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

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

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

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

Classical Studies
   Connie Rodriguez (2015)

Counseling
   Thomas Foster (2016)

Criminal Justice
   David Khey (2015)

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

History
   Maurice Brungardt (2015)

Institute for Ministry
   Michael Cowan (2015)

Jesuit Social Research Institute
   Alex Mikulich (2016)

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

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

Law Library
   Brian Huddleston (2016)

Mass Communication
   Cathy Rogers (2015) – proxy to Bob Thomas
   Bob Thomas (2016)

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

Monroe Library
   Teri Gallaway (2016) – proxy to Mary Hines
   Mary Hines (2015)

Music
   Alice Clark (2015)
   Meg Frazier (2016) – proxy to Ed McClellan
   Ed McClellan (2015)
   Janna Saslaw (2016) – proxy to Jeff Albert
   Nicholas Volz (2015) – proxy to Alice Clark

Music Industry Studies
   Jeff Albert (2016)

Nursing
   Gwen George (2015) – proxy to Patricia Pearce
   Patricia Pearce (2016)

Philosophy
   Jon Altschul (2016)
   Joseph Berendzen (2015)

Physics
   Armin Kargol (2015) – proxy to Tirthabir Biswas

Political Science
   Peter Burns (2015)

Psychological Sciences
   Charles Nichols (2016)
   Glenn Hymel (2015)

Religious Studies
   Adil Khan (2015)

Sociology
   Marcus Kouak (2015)
   Jaita Talyukdar (2016)

Theatre Arts and Dance
   Geoffrey Hall (2016)

Guests:
   Marc Manganaro, Provost
   Elizabeth Kordahl, Exec. Asst. to the Provost
   Melanie McKay, Vice Provost Faculty Devel.
   Karen Rosenbecker, Parliamentarian
   Bret Jacob, Staff Senate chair
   Carrie Ledlow, Maroon
   James Shields, Public Affairs
CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m.

INVOCATION
Rosalie Anderson offered an invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (11 September 2014)
The minutes from the September 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
University Budget Committee
Senator Isabel Medina reported that, as the school year moves along, times at Loyola continue to be challenging. We currently have student enrollment as it was predicted. Provost Manganaro added that the UBC is beginning to project multi-year budgeting, and assessing what they believe to be the best estimate moving forward over the next five years. They will begin discussions with Roberta Kastkel regarding the enrollment numbers, which will be expected to increase over next five years. Senator Barbara Ewell asked if UBC discussed how the reduction to Loyola’s retirement contribution will be added back into the budget. Isabel Medina responded that the decision to reduce that benefit was not made by the UBC, it was made by the President and Board of Trustees. Provost Manganaro concurred with Ms. Medina and added that it is his understanding that Fr. Wildes does intend to build the percentages back into the budget after the two-year period. Dr. Clark emphasized the importance of the University Senate allied with the Staff Senate to be vigilant and make certain that the benefits are fully restored after the two-year period. Senator Ed Vacek asked if there was any pushback on the enrollment numbers. He asks because he knows of two Jesuit Universities that have increased and even have record enrollment numbers this year. Loyola has hired firms to investigate the reasons for our decline and he is not satisfied with the end result. Ms. Medina responded that she is simply reporting information to the Senate that has been provided to the UBC as to what to expect in the near future as a result of where the University stands in terms of student choices, student options, and the prestige that we have. Provost Manganaro added that Enrollment Management, aided by the consulting firms, especially Scannell & Kurz, is reporting that, given our situation and the national demographics, we should not expect to see a huge increase in enrollment next year. Increased enrollment is something that we will work toward over time. There are some Jesuit universities that are seeing record enrollments and others that are experiencing a challenge with enrollment numbers. The good news is that we met our enrollment goals this year, but we cannot expect enrollment numbers based on what we want, but rather based on the best information on where we stand as an institution.

