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

INVOCATION  
Alice Clark offered an invocation.

The following guests were introduced: Kevin Wildes, President; Jay Calamia, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Melanie McKay, Vice Provost for Faculty Development; Roberta Kaskel, Interim Vice President for Enrollment Management; Leon Mathes, Director of Financial Affairs; John Lovett, Associate Dean, College of Law; Meredith Hartley, Director of Public Affairs.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
The minutes from the February 13, 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  
Behrooz Moazami announced that March 31-April 4, 2014 is Peace Week.

Senators who serve on university committees were asked to provide a report for either the April or May meeting.

Other Reports – None.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT  
President Wildes thanked Alice Clark for providing him with information on issues to be addressed. He began by clarifying the order of operations within his office. The Vice Presidents report directly to him, and regular meetings are held every other week. Two of the Vice Presidents (Roberta Kaskel, Enrollment Management; and Cissy Petty, Student Affairs) are also Associate Provosts and report directly to Provost Manganaro. He also appointed Provost Manganaro as chief academic officer to oversee the day-to-day operations. The Office of General Counsel was created several years ago as a request from the Board of Trustees. Prior to the creation of the office, the university outsourced the work to legal firms in the New Orleans area. Since the inception of the office, the university saves approximately $60,000 a year. Higher education is a highly regulated industry and one of the key responsibilities of the Office of General Counsel is to prepare and submit fifty-five reports on an annual basis that are required for compliance reasons. Institutional Advancement structures are under review.

One important responsibility of Bill Bishop, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, is to provide reports to the President regarding the return on investment of the office. It was reported that last year every dollar that was spent by Institutional Advancement brought a return of $9.50. The public phase of the Capital Campaign will be launched in fall 2014.
Two of the university’s main focuses have been on controlling expenses and growing enrollment. In terms of enrollment, many new strategies are being implemented and some previous strategies are being brought back. Recently, high school counselors were invited to visit campus. We need to budget and plan conservatively. Endowment funds have been used to meet some of the challenges, but they are not there to be used frivolously. The endowment will continue to be watched closely and serious consideration will be given before the Board is asked to use more of the funds. President’s Open House is March 29th.

Senator Connie Rodriguez inquired about the restructuring of President’s Open House. Roberta Kaskel responded that because of the construction on campus and Nunemaker Hall being offline, it makes it difficult to accommodate the volume of people expected. Last year one of the changes included separating students and parents. She disagreed with that change and believes choosing a college is a family decision, so parents and prospective students should remain together. One of the new changes will be a welcome by each college and by intended major. After the welcome, there will be breakout sessions by major. The focus will be on academics first. Clusters of colleges are being created to incorporate interdisciplinary studies of majors and minors.

Senator Ed Vacek asked for clarification on three issues. 1. There were fewer students last year. 2. Two firms were hired to help us with recruitment efforts. 3. There will be fewer students next year than the current year. President Wildes affirmed the first two items. In response to the third item, it is not yet known if there will be fewer students next year because the numbers are still coming in. The University is working very hard to introduce Loyola to high school students earlier in the high school years rather than waiting until their senior year. One of the firms specializes in financial aid, and the other firm specializes on marketing and recruitment. Roberta Kaskel added that one of the challenges we are facing is the rebuilding process. They are now working with high schools to engage students at the freshmen and sophomore level. Loyola and will keep that line of communication through the entire high school years.

Senator Behrooz Moazami asked what was paid to the two consulting firms. Also, he is aware of a student who is doing research on the students we lost and says that most of the students we lost are African American. Is this true? Provost Manganaro and Roberta Kaskel expressed doubt that that information is correct, and they do not know how a student would be able to get that information. Provost Manganaro added that reports can be run to get that information. Roberta Kaskel added that she thinks we are losing students across the board in all ethnic groups. The primary reasons students left Loyola are academic and financial.

Senator Connie Rodriguez commented that it seems like Loyola lost its identity in terms of marketing. The critical thinking series of sweatshirts made a strong point before Katrina. Roberta Kaskel responded that one of the consulting firms is conducting a brand and identity study. That data is at the analysis stage. It was kept open six weeks longer than anticipated due to low responses by students.

