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I. The Chair, John Murphy, called the meeting to order at 3:35.

II. President Wildes offered the invocation.

III. The minutes for March 9th were approved as corrected.

IV. Administrative Business
Since the process had been inadvertently omitted from the agenda, Nancy Dupont moved that the committee to name the recipients of Senate Awards (in teaching, research, advising, and community service) be elected electronically. Georgia Gresham seconded and the motion was approved.

With the resignation of Ed Kleist, Maria Calzada was elected unanimously to complete his term as Senate representative to the UPT.

V. Reports
John Murphy reported on the UPT meeting of March 22, 2006. [Full report attached.]

--Provost Walter Harris reported the success of the SACS review and the enthusiastic approval of the QEP. The approval of two new programs was announced: a master’s in United States law in the School of Law and a certificate in international logistics in the College of Business Administration.

--Vice-president for Business and Finance Rhonda Cartwright reported the current deficit to be $15-$16 million, with $5.1 million in physical damage from Katrina. Insurance may not cover recreational facilities and churches (our most damaged structures), and termination of business insurance (about $15 million) may take three years to collect.

--Dean of Admissions Debbie Steiffel reported that applications for admissions are running at about half their pre-Katrina numbers. Admissions will continue through the summer to meet the goal of 700 incoming freshmen. It is assumed that since the 580-600 admits to date applied after Katrina, they will produce a larger than usual yield of students.

--Jerry Goolsby presented “a draft with dissent” from the UPT subcommittee on committee effectiveness, which has been charged with developing the recommendation from the task force on shared governance to consolidate the functions of SCAP, UPT, and UBC. After further revisions and approvals, the proposal will be submitted to the Handbook Committee. [A copy of the complete draft can be obtained by email to Professor Goolsby: jgoolsby@loyno.edu.]

Maria Calzada reported on the SCAP meetings in February and March.
--At the meeting of February 14th, Tim Cahill called for the development of procedures during unexpected university closures to ensure faculty participation in decision-making; a subcommittee to create such procedures was formed.

--At the March 21st meeting, programs in law and business (noted in the UPT report above) were approved, and a proposal for a Ph.D. in counseling was introduced.

--At the special meeting of March 23rd, the discussions of the criteria for the program review continued. Some of the recommended changes were incorporated into the Provost’s criteria, which was available on the Provost’s website April 5.

--At the March 28th meeting, a motion was passed to bring the program review criteria to the University Senate for approval and/or modification.

Steve Scariano asked, as a point of clarification, if SCAP’s unanimous recommendation was merely to accept the criteria and forward them to the Senate or if it was to approve them as the president’s letter to the faculty of April 6 indicated. President Wildes then apologized for his misunderstanding and agreed to correct the mistake publicly.

Mary Blue noted that the Handbook requires that either the Senate or SCAP create or approve any criteria for reviewing academic programs that involve program discontinuance or financial exigency. Provost Harris indicated that the data to support the criteria would be posted Friday, April 7th, with the “blueprint” for structural changes to be posted on Monday, April 10th.

Steve Scariano observed that unless a rationale is linked to the data, the data will be meaningless; Provost Harris replied that the data will be made available Friday.

Marcus Kondkar pointed out that the SCAP document closely resembles the previously posted criteria and asked if further review was necessary before a vote for approval. Maria Calzada then clarified the specific differences: a change in the order of the criteria, a new first paragraph allowing more flexibility in applying the criteria; an omitted ambiguous sentence (p. 2); and a long footnote (p. 3).

Mary Blue expressed concern that the document fails to include any rationale or guidelines for discontinuing tenured positions.

Tim Cahill (guest and member of SCAP) emphasized that despite SCAP’s disapproval of portions of the criteria, the committee believed the Senate must be involved in the process.

Georgia Gresham asked which points were of particular concern to SCAP; Cahill replied that the document lacks information about weighing and ranking the
criteria, about their relation to mission, and about a methodology for comparing program expenses.

Steve Scariano pointed out that the Senate is being asked to review and approve a complex process in a very short time. He then moved that a subcommittee be formed to review the document and data carefully so that the Senate can reach an informed decision. The motion was seconded and discussion continued.

Barbara Ewell asked if there was any point to a review of the criteria and the data at this point, since the results of the program review will itself be issued in three days.