Dr. Clark asked all Senate representatives serving on a University committee to submit a report before the November meeting.
Senator Gwen George, a faculty representative to the Fringe Benefits Committee, had previously conveyed to Dr. Clark that a report from that committee was not necessary because Fr. Wildes recently sent an email regarding the change in health benefits. Dr. George had intended to be available to answer questions, but circumstances made it impossible for her to attend the meeting. Senator Chuck Nichols, another faculty representative to the Fringe Benefits Committee and a member of the Senate, agreed to answer questions. Dr. Nichols noted that there were two Fringe Benefit Committee meetings in September. At one meeting there were representatives from Gallagher Consulting Firm (the group who interfaces with the healthcare providers), and at the second meeting there were representatives from United Health who explained their bid and that it essentially matched the coverage from Blue Cross but was much cheaper. Senator Isabel Medina asked if the difference in plans affect which doctors you have access to within the network. Dr. Nichols reported that the committee was told that 97% of the doctors in the Blue Cross network are also available through United Health. Senator C.J. Stephenson asked if United Health explained what the 97% overlap covered. Dr. Nichols responded that pamphlets and print materials were provided as well as internet links for committee members to confirm what is being covered. Senator Geoffrey Hall asked what the 3% difference represents. Dr. Nichols does not know specifically what the 3% represents, but presumed they are various doctors and specialties that may have an agreement with Blue Cross but not with United Health. United Health presented a number of benefits and advantages. For instance, United Health offers a national network, so if you are out of state, you can still access doctors within the network. Senator Barbara Ewell asked about the timing of the decision: what was the reason for the decision to be made so quickly, is it possible next year to schedule meetings earlier in the year to allow more time to investigate different options? Dr. Nichols responded that the need for urgency was because of the last-minute bid from United Health Care. Staying with Blue Cross would have included a 10% cost increase both to the University and to employees. Senator Mitchell Crusto asked if it would be beneficial to invite a representative from United Health to come to the November meeting. Dr. Clark responded that she is not sure if that is a possibility but will consult with the Executive Committee and Ross Matthews to find out.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST
Provost Manganaro reported that on October 9, 2014 the public phase of the Comprehensive Campaign was launched, with a ceremony taking place on campus. It was well attended by the Loyola community as well as by the public and media.

The October meeting of the Board of Trustees was very successful. He and Dean Bill Locander from the College of Business presented the Strategic Plan to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, and to the full Board. It was unanimously approved by both bodies. A good discussion has begun on how to proceed and move forward. The current Strategic Plan does not include the budget details for the next five-year period, but it does include budget information for the high-priority action items for the first year. A chart was shared that showed how the 19-20 action items will be phased in. They also discussed making strategic investments, allocating resources, and how to grow programs. The Strategic Planning Team (SPT) is also working with the web team to create a web site for the strategic plan. The SPT will move forward with immediate implementation. College Deans and Vice Presidents were asked to begin working to align their strategic priorities and plans with the University plan. The SPT will monitor and assess the implementation process. The Board of Trustees approved two new degrees: a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Digital Filmmaking, and a Bachelor of Science in Popular and Commercial Music. They also discussed the progress being made on the college restructuring.

An advisory committee on restructuring has been formed and has already met twice. This committee is articulating the issues that need to be worked out, such as the “movable parts” (remaining questions of who
should go where, and why). They will continue to meet on a weekly basis with the hope to have the work completed within the next month.

As it was noted in the Chair’s report, a group of administrators is working on articulation agreements with several community college systems in the region; these would be 2+2 programs, where students would arrive after two years at the other institution and slide seamlessly into junior-year coursework so as to graduate at the end of two years at Loyola. The goal is for these agreements to be completed and approved by the end of the calendar year so as to have a positive effect on recruiting for next fall. Dr. Manganaro and Brad Petitfils are beginning to meet with deans and their department chairs to work out some of the details that will be involved. These agreements are not expected to yield a lot of students the first year they are offered, but the number is expected to increase over the years. Senator Mitchell Crusto complimented the articulation agreements and asked if there has been any movement in the association with Catholic high schools. Dr. Manganaro responded that Roberta Kaskel and many faculty members have increased communication with the local Catholic high schools. One of the reasons for our shortfall is due to the increased competition with state schools such as LSU and UNO because of the difference in tuition pricing. Mr. Crusto asked if it might be possible to offer AP courses to high school seniors to get their foot in the door toward college. Provost Manganaro will discuss the idea with Ms. Kaskel and find out if it is a possibility.

