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I. Acting chair, Marcus Kondkar called the special meeting of the Senate to order at 3:40 p.m.

II. Lawrence Moore, S. J., offered the invocation.

III. Reports

Report of the Subcommittee of the Senate to Review Program Criteria

[The members of the subcommittee were Alice Clark, Robert Gnuse, Alicia Hansen, Dee Harper, Marcus Kondkar, Connie Rodriguez, and Thomas Spence. For complete report, see “Review Criteria” on Senate website.]

Dee Harper reported that the committee was charged with reviewing the April 5 version of “program review criteria,” the data posted on the provost’s web page, and their relationship as reflected in the Pathways Strategic Plan.

Harper explained that the program review criteria lists eight unranked categories, ordered to reflect SCAP’s discussions of their relative importance to the process. These categories are subdivided into 30 separate indicators, but the data provided by the provost addresses only addresses nine of these. No data—qualitative or quantitative—has been made available that addresses mission centrality and program quality and reputation (which are the first two review categories) or community impact in the recovery of New Orleans and the competitive advantages created by programs. Furthermore, data in three of the remaining four criteria are incomplete. The absence of evidence, particularly in the areas of mission and quality (which rank considerably higher than all others in the view of SCAP), makes it very difficult, but not impossible, to draw clear connections between the program review criteria and the strategic plan. The subcommittee concluded that perhaps all or some parts of the strategic plan are not actually based on the program review criteria, or that the inconsistencies can be explained by information that is unavailable, or by unstated factors in the decision-making.

In fact, the data does indicate that strategic cuts could be made in inefficient programs (as defined by institutional cost per student credit hours compared to other institutions) without the elimination of entire programs. The subcommittee further concluded that an effective response to the Blueprint/Pathways Plan is impossible when much of its rationale and evidence remains unavailable.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the report; the report was accepted without dissent.

Report from SCAP (Standing Committee on Academic Planning)

Bill Barnett reported on the findings of the subcommittee appointed by SCAP to examine the Pathways Plan; its members included Tim Cahill, Maria Calzada, Ralph Tucci, Alice Clark and Mary Blue, with assistance from John Sears.

The charge of the committee was to report within a week, noting that any revisions to the draft plan had to be financially neutral. Meeting intensively over Holy Week, the committee recommended several revisions to the Pathways Plan, including the retention of a single College of Arts and Sciences, the maintenance of separate departments of chemistry and physics, the retention of one (of four) computer science programs, and the retention of programs in communications, which appear to be financially productive.
committee noted that with the available data and time pressures, it was virtually impossible to determine the relationship of expenses and revenue by program. The findings of the subcommittee, which were ultimately adapted by SCAP, were also presented to the UPT (University Planning Team). In addition, SCAP recommended the retention of separate departments for physics and chemistry and for Religious Studies and the Loyola Institute for Ministry (LIM); SCAP also agreed that a much better plan could be devised with more time.

Barnett noted that businesses frequently re-organize in response to crises. But he also observed that the goal of judicious eliminations would be to grow ourselves out of the current fiscal problems.

Acceptance of the report was moved and seconded. Barnett then asked other members of the committee present to comment. Others noted that SCAP had also affirmed the university’s commitment to non-traditional students and the positive revenue of the program in broadcast production.

Margie Dermody clarified the financial status of the Department of Education, which has been portrayed as running deficits. She noted that some professors in counseling were incorrectly included in the calculation of the department’s expenses. She also pointed out that in the previous six years, the department has been awarded over $1.75 million in grants, which were used to provide computer training to Loyola faculty as well as pre-service training for over 2000 local teachers and over 60,000 K-12 students. In addition, the department provides in-service education in science, math and technology and offers coursework for music education majors. None of this service was included in the computation of the department’s revenues. She added that the Education Department provides a particularly important resource for the community in the aftermath of Katrina.

Georgia Gresham noted that the costs for elementary education should be separate from those for secondary education, since so many departments rely on the latter to enhance the opportunities for students who wish to become teachers. She argued that such interdependence supports the importance of the department of education.

The motion to accept the report from SCAP was approved.

Barnett added that while SCAP may continue to suggest revisions to the Pathways Plan, it is clear that the Board of Trustees intends to make a decision at its May meeting. He also noted that the Pathways Plan does not spell out the financial implications of the loss of seventeen tenured faculty, two from City College and fifteen from A&S. Estimates would suggest a cost savings of about 1.7 to two million dollars, while the budget deficit is projected to be $9-10 million, One would conclude that more cuts are going to be necessary, especially if there is an active hurricane season, which would mean even more drastic reductions in the entering freshman class.

