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Senate Meeting Oct. 12, 2006

Called to order by the chair at 3:40

1. **Invocation was given by Father Moore**

2. **Approval of minutes-posted today Rodriguez moved to table.**

3. **Remarks from Chair**

   Regarding an interview in Interviewed Insight in Higher Education, the chair read a he had sent to representatives of the AAUP clarifying that the views he expressed in the interview were his own and did not represent the sentiment of the University Faculty Senate.

   Joe Harris also asked about representation to faculty senate. Each department should have one per each 6 full time faculty. Make sure proper representation in senate

4. **Motion**

   Motion from Glenn Hymel was introduced by Cathy Rogers who read the motion:

   WHEREAS the document titled A call for Conversation, its embedded links, and its supplemental document titled A Critique of the Pathways Plan have been publicly available for over four months; and

   WHEREAS the aforementioned documents include, but are not limited to, the identification of the following problematic areas associated with the “Pathways Plan”: (a) Process Issues/Violations with Regards to the SCAP, (b) Invalid Data Related to the Pathways Plan, and © Weak Rationale Offered to Justify the Pathways Plan; and

   WHEREAS the requested conversation with President Wildes and Provost Harris for the purpose of addressing forthrightly the specifics of process violations, invalid data, and weak rationale has yet to occur;

   IT IS HEREBY MOVED that:

   The University Senate respectfully requests that Fr. Wildes and Provost Harris and/or members of their administrative team respond by November 30, 2006 to all mistakes and concerns outlined in the aforementioned documents approved by this Senate last spring.

   Maria Calzada seconded the motion.
Maureen Shuh made a motion to suspend the rules and discuss and vote on the motion. Second Elizabeth Hammer No opposing views. Agenda has been changed.

**Discussion:**

Francis Coolidge spoke in favor of the motion. He noted that it is important for Provost office take seriously the concerns of the senate.

Mauren Shuh made a comment that documents were unanimously approved.

Provost Harris requested a list of invalid data and process issues.

Joe Harris commented that he would like E. C. to meet with Harris to clarify points to be discussed.

Tim Cahill asked when will the E.C. would meet with the Provost?

Joe Harris commented that the executive committee meets next week and meeting with Provost can be arranged.

Conrad Raabe called the question and was seconded by Lynn Koplitz. Motion passes with 24 yeas 2 neys and 1 abstention.

5. **Motion**

A was presented by Maureen Shuh:

The University Faculty Senate objects to the formation of the Presidential Task Force which will serve to review the governance processes of the University, a function that should be done by the Faculty Senate which has representatives from all colleges.

**Discussion**

Comments on the motion by MaureenShuh: Huns received a request by Dean to create a Leadership taskforce-one elected person from each college and one appointed person from each college. Maureen felt that the issues of this taskforce can be addressed by the Senate.

Joe Harris pointed out that this was Dean Scully's idea.

Provost Harris clarified that Scully met with him and the President and suggested the formation of an advisory board to get feedback. Provost thought it to be a good idea and suggested some of these reps be elected. He said it was not a leadership taskforce but an "advisory" taskforce.
Tim Cahill noted that dean suggested this during a filibuster at the College Assembly of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences. He noted that no comments were given and the motion was never voted on.

Scariano asked why is it necessary to elect members?

Provost Harris said it does not have to be elected.

Steve Scariano asked why not have an all be elected Committee.

Provost Harris commented that the intent was to ensure broad representation.

Maureen Shuh pointed out that the Senate represents the University and asked why another committee, why not use the senate?

Harris pointed out that the intent was to have conversations.

Conrad Raabe asked if there was any reference of this committee. He pointed out many don't know about the task force. Coolidge-applauded the dean and Provost for this initiative. He is concerned about constitution of committee. Significant problem issues brought up by SCAP may not be carried by this committee for lack of information. Who we have in the committee is crucial.

Connie Rodriguez pointed out that the reason for the committee is problematic. Senate is advisory and can elect an ad hoc committee to do just this.