Senator Jon Altschul asked for an update on a discussion from a year and a half ago with regard to student enrollment and the five-year outlook. Has there been any change to the previous explanation that the shortfall was based on national demographics factors (the smaller number of 18-year olds), and has the cause of those effects been neutralized? Dr. Manganaro responded that the initial theories were based on national demographics and the attempt to lower the discount rate, perhaps a little more than we should have in a declining market. The consulting firm confirmed that lowering the discount rate would not have affected the enrollment numbers the way it did, and that there were other factors that contributed to it, such as the declining market. The consulting firm reported that increasing the numbers could not be done in a one or two year period, but it would take a rebuilding over several years. We need to put some focus on our programs to assure they are appealing, and have the opportunity for growth. Dr. Clark added that we need to do a better job overall articulating our value, not just in specific programs with potential growth.

Senator C.J. Stephenson asked if there have been discussions on what the ideal size of Loyola should be. Dr. Manganaro responded that there have been many discussions about the ideal size. One question that keeps coming up in these discussions is what we mean by ideal size. When ideal size is discussed, it always seems to focus on the number of incoming freshmen, but it is more than that and needs to include retention, as well as transfer students. The past two years we had an 80% freshman-to-sophomore retention rate. They are currently discussing what the number should be for incoming freshmen accepted, depending on how many transfer students we recruit.

Senator Jeff Albert asked how the new Vice President of Marketing will help affect the operation of the web site, and will the web team report to this person? The web site is crucial on how we tell our story. Dr. Manganaro responded that presumably the web team will move under the direction of the new position. The main purpose for this position is to have someone who can serve at the Cabinet level who can steer, guide, and advise on marketing and communication. A national search will be conducted for an individual with the highest level of expertise. He added that the position is not a brand new position, it is a restructured position. Dr. Clark added there must be faculty involvement in the search and consideration must be given to that person’s ability to work with faculty and departments.
Senator Isabel Medina asked for information on how we plan to overcome the problems we are facing. Software system upgrades are needed, there have not been pay raises in over two years, we have been in a cut-back mode with regard to the support available to us, low enrollment, and the deficit. What is going to help us re-energize the faculty, and the other things needed to continue to make us attractive to prospective students? Dr. Manganaro responded that the extent to which we succeed in the strategic plan and the four overarching strategic goals will produce the effects that we want. It will restore operating budgets, salary increases, contribution to retirement, etc. It is crucial to make sure expenses and resources are balanced. The health of the University will not only depend on a robust enrollment but a robust student body. Making sure financial aid is fair and gives students what they need will also help ensure the University gets the revenue it needs.

Senator Ralph Tucci commented that some of our former students are now high school teachers and asked if anyone has reached out to them to funnel students toward Loyola. Dr. Manganaro responded that he will discuss it with Roberta Kaskel, but believes she might already be working on it in conjunction with the alumni office. He added that the two Director positions in Enrollment Management have been filled.

Dr. Clark announced that Robbie Reed will attend the November meeting, and she will ask Ross Matthews to attend as well. December guests will include Fr. Wildes and John Finan, chair of the Board of Trustees.

Senator Mitchell Crusto congratulated Provost Manganaro on his hard work, availability, and transparency throughout a very difficult time at Loyola.

Senator Barbara Ewell asked if the Board of Trustees is going to make the final decisions on the restructuring of the University. Provost Manganaro responded that the Board does not have to approve an academic restructuring if it does not entail the creation or dissolution of programs.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**
Senate Award Guidelines were distributed via email (attached here as Appendix B). The guidelines include the addition of one award. Senator Eileen Doll inquired about the October deadline date listed in the motion as it is fast approaching. Dr. Clark responded that call for nominations will have to be sent immediately upon approval. Senator Isabel Medina has some concern with the number of awards being given. Dr. Clark clarified the purpose of the awards and why they are given. Service is here interpreted as applying to the Loyola community; Community Engagement is service in or with the community. Provost Manganaro added that advising is one of the most important recognitions that we advertise, promote, and reward. Senator Tricia Pearce asked if the Executive Committee or Ad Hoc Committee will develop the criteria for submitting nominations. Dr. Clark responded that those details will be worked out. The motion to approve the guidelines is A to approve; B to object; C to abstain. The results: 34 in favor; 4 opposed; 1 abstention.

