

**MINUTES OF THE CSB/SJU JOINT FACULTY SENATE and
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS MEETING
Wednesday, January 28, 2015
SJU Brother Willie's Pub, Sexton Commons**

The meeting was called to order by chair Terry Check at 4:36 p.m., who welcomed the chairs to this joint meeting.

1. **ROLL CALL:** All members were present except Charles Bobertz, Tom Kirkman, Jessica O'Reilly, and Ann Sinko.
2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS:** There were none.
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Sheila Nelson noted that several of the "Black Lives Matter" posters across campus have been vandalized to say "All Lives Matter," and that it's important to stress the importance of black lives in this campaign, because they have been devalued by society, historically.
4. A **STRATEGIC PLANNING EXERCISE** for the Senators and department chairs, to identify priorities among several options for **Strategic Directions 2020**, was introduced by Terry. [See "*Phase II SD 2020 Campus Conversations.docx*" and "*SD 2020 Worksheets.docx*," distributed with the Agenda and attached to the archival copy of these minutes.]

Terry noted that SD2020 was discussed at the presidents' forum on Monday and in other venues, so he wouldn't provide a long introduction. The group today will be discussing the four main "pillars" as distributed earlier, and examining the strategic options within each. [The four: Engaged Liberal Arts, Holistic Development of Women and Men, Catholic and Benedictine Experience and Partnered Education.] Our purpose in each of the divisions is to have a conversation about the choices we might make if we were to focus our energies on a few of these options. We can't concentrate on all of them; we won't ignore those we don't prioritize, but we will focus our institutional resources on those we decide are most significant. The question today is, where should we put our energy over the next several years? As faculty, we have a voice in this process. Since you are seated at tables of 6-8, we will have conversations at our tables. As a faculty we have had the fall workshop on liberal learning and general education reform, some of which will be useful for SD 2020, but it wasn't focused on strategic planning. In addition, there were sessions on liberal learning last fall, but they were run by the VPs of Student Affairs, and the audience included staff as well as faculty. Yet, the research on this topic has documented the importance of a faculty voice. Quoting from an *Inside Higher Ed* article on how to do strategic planning: "Without the meaningful engagement of faculty in the strategic planning process, the resulting plan will not get carried out." The idea is to have small group conversations, starting with the first pillar, Engaged Liberal Arts. Have the conversation about which of the options are priorities. Each of you can circle your top three priorities; we will be handing out paper ballots, but within the groups we want your thoughts written on the sheets at your tables, which will become evidence of the input we are getting from faculty.

Discussion:

1. Karin Johnston: There are some things on the other list that I would normally think of as liberal arts; should we only look at this list? Life of the Mind, for example.
2. Terry: Jean [Lavigne, JFS vice-chair] thought that was important to add to the category of Holistic Development of Men and Women. There is a category of "other," so if your group wishes to add one, do so. Some may also think the categories are ambiguous; I am not going to define them for you, lest I prime the response, but you should articulate what it means to you.
3. Dan Finn: There are two ways to interpret this. One is to view them over all, or, given what we are doing now, to consider what we think we already do that is most important. Another option on the list might be less important now, but we might think it needs to be pushed.
4. Terry: Think about our future and where we want to go; what needs additional resources to improve or to maintain where we are?
5. Dan: Priorities going forward, then?
6. Terry: I think so. We aren't going to have time to go through each one afterwards. But after your initial discussions, we will move into other groupings by "pillar," so you can meet with and talk to those who want to discuss that particular pillar. At the end of the meeting I will leave time for a full group discussion about preferences or about process; you could raise concerns about SD 2020, or raise issues related to the process.
7. Emily Esch: You really do want us to be thinking in the context of these two institutions, not where my concerns might lie within my department or field, yes? Terry: I would agree. You need to consider the entire community.
8. Greg Schroeder: It is important to note that this exercise was not designed by the faculty, but by someone else drawing in good faith upon discussions that did not adequately represent faculty perspectives on strategic planning. We need to be sure to register our thoughts on the issues. If we don't, our points will be lost. We shouldn't surrender our individual faculty voices right at the beginning of the process.

Group discussions at the eight tables (with six or seven people per table) ensued. Terry reminded everyone to be sure to note their comments on the larger sheets of paper.

At 5:05, Terry called the group back to order, to move to groupings by pillar. He modified the plan slightly, on the fly: because getting up and moving is cumbersome, each group should decide on which of the last three pillars to focus, and at least get through one of them.

As faculty engaged in this conversation, he and Jean distributed the sheets relevant to the conversation at each table. At 5:22 he asked everyone to finish up; he had passed out the ballots for each individual to indicate their priorities, but still wanted to leave time for group discussion. He and Jean preferred to collect the ballots together according to the four pillars, so they gathered them in order by pillar, and then gathered the large sheets from each table. Terry gave a rough tabulation of the ballot votes: "Intercultural Competence/Inclusive Excellence" received 25 votes; "Undergraduate Research" received 22 votes; "Innovative/Distinctive Curriculum" received 21 votes; "Global Engagement/Education Abroad" received 20 votes; "Faculty Development" received 19 votes; and the other options were far behind (the next one received eight votes).

