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CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

INVOCATION
Connie Rodriguez offered an invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (1 May, 14 May, 14 August 2014)
The minutes from the May 1, 2014 meeting were unanimously approved.
The minutes from the May 14, 2014 meeting were unanimously approved.
The minutes from the August 14, 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
Senate committee reports were distributed via email (attached here as Appendices B and C). There was no discussion or question about the report.

Gwen George, Senate representative to the Fringe Benefits Committee, announced to Senators that discussions have begun regarding changes in fringe benefits related to health care. Another meeting is scheduled for September 12, and a full report will be given at the October Senate meeting.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST
Provost Manganaro reported that the Strategic Planning Team (SPT) will provide a report to the Board of Trustees at the meeting on October 9th. Until that time, the SPT continues to meet regularly and is still receiving feedback. Dr. Manganaro has attended each college’s faculty assembly and provided them with an update and also gathered feedback. The deadline for entry of materials into the Board Book for the October meeting is 9/19/14. The plan will first be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board on Thursday, and to the full Board on Friday.

By the end of today’s meeting, he hopes to receive a Senate recommendation with regard to the restructuring plan. That recommendation will be reviewed by President Wildes, and his recommendation will then be presented to the Board of Trustees at the October meeting. He reiterated what the ad hoc committee stated: they perceive changes in college structure to be in the interest of student success and the collaboration of faculty, and to be very coherent with the strategic plan. He thanked the ad hoc committee and the Senate for all of their work and feedback throughout the process.
In a brief enrollment update, he reported that the number of incoming first-year students is slightly higher than the budgeted number of 614. First- to second-year retention is holding at 80%. It may decrease slightly, but not by much.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**
Block Motions (attached here as Appendix D).

**Motion 1 (Fr. Wildes):** Dr. Block provided the rationale for his motions. Senator John Levendis spoke in support of Dr. Block and added that he knows for a fact that Dr. Block did not do or say any of the things he is accused of.

Senator Isabel Medina commented that she is going to vote against the motions and urged her colleagues to do the same. She reported that there is a lot of history behind these events, and because of a blog that was started by Dr. Block where her name was mentioned, she was the victim of harassment. She does not believe that Dr. Block is aware of the injury and damage he brings to people of her gender, to young people, and to African Americans or those of other ethnic origins. Senator Glenn Hymel asked Dr. Block if he has pursued the possibility of sitting down with Fr. Wildes and members of the two groups and having a conversation to resolve the issue. Dr. Block first responded to Ms. Medina’s comment and stated that he never said his views were representative of the entire University. If she has evidence of this, he would like to see it. In response to Dr. Hymel, he did attempt to contact Fr. Wildes and the two groups. The only response he received was from one person on the Diversity Task Force and two people from the group of 18. There was no outcome as a result of these meetings.

Senator Joe Berendzen called the question. Senator Cathy Rogers seconded. Dr. Clark explained that this is effectively a “previous question” motion, which is not debatable and requires a 2/3 majority. If it passes, it stops debate and forces a vote on the pending motion. If it fails, then you return to the debate. To vote – A is to end the debate and vote on the motion; B is to return to the motion and continue debate. The results are: A-40; B-6. The “previous question” motion therefore passed and discussion was closed.

The vote on Motion 1 (Wildes): A is to approve the motion; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results are: A-8; B-32; C-4. The motion failed.

**Motion 2 (18 Loyola faculty):** Senator Marcus Kondkar called the question. Senator Tish Beard seconded. To vote – A is to end the debate and vote on the motion; B is to return to the motion and continue debate. The results: A-37; B-6; C-3. The “previous question” motion therefore passed and discussion was closed.

The vote on Motion 2 (18 Loyola faculty): A is to approve the motion; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results are: A-6; B-33; C-8. The motion failed.

**Motion 3 (Diversity Task Force):** Dr. Block commented that if the Senate votes against this motion, they will be voting to allow an official committee of the University to condemn people without a hearing. He urged Senators to vote in favor of it. Fr. Fred Kammer made two remarks. First, there is a grievance procedure in chapter 8 of the Faculty Handbook that should have been followed. Second, most legal systems have a statute of limitations. The accusations being discussed happened in December 2008. The signers of the document at that time were members of the Affirmative Action Task Force comprised of ten faculty and staff members. Two of the signers no longer work at Loyola. That task force was succeeded by a committee that now has 13 task force members, of which only 4 were part of the action in 2008. This issue should have been addressed through the grievance process a long time ago. He called the question. Senator Barbara Ewell seconded. To
vote – A is to end the debate and vote on the motion; B is to return to the motion and continue debate. The results: A-45; B-2. The “previous question” motion therefore passed and discussion was closed.
The vote on Motion 3 (Diversity Task Force): A is to approve the motion; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results are: A-6; B-37; C-6. The motion failed.

NEW BUSINESS

- Reorganization motion (attached here as Appendix E). Dr. Clark reviewed the motion created by the Executive Committee being presented for a vote.

The University Senate recommends the implementation of Option 1 of the Senate ad hoc committee’s report. In an informal poll conducted at the August special meeting, the Senate overwhelmingly preferred Option 1 to Option 2, and only a minority of Senators found Option 2 to be acceptable.
The Senate further asks the Provost to create a transition and oversight committee to work with the colleges, schools, departments, and other units to implement this framework and settle any necessary adjustments to it. This committee should have substantial faculty representation, including members selected by the Senate and/or the colleges. The Senate asks that this process include an endorsement of the final structure by either the colleges or the Senate before formal implementation begins.
Finally, the Senate asks that the implementation process be used to spur a dedicated joint effort by faculty and administrators to identify and remedy inequities and irregularities in policies and processes, including those identified in the ad hoc committee’s report.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Dr. Clark moved to approve. Senator Janna Saslaw seconded. In order to vote on the motion today, a motion to suspend the rules is needed. Senator Meg Frazier moved to suspend the rules. Senator Glenn Hymel seconded. To vote: A is in favor of the motion to suspend the rules and vote today; B is opposed; C is abstained. The results: A-43; B-4; C-1. The motion passed.

An amendment from Senator Isabel Medina was proposed, which proposes a change in option 1 from the College of Graduate and Professional Studies to a Division or Office of Graduate and Professional Studies within the Office of the Provost. Senator Tish Beard seconded. Ms. Medina noted that part of her rationale for the proposed revision had to do with the smaller number of students in these programs compared to undergraduate students. The School of Nursing is completely online and does not require classroom space for students. Based on that, it made sense to her to have them within an office or division rather than a college with a dean. Senator Dave Khey expressed concern that whether it is a college or division, there is no guarantee that it will be led by faculty. Senator Tom Foster expressed his concerns regarding the lack of advocacy and support for all graduate programs. If there is no dean or college to advocate for resources and support of graduate programs, they will continue to be small and underrepresented.

Senator Joe Berendzen added that this is an example of something similar that happened to non-traditional students after Pathways, and, contrary to the anonymous comments in the document from the Staff Senate, we have good evidence to show that it has not worked well there. That instance should give us cause about potentially doing the same thing to graduate programs. Senator Mike Cowan stated that he is a faculty member of a graduate program, and Loyola’s history has always been that graduate programs have never been given enough attention, focus, and support. This seems like a move in the right direction.

Senator Trisha Pierce made a clarification to Isabel Medina’s comment about the handful of students in graduate programs. The School of Nursing, in fact, has over 500 students in its programs. The School of Nursing faculty did not discuss her amendment, but they would not be in support of it. Ms. Medina responded
by clarifying that her comment was a handful of graduate programs, not a handful of students in those programs.

Senator Connie Rodriguez shared with Senators that Loyola has been talking about improving support for graduate programs for 25 years and it never happened. She thinks it’s about time the graduate programs have a college. Senator Gwen George concurred with Dr. Rodriguez. In addition, she noted that, while nursing is an online program, counseling is not. All of its classes are held on campus. Moreover, during the past three-four years U.S. News & World Report has ranked the School of Nursing in its top ten and often in the top five in the country. This is an opportunity to showcase something we are doing well at Loyola.

