

HUMANITIES AND NATURAL SCIENCES COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

October 26, 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, October 26, 2006 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall. A handout (attached) was distributed to provide the agenda and motions 1-6.

Attendance: Adams, Anderson, Barnes, Berendzen, Bernardi, Biguenet, Boileau, Bourgeois, Brans, Brisco, Brungardt, Butler, Cahill, Calzada, Clark, Cook, Coolidge, Dewell, Dittrich, Dorn, Egejuru, Ewell, Fagin, Fernandez, Gerlich, Gnuse, Gregson, Hammer, Hauber, Hood, Hoyt, Hymel, Janz, Jordan, Kelly, Koplitz, Kornovich, Lewis, Li, Mabe, Matthews, McCormack, McHugh, Moore, Nicoll, Randall, Rodrigues, Ross, Rowntree, Saxton, Sebastian, Shuh, Spence, Thibeaux, VanCott, Walkenhorst, Wessinger, White, Zeph, Zucker.

II. INVOCATION

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

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Previous minutes will be posted in advance of the next meeting.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

a) Dean Scully said that a PIES program pertaining to faculty leadership will be developed next summer, perhaps including readings to inform them more deeply about decisions administrators make; RFP is coming out by November 4, with an application deadline of November 24 and stipends connected. He encouraged faculty to participate and to encourage their colleagues to get involved, hopefully with broad participation across the university.

b) Dean Scully acknowledged and congratulated the new distinguished professors: Drs. John P. Clark, Gary B. Herbert, Catherine L. Wessinger, and James L. Wee. He said that the call for nominations of endowed professorships would be announced soon.

V. OLD BUSINESS

None.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Motion by Maria Calzada, seconded by Glen Hymel: *"Suspend the rules on all agenda items unless tabled,"* passed by acclamation, with one nay.

Because of the long agenda, the Dean asked for a motion to limit discussion and consider together: a) Accepting the A&S College Handbook, b) Forming a Handbook Revision Committee, c) Forming a Strategic Planning Committee. Group consensus was to give separate consideration to each topic.

Introduction of Motions 1-3: The Dean said that the motions came out of the CPT and introduced Elizabeth Hammer to present the motions and rationale. Elizabeth described utilizing the current handbook while working, and having broad, proportional representation.

MOTION 1: *The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences will form a committee to write a Handbook for the new college. The committee will be made up of one faculty member from each department: Biology, Chemistry, Classical and Modern Languages and Cultures, English, History, LIM, Mathematics, Physics, Philosophy, Psychology, Religious Studies.*

Discussion: committee size, standing or non-standing, elected or appointed, time line. Friendly amendment 1: sentence two: insert word “*elected*” from each department was accepted. Friendly amendment 2: Insert “*The committee report will be presented to the April meeting of the assembly and subject to approval by a simple majority*” was accepted. Motion: call the question; seconded and passed by acclamation. Vote on Motion 1 as amended carried unanimously.

MOTION 2: *The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences will utilize the Handbook from the former College of Arts and Sciences to conduct its business until a new Handbook can be written. The elected representation from each of the two divisions on various college committees will be handled as follows:*

<i>College Curriculum Committee</i>	<i>2 Humanities + 2 Natural Sciences + 1 At-Large</i>
<i>CRTC</i>	<i>One Rep from each department</i>
<i>Common Curriculum Committee</i>	<i>No Change</i>
<i>College Conciliation Committee</i>	<i>2 Humanities + 2 Natural Sciences + 1 At-Large</i>
<i>SORC</i>	<i>3 Humanities + 3 Natural Sciences + 1 At-Large</i>
<i>University Honors Advisory Board</i>	<i>1 Humanities and 1 Natural Sciences (no change)</i>
<i>College Elections Committee</i>	<i>2 Tenured + 2 Untenured Faculty</i>
<i>College Planning Team</i>	<i>2 Humanities + 2 Natural Sciences + 1 from SCAP + 1 from</i>
<i>UPT + 1 Chair</i>	
<i>UPT</i>	<i>1 Humanities + 1 Natural Sciences</i>

Discussion: spreading responsibility, shared governance, CRTC recursion from departmental votes, CRTC protocol, importance of non-traditional student representation, non-traditional rep on CPT (LIM) and CCC, LIM inclusion amid SORC reps, SORC time constraints on smaller departments, addressing needs of different constituencies. Friendly amendment introduced by Barbara Ewell: Insert at CCC and CPT: *+1 Non-traditional (elected from former CC)* was accepted. Motion: Call the question; seconded and passed by acclamation. Vote on Motion 2: Ballots were counted by two persons; results: 52 for, 13 against, 1 abstained. Motion carried.

