

# HUMANITIES AND NATURAL SCIENCES COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

September 5, 2006

## Minutes

### I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the College Assembly was called to order by Dean Frank Scully at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 5, 2006 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall.

Attendance: Adams, K.; Anderson, B.; Anderson, R.; Barnes, P.; Beard, L.; Berendzen, J.; Bernardi, P.; Biguenet, J.; Birdwhistell, K.; Blundell, B.; Bourgeois, P.; Brans, C.; Brazier, M.; Butler, S.; Cahill, T.; Calzada, M.; Chambers, C.; Clark, J.; Coolidge, F.; Cotton, T.; Dewell, B.; Doll, E.; Dorn, P.; Egejuru, P.; Ewell, B.; Fagin, G.; Fernandez, M.; Fleischer, B.; Gerlich, R.; Gnuse, R.; Gossiaux, M.; Vernon Gregson, V.; Hammer, E.; Hauber, D.; Herbert, G.; Hood, C.; Janz, D.; Jordan, F.; Kaplan, G.; Kargol, A.; Keulman, K.; Khalaf, E.; King, C.; Knight, D.; Koplitz, L.; Langlinais, J.; Lewis, L.; Mabe, C.; Markuly, M.; McCay, M.; McHugh, M.; McKay, M.; Moore, D.; Mui, C.; Leo Nicoll, L.; Rogers, P.; Ross, M.; Rowland, R.; Rowntree, S.; Salmon, J.; Scariano, S.; Sebastian, J.; Shuh, M.; Spence, T.; Tonsmann, G.; Tucci, R.; Walkenhorst, B.; White, D.; Zeph, C.; Zucker, E.

### II. INVOCATION

Rev. Leo A. Nicoll, S.J. delivered the invocation.

### III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### a) RFP Writing Intensive Courses

Dean Scully discussed an initiative on writing-intensive courses, the usual conflict between class size and writing-intensive courses, the need to guarantee a size to faculty who propose such courses, and having consequences for those not having writing-intensive courses.

#### b) Retention

Dean Scully announced that approximate retention figures were 87% overall, 77% across freshman level spring-to-fall, and according to the Maroon, more students than anticipated. He said the budget would not be out of the woods long term, but would be better than expected. He praised faculty for the outcome of Debbie Stieffel's Colorado spring survey of returning students, in which students overwhelmingly cited Arts and Science faculty members as their reason for returning. He expressed pride in the long tradition of A&S faculty excellence.

#### c) Additional Announcements

Dean Scully said that he wanted to present a brief overview of what he had attempted in his conversations with the President and Provost about what was happening in the university. He said the Provost initially spoke of having an advisory council of faculty. He said he objected when the President proposed holding October meetings with separate colleges, missing the September 15 date, and told the President that the issues the faculty wanted to address had nothing to do with the differences between the humanities and natural sciences; rather, they wanted to talk about the 'conversations' document that came out in the Senate last year. He announced that the meeting date the President and Provost finally determined is September 21, the third Thursday of the month.

#### IV. REPORTS

a) Report on Enrollments

Dean Scully said that was covered in his discussion of retention (above).

b) Discussion of May 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Concerned Faculty Members

**Motion:** Lynn Koplitz moved that the report be presented after the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee report.

**Second:** The motion was seconded by Stephen Scariano. Dean Scully called for a vote.

**Vote:** Ayes were unanimous.

c) Report from Ad Hoc Faculty Committee that Met with Provost

Dean Scully introduced representative faculty members Maria Calzada, Maureen Shuh and Thomas Spence to deliver their report on the August 22, 2006 meeting with Dr. Walter Harris, Provost. Thomas said they spoke at length with the Provost about what could be done to move forward. They mentioned the pending work of revising QEP and common curriculum. He said their only recommendation was replacing three persons in the current administration with a possible transitional team to continue working with the faculty. Maria and Maureen said they were clear that faculty would not be able to work on revising the curriculum and QEP with the current administration in place.