An Award Committee needs to be formed. Senator Mitchell Crusto moved to have the Executive Committee serve as the awards committee. Senator Barbara Ewell amended the motion to empower the Executive Committee to either serve as the awards committee or to appoint members to the committee. Senator Jeff Albert seconded. The vote to create an awards committee is A to approve; B to object; C to abstain. The results: 34 in favor; 4 opposed; 0 abstentions.

**NEW BUSINESS:**
Because of one departure and one sabbatical, two members are needed to serve on the University Board of Review during the spring semester. Senators Mitchell Crusto and Ed Vacek have volunteered to fill those positions. There was no objection to these individuals serving.

A motion on domestic partner benefits was distributed via email (attached here as Appendix C). The motion was submitted by Charles Nichols, a member of the Fringe Benefit Committee and the Diversity Task Force as well as the Senate. Connie Rodriguez seconded. Senator Isabel Medina pointed out that the language in the last paragraph seems unclear and asked for clarification. Dr. Clark responded that because “all spouses and domestic partners” is not limited it should be assumed that it includes both homosexual and heterosexual relationships. Senator Jeff Albert commented if the goal of the motion is to imply that we want to treat heterosexual and homosexual relationships the same and that all spouses and domestic partners are benefits-eligible. He also asked for clarification that the motion includes heterosexual domestic partners. Dr. Nichols responded that the motion does include heterosexual domestic partners. He explained the reason for the language in the motion is because some states do not accept same sex-marriages and if those individuals get married out of state, it is not recognized in the state in which they reside. Provost Manganaro asked if there is there a generally recognized definition of domestic partners. Dr. Nichols responded that New Orleans has a domestic partner law where, if at least one member of a couple lives or works in Orleans Parish, you can register on a domestic partner registry. It applies to same-sex and opposite-sex partners. This is one way to show an official status. Another approach is to write an affidavit. Senator Isabel Medina added that they are not trying to change the laws of Louisiana, but rather trying to set a standard at Loyola to where the University can establish or adopt the city or state laws. Senator Jon Altschul asked what will happen if the State of Louisiana does pass a law to allow same-sex marriage: will we still want to extend benefits to domestic partners of either sexual orientation who are not married? Dr. Nichols responded that the motion that was distributed includes a list of other Jesuit colleges and universities, with the benefits each offers regarding this topic. At a time if and when the State of Louisiana accepts same-sex marriage, the question can be readdressed. Senator Jeff Albert commented that it would be difficult to retract a domestic partner status once it is established. Senator Bob Thomas asked if there any legal ramifications regarding the break-up of domestic partnerships. A Senator responded that the break-up of same sex partners would be no different than a heterosexual couple divorcing. Senator C.J. Stephenson asked what is meant by the phrase “the faculty Senate resolves” listed in the motion. Dr. Clark responded that it means the Senate is in favor of or in support of it. Dr. Nichols added that this discussion initially began with the Fringe Benefits Committee, and the consensus of that body thought it would be better for the faculty Senate to lead the introduction of the motion. Mr. Crusto commented that marriage is an established process with a clear beginning and ending. It is assumed that if the state legalizes same-sex marriage, that process will work the same, but the same is not true for domestic partnerships. He also wonders what kind of impact it would have with regard to health benefits. Ms. Medina shared that the rate of non-marital couples and children is rapidly increasing, to the point of being larger that the number of married couples. She expressed her support for the motion. Senator Ed Vacek will share his comments in writing for discussion at the next meeting. The motion will be voted on at the November meeting.

A motion from the Senate ad hoc committee on HR Policies was distributed via email (attached here as Appendix D). The motion was submitted by Senator Jon Altschul, chair of the committee. Senator Barbara Ewell seconded. There was no discussion. A vote will be taken at the November meeting.

