University Senate Minutes for Thursday, November 8, 2007

**Biological Science**

E. L. Beard  
Maureen Shuh  
(E. L. Beard proxy)

**College of Business**

Karen Arnold  
Walter Block  
Wing Fok  
Brett Mathern  
(Karen Arnold proxy)  
Mike Pearson  
Mike Sibley

**Chemistry**

Lynn Koplitz  
(Bob Dewell proxy)

**City College**

Barbara Ewell  
(Marcus Smith proxy)

**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  
(Maria Calzada proxy)  
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  
Xuefeng Li

**Music**

Alice Clark  
James MacKay  
Janna Saslaw

**Philosophy**

Joe Berendzen  
Mark Gossiaux  
(Joe Berendzen proxy)

**Physics**

Mickey King

**Political Science**

Conrad Raabe

**Psychology**

Glenn Hymel  
Lawrence Lewis

**Religious Studies**

Robert Gnuse  
Boyd Blundell

**Sociology**

Marcus Kondkar

**Theater Arts and Dance**

Georgia Gresham

**Visual Arts**

Simeon Hunter
The meeting was called to order at 3:33 PM.

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

2. The minutes from the October 11 meeting were approved.

3. Remarks from the Chair.
   a) Master plan report – Fr. Gerlich asked Fr. Wildes to arrange some sort of meeting. Mr. Muñoz is willing. Do we want this presentation to be for the faculty as a whole or just the senate?
   b) Ignatian scholarships – Fr. Wildes checked into the situation, and the Ignatian Scholarships have been increased to match the athletic scholarships, and the whole scholarship package program is under review.
   c) Reopening of the Senior Commons – the faculty had no place to meet as a faculty. Fr. Wildes agreed that a quiet place to have lunch is important. The Senior Commons area will be open for faculty during the lunch hours.
   d) Substitution for the Dux Academicus Committee – The protocol states that the elected members from the Senate should be from different colleges, but Fr. Gerlich had forgotten to mention that last month, and we elected two members from the same college. The protocol allowed the Executive Committee to appoint someone, so Fr. Gerlich asked Wing Fok from the College of Business to serve, and Prof. Fok graciously agreed. Fr. Gerlich had asked whether Ted Cotton could also continue to serve on the committee, but he was told no, so Dr. Cotton has withdrawn from the committee.
   e) At the UPT meeting, members discussed how to address the Identity of the University, Recruitment and Enrollment (Retention), and Campus Atmosphere. Fr. Gerlich thought this was already being done in other areas of the university. He is concerned that a) the committee structure is still not functional, and b) the Faculty Handbook Committee only addresses specific requests, rather than taking on a general rewriting of the handbook. Fr. Gerlich would like us to address these issues during this academic year.

4. Reports
   a) Craig Hood reported on the University Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees (report and data sheets attached). The 2006-2007 budget had a surplus of about $500,000. For 2007-2008 a deficit of $3.3 million is projected, but one-time federal grants decrease that deficit to about $.5 million. Most of the deficit is due to a shortfall in enrollment. Dr. Hood pointed out a seeming loss of 112 juniors this year – an area of concern for the committee. Fr. Gerlich asked whether students had been lost due to discontinuance of programs. Dr. Hood replied that the committee had not addressed the reasons for the statistics. Marcus Smith noted a pattern in which it seemed there was a loss of about 100 juniors in several of the years. He asked whether the committee had looked into this, and was told that they hadn’t.
   b) Maria Calzada reported on the two recent UBC meetings. They went over the financial information just presented by Dr. Hood. The committee also learned that Loyola had reached a settlement with the insurance company for interruption of
business insurance. The amount was undisclosed due to continuing negotiation with other universities. Those funds may be used to help balance the budget in future years. Three possible scenarios were also presented for tuition increases in 2008-9 (6, 7, and 9%). They all resulted in budget deficits, assuming no salary increases and no new hires. Georgia Gresham asked whether an increase of 3-4% could be possible. Dr. Calzada replied that anything was possible. Ted Cotton asked when we would find out how much we got from the settlement for interruption of business. Someone must know because they have planned on it in budgeting. It was not known when this disclosure would come. Marcus Kondkar asked where the money to cover deficits of $3.9 million, etc. would come from, and Dr. Calzada replied that she thought it would come from the interruption of business settlement money, but she didn’t know for sure. There was further discussion of how the increases would affect juniors.
c) Dr. Calzada reported on the SCAP meeting. A new proposal for representation on SCAP was discussed. Conrad Raabe mentioned the difficulty of determining the constituency of each college and a fair method of representation. It was noted that the library has a representative on SCAP, which was not mentioned in the report.
d) Dr. Raabe reported on the constituency of the senate. The Faculty Handbook is no longer valid. For one thing, it refers to currently nonexistent colleges. The ratio was 1:6 (one rep for each six faculty members), with any fraction over three granted another representative. In late April each year we find out the constituency of the faculty. The Executive Committee decided to leave the Senate where it is for now. We are satisfied that the current Senate constituency is representative. Dr. Raabe suggested that we live with what we have for the rest of the academic year, and if anyone feels underrepresented, Dr. Raabe will vote however that area directs. Prof. Gresham asked about the increase of part-time or full-time extraordinary faculty factoring into the equation. Dr. Raabe stated that the Handbook specifies only full-time ordinary faculty. Prof. Gresham asked that we continue the discussion, including the issue of full-time equivalent faculty. Dr. Raabe responded that it has been discussed, but no conclusions have been drawn yet, and it bears further discussion. Dr. Clark suggested that the Handbook at some time require an annual review of membership. Prof. Gresham added that full-time extraordinary people are now taking the place of tenure-track faculty. Dr. Raabe responded that one argument is that part-time people don’t have a long-time interest in the university, but he felt that this argument fails when one looks at the long-time extraordinary folks in English and music. Stephen Higginson asked whether anyone was currently disenfranchised, and Dr. Raabe replied no, and added that in April we will have an exact count of ordinary faculty. Mary McCay added that in English the part-time person is hired semester to semester and their full-time extraordinary people get a full-year contract. Dr. Raabe continued, “So the problem really is one of how you define those who have a long-time vested interest in the future of this university. And, you know, we may have part-timers who have been here forever. And what do they call them, the academic proletariat – these are people who are truly abused, and I feel sorry for them, but they don’t qualify actually as ordinary faculty.” He will do the arithmetic again in April when we get the final figures. Walter Block asked why Dr. Raabe called the part-timers abused – didn’t they take their jobs voluntarily? Presumably they consider this the best job for them, or they would have taken another
job. Dr. Raabe replied that he disagreed with that. Janna Saslaw asked whether a motion to continue the present senate representation until April was now necessary. Dr. Raabe suggested that a motion should be made to keep the present configuration of the Faculty Senate in place and reopen the discussion in April. Fr. Gerlich made the motion. A motion was made to suspend the rules to present this motion, and it passed. The motion was made, and it passed.