Senator Ed Vacek stated that if the financial aid package was a problem last year and we will have fewer students this year, it does not seem like the financial aid package has been adjusted. Roberta Kaskel responded that nearly 1400 financial aid packages have been mailed and they are more favorable to the higher quality students at the top of our bands. Provost Manganaro added that through the work of Scannell & Kurz they are adopting a model that will bring in greater revenue with the same or fewer students.

Senator Maurice Brungardt read some statistical information about our enrollment pattern and where our students come from. He didn’t see anything about international students. Roberta Kaskel responded that
international students were excluded from the models, but she will have more information about international students in April.

Senator Mitch Crusto said the law school went down to the 4th tier in the US News & World Report rankings, so they are now unranked. He encouraged Loyola to consider or reconsider to spend some of the endowment dollars on the central services at Loyola. Provost Manganaro responded that the Board of Trustees did allow use of some of the endowment money to fund the Voluntary Severance Package. The return on those funds was supposed to be five years, but it will actually be paid back in a little less than two years. President Wildes added that because they just used some of the endowment funds, he does not want to ask the Board for more money anytime soon.

Parliamentarian Karen Rosenbecker asked how much money has been paid to the consultant groups. Roberta Kaskel responded that Scannell & Kurz is a flat fee and it is well under $100,000. The Lawlor Group expense would have to be calculated.

Senator Barbara Ewell commented on the Office of Legal Counsel and Enrollment Management. Those offices could use a much lower profile as far as their presence on campus, and greater availability to the faculty. If they are not eliminated can their structure be evaluated to at least make them more responsive to faculty needs? President Wildes responded that he conducts an annual review on all of the units that report to him, including evaluations and setting future goals. He stated that the Senate chair would be be involved with that evaluation process, and Dr. Clark said she would likely recruit help from some Senators if that is the case.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST
Provost Manganaro reported that the March meeting of the Board of Trustees was in a retreat format. They focused on enrollment management, strategic planning, and the comprehensive campaign. The Lawlor Group gave two presentations, one on general trends and the other a preliminary presentation on the brand and identity study. He and Bill Locander gave an update on the Strategic Planning process and the four overarching strategies. A work group session took place and a number of trustees completed action plan forms. The Strategic Planning Team is moving forward and working hard on the four strategies. They are continuing to bring in materials and information, and hope to have a preliminary report ready for the May Board meeting. Alice Clark reminded Senators that information is still being collected and if anyone has thoughts to get them in soon.

REPORT FROM JAY CALAMIA
Jay Calamia gave a presentation on how the University met the $7.5 million deficit. He developed the Excel spreadsheet that was displayed during the meeting in response to concerns and questions expressed. The Board of Trustees has not yet seen the spreadsheet, but it will probably be part of his report to the Finance Committee of the Board in May and then also presented to the entire Board. The university deficit was $7.5 million. To cover this deficit, each unit had to make a total reduction of 10.6% of its salary budget. He reviewed the spreadsheet and showed how unit made its reduction. Some areas used some of their operating funds but most made reductions in salary pools. There is an area on the spreadsheet called “other” and that category included attrition, not filling vacant positions, reduction in hours whether voluntary or involuntary, operating funds, and unallocated budget funds. $4,836,000 of endowment funds were used. That comes down to .65 cents on the dollar for a pay back over a two-year period.

Senator Jon Altschul commented that the “other” category seems to cover almost half of the deficit. He asked Mr. Calamia to speak more about it. Leon Mathes responded that in Financial Affairs there were two positions
that were not replaced, and two people volunteered to reduce their hours. If a position was replaced it was at a lower salary, and that led to unallocated salary dollars.

Senator Behrooz Moazami is confused about the total deficit. He thought it was four million dollars and did not realize it was $7.5 million. Provost Manganaro clarified that the $4 million he heard about is the deficit for next year. Jay Calamia added that some faculty elected not to leave the University in January and therefore they have to be paid through May.