The security level of the Senate minutes on the website was discussed last May and was not concluded. A summary of that discussion was included in the Chair’s Report. The Executive Committee decided not to submit a formal motion because they were unable to come to a consensus on what the level of security should
be. If a Senator is interested in making a motion, perhaps one can be introduced in November for approval in December. Senator Jeff Albert shared his opinion that minutes should be part of the intranet, with access available to the Loyola community, including students. Some Senators do not see the need to have it completely open, because of the potential for misuse by the media. Senator Mitchell Crusto noted that it only takes one click of a button to forward information and make it available to the press. Senator Barbara Ewell asked if there has ever been harm in it being open. If it is not broken what are we fixing? Provost Manganaro responded to Mr. Crusto that there have been times that information was brought to the Senate that we would not want given to the media. The option exists to go into executive session for confidential discussions. Ms. Medina commented that it is a tough issue because we are an open institution and when it comes to policies, processes, and procedures she believes the current system of making it completely open should be maintained. She is not aware that there was or is a problem. Senator Jeff Albert asked for confirmation that Senate meetings are open to the public, and if they are what is the purpose in making minutes private. Dr. Clark responded that the meetings are open. Senator Edward Vacek added that if the minutes are completely open, it allows for things to be found with a simple Google search. Senator Tricia Pearce is uncomfortable making the minutes completely open as well. The discussion can continue at the November meeting.

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

Appendices:
A. Chair’s report (October 2014)
B. Senate award guidelines
C. Draft motion on domestic partner benefits
D. HR policies report and motion
Much of what I would otherwise report has already been announced, or will be shortly, in messages from Kevin Wildes and others to the entire University community. I will therefore touch on a few Senate-related matters, and a few other things, below.

**Senate minutes**
This month we can finally continue the discussion begun last spring about whether to leave our minutes open on the intranet or put them behind an intranet password wall—and, if that, whether access should be open to faculty and staff only or to the entire Loyola community (including students). For what it’s worth, the following University committees limit access to their committee page (not only their minutes) to the Loyola community: the Standing Committee on Academic Planning (SCAP), the Strategic Planning Team (SPT), the University Budget Committee (UBC), the Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum (SCCC), and the Monroe Steering Committee. The Graduate Council limits access to its page to faculty and staff only. The Staff Senate’s page is open, but access to its minutes is limited to the Loyola community. There is no University requirement, nor do our by-laws address the matter, so we may do as we wish—whatever that is!

**Committee reports**
I will ask all committees with Senate representation to provide brief written reports for distribution for the November meeting. Isabel Medina has asked to do a brief oral UBC report at this meeting. Gwen George believes most of what the Fringe Benefits Committee would want to report at this time was outlined in Kevin Wildes’ recent message regarding the change to the health plan, but she is willing to answer any questions members may have. I am grateful to these and all of you who represent the Senate, and therefore the entire faculty, on the various University committees.

**Provost’s Council**
We were told at the last Provost’s Council meeting of several changes in the marketing area, caused in part by recent and upcoming departures (including Terry Fisher and Sean Clark), as well as Mikel Pak’s upcoming maternity leave. We were asked first of all to have patience with a reduced web team; a process is underway to replace some positions, but it will take time to get new people up to speed. In addition, Kevin Wildes is deliberating on a recommendation of a workgroup regarding the reporting structure for the marketing department (not having seen that recommendation, that’s about all I know!); once that decision is made, other changes can follow.

Roberta Kaskel and her team are working on a new system for Magis Mondays and will reach out to specific faculty as needed. As some of you know, this program is designed to give visiting prospective students and their families a personalized experience that relates directly to their interests. They are also working on the Fall Open House, which will be held 15 November; the main goal of this program, for juniors and seniors, is to drive applications.

A group of administrators is working on articulation agreements with several community college systems in the region; these would be 2+2 programs, where students would arrive after two years at the other institution and slide seamlessly into junior-year coursework so as to graduate at the end of two years at Loyola. The goal is for these agreements to be completed and approved by the end of the calendar year so as to have a positive effect on recruiting for next fall.
Upcoming meetings
We are on track to have Robbie Reed to our November meeting, to talk about the tobacco-free campus plan. We may also invite Ross Matthews to be present during our discussion in November of the motion on domestic partner benefits; since that meeting comes just before the end of the brief open enrollment period, he could presumably also answer any lingering questions about the new health plan.