Senator Barbara Ewell called the question. Senator Cathy Rogers seconded. To vote - A is in favor; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: A- 45; B- 2; C-1. The “previous question” motion therefore passed and discussion was closed. The vote on the motion presented by Isabel Medina is: A in favor; B opposed; C to abstain. The results: A-6; B-39; C-4. The motion did not pass.

Discussion returned to the original motion. Dr. Clark noted that she had erred in including the last sentence in the second paragraph: “The Senate asks that this process include an endorsement of the final structure by either the colleges or the Senate before formal implementation begins.” This had been discussed by the Executive Committee, which had decided not to include it, because it would be too difficult to go through a formal approval process of that sort in the limited time available. Senator Connie Rodriguez moved to strike that sentence from the motion; Senator Janna Saslaw seconded. Senator Bob Gerlich moved to make a secondary amendment to replace the sentence that Dr. Rodriguez moved to strike with “the committee shall report to the Executive Committee as well as to the President and Provost.” Dr. Rodriguez seconded.

Senator Isabel Medina asked what will happen once the motion is approved by the Senate. She realizes that it will go to the Provost, President, and then the Board of Trustees. But what will the Board do with it? Will Board approval forbid future changes, or will the prospect of future changes lead the Board not to accept it? Dr. Clark explained that a series of small adjustments have been proposed that do not change the overall framework. For instance, the Jesuit Social Research Institute does not appear in the plan other than in a general area of centers and institutes. JSRI has made their case that they would like to be housed within the social science division of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Requests and ideas like this have merit and need discussion, but they do not change the framework. Therefore, the Senate will focus on the framework, and these discussions will take place a little later. The first task of the committee proposed in the Senate motion will be to have these types of discussions. Provost Manganaro stressed the importance of the Senate approving a basic structure of a plan at today’s meeting. The smaller details of the moveable parts can be worked out once the basic plan is approved. It is the overall plan that will be presented to Board.

Dr. Clark asked if Fr. Gerlich would be willing to withdraw his motion, with the understanding that what he proposed will be handled by the Executive Committee. Fr. Gerlich formally withdrew his motion. The discussion reverted back to the motion to strike the last sentence from the second paragraph. To vote: A is to strike the sentence; B is opposed (not to strike it); C is to abstain. The results: A- 35; B- 7; C- 6. The motion passes.

Senator Trisha Pierce asked for clarification on what is meant by “substantial faculty representation,” because there are a lot of people who will be moved around in the process and they need to be represented. Dr. Clark responded that the committee will have to be constituted immediately and start working right away. The
Executive Committee discussed with the Provost possible committee configurations. For instance, faculty representation could consist of two representatives each from the affected colleges (graduate, liberal arts, and music/media/arts), and one representative each from unaffected colleges (business, law, and library). Senator Jon Altschul added that the Executive Committee came to the conclusion that there was not enough time to hold elections for committee representatives. Membership on the committee will be based on recommendations.

Senator Marcus Kondkar pointed out an issue with the restructuring model: the resistance of the School of Mass Communication (SMC) to be included in any of them (giving reference to the document distributed by SMC at the beginning of the meeting). He inquired about how SMC concluded there would not be any additional cost to the University for it to be a free-standing unit, and how that is possible. Senator Bob Thomas responded that under the current structure of SMC, they have faculty and staff in place to stand alone as a fiscal unit, and everything is handled within their own school. They also work closely with IA on fundraising issues.

Fr. Fred Kammer move to amend the motion to add language to the last sentence of paragraph two: “as well as representation from staff, and institutes/centers.” There seems to be some sentiment that staff have not been significantly consulted in the process but will be significantly be impacted by the changes. There are also thirty centers and institutes on campus that are also not represented. Senator Larry Moore seconded. Dr. Manganaro concurred that he is in complete agreement with this amendment. To vote: A is in favor; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: A-35; B-6; C-4. The motion passes and the language will be added.

Senator Bob Thomas reviewed the document that he distributed at the beginning of the meeting. The School of Mass Communication believes that if they are a stand-alone school it would assist the University on several levels including increased enrollment, national visibility, increased fundraising and student success. The details for this rationale are outlined in the print document.

Senator Janna Saslaw moved to amend paragraph one of the motion, to add a line that states: “except that the School of Mass Communication be a stand-alone unit, assuming there is no further cost to Loyola.” Senator Isabel Medina seconded. Senator Ed Vacek commented that this seems like an inappropriate time to receive this type of amendment, when the committee has been working on the document since last spring. Senator Barbara Ewell commented that schools and colleges at Loyola are for the most part parallel. She is against the idea of creating another college. She believes Loyola needs to have a structure of colleges with schools within them. Senator Cathy Rogers responded to Fr. Vacek and clarified that the opposition by SMC is not new. There are footnotes and other things noted in earlier reports with regard to SMC standing alone. She also served on the restructuring committee and they did work very hard. They also worked in the absence of data. The committee did not have any enrollment data, fundraising data, or budget data to show that option one will be any better than what we currently have. The SMC does have some data and best practices to confirm their opinion. Dr. Clark confirmed that the wishes of SMC have been made clear throughout the process. Senator Glenn Hymel spoke out in his support of the amendment. Senator Isabel Medina added that she also served on the restructuring committee and there was a split of opinion on the committee, but there was an understanding that it would be brought to the floor for discussion at some point. Senator John Levendis was also a committee member and his impression was that with the overall structure there was always a debate on where SMC belongs and that would be discussed another time when the smaller details are worked out. To vote: A is in favor; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: A-11; B-35; C-2. The motion fails.

Senator C.J. Stephenson asked for clarification on when the new committee will begin working. Provost Manganaro responded that the committee will be formed shortly after Board approval is received. Fr. Kammer is puzzled by how quickly this is being pushed through for two reasons: first, the report from the committee
listed ten points that were used to consider option one, yet several of them point out things that cannot be addressed by that option; second, some of the more serious questions that are left unanswered are staffing implications, costs, and creating a College of Arts and Sciences with fifteen departments in it. These are some of the concerns from the JSRI faculty and staff.

To vote: A is in favor; B is opposed; C is to abstain. The results: A- 36; B- 9; C-3. The motion passes.

The amended motion will read:

The University Senate recommends the implementation of Option 1 of the Senate ad hoc committee's report. In an informal poll conducted at the August special meeting, the Senate overwhelmingly preferred Option 1 to Option 2, and only a minority of Senators found Option 2 to be acceptable.

The Senate further asks the Provost to create a transition and oversight committee to work with the colleges, schools, departments, and other units to implement this framework and settle any necessary adjustments to it. This committee should have substantial faculty representation, including members selected by the Senate and/or the colleges, as well as staff and institutes/centers.

Finally, the Senate asks that the implementation process be used to spur a dedicated joint effort by faculty and administrators to identify and remedy inequities and irregularities in policies and processes, including those identified in the ad hoc committee's report.

- Senate award guidelines (attached here as Appendix G): Dr. Clark explained that there have been no formal guidelines for these awards. These are proposed by the Executive Committee; guidelines need to be approved at the October meeting in order to proceed with the process as outlined. Dr. Clark further noted that a fifth award has been added for Community Engagement. Senator Janna Saslaw seconded the proposed motion, which will come up for a vote in October.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Appendices:
A. Chair’s report (September 2014)
B-C. Senate committee reports (September 2014)
D. Block motions (May 2014)
E. College reorganization motion
F. Anonymous comments to Staff Senate
G. Senate award guidelines
H. Document from Isabel Medina
I. Memo from SMC
Appendix A: Senate Chair’s Report
Senate chair’s report
September 2014

As usual, reports on the various committees on which I represent you _ex officio_, plus a few extras at the end. I’ve appended my June report as well, in case you weren’t reading mail or otherwise didn’t see it then but want to now.

Academic Affairs meeting (aka Provost’s “retreat”)
I continue to be included in the all-day meeting of Provost’s Office staff, vice provosts, and deans that takes place at the beginning of each semester. This fall the budget was still a matter of concern, of course, but there was less talk of cuts and more on ways we can improve what we do, among other things to become an “enrollment-centered institution.” The goal here is not simply to reach a certain number of incoming students, but to increase net tuition revenue, and that means recruiting students we can retain and graduate. This also includes moving forward on articulation agreements with community colleges and seeking additional markets. As we discussed last month, even though the number of graduating high-school seniors has reached a low point and will gradually rise, we can’t limit ourselves to that market.

