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CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m.

INVOCATION
Daniela Marx offered an invocation.

Guests were introduced. Student guests announced their presence at the meeting: Mary Graci, a news reporter for the Maroon, and Sophia Masone, a journalism student.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The minutes from the December 12, 2013 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 questions about the report.

PROVOST’S REPORT
The Report from the Provost was distributed via email (attached here as Appendix B). There was no discussion or questions about the report.

REPORTS
Other Reports – None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
Faculty Handbook revision (Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum) (attached here as Appendix C). There was no discussion or questions about the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 38 in favor and 2 abstentions. The revised protocol was approved and will be forwarded to Provost Manganaro.

CSS restructuring motion (attached here as Appendix D). Senator Kathleen O’Gorman commented that she was part of the discussion when the CSS memo was written and the decision to postpone the restructuring of the college was based on the fact that the entire university should be involved. The restructuring of CSS will affect the entire university, not just the departments currently within the college. The motion appeared to cover only one college, and there was more to be considered. Alice Clark responded that the executive committee motion was intended mostly to keep the issue on the agenda for a full discussion in February, since there was not time for discussion at the December Senate meeting. Senator Isabel Medina asked if it was necessary to vote on the motion since Provost Manganaro supported the memo at the December meeting. Alice Clark confirmed that the Provost did state that there is no plan to restructure the college, but because there was a motion on the table it must be voted on. Senator Isabel Medina moved to table the motion. Tish Beard seconded. The motion to table, which required a 2/3 vote, did not pass (26 in favor, 7 opposed, and 9 abstentions). Senator Jon Altschul felt it was a harmless motion that should be passed, and recalled the Provost having no objection to the motion. Senator Mitchell Crusto commented that the reference to CSS should be removed from the motion since any reorganization would affect the entire university. He moved to amend the motion to change the language to
read “amend any college” and not specifically CSS. Craig Senn seconded. Senator Marcus Kondkar commented that the mention of another college is just recognizing that the restructuring of CSS is going to have implications on other colleges. Connie Rodriguez called the question. The vote to amend the motion passes with 23 in favor, 13 opposed, and 5 abstentions. There was no further discussion on the motion as amended. Gwen George called the question on the motion as amended. Connie Rodriguez seconded. The vote on the amended motion passed with 37 in favor and five opposed. There will be further discussion of the structure of the College of Social Sciences and related issues at the February Senate meeting.

Print Services motion (attached here as Appendix E). Senator Marcus Kondkar commented that it was his understanding that the individuals involved in finding space have made every effort possible and concluded that the Danna Center space is the best scenario that can be offered. Guest Carol Leake noted that the Danna Center space has the potential of exposing students to faculty materials, which could lead to such materials being sabotaged. Senator Mark Grote supported what Marcus Kondkar commented, and added that it has been made very clear by the administration and the space committee that every possible location has been investigated and the Danna Center space is the only adequate space available at this time. Senator Glenn Hymel asked for clarification on what Mark Grote stated “at this time”; does that mean that the move to the Danna Center would be a temporary move? Bret Jacobs, Chair of the Staff Senate, commented that the move to the Danna Center is a permanent move for the foreseeable future. Senator Mitchell Crusto suggested tabling the motion because there were more significant issues to discuss at this meeting. He moved to postpone the discussion to the February meeting. Bill Walkenhorst seconded. Senator Glenn Hymel asked whether, if the motion was approved in February, it would allow sufficient time to look for alternate space in time for a move in March. The motion to postpone the discussion to the February meeting did not pass (15 in favor, 22 opposed, and 5 abstentions). Senator Glenn Hymel added that at a previous meeting the observation was made that allegedly the Danna Center location is centrally located. That may be geographically correct but not when you consider the clientele served. Senator Daniela Marx asked whether the discussion was moot since the renovations have already begun and the decision has been made. It does not seem to be a negotiable decision. Senator Behrooz Moazami added that the major concern was that Randy Laumann was not consulted about the move prior to a decision being made. Senator Jon Altschul commented that, if Mark Grote was correct that every option has been investigated, then there is not much more we can do and he would approve the motion. Senator Tish Beard added that space was found in the Communications building that would meet the space needs, and said this needs to be further investigated. Senator John Murphy agreed that the motion states that the Senate supports the search to find more adequate space, and it does not seem necessary to continue the discussion. He called the question. Bill Walkenhorst seconded. By unanimous consent the senate agreed to vote. The motion passed with 31 in favor, 8 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Criteria for financial exigency (attached here as Appendix F). Senator Bill Walkenhorst asked for clarification about item 2 in the recommendations of what the committee should consider. If the motion passed, which year would be considered the first of the two years? Would it be this current year or next year?

