University Senate Minutes for April 15, 2010
Names in italic represent senators who were present:

**Biological Science**
*E. L. Beard*

**Business (College of)**
Wing Fok
Pat Lynch
*Chris Screen*
Stuart Wood
Lee Yao

**Chemistry**
*Joelle Underwood*

**Classical and Modern Languages and Cultures**
*Blanca Anderson*
*Bob Dewell*

**Criminal Justice**
*Dee Harper*

**English**
*Barbara Ewell*
*Mark Yakich*

**History**
*Robert Gerlich, S. J.*
*John Nielson*

**Law (College of)**
*Lloyd (Trey) Drury*
Rob Garda
Jim Klebba
*Lawrence Moore, S. J.*
*Markus Puder*

**Law Library**
*Cathy Wagar*

**Library**
*Liz Cashman*
*Ria Newhouse*

**Mathematical Sciences**
*Ralph Tucci*

**Ministry (Institute for)**
*Kathleen O’Gorman*

**Music**
*Alice Clark*
*Meg Frazier*
*James MacKay*
*Janna Saslaw*

**Nursing (School of)**
*Kim Brannagan*

**Philosophy**
*Joe Berendzen*
*Mark Gossiaux*

**Physics**
*Armin Kargol*

**Political Science**
*Conrad Raabe*

**Psychology**
*Evan Zucker*

**Religious Studies**
*Robert Gnuse*

**Sociology**
*Marcus Kondkar*

**Theater Arts and Dance**
*Geoffrey Hall*
Visual Arts
Nancy Bernardo

Guests:
Lydia Voigt, Vice Provost
Elizabeth Kordahl, Exec Asst to Provost
George Capowich, Vice Provost

Pearla Mutombo-Watumba
Melanie McKay – Academic Affairs
Maria Calizada – Assoc. Professor/Math
Laurie Phillips – Library
Mary Oriol – Nursing
CALL TO ORDER:

Chair, Dr. Conrad Raabe, called meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

Invocation by Fr. Robert Gerlich, S.J.

March 2010 minutes were approved.

REMARKS FROM CHAIR:

- Dr. Raabe stated that the scheduled guest speaker, Suzanne Mestayer, had other obligations and could not attend the meeting. Subject to her schedule, she will make every effort to attend a meeting within the year.
- Chair introduced Sal Liberto, Vice President for Enrollment Management, as guest speaker.

Mr. Liberto opened with the discussion of enrollment and retention.

Mr. Liberto stated that he understands there may be some questions regarding conditional admits. He will give a brief description of conditional admits and he will take questions following.

For clarification purposes Mr. Liberto explained exactly what a conditional admit means. To be accepted conditionally means one or two things: These students are either required to complete the summer bridge program and fall and spring enrichment (or) take fall and spring enrichment. Fall and spring enrichment means you have to take the protocols of learning course in the fall (transition course) and you are required to meet with an academic counselor once a week. Conditionally admitted into the bridge program means you are required to take two courses in the summer (summer bridge) and earn a C or better in both courses. Then you continue to be a conditionally admitted student in the fall.

This year just below 24% of our pool of enrolled students has been students accepted conditionally. In 2004 – 19%, 2005 – 17%. Last year the percentage of conditional admits was 24%.
Mr. Liberto stated that there are positive and negative aspects to admitting conditional students. In the positive aspect we are getting students involved with the academic counselling procedures, which data has indicated improves retention at the university. The negative aspect is that we are admitting students that are not at the high end of the profile. These admissions are utilized for students that have either lower test scores or GPA.

Mr. Liberto explained that, as applications increase, the number of conditional admits will be lowered.

Dr. Harper asked if conditional admits are eligible for recognition awards. Mr. Liberto responded yes, they are eligible for scholarships and financial aid.

Dr. Tucci asked what the ideal percentage of conditional admits is. Mr. Liberto responded by stating 15 to 20% would be ideal.

Dr. Kondkar posed a concern of maintaining a high standard for student enrollment vs. higher enrollment. Mr. Liberto explained that the question of conditional admits continues to be discussed. Mr. Liberto concluded that we would always want to offer a service to students to succeed. Data indicates that most students that complete the summer bridge program do as well as unconditional students and sometimes even better.

