ARTENDANCE SHEET
(Names in italics represent Senators present)

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

Biology
Rosalie Anderson (2016)
E. L. Beard (2015)

Business
Karen Arnold (2015)
Walter Block (2016)
Leo Krasnozhon (2016)
John Levendis (2016) — proxy to Leo Krasnozhon
Leo 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)
Timiko Melancon (2015)
Timothy Welsh (2016)
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Maurice Brungardt (2015)

Institute for Ministry
Michael Cowan (2015)

Jesuit Social Research Institute
Alex Mikulich (2016)

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

Law
John Blevins (2016)
Christine Cerniglia Brown (2016)
Mitchell Crusto (2016)
Isabel Medina (2016)
Lawrence Moore, S.J. (2016)
Craig Senn (2016)
VACANT
VACANT

Law Library
Brian Huddleston (2016) - Proxy to John Blevins

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

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

Monroe Library
Teri Gallaway (2016) - Proxy to Bea Calvert
Mary Hines (2015)

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

Music Industry Studies
Jeff Albert (2016)

Nursing
Lisa Linville (2015)
Patricia Pearce (2016)

Philosophy
Jon Altschul (2016)
Joseph Berendzen (2015)

Physics
Tirtho Biswas (Alt. Armin Kargol, 2015)

Political Science
Peter Burns (2015)

Psychological Sciences
Glenn Hymel (2015)
Charles Corprew (Alt. Charles Nichols, 2016)

Religious Studies
Adil Khan (2015)

Sociology
Marcus Kondkar (2015)
Jaita Talukdar (2016) - Proxy to Marcus Kondkar

Theatre Arts and Dance
Geoffrey Hall (2016)

Guests:
Marc Manganaro, Provost
Desiree Rodriguez, Exec. Asst. to the Provost
Melanie McKee, Vice Provost Faculty Devel.
Karen Rosenbocker, Parliamentarian
Bret Jacobs, Staff Senate Chair
James Shields, Public Affairs
CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

INVOCATION
Ralph Tucci offered an invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (11 December 2014)
The minutes from the December 11, 2014 meeting were unanimously approved.

REPORT FROM CHAIR
The Report from the Chair was distributed via email (attached here as Appendix A). There was no discussion or question about the report.

REPORTS
Board Committee Reports were distributed via email (attached here as Appendix B).

Senator Isabel Medina asked for clarification on two things mentioned in the Finance Committee report. 1. The report seems to suggest that applications are slightly down compared to last year. While there is a possibility that the articulation agreements with the community colleges could slightly increase that number, it may not. 2. She would like to get a better sense on where we stand long term and if we will continue to be viable if we are unable to increase enrollment and if we happen to experience any other kind of reduction. She also asked if Jay Calamia, Vice President for Business and Finance can be invited to attend one of the senate meetings. Dr. Clark responded that she is already working with Mr. Calamia to select a date for him to attend. Provost Manganaro pointed out that there were several documents distributed as part of the Finance Committee reports and asked Ms. Medina to clarify which report she was referring to. Ms. Medina responded that she was referring to the narrative report provided by the Senate representatives of the Finance Committee of the Board. Dr. Manganaro responded that he has received updated numbers from Ms. Kaskel since that report was written. The most recent numbers do not indicate that we are below where we were this time last year. The enrollment goal of 640 is modestly above what we achieved last year. He also added that Ms. Kaskel is scheduled to attend an upcoming Senate meeting, at which time she will be able to provide more concrete numbers. Enrollment Management is also working on some initiatives that will project enrollment numbers over the next 4-5 years. The goal is for those numbers to steadily increase over time. The articulation agreements and the new programs we are offering are showing a lot of applicant interest. Dr. Clark added that changes in software mean that information about applications are not completely comparable from last year to this. She announced that Jay Calamia will most likely attend the April Senate meeting and Roberta Kaskel is tentatively planning to attend the March and April meetings.
Senator Bill Walkenhorst commented that the web site is not doing a very good job of promoting and advertising that we have completed a $100,000,000 renovation to the campus. How can we expect to attract more students with the newly renovated buildings if they are not promoted? Dr. Manganaro explained that there are transitions taking place in Marketing and Communications, but the web site is continually being updated. Monroe Hall is a major attraction that should definitely be used as a recruiting tool and was used to host a lot of the Fall Open House events.

**REPORT FROM THE PROVOST**

Provost Manganaro welcomed Senators back from the holiday break. He reported there was a very successful all-day Provost’s Council meeting on January 12, 2015. They discussed and worked through many topics including strategic planning, budgeting, and college restructuring efforts.

The QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) is part of the SACS reaccreditation process. He is very pleased with the work of the QEP team. They are currently focused on experiential learning and the first overarching strategy of the Strategic Plan. Joy Allen, a faculty member in the College of Music and Fine Arts, is now serving as the director of the QEP. In December Dr. Manganaro spent a day with the team, and they attended a class taught by Cathy Rogers, Professor in the School of Mass Communication. Dr. Rogers’ students are developing a plan to best present and advertise the QEP internally to the University community. He and the team were very impressed with the presentations. He emphasized the importance of the University community being aware of and familiar with the QEP by the time the SACS team visits our campus next academic year.

Articulation agreements with five community colleges continue to move forward. Three agreements have been signed to date, and the other two are near completion. Roberta Kaskel and her team were recently in Miami for a conference, and they spent a day visiting with the administration at Miami Dade Community College. He reiterated that recruiting is an 18-month cycle, and we will not see significant effects from the articulation agreements by next year. The intent is to attract a different set of students over the next couple of years. He thanked Melanie McKay, Bret Jacobs, and Brad Petitfils for their hard work with developing the agreements.