(2) whether tuition revenue has fallen short of budgeted expectations by at least 25-30% for two or more consecutive budget years (as calculated on 1 October of each year);

Guest Thom Spence responded that the university is nowhere near being 25% short on tuition revenue. Senator Joe Berendzen noted in response to Bill Walkenhorst’s question that no one item or specific combination of items listed qualifies the university for financial exigency. Connie Rodriguez called the question. The motion passed with a vote of 36 in favor, 4 opposed, and 4 abstentions. The criteria are approved and need to be reviewed not less than once every three years. Senator Bob Gerlich asked if the criteria require an approval by
the Board of Trustees. Alice Clark stated that the Faculty Handbook does not state that Board approval is required, only that the Senate establish criteria for financial exigency.

College of Law motion (attached here as Appendix G). Senator Mitchell Crusto pointed out that there seem to be two parts to the motion – one about the retirement contribution issue, and one about making across-the-board budget cuts. He recommends discussing them separately. Senator Joe Berendzen agreed with Dr. Crusto that the two items should be discussed separately. Senator Gwen George asked if Isabel Medina can amend the motion to have two separate discussions since she is the one who wrote it. Senator Joe Berendzen moved to discuss the two items separately and voted on separately. Isabel Medina seconded. The vote to separate the motion and discuss and vote on the two items separately passed with 42 in favor and 1 opposed. Senator Isabel Medina moved to go into executive session. Mitchell Crusto seconded. The vote to go into executive session passed with a vote of 30 in favor, 11 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

The senate went into executive session at 4:20 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

Attachments to agenda:
Chair’s report (January 2014)
Provost’s report
Senate minutes December 2013
SCCC protocol revision clean
CSS motion (December 2013)
Letter to provost re: CSS reorganization report
Print Services motion
Exigency Committee Report
Draft criteria for financial exigency
Motion not to reduce contributions (December 2013)
I know it seems as though we’ve just met...So I don’t have a great deal to report.

Meeting with provost and deans
Monday 6 January I participated in a day-long meeting with the provost, vice-provosts, and deans. The morning was given over to a largely open and thoughtful conversation about both the results of the Voluntary Severance Plan and the next stage of cuts. That’s about all I can say, but more will be forthcoming from Marc in his report, from Kevin in his convocation remarks, and so forth.

Various other matters were reported and discussed during this meeting, many of which (such as Monroe Hall and the Common Curriculum) have been reported elsewhere. Roberta Kaskel talked about upcoming yield events (President’s Open House being the largest of these), as well as some preliminary recommendations from the consultants. It will surprise none of you, I think, to hear that both groups feel that prospective students and their parents should have more, and more substantive, contact with faculty and students, and Roberta and her staff continue to work on ways to make this happen.

One thing I found a little disappointing was the sense the Lawlor Group had in their study of the fall open house that faculty often could not articulate the overall value of a Loyola education. Don’t get me wrong: they apparently saw clearly that our faculty are very good at talking about their own work and their own program, but we seem to have lost some sense of overarching relationships. I don’t know what the answer is, but I hope we can work on that.

