

HUMANITIES AND NATURAL SCIENCES COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

November 16, 2006

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the College Assembly was called to order by Dean Frank Scully's representative Dr. David Moore at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 16, 2006 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall.

Attendance: Adams, Anderson, Beard, Berendzen, Bernardi (proxy), Bourgeois, Brans, Brisco, Butler, Calzada, Chambers, Clark, Cook, Coolidge, Cotton, Dewell, Dittrich, Doll, Eagle, Ewell, Fernandez, Gnuse, Gossiaux, Hammer, Herbert, Janz (proxy), Kargol, Kelly (proxy), King, Koplitz, Kornovich, Lagvanec, Lewis, Li, Mabe, Matthews, McHugh, McKay, Moore, Mui (proxy), Nicoll, Randall (proxy), Rodriguez, Rogers, Ross (proxy), Salmon, Saxton, Scariano, Sebastian, Shuh, Spence, Tucci, VanCott, Wessinger (proxy), Zucker.

II. INVOCATION

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

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes as posted on college's intranet site were voted upon, as follows:

Minutes of September 5, 2006 -- Move to approve was made by Pat Bourgeois, seconded by Connie Rodriguez, passed unanimously.

Minutes of September 21, 2006 -- Move to approve was made by Connie Rodriguez, seconded by Elizabeth Hammer, passed unanimously.

Minutes of September 26, 2006 -- Move to approve was made by Connie Rodriguez, seconded by Francis P. Coolidge, passed unanimously.

Minutes of October 26, 2006 -- After clarification, the move to approve was made by Lynn Koplitz, seconded, passed unanimously.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

"The FYE Committee will soon be forwarding an e-mail to Faculty, Staff, and Students to solicit nominations on a theme and book related to that theme to be used as the focus for next year's FYE reading, preview, and events. Please consider responding to that nomination."

Mark Fernandez suggested that faculty see the website, said the language was clear and faculty could weigh-in on something they would like to discuss.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Motion 1:

(Clarification of agenda item, "A Call for Action – Part I. Process Issues": As reflected in the October 26 minutes, this business was completed as Motion 5, Part I, presented by Maurice Brungardt, and accepted by acclamation.)

Motion 2

(Clarification of agenda item, "A Call for Action – Part II. Personnel Issues": As reflected in the October 26 minutes, Motion 5, Part II, was amended to change "*immediately*" to "*as soon as possible*.")

Reintroduced in Maurice's absence:

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

PART II. PERSONNEL ISSUES

1- Thank the Provost and his assistants for their service and then send them on sabbaticals that begin as soon as possible 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.

Discussion and move to call the question: Discussion served to clarify the two agenda items (above).

Lynn Koplitz moved to call the question, seconded by Connie Rodriguez. The move carried by acclamation.

Vote and point of order: David called for a vote on Motion 2. Point of order was raised by John Sebastian regarding a quorum. Lynda Favret and two faculty members conducted an immediate count. Results: 48 present among 125 faculty names on the pre-printed roster, which listed 19 extraordinary faculty. (Lynda Favret is to provide an updated list of eligible voting members.) The final count on the post-meeting roster was 53, including proxies. Robert Gnuse suggested possibly following the vote in the assembly with an electronic vote among the whole body.

Assembly vote: Assembly vote on Motion 2 was by paper ballot. Results: 42 in favor, 7 opposed, 3 abstained.

Motion 3:

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.

Friendly amendments: Francis Coolidge read the motion. Friendly amendment 1 proposed by Eileen Doll was accepted as follows: change the wording “*prior to the November meeting*” to “*as soon as possible*” and “*November meeting agenda*” to “*next meeting agenda.*” Friendly amendment 2 proposed by Francis Coolidge was accepted as follows: insert “*with approval,*” to read “*to forward with approval the University Senate approved document.*” Friendly amendment 3 proposed by Fr. Nicoll was accepted: change the word “*Jesuit*” to “*University*” to read “*Secretary of the University Corporation.*”

Amended Motion 3:

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences moves to forward with approval the University Senate’s 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 University Corporation for distribution to corporation members as soon as possible and for inclusion on the next meeting agenda.

Discussion and move to call the question: Faculty questioned whether the Pathways documents should be sent to the corporation by the College Assembly as a call to action, sent solely by the University Senate, or sent by both bodies. Fr. Nicoll expressed concern that time would be wasted upon the corporation as that body had given its power to the Board of Trustees, and suggested spending time trying to get the College of Social Sciences on board. The move to call the question was seconded and carried.

Vote: Vote on the motion 3 was by show of hands and proxy counts: 45 in favor, 1 opposed, 4 abstained. The motion carried.

Motion 4:

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

Introduction: Lynn Koplitz introduced the motion. She said she was concerned as to how the college’s evaluations were being used or punitively misused, whether those devised by faculty members could share consideration, and the cost of the evaluation system.

Discussion and clarification: Points included avoiding possible negative perceptions by continuing rather than suspending the current system while charging the handbook revision committee with writing a section on teaching evaluations and how they will be used, having the new college discuss the evaluation system, having the current system declared optional, allowing faculty members to devise their own evaluations. Elizabeth Hammer’s move to table the motion was not seconded. Faculty requested clarification of the matter under discussion. Clarification included observations that the evaluation instrument put forward by the Dean had not been “evaluated,” evaluations had been partially instrumental in the termination of two tenure-track faculty members, the College Assembly had agreed that good evaluations could be used toward raises but not punitively. Faculty expressed concern for those in precarious positions and fear of repercussions for not doing the evaluations.

Substitute motion and move to call the question: Mark Fernandez presented a substitute motion accepted by Lynn, with friendly amendments. “*The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences will direct the Dean to continue to use the current system of evaluation, will begin as soon as possible to launch an evaluation of the system, and will discuss at the next College Assembly the appropriate uses of student evaluations of teaching in the short term.*” Barbara Ewell presented a friendly amendment to the substitute motion, accepted as, “*In addition, the present evaluation system will not be used punitively.*” The amended substitute motion was read to the assembly. The move to call the question was seconded and passed by voice vote.

Vote on Motion 4: Voice vote was unanimous.

Motion 5:

DeLoitte and Touche Limited Liability Partners -- 3700 One Shell Square, New Orleans, La. (504- 581-2727) -- are the official auditors for the finances of Loyola University. Faculty of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences need current and accurate information from the university auditors to evaluate the Pathways project. The College requests that elected faculty representatives meet with the Loyola University Deloitte and Touche auditors to obtain information on the College of Arts and Sciences departmental operating budgets and expenditures for the period of time used by Loyola University's administration to design the Loyola Pathways project. The information must be provided in a format that is understandable to the faculty.

Dr. Thom Spence, Dr. Maria Calzada, Dr. Martin McHugh, Dr. Maureen Shuh , Dr. Steve Scariano are mathematicians who have conscientiously studied Loyola's finances this year and are especially qualified to evaluate the gain/losses from Pathways on the basis of the data requested from the auditors.

Introduction, discussion and friendly amendment: Letitia Beard introduced the motion, saying it was to obtain information as yet unavailable, and to have honesty and facts to work with. Maria Calzada offered a friendly amendment to include Lynn Koplitz among the faculty names listed. Letitia Beard accepted the amendment and said that the list should be open-ended so that other participants could be added. The motion will continue at the next college assembly.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn was made by Fr. Nicoll, seconded and passed by acclamation. The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.