Senator Marcus Kondkar asked two questions. First, are we expected to have a better or worse deficit next year? Second, in the “other” category we’ve recouped those funds over a period that extended beyond one year, so it is unlikely that we would be able to find $3.2 million dollars of “other” funds next year—is that correct? Jay Calamia responded that he does not see it, it may be less. The UBC is currently working through several scenarios in projecting the shortfall in 2014-15. The four million dollar deficit that was reported to the Board of Trustees in December is being updated and the deficit could be less. The magnitude of the deficit is still in the working stages. Provost Manganaro pointed out that one of the other things they tried to calculate is how much money was left on the table by not increasing tuition by a modest amount. That number could be approximately two million dollars. Alice Clark understands next year to have a four million dollar debt service deficit, plus the two million differential for not raising tuition, and some smaller incidental amounts. Provost Manganaro added the UBC is looking at the figures and President Wildes asked the UBC to make several recommendations on how to reduce the deficit for next year. That work has recently begun. No one measure will get us the savings we need.

Senator Alice Clark inquired about the debt service and how long it will last. Jay Calamia responded that in 2013-14 the debt service was $7.5 million. By 2017-18 it will increase to $11.2 million. She asked how much and how long will we have to tighten the belt. Mr. Calamia said the UBC is working with five-year budget models to provide a comfort level for the subsequent and future years. The modeling they are currently working on is through 2018-19. Mr. Calamia has the information that Dr. Clark is asking for but he didn’t bring it to the meeting; he promised to send it later.

Senator Jon Altshul commended President Wildes and the Board of Trustees for not raising tuition. He also asked what will happen if we are not going to receive raises and have retirement contributions suspended. Fr. Wildes responded that he does not anticipate a salary increase freeze beyond this year, and retirement contribution cuts will be a last resort. If we do have to resort to retirement contribution cuts it will be pro-rated based on years of service and salary.

Senator Connie Rodriguez asked how our endowment is doing right now. President Wildes responded that he is pleased with the return and the people who are handling the endowment. He was not happy with where we were several years ago and the firm that handled it. Provost Manganaro noted that it is extremely important to move forward with the strategic planning process because it will guide the priorities on how we spend our money.

Senator Bob Gerlich is puzzled with the numbers. Has it always been based on increasing enrollments? In looking at the numbers and the debt service coming forward the numbers are so immense he wonders how we ended up in this position and what kind of strategy we have to get out of it. He also asked how many students represent a million dollars of income. Jay Calamia responded that net tuition from 50 students will earn one million dollars. He also added that when the University was planning to borrow money, we had to convince the rating agencies that we would be able to pay back the money borrowed. The headcount that was used remained
constant over the five year period of time and that number was 900 students. That number has drastically changed and we do not have 900 students. The 2014-15 budget will most likely be based on 614 incoming students. The other expectation was that graduate students would bring in net tuition revenue of $10.8 million with an expectation of continued increases. In reality that number is $8 million. The decline of entering freshmen classes and the decline in graduate tuition revenue have put us in the deficit we are facing. In October 2016 the library debt will be paid off.

Senator Bill Walkenhorst asked for the current value of the endowment. Jay Calamia responded that the unrestricted endowment is $175-180 million and the restricted endowment is $110 million. The 5% draw is based on an average of income on the $175-180 million over a three year period.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
Non-Retaliation Policy (attached here as Appendix B). There was no discussion about the policy. The vote in favor was 32 with 2 opposed and 5 abstentions.

NEW BUSINESS
An Election Committee needs to be formed. Three members are needed, preferably one each from HNS, Business, Law, or Library (since CSS and CMFA are already represented by the Senate Chair and Secretary). Connie Rodriguez from HNS volunteered. Teri Gallaway nominated Mary Hines from Monroe Library. Mary Hines accepted. Barbara Ewell nominated Chunlin Leonard from the law school. Chunlin Leonard accepted.