MOTION 3: *The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences will form a committee to develop a Strategic Plan for the College. The College will elect 4 representatives from humanities and 4 representatives from natural sciences and one at-large representative. The dean will appoint four additional representatives based on their background and expertise.*

Discussion: The Dean and faculty mentioned that broad representation was desired, suggested an orientation in order to teach non-traditional students, and recommended sub-committees work simultaneously. Friendly amendment: insert into motion 3: “*including one from former City College.*” The amendment was accepted. Motion: Call the question; seconded and passed by acclamation. Vote on Motion 3: Passed by acclamation.

MOTION 4 introduced by David Moore on behalf of Mary McKay: “*To Recommend to the Common Curriculum Committee the Renumbering of Advanced Common Curriculum Courses...*” (See attached handout.)

Discussion: Faculty said that paragraph 1 and points 1-3 were acceptable. Friendly amendment introduced by Stephen Rowtree: End the motion after paragraph 1, point 3. Delete “*The following criteria have been used to designate ...*” and points 1 through 7. The amendment was accepted. Discussion: Curricula change beyond re-numbering, voice needed for 2/3 students in Natural Sciences. Motion: Call the question; seconded and passed by acclamation. Motion by Maria Calzada: Table; motion to table did not carry. Motion: Call the question; seconded and passed by acclamation. Vote on Motion 4: Ballots were counted by two persons; results: 43 for, 22 against, 2 abstained. Motion carried.

MOTION 5 introduced by Maurice Brungardt:

“The faculty of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences (HuNS) strongly recommend to the President the following plan to move Loyola University forward... (See attached handout.)

Discussion: Several faculty members immediately expressed appreciation to the person(s) who crafted the motion. Clarification of language was requested: line 1 of motion, use of the word “recommend.” Discussion continued on “*A Call for Action and a Way to Move Forward Post-Pathways, Draft 6... Part I, Process Issues (7 points) and Part II, Personnel Issues (5 points)*.” Clarification was requested for Part I, item 1, “presumptively valid;” Maria Calzada replied that the source may have been “URTC would consider SCAP recommendations presumptively valid.” Different timetables were suggested for Part I and Part II, specifically Part II, item 1.

Proposed Amendment to Part II, item 1, sentence 1: Change the wording from “*immediately*” to “*as soon as possible*.” Amendment was seconded. Discussion: Two faculty expressed concern that the presence of the administrators would be needed for informational and transitional purposes. Other faculty commented that they likely would be at Loyola. Motion: Call the question; seconded and passed. Vote on the amendment: passed by acclamation.

Motion: Divide the question -- separate Part I from Part II was seconded. Motion: Call the question; seconded and passed by acclamation. The question was divided.

Motion: Vote on Part I was made and seconded. Motion: Call the question without discussion was made and seconded; the vote was 41 in favor, 11 opposed. Vote on Part I: passed by acclamation.

(Due to the lateness of the hour, Motion 5, Part II is continued.)

Motion: Have another assembly in one week or two weeks. The Dean agreed. No vote was called.

Tabled until next meeting: agenda items 6. e. (partial), 6. f, and 6. g.

VII. ADJOURNED

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 P.M.

**COLLEGE ASSEMBLY
(Revised) Agenda
October 26, 2006**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Invocation**
- 3. Approval of Minutes of 9/20/06**
- 4. Announcements and Items for Discussion**
 - a) PIES
 - b) New Distinguished Professors
- 5. Old Business**
- 6. New Business**
 - a) Accepting the A&S College Handbook
 - b) Forming a Handbook Revision Committee
 - c) Forming a Strategic Planning Committee
 - d) Renumbering Common Curriculum Courses
 - e) A Call for Action
 - f) Forward the University Senate approved document "A Call for Conversation and a Critique of Pathways" and Draft Six of "A Call for Action and a Way to Move Forward Post-Pathways" to the Jesuit Corporation
 - g) To Discontinue the Current Course Evaluation System

Motion 1

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences will form a committee to write a Handbook for the new college. The committee will be made up of one faculty member from each department: Biology, Chemistry, Classical and Modern Languages and Cultures, English, History, LIM, Mathematics, Physics, Philosophy, Psychology, Religious Studies.