We also have to be aware of changes within that market, both in terms of demographics and level of preparation. Brad Petitfils presented data from the ETS Proficiency Profile given to incoming students last fall, and the results were sobering. For instance, only 69% of our incoming students were evaluated as proficient at reading to Level 1, which is defined as being “able to:

- recognize factual material explicitly presented in a reading passage
- understand the meaning of particular words or phrases in the context of a reading passage”

Yes, that means that nearly a third of our incoming students are defined as either marginally proficient (18%) or not proficient (13%) at this very basic level. These are first-years, but I’m sure most of us assume that level of proficiency of all our students. This is not the only evidence that we need to rethink much of what we may take for granted: the AJCU Fact File, which includes a wealth of demographic information about the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the US, says that in 2012-13 27% of our entering students were in the top tenth of their high-school class, but 23% were in the bottom half—that figure puts us on a par with Wheeling Jesuit and significantly higher (or worse) than all other AJCU schools except St. Peter’s. Our six-year graduation rate (58%) is slightly above that of Wheeling Jesuit and University of Detroit Mercy, with St. Peter’s again holding up the rear at 51%. All this shows that our students may not be who we think they are. Melanie McKay is working on faculty development programming to help us deal with this gap in our classrooms—I for one am looking forward to learning how I can better serve these students.

Enrollment Management Steering Committee
This committee hasn’t met since mid-June, but, as I mentioned in August, we met with the four candidates interviewed for the Director of Admissions position; they came, respectively, from Spring Hill College, the College of Charleston, MacMurray College, and LeMoyne College. As I understand it, an offer has been made, but the identity of the candidate has not yet been announced publicly. I will say, however, that the person I believe was hired seemed quite enthusiastic about working with faculty in all stages of the recruiting process, so I’m optimistic. A Director of Admissions Operations is also in the hiring process; this is a more technical position, and I was not included among those groups who met with candidates. Both these titles are new, but the positions represent a consolidation of already-existing lines, and this is part of a fundamental reorganization of the office, which has had an extraordinary amount of turnover in the past year.

I’ve also had a preliminary conversation with Roberta and Marc about the current Enrollment Management Committee, which has never met, and alternatives for a committee that might better meet the current needs of Enrollment Management and Loyola as a whole. Some of you may recall that I was added to this committee because it was felt that the committee outlined in the Handbook was not what was needed, and it was not the right time to determine what was; the decision to add me to this committee was designed to get a faculty voice at that table. As a result of my discussion with Roberta and Marc, a dean and a second faculty member will be added in the near future; I’ll keep you posted.
Strategic Planning Team

We are currently working on a final report; the four overarching strategies and the action plans under each have not changed. In July we identified priorities among those action plans, and those have also not changed:

- 1a: Ensure that each student will engage in at least two experiential-based practices which may include: collaborative research, community engagement, internships, study abroad and global immersion. (This is the Quality Enhancement Plan, mandated by SACS as part of the accreditation process for the University. As such, it focuses on these four high-impact practices, but naturally the hope is that they will help foster more attention on all forms of experiential learning.)
- 1c: Centralize academic support services that create highly visible space to foster independent and mentored student learning and success.
- 2a: Transform Loyola’s Career Services to make it a signature program and recruitment tool.
- 2b: Create a new model for advising that is collaborative across academic and non-academic units and that focuses on student development, not just progress toward degree.
- 3d: Create and enhance programs that will supply graduates for growing-demand professions in New Orleans.

Action plan 1d (develop, review and revise college organizational structures and programs) is the reorganization process that we are moving forward; at this point it is not on most lists of top priorities, but that may well be because it is already well in progress.

One thing I find heartening about this plan, in general and in terms of the priorities listed above, is that it focuses resolutely on our work with students. In that way it seems to my mind (and I am absolutely speaking personally here!) to be more strongly focused on our mission and identity than the previous plan, which in many ways did not come to fruition. At this time when all stages of the enrollment process, from recruiting to retention to graduation, are very much on all of our minds, this gives me hope. At the same time, I have to admit our evaluation and reward structures in many ways do not align with the increased attention to experiential learning, academic support, and comprehensive advising outlined in this plan, and this worries me. Moreover, in the current budgetary situation, we simply don’t have new funds to invest, and any refocusing of resources will require a loss somewhere else. Loyola does not have a good track record on truly strategic reallocation of resources; too often the reaction has been across-the-board cuts, whether to operating or salary budget, and for various reasons that is simply not an option anymore. It seems to me that we will have to undergo something of a cultural alignment in order to fulfill this plan, and indeed to build our enrollments and net tuition revenue as discussed earlier, and this will likely not be easy to achieve. I don’t mean a revolution here!—our contributions to our respective fields, for instance, are important, but we do that within the context of what is fundamentally a student-centered community.

research misconduct policy

Heidi Davis, working with a group of faculty, has updated the “Misconduct in Research” policy, which applies especially to federally-sponsored research. She provides the following summary; more information can be found at http://academicaffairs.loyno.edu/grants-research/policies-procedures, or you may ask Heidi directly.

The proposed policy is an update of the 1990 "Misconduct in Research Policy." A current research misconduct policy is required for institutions with federally sponsored research. The 1990 policy is inconsistent with federal regulations.

- The definition of misconduct is overly broad (includes vague language including "other practices.")
- The policy neglects to inform faculty that data for federally funded research projects must be sequestered in response to a misconduct allegation
- The policy fails to provide that, in cases of apparent conflict, federal regulations will prevail over university policy in cases of allocations involving federally funded research
- The proposed policy is broader than necessary: It covers research and broader areas of scholarship, whereas the federal requirements are limited to research. The expanded scope is consistent with the 1990 policy (despite its name). The proposed policy is designed to provide a thorough, competent, objective, and fair response to each allegation of misconduct. Further, the maximum degree of confidentiality is provided (although disclosure to sponsor and federal oversight bodies may be required). Features include the following:
Procedural structure is similar to that of previous policy. Steps include disclosure, formal inquiry, formal investigation, and two-step appeals process.

- Disclosures made to IRB chair
- Provost to select inquiry and investigation committees
- Committees chaired VP selected by provost or chair of applicable oversight body for specialized research (such as IRB)
- Grants director not part of either committee
- Steps in place to remove conflicts of interest
- If misconduct determined, Provost to determine sanctions based on committee recommendations
- Two-part appeals process is as before (Provost, President)
- Results may need to be reported to third party (sponsor, federal oversight office)
- Provides that any applicable sponsor requirements will be met

varia

I know many of you are concerned about a seeming lack of engagement with the faculty on the part of the President. Last spring someone suggested to me that Kevin meet informally with a small group of faculty as a kind of “kitchen cabinet,” and I pitched the idea to Marc and Kevin. Kevin liked the general idea and has decided to start with occasional lunches with the executive committees of both the University Senate and the Staff Senate; the EC is scheduled to have its first lunch with Kevin on 23 September.

I understand some concern has arisen from the HNS Council of Chairs about the Academic Integrity Council and the processes outlined in the Academic Honor Code. As I can untangle it, the code itself was created by the Associate Deans’ Council, but it was not sent to the colleges. In spring 2013, the Senate was asked to create an ad hoc Academic Integrity Council, which serves as an appeals body for the code; at that time some concerns were expressed about some aspects of the draft code as well, which the Academic Integrity Council attempted to fix. I want to thank Teri Gallaway and the Academic Integrity Council for their work in this area. Teri, along with Melanie McKay and Patrick Armstrong from the Provost’s Office, Kathy Gros, and Maria Calzada and Uriel Quesada from the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences are working on clarifying the processes outlined in the code. I have expressed my hope that a revised Academic Honor Code will go to the colleges for discussion and approval; a final protocol for the Academic Integrity Council will likely go through the process this year for addition to the Faculty Handbook.