We also had a report on the strategic planning process. As Marc laid it out, the list of strategic initiatives previously circulated seem to be coalescing into four key areas: (1) enrollment / recruitment / branding, (2) encouraging and enhancing innovating programs (not just degree programs, but certainly including those), (3) student success (e.g., retention, graduation rate), and (4) financial stability. In the course of the ensuing discussion, I pointed out that I am heartened by this direction, because it refocuses our attention on our key educational mission—on faculty relationships with students—in a way that I did not find foregrounded enough in the previous strategic plan. I should reiterate that discussions on this process will continue and be extended: Marc and Bill Locander will be visiting the colleges, we’ll carve out some time in the Senate, and we’re looking at other possibilities, such as town hall meetings or small-group discussions. Please continue to pass along to me, or to your college representative (or both), any thoughts you have.

General Counsel
I had a productive meeting with Gita Bolt on Friday 3 January. We discussed the Faculty Handbook revision process in general, and specifically the revised protocol for the University Conciliation Committee (passed by the Senate last spring) and a revised non-retaliation policy. Both of those matters have gone to the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee, and I hope they will come to the Senate for approval later this semester. I hope this sets the stage for a more effective working relationship.

Senate awards
Senate awards will be presented at the President’s Convocation on Friday 10 January. The Executive Committee is also working on a protocol and timeline to guide future award processes; that will be presented to the Senate for input soon.

The beginning of the new year, and new semester, is also a good time to look ahead to future Senate meetings and issues on the horizon:

College of Social Sciences
We still intend to have a discussion of the future identity and structure of the College of Social Sciences at our February meeting. Members of this college have had wide-ranging discussions that have not come to any consensus, but it is clear
that nearly every potential modification of this college has implications for the others, so the Senate seems a logical place
to consider such matters.

Enrollment Management
I’m in communication with Roberta Kaskel to try to arrange some form of regular update from her office through the
spring semester; my hope is to find a mechanism that will provide us with the information we want while not creating an
extra burden for her. We are also tentatively hoping to invite her to our March or April meeting to update us personally
and answer questions.

Strategic Planning Team
We are tentatively planning to spend some time at the February meeting, and possibly in March as well, discussing the
draft strategic initiatives as they develop. I hope there will be something we can distribute in advance of the February
meeting to reflect where the committee’s thoughts are headed, and to provide some basis for the Senate’s discussion. The
Board will also discuss the strategic planning process at its March meeting, and their thoughts may provide some fodder
for us to consider as well.

Please continue to come to me with thoughts or concerns.

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

6 January 2014
Appendix B: Provost Report

January 8, 2014
Dear Senators,
I want to wish you a happy New Year and a successful start to the Spring 2014 semester.
I am sorry to miss the Senate meeting on Thursday, which is the first and only Senate meeting I will miss in my first two years as Provost, but as I believe Alice mentioned, I was invited to participate in the Chicago Humanities Summit that is immediately preceding the Modern Language Association meeting in Chicago, and I did not want to miss the opportunity to have a voice in that national discussion on the future of the Humanities, and to represent Loyola there. I will report back to you at the February Senate meeting on the Summit.
While I will not provide here a full Provost report, I did want to address one issue, which is the effect of the Voluntary Severance Program (VSP) and the consequent budget reduction measures. Overall the VSP was quite successful. In Academic Affairs savings in faculty salaries amounted to over $1,133,000, and savings in staff salaries amounted to almost $675,000, bringing us a total of over $1.8 million in Academic Affairs salary savings. In meetings with the deans, I can tell you that three of the deans reported that the savings were greater than expected, and three of the deans reported that those savings landed about where they were estimating. No deans, or for that matter academic units, report having results less than expected. We are very grateful to the faculty and staff who did accept the severance, for their many years of dedicated and excellent service to the University.
However, even with these savings, with a $4.5 million deficit in Academic Affairs, there remains approximately $2.7 million that needs to be reduced. The deans and the Vice Presidents have been working at modeling budget reductions, and I thank them for the emphasis put upon minimizing the effects that budget cutting will have on our primary mission of educating our students. It is the case, however, that there will need to be a reduction in force of employees in February that along with other measures (further operating cuts where possible, not filling open positions, in some cases reduction of hours of employees, etc.) will enable us to close a deficit of around $7.5 million for the University as a whole. I am pleased to say that the hard work of the deans to date has resulted in having to take less recourse to involuntary severance in the colleges, but there still needs to be a reduction in force, that is clear, and that you need to know.
While I have noted this before, I wanted to reiterate that involuntary severance is a measure that will not extend to tenured or tenure-track faculty. Deans will make decisions on extraordinary faculty renewals subject to contracts and according to instructional needs. While we certainly expect to be able to renew the great majority of our extraordinary faculty, and we greatly appreciate their gifts and efforts and accomplishments, there may be cases where with an undergraduate student body significantly smaller we may not have the need for all of the extraordinary and adjunct faculty we have employed in the past few years.
I know this is a difficult and trying process, and not one that can be resolved immediately, but I share in the President’s resolve that we will move forward strategically and with confidence and transparency, and we will become an even stronger university in the years to come. Thanks for your dedication, and my best wishes to you in a substantive discussion in the Senate meeting on Thursday.
All my best,
Marc
Marc K. Manganaro
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affair
Appendix C: Faculty Handbook revision (Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum)