Dr. Zucker posed a concern that conditional admits are not part of the profile. Mr. Liberto stated that this is standard practice, but he doesn’t like it

Dr. Calzada asked if the construction is affecting enrolment. Mr. Liberto stated that the renovations have not affected enrollment. He also explained that the construction is presented as an asset to students who will be attending the next four years.

Also, senate members discussed the options of study for conditional students (i.e. courses pertaining to pre-med, and if these students are eligible for enrolling in any type of study). Mr. Liberto continues to look at these areas.

Some discussions were tabled regarding the advantages and disadvantages of having conditional students. Some members have seen these students excel and suggest that we continue to consider conditional admits as being part of Loyola’s enrollment.

**REPORTS:**

**SCAP Reports**

Dr. Raabe asked SCAP representatives to give a brief description of upcoming programs:

- SCAP/Senate Committee on Program Review Criteria – Dr. Maria Calzada
Dr. Maria Calzada presented the criteria for program evaluation, program discontinuation and new programs for the joint SCAP senate committee. She stated that we really need periodic reviews and it is very useful to have specifics. This proposal was brought to the senate several months ago. It is an action item for the SCAP meeting on Tuesday and the senate will need to approve at a later date.

Dr. Calzada noted that the faculty handbook states that these program reviews are required every five years.

Dr. Saslaw stated that this proposal could be voted on at the first meeting in the fall. The committee contributed some good ideas for particular programs. She suggested that senators take a look at the preambles.

Dr. Raabe motioned to table SCAP Criteria for Evaluation of New Academic Program Proposals, Periodic Program Reviews and Program Discontinuances for first meeting of the senate Fall, 2010.

- **Motion passed unanimously**

**Senate Representation: (Added agenda item)**

Dr. Raabe asked if anyone had questions about the senate representation sheets.

Dr. Saslaw stated to members that in order for faculty (ordinary or extraordinary) to be eligible to serve on the senate they would need to have been at Loyola for one year. Dr. Saslaw stated that Dr. Ewell had distributed the number of eligible members for each department. If elections have not taken place within the department, please encourage them to do so before May 6th. Also, membership on other committees is encouraged from members and non-members willing to represent the senate.

Dr. Raabe reminded senators that there would be nominations for executive committee members of the senate at the next meeting as well.

**Ad hoc Compression Committee**

Dr. Tucci presented the progress that the Ad hoc Compression Committee has made. This committee has worked very hard on salaries and compression/equity issues. There still remains a lot of negotiating that needs to take place for faculty members. At the present time compression is being adjusted over four years. However, there are still several faculty members that deserve salary adjustments.

Dr. Capowich, Vice Provost, stated that the university has met many of the recommendations on adjustments. Letters for approved adjustments have gone out in the past few weeks (effective next year). The university could not meet all of the compressions approved for this year, but they will continue to work on these adjustments in the upcoming year.
Dr. Capowich explained the process by which he presented the Deans with the guidelines, ranges and adjustments. The Deans gave recommendations and the provost and budget managers worked on adjustments.

Dr. Capowich stated that compression and equity are conceptually different concerns. At present, we are addressing compression - equity determinations will follow. Each fall these items will be looked at again.

Dr. Calzada thanked Dr. Capowich for assisting with this process. She also stated that a faculty member’s discipline should also to be looked at when assigning compression monies. Dr. Capowich agreed.

Dr. Raabe stated that the Ad hoc committee’s completion date is in May. The senate will have to reappoint this committee at the first meeting in the fall if they want it to continue.

**Provost’s Report**

(Dr. Lydia Voigt, Senior Vice Provost)

Dr. Voigt gave Dr. Kvet’s regrets for not being able to attend the meeting. Dr. Kvet requested that she give the reports on his behalf.

1) The surveys for the Dean’s evaluations have gone out. Completion deadline is April 20th.

2) Father Wildes will be attending the May 6th senate meeting.

3) There is now a link for facility updates on the Loyola website. There will also be a newsletter for the neighborhood. The current work on campus should be completed by the end of the summer. The parking garage and Thomas Hall should be completed January 2011. Invitations have gone out to 25 architectural firms. Review of finalists will take place in May and a final decision will be made in mid June. When the selection has been made an announcement will be sent out.