John Finan, the new chair of the Board of Trustees, will come to the December meeting, as will Kevin Wildes. If we don’t have lots of business, that might be a good opportunity to discuss a question that came up at today’s Board meeting and will be under further discussion by the trustees, among others: how can we remain a Jesuit and Catholic school? I think it’s fair to say that today Loyola’s Ignatian mission belongs first and foremost to a lay faculty who come from a wide variety of disciplinary perspectives and personal outlooks. This does not mean by any means that we should turn our backs on the Jesuit tradition, but rather that we should be intentional in discerning what form our mission takes in our time and place.

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.

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

10 October 2014
Senate awards are given each year in the following five areas: advising, community engagement, research, service, and teaching.

1. The award is not intended as a career retrospective, but rather focuses on the previous year’s work.
2. Two awards can be given in a single category if warranted. It is also permissible for no award to be given in a specific category.
3. An individual may not be receive an award in the same category for a period of three years. There are, however, no other limits on the number of times an individual may be nominated or receive any award.
4. All full-time faculty, both ordinary and extraordinary, are eligible for all awards.
5. Any member of the University community may make nominations for Senate awards. Members of the committee determining award recipients, however, may not make nominations, nor may they be nominated.

The award process is overseen by a committee of Senate members determined annually at the October meeting. This is be a specially constituted ad hoc committee, or the Executive Committee may be given the task with the approval of the Senate; in either case, every effort should be made to include individuals from several different colleges.

A call for nominations is sent by the award committee to the campus community by 15 October, with nominations due by 1 November. Nominees are then contacted and asked to submit supporting materials by 1 December. The award committee will then deliberate and make selections; those names must be given to Kristine Lelong by 15 December so that medals can be engraved in time for presentation at the January President’s Convocation. The identity of award recipients will be kept secret until that time, though the recipients will be notified in advance of the Convocation.

Supporting materials should include the following:

1. a letter or narrative statement from the candidate outlining activities in the area of the award nomination, focusing on activities during the previous academic year
2. up to three letters of support from faculty and staff colleagues; this may include faculty at other institutions, staff from community agencies, etc.
3. up to three letters of support from current and former students
Appendix C: Domestic Partner Benefits

**Draft Motion on Domestic Partner Benefits**
Whereas the current policy of Loyola University New Orleans of extending fringe benefits to opposite-sex spouses of Loyola employees, but not to same-sex spouses or domestic partners of Loyola employees, is unfair and potentially conveys the message that non-heterosexual Loyola employees and their loved ones are valued less than other employees,
Whereas changing the policy to allow all spouses and domestic partners of Loyola employees to access fringe benefits on the same basis as opposite-sex spouses will make our University stronger by demonstrating that we value inclusivity, fairness, and the well-being of all our employees and their families,
The Faculty Senate resolves that all benefits currently enjoyed by opposite sex spouses of benefits-eligible Loyola University employees should be extended to all spouses and domestic partners of benefits-eligible Loyola University employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AJCU School</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Legally Domiciled Adults</th>
<th>Domestic Partners (opposite sex)</th>
<th>Registered Domestic Partners and/or legally married in some states (same sex)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>Chestnut Hill</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Legally married same sex partners *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius College</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Legally married same sex partners *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Legally married same sex partners *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (effective 1/1/15)</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll University</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Moyne College</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount University</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Same sex DP’s only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis University</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – Civil Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Legally Domiciled Adults</td>
<td>Domestic Partners (opposite sex)</td>
<td>Registered Domestic Partners and/or legally married in some states (same sex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhurst University</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s University</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter’s College</td>
<td>Jersey City</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJCU School</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Legally Domiciled Adults</td>
<td>Domestic Partners (opposite sex)</td>
<td>Registered Domestic Partners and/or legally married in some states (same sex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill College</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit Mercy</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>No – since 2012 Grandfathered LDA’s only</td>
<td>No, unless qualify under CA’s RDP definition which includes at least one person in the partnership being over age 62</td>
<td>Yes – RDP *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Scranton</td>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (all legally married spouses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Same Sex Marriage</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling Jesuit University</td>
<td>Wheeling</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*States with statute or judicial decision allowing same sex-marriage*
This committee was charged with the tasks of (1) recommending procedures for ongoing communication between Human Resources and faculty as future changes and updates to the Human Resources (HR) Manual are created, and also (2) identifying any current policies in the HR Manual that conflict with the Faculty Handbook. We address each of these tasks below.

