University Senate Minutes for Thursday, September 11, 2008

**Biological Science**
*E. L. Beard*  
*(?)*

**Business (College of)**
*Karen Arnold*  
*Wing Fok*  
*Pat Lynch*  
*Chris Screen*  
*Stuart Wood*  
*Lee Yao*

**Chemistry**
*Joelle Underwood*

**Classical and Modern Languages and Cultures**
*Connie Rodriguez*  
*Bob Dewell*

**Criminal Justice**
*Dee Harper*

**Counseling**  
*(?)*

**English**
*Marcus Smith*  
*Barbara Ewell*

**History**
*Robert Gerlich, S. J.*  
*Maurice Brungardt*

**Law (College of)**
*Lloyd (Trey) Drury*  
*Rob Garda*  
*Jim Klebba*  
*Lawrence Moore, S. J.*  
*Markus Puder*

**Law Library**
*Cathy Wagar*

**Library**
*Richard Snow*  
*Alicia Hansen*

**Mass Communication (School of)**
*Anita Day*

**Mathematics**
*Maria Calzada*  
*(K. Saxton, proxy)*

**Ministry (Institute for)**
*Tom Ryan*

**Music**
*Alice Clark*  
*Meg Frazier*  
*James MacKay*  
*Janna Saslaw*  
*(Alice Clark, proxy)*

**Nursing (School of)**
*Kim Brannagan*

**Philosophy**
*Joe Berendzen*  
*Mark Gossiaux*

**Physics**
*Armin Kargol*

**Political Science**
*Conrad Raabe*

**Psychology**
*Glenn Hymel*

**Religious Studies**
*Robert Gnuse*

**Sociology**
*Marcus Kondkar*

**Theater Arts and Dance**
*Geoffrey Hall*

**Visual Arts**
*Simeon Hunt*

**Guests:**
Provost Edward Kvet  
Elizabeth Kordahl  
Sara Butler
The meeting was called to order at 3:35 PM.

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

2. The minutes from the May 8, 2008 meeting were approved.

3. Chair’s Remarks – Fr. Gerlich began with introductions of senators. Then he announced some changes to the Senate schedule. He mentioned that President Wildes has planned to attend Senate meetings on Nov. 13 and March 19. Fr. Gerlich announced as well that four more faculty representatives were needed for the restructured University Board of Review. He asked for volunteers. Similarly, the Faculty Handbook Committee is in need of two more members. Fr. Gerlich also noted that any questions about numbers of representatives on the University Senate should be addressed to Senate Secretary, Janna Saslaw. He also expressed the need for members of the Senate Awards Committee, since the awards are scheduled to be given on Jan. 23. Finally, he brought up problems with the efficacy of the university committee structure, for which Dr. Kvet has a plan.

4. Reports
   A. Provost Kvet referred to a document containing a proposed experimental restructuring of committee structure (Planning Ideas and Working Group Configurations, attached). Last year the Faculty Handbook Committee decided to look at the handbook standing committees with the aim of redoing some things. There was simultaneously a proposal from the UPT, from an ad hoc group chaired by Jerry Goolsby that looked at redoing the committee structure as well. It proposed a university wide committee that would feed into a budget committee, into a college committee, etc. The Handbook Committee was asked to review this proposal, which also went to UPT and some of the colleges. Over the summer, Dr. Kvet decided to look at the existing committees and make them more effective. UBC and UPT had gotten so large that they were in gridlock. Some committees had no student representation. Dr. Kvet’s strategy was to try to streamline membership in various committees without changing ratios of representation. He asked the Senate for its approval of his proposal for a one year experimental period.

   Connie Rodriguez was concerned that no deans were projected to be on the UBC, though they know a lot about budgets for their colleges. She was also concerned about reduction of faculty representation on the committees. Dr. Kvet replied that he was trying to create true representation of larger bodies. He felt that he was a true agent of the deans. He also stated that his proposed smaller committees retained the ratio of faculty that had existed in the larger ones. Dr. Rodriguez asked for further explanation of the Working Group on Planning. Dr. Kvet responded that this year he wants a group to look at the overall planning structure. He also needs to do some planning right away. This is why he is proposing this one year experiment. In order to use existing committees, he is using the six members of the Faculty Handbook Committee, who were working on such issues
last year, plus two more for a university wide plan. When Faculty Handbook
issues come up, the existing committee will operate without the extra two
members.