Henry Folse observed that current enrollment projections do not, in fact, reflect a transformed university, but are instead based on pre-Katrina configurations and expectations. Loyola may well have a totally different set of potential students--without
broadcast operations, without a Physics Department, without City College. These changes, in addition to the perception that Loyola is in a mode of retrenchment may have an even more deleterious effect on our enrollments. Rather than solving the budgetary problems, these changes might well exacerbate them.

Mary Blue noted that procedurally, SCAP is fulfilling its duty to present its advice in writing both to the Board of Trustees and the University Senate. She suggested that the Senate should offer its own response, rather than simply approving SCAP’s recommendations. She referred to a letter from the AAUP which indicated that the decisions of faculty committees are considered presumptively valid in any sort adjudicative process; the burden of proof is on the administration to show that the process was correctly followed.

Further discussion followed on how suspending or discontinuing programs that are functioning in the black can save money for the university. Dermody noted the concerns of the Louisiana Department of Education on the discontinuation of these programs, including the certification of over 150 music students. Many students are feeling betrayed, especially given the history of Jesuit commitments to education. She also noted the efforts of faculty to develop grants to be financially efficient and to supplement student supplies.

Ewell observed that the Pathways Plan also fails to appreciate the complex nature of the programs in City College and the difficulty of simply moving them elsewhere; even programs that are meant to be sustained may well be harmed or destroyed. She added that the university has already damaged its commitment to non-traditional students by announcing the closure of City College. In fact, Pathways provides no indication of how the university plans to maintain the complex structures that serve adult students.

Deborah Poole commented that while we may not want Loyola to change, we must identify some essential cuts. She added that many staff members have already lost their jobs last fall in addition to cuts in operating expenses campus-wide.

Joseph Ganitsky noted that he has been particularly disturbed by the conduct of this process, with the administration developing an analysis and recommendations in isolation, apart from the regular faculty processes. He added that the absence of the president and provost suggested a need for greater communication between the faculty and the administration. The Senate should seek not only to have more time to develop better solutions to these painful problems, but also to insure that the analysis is objective, comprehensive and truly inclusive.

Maria Calzada said that President Wildes had asked her to convey to the Senate an apology for his absence—he had a twice-cancelled previous commitment—and a reminder of his role in organizing the meeting between the subcommittee of the Board and the Executive Committee of the Senate, which he hoped would serve as the voice of the faculty.
Robert Gerlich observed that what is most disturbing about this process is the lack of connection between the criteria and the recommendations. We have absolutely no way to judge the process because the results are never justified by the criteria. Instead, the process seems driven solely by financial concerns. We should be able to demand that whatever proposals are made, they are justified in the context of visible criteria.

Michael Ross argued that cutting programs that are in the black based on the prospect of lower enrollments seems short-sighted; only a year from now we will know which programs are actually under-enrolled in a changed university.

Grant Kaplan reminded the Senate that even the proposed budgets do not really reflect the severity of the prospective losses (which include building maintenance and administrative costs) if there is not a strong freshman enrollment. If the Board has determined that even in a severe financial crisis the endowment cannot be used, then cuts are imperative. Unfortunately, Pathways does not contemplate cutting administrative perks or reducing the highest salaries.

Ralph Tucci argued for approving the SCAP subcommittee report, which despite its shortcomings, is at least a step toward moderating the effects of the Pathways Plan.

The Chair requested that the Senate focus on providing specific input to the Executive Committee for its meeting the next day with the subcommittee of the Board of Trustees—in addition to the reports from SCAP and the Senate subcommittee, which have concluded that we do not have sufficient evidence to evaluate the plan.

Stephen Scariano pointed out that despite a range of committees with faculty representation—the UPT, the University Budget Committee (which not met this semester), and the President’s Planning Task Force, there still has not been any real communication with the faculty about these restructuring plans in a critical time. He complimented SCAP and the subcommittee for demonstrating that faculty can indeed offer timely and constructive solutions, even without the cooperation of the administration.

Report of the University Planning Team on Pathways Strategic Plan [See “Summary of UPT Comments on SCAP Report” on Senate website.]

Maria Calzada explained that the SCAP report had also been presented to the UPT, where there was a very heated discussion, since the UPT wanted to make its own response to SCAP and to the Senate. But since the time was very short, the UPT decided only to compile individual comments on the SCAP report. Frank Scully referred to a source that supported the potential for growth in computer science and also noted that the data for education falsely inflated costs by lumping graduate and undergraduate professors. Si Hendry questioned how the distinct programs in City College and A&S would be merged and the movement of economics to a College of Social Sciences. Marcel Dumestre argued that evening courses are not equivalent to full programs and support systems designed for adult students; he recommended that computer information systems be kept
because of its practical applications. The SGA also presented its analysis of eliminated programs and concluded that education and communications should be retained.