**Task (1): Recommend procedures for ongoing communication between Human Resources and faculty as future changes and updates to the HR Manual are created.**

This committee recommends the following MOTION to the Senate:

i) The Senate calls on the director of Human Resources to notify both the Chair of the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee and the Chair of the University Senate whenever changes are made to the HR Manual that pertain to faculty. The Chair of the Senate shall communicate these changes when the Senate reconvenes so that each Senator is informed and that the changes are recorded in the Senate’s minutes. These changes include:
   - Adding a check (“✓”) to a faculty box in a given section of the HR Manual
   - Removing a check from a faculty box in a given section of the HR Manual
   - Adding a new section to the HR Manual that places a check in the faculty box
   - Removing a section from the HR Manual that has a check in the faculty box
   - Making a change to a section of the HR Manual that has a check in the faculty box

ii) The Senate also moves that a weblink be created on the Faculty Handbook website that lists all policies from the HR Manual that apply to faculty.

iii) Lastly, the Senate moves that the director of Human Resources report to the Chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee and the Chair of the Senate at the end of each academic year, summarizing any changes pertaining to faculty that have been made throughout the year. In years wherein no changes were made to the HR Manual, the director shall notify both chairs that no changes were made.

**Task (2): Identify any current policies in the HR Manual that conflict with the Faculty Handbook.**

Overall, this committee found no instances of direct conflict between the HR Manual and the Faculty Handbook; therefore, we do not recommend any changes to either document at this time. However, this committee identified several areas in which ambiguous or ill-defined language in either document could be interpreted in more than one way, potentially causing a conflict in policy between the two documents. These areas in particular are: Reduction in Force, Catastrophic Closing, Long Term Disability, and Conduct.

The report below describes these four areas in more detail, and it provides a general summary of the committee’s observations of each section of the HR Manual.

**HR Section 1: Introduction**
There are no conflicts between the HR Policies and Procedures Manual and the Faculty Handbook in Section One – Introduction – in their presentations of the overview of the university and its goals. Interestingly, HR 1-3 University Strategic Goal is not checked as applying to faculty even though it corresponds to, and reflects the language in the Faculty Handbook Introduction 1-2.

**HR Section 2: Employment**

This section deals with federal guidelines and regulations such as EEO, Affirmative Action, Disabilities and policies governing employee selection, status, staffing, payroll, benefits and the like. Those sections which deal with the federal guidelines and policies and which pertain to all parts of the university are checked as applying to faculty. HR 2-5 (Parental Leave) is not applied to faculty for whom a different policy exists in the Faculty Handbook 12-2. HR 2-6 (Employment Status) and HR 2-16 (Search Committees) recognize that policies for faculty fall under the Division of Academic Affairs, hence the Faculty Handbook and college handbooks. HR 2-8 states that official personnel files for faculty reside in the Provost’s Office.

There was only one section, HR 2-22 (Pro bono Faculty) for which there was no equivalent section in the Faculty Handbook. This committee recommends that the Handbook Revision Committee address this issue.

**HR Section 3: Payroll**

**Reduction in Force**

In the Reduction in Force Pay section, HR 3-15, the box for faculty is not checked. However, a question was raised as to whether or not this policy could be construed to apply to full-time Extraordinary Faculty and Writer, Artist, or Composer in Residence on limited contracts. The Faculty Handbook states:

- **FH Ch15-C. Visiting Professor**
  A Visiting Professor is one who either does hold or is qualified to hold professorial rank at an institution of higher education and is temporarily serving full-time as a faculty member at this University.

- **FH Ch 15-D. Writer, Artist, or Composer in Residence**
  The Writer, Artist, or Composer in Residence may be employed on a part-time or full-time basis.

This committee suggests that revisions to section 15-1 in the Faculty Handbook will help to clarify the status of extraordinary faculty in relation to Reduction of Force.

