

**Humanities and Natural Sciences College Assembly**  
**April 19, 2012**

**MINUTES**

---

**I. Call to Order**

The assembly was called to order at 12:30 p.m. by Dean JoAnn Cruz in Bobet Hall 332. Attended: Altschul, B. Anderson, Beard, Bednarz, Bell, Berendzen, Biguenet, Birdwhistell, Biswas, Brungardt, Cahill, Calzada, Chambers, Clark, Corbin, Corprew, Eklund, Kendall Eskine, Ewell, Fernandez, Garrity, Gossiaux, Hauber, Hoffman, Hymel, Kornovich, Lewis, Li, Mabe, Matei, McCay, McHugh, Melancon, Moore, Nystrom, Peterson, Philip, Quesada, Rosenbecker, Saxton, Schaberg, Shanata, Spence, Stephenson, Tan, Thibodeaux, Tucci, Underwood, Willems, and Associate Dean Hunt.

**II. Invocation**

The invocation was given by Rev. Robert S. Gerlich, S.J.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of March 15 were approved as written.

**IV. Announcements**

1. At-large College Curriculum Committee nominations are needed.
2. Reimbursement policy states that expenses expire after 90 days (university) and 60 days (college), beginning with the initial credit card charge date.
3. Final college assembly of the academic year is May 3; lunch will be provided.
4. End-of-year party for the college will be in May on a date to be announced.
5. Language requirement reports in other colleges are March 27 for Music, April 24 Social Sciences, with discussions in the Council of Deans; Professor Tan's notes on his comments to the March 15 assembly were given to the deans.
6. Nominations for Faculty Excellence Awards are due Friday, April 20.
7. Biever Guest Lecture applications are due April 28.
8. Student academic grievance procedure (*see attached*) as distributed at the Provost's Council and to the Assembly will go back to the ADC; others expressed concerns; the procedure has to be vetted and presented to the Faculty Senate; its author, Dr. Roger White, wrote it in response to a nursing accreditation issue and to SACs requirements. The procedure and one-page grievance form was added mid-year to the 2012 bulletin. Faculty concerns included: having a shorter version with greater clarity, expanding due process, providing rights to the accused to mount a defense, and removing the document because it was not vetted. Associate Dean Hunt requested that faculty send concerns to her for a broad statement to ADC.
9. Faculty Handbook will be ready August 1; response from the Provost's Office to the request from the assembly for the promised hard copies was to offer options: with binder, without binder, or copy available in Dean's Office. Faculty suggested saving a hard copy in a PDF file in lieu of an achieved copy.
10. Faculty Senate's last meeting is May 10, as announced by Dr. Barbara Ewell. She said that new and old senators should attend, that the advising issue was deferred, faculty representatives should be contacted, medical leave policy passed, and the Honor Code Committee is working summer into fall.
11. Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation awarded a career enhancement fellowship to Trimiko Melancon, Ph.D.

12. Awards to faculty members of the Psychology Department: Dr. Glenn Hymel - Recipient, American Massage Therapy Association's 2011 National Distinguished Service Award; Recipient, Massage Therapy Foundation's Distinguished Service Award for Visionary Leadership. Dr. Evan Zucker - Elected Vice-President of the Southwest Region of Psi Chi, the International Honor Society for Psychology. Dr. Janet Matthews - Named Psychologist of the Year Award from Louisiana Psychological Association.

## V. Reports

1. SORC report (*see attached*) was given by Dr. Kurt Birdwhistell. He thanked Dr. Barbara Ewell for the draft protocol. He presented slides showing statistics and criteria, and he discussed the processes.
2. Equity report was presented by Dr. Maria Calzada and Dr. Thom Spence. Slides included the list of committee members, the modified Akron model, size of the equity problem, estimated equity in ranks, important considerations, Senate motion (passed), reports to deans for planning. Faculty commended the committee for crunching the numbers and getting results to benefit the college. (*Applause.*)
3. Research course releases protocol (*see attached*) was distributed and posted on the internet on behalf of Dean Cruz. She read the changes to the assembly regarding the annotation and information to integrate junior semester leave. Faculty said the protocol should be firmly established. Dean Cruz suggested that CPT take the matter under advisement and referred it to Dr. David Moore.