Comments: Mark Fernandez asked whether discussions included not only the people in place, but also the mechanisms. Thomas replied that they didn't feel they could set parameters; they tried to stay away from details. Maureen said that Maria presented a diagram of the top-down and filters going on. Robert Gerlich observed that having a University Senate (US) and having it ignored -- as the administration didn't come nor send a representative to the US meeting -- seems to be a certain amount of 'divide and conquer.' He added that although the US is representative of the entire faculty and not merely the college, the US attempted dialogue and was ignored. Ralph Tucci said that SCAP worked through three meetings to come up with modifications, and the final was ignored much as the US. Maureen reported that they brought up all the organizations during the meeting.

Faculty members voiced concerns about difficulties in having their considered positions heard. Vernon Gregson cautioned that Loyola informs what is in faculty contracts and the faculty handbook is part of it. He said a principle of contract law is that if repeated violations of a contract are accepted by those under contract, then the more times it's violated, the more impossible even for a court willing to take the contract seriously. He said the factual result of what is going on in all matters will be 'at will,' interpreted by the President and Provost. He said the US is key as is the faculty handbook. Tim Cahill suggested that 2% of the university endowment be transferred to US control so that the administration will listen. Connie Rodriguez said she has two comments: first, the need for faculty to fill positions on committees on the list published by the Chair of the US, and second, regarding the faculty contract and the handbook, that there is no hard copy of the faculty handbook and what's on-line is not being followed. She cautioned that the faculty members need to have a hard copy of the handbook so they will know when the administration makes changes.

John Biguenet said that having missed the May meeting, he'd like to hear specific reasons why the three people should be terminated. In response, Maria Calzada replied that May 12 meeting vote was

'no confidence.' Dean Scully said it's detailed in today's handout from Connie Rodriguez. Lynn Koplitz recalled the May 12 meeting, saying that Mary McCay distributed a handout with 12 statements under the heading: "Can We All Agree?" She said that at the conclusion of the May meeting, group resolutions pointed to incompetence, interpretations of data, and flaws in data.

Maureen returned to the summary of the meeting with the Provost and their communication to him that Pathways decisions were based upon flawed data, incorrect assumptions, and no input accepted from the people who knew the facts. Another observed that data wasn't used for the plan, that it was put together later. As clarifications continued, Dean Scully asked whether the May 12 vote and details about the reasons were on the blog site and suggested someone give the blog site address for those who want it and are unfamiliar with it. Connie Rodriguez responded that there is a blog site for faculty, staff and students [www.loyno.info](http://www.loyno.info) for the timelines, facts, data and analysis of data used to put together Pathways.

Katherine Adams observed that Loyola had done better than Tulane in many instances and that while she agreed the data was a mess, she disagreed with the vote of no confidence and would prefer to say what they've done wrong, cite mistakes, decisions on flawed data, but not at the point of clearing everyone out. She commented that Brenda Joyner did and does a good job and that other colleges are moving forward. She suggested defining what faculty can ask the Provost to do instead of clearing out and potentially getting people who are worse.

Mary McCay asked to get to a motion. Lynn Koplitz said there was no motion on the floor. Dean Scully said that although he wants everyone's comments, owing to the long agenda, comments need to be brief. Craig Hood asked Maureen, Maria and Tom whether their conversation with the Provost included the need for honest communication. Maureen replied that he thinks there already is and that he considered the Town Hall meeting open communication. She said that one of the first things he asked them during their meeting was whether they think the city can sustain its universities. She reported that they talked about the Austin site. She said that for the Provost there seemed to be at issue the viability of this or any university in this city. They talked about the money SLU is making. She said that when they talked about communications, the Provost seemed to consider that everything had been open and reception from the faculty had been mixed.