Since this material had only been available for a few hours, it was agreed that no fair assessments could be made. Blue further noted that the Faculty Handbook doesn’t really provide authority for UPT in these matters; its omission might be an oversight, but only SCAP and the Senate are presently authorized to advise the Board of Trustees.

**Report from the Department of Physics**

Creston King, chair of the Department of Physics presented a brief report (see attached) detailing the arguments for maintaining the department. He noted the large percentage of pre-med students, who require a year of physics. Retaining physics faculty only to teach these courses will mean the loss of about twenty majors. Moreover, recruitment has almost doubled while collaborative research with undergraduates in other majors has increased, and over half a million dollars in research money has been generated by the department in the last several years. Finally, since all prominent universities and especially schools in our aspirational group have strong physics programs, the faculty urges the maintenance of a separate department.

Acceptance of the report was moved, seconded, and approved without dissent.

**IV. Old Business**

Connie Rodriguez presented her motion, introduced and seconded at the previous regular meeting of the Senate, stating that the elected members of the Faculty Senate are unable to express confidence in the process used to prepare the Blueprint/Pathways Plan. This motion does not address the substance of the plan, but the flawed process by which its proposals were developed. [Complete motion attached to Minutes of April 6, 2006].

The mention of fiscal exigency was questioned, since the administration has made a point of not declaring the university to be in this situation. Rodriguez responded that the data that has been presented is largely financial, but agreed to remove the following paragraph:

“Chapter Nine also states: “Educational considerations and financial matters do not include cyclical or temporary variations in enrollments but must reflect the long-range judgments that the educational mission of the University as a whole will be maintained or enhanced by [program] discontinuance.”

The question was then called and the motion was approved as amended with two abstentions.

**V. New Business**

Connie Rodriguez offered for a approval a motion that had been unanimously passed by the College Assembly of Arts & Sciences:
1. That SCAP and the University Senate be provided all the data needed to
determine the advisability of discontinuing academic programs, including a) the
loss of revenue due to transfer of students in these programs, b) the indirect costs
associated with the programs proposed to be eliminated or suspended, and a
record of the extramural grants awarded these programs over the past five years,
AND
2. that SCAP and the University Senate be given one week to review these data
and submit comments or recommendations before action is taken by the Board of
Trustees.

The motion was seconded and discussion followed.

Marcus Smith offered a friendly amendment in the language that “SCAP and the
University Senate be provided all the data used to determine the advisability of
discontinuing academic programs.” Rodriguez accepted the amendment.

It was noted that since the subcommittee of the Board was meeting the next day, the
request for an additional week to consider the data might not be realistic. However, if the
data is in fact available, the full board would not meet until May 19, so there should be
time to obtain and analyze the missing data.

It was moved and seconded that the rules be suspended in order to vote on the motion.
The question was then called, seconded and approved. The motion was then approved as
amended with two abstentions.

Grant Kaplan asked that Vernon Gregson be allowed as a guest of the Senate to present a
motion (attached). Gregson proposed that the second section of his multi-part motion be
considered separately and first; namely,

“That the proposed Strategic Plan be put into a variety of options available for the
Program Review to be completed a year after it began, namely from January
2006- January 2007, thereby allowing orderly decisions by incoming freshmen
and present students.”

A motion to suspend the rules was made, seconded and approved. Discussion ensued on
the clarity of the phrasing “put into a variety of options,” which was explained as a way
of asking the administration to include its plan as one of several options for restructuring
that might be devised by SCAP or other university committees.

Joseph Ganitsky objected to the date of January 2007 as too late, especially since the
Board of Trustees has evidently been pressing for restructuring since February, and in
reality we are in a crisis that must be confronted as soon as possible. Gregson responded
that, in his experience, the Board might be willing to change directions and slow its
decision-making if the Senate were persuasive enough.
Nancy Dupont respectfully argued against the motion, pointing to its ambiguity and the inclusion of a timeline that is unlikely to be taken seriously. Simian Hunter noted that the Rodriguez motion accomplishes similar goals. Robert Gerlich proposed that the Executive Committee discuss the substance of the motion with the subcommittee of the Board without a formal vote.

