Art and Design
  Benjamin Benus (2016)
  Daniela Marx (2015)

Biology
  Rosalie Anderson (2016)—proxy to Ralph Tucci
  E. L. Beard (2015)

Business
  Karen Arnold (2015)
  Walter Block (2016)
  Leo Krasnozhon (2016)
  John Levedis (2016)
  Len Treviño (2015)

Chemistry
  C.J. Stephenson (2016)
  Bill Walkenhorst (2016)

Classical Studies
  Connie Rodriguez (2015)

Counseling
  Thomas Foster (2016)

Criminal Justice
  David Khey (2015)

English
  Barbara Ewell (2016)
  Trimiko Melancon (2015)
  Timothy Welsh (2016)

History
  Maurice Brungardt (2015)

Institute for Ministry
  Michael Cowan (2015)

Jesuit Social Research Institute
  Alex Mikulich (2016)

Languages and Cultures
  Eileen Doll (2016)
  Isabel Durocher (2016)

Law
  John Blevins (2016)
  Christine Corniglia Brown (2016)—proxy to L. Moore
  Mitchell Crasto (2016)
  Isabel Medina (2016)
  Lawrence Moore, S.J. (2016)
  Craig Senn (2016)
  VACANT
  VACANT

Law Library
  Brian Huddleston (2016)

Mass Communication
  Cathy Rogers (2015)
  Bob Thomas (2016)

Mathematical Sciences
  Ana-Maria Matei (2015)
  Ralph Tucci (2015)

Monroe Library
  Teri Gallaway (2016)
  Mary Hines (2015)

Music
  Alice Clark (2015)
  Meg Frazier (2016)
  Ed McClellan (2015)
  Janna Saslaw (2016)
  Nicholas Volz (2015)

Music Industry Studies
  Jeff Albert (2016)—proxy to Janna Saslaw

Nursing
  Lisa Liwville (2015)
  Patricia Pearse (2016)

Philosophy
  Jon Alsbach (2016)
  Joseph Berendzen (2015)
  Jonathan Peterson (2016)

Physics
  Tirtho Biswas (alt. A. Kargol, 2015)—proxy McHugh

Political Science
  Peter Burns (2015)

Psychological Sciences
  Glenn Hymel (2015)
  Charles Corprew (alt. C. Nichols, 2016)—proxy Hymel

Religious Studies
  Adil Khan (2015)

Sociology
  Marcus Kondkar (2015)
  Jaita Talukdar (2016)

Theatre Arts and Dance
  Geoffrey Hall (2016)

Guests:
  Rev. Kevin Wm. Wildes, President
  Marc Manganaro, Provost
  Desiree Rodriguez, Exec. Asst. to the Provost
  Melanie McKay, Vice Provost Faculty Devel.
  Karen Rosenbocker, Parliamentarian
  Bret Jacobs, Staff Senate Chair
  James Shields, Public Affairs
  Jay Calamia, VP for Finance and Administration
  Leon Mathes, Assoc. VP for Financial Affairs
  Maria Calzada, Dean, HNS
  Mary Oriol, Director, School of Nursing
  Uriel Quesada, Associate Dean, HNS
CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m.

INVOCATION
Cathy Rogers offered an invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (5 March 2015)
The minutes from the March 5, 2015 meeting were unanimously approved.

REPORT FROM CHAIR
The Report from the Chair was distributed via email (attached here as Appendix A). Dr. Clark added to her report that the numbers she received by the Provost to determine Senate representation included only ordinary faculty. Extraordinary faculty numbers will not be available until mid-May. Based on her calculations, the numbers are substantially affected by not including extraordinary faculty. Therefore, a motion will be made to postpone elections until the August 2015 meeting. Nominations for Senate representatives to committees are still being accepted. Senators were asked to review the list of nominees that was distributed and encourage nominations from their colleagues. Senators are reminded that a faculty member does not have to be a member of the Senate to serve on a university committee. Nominations are still needed for the University Board of Appeals and University Board of Review. There were no additional questions or additions about the report.

OTHER REPORTS:
Committee Reports were distributed (attached here as Appendix B). There were no questions or additions to the reports.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST: Provost Manganaro reported that President Wildes sent an email on April 8th with an update on the long-term financial equilibrium plan. The President’s Advisory Committee has been meeting regularly with Dr. Lucie Lapovskey. Eight work groups have been formed and are also meeting regularly. There are a lot of ideas on the table being discussed. Additional data is being provided at the request of the Advisory Committee and its work groups for further review as they to continue to work on a recommendation toward long-term financial equilibrium.