Description of Revisions:

The primary changes to the SCCC protocol involve changes to the membership. The representative from the First Year Seminar Program is removed. The Library faculty member is moved from non-voting to voting status. And all voting faculty representatives are now stipulated to be ordinary faculty.

Changes have also been made to the protocol to reflect the existence of/role of the newly created Director of the Common Curriculum position. Also, a quorum policy has been added.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE COMMON CURRICULUM

Chairperson: A member selected by the committee
Secretary: Appointed by the Provost

Director of the Common Curriculum: Appointed by the Provost, serves as the voting member representing his or her college or division according to the membership structure outlined below. The Director cannot serve as the Chairperson of the Committee.

Voting Members:
1. Two Ordinary Faculty members from the Humanities divisional faculty of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences
2. Two Ordinary Faculty members from the Natural Sciences divisional faculty of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences
3. Two Ordinary Faculty members from the College of Social Sciences
4. One Ordinary Faculty member from the College of Social Sciences representing the non-traditional/evening program from the College of Social Sciences
5. One Ordinary Faculty member from the College of Music and Fine Arts
6. One Ordinary Faculty member from the College of Business
7. One Ordinary Faculty member from the University Library

Non-voting Members:
1. One faculty member from the Loyola Jesuit Community
2. One representative from the Deans’ Council
3. One Student Government Association representative

Terms:
1. Faculty member terms are for three years, staggered and renewable, as determined by each college’s protocols/elections.
2. The Director of the Common Curriculum will be appointed by the Provost and serve a three-year, renewable term.
3. Student Government Association representative may be the Student Government Association President or appointed by the Student Government Association to serve an annual term (may be renewed).
4. Term of Deans’ Council representative will be determined by the Deans’ Council.
**Quorum:**
The presence of six voting members constitutes a quorum for matters requiring committee approval or other official voting. In the absence of quorum, the membership present may still deliberate and discuss matters on the agenda for the official record. In cases where a quorum is met, motions require a simple majority of votes cast to be in favor of the motion.

**Purpose:**
This committee reviews Common Curriculum course proposals and provides oversight of the Common Curriculum. This committee is also responsible for conducting a formal, ongoing, and routine review and evaluation of the Common Curriculum.

**Duties:**
1. It shall serve as the review body for approval of all Common Curriculum course proposals; course approvals shall require a two-thirds vote by the SCCC for approval.
2. It shall, in collaboration with the Director of the Common Curriculum, provide oversight of the Common Curriculum program.
3. It shall evaluate the effectiveness of the Common Curriculum, as well as the effectiveness, composition, and processes of the SCCC, beginning three years after implementation and every five years thereafter, and report to the Provost, the Deans’ Council, the University Courses and Curriculum Committee, the Standing Council for Academic Planning, and the College faculty assemblies.
4. It shall serve as the review board for reconciliation of conflicting requirements with degree programs across all colleges and majors, including professional and continuing studies (non-traditional/evening) programs. Reconciliation of conflicting requirements must be approved by the University Courses and Curriculum Committee.
5. It shall ensure that the Common Curriculum embodies the Ignatian vision of education and values.
6. It shall revise, as necessary, criteria that govern Common Curriculum course approval, course evaluation, course development, and course implementation. Revisions to criteria must be approved by the University Courses and Curriculum Committee.
Appendix D: CSS Restructuring Motion