Motion 2

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences will utilize the Handbook from the former College of Arts and Sciences to conduct its business until a new Handbook can be written. The elected representation from each of the two divisions on various college committees will be handled as follows:

College Curriculum Committee	2 Humanities + 2 Natural Sciences + 1 At-Large
CRTC	One Rep from each department
Common Curriculum Committee	No Change
College Conciliation Committee	2 Humanities + 2 Natural Sciences + 1 At-Large
SORC	3 Humanities + 3 Natural Sciences + 1 At-Large
University Honors Advisory Board	1 Humanities and 1 Natural Sciences (no change)
College Elections Committee	2 Tenured + 2 Untenured Faculty
College Planning Team	2 Humanities + 2 Natural Sciences + 1 from SCAP + 1 from UPT + 1 Chair
UPT	1 Humanities + 1 Natural Sciences

Motion 3

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences will form a committee to develop a Strategic Plan for the College. The College will elect 4 representatives from humanities and 4 representatives from natural sciences and one at-large representative. The dean will appoint four additional representatives based on their background and expertise.

Motion 4

TO RECOMMEND TO THE COMMON CURRICULUM COMMITTEE THE RENUMBERING OF ADVANCED COMMON CURRICULUM COURSES

In light of the fact that most Loyola students take 45 credits of 100-level common curriculum courses, and many take even more to complete their major with courses from the advanced common curriculum, those students are disadvantaged in their job applications, in graduate school admissions, and in fellowship competitions. In order to deal with the problem and show clearly on student records that advanced common curriculum courses are not introductory courses, we are recommending a three-step process for changing the numbering of advanced common curriculum courses:

1. Tier courses in Philosophy and Religious Studies to indicate 100-level introductory course, a 200-level course and a 300-level course. Students would take a 100, 200 and 300 level course in those two departments. Students may not take 300-level courses without first having completed 100 and 200-level courses in the sequence.
2. Renumber all other upper level common curriculum courses as 200-level courses because students are required to take only one from each area. We would simply change the 1 to a 2 leaving the U-Z designation. The U-Z letters will keep the courses as common curriculum, even if a dept. has an A course of the same number, it won't matter.
3. Exclude the Natural Sciences advanced common curriculum from renumbering at the present time because students might take a biology 122 and then astronomy, so there is no real connection between the two courses.

The following criteria have been used to designate Philosophy and Religious Studies 200 and 300 level courses.

1. 200- level courses emphasize critical reading, writing, and thinking; they prepare students for the more rigorous work of 300-level courses.
2. 200-level courses cover a wider range of issues than do 300-level courses.
3. Courses that are also used in interdisciplinary minors should be 200-level courses.
4. 200-level course should be of value to a great many students.
5. 300-level courses require more reflection than 200-level courses. They put to use in more varied assignments the critical thinking, reading, and writing of the 200-level courses.
6. 300-level courses have a more defined subject matter than 200-level courses.
7. 300-level courses have a heavy emphasis on discussion, student research, and primary texts.

Motion 5

The faculty of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences (HuNS) strongly recommend to the President the following plan to move Loyola University forward:

A CALL FOR ACTION AND A WAY TO MOVE FORWARD POST-PATHWAYS

DRAFT SIX

There have been a number of calls for a plan outlining how we should proceed in helping to move Loyola University New Orleans (LUNO) forward. As a starting point, we have decided that it may prove helpful to put forth a list of points that we believe are critical to foster more cooperative working relationships between faculty members in the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences (HuNS) and senior administrators.

PART I. PROCESS ISSUES

1-The President must immediately acknowledge that the faculty handbook is the equivalent of our Constitution whose primacy must be defended and maintained at all cost. Given this, he must also accept the Standing Council for Academic Planning (SCAP) Pathways report as “presumptively valid.” If all of the SCAP recommendations cannot be implemented at this time, the university should make every effort to place terminated, tenured or tenure-track, faculty in other appropriate university positions. If this is not possible, then the administration should begin negotiating fair agreements with all terminated faculty members “equitably adjusted to the faculty member’s length of past and potential service” (see point I.2 below).

2- The administration (working with legal counsel) should negotiate fair and equitable separation packages with all terminated faculty members who cannot be placed in other university positions. Packages must be judged as reasonable based on AAUP guidelines which state that, in such matters, years of past and potential service be factored into such decisions. In fact, LUNO should seek input from the AAUP to help develop the packages. After all, LUNO will have to settle with faculty members eventually and most Loyola community members would like to see the dollars go to our terminated colleagues rather than to legal representatives. LUNO should move quickly on this item so that we can salvage as much good will and hope for our community as possible.