Dean Scully concluded the agenda item, saying that the Provost had asked him for feedback from the meeting with the faculty members. The Dean said that he reiterated to the Provost the need for a response to faculty members' legitimate concerns with issues where faculty had been overlooked. The Dean thanked Maria, Maureen and Tom for their report. Applause erupted as the three stepped down.

d) Discussion of May 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Concerned Faculty Members [*reordered agenda*]

Lynn Koplitz said that she would first summarize the May 12 meeting, and second follow with a motion concerning the minutes at the end of her summary. She summarized as follows: 77 faculty met and discussed issues that have already come up at today's meeting; Maria Calzada reported that Education and Computer Science departments were in the black 2004-2005; Tom Spence reported flaws in data such as Communications' \$155,000 equipment costs actually having been partially offset by \$65,000 revenue from student fees, net ratio-to-cost in A&S as being higher than other colleges, yet programs reportedly

higher were dismantled and lower programs continued; Mary McCay presented 12 points “Can We All Agree?” Lynn said motions that passed resulted in recommendations being put forward in a document later delivered to the President, Provost and Board. They strongly recommended that the Board table the Pathways Plan until November 2006. A vote of “no confidence” against Walter Harris, Jr., John Cornwell, Brenda Joyner and David Estes passed with 71 in favor, 2 opposed, and 4 abstained.

Lynn concluded her summary and said that despite those efforts to communicate concerns to the Administration and Board, on May 19 the Board met and voted in favor of Pathways, on May 22 the President broadcast an e-mail message of confidence in the Provost, and characterized the May 12 meeting as people caught up in the heat of the moment. She observed that it had not been a heated, emotional meeting, that it had been systematic, thoughtful, and clear as to the will and intention of the group.

**Proposed motion:** Lynn Koplitz proposed including minutes of the May 12 meeting along with the College Assembly minutes. Dean Scully replied that the motion would come under ‘new business,’ and said the May 12 minutes should be first be distributed and voted upon. Lynn said they are an important record of an important meeting and needed to be available somewhere. Distribution and posting methods were discussed.

Comments: Boyd Blundell said there had been a lack of transparency and responsiveness, with the Dean not consulted and faculty not able to comment, and as these were major issues -- there was no formal process. Leo Nicoll asked whether May 12 was an official College Assembly. Dean Scully replied that it was not. Leo observed that if it was not an official meeting of the College Assembly, then the May 12 minutes do not have to be approved. Tim Cahill said that it should be considered a College Assembly, it met the criteria of a College Assembly, and faculty considered it the final meeting of the College Assembly. Dean Scully said that the May 12 meeting was not called by the Dean as required by the handbook, and commented that he was not invited as a member of the faculty. He moved to the next agenda item, with the provision that they would get back to the issue.

- e) Report from Committee on Tiered Courses and Renumbering Advanced Common Curriculum Courses  
Mary McCay distributed the handout cited above (attached), briefly mentioned learning styles, and presented the points in the handout. She spoke to the need for input from former departments now diffused in other colleges, including Sociology, Political Science, Music, and Visual Arts. She mentioned 100 level courses being at a disadvantage in a tiered system, advantages of tiers, movement to 200 level courses, and advanced common curriculum being determined by departments. She commented that perhaps it hadn’t been thought through in all areas and invited comments.

Comments: Dean Scully suggested departments might think of ways to have 200- and 300-level prerequisites serve from other departments. Vernon Gregson observed that although good logic, in effect Xavier experienced that given the number of faculty and courses offerings, they couldn’t schedule these numbers at times workable for students. Leo Nicholl discussed concerns regarding missing the essence of common curriculum, the concept of building on other areas, the assumption that as you move further on you focus on small particulars and the opposite – read more and larger, have syntheses rather than

analyses. He said that focus on verbal communication must be maintained, with reading, writing, thinking and speaking.

Dean Scully thanked faculty for the reports and comments and asked to move on to the next agenda item.

## V. OLD BUSINESS

The Dean described the sentiment of what has and hasn't been done, that there are a lot of faculty who are concerned about a lack of dialogue with administration, that he is concerned not only by the large number of angry voices, but by the disengaged. He said he is concerned that they could be heading rather quickly to a potential crisis and cited the need to be careful "in what and how we do it." The Dean asked that faculty listen at the September 21 meeting with the President and Provost and give them a chance to respond. He repeated comments he had made to the President: that it isn't so important that faculty hear about his vision as that he hear about their vision, and the faculty need to know he is concerned about what they say. He asked faculty to delay the motion until after that meeting.