That the provost hold off considering any restructuring of the College of Social Sciences (or any other college) before the Senate has sufficient time to discuss the impact of voluntary severance and/or reductions in force on the colleges.

attachment: letter to provost re: CSS reorganization report

November 7, 2013

Dr. Marc Manganaro Vice President and Provost Academic Affairs

Re: CSS Ad Hoc Committee’s Report on the CSS Reorganization

Dear Marc,

The CSS Ad Hoc Committee on the CSS Reorganization held its last meeting on Monday, November 4, 2013. The results of that meeting were presented to faculty on Tuesday, November 5th at the third and final faculty assembly of the fall term.

It was motioned, seconded and approved by 90% of the vote that the CSS Reorganization Report be forwarded to you for review with the following resolution:

The CSS faculty are unable to meet the directive for a college restructuring plan for failure of a concrete directive and coherent vision of the University’s expectation and without a discussion that incorporates the larger Loyola community.

You will find that the attached CSS Reorganization Report reflects a summary of each unit’s position of how it would like to fall within a proposed reorganization of the CSS.

The CSS faculty looks forward to their discussion with you at the first assembly of the new year, Tuesday, February 11, 2014, Monroe Library Multi-media Room 2.

Sincerely,

Roger White
Interim Dean, College of Social Sciences

www.css.loyo.edu

Celebrating our Past, Embracing the Future
Introduction: The Ad Hoc Committee on the CSS Reorganization held its last meeting on Monday, November 4, 2013 at noon. It was concluded that at this juncture the CSS is not ready to vote on specific models for the College restructuring. The College is able to offer in the alternative, a summary of each unit’s vote of how it prefers to be structured.

Academic Units

Counseling: Counseling faculty are in majority agreement (2 abstained from responding, the others agree) on the need to have an office of graduate education, that reports directly to the provost and will support grad programs, with a voice at the important committees such as UCCC, UBC, UPC, etc. At the college level, the faculty majority agreement (2 abstained from responding, the others agree) that we would like to be either in a ROBUST CSS, including all of the social sciences, or return to the way it was before pathways, if a robust CSS is not an option. Faculty do not want to be in a college that is just the “leftovers” of CSS.

Criminal Justice: Majority agreement with 1 abstention that the “Re-org” effort is absent strategic direction and vision with respect to how the social sciences fit into the plan for the university moving forward; therefore, we move to not change the structure of the college and instead keep the college as is and focus on a long term solution for a dean.

Loyola Institute for Ministry: 100% in favor of staying in a robust and viable CSS. LIM is also open to exploring the possibility of linking to the Department of Religious Studies perhaps to form a School of Religion and Ministry.

School of Mass Communication: 100% support to become an independent operating unit.

School of Nursing: 78% support to become an independent operating unit; also support for staying as part of CSS, with CSS emphasizing development of ROBUST CSS; against becoming a part of HUNS.

Political Science: 1) A majority of faculty would desire a robust CSS that incorporated other traditional social sciences. 2) If that is not feasible, the faculty is split with 50% wishing to become a part of HUNS and 50% wishing to remain a part of the CSS.

Sociology: Does not have a unified departmental preference. Some faculty are opposed to returning to HUNS, others are open to that possibility, and some are agnostic.

Centers and Institutes

Center for the Study of New Orleans: Abstains from taking a position at this time.

Environmental Communications: 100% support to continue as part of SMC.

Donnelley Center: 100% support to continue as part of SMC.

Institute for Quality and Equity in Education: Director on sabbatical.

Jesuit Social Research Institute: 100% support to remain part of a robust and viable CSS.