Marcus Smith was bothered by the fact that previous provosts had decided to
reorganize the committees in the name of efficiency, concessions were made, yet
the operations were not particularly efficient. In addition, Dr. Smith stated that
Dr. Kvet can fire deans, so he questioned how Dr. Kvet could represent them. Dr.
Smith also felt that the increased size of the UBC led to more information
circulating. He argued for transparency. Dr. Kvet answered that he is not the
kind of person who fires people for disagreeing with him. He wants to hear
different views. He also felt that two faculty could allow as much transparency as
four if those two inform their constituency well. Dr. Kvet stated that this all
might not work, and at the end of the year some other process would be
necessary. Dr. Smith recalled that the UBC had a steering committee recently
that brought their proposals to the larger committee. The steering committee was
the efficiency agent. He was bothered by having only two faculty on the
committee – how would they get the information to the rest of the faculty? On the
web? Dr. Kvet agreed that the web would be a good location for this information.
Conrad Raabe suggested that perhaps the minutes and proceedings of UBC could
be published on the web.

Dr. Kvet went on to mention that we are a year or two behind in budgeting. We
should be planning budgets several years in advance. He claimed that UBC was
not functioning properly.

Bob Dewell asked if it were really necessary to have all the Vice Presidents on the
UBC. Dr. Kvet responded that they represented huge constituencies. The
rationale was total university representation. Dr. Rodriguez asserted that the
faculty represented a vast constituency, and she was concerned that two faculty
members would not be able to disseminate information to that constituency. Dr.
Kvet stated that he understood her point, but felt that two members could do as
well as four. Fr. Gerlich added that committees that do not function are an insult
to the faculty. They need to be representative but also functioning. Dr. Kvet said
that the Board had requested he report in March on 1) progress on Common
Curriculum, 2) whether the university should work toward a residential campus,
3) shared governance/planning structure (long range planning), and 4) strategic
planning. So, he needs to move quickly to get this done.

Dr. Raabe asked whether votes on the committees had an impact. Were
committee members representing interests or constituents? If the former, then the
number of faculty votes didn’t matter, but if the latter, then numbers would be
significant. Dr. Kvet replied that the committee votes resulted in
recommendations to the President, who took them to the Board, but that the
committees generally came to a consensus.
Maurice Brungardt stated that the old system was broken and we need something else. But he agreed with Dr. Raabe that we need more information regarding the workings of these central committees. People need to know what’s going on so they can provide feedback. He called for this information to be online. Fr. Gerlich agreed that this would be helpful. He stated that with the steering committee, UBC members are presented with a choice between one course of action or nothing. He advocated for eliminating the steering committee and having information online, which could allow for more transparency. Dr. Brungardt agreed that this technology is crucial. Simeon Hunter asked about the relationship between the Handbook Revision Committee and planning. Dr. Kvet agreed that the relationship was a bit awkward, but the committee did occupy itself a lot last year with committee structure.

Dr. Smith asked for a quick “temperature reading” on the endowment, which he’d heard had taken a hit. Dr. Kvet wanted to defer to Jay Calamia, but confirmed that it did take a hit. More would be discussed at the next Senate meeting.

Fr. Gerlich asserted that Dr. Kvet needed to get things moving, so he proposed that we accept these changes as a one year experiment, and look at changing the handbook as a separate issue. Wing Fok asked what mechanism would indicate that the proposal was working. Dr. Kvet stated that the planning committee would start right away, and would assess by the end of the year whether this was working. Fr. Gerlich said that our representatives would be able to tell us whether it was working or not. Alice Clark expressed concern that a committee focusing on online learning would have only two teachers on it. She didn’t want that concern to derail the motion, however. Dr. Kvet pointed out that this is an ad hoc committee. Dr. Clark responded that we still need to address the standing committees.

Dr. Raabe stated that our first need is a motion to suspend the rules. Second we need to incorporate the concerns of the faculty that this is working. We want transparency. He suggested a report at every Senate meeting on how the process is working. We need feedback if we are to endorse this. Dr. Smith wanted to add a clause to the final motion that at the April meeting of the Senate we would vote on how the new structure was working. He felt this was the most radical revision of the contractual part of the handbook that he’s seen since he’s been at Loyola. He recommended a two-thirds supermajority for such a radical handbook alteration.

