vacancy.

In financial aid, joint financial analysis for married couples attending both colleges to ensure equitable awarding; joint financial analysis of CSB/SJU employees in coordination with tuition waiver policies; regular exchange of information concerning changes in financial aid funding levels and other program changes; and use of joint computerized financial aid information system.

30 November 1981

PART TWO

ANALYSIS OF COOPERATION

and

PRESIDENTS' RECOMMENDATIONS for FUTURE COOPERATION

A careful consideration of the kind of cooperative agreements now in operation between the two colleges has led the presidents, in consultation with their chief administrators, to recommend changes in policies, procedures, and structures which could enhance cooperation in order to increase the effectiveness, and wherever possible, the efficient use of human and fiscal resources to carry out the missions of the colleges. All changes are intended, ultimately, to enhance the quality of the education which is offered to women and men who enroll at Saint John's and Saint Benedict's.

Changes recommended by the presidents will be discussed under the following categories: institutional identity; educational objectives; functions and structures; and policies and procedures.

INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY

The missions of the colleges are very much alike. The nature of the two institutions engaged in these similar missions has been profoundly altered as a result of cooperation. Present descriptions of the college missions, however, do not acknowledge the significance of that cooperation. Instead, mission statements or descriptions of institutional purposes make only peripheral references to the presence of the other institution.

While cooperation has been serious and pervasive, all efforts to cooperate have been made with the intent of avoiding merger. Organizational arrangements which might seem irrational can sometimes be explained by the presence of two seemingly contradictory goals: to cooperate but not to merge.

Presidents' recommendations: That the colleges adopt a joint mission statement or an identical paragraph describing the importance of cooperation in two different mission statements. Such an articulation of the role of cooperation in the lives of the institutions could reinforce institutional commitment to cooperation and give direction to administrators, faculties, staffs, and students to strive for harmonious, ongoing working relationships.

A suggested draft of such a paragraph follows:

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University have a unique, multifaceted relationship of intercampus cooperation that is apparent in all aspects of campus life. The arrangement allows both colleges to offer a broader and more diverse coeducational academic program as well as coeducation social, cultural, and spiritual programs. Single-sex undergraduate residences, along with the coeducational programs, encourage students to come to terms with their own personal development in relationship to their peers and provide the opportunity for them to experience the equality of the sexes. This form of intercampus cooperation enriches the lives of both colleges while prompting them to enhance their distinctive identities.

EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

The educational objectives which characterize the academic programs are virtually identical except for those of the two core curriculums which are currently being studied by a joint committee.

It is not clear whether or not the objectives of the two student development/affairs programs differ in essence or only in the language used to describe them. CSB uses the language of developmental psychology theory; SJU uses the language of Benedictine values. However, it is clear that the methods used to reach these objectives differ significantly. CSB is intentional about applying a particular theory of Chickering and Perry to foster student growth through developmental stages. While SJU is engaged in a longitudinal study of the developmental growth of its students, its student affairs program relies, for the most part, on less formal efforts to effect the same growth by inculcating Benedictine values.

Presidents' Recommendations:

1. That the vice presidents of academic affairs facilitate the work of the committee which is studying the two core curriculums with a view to identifying, wherever possible, common goals and objectives; and that if sufficient commonality is found, a joint core curriculum be designed and implemented; and that the faculty take into account in those requirements what the future needs of graduates will be for competency in mathematics, computer science, and foreign language, especially if the United States should become bilingual.
2. That the vice presidents of student development/affairs establish a broadly based committee to state their goals and objectives in a common language and to develop ways to make use of student development/affairs resources to reach those goals and objectives.

FUNCTIONS AND STRUCTURE

Administrators, faculty, staffs, and students perceive obstacles to cooperation in the lack of parallel administrative structures for managing the functions of the two colleges. For example, to plan a joint Parents Day is found to be difficult partly because parent relations at CSB is managed by the director of alumnae and parent re-

lations who reports to the vice president of development, while parent relations at SJU is managed by the parent coordinator who reports to the vice president of student affairs. While this difference may appear negligible, it illustrates a difference which could cause conflict because of functions being subsumed under non-parallel structures. Administrators in student development/affairs, in contrast to those in public relations or development, might have somewhat different objectives for sponsoring a Parents Day and, consequently, would plan such an event quite differently.

It may be that the most serious of the obstacles to cooperation include perceptions people have of the difficulties. Perceptions of difficulties, particularly when held by administrators, can work against cooperation. Initially, the absence of parallel structures at CSB and SJU was viewed as a serious obstacle to cooperation. Later, differences between men and women, between goals and objectives, and between policies and procedures were viewed as obstacles. These perceptions may be a reflection of the very real and understandable difficulty persons experience in any organization in which two presidents are seeking to establish efficient cooperative arrangements which could result in personnel reductions. For that reason the presidents of CSB and SJU want to assure their current administrative personnel that their contributions are deeply appreciated and that if changes are made, they would be implemented in mutually acceptable ways.