Lindy Boggs Literacy Center: 100% support to remain part of a robust and viable CSS.

Twomey Center: 100% support to remain part of a robust and viable CSS.
Appendix E: Print shop motion
Print Services motion (submitted by E. L. Beard)

Resolved: that the Loyola University Senate support finding adequate, functional space in Monroe Hall or a building near the front of the campus to house Print Services.

from E. L. Beard, 26 November 2013:
Randy Laumann runs the Loyola Print shop singlehandedly and the service he provides is extraordinary in the quality of work, the competence of the output, the exceptional accommodation made to the administration, faculty, and student organizations he serves. He turns out bound manuals for the Board of Trustees Meetings, Lab Manuals for Science courses, gorgeous event programs and posters of all kinds through the year. He does work that I know nothing about but we faculty ask him to turn out multiple copies of exams, class notes, instructional materials of all kinds - we are forever asking/begging for his help at the last minute, and he responds in great good humor and kindness by getting our work done accurately and on time.

The Monroe Hall renovations require Print Services to move in May 2014 from its present quarters in Monroe Hall to a space in the Danna Center Basement. Randy has informed his supervisors and his customers that, for many reasons, he cannot accept this space, and that it will make it impossible for him to remain as Print Services Manager. (Please see his letter, reproduced below, for the detailed reasons behind his position.)

The Provost mentioned that having the print shop in the Danna Center would make it more accessible to students, but Print Services' primary purpose is to serve the higher-volume needs of university faculty, staff and organizations, and it is not designed to produce small jobs right away which students typically need.

This motion asks that the Loyola University Senate support finding adequate, functional space in Monroe Hall or a building near the front of the campus to house Print Services.

We will never be able to replace the exceptional service that Randy Laumann provides Loyola.

Thanks so much for your help- Tish Beard

+++++++

from R. Laumann (forwarded by E. L. Beard, included with permission):
Dear Print Services Customers,

On Friday, October 11, 2013, I was notified that Loyola has officially decided to move forward with plans to relocate Print Services to the Danna Center basement as part of the current Monroe Hall renovation and to begin the process of preparing that space for the May 2014 move from Monroe Hall.

Because the Danna Center (DC) location is not an adequate, functional space for Print Services, I have informed my supervisor that I cannot accept it, and that relocation to this space will make it impossible for me to remain as manager of this department.

The Print Services 2010 allocation in the renovated Monroe Hall was 1520 square feet. My calculations indicate that Print Services' minimum space requirement is 1000 square feet. The Danna Center basement space is only 665 square feet.

The DC location's reduced size prohibits items essential to workflow (table surface work area will be reduced by 74%) and reduces storage capacity significantly (shelf area by 75%, floor area by 55%); this will prevent economical purchasing of supplies (resulting in higher prices) and make it impossible to provide the existing range of printing options and services. The DC location's floor plan will result in a dysfunctional and inefficient workflow; this will make it impossible to maintain the
existing level of productivity and quality. Other concerns about this location include decreased convenience for most customers, confidentiality risk, and basement moisture.

As the sole worker managing a print shop that serves a full spectrum of university needs, I cannot afford to move into a space that will prevent me from delivering quality services in a timely and efficient way.

My goal has always been to avoid this crisis. I made appeals to my supervisor, Leon Mathes, and to his supervisor, Jay Calamia, VP for Finance and Administration. They both made appeals on my behalf to find suitable space for Print Services, but were unable to change the outcome.

I do not know if this outcome can be changed, but if Loyola can find adequate, functional space for Print Services, I would be grateful to remain as manager of this department. If it is important to you to have a functional Print Services as well as one managed by me as I have done for 21 years - now is the time to express your thoughts. I have been told that Bret Jacobs would be the appropriate person to whom your concerns should be addressed; Leon Mathes and Jay Calamia may also be CC’d.

I do not want anyone to feel obligated to act on my behalf. I will only ask that you act in your best interest as one who depends on my services to fulfill the needs and mission of the university.