3-The administration should meet with representatives from AAUP immediately and demonstrate progress being made in effectively working with the faculty (especially on items I.1 and I.2). We need to engage in appropriate processes because the outcomes will impact the life of this institution for many years to come. We must avoid AAUP censure and sanction if at all possible.

4- All committees that are part of our university governance structure should begin regularly scheduled meetings immediately. This is especially critical for committees like the University Budget Committee (UBC). Faculty representatives should be provided with detailed budget information from 2005-06 and 2006-7. They should also be provided with reasonable projections for the next four years as well as a clear justification for all of the assumptions that are entering into the projections. It is only through such a process that our claims to SACS that we operate under a system of shared governance and that we have a rational approach to planning and budgeting can be substantiated.

5- Suspended programs must have the opportunity to appeal their suspension immediately to avoid irreparable damage to those programs. Each suspended program shall submit a proposal justifying reinstatement to the appropriate academic Dean. Upon approval by the Dean, the proposal will be forwarded to the Provost to be placed on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled SCAP meeting, where the Dean and respective department Chair will argue the merits of reinstatement.

6- The University Senate should act on SCAP’s request that they adopt and/or modify the Program Review Criteria. This is important in the event we face another round of terminations and/or suspensions. Further, these approved criteria should be used to reconsider the Pathways terminations via SCAP working in collaboration with representatives from the Provost’s office.

7- The University Senate, in cooperation with the administration, will formulate criteria for identifying a bona fide state of financial exigency and for determining proper institutional responses to such a condition. (Faculty Handbook 9.F.) This proactive planning approach should become part of our emergency planning efforts in case of another disaster.

PART II. PERSONNEL ISSUES

1- Thank the Provost and his assistants for their service and then send them on sabbaticals that begin immediately and run through the 06-07 academic year. This is not personal, but is based on a pattern of problematic performance over time. All of these administrators are tenured and can return to their departments in AY 07-08.

2- Name an existing faculty member or academic Dean as Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to allow the institution adequate time to search for our next Chief Academic Officer (CAO). The person selected for the Interim position must have an understanding of Loyola culture, solid administrative experience, and good working relationships with faculty members.

3- The Interim Provost should recruit talented and capable faculty members from within the University to serve as assistant/associate provosts on a rotating basis (e.g., three year terms) to help create and maintain a solid bridge between faculty members and the administration. This strategy also hardwires a mechanism for ongoing faculty leadership development that will benefit institutional culture over time.

4- After points I.1-5 And II.1-3 have been given appropriate attention, the Interim Provost should establish a faculty leadership team (perhaps the Bring Back LUNO Committee) to help identify and begin working on the most pressing issues facing the university (e.g., recruitment and retention of students, staff, faculty members; financial challenges facing the institution; etc.) This is another mechanism to engage the faculty and, hopefully, convince them to make a long-term commitment to Loyola. We must turn the challenges we face into opportunities by mobilizing our campus community, aligning our limited resources, and building a sense of common purpose and community. Faculty members need to be empowered by having a real voice in shaping a future that is built on the promise of a brighter tomorrow.

5-The President must focus on being President. This means hiring a competent and capable Provost and then staying out of her/his way. We need our President to do fundraising and external relations. To attract strong Provost candidates we must be able to assure them that they will be allowed to lead the academic side of the university without unnecessary interference from the President, the Board of Trustees, and/or their consultants/advisors. We should not overlook the possibility of appropriate internal candidates willing and able to serve our institution well.

Once again, the above is NOT intended to be a comprehensive plan, but just a starting point for open and honest discussion about how we begin to think about our future together. This document has been floated and edited by faculty members within the College of HuNS but does NOT claim to represent all the diverse views of those within the college. In conclusion, we end with the critical point that many HuNS faculty members stand ready to assist the President as we try to deal with all the challenges that still remain Post-Katrina and Post-Pathways.

Motion 6

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences moves to forward the University Senate approved document "A Call for Conversation and a Critique of Pathways" and Draft Six of "A Call for Action and a Way to Move Forward Post-Pathways" to the Secretary of the Jesuit Corporation for distribution to corporation members prior to the November meeting and for inclusion on the November meeting agenda.

Motion 7

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences will discontinue the current course evaluation system.