A special Provost’s Council meeting was held this morning with Sheila Murphy, the Witt Kiefer consultant who is working with the University on the search for a Vice President of Marketing and Communication. Cathy Rogers is the faculty representative and chairs the committee. The overall expectation is to invite the finalist to campus in late April and early May, and have the position filled by July 1. Dr. Clark informed the Senate that she had lunch with Ms. Murphy and Dr. Rogers and was able to share with them some of the thoughts and concerns she has received from faculty about marketing as it relates to enrollment and other issues. Dr. Manganaro added that during the meeting Ms. Murphy pointed out that approximately 20 years ago many universities did not have a position of this type, and today many institutions feel the need to have it. Dr. Rogers added that she is excited about the opportunity this position affords the University. The committee and the consultant are aware of the urgency and the need to have the position on our campus. They are working as quickly as they can to bring in the best possible candidates. She is available to the Loyola community to address any questions or concerns they may have. There will be an opportunity for the University community to attend a presentation from each candidate when they visit the campus. Information will be sent via email as the
presentations are scheduled. Senator Mitch Crusto asked how internet marketing for recruiting will be tied in with the new Vice President. Dr. Rogers responded that it is one of the top priorities that the candidate selected possesses the skills needed to enhance this area. Senator Isabel Medina pointed out that the law school does not have representation on the search committee. Provost Manganaro acknowledged this, and further noted that the dean of the College of Law was unable to attend the Provost’s Council meeting, but he reassured Ms. Medina and all law faculty that information will definitely be communicated to the law school.

Monroe Hall is near completion. The last occupants in the Mercy trailers moved back into Monroe right before the Christmas break. The trailers are scheduled to be removed from campus by the end of January. Nunemaker Hall was completed in time for President’s Convocation. The Monroe Hall Steering Committee has evolved into a building committee and will change its focus toward clean-up efforts, continued maintenance, and room usage. Bret Jacobs will continue to chair the committee. Mr. Jacobs added that there was not enough time before the holiday break to move everyone from St. Mary’s Hall into Monroe, because their spaces need to be cleaned up after they were used by others temporarily. That work will continue through the spring semester, and the final moves of Theater from Marquette Hall and those remaining in St. Mary’s will take place by the end of the summer. Senator C.J. Stephenson inquired about the plan for the demolition of the old library. Dr. Manganaro responded that it will probably be removed sooner rather than later. Mr. Jacobs added that a date has not been set, but it will probably happen shortly after President’s Open House, and in conjunction with the clean-up of Monroe Hall. There is some underground wiring that needs to be addressed as well. Senator Barbara Ewell commented that much of the University community is not aware that the old library is going to be demolished. She asked if information can be better communicated. Dr. Manganaro responded that information has been sent out, but he will make sure information is more widely disseminated.

The Strategic Planning Team has evolved into a committee that will now assess the progress of the plan. Bill Locander, co-chair of the committee, has been meeting with deans and the faculty of the College of Social Sciences to work on department and program planning to customize their plan with the University plan. In the coming months the SPT will continue to track the progress on the high priority action plans and how they will be accomplished.

In a recent meeting with law faculty several important issues were discussed. Maria Lopez is resigning from her position as Dean effective August 1, 2015. They are in the process of selecting an interim Dean. A call for nominations was made in December and many names were received. The deadline to submit nominations has been extended through January. At the request of the law faculty, Fr. Wildes will join Dr. Manganaro at their January faculty meeting so that faculty can provide further feedback. It has also been determined that the interim dean will serve for two years. The law faculty and administrators have been asked to create a long-term sustainability plan for the College of Law.

Fr. Wildes announced during convocation that the Board of Trustees has requested that he create a longer-term financial sustainability plan for the University. He is committed to doing that and will form an advisory committee and bring in a consultant to look at data, analyze efficiencies, and determine what we should strategically invest in. This committee will be comprised of representatives from across campus, and their work will not be limited to academic units. The goal is to have a good set of
recommendations from the committee by the end of this fiscal year. Updates will be provided throughout the process. Senator Connie Rodriguez asked about the composition of the advisory committee and if it will have faculty representation. Dr. Manganaro responded that the details of the representation are still being worked out, but he assured Dr. Rodriguez there will be faculty representation from each college, as well as some of the Vice Presidents, and the Chairs of the University and Staff Senate. Dr. Rodriguez added that the HNS Council of Chairs voted to request to have two representatives from their college, one from the humanities division and one from the natural sciences division. Dr. Manganaro responded that he had already been notified of the vote by Maria Calzada.

The final report from the Provost’s Advisory Committee on College Restructuring has been received. It was brief but concise. He shared the report with Fr. Wildes and they have met several times to discuss it; they will both meet with Connie Rodriguez, committee chair, on January 26, 2015. The recommendations in the report focused on the placement of interdisciplinary minors and programs, centers and institutes, the School of Mass Communication, and the Office of Professional and Continuing Studies, as well as the name of the new graduate college. Dr. Rodriguez added that the Center for the Study of New Orleans spans over more than one college and its placement still needs to be determined. Fr. Wildes intends to make a decision by the end of January. Changes will be effective in fall 2016.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
Handbook revisions: Chapter 11A (Law Clinic). (Attached here as Appendix C).

Dr. Clark explained that the reason for the proposed change is for the College of Law to be in compliance with the American Bar Association (ABA) for an upcoming accreditation site visit. Senator Joe Berendzen, chair of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee (FHRC), reviewed the changes, noting that the proposed changes have gone through several approval levels before being presented to the Senate. The Law Clinic faculty initially proposed the changes. It was then approved by the entire law faculty. At that time it was submitted to the FHRC who made minor modifications. FRHC then forwarded it to General Counsel for review. It is now being presented to the Senate for approval.