Marcus Kondkar made a motion to suspend the rules. It was seconded by Barbara Ewell. It passed. Dr. Ewell moved to accept this proposal in principle, with all the viva voce amendments. The new structure will be reviewed at our April meeting, and will require a supermajority to be accepted. The motion was seconded by Alice Clark. The motion passed unanimously.
Dr. Kondkar asked if elections needed to be set up for committee members now. Fr. Gerlich replied that for committees that were becoming smaller, some process would need to be found, but perhaps some moving around to committees needing members could be done. Joe Berendzen noted that on the UPT there were only five faculty members, but there were six entities (colleges and library) to be represented. Fr. Gerlich claimed he would represent HUNS. Since the committees need to start working as soon as possible, Dr. Kvet suggested that the Executive Committee could propose members. Fr. Gerlich suggested that the Senate could empower the Executive Committee to handle this in the most efficient way. Since no one objected to this proposal, Fr. Gerlich affirmed that the Executive Committee would do so.

B. Proposed change in maternity policy. Dr. Kvet related that the Handbook Revision Committee had gotten a proposal about a year ago based upon on a maternity leave policy from a 1993 memo signed by Fr. Carter. They approved it, and moved it forward to the Board of Trustees. The university attorneys determined that the policy was discriminatory, based on new law, because it only dealt with women being given leave. The attorneys took it and tried to make the language non-discriminatory. The wording presented here passed muster. Dr. Berendzen pointed out a problem in the wording of the policy, and corrections were proposed. A motion was made to suspend the rules. It passed. A motion was made to accept the policy, and it passed.

C. Service Learning. Kelly Brotzman, new director of the Office of Service Learning, introduced herself and provided some basics on service learning. She reported that service learning at Loyola is largely ad hoc and disorganized. There is, however, broad support for it. She feels that Loyola is uniquely poised to become nationally recognized for service learning, and to distinguish itself among its peers for service learning, community based learning, socially engaged teaching and scholarship. Community partners desire quality of service learning rather than quantity. At Loyola, she would like to see a move toward a semester-ahead planning model by which faculty register their service learning intentions with her office before entering a course in LORA. In this way she can work with faculty one on one to develop the right partnerships for their courses. Ms. Brotzman would be happy to talk about implementing these ideas.

5. New Business
A. Fr. Gerlich wished to bring up the motion previously passed by the Senate last year regarding AAUP censure of Loyola. The motion was presented as in last year’s wording for future discussion.

B. Fr. Gerlich asked to hear from Dr. Kvet about the evacuation procedures for Hurricane Gustav and how well they worked. Dr. Kvet responded that administrators being together to make decisions was a huge improvement over Katrina. The use of Blackboard to contact students was a great success as well. He heard many good reports. Gustav was a model hurricane for evacuation. We
knew early enough to make plans. An ad hoc group from SCAP is looking at our current protocols, what went well, what didn’t. Once that comes back we will examine Blackboard procedures. Parents appreciated our decisiveness and timing in getting information to them. Now is the right time to look at these things while they’re still fresh in our minds. Dr. Kvet felt a lot more secure this season, and gave credit to Jay Calamia and others. Dr. Smith congratulated Dr. Kvet on how he handled the evacuation. He mentioned a problem for the city – the evacuation ex post facto was unnecessary. You can’t shut a city down every year. He also mentioned the possibility of starting the fall semester later. Dr. Kvet has heard a lot about that, and would welcome Senate recommendations. If the Senate would like to have the administration investigate a later start, it might make sense. He advised faculty members to direct feedback to their SCAP representatives. Dr. Clark asked who is on the SCAP ad hoc group. Dr. Kvet replied that Maria Calzada is chairing, and other members are Lynn Koplitz and David Moore.

C. Dr. Kondkar asked what Pick-a-Prof is. Fr. Gerlich replied that we can discuss it at the next meeting, but Provost Kvet simply supplied the materials to us to indicate what kinds of things are constantly asked of him. We are not legally obliged to provide this information. We don’t need to deal with it now.


The meeting was adjourned.