Mary Blue added that the national office of the AAUP has emphasized that any criteria that are to be used to eliminate academic programs and associated tenured faculty (rather than for continuing evaluation) must be generated and approved through the processes outlined in the Handbook; she noted that those processes are not being followed in the present review.

Georgia Gresham said that many faculty think that the process has not been sufficiently inclusive and suggested that the committee postpone its review until the report is released to better respond to the problems of procedure, as well as to those of restructuring and elimination of faculty and programs.

Alice Clark asked if SCAP believed that the intent of these criteria is for continuing evaluation or only an ad hoc review. Dr. Harris responded that it was his intent to use the criteria as part of a continuing review process. Marcus Smith asked if the criteria are being applied to all colleges or only A&S, to which Dr. Harris responded all colleges.

Robert Gnuse (guest) said the Senate has to take sufficient time for a serious review or jeopardize its own credibility. Steve Scariano observed that given its hasty development and implementation, this review resembles a reaction to crisis more than an ongoing evaluation process. Dee Harper noted that the criteria themselves might be unobjectionable, but unless they are linked to specific data and clear measures, they are ineffectual.

Larry Moore (also a member of the Board of Trustees) explained that the Board had asked the administration for a restructuring plan by February; when it was not provided, the Board insisted that the final date at which it would accept a completed plan for restructuring would be its May meeting.

Steve Scariano asked why the plan had not been presented to the faculty in March. Dr. Harris replied that in order to begin discussions, he had provided SCAP a draft of the criteria in January. The revised criteria had been posted on the provost’s website, and since March 20, the university community had been asked to relay its responses to its SCAP representatives.
Nancy Dupont questioned how seriously the Senate’s opinion of the criteria was being solicited, since the results of the whole process would be released the following Monday. President Wildes reiterated the May deadline set by the Board and indicated that the draft of the review posted on Monday would be available for further input and advice. Nancy Dupont replied that, that being the case, it was incumbent upon the Senate to give its advice, despite the short timeframe.

Connie Rodriguez asked why the criteria did not mention tenured faculty. Provost Harris responded that programs were central to the process, and President Wildes added that the Handbook was clear about tenured faculty.

Robert Gnuse asked what the Board expected by May, and Larry Moore responded that they expected definitive recommendations.

Joseph Ganitsky said that since the Senate has been given an opportunity to provide feedback, it should comply; he argued that despite the short time frame, a proper review can occur.

Eric Gorham asked for clarification of the first paragraph of the document, since it essentially allows the administration to ignore the criteria altogether. He recommended its deletion. Maria Calzada and Provost Harris explained that the paragraph had been added after SCAP’s meeting and reflected ideas articulated at SCAP, although there had been no consensus or agreement about them.

Steve Scariano suggested a motion to strike the paragraph, but Elizabeth Hammer argued that unless the Senate were to approve the criteria before constituting the review committee under discussion, such an action was unnecessary.

Ralph Tucci said that the criteria do not take into account the distinctive strengths of different programs. Mary Blue noted that no votes had been taken on any of the criteria to resolve conflicting opinions in SCAP. She pointed out that the criteria lacked adequate measures, that the data had not been properly collected, and that there was no appeals process.

Barbara Ewell asked why, since both the data and the report are evidently ready, are they not being released immediately. Provost Harris indicated that details were unfinished, and President Wildes said that he wanted the report released as a whole.

Grant Kaplan said that the subcommittee would be the only way to deal with the time constraints of the situation.

Mary Blue pointed out that if the Senate accepts the program review as a “done deal,” then the provisions of Chapter 9 of the Handbook will be violated. Mike
Sibley suggested that the normal processes may have to be suspended when action is necessary.

Robert Gerlich said that the committee should not simply review the work of SCAP on the criteria, but also try to determine their possible impacts on programs.

The question was called; a motion to suspend the rules was unanimously approved; then the motion to form a subcommittee to review the SCAP document was approved.

Discussion followed on the constitution of the subcommittee, and it was agreed that it include seven members, representing the colleges and A & S divisions. Robert Gnuse, Thomas Spence, Marcus Kondkar, Connie Rodruigez, Dee Harper, Alice Clark, and Alicia Hanson were appointed.