For the past two years, the Committee on Intellectual Property and Policy and Rights has been meeting to rewrite the entire policy. Their work is now concluding and a draft policy will be submitted to the Senate for review prior to the end of this academic year, with the expectation for the Senate to review it early in the fall semester. He thanked everyone who served on the committee for their hard work.
REPORT FROM ROBERTA KASKEL, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT: Ms. Kaskel distributed two documents for review. One is a summary report that highlights where we are right now with undergraduate enrollment for the fall. The other is the newly designed dashboard that was developed with the help of the Enrollment Management Steering Committee and the Board of Trustees Subcommittee on Enrollment. It provides more detail about the enrollment numbers and what profiles look like for an entering class. The budget for 2015-16 is built on a first time, full-time entering class of 640 students and 130 transfer students. Today, in comparison to this time last year, deposits are tracking favorably to meet those goals. Right now we are 103% ahead of where we were this time last year with a smaller goal of 620 incoming students. There are 189 first-year students who have made deposits. Transfer deposits are at 16 compared to 10 this time last year. We are completely focused on yield. There are many upcoming visits scheduled, faculty have been making phone calls to applicants, and current students are more involved with the campus visits. Her office remained open Holy Thursday, Easter Saturday and Easter Monday to be available for phone calls and student visits. She thanked faculty for their hard work and for continuing to make calls and meet with students.

Ms. Kaskel does a lot of environmental scanning and spends time contacting our competitors and other AJCU schools. One of the things she has learned this year is many families have been making deposits at more than one school.

All of the Ignatian student award letters have been mailed. To date, eight students have accepted the award. However, one of them was granted a gap year and will delay her start by one year. The Summer Bridge program has been restructured and is now called the Magis Program. One change in the program is that it will no longer be offered in the summer. They learned that it was too difficult for out-of-state and international students to get to campus the summer before school begins, and there was also an issue with finding housing between semesters. Another change is that these students will be given extra enrichment throughout the academic year. They have all been promised financial aid support to accomplish the goal of graduation in four years. Three students have accepted the offer so far. These students are coded as “provisional students” and are required to participate in the Magis Program. Ms. Kaskel reported that President’s Open House was very successful and they received positive feedback from parents.

On page four of the dashboard under admitted numbers, Senator Jeff Albert noticed a difference between the categories of “2015 Date in Time” and “2014 Census.” Ms. Kaskel responded that because the previous database was corrupted, rather than making up numbers and giving everyone false information, they received approval from the Board of Trustees to measure everything off of the numbers from the census for this year only. They worked with the Enrollment Management Steering Committee and staff from I.T. to obtain the necessary information. We need to work very hard to grow yield and get back to a base of 20% or better.

Senator Ed Vacek asked if it was ever figured out how we lost 200 students in one year. Ms. Kaskel responded that we did not do a very good of a job of seeing some natural loss
in yield coming because of the competitive environment against all schools. We were pushing through applications that were never going to be yielded. There was also a mishap with financial aid. A lot of trust was lost when families were given several different scenarios on how their financial aid package was going to look. We now have to work extremely hard to rebuild that trust. We are being very transparent with new incoming students and parents about how an aid package is built, we are very clear that it is a four-year aid package. Fr. Vacek pointed out that it has been two years since the decline in enrollment and asked if we will ever get back to a student class of 850. Ms. Kaskel is not convinced that 850 is the right size for Loyola. She believes a more accurate number is in the range of 750 first-time, first-year students, and approximately 150-175 transfer students. What will get us to a really good place where we will maintain a full community and the right kind of revenue is to improve the successes in retention by a point or two, and sustain graduation rates. It is going to take time to get the word out and rebuild the trust. Dr. Clark reminded Senators that she is chairing the work group to help identify curricular road blocks to graduation. If anyone has ideas to share, please email them to her.

Senator Jon Altschul asked if our peer institutions are also seeing an increase in early deposits like we are experiencing. Ms. Kaskel responded that most schools will not reveal that information at this time. She noted that, given the fact that many families are double depositing here, numbers of deposits at other institutions are likely up as well.

**REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT:** President Wildes did not prepare a report for the Senate because it is still too soon to provide accurate information. As mentioned in his email of April 8th, the work of Dr. Lucie Lapovsky, the President’s Advisory Committee and its eight work groups is ongoing, and he will provide an update when the work of these groups is complete. He thanked Senators and faculty who are serving on the committee and its work groups for their dedication and hard work.

**REPORT FROM JAY CALAMIA, VICE PRESIDENT FOR FINANCIAL AFFAIRS AND ADMINISTRATION:** Jay Calamia reported that the current fiscal year will end with a surplus of approximately $338,000. That number may climb as we near the end of the year. At the May meeting of the Board of Trustees he will report that there is approximately $7,000,000 in tuition revenue that is anticipated to be received before the end of the fiscal year. In consideration of the surplus, it reflects an additional endowment draw of $7,234,000. To put it another way, if we took only the revenue and expenses of the university and took the traditional 5% from the endowment to support current operations, we would have an operating deficit of approximately $6,900,000. When the 2014-15 budget was presented to the trustees last May we requested an endowment draw of approximately $7,200,000 in order to bring the budget in line. Therefore, the surplus that is reported will reflect an additional endowment draw of approximately $7,000,000. The percentage equates to a 9.17% draw from the endowment rather than the traditional 5%. If we achieve revenues well beyond $500,000 we will reduce the draw from the endowment that the trustees approve by the excess amount. For example: If there is a surplus of $1,000,000 we will leave the surplus at $500,000 and
reduce the endowment draw of $7,214,000 by $500,000. We will do as much as possible to preserve the endowment.