Comments: Elizabeth Hammer asked whether or not the Dean would have to call a College Assembly if they wait until after September 21. Dean Scully replied that he would immediately call a meeting of Chairs and would immediately respond to a motion of the Chairs. Faculty discussed the status of the May 12 meeting.

**Proposed motion** – Catherine Wessinger asked for help with wording to propose a motion to distribute and vote upon the May 12 minutes.

Comments: Dean Scully said he would distribute the May 12 minutes from his office to give all faculty the opportunity to read them. Mickey told Dean Scully that they had brought to him the list of names so that he'd be forced to call a College Assembly. John Biguenet cautioned that there were mistakes in the past, the need to avoid mistakes in the future, and said that he considers it a dangerous time at Loyola. William Cotton asked for clarification as to who will attend the September 21 meeting and asked how many are in the current college. Dean Scully replied that the college is roughly 85 and was 145.

When recognized by Dean Scully, Stephen Scariano said he wanted Connie Rodriguez recognized in his place. Dean Scully replied that there was a motion, that the floor is now having comments and if Connie asks to be recognized she will be. Lynn Koplitz asked for a point of order. Connie asked to be recognized, and said she appreciates what Dean Scully says about a conversation with the President and Provost. She said faculty had asked for conversations since before Pathways, as had the Senate and SCAP. She introduced the handout (attached), which was distributed at the start of the meeting along with a blank ballot for votes on the issue of no-confidence.

**Proposed motion:** Put the vote of no confidence on the agenda.

**Second:** Vernon Gregson

Discussion: During discussion of whether or not the motion could be added at this time, additional motions were voiced, without recognition:

- Proposed motion: To suspend the rules.
- Proposed motion: Put Connie Rodriguez's motion on the agenda.

John Sebastian was recognized and said he didn't understand why he and the group would change procedures while concerned about procedures not being followed. He observed the 1:30 PM time and added that his

department hadn't seen the website and the matter was too serious to consider without first reading. Lynn Koplitz said that motions have been made and are being ignored. Questions of adding agenda items were vigorously discussed.

Calling the question: Dean Scully repeated the motion for changing the agenda to include Connie Rodriguez's motion under new business and called the question.

**Vote:** Show of hands indicated 37 in favor, 16 opposed. The motion carried.

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

### a) Election for Faculty Development Committee

**Motion:** Have an election for a Faculty Development Committee to work with the Provost.

**Second:** Mary McCay

Discussion: Vernon Gregson said the group followed A&S procedures, but needs a committee to formulate protocol for H&NS. Dean Scully replied that there is no protocol for electing ad hoc committees. Vernon observed that if the May 12 meeting is problematic, then so is this meeting, which has no set of procedures under which to operate. Dean Scully asked faculty to accept for the time being the protocol of A&S for this body. Vernon said that is a new motion. Dean Scully said the issue on the floor is whether to have an elected committee.

**Motion:** Elizabeth Hammer: Table this until after the September 21 meeting.

**Second:** Mary McCay and Leo Nicholl (simultaneously).

**Vote:** Vote by acclamation was agreement, with two opposed.

### b) Strategic Planning

Tabled by acclamation.

### c) Implementation of Pathways

#### i. Re-writing College Handbook

Tabled by acclamation.

#### ii. Re-doing Elections

Tabled by acclamation.

Dean Scully said that as it's 1:50 pm, he suggests tabling the last items until the next regular meeting. He added that if the September 21 college faculty meeting with the President and Provost ends early, then they will proceed with other motions on the floor. Francis Coolidge asked whether there are there are plans for the CSS to meet with the President and Provost. Dean Scully replied yes, in October.

Closing comment: Peter Bernardi requested that members of City College here for the first time be recognized and welcomed. Loud applause and vocal "welcome" followed.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

Dean Scully adjourned the meeting at 1:55 p.m. by acclamation.