4) The search for Vice President of Institutional Advancement is completed and will be announced early next week.

5) The search for the new Dean of the Law School is continuing. The interim Dean will be in place by the 1st of May.
OLD BUSINESS:

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee

Dr. Harper presented the proposed revision for Emeritus Status: Section J Ch. 6 pp 6-8 & 6-9. And
Noted: Added amendment item -under privileges there will be clarification on continued research support for emeritus personnel.

Dr. Raabe seconded the motion for amendment.

There was a request to move to question:
  o None opposed
  o No abstentions

The motion was put to question:

Votes in favour of the motion: 21
Votes against the motion: 1
Abstentions: 0

FHRC – Proposed revision to Faculty Handbook on Emeritus Status

Revisions include:
  o Faculty notifying chair, Dean and academic administrators should notify the Provost, one year in advance of their intention of retiring at the end of the following academic year.
  o CRTC will forward to the Dean a recommendation regarding the granting of emeritus status prior to January 31 in the year, which they are retiring.
  o Dean appends his or her recommendations and sends both to the Vice President for Academic Affairs prior to February 15th.
  o Newly appointed emeriti faculty will be recognized each year at graduation.
  o Retaining university email privileges unless the emeritus request removal from the email server.
  o Whenever there is a need for emeriti faculty members to teach courses in their special areas of expertise, compensation will be appropriate to rank and emeriti status.

This item was previously seconded:

The motion was put and: APPROVED

Votes in favour of the motion: 19
Votes against the motion: 0
Abstentions: 3

Dr. Raabe announced the results of FHRC revision for Emeritus Status - {approved}
Continuation for faculty handbook revision committee through next year (continuing resolution)

Dr. Raabe motioned for continuation. (It was also announced that this would need to be a quorum vote).

- Therefore, Dr. Saslaw announced that there are 39 total senators:
- It was then determined how many members were present at this meeting:
  - 20 senators
  - 2 proxies

The motion was put and: 

- 20
- 1
- 1

Dr. Raabe announced the results of the Continuation for faculty handbook revision committee through next year- {approved}

NEW BUSINESS:

FHRC – Grants and Leave Committee Protocol – Dr. Melanie McKay

Dr. McKay presented the new draft for the protocol of the University Committee on Grants and Leaves. She also discussed the merger of the grants and leaves committee and the faculty development committee. Committee members and chairs have been working on this and the chairs have done an excellent job. Both have worked throughout the spring and they have completed new guidelines and protocols. Guidelines will be put on the website for clarity. They are proposing the merger to start in August 2010. Ideally, membership should be called together in the summer.

Dr. McKay encouraged the senate to review the new protocol and suggested it be voted on at the next meeting. She presented the procedure for selecting members, the term of members, the purpose and duties, and the procedures and policies.

Concerns noted:

Dr. Clark had concerns about the logistics of this committee. Concerns were the high number of members and replacing a person at the end of a term.

Dr. Harper suggested getting external reviewers to eliminate the issues with a big committee.
Dr. Calzada stated that two faculty members in the math department had serious concerns about the minor change or revision that was being made so quickly.

It was expressed that HUNS College Planning Committee had many concerns as well.

Dr. McKay responded to all of the concerns and stated that this committee is a vital one and in order to have ideal representation, each college should have members on this committee. She also stated that it was determined it would be more beneficial, due to the type of committee it is, to rotate members.

Laurie Phillips, Chair of the Grants and Leaves committee, stated that given the new time frames it is far enough into the fall semester that technically you could vote on it in the first August meeting.

Dr. Raabe suggested everyone read the proposal over very carefully and look for exceptions. Email concerns to the Executive Committee through Dr. Raabe and they will discuss these at the Executive Committee Meeting.

Dr. Raabe concluded that any concerns being substantive would be brought to the next meeting. All concerns at this meeting are noted and a vote will take place on this revision at the next meeting on May 6, 2010.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The Chair thanked all participants for their presence.

Meeting adjourned at 5:11pm.