With regard to future budgets from 2015-16 through 2019-20 the budget committee is still meeting and has not finalized their recommendations to the President at this time. Based on information collected in late February 2015 concerning enrollment numbers (undergraduate, graduate, and law), we would experience deficits ranging from $15,000,000 to $23,000,000. This figure does not include any adjustments from the President’s Advisory Committee or the University community. If we do nothing to control expenses and enhance revenue, those are the numbers we could be facing over the next five years. The $25,000,000 that is referenced in Fr. Wildes’ email is the amount of money that needs to be saved over a 4-5 year period through reduction in expenses and increased revenue in order to accomplish financial equilibrium. Once financial equilibrium is accomplished, we will be able to borrow money for facilities, reinstate pay raises, and do other things to enhance the University. There are several reasons for having such a large range in the deficit. One example is debt service. Debt service for the current year is $6,500,000 and grows to $11,400,000 in the year 2017-18. Another example is the law school decline in enrollment. In 2014-15 the total enrollment was 609 students. In 2016-17 it declines to 442 students. That decrease has a tremendous impact on what the law school is able to contribute to the university.

Leon Mathes reiterated that the increases in the debt service and the decline in enrollment is the driving force of the deficits over the next five years. In 2017-18 debt service reaches its maximum and enrollment should begin to increase.

Provost Manganaro added that the parallel of the undergraduate population to the law population is that each year that we enroll a little over 600 first-year students compared to a little over 800 students, the total undergraduate student body decreases. Even when we start to see a slight increase in the numbers, the overall student body is still decreasing, which results in great revenue implications. With regard to the $25,000,000 referenced in Fr. Wildes’ email, that amount is a target and not what the deficit will actually be over a five-year period. It is a calculated number to keep revenues and expenses in alignment over a 4-5 year period and will accomplished through controlled expenses and enhanced revenue. The eight workgroups are working on many avenues on how this can be accomplished. There is not a concrete plan at this time, but many ideas. The Board of Trustees made it very clear at the March meeting that they think this work is very important and they would like to see it accelerated as quickly as possible to see the impact of it in 2015-16.

Mr. Calamia shared that the total revenue for the university in 2014-15 based on the February enrollment numbers will be approximately $155,000,000. In 2016-17 it drops to approximately $132,000,000. It begins to climb in 2019-20 to approximately $146,000,000.

Senator Barbara Ewell asked Mr. Calamia for his sense on the state of the University. In conversations she hears from junior faculty, they seem to be very scared of the numbers
that are being discussed. Is this a situation Loyola with be able to work through, or should faculty start looking for other jobs? Mr. Calamia responded that he has been at Loyola for 46 years, and he has witnessed Loyola weather many storms and after every valley that we have fallen into we have come back stronger. He truly believes that we will overcome this storm as well. Enrollment numbers change constantly. The projected numbers we are looking at right now do not include students that may be recruited as a result of the agreements with the community colleges. Through the hard work of Roberta Kaskel and her staff, there is light at the end of the tunnel. Dr. Manganaro added he does not believe this is the end at all. If we choose to do nothing at all and not work toward financial equilibrium, things may not look as promising. That is why the administration feels very strongly to be transparent with the University community. He thinks it is important for the community to know the true numbers and a real understanding of our current situation.

Senator Connie Rodriguez agreed with the Provost and Mr. Calamia in that we will come back stronger. Her concern is that we have not fully recovered since Hurricane Katrina. She asked if financial exigency has been discussed. Mr. Calamia responded that financial exigency has not been discussed. He added that following Hurricane Katrina the business interruption insurance paid $15,000,000. At that time, the University hired a firm called Ernst and Young to give us the calculation of what would likely be our business interruption losses. They came back with a figure of $24,000,000. The maximum insurance coverage the University had at that time was $15,000,000. By the year 2012-13 the University had come back with a surplus.

Senator Maurice Brungardt stated that he has a great deal of faith and fully supports Jay Calamia. He is straightforward and very honest in what is reported to the University community.

Senator C.J. Stephenson asked Mr. Calamia for clarification of an earlier statement that in 4-5 years, when enrollments have increased and the University should reach financial equilibrium, we will be able to borrow money again and issue pay raises. Does that imply that salary increases will not be awarded until the end of the 4-5 year period? Mr. Calamia responded that he is assuming that as the recommendations of the President’s Advisory Board come into play, we should be able to, at some point, begin resuming salary increases. The current salary budget of the University is $52,000,000. A 1% raise costs $500,000. A 2% raise costs $1,000,000. If we are able to achieve savings he does expect there will be some type of salary increase.

Senator Mitch Crusto asked if the net assets of the University have increased. Mr. Calamia responded yes, the largest net asset of the University is in the endowment and the market has been doing very well. Mr. Crusto asked about the assets in the infrastructure. Mr. Calamia responded that those assets have increased as well.

