Minutes of the September 13th Meeting of the University Senate

**Biological Science**  
*E. L. Beard*  
*Maureen Shuh*  
(E. L. Beard, proxy)

**College of Business**  
Karen Arnold  
Walter Block  
Wing Fok  
Brett Matherne  
Mike Pearson  
Mike Sibley

**Chemistry**  
*Lynn Koplitz*

**City College**  
*Barbara Ewell*

**Communications**  
Anita Day

**Criminal Justice**  
Dee Harper

**English**  
Kate Adams  
Ted Cotton  
Marcus Smith

**History**  
*Robert Gerlich, S. J.*  
Mike Ross

**Languages and Cultures**  
*Connie Rodriguez*  
Bob Dewell

**College of Law**  
*Stephen Higginson*  
Patrick Hugg  
Jim Klebba  
Blaine LeCesne  
*Lawrence Moore, S. J.*

**Law Library**  
*Michele Pope*

**Library**  
*Richard Snow*  
*Trish Nugent*

**Mathematics**  
*Maria Calzada*  
(Connie Rodriguez, proxy)  
Xuefeng Li

**Music**  
*Alice Clark*  
*James MacKay*  
*Janna Saslaw*

**Philosophy**  
*Joe Berendzen*  
*Mark Gossiaux*

**Physics**  
Mickey King

**Political Science**  
*Conrad Raabe*

**Psychology**  
Glenn Hymel  
*Lawrence Lewis*

**Religious Studies**  
Robert Gnuse

**Sociology**  
*Marcus Kondkar*

**Theater Arts and Dance**  
*Georgia Gresham*

**Visual Arts**  
*Simeon Hunter*
The meeting was called to order at 3:40 PM.

1. Invocation by Larry Moore, S. J.

2. Election of University Senate Executive Committee
   Discussion
   A slate of candidates was assembled:
   Bob Gerlich, S. J. – Chair
   Barbara Ewell – Vice-chair
   Janna Saslaw – Secretary
   Alice Clark – at-large representative
   Conrad Raabe – at-large representative

   A vote was taken, and the slate of candidates was accepted, 20 for, 3 against, and 1 abstention.

3. Election of Senate representatives for the Fringe Benefits Committee. Three representatives were needed. The names of Jim Wee, Trish Nugent, Gwen George, Stephen Higginson were proposed. Jim Wee declined the nomination. All were accepted by acclamation. Stephen Higginson, who was not present during the nominations, declined at the end of the meeting.

4. Fr. Gerlich took the podium as new chair of the senate, and made some remarks. He had at first declined the position, since he felt that a non-Jesuit should be chair of the senate. He accepted on the condition that, “For the good of the university, if I can somehow help to bridge the relationship, which has suffered over these last couple of years, between the administration and the faculty at large, then it was a worthy effort on my part to at least undertake this.” He met with Fr. Wildes and asked him to meet with the Faculty Senate as a whole, not just with the Executive Committee.

New Business

5. A motion was presented by Marcus Kondkar (attached) that the Executive Committee should deal with the mismatch between Senate representation and the new structure of the university. The motion was seconded. Barbara Ewell moved to suspend the rules in order to take up the question immediately, and her motion was seconded by Alice Clark. A show of hands vote was taken, and the motion to suspend the rules was accepted. The motion was read. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Kondkar mentioned that the Faculty Handbook has not been updated since the reorganization of colleges, but one can glean from it that the ratio of faculty to senators is 6:1.

Simeon Hunter raised the issue that some senators are not elected but appointed.

Dr. Ewell pointed out her own anomalous position as a senator representing an academic unit that no longer exists. Her wish is to make the senate consistent with the [present] structure.

Georgia Gresham mentioned that academic units that had not changed could simply reaffirm their senators.

Fr. Gerlich suggested that the Executive Committee should have been able to discuss this earlier so that a clear motion would be presented.
Dr. Hunter suggested that the Executive Committee redefine the motion.

It was suggested that changing the language could eliminate the problems.

Dr. Clark suggested a wording that was accepted as a friendly amendment by Dr. Kondkar.

Dr. Hunter inquired if the Faculty Handbook is wrong, aren’t we committing ourselves to leaving things the way they are?

Dr. Kondkar replied that the Handbook does include the 6:1 ratio, so a new structure could be determined.

Lynn Koplitz asked to call the question. By unanimous voice vote the question was called. Fr. Gerlich read the motion again, which was accepted by unanimous voice vote.

Fr. Gerlich stated that the Executive Committee would take this up as soon as possible.

6. Dr. Koplitz mentioned a new Master Plan on reserve in the library, which seems like something the Senate should be involved with. It has not gone through the Space Allocations Committee.

Discussion
Larry Moore stated that this is stage 1; there will be more. He felt that it’s perfectly appropriate for the Senate to ask to be part of the process. This plan leads to a master physical plan.

Dr. Koplitz and Connie Rodriguez mentioned that this plan will have implications for programs.

7. Dr. Koplitz mentioned two other issues that could lead to building bridges between Father Wildes, the administration, and students and faculty. The Ignatian Scholarships Committee noticed that the Ignatians weren’t the highest award on campus any more. The basketball scholarships exceed them. Father Wildes put this in the hands of the Provost, where it has stayed. The Ignatian scholarships could be bumped up a little to include the room and board or board and fees that the basketball scholarships include.

8. [Second issue from Dr. Koplitz] It would be nice if the doors of the Senior Commons Room could be open for faculty to eat lunch together even if no lunch is served. It would be a step in building bridges.

Dr. Hunter mentioned that there is a plan to include reorganization of the general dining facilities that will include a space for faculty.

Dr. Koplitz responded that the Senior Commons is there now.

It was stated that part of the Orleans Room (near the conveyor belt) will be available as a faculty dining area, possibly in the spring.

Dr. Hunter mentioned that the Senior Commons room is equipped for media, and Fr. Wildes wanted it to be available for teaching.
Dr. Koplitz replied that the room is not being used.

9. Marcus Smith suggested that the Executive Committee should take up the issue of the censuring of the administration by the AAUP and what, if any, appropriate response the faculty through the senate should make to that action. If we decide to ignore it, then that should be a public action. But we cannot walk around the issue.

Fr. Gerlich asked what the sense of the senate was on the subject.

Dr. Koplitz stated that it’s a great idea.

Dr. Ewell stated, “I think he’s right about that. That’s the elephant in the room. We can’t ignore it. We can say we pass, or we can’t agree on a response, but we at least have to say it’s there.”

10. Fr. Gerlich asked if there were any more items. Dr. Koplitz recalled that there has not been a call for nominations from the Provost’s Office for the Dux Academicus for 2007.

Dr. Rodriguez remembered that when the Executive Committee asked about it during meetings with the President and Provost last year they were told several times that it was a senate award, but this is not the case. It’s a university award.

Fr. Gerlich stated that we need to request information about these issues from the administration. We do not determine these things, but we can ask where they stand.

[Secretary’s Note: A call for nominations for the Dux Academicus Award was issued by the Provost on Sept. 21]

Dr. Kondkar asked about the status of the Senate Awards.

Dr. Rodriguez mentioned that they have not been given for two years.

Dr. Kondkar responded that the fault lies with us. We should put that on an agenda.

It was recalled that the Senate Awards Committee is comprised of members from senate, and the awards are in four categories (teaching, research, service, advising).

Janna Saslaw stated that she was a past chair of the committee, and has a description of the awards. She recalled that the call for nominations comes up in the spring.

Fr. Gerlich stated that the subject would be taken up in the Executive Committee meeting.

Meeting was adjourned.