## VI. New Business

In the allotted time remaining in the assembly, two motions were introduced and discussed, with voting anticipated at the next assembly:

1. Motion 1 to revise the *College Handbook* section "Search Procedures for New Dean," as given in the attachment. Dr. Maria Calzada introduced the motion, which was published in the agenda and presented on a slide. She and Dean Cruz explained the motion and said the proposed revisions were from the ad hoc committee members Drs. Cahill, Fernandez and Calzada. Discussion followed. Points included: the search chair manages the committee, doesn't have a determining voice, and should be a dean or someone with administrative (clerical) support; candidates may include associate professors to afford Loyola's departments the opportunity to vote on rank.
2. Motion 2 to revise the *College Handbook* with regard to assembly voting eligibility in *Articles II and VI*, as given in the attachments. Dr. Maria Calzada proposed the motion, published in the agenda and distributed at the assembly. She asked to clarify the part-time faculty designation. Dr. Fernandez supported the provision, and suggested that the adjunct discrepancy in the handbook be revisited next year. Dr. Calzada proposed clarifying proxy requirements. Discussion included mention of AAUP dissent regarding part-time faculty, and consideration of shared governance.

## VII. Move to Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

## Attachments:

- Student Grievance Procedure
- SORC Report
- Research Course Releases (revised by CPT and CoC)
- Motion 1 - Handbook re Search for New Dean
- Motion 2 - Handbook re Assembly Voting Eligibility

# STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

The following policy is subject to periodic review and modification.

## 1. Coverage

- a. Any Loyola undergraduate or graduate student who in their opinion believes that they have been subjected to an improper decision on an academic matter is entitled to file a grievance to obtain an independent review of the allegedly improper decision. This procedure does not include grade appeals, or matters of discrimination or harassment, which are addressed by separate procedures. A grievance is a complaint in writing made to an administrative officer of the University concerning an academic decision, made by a person or group of persons acting in an official University capacity that directly and adversely affects the student.
- b. For purposes of this procedure, an appropriate matter of grievance is defined as any decision of an academic nature which in the opinion of the student is improper and by which the student believes they have been adversely affected.
- c. This grievance procedure applies only in those cases involving a perceived academic impropriety arising from a decision taken by: (1) an individual instructor or researcher; (2) a school, department, or program; (3) a committee charged to administer academic policies of a particular school, department, or program; or (4) the University Director of Registration Services, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the University Senate, or any committee or subcommittee charged to administer the academic policies of Loyola University New Orleans.

## 2. Grievance and Appeal Procedures

- a. *Informal Attempts at Resolution:* the student first should discuss the matter with the individual most directly responsible for the decision in question.
- b. *The Filing of the Grievance:*
  1. If informal means of resolution prove unsatisfactory, the student should thereafter set forth in writing a statement of the decision that constitutes the subject matter of the dispute, the grounds on which it is being challenged, and the reasons why the grievant believes that the decision was improperly taken. The statement should also include a description of the remedy sought and the informal efforts taken to date to resolve the matter.
  2. The grievance document should be submitted to the dean of the school in which the grievance arose. If the grievance is related to the Honors Program or to any other academic unit reporting directly to the Office of the Provost, the grievance should be submitted directly to the aforesaid office. If the dean of the school is a subject of the grievance, the grievance should be submitted directly to the Office of the Provost. A grievance must be filed within 30 days of the end of the academic semester in which the adverse decision occurred or should reasonably have been discovered. Except in extraordinary circumstances, delay in filing a grievance will constitute grounds for rejection of the grievance.
- c. *The Response to the Grievance:*
  1. The relevant dean will consider the grievance, and attempt to resolve the matter.