Senator Isabel Medina asked how the Senate and faculty at large at the University will be kept apprised and allowed to have input in the decision-making processes that will address possible future cuts at the University. Dr. Manganaro responded that faculty
input is already being received and continues to be received by Dr. Lapovský and the President’s Advisory Committee, which has a large make-up of faculty representation. There will be many recommendations from the committee that will be shared with the University community. They are very mindful there are provisions in the Faculty Handbook that provide protection to faculty and they will be very cognizant of that moving forward. Ms. Medina asked for a timeline on when the recommendations will be made to the President and Board of Trustees. Provost Manganaro responded that is expected to be done by May or June.

Senator Craig Senn asked about the target deficit of $15,000,000-$23,000,000 and what percentage of an endowment draw we might be looking at to cover it. Mr. Calamia responded that all of those projections are using a 5% draw, and any of the above amounts are an additional draw from the endowment. Provost Manganaro added that during Fr. Wildes’ ten years as President, this is the first time we ever had to draw more than 5% from the endowment. Fr. Wildes responded that he has maintained slightly under 5% in his years at Loyola.

Senator Bob Gerlich expressed concern about the talk around campus being focused on the negative, and cuts that may be forthcoming. He asked when there will be discussions of something positive and projections for growth, perhaps talk of restructuring to work our way out of the problems instead of cutting our way out. Fr. Wildes responded that he is very careful with the language he uses such as controlling expenses, but we also need to make investments. There are several new things being worked on that will be growth opportunities in enrollment, retention, and graduation.

Ms. Medina asked if it is possible to invite Dr. Lapovský to a Senate meeting to give a presentation. Dr. Manganaro responded that he might be able to work that out, but stressed that she is a consultant and a lot of her time is being spent with the work groups.

Senator Bob Thomas asked if there has been any discussion about the growth rate of the endowment. Mr. Calamia responded this year the unrestricted fund was approximately 4%. The two years prior, unrestricted fund growth was in the double digits. Restricted funds had a 28% growth. The drawdown is based only on unrestricted funds.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Staff Recognition (attached here as Appendix C). There was no additional discussion.

To vote on the motion as presented: A is to approve; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: 100% in favor. The motion was unanimously approved with 40 votes.

Motion to Increase Salary Increments at Promotion (attached here as Appendix D). Senator Isabel Medina commented expressed concern that this motion is essentially a salary raise and only people up for promotion are eligible, leaving the rest of the faculty with no increase. With the current budget problems she is concerned with it being approved. Senator Bill Walkenhorst understands Ms. Medina’s concern, but he noted that it is a very small number of faculty who are eligible for promotion each year, which
Senator Trimiko Melancon appreciates the efforts that went into writing the motion and understands Ms. Medina’s concerns. However, she reminded everyone of the amount of work that goes into applying for promotion in rank. In her department one of the requirements is the faculty member must publish a book. It cost more than the current payment for promotion to publish a book. So in essence, the current stipend paid with promotion does not cover the cost of what is involved with being eligible to apply.

Senator Mitch Crusto asked for clarification on the purpose of the motion to increase the payment. Dr. Clark noted that a salary increase in promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor has existed for some time. The current payments are $2,500 to Associate and $3,500 to full Professor.

Senator Craig Senn is concerned with salary compression between those coming up for promotion and those who have recently been promoted if it is not made retroactive. There is also a concern that a newer professor who qualifies for the new payment might surpass in base salary a faculty member who was recently promoted under the previous amount.

Senator Jeff Albert pointed out that some faculty have been at Loyola for a shorter period of time and have never received a salary increase. In some ways, you can argue the point that by raising the payment amount only brings those faculty closer to a comparable salary of their peers.

To vote on the motion as presented: A is to approve; B is opposed; C is abstain. The results: 25 in favor; 13 opposed; 1 abstention. The motion passes.

Elections Motion. The University Senate resolves not to pilot electronic elections, but to continue to use the May meeting [this year held 30 April] for this purpose.

To vote on the motion as presented: A is to approve; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: 17 in favor; 17 opposed; 3 abstentions. A tie vote means the motion fails.

NEW BUSINESS:
Motions to delay Senate elections. A motion was made by Senator Barbara Ewell to delay the scheduled elections for 2015-16 and extend the terms of service on all affected committees until the beginning of the fall term, at which time a special meeting will be held no later than September 1 to conduct elections. Senator Meg Frazier seconded. Dr. Clark was somewhat concerned with a deadline of September 1 but noted that classes begin 8/24/15, so a special meeting could be scheduled for August 27th. Senator Connie Rodriguez moved to suspend the rules so the motion could be voted on today. Senator Trisha Pearce seconded.
To vote to suspend the rules and vote on the motion today: A is to approve; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: 33 in favor; 4 opposed; 1 abstention. The motion passes. There was no further discussion.

To vote on the motion as presented: A is approve; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: 33 in favor; 4 opposed; 1 abstention. The motion passes.

Commuter student meal plan (Attached here as Appendix E). A motion was made by Senator Jon Altschul opposing a mandatory meal plan for commuters. Senator Jonathan Peterson seconded. Senator Ed Vacek made a point of clarification that be believes it has already been approved and put in place. Dr. Clark concurred that it is her understanding that a contract has been signed. Senator Mitch Crusto wonders what kind of economic impact this change will have on the University. Dr. Clark responded that she has been told that it would give the University considerably less money to work on what are called “new concepts.” Senator Connie Rodriguez commented that if her undergraduate university had implemented this type of policy she would have been insulted and left that university. Dr. Altschul has several oppositions to the meal plan. He only found about it by reading the Maroon. He spoke strongly against the motion. A vote will be taken at the next meeting.