Senator Isabel Medina pointed out that the language in the current chapter suggests that a contract is not renewable. The proposed change simply clarifies the language to read that contracts are presumptively renewable. There is a bigger change later in the document that addresses issues dealing with termination. Provost Manganaro agreed that the main issue was “presumptive renewal,” where it is presumed that a contract will be renewed unless there is a reason to not renew it. Senator Christine Brown is a Law Clinic faculty member and gave some further background: in a previous site visit the ABA brought the discrepancy to the attention of the faculty as something that needed to be clarified and critiqued in order to adhere with ABA standards. The dean at that time, Brian Bromberger, wrote a letter to the ABA stating that the law school is in fact following the ABA standards. In light of the upcoming site visit, the law faculty felt compelled to make the correction in the Faculty Handbook to reflect current practice. The law faculty have already voted and approved the changes being reviewed today. Dr. Clark pointed out that even if the Senate approves the motion today, it will not be submitted to the Board for approval until May, but at the time of the site visit the ABA could be informed that the changes have been approved by all other bodies other than the Board of Trustees. Senator Janna Saslaw
commented that when she read over the document the requirements for the positions seemed to be much more detailed than any other description in the University Faculty Handbook. She has seen these kinds of details in a college handbook but not in the University Handbook. She understands that the ABA requires it, but is advocating for less to be in the University Handbook and for this information to be handled within the College of Law handbook. Dr. Clark responded that the University Handbook has to include categories of faculty and this category is not discussed elsewhere. Dr. Saslaw added that it is not just a point of clarification, but there is a list of exactly what the faculty are supposed to do. She is suggesting that perhaps less detail is needed. Dr. Berendzen responded that Chapter 11A already existed in the University Handbook and the changes being presented are not drastic. Ms. Medina added that the FHRC is currently reviewing handbooks from other universities and their processes for how extraordinary faculty are handled. This type of specificity is typical in most handbooks for both tenure-track and extraordinary faculty. There is a huge difference between the University Handbook that is approved by the President and Board, and college by-laws that cannot be inconsistent with the University Handbook. Senator Jon Altschul asked if these are norms for appointment as opposed to criteria. He wonders how you would evaluate some of the criteria listed under the teaching section. Ms. Medina responded that this chapter of the Faculty Handbook has been around for 30–40 years, and this is not the subject of the amendment. Ms. Brown concurred with Ms. Medina that the criteria listed are evaluated every year, but that is not the subject of the changes that were proposed. The vote to approve the revision is A in favor; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: 35 in favor; 1 opposed; 3 abstentions.

University Professor Protocol (Attached here as Appendix D).

Dr. Clark reviewed the proposed changes. Senator Isabel Medina, who is a member of the FHRC, stopped discussion of the motion because she is not sure that the document presented on the screen during the meeting is the final version. It could not be immediately determined whether that was the case. In the second paragraph language giving the Provost and President the ability both to appoint and approve University Professors was changed at the request of General Counsel so that the Provost would appoint and the President would approve. In an effort to simplify confusion, Ms. Medina moved to send the document back to the FHRC to make corrections. Dr. Manganaro pointed out that the language in the last sentence of paragraph two states that a recommendation will be made to the President. It does not explicitly say that the President will then be the one to make a decision. Ms. Medina clarified that the intent was for the Provost to appoint and the President to approve, but it is not written that way. Senator Jeff Albert asked for clarification that standard academic appointments come from the Provost. If that is correct, then however the President is involved with the final approval, the appointment should be made by the Provost since all other academic appointments come from him. Another possible solution is to remove the last sentence from paragraph two completely.

Dr. Berendzen moved to amend the motion to change the word “appointed” to the word “nominated” in the first sentence of paragraph two, and in the last sentence of paragraph two add the words “for approval” after the word “President.” Dr. Albert seconded. Senator Eileen Doll supports the revision because it is actually a recommendation from the University Rank & Tenure Committee (URTC). This is the only discussion of the procedure for creating a University Professor. She does not recommend removing the last sentence of paragraph two because it eliminates the final approval. Senator Ed Vacek pointed out another discrepancy in paragraph two with regard to the Provost making an appointment
with the advice and consent of the URTC. Ms. Medina asked Dr. Doll for her thoughts on the first sentence of paragraph two referencing “with the advice and consent of the URTC,” since the revision did come initially from that committee. Dr. Doll responded that what is currently listed in the Handbook is limited to the first and last sentence. The second sentence somewhat replaces half of the first sentence.

Further discussion suggested the issue might be harder to resolve, but a vote was needed on Dr. Berendzen’s amendment: A is in favor; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: 14 in favor; 18 opposed; 5 abstentions. The amendment fails.

Senator Ed Vacek seconded Ms. Medina’s previous motion to refer the motion back to the FHRC. To vote on that motion: A in favor; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: 36 in favor; 1 opposed; 1 abstention. Dr. Clark asked Senators to communicate any additional thoughts, comments, or concerns to herself, Dr. Berendzen, or Ms. Medina, the faculty representatives to the FHRC.

**Collegiality Motion (Attached here as Appendix E).**

Dr. Clark summarized the rationale for the motion. Senator Janna Saslaw commented that after reviewing the articles in Inside Higher Education, it is clear that the AAUP does not recommend the use of collegiality standards in tenure decisions. Their position is that research, teaching, and service should be affected by the collegiality issue and it should be addressed according to those three things. She would like to see more research conducted especially over the criteria listed in those articles. Senator Isabel Medina is against including collegiality as a factor into any kind of tenure or rank decision. Back in the 1990s, when she served on the FHRC, they gave consideration to the question of introducing issues with collegiality into the Handbook provisions that deal with tenure was given, and the idea was rejected because such issues tend to make it easy for the attention to be taken away from merit factors, which is what tenure and rank are supposed to be about, and make it easy for political factors to come into play.