[The top choices in the other categories, as determined by a count of the ballots after the meeting, were: Under the pillar "Holistic Development of Women and Men": "Developing a Culture of the Life of the Mind" (31 votes); "Intercultural Competence/Inclusive Excellence" (29 votes); "Mentorship" (20 votes). "Leadership and Service" was also close with 18 votes. Under the pillar "Catholic and Benedictine Experience": "Service and Social Justice" (34 votes); "Community Experience" (23 votes); "Moral and Ethical Development" (22 votes). "Experience of Benedictine Heritage, Values and Charism" was close at 19 votes. Finally, in the "Partnered Education" pillar: "Organizational Structure" (34 votes); "Sustainable Budget Model" (24 votes); "Affordability" (22 votes)." "Enrollment Size and Strategy" was close at 20 votes.]

Time was then allotted to discussion by the entire group.

9. Matt Harkins: One thing our group talked about—and I have heard conversations about this over the years, though not at higher levels—is that we have a good sense that single-sex education makes sense for women, but we don't have a sense that the data showing benefits is as strong for St. John's. Might we consider what it means to keep St. Ben's single sex, and move St. John's to a coed situation? Also, as we are having difficulty filling enrollment at St. John's, anecdotally, I get the sense that more women are interested in a single-sex college than are men. This is one thing to consider as a plan moving forward.
10. John Merkle: I tend to agree that the single sex environment is much better for women than for men, but going co-ed that could be a death knell for the single sex institution. If you look around the country and what happened to women's colleges several decades ago, it wasn't good for the women's colleges.
11. Claire: I don't know that there is any research showing that single-sex education has been shown to have any benefits, at least at the post-secondary level. If we had one president and did not duplicate the administrative functions, we could still get some of the advantages of single-sex schools, like the St Ben's Senate for women's leadership. I just don't think we have any evidence to support that whole claim about single-sex schools.
12. Dennis Beach: I am co-chair of the Trustees' [i.e. SJU Board's] committee on marketing. Neither institution markets itself as single sex; if we did, we would probably have classes of 200 at SJU and 300 at CSB. The decision to not go co-ed at St. John's was made in the mid-60s, and there is a history there. That is one reason why there is no St. Teresa's in Winona anymore, and why St. Thomas's enrollment is large and St. Kate's small.
13. Jessica Harkins: It is important to have that conversation and gather that data. Looking at video addiction and sexual assault, they have an effect on the students. We would need more data, but in single-sex dorms we have a higher rate of those problems. Are we really serving our male students by putting them in that environment, not just from a marketing standpoint, but with regard to student learning?
14. Terry asked if there was any feedback on the process.
15. Parker Wheatley: My impression is that, with the fall events, where I was being spoken to most of the time, my sense is that a lot of this has been hatched in a different place. Drawing input from the community is what you start with; we are doing it in reverse.
16. Phil Kronebusch: On the Engaged Liberal Arts [pillar], it seemed to me the list was hard to deal with. I want us to have every department improve, have every department strengthen, and improve the education we provide our students. That's the whole big thing we are doing, and it's not on the list. We in Political Science have been told we cannot replace a retiring professor. We will have weaker offerings next year because of budgetary decisions already made. It's hard to look at these priorities when my own department won't be as strong moving forward.
17. Greg: Regardless of what you think of the list or the process, before this goes forward to the Boards in May, it is important that the Senate at least have a clear idea of the faculty stand on this. Some of this has already been presented to the Boards. I think we should assert faculty governance between now and May. The vehicle for that is the Senate, if not the JFA, as the Senate is the designated voice of the faculty. I urge us to demand a voice for the faculty and have a formal response.
18. Claire: One of the things the Senate should do and say, though it's not on here because this was not developed by the faculty, who are the ones who deal with the jointness, the ones to say what needs to be done: we should be discussing not *partnering* education, but *merging* education. We might just get enough efficiency to get that money back to build up our departments if we didn't need two of everything. The assumption is we should go on the way we are going, rather than some deep thinking about a merger which would be beneficial for everybody. I know that's touchy, but we could do it.
19. Imad Rahal: We've discussed this; what happens between now and May?
20. Terry: Jon McGee will collect all this input by mid-February and present it to the Boards in an initial form.
21. Rita Knuesel: We have board meetings February 26-27, and I'm sure there will be some sort of update given.
22. Dennis: The February meetings will be on the budget. What the Boards did in the fall was all about process, and they felt they should go through the process, too. The same thing done in the fall by the other groups was also done by the Boards.
23. Jean: The Boards formally endorsed the four pillars in the fall.
24. Rita: It may have happened differently at the St. John's Board and the St. Ben's Board; I'm not sure. I know at St. Ben's the president asked for endorsement of the four pillars by the Board.
25. Terry: I am gathering that there is a perceived need for more faculty input; this is an important first step. The Executive Committee can discuss this, and Jean and I can stress to the Strategic Directions Council the need for more and better faculty input.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Peggy Roske