Background check and minors on campus policies. (Distributed via email as PDF files.) Senator Isabel Medina spoke against sending this policy to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee. She was going to move to table the discussion until there was time to receive a presentation explaining the cost associated with it, the need for it, and the appropriateness of having this type of policy before it is sent to a committee to work on the language. Dr. Clark responded that this raises an interesting procedural issue. The Faculty Handbook Revision Committee has developed a process by which all policies that apply to faculty but are not part of the Handbook will essentially be treated as Handbook revisions and go through the process of being reviewed by that committee for approval, then to the Senate for approval, then to the Board of Trustees. That policy does not exist but the Handbook Revision Committee has agreed to follow it.

The policy was given to Dr. Clark by Gita Bolt for Senate review. Because a motion has not been made to approve the document, it cannot be tabled. At this time there are some options available on how to communicate the opposition. A Senate committee can be formed to review the policy in further detail. Gita Bolt can be invited to attend a Senate meeting to discuss the document and answer questions. Ms. Medina added that the problem with sending it to the Handbook Revision Committee is that committee is not in a position to ask why the policy is being generated, and the cost ramifications involved. The Senate can request that kind of information. Dr. Clark will invite Ms. Bolt to come to a meeting and discuss the proposals. Dr. Pearce commented that if Ms. Bolt comes to speak about the proposals she needs to clearly state the justification. Also, the wording and the detail in the proposal is very broad and will be problematic.

Campus security authorities. (Distributed via email as a PDF file). Deferred to the next meeting.
ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Appendices:
A. Chair’s report (March 2015)
B. Committee Reports
C. Staff recognition motion
D. Motion to Increase Salary Increments at Promotion
E. Commuter Student Meal Plan
F. Background Check and Minors on Campus Policy (Distributed via email as a PDF file)
G. Campus Security Authorities (Distributed via email as a PDF file)

Appendix A:
Senate chair’s report
9 April 2015

I’ll start with a few Senate-specific items, then move on to the Board meeting and other campus-wide issues.

Background check and minors on campus policies
These documents were given to me by Gita Bolt, who notes that other institutions have instituted similar policies, for Senate review. Because the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee has drafted an addition to Chapter 14, by which additions or revisions of policies that apply to faculty but do not appear in the Handbook will undergo the same approval process as Handbook revisions and additions, I am sending these to Joe Berendzen for FHRC review, but we agree that there is value in getting broad faculty input now, so I send them to you now for your information. In the Executive Committee’s recent meeting with Marc Manganaro a number of issues were brought up, and we may well recommend some level of revision before either policy goes to the Senate. If you have thoughts you’d like to share, please feel free to get them to me, or to Joe.

Additions and revisions of policies not in the Handbook
Following up on the report of the Senate ad hoc committee chaired by Jon Altschul, the FHRC has drafted an addition to Chapter 14, calling for such policies to undergo the same approval process applied to Handbook revisions. This item has been sent to Gita Bolt for review, following the approval process worked out in the past year, where the Office of General Counsel provides its input at an early stage, before the FHRC sends items to the Senate for approval. We hope this will be uncontroversial, in which case the revision should come to the Senate early in the fall.
Other matters have interfered with my efforts to get a web page set up as an adjunct to the Handbook page, to include links to policies within the Human Resources manual and any other policies that apply to faculty but are not part of the Handbook, but there seems to be broad agreement that this is a good idea. The main question seems to be who does the work to set it up!

**Campus security authorities**
A few weeks ago, a message went out to select individuals (including, apparently, faculty advisors to student organizations) declaring that they are campus security authorities under the Clery Act and explaining the actions required of such authorities. That message led to some confusion and consternation, and I have been asked to put the issue on the agenda for this meeting, though as of yet there is no motion or specific action requested on the part of the Senate. Whether it is the will of the Senate to make some statement, or to invite Arlene McCarthy to a meeting to explain how such individuals are chosen, or do something else, may come out of that discussion.

**Upcoming meetings**
Since only preliminary information regarding both enrollment and the budget can be available for this meeting, my thinking is that it would be desirable to set up another opportunity to talk with Roberta, Jay, and Leon, as well as Marc. Given the fact that elections normally take up the vast majority of the May meeting (which will occur on 30 April this year!), and even that is too early for good information on those matters, I suggest another special meeting following the May Board meeting. With the Board meeting 14-15 May, that would presumably mean a special Senate meeting Thursday 21 May. I know this is after graduation and as people are starting to disperse, but it seems to me the most effective way to get the kind of information and discussion we can’t have beforehand. As a special meeting, there would be no formal business, so no votes—just reports from and conversation with Marc, Jay, and Roberta. Please let me know your thoughts.