Senator Eileen Doll, a current member of URTC, explained the reasons for presenting the motion. While her personal opinion is against including collegiality as part of the review for tenure and promotion, it does exist in some places on our campus. Currently, there is nothing in the Faculty Handbook about collegiality, but because some departments on campus use it and others do not, it makes for an inconsistent review of candidates who apply for promotion in rank or tenure, especially in the case of an appeal to URTC. The review process is very difficult when there are inconsistencies across campus. Because we are about to restructure the colleges, this seemed like an appropriate time to provide a definition of collegiality to be used where deemed appropriate. It is difficult to make something part of any process if it is not in the Handbook. Senator C.J. Stephenson commented that there does not seem to be a good way to apply this to the review of promotion or rank and asked if the Faculty Handbook could simply add a sentence that collegiality should not be used during the review for promotion in rank or tenure. Dr. Clark responded that his suggestion would require someone to write the language, determine where it should be placed, then propose it to the FHRC. Senator Ed Vacek would like to see collegiality addressed somewhere but this is not the place. The proposed motion does not define exactly what we want collegiality to be. That needs to be determined before a decision is made on whether or not to apply it consistently across campus.
Senator Maurice Brungardt asked Dr. Doll if the URTC could omit information about collegiality in a review since it is not consistent across campus. Dr. Doll responded that a collegiality clause does exist is in the protocol of some departments or programs. It is not in conflict with the Faculty Handbook, but a problem does exist if a person is being denied rank or tenure based on his/her collegiality and there is nothing listed in the Handbook. Senator Trimiko Melancon asked to what degree it presents a conflict. If an individual is up for tenure and the criteria are not consistent across the board, wouldn’t that present an opportunity for the applicant to sue the University? Senator Ralph Tucci asked if a departmental protocol becomes part of a college handbook, and whether that in effect becomes part of the University Faculty Handbook. Dr. Clark responded that one does not become part of the other, but they become part of the basis on which a decision is made and how it is handled. Ms. Medina pointed out that the University Faculty Handbook was approved by the President and Board of Trustees. If college and department protocols are consistent with the University Handbook, there should not be a problem. But, when departments begin to add their own language to their document that is not consistent, that is when problems arise. She is not sure the Senate is the appropriate place for that to be addressed. To vote for the collegiality motion A in favor; B opposed; C is to abstain. The results: 4 in favor; 29 opposed; 0 abstentions. The motion fails.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Appendices:
A. Chair’s report (January 2015)
   Current Reserved Spaces (Distributed via email as a PDF attachment)
B. Board Committee Reports
C. Handbook Revisions: Chapter 11A (Law Clinic)
D. Handbook Revisions: University Professor
E. Collegiality Motion
Appendix A: Senate Chair’s Report
January 2015

renewal of phased retirement plan
The current phased retirement plan is in its fifth year and therefore up for renewal. Marc Manganaro has asked us to review it and recommend any revisions we believe might be helpful. In particular, he has noted that the current plan requires faculty complete the phase by the age of 70, and he wonders whether this is necessary. The Senate does not have standing to approve this plan, but Marc rightly feels it is a good medium for soliciting comments from faculty, so I encourage you to raise the issue with your constituents. (I’ve specifically asked the faculty representatives to the Fringe Benefits Committee to weigh in as well.) Please send me any comments or thoughts you have, so I can compile them for Marc and others; if any of you feel the need for a fuller discussion at a Senate meeting, let me know, and I’ll work on that. Marc wants all recommendations by 6 March 2015, so that they can be digested and used in the plan presented to the Board for approval in May. The current plan can be found at http://academicaffairs.loyno.edu/renewal-loyola-university-new-orleans-phased-retirement-program-tenured-faculty.

reserved parking places
Robbie Reed sent me the list of reserved parking places that Barbara Ewell requested at the November meeting, so I’m attaching it here.

Serpas hire
The circumstances and implications of Ronal Serpas’s hiring to our faculty came up at our last meeting, and I want to follow up a bit here. I continue to be very concerned about the use of the title Professor of the Practice, which has no precedent on our campus and has associations elsewhere of a kind of sometimes second-tier, usually teaching-intensive position (sometimes tenurable, sometimes not) that I think raise very troubling issues. That question, however, is something I’m trying to work on behind the scenes and in connection with the Chapter 15 revisions the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee is working on.

It seems to me the fundamental issues for our purposes have to do with the process by which he was hired: faculty input, college salary budgets, and tenure procedures. Marc has told us that the hire was made with the input, and perhaps even at the instigation of, the Department of Criminal Justice, so the first criterion is met. Marc has also noted that this department is down a couple of faculty, and he has at least implied that the salary associated with this position falls within the existing salary budget for the College of Social Sciences. One may well question the wisdom of using the budget in this way—I don’t feel qualified to take a definitive stand on this question—but a dean does have the right to make such a decision.

This leaves the question of tenure: specifically, was Dr. Serpas’s tenure approved by the Rank and Tenure Commitee of the College of Social Sciences? I know from direct experience that in the not terribly distant past hires with tenure, especially administrative hires, have not always gone through any sort of process, but that seems to have been improving. Marc has asked Roger White to determine whether that step was indeed taken here; I will report to you when I find out.
I have suggested to Marc that it might be wise to have a definitive commitment that all hires with tenure—senior faculty “stars,” administrators, whatever—will be vetted by the relevant college’s rank and tenure committee (expedited when necessary). This may require an addition or revision to the Faculty Handbook as well.

I am well aware there are other concerns, relating specifically to his leadership of the New Orleans Police Department. There I tend to agree with Kevin Wildes: we need to see what may come out of the investigative process. In any case, Dr. Serpas is entitled to all the due process protections of both the law and his status as a tenured member of the faculty. I’m sure this is not the end of the story.

academic honor code
This fall, the academic honor code for which the Academic Integrity Council serves as appeals body was presented to the HNS Council of Chairs, several members of which apparently said they had not seen it before. It became clear that no faculty body had in fact approved the code—the Senate discussed (and in a way approved) a draft in spring 2013, and it has chosen faculty representatives for the Academic Integrity Council since that time, but that’s it.

I’ve been in conversation with Teri Gallaway, chair of the Academic Integrity Council, Kendra Reed, who will take over that task when Teri goes on sabbatical in April, Uriel Quesada, Associate Dean of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences, and Melanie McKay. Uriel has also taken the academic honor code to the Associate Deans’ Council, where they have clarified some aspects. (These changes are enshrined in the code as it appears in the 2014-15 Bulletin; see 2014bulletin.loyno.edu/academic-honor-code.) It still seems rather unclear to me who exactly has oversight over this policy (including future revision): according to the code itself, the Academic Integrity Council (which currently consists of six faculty representatives, two staff members, and four student representatives) officially has no role other than handling appeals.

We’re still working on this, but Melanie suggested the following, which seems like a sensible way to proceed: the deadline for the 2015-16 Bulletin is very soon, so we need to roll over the current policy for that publication. This spring, however, the associate deans and the (faculty) members of the Academic Integrity Council would engage in a campaign to circulate this document to the four colleges (it does not apply to Law, though it does apply to other graduate students) and the library, where faculty would be encouraged to discuss it and make recommendations. Those would be incorporated into a final draft that will come to the Senate for approval in the fall.