2. The dean may also refer the grievance, or any issue therein, to any person appointed by the dean who can consider the matter and report to the dean as the latter directs. The dean will inform the grievant (and the party against whose decision the grievance has been filed) in writing of any referral of the matter and will specify the matters referred, the directions to the person or persons to whom the referral is made, the name of that person, and contact information.
  3. In undertaking the review, the dean or the grievance officer may request a response to the issues raised in the grievance from any individuals believed to have information considered relevant, including faculty, staff, and students.
  4. The dean will decide the grievance, and will notify the grievant (and the party against whose decision the grievance has been filed) in writing of the disposition made of the grievance and the grounds for the disposition at the earliest practicable date after his or her receipt of the grievance.
  5. Normally, no more than 60 days should elapse between the filing of a grievance and the disposition by the dean. If, because of absence of key persons from the campus or other circumstances or exigencies (including those due to breaks in the academic calendar), the dean decides that disposition on that schedule is not possible, he or she shall inform the grievant (and the party against whose decision the grievance has been filed) of that in writing, giving the grounds therefore and an estimate of when a disposition can be expected. During summers and the winter closure, this time frame will nearly always be extended.
- d. *The Filing of an Appeal:*
1. If the grievant is dissatisfied with the disposition of the grievance at the decanal level, either on substantive or on procedural grounds, she or he may appeal in writing to the Provost.
  2. The appeal must contain the following:
    - a. A copy of the original grievance and any other documents submitted by the grievant in connection therewith.
    - b. A copy of the determination made by the dean on that grievance.
    - c. A statement of why the reasons for the determination of the dean are not satisfactory to the grievant. This statement should specifically address the matters set forth below in the *Standards for Review*.
- e. The grievant will file her or his appeal at the earliest practicable date after the grievant's receipt of the determination by the dean. Normally, no more than 30 days should elapse between the transmittal of the dean's decision on the grievance and the filing of the appeal.
- f. *The Response to the Appeal:*
1. The Provost may refer the appeal to any person who can consider the matter and report to the Provost as the latter directs. In conducting the investigation, confidentiality will be maintained to the greatest extent possible.

2. The Provost will inform the grievant (and the party against whose decision the grievance has been filed) in writing of any referral of the matter and will specify the matters referred, the directions to the person to whom the referral is made (including the time frame within which the person is to report back to the Provost), the name of that person, and contact information.
  3. The Provost will decide the appeal, and will notify the grievant (and the party against whose decision the grievance has been filed) in writing of the disposition made of the grievance and the grounds for the disposition at the earliest practicable date after his or her receipt of the appeal. The decision of the Provost shall be final, unless the grievant requests a further appeal to the President pursuant to subsection 2f below, and the President agrees to entertain this further appeal.
  4. Normally no more than 45 days should elapse between the filing of the appeal and the disposition by the Provost. If, because of absence of key persons from the campus or other circumstances or exigencies (including those due to breaks in the academic calendar), the Provost judges that disposition on that schedule is not possible, he or she will inform the grievant (and the party against whose decision the grievance has been filed) of the fact in writing, giving the grounds therefore and an estimate of when a disposition can be expected. During summers and the winter closure, this time frame will nearly always be extended.
- g. *The Request to the President:* if the student is dissatisfied with the disposition of the appeal by the Provost, he or she may write to the President of the University giving reasons why he or she believes the grievance result to be wrong. No more than 30 days should elapse between the transmittal of the Provost's disposition and the written statement to the President urging further appeal. In any case, the President may agree or decline to entertain this further appeal. If the President declines to entertain the further appeal, the decision of the Provost is final. If the President decides to entertain the further appeal, he or she will follow the general procedures set forth in Section 2e above, and the decision of the President will be final.
3. Grievances Concerning Decisions of the University Director of Registration Services, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the University Senate, or any committee or subcommittee charged to administer the academic policies of Loyola University New Orleans.
  4. For a grievance concerning a decision of the University Director of Registration Services, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the University Senate, or any committee or subcommittee charged to administer the academic policies of Loyola University New Orleans the grievant will file his or her grievance with the Provost, rather than with the dean, and the Provost will handle that grievance in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 2c above.
    - a. There is no appeal of the Provost's disposition of that grievance except as specified in Section 2f above.
  5. Standards for Review and Procedural Matters
    - a. The review of grievances or appeals will usually be limited to the following considerations:
      1. Were the pertinent policies properly followed?