A Senate representative to the Fringe Benefits Committee recently approached me about extending benefits to same-sex partners. This has been discussed in both the Diversity Committee and the Fringe Benefits Committee, and there seems to be broad support for this move, including in the Office of Human Resources. As this discussion moves forward, a motion asking for support from the Senate is likely.

Robbie Reed has asked to come to the Senate, probably in November or December, to talk about the upcoming smoke-free campus policy (to be effective 1 August 2015). He said they are not necessarily looking for Senate endorsement or support, but would be glad to receive it, so feel free to consult with me if you’d like to craft a motion!

As always, please continue to come to me with thoughts or concerns. Here’s to a good new year!

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

You’ve already heard something about the May Board meeting, but let me add some of my impressions.

At the Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting, there was some good discussion of both the draft strategic plan and the report of the Senate ad hoc committee on academic structures. Among the concerns expressed about the strategic plan were the demands on faculty and faculty development resources, the question of how this plan sets us apart, and concerns that are not directly addressed within the broad outlines of the plan (e.g., completion rate). The potential of an e-portfolio program, not only as a “resume on steroids” (as one trustee put it) but also as a resource for student reflection and discernment, probably got the most positive feedback.

Reaction to the possible restructuring of colleges was preliminary but thoughtful. One person expressed some feeling that October was too soon to have a proposal (a feeling shared by some faculty, of course), and the Board wouldn’t be responsible if they didn’t ask about costs, but the conversation was mostly about how any possible change would affect recruiting, retaining, and graduating students. One trustee asked how the question relates to mission, and I was pleased to be able to explain how discussions of mission formed the foundation of the committee’s work.

Thinking of mission, the Office of Mission and Identity in its report to the Mission and Identity Committee of the Board identified several goals that relate to faculty, most notably “creatively re-imagining the mission and goals of the Jesuit Center” and “explor[ing] the role of mission in the hiring and reward process.” When I spoke with that committee in December, there was a strong component who want to see a return to “hiring for mission” in traditional terms, but others (including me) advocated for a focus rather on formation in a more holistic sense. Versions of this conversation are also happening in the Strategic Planning Team and elsewhere.

I’m working on ways to get access to reports from the consultants, either the material that was included in the May Board book or something else. The main concern identified by Scannell & Kurz has to do with a decline in first-year yield rates over the past few years. The increased discount rate they see as a sign of a misalignment in recent years between price and prestige. For various reasons, we can’t fix this through financial aid; the key here is in telling our story better, articulating the value of a Loyola education more clearly, collecting and using data on career and other outcomes, and improving every stage of recruiting, from initial inquiry to enrollment. They note the willingness of faculty to help, and they emphasize that faculty resources need to be used more consistently and strategically.

Finally, I have confirmation that John Finan, the new Chair of the Board, will attend our September meeting.

Danna Center coffee

I know some of you were surprised to find that CC’s is gone, and a Starbucks is going into that space. A press release has been distributed, but I want to fill in a couple of things Cissy Petty told me that didn’t make it into that public statement. First of all, apparently the space needs upgrading, and CC’s was unable or unwilling to do that work, while Starbucks was. Second, a survey was taken early last May—yes, 2013, which is probably why you don’t remember it! A total of 426 responded, and according to the press release 77% preferred Starbucks. Actually, 72% of the faculty responding preferred CC’s, but that’s out of a total of 25 respondents. (The 69 staff who replied preferred Starbucks, 60/40.) The students surveyed overwhelmingly preferred Starbucks: 85% of the 332 who responded. The press release explains aspects of Starbucks’ commitment to community involvement and ethical sourcing (as they put it), which might take away some of the sting I know some of you feel by replacing a local vendor with a national company.

Enrollment Management Steering Committee

In addition to receiving reports on deposits and financial aid commitments, this group has been concerned mostly with three issues: the upcoming search for new directors of admissions and admissions operations to replace recent departures and complete the reorganization begun last year, the switch to a new management system (due in part to serious problems
with the existing one), and concerns about satisfactory academic progress for students on scholarship. That last will probably show up on the radar of the Academic Advising Council and/or the Student Success Summit, because it’s an area where faculty participation may well be of real assistance in helping struggling students succeed.

Please continue to come to me with thoughts or concerns.

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

29 June 2014
Appendix B: Senate Committee reports (September 2014)


Gallagher Benefit Services personnel presented results of a review of our current fiscal year insurance use and a projection for 2014-15 expenses. There were two handouts: Employee Benefits Review and Voluntary Worksite Benefits Proposal. The review included a list of current benefit plan offerings and the renewal schedule for each. They will receive benefit company proposals in July and present their recommendations to the committee in August. They anticipate no rate change for 2015 in vision, basic life insurance, long-term disability and employee assistance program. It is likely that there will be increased costs to the university for medical and dental programs. They will also review flexible spending vendors for lower-cost providers.

Many dental coverage providers do not provide with DHMO and DPPO services. In 2014, the medical plan performance of all three levels was compared. There has been an increase in the 'medical loss ratio,' the percentage of premium revenue spent on expenses other than clinical treatment and quality improvement. Ideally this should be less than or about 15%. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) requires insurers to report this figure to see if they are spending an undue amount on administration. Blue Cross Blue Shield (BCBS) is below that amount. Insurers look at our overall claims to see how much we are likely to cost. Claimants with over $100,000 in expenses are removed and reinsured separately by the company. Only claims less than $100,000 are used to determine cost to the university. BCBS has the best discount for the most frequently used inpatient facilities. There are many non-negotiable expenses due to ACA. It is likely that BCBS will make a proposal at a higher cost than the last few years. Vice President for Finance and Administration Jay Calamia is on record as saying that the university cannot absorb an increase in costs. The increase will be passed along to employees or other ways to economize must be found, such as offering lower coverage and/or higher deductibles.

The university's medical care insurance plan has been 'grandfathered' into the current market. This means that our plan does not meet some ACA standards. As long as we do not make certain changes, we are able to keep our plan. However, we will likely fall out of compliance and lose the grandfathered status. This means there will be some changes.

Gallagher suggested that we also consider offering employees some voluntary benefit plans. These do not replace any other current insurance coverage, but augment them. These are all indemnities that make payments directly to the insured. One is critical illness payments for conditions like heart attack, stroke, and organ transplant. Others cover expenses for cancer, heart/stroke, accident (the most popular one), hospital and life insurance. Payments are made based on events, such as the diagnosis of cancer for critical illness. Payments are not "once and done," but can be made more than once, say if someone has repeated accidents.

In 2015 rollovers of up to $500 are allowed in our flexible spending accounts. This is a first and a result of the ACA.

No votes were taken at the meeting. The next meeting will be in August to evaluate the results of Gallagher's discussions with vendors and their proposals to the university.

Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board (16 May 2014): Carol Ann MacGregor, Eileen Doll

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees held a meeting at 1pm on Thursday May 15th, 2014. The meeting began with a discussion of three core items: enrollment management, strategic planning, and the proposed restructuring of colleges.

Ms. Roberta Kaskel noted that as of May 15th Loyola had received 586 deposits, which is down one from May 15th, 2013. The University Budget Committee has set the budget based on an enrollment of 614. Ms. Kaskel detailed how her office continues to aggressively pursue several strategies to ensure that we meet or surpass that budgeted enrollment number. These strategies include reaching out to Louisiana families that have not yet declined Loyola’s offer and do not appear to have accepted elsewhere, working with partner high schools to identify students who have not made a decision and have not yet applied to Loyola, working with athletics where a number of teams have not yet finalized their rosters, and
beginning a media blitz around the creative arts and forensic chemistry programs. Provost Manganaro also noted that Thom Spence has been working on articulation agreements with numerous local community colleges that would make it easier for students to transfer into Loyola. This was met with enthusiasm from the Trustees on the committee, although this enthusiasm was tempered by concerns that transfer students aren’t exempted from too much of what forms the core of a Jesuit education. The new agreements will most likely be in place within a year.