Please let me know any thoughts you have on this issue. I’m grateful to Teri, Kendra, Uriel, and Melanie for their help to ensure that the critically important matter of our students’ academic integrity is handled effectively and in a manner that protects the best interests of all.

short-term faculty medical leave
This is another issue that goes back before my election as chair in May 2013. As some of you know, the Senate passed a policy calling for up to six months of paid medical leave for ordinary faculty (three months for full-time extraordinary faculty with at least one year of service); the policy was revised by
Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel and sent back to the Senate in early 2012. The major substantive change was that the Senate provision allowing faculty to use this leave to care for members of the immediate family was eliminated. After some discussion, the Senate restored that provision in April 2013, and the revised policy has remained in limbo since that time.

When I approached Gita Bolt in October, she informed me that the policy approved by the Senate in April 2013 did not in fact go back to her office, but that she would look at it. I’m still trying to get a firm answer following up on that, but I suspect it’s going to be a refusal to accept anything other than the version sent by her office to the Senate in spring 2013, which would put us at an impasse. I will report back to you when I know something more, at which time we can determine what to do.

upcoming meetings
I’m working to get Jay Calamia and Leon Mathes to meet with us, probably in March or April, to talk about the financial outlook for the University. Roberta Kaskel will probably come to talk about enrollment issues in both March and April. I’m also hoping Cissy Petty can come talk with us about Title IX and campus sexual assault. Kevin Wildes will surely come at some point during the semester, but I want to get these scheduled first—which probably means his appearance will be late in the term.

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
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Appendix B: Board Committee Reports (January 2015)

Academic and Student Affairs Committee (Carol Ann MacGregor, Eileen Doll)
The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees held a meeting at 1pm on Thursday December 4th, 2014. The meeting began with a presentation by Dr. Cissy Petty, Vice President for Student Affairs about new legislation related to sexual violence. She provided an overview of the federal laws that apply to Loyola and noted that her office is working with the Office of the General Counsel to ensure Loyola is compliant. She noted that Loyola has nine trained Title IX coordinators which is the most of any Jesuit institution. She also spoke briefly about the SGA’s involvement in the “It’s On Us” campaign and the Loyola Advocates Initiative. The latter won the Jesuit Association of Student Affairs Professional’s Ignatian Medal for Best Program. One important part of the new policy for faculty is the mandatory reporters component which means if a student reports they have been a victim of sexual assault you cannot keep it in confidence. We must inform the student right away that we have to report, and if the student requests it not be reported, then send her/him to the Student Health Center or to talk with clergy.

Roberta Kaskel, Vice President for Enrollment Management, gave an update on enrollment and noted that we are about 300 applications shy of where we were this time last year. However, she noted this may be because of a late administration of the ACT in Louisiana which is a requirement for TOPS and other scholarships. However, the auditions for the College of Music and Fine Arts are higher, and there is significant interest in the new degree programs (Film, Popular and Commercial Music, and Design). She noted that there has been a lot of turnover in her office, particularly among travelling admissions officers, but that the team now in place is working very hard. She will provide a more comprehensive enrollment update at the March meeting.

Provost Manganaro gave an update on strategic planning noting that action plans are in progress, and financial plans for each of the five areas are in the works. He also gave an update on the proposed restructuring of the colleges. He noted that the ad hoc committee working on restructuring is about to make its final recommendations to the President who will ultimately make the decision. There was a discussion of the future of Mass Communication after two trustees asked questions.

Bud Sheppard gave a report from the SGA and their activities. If anyone is interested, he posts the Weekly Howl on youtube and Facebook now.

There were two action items on the agenda. First, after a brief discussion, the committee unanimously approved a new degree (B.A.) in Theatre Arts and Musical Theatre. Second, the committee moved to accept the committee on Honorary Degrees recommendation that two high profile entertainers be added to the pool of potential honorary degree recipients.

Finance Committee (Craig Hood and Chris Screen)
For the Board of Trustees meeting on December 4, 2014 focused on an update of the AY 2014-15 budget, the
endowment, the current projected AY 2013-14 budget, and recommendations for addressing the budget deficit

2014-15 Projected Budget Status (see attached spreadsheet)
The university’s operations for the fiscal year 2014-15 were calculated to result in a budget deficit of $1.2 million. The results of the VSP were not known at this time, but projections are for a deficit of $1.2 million for 2014-15 with a 9.17% draw on the endowment to support current operations.

Concerning Projected Revenues, the Total projected revenues of $152.9 million were under budget approximately $1.2 million. This included decreased Graduate School, Summer School, Gifts, and Residence Hall revenues. However, increases in revenues included increased Law revenue due to more students enrolled than projected.

Concerning Expenditures, the Total expenditures of $153.2 million are under budget by $0.1 million. This included increased expenditures in Law Scholarships and Financial Aid, due to the VSP. Decreases in expenditures included decreased Financial Aid (due to a better managed award system), All Other budget, and decreased salaries due to positions not being filled.

2015-16 Proposed Budget (see attached spreadsheets)
The budget proposal as recommended by the University Budget Committee was reported to be based on incoming Undergraduate class of 640 new students and 130 transfers for a total of 770 new students and a retention rate of 75%. Law revenue is to be based on enrollment of 497 students.

Fr. Wildes, following recommendations of UBC, recommended a 2.0% Undergraduate Tuition increase, no increase in Law, no increase in Graduate programs, no Room increase, a 3.0% Board increase, an increase in Athletics fee (from $145 to $275) and no increase in Faculty/Staff Salary Merit Pool. The final budget will be presented in the May 2015 Board meeting.

Reference Group Data on tuition costs, extracted from US NEWS INFORMATION, as well as a report by Scannell & Kurz were presented to put the current costs in context.

There was extended discussion on the proposed increase of the Athletics fee as well as comparing the results of the US NEWS and Scannell & Kurz data. It was noted that the total student costs in the two studies are not entirely comparable. The proposed increases in Athletics fee will support expansion of Intercollegiate Athletics and add offerings that will support recruiting students to the university.

The Finance Committee of the Board approved the recommended budget as proposed by Fr. Wildes.

Report on Facilities (from Facilities Subcommittee)
All major construction and renovation projects are proceeding on schedule and scheduled occupancy of under-construction portions of Monroe Hall are expected by December 8th.