**Board of Trustees**
The March meeting is usually characterized as a “retreat” meeting, meaning that it is mostly focused on open discussion rather than committee meetings and other business. This included a presentation and discussion led by Lucie Lapovsky and conversations led by Zeddie Bowen, a guest from the Association of Governing Boards. He emphasized that boards should be engaged, but on a strategic rather than operational level, focused more on the future than the past. This was fitting given the budgetary realities outlined in Lucie’s presentation, and I was heartened to see the level of engagement and commitment manifested by the Board during those conversations.

**President’s Advisory Committee**
As Kevin Wildes recently reported to the Loyola community, eight workgroups have been formed, each chaired by a member of the committee (though members of the workgroups may be drawn from across campus). Many of these focus on administrative areas, from utilities to purchasing to contracts, which bears out the refrain that everything is on the table. The two that focus primarily on academic issues are faculty workload
(chaired by Maria Calzada) and curriculum. Since I’m chairing that last, let me give some of my thoughts on that issue—keep in mind these are my thoughts, and I’m not speaking for anyone else!

This group was formed in response to a number of comments on Lucie’s feedback form (http://president.loyo.edu/suggestions, which is still open) calling for the Common Curriculum to be trimmed. Because I was aware that discussions were underway about not so much cutting the CC as clarifying it in a way that reflects current practice, I suggested broadening the scope of this workgroup to curricular issues in general, specifically those that serve as roadblocks to recruiting, retaining, and graduating students. This may include the core curriculum—though some of the CC-bashing is to my mind overstated—but it goes far beyond.

The workgroup has had an initial meeting, during which I laid out what seem to be four basic tasks. In each case the workgroup may well not be able to find solutions so much as shine light and ask questions—especially since we’re supposed to make a preliminary report by the end of April and a final report by mid-summer! The basic areas are:

1. core curriculum: The Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum is discussing a proposal for a “Loyola core” drafted by John Sebastian, as well as a number of responses and two alternative models. All these models create a standardized core of 39-40 credits—that being the number of credits currently done by most students outside the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences—to which more could be added if, for instance, programs in the humanities division of that college decided to create a set of common adjunct courses similar to what is done among science majors. This would be fundamentally a clarification and standardization of what is now a confusing and inconsistent pattern of reductions, though the ability to predict better what needs to be offered from one year to the next may result in some cost savings as well.

2. barriers to transfer (including the new 2+2 articulation agreements): It is all too common that prospective transfer students (not only here) are told that most of the credits they bring can be used only as general electives, which in many programs means they are all but useless. If we are to increase our transfer market, we have to work together to find ways to ameliorate this, while still ensuring that students are able to succeed in the courses into which they are placed. We also need to look at the time it takes to make those decisions: prospective transfer students often don’t make a decision until they know how their credits will fit, and some schools provide that information within 24 hours!

3. schedule issues and other factors preventing completion from a student's perspective: The Academic Advising Council formed a workgroup to look at course scheduling, but other issues intervened. Bud Sheppard, SGA president, is a member of this workgroup, and he can facilitate some brainstorming on other areas to address.

4. other curricular barriers: I’m thinking about going to the Academic Advising Council and faculty generally to brainstorm on other issues. Our first-to-second-year retention has been at around 80% for the past several years, which is good, but our six-year graduation rate has hovered below 60%; this year it rose to 62%, but that is still below LSU’s. Why? More importantly, what can we do to improve it?
If we can improve our graduation rate and make it easier for transfer students to come and succeed, that improves the value of a Loyola education and makes it easier to market to new first-time and transfer students, and so on. This is perhaps the most important way we as a faculty can help the long-term financial stability of our institution. I appreciate whatever thoughts you have on the issue.

**Enrollment Management**

At the 6 March meeting, we were given first- to second-semester retention figures: over 90% for all four undergraduate colleges, and 93.6% overall! This puts us on track to match the recent first- to second-year retention rate of around 80% we’ve been achieving for the past couple of years. (The budget is based on 75% first- to second-year retention.) First a round of applause for all of us—then back to keep up the good work! Otherwise we were given updates on the enrollment and financial aid pipelines, but Roberta will have much more recent information for us.

President’s Open House was by all accounts a success—thanks to all of you who participated. A total of 761 attended, including 300 students (up from 274 last year), and 22 students attended a new event on Friday from the University Honors Program. As she did last year, Carrie Glass and her office worked to send out as many complete financial aid packages as possible in advance of the open house, and she and members of the financial aid and admissions staff were available to meet with individual families there.

At the 20 March meeting, Carrie Glass brought a proposal for a process to regularize the renewal (or, when necessary, the non-renewal) of merit scholarships. Current practice does not consistently enforce the published criteria for renewal of merit scholarships, which is not fair to anyone, including students who continue to receive financial aid even when it is clear they cannot progress successfully to graduation. This proposal will be further discussed by this committee and by the deans and associate deans, with an eye toward implementation next year. In the course of that conversation, I and others asked about ways faculty advisors could be brought into the picture to help students who are struggling and in potential danger of losing their scholarship, so we can reach them before that happens. Carrie has built a relationship with the Academic Advising Council, and I expect she will continue to work with that body and with Liz Rainey and the Associate Deans’ Council to help these students at risk.