Thank you! If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Randy Laumann
Print Services Manager
Loyola University New Orleans

***APPENDIX***

ITEMS THAT WILL NOT FIT:

**PS Existing = Print Services in current Monroe location**

**DC = Danna Center**

**SHELF STORAGE SPACE (Multi-Level Shelving, represented in linear inches)**

PS Existing Shelves (Linear) ......................1,198”
DC Location Shelves (Linear) .........298”
Deficit ..........................................................900” (will not fit)

**TABLE SURFACE WORK SPACE (SQ IN)**

PS Existing (10 tables) ........................12,232 sq in (84.95 sq ft)
DC Location (2 tables will fit) ...............3,096 sq in (21.5 sq ft) ........ includes padding table in DC
Deficit (8 tables will not fit) .................9,136 sq in (63.45 sq ft) (will not fit)
— Eight tables: 30x48, 30x48, 24x36, 20x32, 18x48, 33x48, 33x48, 20x36

**FLOOR SPACE FOR STACKED PAPER BOXES (UNOPENED):**

PS Existing .......................... 2592 sq in (18 sq ft)
DC Location .......................... 1152 sq in (8 sq ft)
Deficit .............................. 1440 sq in (10 sq ft) (will not fit)
Appendix F: Criteria for financial exigency

The essential function and mission of Loyola University is teaching and research. This essential function is served primarily by tenured and tenure track faculty. The state of financial exigency is important to articulate because it marks a state where tenure loses some of its protective value. Even when the University declares a state of financial exigency, tenured faculty are entitled to a number of substantive and procedural protections provided in Chapter 9 of the Faculty Handbook. FH, Chapter 9, §F.

The Faculty Handbook provides that the University Senate, with the University administration, shall formulate criteria for identifying a bona fide state of financial exigency and determining the proper institutional response to such a condition. UH 9-10. The Faculty Handbook defines financial exigency as a “demonstrably bona fide imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole and which cannot be alleviated by less drastic means.” FH, Chapter 9, §A, ¶ 10.

In determining whether a state of financial exigency exists at the University, the factors described below should be considered and evaluated in the context of the University’s financial position over the course of several years. At the core of the institutional mission is instruction and research; thus, financial exigency must not be the result of a shift in resources from teaching and research towards administration costs and capital expenditures. No one factor or criteria is determinative, but consideration of all or a majority of factors should lead the Exigency Planning Committee, FH, Chapter 9, § F, to determine whether a specific financial crisis in fact threatens the survival of the institution as a whole, that cannot be alleviated by less drastic means than declaration of financial exigency.

The Committee should consider:

1. whether the budgetary conditions that have given rise to the financial crisis are chronic or ongoing—that is, not a temporary shortfall in enrollment, unanticipated increase in costs, etc.—and whether the University’s actual budgetary and economic conditions over the long-term (a minimum of two consecutive academic years, but more appropriately three to five years) suggest a likelihood that the conditions will continue into the future;

2. whether tuition revenue has fallen short of budgeted expectations by at least 25-30% for two or more consecutive budget years (as calculated on 1 October of each year);

3. the extent to which the financial crisis has resulted from a shift in resources from teaching and research towards administration costs and capital expenditures (factors that should be considered in determining whether the financial crisis has resulted from a shift in resources include the extent to which resources that directly support instruction and faculty scholarship have been significantly reduced and diverted to nonacademic expenditures like sports programs, residential halls, development and other nonacademic programs or costs);

4. whether alternatives to declaring a state of financial exigency have been pursued such as expenditure of one-time money or reserves as bridge funding, deferred-compensation plans, early-retirement packages, deferral of nonessential capital expenditures, and cuts to non-educational programs and services, including expenses for administration;
(5) Whether examination of the institution’s financial condition through the composite financial index (CFI) currently used by the University warrants a finding that the institution is in a state of financial exigency. The composite index uses ratios to incorporate institutional debt level and reserves along with other data to come up with a composite score to assess and establish institutional financial health. The Committee should consider in particular two of the ratios used to determine the CFI:

