Minutes of the October 11th Meeting of the University Senate

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

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

**Chemistry**
*Lynn Koplitz*

**City College**
*Barbara Ewell*
(Dee Harper, proxy)

**Communications**
Anita Day

**Criminal Justice**
*Dee Harper*

**English**
Kate Adams
*Ted Cotton*
*Marcus Smith*
(Dee Harper, proxy)

**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*
(Kassia Saxton, 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*
*Boyd Blundell*
(Robert Gnuse, proxy)

**Sociology**
*Marcus Kondkar*

**Theater Arts and Dance**
*Georgia Gresham*
(Janna Saslaw, proxy)

**Visual Arts**
Simeon Hunter
The meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM.

1. Invocation by Fr. Robert Gerlich, S. J.

2. The minutes from the September 13 meeting were approved.

3. Remarks from the Chair.
   a) There have been some changes in the senate meeting dates for spring. The first meeting in January has been moved from the 10th to the 24th. There will be no meeting in February because the original date fell during Mardi Gras.
   b) Constituency of the Senate – Conrad Raabe is looking into it for SCAP as well. He needs more time. Next month he will have a much clearer idea and will present a report then.
   c) Status of the Ignatian Scholarships. The president was not sure about the amount compared to athletic scholarships. He will check into this. Fr. Wildes felt that the Ignatian scholarships should be our highest scholarships.
   d) The president also said he hoped to attend the senate meeting, and will attend as many of these meetings as possible.
   e) Master Plan – The president reports that Henry Muñoz will have a more detailed presentation for the board this week on the master plan. He has consulted with the University Space Allocation committee, as well as the Classroom Enhancement Committee, and will do so again. Fr. Wildes asked if it would be helpful at some time in the near future to do a presentation-discussion with some group of the faculty. Fr. Gerlich told him that the Faculty Senate should be given a presentation over the Muñoz plan. We’ve had very little direct input. The president agreed to do so.

Questions:
Lynn Koplitz asked whether the University Space Allocation Committee met. An article in the Maroon said they hadn’t met.
Walter Harris stated that Muñoz did meet with those committees.

4. Reports:
   a) SCAP Motion for a joint committee (attached).
      Fr. Gerlich related that this is a motion by SCAP from April 2007 calling for a joint SCAP-Senate subcommittee to examine program review criteria. Tim Cahill (not here this semester) and Maria Calzada (not available today) were involved with this. She sent this piece of information for our consideration. He asked if we still have a subcommittee that was looking into these agenda items. It was stated that we had one. It was an ad hoc committee. Dee Harper was chairing it, Marcus Kondkar, Bob Gnuse, and Alice Clark were members.

Fr. Gerlich asked if they would be willing to carry this forth and meet with SCAP, because they have the greatest background in this. Dr. Kondkar said, “Sure.” Fr. Gerlich continued to say that this was SCAP’s recommendation. It will not go anywhere until the two groups get together and meet. Dr. Kondkar clarified that we have a SCAP document, and a senate document, and we need to join the two together. There is a SCAP subcommittee: Dr. Raabe, Mark Gossiaux, and David Moore are on it. The idea is to meet with the Senate subcommittee and iron out the matter. David Moore is the chair. Fr. Gerlich then said that we need to contact him to set up a time so we can move forward on that.

Dr. Kondkar asked whether these were the only two points where the two proposals diverge from one another. Dr. Gossiaux stated that there is a document, prepared by the Provost’s office, on which one can track the changes.
Fr. Gerlich asked Dr. Harper if he and Dr. Gossiaux could discuss this and pass information where necessary. He also asked to have a preliminary report for the next meeting.

b) Revisions to the Faculty Handbook (FH). (Documents attached)

Dr. Kvet, speaking for the Faculty Handbook Committee (FHC), explained that these were all items addressed last year. The first two are complete revisions to Ch. 11 of the FH. The first is from the library faculty, the second is from the law library faculty. Both documents emanated from these faculties to the committee, the FHC went through, asked for some revisions, sent them back, the faculty approved the revisions, it came back to the FHC, and they approved them. A lot of it was trying to put the two [university library and law library] documents in sync. There weren’t many substantial changes. The third item is a policy for maternity leave from 1993, brought to the committee to place it in the FH. Maureen Shuh brought it to the committee.