**Strategic Planning Team**

At the last meeting, each dean (save María López, who was unable to attend) spoke about that college’s progress toward its strategic plan, so we can begin to talk about how the college plans interact with the broader University overarching strategies. There were also reports on the five prioritized strategies (academic support, career services, experiential learning, new/enhanced programs, and advising), and the discussion of budgeting continues.

**VP Marketing search**
Cathy Rogers, chair of the search committee, has already announced public forums with candidates: Tuesday 21 April, Thursday 23 April, and Tuesday 28 April, all at 12:30pm in the Whitney Presentation Room in Thomas Hall. I’ve also been invited to lunch with each candidate, and I believe there are other opportunities for contact with faculty. Thanks to Cathy and the rest of the committee for both creating those opportunities and publicizing the progress of the search.

As always, please continue to come to me with thoughts or concerns. Thanks to all of you for your commitment to the Senate, and to Loyola.

Best, Alice

Alice V. Clark
Professor of Music History
Chair, University Senate

31 March 2015
Appendix B:
Senate committee reports (April 2015)

(Board committees have not met since December; reports will follow the May Board meeting.)

**Academic Integrity Council**
no report

**Conflict of Interest Committee (Chuck Nichols)**
committee has not met

**Fringe Benefits Committee (Kate Adams, Chuck Nichols)**
committee has not met

**Intellectual Property Policy and Rights Committee (John Blevins, Susan Brower)**
The Intellectual Property Policy and Rights Committee has almost completed its work updating the University’s Intellectual Property Rights Policy. We expect and intend to share a draft with the Senate before the end of the Spring 2015 semester.

**Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Council (Sean Cain)**
Loyola’s Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Council met on February 24, 2015. Athletic Director Brett Simpson, along with Associate Athletic Director Jonathan Wojciechowski, described the athletic and academic successes of Loyola’s student athletes. In addition, Simpson detailed the $17 million capital campaign to renovate the SAC to improve and make more efficient its athletic space and office space. This campaign was recommended by a team of sports consultants who wrote a report on the status and possibilities of Loyola’s athletic programs for Fr. Wildes in the past few years. Part of the rationale for the capital campaign is to upgrade facilities in order to be eligible for consideration for an invitation to Division II or III of the NCAA. Simpson and Wojciechowski noted, though, that the level of competition in Loyola’s current NAIA conference is quite strong, but it requires an amount of travel for student athletes that can be a strain. They also explained plans to expand Loyola’s athletic offerings for recruitment purposes, and these plans include adding men’s and women’s swimming as well as competitive dance and cheer,
along with an expansion of the track program. Lastly, they both indicated pride in having met a $100,000 goal of funding endowed scholarships in baseball and track.

Standing Council for Academic Planning (SCAP)
no report

Student Affairs Policy and Student Handbook Advisory Committee (Kate Adams)
committee has not met

University Board of Appeals
The membership of this committee does not meet as such, but rather serves as a pool from which individuals are drawn to serve on cases as needed.

University Board of Review (Kate Adams)
The membership of this committee does not meet as such, but rather serves as a pool from which individuals are drawn to serve on cases as needed. That has happened fairly often, but the details of those hearings cannot be made public.

University Budget Committee (UBC) (Isabel Medina)
The University Budget Committee resumed its 2014-15 meetings to complete the 2014-15 budget and plan for the 2015-16 budget, in order for that budget to be presented to the Board of Trustees in May. The Committee will continue to meet in April and consider measures to address projected deficits. The Committee may defer to or work with the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Group in planning for the 2015-16 academic year.

University Faculty Handbook Revision Committee (Alice Clark)
This committee has completed revisions to the University Professor protocol and Chapter 11A, covering Law Clinic faculty. An addition to chapter 14, which would require that non-Handbook policies that apply to faculty would go through the same process as Handbook additions and revisions, has been drafted and sent to the Office of General Counsel for input. The revisions to chapter 15, on the extraordinary faculty, continue.

University Parking Committee (Mary Brazier)
Parking committee meets almost weekly to hear appeals, some in person, most are written. Decisions are reached based on the stated policies of parking at Loyola University. We have had fewer appeals than in the past.

Vendor Policy and Practices Committee (Larry Moore)
committee has not met.

Centennial Campaign Council
no report

Smoke Free Campus Committee (Jane Savage)
• The proposed Tobacco Free Community Policy, with the purpose of promoting a healthy campus environment by decreasing exposure to second-hand smoke and to assist persons who wish to stop their tobacco consumption, is approved by Fr. Wildes and Administrative Council.
• Phase I- Education/Information/Cessation programming is underway.
• Phase II (8/1/15) is the start date for tobacco and smoke free campus with violators receiving warnings.
• Phase III (1/1/16) will commence with fines, conduct procedures being issued to offenders.
• A website has been created to assist in communicating the policy to students, staff and faculty. Signage will be posted; messages of our tobacco free status will be communicated to parents, alumni, vendors, conference attendees, all special events will give notice of the new policy.

Comprehensive Campaign kickoff planning (Mark Fernandez)
The committee, made up of Institutional Advancement Staff met every two weeks in September and October to prepare for the launch of the Faith in the Future Campaign in October. The event was a big success with heavy attendance from faculty, staff, students, and community members. At the event, Mr. Bill Bishop, Vice-President of Institutional Advancement announced several major gifts to the campaign.