(a) the viability ratio that measures the ratio of reserves to the institution’s long-term debt (the ratio of expendable net assets to long-term debt). The Committee should consider in particular whether the viability ratio has fallen below the minimum recommended by the external benchmark of 1, currently set by KPMG; Prager, Sealy & Co. LLC and Bearing Point, STRATEGIC FINANCIAL ANALYSIS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, 6th ed.; and

(b) the primary reserve ratio measuring the ratio of reserves (expendable net assets) to operating expenses plus interest on capital-asset related debt, to show how many months an institution could continue its operations even if it had no sources of revenue (the ratio of reserves to total expenses). The Committee should consider in particular whether the primary reserve ratio has fallen below the minimum recommended by the external benchmark of 0.4, set by KPMG; Prager, Sealy & Co. LLC and Bearing Point, STRATEGIC FINANCIAL ANALYSIS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, 6th ed.;

(6) Whether Moody’s or Standard & Poor’s have downgraded the institution’s bond rating;

(7) Whether the city’s infrastructure has been compromised to the extent that it cannot support the University over the long-term (at least two semesters).

Prepared by Ad Hoc Committee to Determine Criteria for when a state of financial exigency exists (Isabel Medina, Chair, Alice Clark, Joe Berendzen, Joelle Underwood, Thom Spence) Reviewed by Rev. Kevin Wildes, S.J., Marc Manganaro, Jay Calamia and Leon Mathes.
Appendix G: College of Law motion

Motion proposed by M. Isabel Medina (Law):

The University Faculty Senate joins the College of Law Faculty in urging the President and the Board of Trustees not to reduce University contributions to faculty and staff retirement accounts. Moreover, the Senate and College of Law Faculty urge the President to cease across-the-board budget cuts because they undermine and ultimately are destructive of Loyola’s essential academic mission. Instead, the Senate and College of Law Faculty urge the President to work with the Provost, the other vice-presidents and the Senate’s Ad-hoc Committee on the Administrative Structure of the Institution to identify appropriate areas where budget expenses may be reduced, as has been already undertaken at the College of Law.

Motion passed by the College of Law, 19 November 2013: The College of Law Faculty urges the President and the Board of Trustees not to reduce University contributions to faculty and staff retirement accounts. Moreover, the College of Law Faculty urges the President to cease across-the-board budget cuts because they undermine and ultimately are destructive of Loyola’s essential academic mission. Instead, the College of Law Faculty urges the President to work with the Provost, the other vice-presidents and the Senate’s Ad-hoc Committee on the Administrative Structure of the Institution to identify appropriate areas where budget expenses may be reduced, as has been already undertaken at the College of Law.
Appendix H: Alternative motion on temporary suspension of retirement contribution

The following motion is proposed by the Executive Committee as an alternative to the one proposed by Isabel Medina in December. If that motion passes, then this one would be redundant and would therefore not be proposed. If, however, it does not, then this one will be proposed as new business, which means that it would come up for a vote at the February Senate meeting unless there is a motion to suspend the rules in order to vote on it this month. It is distributed here to provide an alternative that expresses the concern of the Senate about the extreme measure of suspending, even temporarily, the University’s contribution to faculty and staff retirement, without rejecting outright any particular action in response to our budgetary difficulties.

Motion: The University Senate expresses its concern about the proposed temporary reduction or suspension of the University’s contribution to faculty and staff retirement accounts. While we understand the seriousness of our budgetary situation, it is natural to fear that any reduction or suspension might become permanent. Moreover, there is currently little evidence that the time achieved by these temporary means would be used productively, to make strategic cuts to restore the financial health of the University in a way that prioritizes its educational mission. We ask that the administration make explicit the purposes and parameters of any temporary reduction or suspension of benefits before proposing such an extreme measure. We further urge the President and his cabinet work to ensure that any budget cuts or other measures made during the term of such a temporary reduction or suspension be sufficient to allow a complete restoration of retirement contribution at the end of the one-year period. Finally, we ask that the administration involve the Senate ad hoc committee in its work to study the administrative structure of the University.