Presidents' Recommendations:

1. That the vice presidents of academic affairs develop a plan for joint academic administration and that, if such a plan is acceptable, its implementation not be delayed until such time as financial pressures make the change a necessity.
2. That academic departments be made joint when the proportion of men and women students warrants it.
3. That the vice presidents of student development/affairs develop a plan for joint student development/affairs administration, and that, if such a plan is acceptable, its implementation not be delayed until such time as financial pressures make the change a necessity.
4. That the admissions offices be joined under the direction of a dean of admissions, reporting to the director of college relations at CSB and to the vice president of institutional advancement at SJU; that the admissions staff be a single one, with offices on both campuses.
5. That other administrative departments or services in student development/affairs, institutional advancement, and administrative services be joined when their effectiveness as well as the efficient use of human and fiscal resources would be improved.
6. That student groups, established to influence their peers (resident assistants, peer advisors, health advocates, peer resource persons, orientation leaders, prayer groups, and the volunteer organization [VISTO]) be encouraged to operate jointly.
7. That joint student governments, judicial systems, clubs, publications, and activities be encour-

aged while preserving equal representation of students from both campuses, with leadership alternating annually.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

As greater clarity is reached concerning commonality of institutional identity and educational objectives and as more joint functions and structures are created or strengthened, it is imperative to clarify and formalize the numerous policies and procedures which give direction and guidance to the daily activities of administrators, faculty, staffs, and students. It should be understood that administrators and staff responsible for similar functions on the two campuses who have not already established a schedule of regular meetings to ensure satisfactory communication about cooperative policies should do so.

Presidents' Recommendations for Academic Area:

1. That the colleges move toward similar faculty personnel policies insofar as is feasible, beginning with policies for promotion and tenure.
2. That the boards establish a joint committee to explore the fiscal implications of parallel compensation policies.
3. That a joint and comprehensive program for faculty evaluation and development be designed and implemented.
4. That, should the Joint Core Curriculum Committee recommend the establishment of a joint core curriculum, appropriate policies and procedures be designed to implement the modification in both academic programs.
5. That strategies for retrenchment be designed cooperatively and that such strategies involve retrenchment in administrative as well as academic departments.

Presidents' Recommendations for Student Development/Affairs Area:

1. That similar policies and procedures be designed and implemented for dealing with student issues.
2. That, in preparation for a more unified program, staffs in student development/affairs engage in joint planning of all current programs and services in order to avoid duplication or omission.
3. That, in order to reinforce the work of the committee studying goals and objectives of the student development/affairs areas,

the current staffs engage in joint in-service training which could prepare them to accept a common language describing goals, objectives, and methods for student development/affairs activities.

4. That the vice presidents and staffs establish a regular meeting schedule to ensure satisfactory communication and enhance cooperative arrangements.
5. That, in lieu of joint appointments to student development/affairs functions, similar job descriptions be created for staff members responsible for the same functions on the two campuses.

Presidents' Recommendations for Institutional Advancement:

1. That the dean of admissions develop an appropriate set of policies and procedures to operate a joint office of admissions.
2. That the dean of admissions, in cooperation with the academic, financial, and student affairs staffs, modify all current policies and procedures which will be affected by the creation of a joint admissions office.
3. That administrators responsible for public relations develop a set of policies and procedures to ensure cooperative publicizing of the two institutions.
4. That the public information offices develop a joint calendar and joint on-campus publications.
5. That the alumni offices combine activities whenever feasible, especially events for young alumni.
6. That information in the two alumni files be correlated in such a way as to assist in the recruitment of daughters and sons of alumni.
7. That a joint legislative liaison officer be appointed to influence legislation on behalf of private colleges.
8. That, if the Bahamian pilot program becomes an established program, a development plan be implemented to raise scholarship funds for Bahamian students to enroll at both campuses. Such joint efforts to raise funds seem possible since Bahamians, particularly those familiar with the pilot two-year program, seem to perceive CSB and SJU to be a single entity.

Presidents' Recommendations for Administrative Services:

Finances

1. That the boards coordinate the budgeting schedules and design

fiscal policies, which would be the most supportive of both colleges, for tuition, faculty and staff compensation, and total institutional budgets. Although the timing of the budgeting process might change each year, continuous consultation could ensure cooperative budgetary decision-making.

Physical Plant

1. That additions to the physical plants be reviewed by both boards to avoid unnecessary duplication of identical facilities and to ensure the creation of complementary facilities.
2. That the staffs establish a procedure to guarantee that each staff review plans-in-progress of the other staff for construction or renovation of facilities.
3. That the boards design parallel policies to establish a reserve, in lieu of depreciation, for repair and replacement of academic buildings as well as for auxiliary service buildings.

Auxiliary Enterprises/Services

1. That the financial officers once again inventory areas where joint purchasing and contracting might result in savings.
2. That the possibility of a joint bookstore be explored.

Other Administrative Services

1. That the colleges move toward parallel personnel policies for staffs.
2. That when parallel policies have been designed, a joint personnel director be appointed.
3. That a joint comprehensive program for evaluation and development of staff be designed and implemented.
4. That the two financial aid directors analyze the differences resulting from separate financial aid policies with the intent of designing similar policies and procedures for the distribution of aid.
5. That the boards regularly review financial aid policies.
6. That enhanced cooperation be achieved for the data processing function by the Joint Executive Staff regularly reviewing the priorities for the processing and analyzing of data in their area.