Mike Sibley noted that this is not an either or process. If Dr. Harris and Fr. Wildes want to form a committee they can do so. Senate can also give advise.

Elizabeth Hammer commented that the administration should try to work within our existing structures.

Robert Gnuse mentioned that this committee must be perceived as representing the faculty. That is what the senate is.

Alice—even if members are appointed by deans they should be senators-compromise

Klebba—maybe Provost and President could accept EC as this advisory group. Provost thinks Senate as sounding board is fine. President started having conversations with faculty. You don't mean we should not be having informal conversations with faculty. Koplitz—place to start having these conversations is executive committee of the senate.

Provost said this is already in the works. This term "leadership" was only used in the college of humanities and natural sciences.
Joe Harris said this has not come up in other colleges.

Alice said Ed asked for a member to serve in an advisory committee

Elizabeth hammer suggested a change language to Provost and President informal conversation committee.

Koplitz proposed a friendly amendment that they use EC as the core of this committee.

Conrad Raabe asked what is the purpose of this advisory committee? We have structures like SCAP, We don't need to create more committees.

Mark Gossiaux mentioned that this effort was made in good faith by dean. we don't know enough about the taskforce to object to it.

Michele Pope noted that getting to speak with Prof. Wildes was hard enough and, as a result, we are potentially creating another point of contact that supercedes the Senate. this committee would usurp the power of the senate.

Tim Cahill noted that the President did not make any SCAP meetings last spring. Especially at the end of the semester when time was short. He asked what would happen if the president and provost received conflicting advice? It seemed the confusion would muddle the problem.

Maureen Shuh accepted Dr. Hammer's amendment and turns down Koplitz amendment.. The motion

Raabe rewrite Maureen accepts change. Provost-nothing to do with the review of governance.

Mike Sibley objects with Raabe's efforts to define governance structures. Joe says that President can create any taskforce. Rodriguez. faculty handbook- says how faculty, administration and staff work in tandem. To step aside is unacceptable.

Father Gerlich agrees with Rodriguez, but here is on informal discussion group. this group does not help the fact that procedures were not followed and there was a break in the trust. Let them do whatever they want. In the end we have the same problem, a discussion group does not help with the issue, namely that procedure was not followed and that broke a line of trust. If that issue is raised by the advisory group but we are discussing two different issues, let the administration call whoever they want. Our message does not change-procedures were not followed.
Francis Coolidge agreed with Fr. Gerlich. On the other hand trust is at an all time low—we need to hold the administration accountable. Perhaps this is another channel that will help restore trust. Dr. Coolidge expressed concern with way the committee will be formed, but he speaks against the motion ask because he still sees hope that a group could help rebuild the trust which has been lost.

Conrad Raabe notes that a committee meets at pleasure of chair. A taskforce meets at will of the creator. If a committee is not constituted by faculty and chaired by faculty we have a problem.

Michele Pope Feeling that this body did not have a voice, this group should not have a voice in competition with Senate. She would like people to be in support of the senate, to report back to the senate allowing the senate have input.

John Murphy agrees that conversation should happen within the senate.

Joe Harris asked if we needed clarification from Scully?

Maureen Shuh commented that the dean sent a long clarification. The Dean mentioned that while it started in HuNS-everyone else will see this proposal later.

Provost Harris commented that everyone else had already submitted names.

Maureen—so many bodies can provide advice. Why do we need yet another taskforce?

Cathy Rogers asked if the names from other colleges knew they were going to be members of a "Leadership" taskforce?

Provost Harris commented that he does not think so.

John Murphy points out that it is the thrid year in a row with a group with a similar name.

Scariano administration does not have a pulse on faculty. group may bring recommendations and administration would use it as the will of the faculty. Yet another taskforce threatens the faculty governance structure of the University.