Provost Manganaro and Dean Bill Locander provided an update on the strategic planning overarching strategies and action plans. In general the board and trustees seemed pleased with progress made between March and May. The Board Book included reference to the various proposed models for restructuring the college. Provost Manganaro provided some background on how the discussions started and emphasized they were ongoing and would be guided by the university’s strategic planning process. Committee members expressed some concern that all the planning be guided by our new strategic plan, and felt it might be too fast to approve a specific restructuring by October. Dr. MacGregor stressed the urgency felt by the College of Social Science to have leaders very soon.

The new president of the SGA James “Bud” Sheppard reported on the SGA’s major accomplishments for 2013-2014 and outlined the major goals for 2014-2015. The latter include implementing “Wolf Pack Wednesdays” to promote school spirit and highlight the SGA Senate meetings, hosting town hall meetings between student leaders and the administration, and greater visibility of spending practices and promotion of funds available from SGA.

The committee unanimously approved the revisions proposed by the Faculty Handbook Committee and at 2:50 the committee moved into executive session.

Finance Committee of the Board: Craig Hood, Chris Screen
no report received

Institutional Advancement Committee of the Board: Cathy Rogers
no report received

Mission & Identity Committee of the Board of Trustees (15 May 2014): John T. Sebastian, Lawrence Lewis
The meeting opened with introductions and approval of the minutes of the December 5, 2013 meeting.

Two graduating seniors, Christine Johnson and Matthew Higginbotham, both Music Therapy majors, were then invited to reflect on their four years attending Loyola. During their undergraduate careers, both student were active in events sponsored by the Office of Mission and Ministry and in student liturgies. Ms. Johnson described participation in a Christian Life Community (CLC) as her most important college experience, which enabled her to reflect on questions concerning her identity, her relationship to God, and the meaning of that relationship for her life. She also described completing one of the practica required for her major as an Ignacio Volunteer in Jamaica, which enabled her to be an “academic in action,” with one foot in school and the other in the real world. Through her experience, she did not just learn about problems in the world but learned to ask why those problems exist. Mr. Higginbotham reflected on the importance of learning self-awareness at Loyola especially in his Christian ethics course, where he had to attend to why he did things. He also described his experience as an Ignacio Volunteer working at Mother Theresa’s Home for the Destitute and Dying, where he discovered the humility that comes being unable to help people whose needs are indeed beyond help. He also talked about his participation in Loyola retreat programs, where he discovered that embracing opportunities to be vulnerable enabled him to grow in courage. Board members then asked about the students’ future plans, including opportunities for further faith development; about the number of students participating in CLCs (60-70); and about their initial interest in music therapy.

Rev. Ted Dziak, S.J., Vice President for Mission and Ministry, then led a review of the academic year and outlined the future. He noted that the university was at a critical moment in its history before providing an overview the changes undergone by Jesuit colleges and universities in the U.S. since their founding. That history is one of gradual secularization of the faculty, administration, and governing boards—Loyola was the last Jesuit school in the U.S. to
incorporate its Board as an entity distinct from the Jesuit Community in 1989—and of dwindling numbers of Jesuits. He noted that only six Jesuits were available for faculty appointments in Fall 2015, that 10 AJCU institutions now have lay presidents, and that 63% of all Catholic colleges have lay presidents. Compared to the 1960s when Loyola’s Jesuit population numbered in the 40s, today only 10 Jesuits work fulltime at Loyola, only five as faculty, and only four are under the age of 60. These demographic shifts raise the question: how do we foster the Jesuit mission with very few or no Jesuits? There is a greater need for partnership and collaboration, which is the challenge that Boards must confront.

Fr. Dziak then recounted the establishment of the Jesuit Center with funds from the sale of WWL and the subsequent creation of the Office of Mission and Identity in 2007 as the unit responsible for fostering mission and catalyzing mission activity. Nevertheless, his office functions on a $900,000 annual operating budget, which represents only 0.6% of the university’s overall budget.

Fr. Dziak laid out three possible future directions for Loyola: (1) become more secularized by de-emphasizing hiring and formation for mission. He described this is not a threat but rather as a possible reality. (2) Become more dogmatically Christian. He observed that the Newman Society currently endorses 20 Catholic universities, none of which are Jesuit. This kind of emphasis would value the pastoral mission of the institution over academic freedom and the desires not only of faculty but also of students and their families. (3) Pursue a middle way by asking what are we doing well, and what can we do better?

He then noted that ministry side of the office is thriving under the leadership of Kurt Bindewald, particularly in the areas of service and community engagement. Indeed, Loyola has been recognized as one of the best community-engaged universities in the country, with 65% of graduates having done some service learning and a total of 90-95% engaged in some academic or co-curricular service. He remarked that LUCAP (the Loyola University Community Action Project) is the largest student organization on campus, despite the fact that Loyola students are not required to undertake service. Other ministry activities include retreats, which have a developmental focus; opportunities for faculty, staff, and alumni to experience the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, including online retreats; active sacramental communities; CLCs; Loyola Life; and opportunities for Scripture study. He gave Ministry an A.

Mission he gave a B. Loyola continues to be very active in national AJCU and Heartland-Delta events. On campus, new opportunities for faculty and staff development for mission have become available, but they involve relatively small numbers (approximately 10-20 faculty and staff per year). While opportunities continue to increase—the office plans to sponsor a pilgrimage to Spain in summer 2015 and is expanding the Lenten series—they tend to be acted on by a small cohort of faculty and staff. The office needs to strengthen faculty and staff formation programs and to work more closely with trustees and alumni. The Benson Jesuit Center promises to galvanize these efforts, but construction has not yet begun, even though the initial gift naming the center was made in 2010. Another $1M has since been raised, but there remains another $7M to go. Raising the remaining funds is a key fundraising initiative in the capital campaign. The building will transform the campus, but in the meantime the office is treading water.

The eventual opening of the new building is also an occasion for rethinking the Jesuit Center, since it would be cumbersome to have an office called the Jesuit Center inside of a building also called the Jesuit Center (the name was established as part of the gift). The new building will also offer space for the newly formed Central and Southern Province of the Society of Jesus. The new center should also be able to do more for faculty and staff development, such as offering increased pedagogical resources and grants to faculty to support course development. The building will also foster greater interaction between the Jesuit community and the faculty. There is also an opportunity for taking advantage of Loyola’s location to engage more with Jesuit universities in Latin America. Belize will be a part of the new province, which creates opportunities for developing new programs abroad. Following models established by Georgetown University and Boston College, the center could also seek to partner more substantially with the archdiocese.

The meeting concluded with questions from the Trustees, who asked about formation and other opportunities for transfer and graduate students, which Fr. Dziak acknowledged as underserved populations. He then spoke briefly, however, about collaborations between his office and the University Honors Program, which has recently become more intentional about
mission. He also cited the broadening of the Catholic Tradition requirement of the recently revised Common Curriculum beyond courses offered only by the Department of Religious Studies. Some Trustees expressed interest in having Fr. Dziak make his presentation to the full Board, not just the Mission & Identity Committee and perhaps even to the Catholic community of New Orleans. Other Trustees noted concerns among the alumni community that the institution is losing its Jesuit identity, perhaps because they simply are not aware of all of that is going on and only see dwindling numbers of Jesuits. There was a sense that the alumni need to be better informed about the programs described by Fr. Dziak. Improved communications were also identified as vital for the recruitment of students and faculty. Fr. Dziak also responded to rumors of hostility toward mission among the faculty. He noted that indifference is more likely than hostility but also worse and stressed that the university needs to dialogue with secular society, which is the mission of the modern Church. He discussed the difference between hiring for mission and forming for mission: in the latter scenario, the faculty “go in their door and come out ours.”

Fr. Dziak concluded his presentation by directing the Trustees to Mr. Bindewald’s report on the Office of Mission and Ministry in their materials. The meeting was then adjourned.
Appendix C: Senate Committee reports (part 2)

Report, May 15, 2014 meeting
Committee on Institutional Advancement for the Board of Trustees,
Loyola University New Orleans

Vice President Bill Bishop gave updates about the Board Chairman’s challenge for fundraising, the SeeLoyno Campaign, the Marketing and Communications Working Group, and the public launch of the capital campaign.

The campaign total to date is $40,492,396.