Dr. Shuh stated that the policy was signed by President Carter, but it never went to the Senate and the Board. Yet all of us have used the policy. It’s just not in the FH. Human Resources does not have a maternity leave. For staff, maternity leave is sick leave. Pregnancy is an illness at this university. Since this (faculty) policy has been in practice, she felt it was time to vote whether the Senate would like this to be in the FH, and then forward it to the board and let them decide whether they want it in the FH or not.

Dr. Kvet also recalled the concerns of the committee that in absence of policy you then have different interpretations. He stated that it’s pretty important that there is a policy.

Dr. Kvet then turned to his fourth item. There is a fairly detailed Human Resources manual that covers all sorts of university policies from affirmative action to conflict resolution, etc. The FHC had not formally signed off on these policies. He added, what you see is all of those sections in which faculty were involved, whether as individuals or groups. He presented these subsections and the FHC’s vote on them.

Dr. Kvet’s last item was an update of the FH to reflect the current policy on Accidental Death and Dismemberment.

Fr. Gerlich called for questions. He inquired if this was part of the overall revamping of the FH. Dr. Kvet said yes, and emphasized that the charge of the committee is to react to items sent to the committee. The law and university libraries recommended the changes. It is not the committee’s role to review the FH, it reacts to others telling it to do so. Dr. Kvet asked for a motion to accept the recommendations and then vote on it at a later meeting.

There was a motion to suspend the rules to vote on this now. It was seconded. A vote was taken and the rules were suspended. Fr. Gerlich asked if there were questions.

Dr. Kondkar asked whether the maternity leave policy had been altered by the FHC. Dr. Kvet replied, no, this is a copy of the 1993 policy. Dr. Kondkar asked for a copy of the policy, and it was discovered that the senate members were not sent one. Dr. Kvet then read the policy. “It is eight weeks of maternity leave with full pay for faculty or staff for either the birth or adoption of a child, and an option for faculty of 16 weeks at half pay.”

Alice Clark noted that the policy says “faculty or staff,” but Dr. Shuh had stated that staff weren’t included. Dr. Kondkar pointed out that Loyola can’t go around federal
requirements for maternity leave. Dr. Shuh explained that Federal Law states that right
now, it is, for private employees, sick leave. You can do above that. It used to be that staff
got eight weeks. Recently, Sue Messner changed that and eliminated the eight weeks for
staff. This was right before she left. Dr. Clark stated that since the FH isn’t binding on
staff, in a way it doesn’t matter what we do, but if we approve this policy, it actually says
staff. Dr. Shuh offered to eliminate the words “and staff.” Dr. Clark and Dr. Koplitz
concluded that we should not do so.

There was discussion of whether the senate was discussing the details of the actual policy
or simply talking about including this verbatim in the FH. It was concluded that we were
considering the language as given.

Dr. Koplitz asserted this should be in the FH. We get new people in HR, and they don’t
know where to look for the policy.

Dr. Kondkar asked whether we have a paternity leave. Dr. Koplitz said no.

Fr. Gerlich asked if the question could be called. The vote was split, so Fr. Gerlich broke
the tie and opted to continue the discussion.

Bob Dewell asked if any of these HR changes affect the age of tuition waivers for children.
Dr. Kvet and Dr. Shuh didn’t think so. Dr. Shuh looked up the HR website and confirmed
that children have to be IRS legal dependents.

After an inquiry about what the FHC amended in that section (4-18), Dr. Kvet determined
that the changes referred to staff taking classes and eliminating a redundant clause relating
to tuition exemption for spouses and dependent children.

Dr. Dewell thought there was a new age limit for dependent children. In the ensuing
discussion it was determined that IRS legal dependents have graduated requirements, they
can be above 22, but must be below a certain earned income threshold.

A question arose as to procedure. Fr. Gerlich stated that we can’t vote to change the
wording, but if we vote against this, it would be implicit that we were not happy with the
wording. Dr. Kvet recommended that if we don’t like one section, we exclude just that one
subsection from the total. When asked what would happen if we didn’t accept the proposed
amendments, he speculated 1) nothing would happen and the policy would still continue, or
2) we might make a recommendation to refer this back to the Fringe Benefits Committee
and they might begin to address those concerns. We can recommend whatever we want,
but it needs to go to another group.