Faculty Handbook revisions:
• University Campus Sustainability Committee (chapter 17). (attached here as Appendix C).
  Needs to be moved for approval and will be voted on at the next meeting. Joe Berendzen moved to approve and Connie Rodriguez seconded. There was no preliminary discussion.
• University Conciliation Committee (chapter 16). (distributed via email as a word attachment, with changes tracked).
  Needs to be moved for approval and will be voted on at the next meeting. Joe Berendzen moved to approve and Connie Rodriguez seconded. There was no preliminary discussion.

Strategic Planning Motion:
Needs to be moved for approval and will be discussed at the next meeting. Jai Shanata moved to approve and Nathan Henne seconded. There was no preliminary discussion.

Motion from HUNS of thanks to departing faculty and staff:
Mitch Crusto moved to approve and Dave Khey seconded. Barbara Ewell pointed out that it should read colleges with an “s.” Teri Gallaway moved to suspend the rules to vote on it today. Marcus Kondkar seconded. The vote to suspend the rules to vote on the motion today was 34 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. Jon Altschul asked if there is a university-wide effort or plan to acknowledge the people mentioned in the motion. A Senator responded that Ted Dziak from Mission and Ministry is working on a celebratory mass. The vote to approve the motion is 34 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Motion as approved:
The University Senate expresses its gratitude to the faculty and staff who have departed the university through the recent Voluntary Severance Plan and the Reduction in Force. We thank them for their many years of hard work, service, and other incalculable contributions to our colleges and the greater Loyola University New Orleans Community.
CONTINUED DISCUSSION
Senator Jai Shanata clarified with President Wildes that Mr. Calamia would be able to provide a more detailed accounting of the savings we’ve achieved by having the Office of General Counsel and what is currently being spent on its operations. President Wildes confirmed that Jay Calamia can provide numbers on the expenses associated with the Office of Legal Counsel office and what our savings are.

Senator Connie Rodriguez was looking over preliminary reports distributed via email prior to the meeting, and was struck by the increasing number of non-traditional students and if any thought has been given to restructuring City College? Provost Manganaro responded the Strategic Planning Team and the Board of Trustees are very intent that we look at the reality of the current demographics of students. The non-traditional students of today are not the same as twenty years ago.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no more new business, the Senate was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Attachments to agenda:
Senate minutes February 2014
Chair’s report (March 2014)
Non-retaliation policy
University Campus Sustainability Committee (chapter 17)
University Conciliation Committee (chapter 16, with changes tracked)
Appendix A: Senate Chair’s Report
Senate chair’s report
March 2014

Apologies for the length of what follows, but I want to give you all as much information as possible.

I should probably start by addressing the anonymous letter claiming to come from a member of the Administrative Senate (now called Staff Senate), sent to all Senate members last month. It’s fair, I think, to say that this individual’s concerns mirror many of our own, and I believe many of us do advocate for the entire Loyola community in most of our dealings, both as a body and as individuals—something I hope will continue.

The concerns raised in that letter about the cost and effectiveness of the Office of General Counsel are widely discussed, including in Executive Committee meetings with the Provost and my own informal meetings with both the Provost and President. The EC has discussed the following draft template for a motion expressing that concern:

The Office of General Counsel has become an impediment to the educational mission of the University, by....Moreover, the cost of the office is a luxury we cannot afford at a time of resizing across the institution. We therefore call on the President either to provide a report to the Senate justifying its expense and providing a plan to make it more responsive to the needs of faculty, or to close the office.

We do not, however, have the experiences necessary to fill in those ellipses, without which the motion is simply a vague request that is not likely to be effective. We therefore do not feel capable at this time to bring forth such a motion. I have discussed the matter more than once with a Senate member in one of the departments that apparently does have that experience, and I know that has led to other discussions. There’s a good chance, I believe, that a strong motion will emerge in due course.

On the other issue: I will say honestly that, for my own part, I don’t think a no-confidence motion is an effective means at this point in time, and, like some of you, I am trying to work behind the scenes as well as through the Senate to bring concerns to the administration and to try to effect change. I’m grateful to all of you who have given me your thoughts and ideas; I have done my best to use them in those background conversations.