The goal of the Chairman’s Challenge is to increase / encourage giving to the Loyola Fund (unrestricted gifts). The goal of the SeeLoyno Campaign is to reach an undergraduate alumni participation rate of 12 percent with a video produced by an alumna and narrated by university photographer Harold Baquet.

Bishop reported that Anne Gauthier agreed to serve as campaign co-chair. Other volunteer committee chairs are: Mary Dumestre for the Center for Law Practice Readiness; Clayton White for the Business Center for Continuity, Entrepreneurship, and Innovation; Mark Fernandez for the University Family Committee (faculty, staff, students, and parents); and Dr. Rachel Kent for HUNS – Research Endowments.

Bishop said that the Marketing and Communications Working Group is expected to give a recommendation to Fr. Wildes soon. At the beginning of this academic year Fr. Wildes directed the formation of a university working group to review and make a recommendation regarding: the current structure, where it should be located, and the reporting level. Dr. Cissy Petty is the chair of the committee.

Associate VP Terry Fisher discussed the activities planned for the public launch of the capital campaign scheduled for October 9. As they plan the event, they recognize and will be sensitive to the economic realities of the university.

Committee Chair Derby Gisclair led a discussion about Giving Guidelines for the Board of Trustees members and expectations for board members during the capital campaign. Committee members were asked to send recommendations about the proposed documents regarding Giving Guidelines to Bill Bishop which will be discussed at the October committee meeting, to be followed by coordination with the Trusteeship Committee to decide whether and when to present a document to the full board for approval.

Bishop thanked Mr. Gisclair for his time and service as chair of the Committee on Institutional Advancement, as his term on the Board ends at the end of the fiscal year. Anne Gauthier will be the Chair beginning in the new fiscal year. The Committee moved into an executive session at the close of the meeting.
Appendix D: Block Motions
Three motions from Walter Block (Business)

1. Resolved, Fr. Wildes, S.J., accuses our colleague, Walter Block, with supporting slavery as it actually existed. Wildes has not called forth a single shred of evidence (in the form of any quote from Block's voluminous publications, or any statement of his, public or private, nor did he have the courtesy to ask Block about this before publishing his letter) to substantiate this unwarranted, malicious, libelous comment of his, which has already led to threats against Block's physical safety. This incitement must end with Wildes' apology to Block.

2. Resolved, 18 members of the Loyola faculty accuse our colleague, Walter Block, with supporting slavery as it actually existed. These 18 members of the Loyola Faculty have not called forth a single shred of evidence (in the form of any quote from Block's voluminous publications, or any statement of his, public or private, nor did any of them have the courtesy to ask Block about this before publishing their letter) to substantiate this unwarranted, malicious, libelous comment of theirs, which has already led to threats against Block's physical safety. This incitement must end with the apology of these 18 members of the Loyola faculty to Block.

3. Resolved, the Diversity Task Force of Loyola University found Block guilty of racism and sexism. They did this based on a speech Block gave at Loyola University, Maryland. None of the members of the Diversity Task Force of Loyola University attended that lecture, nor had the courtesy to ask Block for his side of the story before condemning him. This violation of procedural and substantive justice must end with their repudiation of their condemnation of Block and the apology of the members of the Diversity Task Force of Loyola University to Block.

supporting material:


1. letter in the Maroon of 2/7/14 (Murphy, Laura, Anthony E. Ladd, Barbara Ewell, Charles Coprrew, Laura Hope, Kathleen Fitzgerald, Angel Parham, Ashley Howard, Trimiko Melancon, Alex Mukulich, PaTrisha Boyett, Julie Thibodaux, Nicole Eggers, Ted Quant, Susan Weishar, Alvaro Alcazar, Lisa Martin, Judith Hunt. 2014. “Letter: Faculty says Walter Block’s claims were, once again, untrue and offensive.” February 6; http://www.loyolamaroon.com/2.6713/letter-faculty-says-walter-block-s-claims-were-once-again-untrue-and-offensive-1.2854769#.UvaP6bex6M8)
2. Block’s response to them of 2/21/14 (Block, Walter E. 2014. “The faculty’s letter was misinformed and lacks integrity.” February 20; http://www.loyolamaroon.com/2.6713/letter-the-faculty-s-letter-was-misinformed-and-lacks-integrity-1.2857245#.UwdnEE-x6M8)

Appendix E:  Motion for the University Senate

The University Senate recommends the implementation of Option 1 of the Senate ad hoc committee’s report. In an informal poll conducted at the August special meeting, the Senate overwhelmingly preferred Option 1 to Option 2, and only a minority of Senators found Option 2 to be acceptable.

The Senate asks the Provost to create a transition and oversight committee to work with the colleges, schools, departments, and other units to implement this framework and settle any necessary adjustments to it. This committee should have substantial faculty representation, including members selected by the Senate and/or the colleges.

Finally, the Senate asks that the implementation process be used to spur a dedicated effort joint effort by faculty and administrators to identify and remedy inequities and irregularities in policies and processes, including those identified in the ad hoc committee's report.

amendment (M. I. Medina)
Motion to amend the models for the reorganization of Loyola University New Orleans to change the proposed College of Graduate and Professional Studies in option one or the Graduate College in option two, to a division or office of graduate and professional studies to report to the Office of the Provost.

(What follows is an attempt to provide an introduction to the motion/recommendation that can be sent to the President and Provost and used by them to craft material for the Board Book. I have drafted this because I have heard some sentiment that the ad hoc committee’s report itself should not be included in the Board Book. I welcome any suggestions—AVC)

The University Senate was asked in late 2013 to have a discussion of possible restructuring of academic units at the request of members of the College of Social Sciences, which had failed to come to a consensus about its future in the fall semester. At the Senate discussion, an ad hoc committee was suggested to consider the possibilities and make a recommendation to the Senate, which could in turn make a recommendation to the President and Provost.

This committee was broadly representative of the academic units of the University, though the membership from the beginning adopted an attitude of considering the best interests of the University as a whole, not only their individual units. They started from the mission of the University and developed a rubric of ten issues any proposed model should address; from there they analyzed the current situation and considered structures used at other institutions. From these discussions they developed the two models outlined here.

At a special meeting of the University Senate on 14 August 2014, a strong preference was articulated for Option 1; indeed, a majority of those present at that meeting considered Option 2 unacceptable. That discussion shaped the motion presented to the Senate at its 11 September meeting, given above.

A preliminary word on the language used here: new college titles are provisional and subject to change. All departmental units are given their current title, with the exception of the proposed new School of Media Arts, which has been under discussion within the College of Music and Fine Arts for some months. The use of
current names here by no means precludes changes to those names, and indeed some changes are under active consideration. Moreover, some changes of location of specific units have been proposed (most notably that of the Environment Program, from the Division of Interdisciplinary Studies to the Natural Sciences division of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Jesuit Social Research Institute to the Social Sciences division of that same college); those have not been reflected here because they do not change the fundamental framework and require more discussion than is possible in the context of a Senate meeting. (In our recommendation, we call for a transition/implementation committee whose first task would need to be to have these conversations.) As with the use of current names for departmental units, this does not mean that such changes cannot and indeed perhaps should not happen, simply that the Senate is focused on the basic skeletal framework and acknowledges that fuller discussion of these issues will be needed in a transition/implementation stage of the process.