Report on Endowment (from Endowment Subcommittee)
It was reported that overall, Loyola’s Endowment is strong, given the draw-downs for operations. As of September 30, 2014, the market value for the Unrestricted Pool was $163.6 million, whereas the value of the Restricted Pool stood at $111.5 million.

As of July 2013, the Loyola Unrestricted Pool was invested as follows: 66% in Equities, 31% in Cash/Fixed Income and 2% in Alternatives. The Restricted Pool is currently invested in a balanced mutual fund which maintains a blend of approximately 73% Equities and 27% Bonds.

During the fiscal year, the Endowment Committee spent considerable time working with Loyola’s investment consultant to select several new investment managers. In light of today’s low yield environment and the heightened
potential for rising interest rates in the years ahead, the Committee funded three new Fixed Income managers to reduce U.S. interest rate risk within Loyola’s portfolio. Two new International Equity managers were funded to both replace an underperforming incumbent manager and gain selective exposure to Emerging Markets. Finally, the Committee approved several new managers to fill out approved Hedged Equity and Real Estate targets, which represent relatively new asset classes for Loyola. Loyola staff has been working with their custodian and investment consultant to effectively allow for the commingling of the Unrestricted and Restricted Pools for investment purposes. These efforts are expected to improve diversification within the Restricted Pool and result in significant cost savings for the university while still maintaining compliance with required guidelines set forth by the Louisiana Board of Regents.

2013-14 Projected Budget (see attached spreadsheet)

It was reported that the university’s operations for the fiscal year 2013-14 are calculated to result in a budget deficit of $7.5 million.

Offsets to this deficit are being recommended in two phases to the Trustees. At this October meeting, Fr. Wildes presented his initial recommendations for approval – a Voluntary Severance Plan (VSP) – discussed below. Based on the savings realized from the VSP, additional recommendations to reduce the shortfall will be recommended to the Trustees at its December 2013 meeting. At this point, because projected savings involve a voluntary severance program for Ordinary faculty, it is believed that most tenured faculty will elect to participate when their 2013-14 contract expires; thus these savings would occur August 1, 2014. The VSP associated with staff and extraordinary faculty would take place midyear, thus half of their current budgeted salaries would produce savings in this AY budget. With the above in mind, there is a projected deficit of $4.3 million for 2013-14 with a 5% Endowment draw to support current operations.

Voluntary Severance Plan— The VSP was submitted to the Committee, which included:

Voluntary Severance Program for Tenured Faculty
The severance amount recommended is one and a half year’s salary, paid in a lump sum, with no extended benefits. There are 94 faculty that are age 55+ with 10+ years of service. This program would be effective January 2, 2014 or August 1, 2014. Faculty would have a choice to leave before their 2013-14 contract expired, January 2, 2014, however, they would not be paid their remaining portion of the 13-14 contract.

Voluntary Severance Program for Extraordinary Faculty
The severance amount recommended is one year’s salary, paid in a lump sum, with no extended benefits. There are 9 faculty that are age 55+ with 10+ years of service. This program would be effective January 2, 2014 or August 1, 2014. Faculty would have a choice to leave before their 2013-14 contract expired, January 2, 2014, however, they would not be paid their remaining portion of the 13-14 contract.

Voluntary Severance Program for Full Time Staff
The severance amount recommended is one year’s salary, paid in a lump sum, with no extended benefits. There are 82 full time staff that are age 55+ with 10+ years of service. This program would be effective January 2, 2014.

Budget Savings (see attached Exhibit III)
Based on experiences from other universities, budget savings were calculated on the basis of a 30% participation in each category of faculty/staff with the assumption that none of the Ordinary Faculty would begin the plan until the end of the current AY.

Discussion
There was extended discussion of the plan, with emphasis placed on ensuring that the plan be voluntary. Concern was expressed that some departments or programs might have several faculty/staff members electing to participate in the plan, and immediate replacement of some positions to ensure that the work of those programs was not compromised would be needed. Depending on the number of faculty/staff who elect to participate (and thus the amount of savings to the current AY budget), the President will propose further deficit reduction plans at the December Finance Committee meeting. However, as shown in Exhibit III, 30% participation will only contribute about $1.2 million in savings, thus a substantial deficit will remain this AY. The future “size” of Loyola’s student body was noted as an important piece of the near-term and longer-term budget planning for the university.

The Finance Committee approved the proposed Voluntary Severance Plan, which will be addressed by the full Board of Trustees in the full board meeting on October 18th.

Institutional Advancement Committee (Cathy Rogers)

Trustee Attendees: Anne Gauthier, Robert LeBlanc, Sean O’Keefe, John Simmons, Edgar Chase, Janet Boles, Robert “Bobby” Savoie, Alumni Board President Allison Plaisance (ex officio); IA Staff Attendees: Bill Bishop, Chris Wiseman, Laurie Leiva, Rhonda Brehm and University Senate Representative Cathy Rogers.

Vice President Bill Bishop gave updates about the Faith in the Future Campaign. The campaign total to date is $47.85 million overall. Of that amount, $926,711 is for Unrestricted and Budget Relief which Bishop said is great for a university our size and that he expects the goal of $1.9 M for that category to be exceeded. This will be the first time in a long time to reach a million dollars in that category. While still a little short of the 50 percent mark, Bishop was optimistic and praised his staff. The fact that the staff is smaller than when the Campaign began, his office has relied more on alumni and the Board to engage people.

Chris Wiseman, Associate VP for Development, reported on his recent meeting with all Campaign committee chairs and said that the committees are starting to build out. He introduced the Social Entrepreneur program that he and Stephanie Hotard have initiated to address the declining success of traditional alumni phonathons because of the declining answer rates. Alumni participation is declining nationally, and Wiseman expects this pilot program to help Loyola improve its 8-10 percent rate of alumni giving, a rate that is not satisfactory. The program takes advantage of the internet and social networks to find alumni contact information, and his office has hired five part time “annual giving social entrepreneurs” to identify at least 1,000 new and renewed donors. Their goals are discovery of contact information, engagement and successful solicitation.