Senate committees
The Executive Committee has invited the following individuals to serve on the two new ad hoc committees:
- academic structures (Gwen George and Joelle Underwood, co-chairs): Tish Beard, Joe Berendzen, Barbara Ewell, Thomas Foster, Meg Frazier, David Khey, Daniela Marx, Laurie Phillips, Cathy Rogers, and John Snyder
- policies (Jon Altschul, chair): Mary Finans Hines, Bill Kitchens, Artemis Preeshl, and Connie Rodriguez

Thanks to all who volunteered either themselves or someone else. We had far more people for the academic structures committee than we could use, but please keep us in mind, because it’s almost time to elect Senate representatives to a host of committees for next year!

Speaking of which: we need members for the Elections Committee. This group proposes nominees for the various committees, in advance of the May elections. I and Gwen George serve ex officio, but we need three
more faculty members, preferably from colleges other than CSS and CMFA. Please let me know by Thursday’s meeting if you are willing to serve.

Finally, Mary McCay has asked to be removed from the Academic Integrity Council as she prepares for retirement. Following a recommendation from the Executive Committee, I have asked Brenda Vollman (Criminal Justice) to fill in until elections in May.

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee
The committee has two Handbook revisions to send to the Senate for approval. The University Campus Sustainability Committee has functioned as an ad hoc committee; this protocol, created with the collaboration of Bob Thomas, current committee chair, gives it a more official status and fixes its representation, duties, and reporting structure.

The University Conciliation Committee protocol had previously been approved by the Senate, but the Office of General Counsel intervened before it could go to the Board of Trustees. The current version represents the fruit of work between the FHRC and that office, using a new process that we hope will facilitate future Handbook revisions by involving General Counsel earlier in the revision process so that all issues are dealt with before any proposed revision gets to the Senate. The basic issues under revision are twofold: first, the membership and terms are modified in light of the fact that the College of Law and the University Library do not have separate Rank and Tenure committees, so all tenured faculty are involved in all tenure decisions. Second, the FHRC has specified that all members of this committee must be tenured.

Board of Trustees
Before the beginning of the meeting, a group of three faculty (Kendall Eskine, John Sebastian, and myself) met with two trustees (Anne Gauthier and Joe O’Keefe) for informal discussion over coffee. All of us, I believe, found the conversation open and productive, and I hope it will be possible to continue these informal meetings to build relationships between faculty and trustees.

The Board meeting was set up as a “retreat,” which actually meant there was more opportunity for informal conversation than normally, when I’m at a table on the periphery with Bret Jacobs (as chair of the Staff Senate) and others. The meeting had three main topics: enrollment management (broadly conceived), strategic planning, and the comprehensive campaign.

The first segment was really a series of presentations from the Lawlor Group, first focusing on general trends, then a (very) preliminary report on their brand and identity study. (We’ll make sure we get a fuller report as it becomes available, both from Lawlor and from Scannell & Kurz.) They drew data from surveys of trustees, faculty, staff, current undergraduates, recent undergraduate alumni (2006-13), prospective undergraduates (9th-12th-grade students who had made inquiries but had not applied), and parents of prospective undergraduates. They were impressed with the response from faculty, which apparently was much stronger than expected. Here are a few things that struck me:

- among prospects and parents, the top characteristics considered “very appealing” were development of personal potential, learning from experience, and critical thinking and effective communication skills
- among this same group, factors that enhance reputation are others’ value/respect for a degree from the institution, job placement rate, four-year graduate rate, and graduate school placement rate
- 61% of faculty agreed (either strongly or somewhat) that they have pride in being associated with Loyola. This is true whether the individual was hired before or after the storm (59% and 63%, respectively). This sense of pride, regardless of areas of criticism, was something the Lawlor folks
emphasized to the trustees. Even higher figures were apparent for this question from staff (78%), current undergraduates (80%), and alumni (87%). Whatever difficulties we have to face, we as a faculty are committed, and we’re clearly doing something (many things) right!

Their findings will surely be very useful for the upcoming activities of the Strategic Planning Team, so I’ll move on to that area. Marc and Bill gave a presentation, then we were asked to talk in small groups about the four overarching strategies, using the same worksheet the SPT is using, which I also distributed to you. The fruits of those discussions will form part of the next meeting of the SPT, as will all other reactions and ideas for action plans any member receives (hint, hint).