Current structure
1. College of Business

2. College of Humanities and Natural Sciences
   - Humanities division: Departments of Classical Studies, English, History, Languages and Cultures, Philosophy, Religious Studies
   - Natural Sciences division: Departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Mathematical Sciences, Physics, Psychological Sciences

3. College of Law

4. College of Music and Fine Arts
   - Department of Art and Design
   - School of Music
   - Department of Music Industry Studies
   - Department of Theatre Arts and Dance

5. College of Social Sciences
   - Department of Counseling
   - Department of Criminal Justice
   - Loyola Institute for Ministry
   - School of Mass Communication
   - School of Nursing
   - Department of Political Science
   - Department of Sociology
   - institutes and centers: Institute for the Study of New Orleans, Center for Environmental Communications, Donnelley Center; Institute for Quality and Equity in Education; Jesuit Social Research Institute; Lindy Boggs Literacy Center; Twomey Center

6. University Library

other cross-college units (housed in the Office of the Provost): Common Curriculum, Honors Program, Interdisciplinary Programs, Summer School
Option 1

1. College of Business

2. College of Graduate and Professional Studies
   - Department of Counseling
   - Loyola Institute for Ministry
   - School of Nursing
   - This college would also provide administrative support and advocacy for graduate programs housed in colleges other than Law; at this time that includes the MBA (Business) and the MM in performance and MMT in music therapy (Music and Fine Arts)

3. College of Law

4. College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
   - Humanities division: Departments of Classical Studies, English, History, Languages and Cultures, Philosophy, Religious Studies
   - Natural Sciences division: Departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Mathematical Sciences, Physics, Psychological Sciences
   - Social Sciences division: Departments of Criminal Justice, Political Science, Sociology

5. College of Music, Media, and the Arts
   - School of Media Arts (with divisions of art, design, music industry studies, theatre, dance)
   - School of Music
   - School of Mass Communication

6. University Library

other cross-college units (housed in the Office of the Provost): Common Curriculum, Honors Program, Interdisciplinary Programs, Summer School, centers and institutes, Office of Part-Time and Transfer Students

Option 2

1. College of Law

2. Graduate College
   - Department of Counseling
   - Loyola Institute for Ministry

---

1 The School of Mass Communication faculty unanimously oppose this placement and support treatment as a free-standing unit independent of any college.

2 The location of specific centers, institutes, and interdisciplinary programs may be subject to revision, since some of which may be better placed within academic units in other colleges.

3 The name and scope of this office needs to be clarified, depending on the level of commitment Loyola chooses to give to “non-traditional” students of various types. At this time part-time, stop-out, veteran, international, transfer, and other students who are not full-time, first-time undergraduates often are treated as secondary.
• School of Nursing
• This college would also provide administrative support and advocacy for graduate programs housed in colleges other than Law; at this time that includes the MBA (Business) and the MM in performance and MMT in music therapy (Music and Fine Arts). It would also house an office of continuing studies for graduate students and handle summer school for graduate programs.

3. Undergraduate College
• School of Business
• Communication, Music Industry, and Design division:  (Department of) Design, Department of Music Industry Studies, School of Mass Communication
• Humanities division: Departments of Classical Studies, English, History, Languages and Cultures, Philosophy, Religious Studies
• Music and Fine Arts Division: (Department of) Art, School of Music, Department of Theatre Arts and Dance
• Natural Sciences division: Departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Mathematical Sciences, Physics, Psychological Sciences
• Social Sciences division: Departments of Criminal Justice, Political Science, Sociology
• cross-divisional units: Common Curriculum, Honors Program, Interdisciplinary Programs, Summer School, Teacher Certification Program, part-time and continuing undergraduate students

4. University Library
Appendix F: Anonymous Comments to Staff Senate

Anonymous comments to the Staff Senate regarding proposed College restructuring plans

COMMENT ONE

This report mentions the provost's office needing to take into account the salary/benefit implications for faculty to the college re-structuring. Is there any indication from the provost that he will take into account the implications for the staff as well? It feels like we are being brought in at the end of the process and not being given time as staff to offer our opinion and formulate our own report and that only faculty members' opinions matter in this discussion because they are seen as the more informed body about this issue, which is not necessarily the case.

For example regarding the current structure, this report says that there is no clear home for continuing, non-traditional, and part-time undergraduate students. But that's not the case at all. The office of professional and continuing studies is that home and it reports directly to the provost - not a specific college. Also, they mention some "Other Academic Programs/Offices" without being comprehensive. They don't mention the Office of Community-Engaged Learning, Teaching & Scholarship, which is academic in nature. They also don't mention the Academic Advising program, First Year Experience, The Center for International Education, the Academic Resource Center, among others. I think the beginning of their conversation starts with a skewed understanding of the university's current organization.

Regarding the options that the committee puts forth, I think some of the terminology in Option 1 creates the opportunity for more misunderstandings about budget/organization in the future. They use the words college, Division and School inconsistently. They create five colleges, plus a Cross-Collegiate Programs office?, and the library is mixed in there somewhere. Under those five colleges, there are some schools and there are some divisions. Under those schools and divisions, there are more divisions and departments. The word "division" is not used consistently between colleges, which is alarming and potentially a real budget hazard.

In general, I do not like the use of the word "division" for the same reasons that Loyola stopped using the terminology many years ago. I feel the word "division" is divisive! We want to create an environment of more collaboration and fewer fiefdoms and silos.

If we merge colleges and make some departments their own colleges, this will surely affect us as staff and might even mean some staff members will lose their jobs and new positions will be added in other places. I think it is very important that the provost consider the staff's opinions on these models, especially in light of the exodus of staff that is occurring throughout the university and the very real issue of morale. If we want to boost morale, I think ensuring staff feel that they too are an important part of the conversation is the first step.
COMMENT TWO

After reading report created by the University Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structures, I have a number of concerns which I would like to mention.

In the Summary of Committee Work the following sentence in the first paragraph concerns me. 
“In the Summer, the committee attempted to obtain data regarding accurate student enrollment (doctoral, graduate and undergraduate), but the information provided is clearly inaccurate”.

As a person who often utilizes information from the SIS system, it disturbs me that this statement is even in this report. If “obviously inaccurate information”, was provided, I would expect feedback to be expressed so the information could be either confirmed or corrected. Since it appears no such communication took place, it leads me to wonder whether the intent of the statement was an indictment of the offices providing the information or whether the information was not what they wanted to see so they dismissed it.

In the third paragraph of the committee work summary, a second statement that is included also concerns me.

“The committee has tried to identify any additional faculty and staffing requirements for these models but must leave actual cost assessments for both the transition and long-term operations to the Provost’s office, using actual salary and fringe benefit data”.

Loyola University New Orleans is at a critical crossroad which could lead to our growth, our demise or continuation of an uncertain future. With the statement above, a comprehensive evaluation of the proposed plans is not possible and selecting one or the other would be more of a leap of faith rather than a clear plan with a fair percentage of success possible.

Throughout the report there a statements and words included in each plan to show a consistency with the current strategic plan. They are followed, however, with generalities in terms of how the plan will accomplish or lead to the stated challenges and results of each plan.

Additionally, both proposed plans fail to realistically addresses the reality that we need to transition to a smaller university with a smaller budget. From what I have read, I see movement of the existing pieces of the puzzle from one reporting structure to a different reporting structure and an overall increase in the number of positions (divisions) which would require administration. Additionally, someone has to do the work for all of these proposed divisions and consideration for this set of employees is as absent as the specific identification of each level of positions the proposed plans would require.

The report does highlight many important areas we should be considering in the “Beyond the Rubric” section. Many of these are essential elements of a solid plan for success and growth and should be incorporated into any plan developed. How this would be accomplished should be specifically stated so a clear path can be created for us to follow.
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 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 to 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 H: Document from Isabel Medina

Loyola University New Orleans College of Law has established the J. Skelly Wright Memorial Fund in honor of the Honorable James Skelly Wright, a graduate of the law school and one of its most esteemed jurists. To honor Judge Skelly Wright’s contributions to the City, the State and the Nation, the school has commissioned local sculptor Thomas Bruno to create a bronze bust of Judge Wright to be placed at the entrance to the law school. In addition, the memorial will fund the J. Skelly Wright Scholarship. On the evening of Friday, October 24,
2014, the law school will unveil the J. Skelly Wright Memorial. That day, the Loyola Law Review will also host a symposium in honor of Judge Wright featuring a number of speakers on various topics involving Judge Wright’s long distinguished career as a district judge in New Orleans and a circuit judge in Washington, D.C. Among the speakers are Jim Wright, Judge Wright’s nephew, with the law firm of Jones Walker, and several of Judge Wright’s former law clerks, including Richard H. Fallon, Jr., Harvard Law School; Sally Katzen, Podesta Group; Randall L. Kennedy, Harvard Law School; Carol F. Lee, Taconic Capital Advisors; Louis Michael Seidman, Georgetown Law School; and Carol Steiker, Harvard Law School. The events are free and open to the public.