More discussion followed on the appropriateness of the process. It was argued that the development of the criteria violated Chapter 9 of the Handbook and counterargued that Chapter 16 allows SCAP to proceed as it has. Maria Calzada suggested that the document before the Senate was in accordance with both.

Joseph Ganitsky reminded the Senate that the Board’s fiduciary responsibilities require prompt action. Grant Kaplan asked whether, given the numerous concerns about the process, the Board was very concerned about following faculty protocols. Larry Moore responded that the board expects the administration to follow the handbook.

The subcommittee was encouraged to review the absence of an appeals process and the lack of well-defined and measurable criteria, especially in view of the fact that program discontinuations are at stake, decisions which should be the most carefully considered.

Provost Harris commented that there would be data available on every program that would cover a range of elements.

Dean Bromberger (guest) reminded the Senate that the draft had been in development for many weeks and that we could not expect a fully revised plan from a relatively uniformed group in a few days. It was agreed that the subcommittee would review the criteria, the data, and the blueprint and advise the Senate in making a thoughtful response and any recommendations for reconsideration.

Mary Blue moved to table all old motions until the next meeting. Motion was approved.
NEW BUSINESS
Connie Rodriguez introduced a motion of no confidence in the processes being used to create the blueprint (see attached). Marcus Smith seconded. Further discussion was postponed to the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 PM.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Report on University Planning Team meeting (March 22, 2006) by Senate Chair, John Murphy.

- Dr. Harris reported on the success of the SACS review. He reported that SACS team had approved the QEP “without reservations”. This is very unusual. The leader of the SACS team stated that if the plan is carried out successfully it might very well give Loyola national recognition.

- Two new programs were announced. They had both already been approved by the Curriculum Committee. The Law School will begin an L.L.M., a Master of Law degree, for foreign students wanting to study U.S. law. The Business Administration College will begin a Certificate in International Logistics. It was stated that the program would break even with an enrollment of 14 students and it is thought that will prove to be an easy goal.

- Rhonda Cartwright gave a report on finances. The deficit is thought to be 15-16 million. There had been 5.1 million dollars of physical plant damage from Katrina. Insurance companies are trying to claim that losses on recreational facilities and churches are not covered. Of course, most of our damage was to the recplex and Holy Name Cathedral. It is hoped that termination of business insurance in the amount of 15 million may be awarded, but that it may take three years to actually receive payment.

- Debbie Steiffel reported on admissions. Applications were about half of last years at this time. Admissions will continue throughout the summer in order to achieve the goal of a freshman class of 700.

- Professor Goolsby presented what was titled a “draft with dissent” from the UPT Effectiveness Subcommittee. This committee is fleshing out the recommendation from the Task Force on Shared Governance to combine SCAP, UPT, and UBC. Copies of the draft can be obtained by an e-mail request to Prof. Goolsby.
B. Motion by Connie Rodriguez, Senator from Languages and Cultures

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE PROCESSES USED TO CREATE THE BLUEPRINT

In a letter emailed to the Loyola Community on April 5, 2006, Fr. Wildes announced that he and other Administrators “have been hard at work the past several months developing a comprehensive, strategic blueprint to guide Loyola for the next five years.” He announced that the data for “program review” will be posted on the Provost’s web page on April 7th and that “Next Monday, April 10, [he] will be ready to provide the University community with the full details of the plan” and only then begin to get the thoughts of the Loyola community at a Town Hall meeting scheduled for April 11 from 12:30 to 1:30 pm in Roussel Hall.

Fr. Wildes’s letter refers directly to continuing “to follow the process as outlined in the Faculty Handbook” and refers to “decisions about program terminations.”

The Faculty Handbook clearly states in Chapter 9, Section E., that any proposal for discontinuing a program or department of instruction will “apply the criteria established by the University Senate.”

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.”

These sections of The Faculty Handbook are part of the contracts of regular fulltime faculty and have been recently reaffirmed in contract letters sent to faculty for the next academic year.

The Administration has not followed these and other relevant sections of the Handbook in preparing the Blueprint to be released on April 7, 2006.

Therefore, we the elected members of the Faculty Senate are unable at this time to express confidence in the process used to prepare the Blueprint.

This motion does not address the substance of any of the proposals or decisions in the Blueprint.