The comprehensive campaign was the third main topic. Tom Scheye, a consultant who has been working with the Board, began by stating that net tuition revenue will remain flat nationwide in the foreseeable future, so funds for innovation must increasingly be funded through philanthropy. He and Bill Bishop spoke in general about the campaign, concluding with the decision to postpone the kickoff of the public phase until fall. S. Derby Gisclair, trustee and campaign chair, spoke to the trustees about the need for their support, through individual philanthropy and facilitating giving by others.

Strategic Planning Team
The group has refined previous materials into the following four overarching strategies:

- **Create a learning-centered community**
  - dedicated to a high-quality, experiential, and values-based education
  - devoted to students' discovery of their vocation and a life of service
  - infused by the culture and traditions of New Orleans
  - rooted in the Jesuit and Catholic commitment to justice

As you know, we are starting to collect and refine action plans that can bring these overarching strategies to life; from these will grow the strategic plan. Please send me and/or your college representative any ideas you have! (College representatives are Trey Drury, Teri Gallaway, Bill Kitchens, Cathy Rogers, John Sebastian.)

Provost’s Council
At the February meeting the Provost’s Council considered four models of a summer 2015 schedule, with an eye toward thinking about beginning later in order to capture non-Loyola students. After discussing the models, and other evidence brought to bear by the Associate Deans’ Council, the group agreed to keep the basic schedule as it is now, but over time to think about alternative models, including a “Maymester” that would allow short but intense experiences.

Cissy Petty reported that her office is working toward hosting a Jesuit student leadership conference for high school students in summer 2015. This would serve, among other things, as a long-term recruiting tool, since it would bring students to our campus from all over the country. Cissy will also chair a workgroup, formed by the president, to examine our marketing office, focusing on its placement in the institutional structure and related issues.

As some of you know, Institutional Advancement had tentatively planned for a public launch of the capital campaign in April, but the President has recently decided to plan for a possible October launch instead. Institutional Advancement, responding to recent personnel losses, is reorganizing its staff: where in recent years 80% of the Development staff has been assigned to college-specific tasks, 80% of the comprehensive
campaign is focused on university-wide projects. More staff will therefore be deployed to those campus-wide tasks. Colleges will continue to have major gift officers who focus on the activities and needs of those colleges.

Enrollment Management is also reorganizing, with a leadership team consisting of four associate directors supporting Roberta Kaskel. They are also working on developing liaisons with each college, as well as athletics. Merit awards have gone out, and they will soon begin packaging need-based awards, with an eye toward having those out as well by the President’s Open House. This will allow students and parents to discuss with Financial Aid staff how to finance an education at Loyola in specific terms.

**Enrollment Management Steering Committee**

As Roberta has said, everything is now about yield, so at this time there is little concrete information to report, but lots going on. Admitted student receptions have occurred or are being organized in cities such as New York and Miami, financial aid and admissions staff are meeting together to work on how to talk with students and parents about making Loyola affordable, students and faculty are being enlisted for help, and of course planning for the President’s Open House is underway.

We, along with the members of the University Budget Committee and the Board of Trustees, were invited to attend a webinar with Kathy Kurz of Scannell & Kurz. She expressed her conviction that the attempt to lower our discount rate was not the primary factor in our enrollment decline—and, more importantly, lowering discount rate is not the key to recovery. Rather, increasing our yield (the percentage of accepted students who come) is the most likely way forward, and that requires working on our prestige and our ability to articulate Loyola’s value. Her other major recommendation was to focus more attention on enhancing our transfer pool: those students have both a higher yield rate and a lower discount rate, so they provide higher net tuition revenue. Thom Spence is already working with a group of faculty and administrators to determine where we can create more and better articulation agreements to facilitate transfer students.