5. Fr. Gerlich asked that one more item be considered – the form of the meeting with Mr. Muñoz. The meeting of the board with Mr. Muñoz dealt with cosmetic changes to buildings that would be made this summer. It was not clear what faculty input there had been, so Fr. Gerlich asked Fr. Wildes to request that Mr. Muñoz meet with us. Mr. Muñoz was happy, even anxious to do so. A date in January or February was proposed. The form of the meeting was up to us. The timing would be left to the Executive Committee to determine. Should Mr. Muñoz meet with the whole faculty or just the senate? Dr. Smith proposed a town hall. Others concurred. Joe Berendzen felt that perhaps just the senate would be better able to pose focused questions. Fr. Gerlich suggested a town hall and then also on the same day a meeting with the senate for questions and answers. Dr. Clark pointed out that others could attend the senate meeting if they had something to contribute. Fr. Gerlich added that the presentation could be made to the larger body and our questions could be asked based upon it. Prof. Gresham agreed. We could make it clear that people could pass their questions on to their senate representatives. Fr. Gerlich said that there would probably be questions at the town hall as well.

Dr. Kondkar asked whether it had been proposed to put this money into the Danna Center and then demolish the building later. Fr. Gerlich said yes, since we’re trying to recruit students. The $2 million put into the Danna Center is meant to turn into a larger return in recruited students. According to Mr. Muñoz, the building otherwise is a disaster. It should be torn down. Dr. Smith asked, what about $2 in endowed professorships? Oxford and Cambridge have pretty dingy buildings. We are neglecting investing in programs. The number given in the meeting is that our attrition rate is 24%, and the board is being told that you have to do something to hold students. What can we do that is cheap enough, that will be effective? Students are spoiled and want amenities and a comfortable physical environment. Dr. Smith suggested that we accelerate the replacement. Fr. Gerlich responded that this was discussed. Mr. Muñoz will have to explain this. They’re looking at a timetable of when the money will arrive. Fr. Gerlich recapitulated that we would hold a town hall with Mr. Muñoz and then a meeting with the senate. Dr. Smith asked that the proposal be placed on the web. It was stated that the proposal was not in digital format, and Mr. Muñoz might not want it to be that public. Dr. Clark suggested putting it on the faculty intranet, which is equally as public as it is now. Fr. Gerlich said he would ask for that.

6. A statement from Fr. Wildes dealing with faculty raises was distributed (attached), which he had wanted to present in person, but a meeting with Governor-elect Jindal prevented his appearance. Fr. Wildes wanted to counter a rumor that it had been
agreed upon that there would be no raises this year. Dr. McCay had asked Rhonda Cartwright whether it was assumed that there would be no raises, and Ms. Cartwright said no. Dr. Calzada agreed that this was her understanding of the UBC meeting. Dr. Kondkar read the report to mean that the budget was calculated without including raises, but that if the disaster loan program comes through then we could have raises. Fr. Gerlich replied that the disaster loan program was for students. Dee Harper added that there would be assessments of enrollment in the spring, and apparently from this statement also in late summer. Dr. Calzada recalled that the educational disaster loan program was not for students but to refinance our debt. Dr. McCay agreed, and stated that it would free up money for other things. Mike Pearson urged further discussion of what we can do to attract more students. Fr. Gerlich said that we can have appropriate speakers address this issue. Dr. Higginson agreed that we should be spending a lot of our time talking about that, and there should be close scrutiny about why we are unable to turn things around when other schools in the city have done better.

The meeting was adjourned.