Grant Kaplan noted the overwhelming sentiment among faculty that, not only is this process deeply flawed, but the manipulative uses of the data and the inability of the president to articulate clearly how Pathways will make Loyola a better institution call into question the competence of both the provost’s office and the president. He urged the Executive Committee to express to the Board how very little confidence remains, not just in the process, but in those executing it—especially how little time has been allowed the faculty to respond to such a serious and complex matter,

Mary Blue added that the Senate Executive Committee should remind the Board that the Faculty Handbook clearly stipulates that faculty committees must be allowed adequate time to deliberate recommendations; accordingly, if the process is invalid, the Board will face serious difficulty in any litigation that terminated faculty members might pursue.

The question was then called, seconded and approved. The motion failed with ten in favor, nineteen opposed and no abstentions. Vernon Gregson withdrew the remaining parts of his motion in favor of further advice to the Executive Committee for its meeting with the subcommittee of the Board of Trustees.

In response to a query about what changes or cuts the Senate might, in fact, be willing to endorse, Georgia Gresham replied that the SCAP proposal indicates an acceptance of cutting various graduate programs and certain aspects of the reorganization, though A&S would very much like remain intact. She emphasized that the faculty seems willing to undergo some reorganization if specific programs can be preserved.

Marcus Smith noted anecdotal evidence of students exploring other options and suggested that the mishandling of this reorganization has created anger and insecurity among the students that may well exacerbate this crisis into real disaster. It was urged that the university be saved from the Pathways Plan’s slow death by suspension, and that the administration release the creativity of the faculty to offer alternate solutions for balancing budgets and leveraging scarce resources. Marcus Kondkar pointed to the plan’s lack of information and a clearly articulated sense of mission, and said that transparency and collegiality are critical to any successful transformation of the university.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15.

--, Acting Secretary
I. Report from Physics Department on Proposed Suspension

To: Faculty Senators
From: Physics Department
Subject: Suspension of Physics major

The Physics Department at Loyola is deeply affected by the proposed changes. Arguments against the merger with Chemistry have been made effectively elsewhere. Here we would like to argue against the suspension of the physics program.

1. The proposal calls for a suspension of the physics major, but physics instruction is needed at Loyola. A large percentage of students in science programs (biology, chemistry, psychology) are in pre-med (or other pre-health) sequences. Medical schools require that the applicants complete a 1 yr course in Physics, with laboratory. For this reason, physics will not be completely eliminated from the campus. That brings a question: If we need physics faculty for the sake of pre-health programs, and if it is strongly advised to maintain a separate Physics Department, what is being saved by suspending the physics major? Are we saving really that much, considering all the damage done to the reputation of sciences at Loyola?

2. The Physics Department is 'on the rise'. Recruitment has almost doubled since the addition of new Physics faculty who are collaborating with undergraduates on interdisciplinary research linking the mathematical, physical, and biological sciences. These faculty have been awarded nearly half a million dollars in external funding for research and enhancement of teaching laboratories. Have these factors been considered in the cost analysis?

3. Physics is a fundamental science. ALL nationally prominent universities and our 'aspirational institutions' have physics programs. Physics professors are supposed to be unhappy about this proposal. After all it is our program that's being suspended and our department being eliminated. Our position is obvious and anticipated. We ask instead that you listen to other scientists on campus, to people not affected directly. We ask that you poll biologists, chemists, psychologists, mathematicians, computer scientists. If the majority of scientists on campus are of the opinion that the elimination of physics will harm the reputation of the sciences at Loyola, that it will hurt their departments, and ultimately might hurt their enrollment numbers, we ask that you reconsider your plan regarding the suspension of the physics program.

II. Motion by Vernon Gregson, Department of Religious Studies

Since Loyola suffered less damage than any other local University from Katrina; And since Loyola has a substantial endowment of more than 300 million dollars;
And because the proposed Strategic Plan, made public this time of the academic year both affecting incoming freshmen and present enrollment,

Motion
That the University Senate, in the strongest possible way, requests that the Board of Trustees:

1) guarantee that present students and incoming freshmen be able to complete all of the present majors offered by Loyola by making available the necessary courses during the next four years, beginning in Fall 2006;
2) that the proposed Strategic Plan be put into the variety of options available for the Program Review to be completed a year after it began, namely from January 2006-January 2007, thereby allowing orderly decisions by incoming freshmen and present students;
3) that all terminations of tenured faculty be put on hold so that next year’s freshmen would be able to complete their programs in four years;
4) and that tenure track faculty be evaluated and promoted, if merited, during this four year period;
5) that freshmen admissions this year remain open till we reach the 10th level of Jesuit University enrollment, or a complete class, which ever comes first.