**HANDOUT 1**

H&amp;NS College Assembly

September 5, 2006

Dr. Connie Rodriguez

WHEREAS Kevin Wm. Wildes, Walter Harris, Jr., John Cornwell, David Estes, and Brenda Joyner - hereafter referred to collectively as the Administrators – have not provided competent leadership of Loyola University New Orleans before, during and after Hurricane Katrina; and

WHEREAS the Administrators have **not** effectively used the shared governance structures and procedures mandated by the *Faculty Handbook* in making decisions about our future; and

WHEREAS the Administrators have **not** exhibited competent leadership in formulating and articulating an inspirational academic vision that students, staff, and faculty can embrace and nurture; and

WHEREAS the Administrators have **not** provided any evidence that their strategic planning processes or emerging plans will ensure a stronger Loyola University New Orleans; and

WHEREAS the Administrators have **not** facilitated avenues of two-way communication with Loyola's students, staff, faculty, and the community at large, regarding the formulation and implementation of their vision and plans; and

WHEREAS the Administrators have **not** fostered an environment which engages and empowers students, staff, and faculty to commit themselves to a future at Loyola University New Orleans; and

WHEREAS the Administrators have **not** cultivated a sense of trust and confidence regarding their stewardship of a healthy, vital Loyola University New Orleans;

BE IT RESOLVED AND PROMULGATED THAT the faculty of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences hereby asserts a vote of **NO** confidence in the aforementioned Administrators.

**HANDOUT 2**  
 H&NS College Assembly  
 September 5, 2006  
 Dr. Mary McCay

Report from the Group studying tiered courses in the CC and on renumbering all Advanced Common Curriculum Courses.

Robert Gnuse, Mary McCay, David Moore, and Stephen Rowntree met on Tuesday, August 29, 2006 to discuss tiering courses in the advanced common curriculum, especially in Religious Studies and Philosophy. Robert Gnuse gave a report on his department's proposal for renumbering and tiering courses, and David Moore reported that his department had done such a justification for 200 and 300-level courses. The group came up with the following possible guidelines:

1. 200-level courses emphasize critical reading, writing, and thinking, and prepare students for the more rigorous discussion of 300-level courses.
2. 200-level courses should cover a wide range of issues.
3. Courses that are interdisciplinary should be 200-level courses for use in the interdisciplinary minor.
4. 200-level courses are valuable for a great many students.
5. 300-level courses require greater reflection than 200-level courses. They put to use the critical thinking skills that are taught in 200-level courses.
6. 300 level courses have more defined subject matter.
7. 300-level courses have heavy emphasis on discussion, student research, and primary texts.

Other problems and issues related to tiering and renumbering courses:

1. Numbering: once a number has been used, it cannot be used again. However, the problem can be solved by using the U-Z code; then any 200 or 300 number may be used because it has never been used before. Honors uses all 200 numbering with an H prefix.
2. Some departments will not want to tier courses. Should those departments just renumber their courses at the 200 level?
3. Departments that do tier courses should agree what the criteria are for each level and make them public.
4. Music and Business allow students to substitute any 200 level course for the common curriculum; therefore, students switching from Music or Business often find that, when they arrive in CHANS or CSS that they have common curriculum gaps and extra general electives.
5. In departments that do have a system of tiers (most especially RELS and PHIL) 200-level courses might be limited to freshmen who have taken the appropriate 122's, sophomores, and possibly junior transfers. 300-level courses would be open only to juniors and seniors. Should departments that have only one ACC requirement, limit their numbers to 200-level courses? For example, Humanities/Arts, Behavioral/Social Sciences, and Nat. Sciences require only one ACC. There are electives, but a student might want a classical humanities to cover the H/A requirement, but might want to take art or English courses for an ACC elective. That would mean the elective would have to be 200-level as well.
6. In the sciences, the group discussed several options, but had no rep from the sciences. We would like to hear from them. Options that were offered were: A student who takes BIOL T122 must take their advanced CC in BIOL. Possibly there could be a general course in Science T122 that covered BIOL, CHEM, and Physics, and then the student could take a 200-level course in any of the three areas. Since no science rep was at the meeting, we only list these as issues we discussed.
7. We need to get a clear sense of numbering from Michael Rachel.
8. We need input from all departments offering common curriculum courses.
9. The Common Curriculum Review committee has not convened, and our Chair has left, so I cannot say what is happening there.