**Catastrophic Closing**

In Catastrophic Closing (HR 3-18), the faculty box is checked. This section states:

If the University remains closed for more than 5 days, the President’s Cabinet will decide if additional days will be paid. In such a situation, the Cabinet would, based on the circumstances, decide whether employees would remain employed on unpaid leave with or without benefits, or would be terminated. Any termination of faculty employment would occur according to the Financial Exigency provisions of the Faculty Handbook.

The Faculty Handbook, Chapter 9, addresses financial exigency, but not other types of catastrophic closures. The Faculty Handbook states:

- **Chapter 9-A. Specific Causes for Termination**
  - Section 10. Termination for financial exigency under extraordinary circumstances because of 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.

- **Chapter 9-F. Procedures for Termination Because of Financial Exigency**
  - Section 2. If, after receipt of the Financial Exigency Plan, the President judges that the condition of financial exigency is serious enough to warrant termination of tenured faculty appointments or cancellation of non-tenured contracts during the contract period, he shall order implementation of the guidelines established for identifying faculty members to receive notice of termination.
- Section 7. Faculty members terminated because of financial exigency are entitled to severance salary equitably adjusted to the faculty member’s length of past and potential service.

Therefore, the Faculty Handbook should address catastrophic closures that do not fall under financial exigency.

**HR Section 4: Benefits**

**Long Term Disability**

HR 4-6 outlines Long Term Disability benefits, and it applies to faculty. This section states:

- LTD coverage coordinates with other sources of disability income (such as Social Security) to ensure a percentage of the employee’s compensation in cases where they are unable to work for more than 90 calendar days. The plan pays a monthly benefit of 66 2/3% (or 66.67%) of pre-disability earnings up to a maximum of $10,000.

Chapter 12-1 of the Faculty Handbook opens with a statement saying that fringe benefits revisions occur frequently and that this summary is for informational purposes only. It continues, “The official plan takes precedence.” Therefore, the Faculty Handbook may need to be updated because there is a discrepancy in the percentage that the university pays for Long Term Disability. It states (FH 12-1): “Premium paid for full-time faculty. 90 day elimination period before benefits begin. 60% of salary up to $10,000 per month.”

**HR Section 5: Conduct**

The policies governing conduct in Section Five of the Human Resources Policies and Procedures Manual are comprehensive and in most cases apply to both faculty and staff. Issues related to conduct are occasionally referenced in the University Faculty Handbook, but faculty wishing detailed information should refer to the relevant section in the HR Manual.

**Ethics Violations Reporting and Non-Retaliation Policy**

The only policy outlined in the Human Resource Manual that might require action by the University Senate or the University Faculty Handbook Revision Committee is HR 5-16, Ethics Violations Reporting & Non-Retaliation Policy (Whistleblower). This policy refers primarily to retaliation resulting from the reporting of ethics violations. This section states:

Examples of reportable activities include violations of federal, state or local laws, and violation of University ethics or policies that involve dishonest or fraudulent conduct or that pose a substantial threat to the health and safety of students, employees or the general public.

The Faculty Handbook makes a brief reference to retaliation in section 1-G in the *Discrimination and Harassment Policy* page 1-18. This section states:

Protection Against Retaliation — Retaliation and/or reprisals against an individual who in good faith reports or provides information about behavior that may violate this policy are against the law and will not be tolerated.

However, intentionally making a false report or providing false information is grounds for discipline.

The Faculty Handbook does not cover retaliation between peers or with regard to the rank and tenure process. Section 5-16 of the HR Manual applies to exempt and non-exempt staff but not faculty. There is a blue asterisk (*) next to “Faculty,” which, according to Human Resources, means that a policy addressing the issue of retaliation among faculty should be reviewed by the University Senate or the University Faculty Handbook Revision Committee.

**HR Sections 6-8: Performance and Recognition, Salary Administration, and Working Conditions**

Policies 8.2 and 8.3 in the HR Manual describe procedures for Emergency Closings and Hurricane Emergencies respectively. Both sections currently do not apply to faculty. Because faculty are subject to the decisions that are made by the Emergency Preparedness Committee and the Vice President for Student Affairs when an emergency or natural disaster approaches, we recommend that 8.2 and 8.3 apply to faculty.