Sean O’Keefe expressed support for this initiative especially because of the way the internet and social networks have transformed the culture. Wiseman said that the program is budget neutral. Bobby Savoie complimented the initiative because of the long-term payoff in creating a giving base for the future. Anne Gauthier stressed the importance of creating a culture of giving.

Bishop summarized the Campaign update with optimism that AY 14-15 is off to a good start. Factors competing for attention in the fundraising environment include the current economic status of the University, the new strategic plan, the enrollment status, the positives and negatives of reorganization and other changes including the decision for Marketing and Communication to be stand alone.
The Committee approved the resolution to request Board of Regents Matching Funds for the Brian Bromberger Distinguished Professorship in Law.

Laurie Leiva, Director of Alumni Relations, and Alumni Association President Allison Plaisance reported on alumni development. Plaisance reported the following info: 29 alumni chapters, 11 committees, more than 47,000 undergraduate and graduate members, 13,372 active alumni addresses, 94 events in FY14, 70 percent are active, which means that they give financially. About 9-10 percent of all alumni give.

O’Keefe suggested that it would be a huge success if the percentage could be increased to 15 percent, and ideally for every person to give any amount every year. Leiva pointed to Transforming Loyola 2020 priority of transforming Loyola’s Career Services with the support of the alumni network. In terms of alumni involvement in student recruitment, the optimum time is the yield phase – January to May, and that her office is working with Admissions to develop alumni support for recruitment. Volunteer training will take place in January 2015, and alumni will reach out during February and March to accepted students. Alumni chapters in Houston, Dallas, Miami and San Francisco will host receptions in March for admitted students. Plaisance said that the Alumni Association is excited to help with recruiting.
Appendix C: Chapter 11A (Law Clinic)

CHAPTER ELEVEN A

LAW CLINIC FACULTY

A. Norms for Appointment and Advancement

The clinical track offers security of position which is the right to continue once a clinical faculty member has received a fixed contract (five years, presumptively renewable and subject to extensions, in five-year increments, as determined by the Clinic Director, the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee, and the Dean) in accordance with this section of the Handbook. Law Clinic Faculty are not Extraordinary Faculty under Handbook Chapter 15.

The norms for appointment and advancement for faculty in the Law Clinic fall into three general areas: teaching, scholarship, and community service. The determination of whether a particular applicant qualifies for appointment to the Clinic faculty, of the rank to be offered on first appointment, of whether a probationary contract shall be extended, and of whether an appointment shall be made and/or renewed under the terms of a fixed contract, not to exceed five years, will be made by the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee, and will be governed by the criteria listed in this Chapter. The Clinic Hiring and Promotion Committee’s determination shall in all cases be subject to approval by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Dean of the College of Law shall in all cases forward to the Vice President for Academic Affairs his or her independent opinion of the determination made by the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee.

1. Assistant Clinic Professor

A person being considered for appointment to the rank of Assistant Clinic Professor, which ordinarily is the beginning rank, must be of good character, must be a member of the bar in good standing, must have a commitment to clinical teaching and University goals, and must have a record of experience or academic achievement indicative of a high probability that he or she will be able to meet the standards for promotion.

2. Associate Clinic Professor

A person being considered for promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Clinic Professor must be of good character and must have demonstrated a level of teaching proficiency, writing ability, and legal experience that provides clear and convincing promise that the candidate will eventually meet all of the standards for promotion to the non-tenure-track rank of Clinic Professor.
Ordinarily, an Assistant Clinic Professor who has completed two years of teaching in the Clinic merits consideration in the third year for promotion in the fourth year. Previous experience, either as a member of a law faculty or as a lawyer engaged in other significant activity, may be taken into account so as to shorten the period of service required for promotion, upon the recommendation of the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee and with the approval of the Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. Clinic Professor

A member of the Law Clinic faculty who has rendered distinctive and outstanding service to clinical education and to the University may be considered for the rank of Clinic Professor.

Ordinarily, an Associate Clinic Professor who has taught on a full-time basis for five years in Clinical Legal Education merits consideration for promotion to the rank of Clinic Professor in the sixth year, to be effective as of the seventh year of service. Previous experience, either as a member of a law faculty or as a lawyer engaged in other significant activity, may be taken into account so as to shorten the period of service required for promotion, upon the recommendation of the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee and with the approval of the Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

B. Norms for Appointment to the Rank of Clinic Professor

Clinic faculty being considered for promotion to or initial hiring at the rank of Clinic Professor shall be evaluated pursuant to the following criteria:

1. Teaching

Since the education of Loyola Law students is the primary mission of the Law Clinic, it is essential that the Clinic faculty be effective teachers, demonstrating both the capacity and the commitment necessary to inspire and challenge their students.

It is not possible precisely to define each of the essential components of one’s teaching ability. This is particularly true with respect to clinical teaching, since clinical methodologies are still evolving and being tested in a variety of classroom settings. It is, however, possible to enumerate factors by which clinical teaching can be evaluated. Clinic faculty should be judged for promotion to or hiring at the rank of Clinic Professor according to their demonstrated abilities and accomplishments in each of the following areas:

   a. Innovation and imagination in the presentation of clinic skills materials;
b. Ability to utilize various methods for evaluating students’ clinical performance and for providing effective guidance and feedback” following such evaluation;

c. Ability to induce, stimulate, and require critical, thoughtful analysis of legal problems and implementation of courses of action to resolve problems within the parameters of appropriate client representation;

d. Ability to help students understand and deal with problems of professional responsibility which arise in clinical situations;

e. Ability to teach students how to evaluate their own work;

f. Maintenance of discipline and control of students in all clinical teaching situations;

g. Punctuality and consistence in all clinical teaching settings;

h. Knowledge of the substantive fields of law and the procedures applicable to the case load;

i. Ability to communicate clearly and effectively;

j. Enthusiasm for the goals of the clinic;

k. Ability to stimulate and maintain student interest in his or her assigned cases and in improving professional skills;

l. Ability to devise meaningful and fair student evaluation procedures;

m. Ability to relate and integrate practical and theoretical considerations;

n. Development of innovative teaching methodology;

o. Development of innovative research and writing techniques regarding teaching methods or other clinic-related skills;

p. Ability to train and supervise other faculty and professional staff in their teaching responsibilities;

2. Scholarship
Clinic faculty promoted to or hired at the rank of Clinic Professor are expected to have produced a high quality of written work, although the content and format of their work may differ from that produced by candidates for the ordinary tenure-track faculty. Publications may be in the form of briefs, memoranda, studies, statutory interpretations or proposals, regulations, teaching materials, or reports, if such writings are appropriate to advancing either the state of the law in the area in which the clinician is working or the state of clinical teaching methodology. All such publications should reflect an active, inquiring, insightful, and open mind indicating that the clinician will continue to strive for personal and intellectual growth and development. While the traditional scholarship expected of ordinary tenure-track faculty is not a requirement for promotion for the clinic faculty, any such scholarship will be viewed positively in connection with consideration for promotion.