Appendix C:
staff recognition motion

Whereas faculty who have served the University for twenty-five years are recognized at the January President’s Convocation, and

Whereas staff who have served the University for a similar period are recognized only at the annual staff luncheon, and

Whereas the Staff Senate has recently passed a motion calling on the President “to have the names of staff who have reached or will reach the 25 year mark during the current year announced at the Spring Faculty/Staff Convocation”;

The University Senate, in solidarity with the Staff Senate, calls on the President to recognize staff members who have served the University for twenty-five years to be recognized at the spring President’s Convocation.
Appendix D:
Motion to increase salary increments at promotion

Whereas the College Assembly of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences recently passed a motion recommending to the Provost that salary increments for promotion be increased to $5000 for attaining the rank of Associate Professor and $5000 for attaining the rank of Full Professor; and

Whereas current salary increments for promotion are not commensurate with the extended period of intensive work in teaching, research, and service required to earn promotion; and

Whereas increasing this increment would, for a relatively minimal investment, compensate high-achieving faculty in a period of no raises and would also help to alleviate the compression phenomenon, especially among Associate Professors;

Therefore, the University Senate joins with the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences College Assembly and strongly recommends to the Provost that the salary increment for promotion be increased to $5000 for attaining the rank of Associate Professor and to $5000 for attaining the rank of Full Professor, effective immediately.
Appendix E:

MOTION
Introduced by Jon Altschul
3/26/2015

Whereas the Office of Student Affairs intends to impose a mandatory, minimum $500 per semester, meal plan to all new commuter students, aged 18-22, beginning fall of 2016,

Whereas the Office of Student Affairs has yet to provide any justifying evidence that mandatory meal plans for commuter students will enhance students' college transformative experience or help them perform better academically,

Whereas a $500 minimum meal plan may be burdensome financially to some commuter students,

Whereas a forced meal plan would limit Loyola students' opportunities to experience New Orleans' renowned cuisine,

Whereas the Loyola faculty aims to grow its students into adults and believes that such growth requires cultivating the student's autonomy and sense of self-determination,

Resolved, the University Senate moves that Loyola impose no mandatory meal plan to current or future commuter students.

RATIONALE FOR THE MOTION

Justification for the New Meal Plan Requirement
Students first learned of the new meal plan requirement when they received an email from the director of Residential Life on March 10th. Amid student protest, the decision to implement the meal plan change was delayed from fall 2015 to fall 2016.

The email noted that “[r]esearch conducted over the past ten years shows that students who spend more time on campus, including dining with others, perform better academically while building a strong sense of community for themselves and their peers.”

Challenges to the Justification
The question of whether “research” shows something to be the case or not should have no bearing on a decision without first identifying the source of the research as credible. Because this email does not identify the source at all, it cannot be judged as credible or not, and the

student is left guessing where the evidence linking better academic performance with spending more time on campus originates. Because Loyola prides itself on teaching its students to always critically evaluate evidence, it is reasonable that numerous Loyola students had a similar reaction to reading the email notification.

The writer of the email may have been alluding to the 2007 Report of Findings by the National Study of Living-Learning Communities as a potential piece of research. The problem here is that while the report does speak to the benefits of being part of a living learning community, the report defines a ‘living learning community’ as “programs in which undergraduate students live together in a discrete portion of a residence hall (or the entire hall) and participate in academic and/or extra-curricular programming designed especially for them.” Commuter students, by definition, do not live on campus, thus any findings from this and other like reports do not justify any action regarding mandatory meal plans for commuter students.

Another possible research source the writer of the email may be referring to comes from the Residential Life webpage from Texas A&M. Here the topic of meal plans does arise:

Students are not the only ones who benefit from on-campus housing. The residential community provides the critical mass and economies of scale for a variety of institutional services and programs. Many on-campus residents are required to have meal plans. This “guaranteed income” provides a base for on-campus food services and a wider variety of dining options. Similarly, the residential per-unit cost for campus telephone services, cable television, and other services improves billing for those services for the entire campus.

There are three problems with using this information to support a meal plan requirement for Loyola commuter students. 1) The ‘guaranteed income’ mentioned here is based on on-campus residents, not commuter students. 2) This study is based on “Benefits of On Campus Housing for Students, Colleges and Universities,” a paper submitted to The South West Association of College and University Housing Officers in 2007. Of the fifteen references cited in this paper, twelve of them date back to the 20th Century. 3) Finally, even if there exist studies that do demonstrate a link between students who eat their meals on campus and students who perform well academically, it does not follow that the correct course of action by this administration is to impose a meal requirement. For, of all the benefits that may or may not exist surrounding eating meals on campus, we must not lose sight of the fact that students are being compelled beyond their wills to make this purchase. When we compare the potential gains of on-campus dining with the pain of loss of dietary freedom, it is not at all obvious that imposing this commuter meal plan requirement will enhance the student’s overall college experience.

For these reasons, I conclude that Loyola must impose no meal plan requirement for current or future commuter students.

---