Richard Snow explained that the reason he asked to suspend the rules now is that the
library wants to bring in some new hires, and they don’t want them to enter under the
present handbook, which has some discrepancies in time and rank.

After discussion of whether to vote only on the first three items, Fr. Gerlich asked how
many felt that we should send the whole thing forward. A motion to call the question was
made and seconded. The amendments were accepted by a vote of 25 in favor, two
opposed, and referred to the Board of Trustees.

5. Elections:
Fringe Benefits Committee: Kendra Reed and Cassandra Mabe were elected by unanimous vote.

Dux Academicus Committee: Fr. Gerlich had been notified by Roger White that we need to elect two members. Dr. Kopplitz recalled that the previous Dux was on the committee, as was the senate chair and an appointee of the senate chair. Dr. White had not yet clarified the situation. Fr. Gerlich received the following from Dr. White: the committee was to consist of a representative from the provost’s office, two ordinary faculty members elected by the faculty senate, an alumnus or alumna (appointed by the alumni association), the SGA president, the senate chair, and an appointee from the Board of Trustees. Dr. Kopplitz (the previous Dux winner) and Ted Cotton were elected by unanimous vote.

University Board of Review. Fr. Gerlich explained that we have a University Board of Review and a University Board of Appeals. We have four members on each, and we need two members for the BoR. The BoR takes the initial cases, passes judgment, and, should there be an appeal, it goes then to the Board of Appeals. Dr. Kondkar mentioned that they’re trying to streamline the process. Most of the everyday cases will be streamlined to Student Affairs, so the BoR will get only the most serious cases. The meetings should be less frequent in the future. Richard Snow and Bob Gnuse were elected unanimously.

6. New Business

The AAUP Censure. Fr. Gerlich stated that this is the motion that the Executive Committee proposed at its meeting. We would read it today, and unless the rules are suspended, we would take it up at the next meeting.

[reads wording – attached]

Dr. Kopplitz moved to suspend the rules. The motion passed, 18 for, five opposed.

Discussion:

Dr. Kondkar suggested that it has been taken for granted that the AAUP censure has had an affect on student enrollment. It might just be the wording, but can we make the case that it has affected student enrollment? It was suggested that we could put in some verb form referring to potential future affects on enrollment. In the past, most people wouldn’t know the censure had occurred, but in the age of the internet that’s not the case. High school counselors might notice. A suggestion to remove the phrase was not accepted by Dr. Saslaw, but the wording was changed to “could affect future student enrollment” since that’s our concern. It was mentioned that we don’t even know if it will affect student enrollments. We can’t show a causal link. Catholic U. has been under censure since 1991. Their enrollments are perfectly fine. Their endowment has increased. Fr. Gerlich said it all depends on the nature of the censure.

It was commented that it was not the censure that created the problems mentioned in the motion. Other factors did that. We should not throw the blame. If the Senate urged the president and administration that censure is a very serious thing and we as the faculty senate feel we should take every possible way to get off of it, we could have a 100% vote. Fr. Gerlich stated that it was not the intention in the writing of this in the EC to place blame. It was simply meant to state a fact. There is a morale problem. There are potential recruitment problems of faculty. Period. It was suggested that those problems existed before. Dr. Saslaw responded that the EC was asked to make a motion related to the AAUP censure, and that’s what they did. Other issues would need to be discussed separately.

Wing Fok stated that he had been on the recruitment trail for the past three-four months, and at no time did prospective faculty candidates mention censure. Dr. Harper then read an email
from a person interested in applying for a deanship here. It refers to negative publicity that the universities of New Orleans have received in the past year with respect to shared governance. The letter asks, “Is tenure real?” Dr. Harper thinks it’s out there. There are some real problems. It was added that some avenues for faculty position announcements will not accept ads from schools under censure.

Jim Klebba felt that AAUP ignored certain crucial facts that were provided by the administration in the context of the history between the senate and the administration.

Discussion of the wording of the motion ensued. Dr. Kopitz suggested changing “created” to “contributed to,” but this did not end up in the final wording. The word “serious” was removed. The phrase “and the AAUP chapter at Loyola” was added to the second part.

It was confirmed that, in this motion, it was not the intention to assign blame or even to implicitly assume the correctness of the censure.

The vote to call the question was accepted. The motion was read and accepted by a vote of 22 in favor and four opposed.

The meeting was adjourned.