**Academic Advising Council**

The orientation subcommittee is working with Heather Roundtree on ways to include advising, and faculty, more in the process. As we’re talking right now, the evening dessert receptions with parents will continue, and faculty will have an opportunity to interact informally with students at lunch, where students will be divided by college. Two formal sessions (or possibly one formal session and a resource fair) are being planned. Perhaps the most important change, though, is to move the college sessions and subsequent advising meetings to the morning of the third day. The goal of this group is to increase substantive contact between faculty and students during the orientation process.

**Student Success Summit**

The steering committee is working on a protocol for a standing committee on student success. It has also set up four workgroups, on advising (chaired by Thom Spence), campus life (chaired by Robbie Reed), institutional effectiveness (chaired by Melanie McKay), and on-line learning (chaired by Thom Spence). These overlap with existing bodies but are working with them—for instance, Melanie’s group on institutional effectiveness is mostly concerned right now with identifying ways to help students make the transition to college, and it is working with the First-Year Experience committee.

**Staff Senate**

The February meeting had an extensive discussion about parking enforcement, with a number of concrete suggestions. There was also some discussion about finding a new staff ombuds officer, since Cecilia Bennett, who had held the position for some time, has retired. A substantial portion of the meeting was given to an open
discussion of campus climate in light of budgetary issues, and it was pointed out that no real reorganization is possible with across-the-board cuts. The body took no action and made no resolution, but Bret Jacobs, Staff Senate Chair, promised to communicate concerns to administration. I was unable to attend the March meeting, but I understand they continued productive discussion of topics such as the basic characteristics that a staff ombuds officer should have and the general campus climate.

Please continue to come to me with thoughts or concerns.

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

14 March 2014
Appendix B: Non-Retaliation Policy

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY NEW ORLEANS
NON-RETAILIATION POLICY
Approved by the Board of Trustees _____________

Policy Statement:
Retaliation against members of the University community who make good faith reports regarding potential University-related violations of laws, regulations or University policies is prohibited, and violators may be subject to disciplinary action.

Reason for Policy/Purpose:
The purpose of this policy is to comply with applicable federal and local laws prohibiting retaliation, and to promote the fair treatment of members of the University community who make good faith reports of potential University-related violations of laws, regulations or University policies.

Applicable to:
Faculty, staff and students

Policy/Procedures
The University is committed to conducting its affairs honestly, ethically and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Members of the University community are encouraged to report good faith concerns about University-related violations of laws, regulations or University policies. Attempts to resolve any such concerns normally should be made by contacting the appropriate supervisor or other contact person with the individual’s unit. If the individual is, for any reason, uncomfortable with doing so, reports may be made directly to the University officials responsible for the subject area in question. Reports may also be made to relevant external entities or governmental agencies responsible for the enforcement of laws containing non-retaliation provisions.

Retaliation is an adverse action against the individual because of the individual’s good faith report or engagement in protected activity. In addition, no individual may be adversely affected because they refused to carry out a directive which constitutes fraud or is a violation of local, state, federal or other applicable laws and regulations. Retaliation against a member of the University community for making a good faith report of potential University-related legal or policy violations is prohibited and will not be tolerated. The University will review complaints of retaliation and attempted or actual retaliatory action covered under this Policy may subject the violator to disciplinary action.

Reports that are knowingly false, made with malicious intent, or with reckless disregard for or willful ignorance of facts that would disprove the allegation made are not good faith reports, are prohibited by this Policy, and may subject the violator to disciplinary action.

Members of the University community who believe they may have been retaliated against in violation of this Policy may submit a written complaint to the Compliance Office, Office of General Counsel, Human Resources, Student Affairs or the Provost Office. Interim actions may be taken by the University prior to final disposition.

This Policy will be reviewed every two (2) years.
Appendix C: University Campus Sustainability Committee (chapter 17)

Chapter 17 Proposed Committee

UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Chairperson: A member selected by the Committee
Secretary: A member selected by the Committee

Voting members:
1. Six members of the full-time Faculty, elected by the University Senate for staggered three-year terms. At least one of these representatives must work primarily on the Broadway Campus.
2. A Student Affairs (food service) Representative
3. A Physical Plant Representative
4. The Chemical Hygiene Officer
5. A student representing Loyola Association of Students for Sustainability
6. A student appointed by SGA as Commissioner for Environmental and Sustainable Affairs
7. A student appointed by the Student Bar Association in collaboration with the Environmental Law Society.