Born in New Orleans of humble origins, the Judge attended McDonough #7, and graduated from Warren Easton High School in 1927. He pursued a bachelor of philosophy degree at Loyola on a scholarship. After graduating from Loyola, he taught at Fortier High School where he was voted most popular teacher. He went on to attend Loyola’s law school at night and graduated in 1934. He served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Eastern District of Louisiana after graduating from law school. During World War II he served as an officer on the U.S. Coast Guard, and during his service abroad in England married Helen Patton, secretary to the U.S. Minister of Economic Warfare and daughter of Admiral Raymond Statton Patton.

Upon his return he took up private practice in Washington D.C., where he represented Andrew Higgins, maker of the PT boat and the “Higgins boats” LCVPs, the man credited by Eisenhower as “the man who won the war for us.” During this time, he also undertook representation of fellow Louisianan Willie Francis in Francis’ appeal of his capital sentence to the United States Supreme Court. Francis, a 17-year-old African American, had been sentenced to death for murder. The state’s initial attempt to execute him failed due to gross incompetence on the part of the state. Francis appealed on the grounds that a second attempt to execute him would constitute cruel and unusual punishment. Wright represented him on this appeal and argued the case before the Court. He lost the case, however, something that affected him deeply.

President Truman appointed him U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District in 1948, succeeding Herbert Christenberry, another Loyola Law graduate, appointed by President Truman to the federal bench. Wright’s appointment to the federal bench in 1949 made him one of the youngest judges on the bench at the time, and he and Judge Christenberry brought recognition to the Eastern District of Louisiana for its efficiency in administering justice and for its staunch commitment to desegregation efforts in the City and State.

President Kennedy appointed Judge Wright to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in 1962. Judge Wright took up residence in Washington D.C. until his death in 1988. Throughout his life in the law, Judge Wright was very involved in the New Orleans legal community. He was a former president of the New Orleans Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, a member of the governors of the Louisiana State Bar Association and a loyal Loyola alumnus.

In Louisiana Judge Wright is primarily remembered for his work while serving on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana (1949-62), in ordering the desegregation of LSU in 1950 and the Orleans Parish public schools in 1956. He also ordered the desegregation of City Park swimming pools in 1957, the streetcars and busses in 1958, public sporting events between black and white participants in 1958, the public schools of East Baton Rouge and St. Helena Parishes in 1960 and in granting an injunction blocking Washington Parish from purging blacks from voter registration rolls.

During this time, Judge Wright and his family became the focus of much hostility, which required that they be placed under police protection. U.S. Marshals and New Orleans Police lived in their home on Newcomb
Boulevard and escorted him to work. Old friends shunned them, a cross was burned on their lawn, he was harassed on the street, and threatening phone calls were a constant both at his office and at his home. He was vilified and made a pariah in his hometown for doing his constitutional duty to enforce the law.

Upon his appointment as a federal circuit judge, his impact went far beyond, to include property/landlord-tenant law recognizing the doctrine of implied warranty of habitability, administrative law, environmental law (some scholars credit him with being the genesis for environmental law), criminal law, contract law, and First Amendment law. He authored over a thousand opinions, wrote (at least) 20 law review articles, and his articles continue to be cited today. Many books have explored his work and legacy including Gilbert King, The Execution of Willie Francis: Race, Murder and the Search for Justice in the American South (2008); Arthur Selwyn Miller, A “Capacity for Outrage:” The Judicial Odyssey of J. Skelly Wright (1984); Liva Baker, The Second Battle of New Orleans – The Hundred Year Struggle to Integrate the Schools (1996); J. Bass, Unlikely Heroes (1981) and J. Peltason, Fifty-Eight Lonely Men (1971).

Judge Wright spent the last two decades of his life in the District of Columbia but throughout he maintained his contacts with Loyola and New Orleans. Notwithstanding the rancor, anger and turbulence of the late 50’s, early 60’s (very clear in his papers), he remained a native son. It is fitting that the school that he attended, the city of his birth, and the Louisiana legal community recognize in a meaningful way his life, accomplishments and legacy.

Contributions may be sent to Loyola University New Orleans College of Law, 7214 St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans, LA 70118. They may also be made on the school’s website at http://loyno.edu/giving (specifying that it’s for the J. Skelly Wright Memorial Fund). Please direct questions to M. Isabel Medina, 504-861-5655 or medina@loyno.edu

Appendix I: Memo from SMC

September 11, 2014

TO: University Senate
FROM: Faculty of the School of Mass communication

MEMO: REASONS FOR REQUESTING STAND-ALONE STATUS.

We believe a stand-alone School of Mass Communication would assist the university on several levels including increased enrollment, national visibility, increased fundraising and student success.

We want to share success stories of schools that have become stand-alone units:

- **At Loyola Chicago**, communications was a department in the College of Arts and Sciences. President Michael Garanzini, S.J. knew the strength of a stand-alone School of Communication and in 2008 began the School of Communication. Under the change, the school has flourished and now has more than 800 majors.

- **The Meek School of Journalism and New Media at Ole Miss** is led by Dr. Will Norton, who headed our ACEJMC accreditation site visit. Five years ago, their school had fewer than 500
students. Their enrollment has more than doubled to 1,100 students. Their fundraising has increased substantially garnering an endowment of more than $30 million.

- **At LSU, the Manship School of Journalism** for decades had been in the College of Arts and Sciences. In 1994, the school’s longtime argument for status as a college-level unit was accepted. What once had a dormant alumni association began to thrive as enrollment grew. The School now only accepts students with a 3.0 or better making admissions highly selective. The school has an enrollment of approximately 650 students and has increased their ability to raise funds dramatically. The school has been considered one of the university’s cathedrals of excellence.

Furthermore, a review of ACEJMC accredited journalism and mass communication programs, the ones that are ranked tops in the country, are stand-alone units.

The success of the SMC over the past five years demonstrates our ability to become a stand-alone unit. Moreover, SMC has a director, student services coordinator, budget and technology staff that allow for unit autonomy necessary to be a stand-alone unit with no extra cost to Loyola. Some of our strengths include:

- Achieved full accreditation by two accrediting bodies (ACEJMC and CEPR) on the first submission per 2012 Loyola Strategic Plan,
- Loyola SMC is the only Jesuit University and the only school in Louisiana to have both national accreditations,
- Loyola SMC has won more national PRSSA national Bateman Case Study Competitions than any other school in the country,
- SMC student job placement is well above the national average with graduates starting at organizations such as ESPN, Ketchum PR and ICON International,
- Princeton Review ranks The Maroon 5th in the country and the paper holds numerous national, regional and local awards,
- SMC has the vision and is raising $5 million in Faith in the Future Campaign for a communications hub that will impact the entire university making Loyola New Orleans’ experts available to the networks giving a national and international presence for the entire university,
- SMC has had two Dux Academicus professors in the last five years,
- SMC has four endowed professorships,
- SMC has developed a model probation program to increase Loyola’s retention,
- With its progressive curriculum and its RFP process for capstone courses, the Center for Environmental Communication and the world-class Shawn M. Donnelley Center for Non Profit Communications, SMC is a model for teaching and service in a Jesuit community,
- All computer labs have been upgraded and facilities renovated offering a state of the art lab that is expected of private universities,
- SMC renovated The Maroon making it a multiple platform newsroom to imitate such newspapers as the Wall Street Journal. Because every tour on Loyola’s campus visits The Maroon, this renovation using all mass communication funds, was an enormous benefit for the entire university,
- The Center for Environmental Communication receives grants and continues to be a news leader for the university,
- SMC sponsors programs that bring community leaders to our campus including programs from the Institute for Environmental Communication, Networking Night, Portfolio Review Night, the Tom Bell High School Silver Scribe Writing Competition to Donnelley Center non profit workshops,
- SMC initiated and supports an MOU with New Orleans only investigative news unit which in turn supports our program with Pulitzer Prize winning journalists as guest speakers, and offers internship opportunities for our students,
- SMC began honoring our alumni through an annual Den of Distinction ceremony.

As we look towards the future, coupled with our past successes, our commitment is stronger than ever to help Loyola University grow its enrollment, increase national visibility, increase fundraising and allow for student success. We believe a stand-alone School of Mass Communication would do that.