3. Community Service

As in the case of tenure-track faculty, clinic faculty are expected to devote full time to their College of Law duties and commitments. In addition to the duties of teaching and writing, a clinic faculty member bears the responsibility of attending and participating in staff meetings and of being available to students to discuss their various needs. Activities outside the Law Clinic should include significant service to the community and the legal profession, which may be met by participation in professional organizations and governmental, charitable, or other community service activity.

4. Character, Integrity and Cooperativeness

These qualities, while essential, require no explanation. Clinic faculty are also expected to meet the professional responsibilities specified in Chapter Seven, Sections A and B, of the Loyola University Faculty Handbook.

C. Arrangements for All Full-Time Clinic Faculty Who Are Appointed Under the Provisions of This Chapter

1. Clinic faculty (except the Director) shall be employed on the basis of Probationary Contracts (one-year, non-renewable, but subject to five one-year extensions, as determined by the Clinic Director, the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee, and the Dean) or Fixed Contracts (five years, presumptively renewable and subject to extensions, in five-year increments, as determined by the Clinic Director, the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee, and the Dean). No fixed contracts will be terminated or fail to be renewed unless there is good cause as defined under Chapter 9.

2. Salaries shall be set by the Dean at levels he or she determines to be appropriate in light of all relevant factors, including the requirements of ABA Standard 405(e).
3. Clinic faculty will be eligible to apply for sabbatical leave on the same basis as the tenure-track faculty, and all such applications will be governed by the procedures and criteria set forth in Chapter Six, Section E, of the Loyola University Faculty Handbook.

4. Clinic faculty will be eligible to apply for research assistants, research and writing grants, and reduced teaching time for research on the same basis and according to the same criteria as govern the tenure-track faculty.

5. Clinic faculty will be expected to serve on such University or College of Law committees as the Dean, at his or her discretion, shall determine.

6. Clinic faculty may apply for authorization to teach any course in the College of Law curriculum and such requests may be granted to a member of the Clinic faculty upon approval of the tenure-track faculty and the Dean.

7. Members of the Clinic faculty may apply for appointment to the tenure-track for ordinary faculty and will be evaluated according to the normal standards and procedures required of other candidates for such appointments.

8. The Clinic shall have a Hiring and Promotions Committee comprised of all Clinic faculty holding the rank of Associate Clinic Professor or Clinic Professor. The Director of the Clinic shall also be a member of the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee. Recommendations concerning initial appointments and promotions of Clinic faculty shall require a majority vote of the Clinic Hiring and Promotions Committee.

D. Annual Review of Clinic Faculty Members Serving Under One-year Contracts

Each member of the Clinic faculty serving under a one-year contract is considered to be on probation. Each shall receive an annual written evaluation from the Clinic Director. This evaluation shall cover the strengths and weaknesses of the Clinic faculty member regarding fulfillment of those professional responsibilities as outlined herein and in Chapter 7 of the Loyola University Faculty Handbook.

E. Procedures for Review of Non-renewals of Probationary Appointments

Procedures for Review of Non-renewals of Probationary Appointments will be the same as outlined in Section G of Chapter 4 of the Loyola University Faculty Handbook.

F. Procedures for Notice of Termination and Termination
Notice of termination and procedures for termination from Chapter 9 shall govern with regard to Clinic Faculty on Fixed Contracts and all references to Chapter 6 are hereby incorporated.

G. Professional Rights of the Law Clinic Faculty
Chapter 8 of the Handbook is hereby incorporated so that Clinic Faculty enjoy all professional rights afforded under the Handbook.

Appendix D: Handbook Revisions: University Professor

5. University Professor
University Professor is a rank that may be awarded in extraordinary circumstances to honor a Loyola Professor who is highly distinguished in his or her profession. It falls directly under the jurisdiction of the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and does not affect the salary pool of any college. This rank may be permanent for any Ordinary faculty member who has served at Loyola, as long as the recipient is employed fulltime by the University. The qualifications for appointment to this rank should parallel those for promotion to the rank of Professor (see Chapter 4, Section A Part 4), but with greater distinction. All three areas (teaching, research, and service) must be considered; excellence in a single category is not sufficient for appointment to this rank.

A University Professor may be appointed from time to time by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs with the advice and consent of the University Rank and Tenure Committee in consultation with the dean and affiliated department(s). A letter of nomination from the Provost, a letter from the candidate, his or her curriculum vitae, and letters of support from the dean and department(s) must be included when the file goes to the University Rank and Tenure Committee for consideration. The committee will send its recommendation to the President.

A University Professor may offer courses in any College with the approval of the Dean and departmental faculty of the College concerned.

4If a department line should be used for a University professorship and the line is withdrawn from the department, the department would be credited with a reimbursed tenure-track line.
Appendix E: Collegiality Motion

Proposed motion for the University Senate:

Whereas certain departments include collegiality in faculty evaluation;

whereas college reorganization is an opportunity to promote consistency in evaluation for rank, tenure, and reappointment;

and whereas the Faculty Handbook does not include collegiality;

the University Senate recommends that a campus-wide definition of collegiality be formulated, and its application to faculty evaluation be applied consistently across the university.

Questions:
Who will create this definition?
How can it be applied and where?
Will anyone who defines it differently be willing to change? or forced to change?
Does it belong in the Handbook if only a few departments/programs use it for evaluation?
Should it be eliminated as a factor for evaluation? If so, should it be replaced with “professionalism”?