Terms:
1. All faculty members serve three (3) year staggered terms.
2. Staff representatives serve as appointed by their agency head.
3. Students are appointed annually.

Purpose:
This Committee shall be responsible for evaluating, monitoring and making recommendations to the administration regarding issues associated with campus sustainability.

Duties:
1. It shall coordinate answering pertinent external surveys and questionnaires on campus sustainability.
2. It shall monitor and gather data on all campus sustainable operations and evaluate their effectiveness.
3. It shall oversee campus wide sustainability audits on a regular basis (at least once every five years).
4. It shall make recommendations for improvement of sustainable operations, through such vehicles as the Facilities Management Committee.
5. It shall communicate all issues pertaining to sustainability to the administration, faculty, staff, and students.
6. Where applicable, it shall oversee the implementation of sustainable actions on campus.
7. It shall report to the Provost and submit an annual report on its activities.
UNIVERSITY CONCILIATION COMMITTEE

Chairperson: A member selected by the Committee
Secretary: A member selected by the Committee

Voting Members:
1. One tenured member of the Faculty from each College of the University and the University Library.
2. One tenured member of the Faculty from each College of the University and the University Library shall be designated alternates.
3. Members of Rank and Tenure Committees of the University or of any College, except the College of Law and the University Library, are ineligible for simultaneous membership on the Committee.
4. All administrative officers of the University and departmental chairs are ineligible for membership on the Committee.

Terms:
1. The members and alternates shall be elected for three-year terms by a majority of those members of the Ordinary Faculty from each College who cast a vote.
2. Principal parties in a matter before the Committee may challenge any Committee member’s participation for cause. That member will be recused and replaced by an alternate.
3. Members of the Committee may recuse themselves from serving in a particular instance if contact with the persons or the issue involved would put impartiality into question.
4. In cases brought forward by or against faculty members from the College of Law or University Library, that college’s representative and alternate are presumptively recused, unless the Law or Library faculty members concerned waive that recusal, in writing, to the committee chair. A request under this provision cannot supersede recusals for cause.

Purpose:
This Committee shall make informal attempts to effect adjustment of grievance of any faculty member.

1. This Committee shall conduct informal inquiry, in an attempt to effect an adjustment in cases of dismissal for cause (see Chapter 9, Section C-2-b) of a faculty member with tenure or with a special or probationary appointment before the end of the specified term.

2. It shall review, upon written request of a faculty member, recommendation or decision against renewal of probationary appointment allegedly based on inadequate consideration in terms of relevant standards of the University. (See Chapter 4, Section G.)

3. It shall investigate and make informal inquiry into an allegation in writing by a faculty member on probationary or other non-tenured appointment that a decision not to reappoint him or her was based significantly on considerations violative of (a) academic freedom or of (b) policies on making reappointments without discrimination with respect to race, color, religion, sex, handicap, age or national origin. (See Chapter 1, Section E and Chapter 8, Section C.)

4. It shall review, upon written request of a faculty member or someone representing the faculty member, a decision to terminate an appointment with tenure, or a probationary or special appointment, before
the end of the specified term for medical reasons. (See Chapter 9, Sections A-8 and D.)

5. It shall review, if the faculty member so requests, evidence for suspension for medical reasons. (See Chapter 9, Sections B and D.)

6. It shall render a judgment to appropriate University administrators concerning suspension of a faculty member because of alleged harm in the absence of a suspension. (See Chapter 9, Section B.)

7. It shall receive petitions for redress from any faculty member alleging cause for grievance in any matter. The Committee shall have the right to decide whether or not the facts merit a detailed investigation, but must investigate if a faculty member alleges violation of academic freedom or of policies against discrimination with respect to race, color, sex, handicap, age, or national origin. (See Chapter 1, Section E and Chapter 8, Sections C and D.)

8. It shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

9. It shall report to the President of the University and to the University Senate.
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