Robert Gnuse noted that the faculty senate is the perfect forum. Existing structures are representative. Stay with existing structures

Cathy Rogers noted that everyone has to feel like they can participate in the discussion. The spirit of the motion is that the administration have to listen to us and work with our structures. The danger we face is to be further divided. The wrong opinion may be brought forth. Appointing people to have

Conrad Raabe—proposes substitute motion:
The University Senate applauds the call for conversations between the faculty and the administrators, but rejects circumventing already existing structures in the Handbook designed to advise said administrators of faculty sentiment.

Maureen Shuh accepted the substitute motion.

Cathy Rogers called the question and was seconded.

The senate votes unanimously to call the question

The senate then voted on the motion, the motion passes (26 yeas, 1 nay)

Old Business

6. Program Review Criteria

Tim Cahill noted that the criteria for program review was sent to the senate for approval and/or modification.

Joe Harris noted he will investigate

Rodriguez noted there was a report submitted by the committee

Tim Cahill noted that the criteria for program review passed to the senate from SCAP needs to be reviewed and, most crucially, weighted and approved by the senate.

Joe Harris said that he will reconvene the subcommittee.

New Business

7. Motion

Connie Rodriguez introduced the following motion. Motion was second by Steve Scariano.

1. WHEREAS Kevin Wm. Wildes, S. J. – hereafter known as the President – has not provided competent leadership of Loyola University New Orleans before, during and after Hurricane Katrina; and
2. WHEREAS the President has **not** effectively used the shared governance structures and procedures mandated by the Faculty Handbook in making decisions about our future; and

3. WHEREAS the President has **not** followed procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook in terminating tenured faculty members; and

4. WHEREAS the President has **not** exhibited competent leadership in formulating and articulating an inspirational academic vision that students, staff, and faculty can embrace and nurture; and

5. WHEREAS the President has **not** provided any evidence that the strategic planning process or emerging plans will ensure a stronger Loyola University New Orleans; and

6. WHEREAS the President has **not** facilitated avenues of two-way communication with Loyola’s students, staff, faculty, and community at large, regarding the formulation and implementation of his vision and plans; and

7. WHEREAS the President has **not** fostered an environment which engages and empowers students, staff, and faculty to commit themselves to a future at Loyola University New Orleans; and

8. WHEREAS the President has **not** cultivated a sense of trust and confidence regarding his stewardship of a healthy, vital Loyola University New Orleans;

BE IT RESOLVED AND PROMULGATED THAT the faculty of the University Senate hereby asserts a vote of **NO** confidence in President Kevin Wm. Wildes, S.J.

8. **Academic Affairs Committee**

Academic Affairs committee of board is meeting tomorrow. Joe Harris was invited to attend. Kate Adams said the senate has representation. Elizabeth said she and I would attend. Lynn asked if others could attend as guests. Kate Adams commented that others can be guests by invitation. Conrad Raabe noted that there were ex officio members, deans, and the senate has two elected members.

9. **Loyno.info Website**

Kate Adams expressed concern that communication is very important. she noted that the website and blog have degraded collegiality. We should agree to agree and disagree with collegiality and personal responsibility. We should think about impact posts on the blog may have on parents, students, grantors..

10. **Finance Committee of the Board**
Marcus Kondkar and Thom Space returned from finance committee of the board. For now Marcus summarized three points (1) we will have a balanced budget for 2006-2007. (2) Salaries paid to fired faculty came out of last year's budget. (3) Projections are that we will break even on last year.

Marcus Kondkar also commented that board members on the committee are interested in fixing mistakes made in the restructuring which are costing the university revenue.

John Murphy asked for clarification on how 35 people got to Houston in December and gave a mandate for the president.

Joe Harris commented that Father Wildes said he would be happy to set up a meeting between the EC of the senate and the EC of the board to discuss this issue.

Steve Scariano made a request that Joe follow up on this.

Provost Harris asked that we think about budget and figures. He noted the budget is balanced because budget is 11 million dollars less than usual. Our Freshman class is 25% less than usual. Keep that in mind. He also commented on Conrad's substitute motion which passed earlier in the meeting. He said respects the spirit of the motion. He hopes we don't mean President cannot have informal Conversations.

Conrad Raabe called to adjourn.