2. Were the proper facts and criteria brought to bear on the decision? Were improper or extraneous facts or criteria brought to bear that substantially affected the decision to the detriment of the grievant?
  3. Were there any procedural irregularities that substantially affected the outcome of the matter to the detriment of the grievant?
  4. Given the proper facts, criteria, and procedures, was the decision one which a person in the position of the decision maker might reasonably have made?
- b. The time frames set forth herein are guidelines. They may be extended by the relevant administrative officer in his or her discretion for good cause.
  - c. Questions concerning the filing and appeal of grievances should be directed to the Office of the Provost. The Provost will designate someone within her or his Office to provide the inquiring party with proper direction.

Thanks to B. Ewell for draft protocol.

## **1. Statistics : SORC numbers:**

Explanation:  $\frac{1}{2}$  pool- dollar amount raise based on certain score.

50% of pool based on a percentage raise.

**(Averages, std Dev) for**      Teaching (Avg= **3.38**, 0.53)  
**from 2012**                      Research(Avg= **3.34**, 0.91),  
   Service(Avg= **3.33**, 0.65) ,

**Largest to smallest raise, Range**

**Highest \$1607, Lowest \$602**

## **Process:**

-Each Committee member reviews each faculty member, reviewing:  
vita update, dept protocol, and chair's recommendation

-Committee meets and decides on score for each faculty member in all  
three areas. We go through the college by department. If a committee  
member is in the department being discussed s/he leaves the room.

After the committee settles on all scores, we meet with the Dean.

The Dean also assigns a score for each faculty member.

The Dean and SORC discuss each faculty member and come to an agreement.

If a particular score differs by .5 or less we split the difference and move on.

## **2. Criteria used by SORC this year:**

Stipends and course releases will be considered in  
awarding points in all areas.

Exs: Chair stipends, releases

## **Research:**

1. DUX, 4s in all categories, for three years
2. Published Peer reviewed article in 2011 a 4
  - Significant external grant 4, in year awarded
  - Works in progress are considered as research
  - Book awarded a 4 in year published plus two following years
3. We consider the last three years worth of peer reviewed pubs.

## **TEACHING:**

-SORC follows the chair's recommendations to a great extent.

Look at (teaching/developing new courses), offering independent studies, doing undergraduate research projects, Honors theses.

Dean brings in teaching evaluations into the discussion and this year whether the faculty member has been posting his/her syllabi on LORA.

## **SERVICE:**

Essential component of service score: some university service is normally required for a **4** in service.



**RESEARCH COURSE RELEASE PROTOCOL FOR THE COLLEGE OF  
HUMANITIES AND NATURAL SCIENCES, LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, NEW  
ORLEANS**

I. Research Course Releases for Tenure-Track Faculty:

First year Tenure-track faculty: 2-2 course load<sup>1</sup>

Tenure-track faculty from year 2 through the year prior to the tenure and promotion review: 3-2/2-3 course load (no more than 6 research course releases can be given to any one tenure-track faculty member). Should a faculty member come with prior years toward tenure, the total would be reduced by one for each year of prior service.

The minimum teaching load allowed when a 3-2/2-3 teaching load is expected is 2-2. Grant/fellowship proposals requesting a lower teaching load must have the approval of the dean and departmental chair.

Junior research semester release: Junior faculty may choose to use 3 of their course releases, in consultation with their chair, toward a semester research leave. The junior semester research leave is to be taken after the second year at Loyola and must be coordinated in such a way as to enable the department to cover its curricular commitments.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a recommended load for first year faculty. If, for curricular reasons a department cannot offer the faculty member a 2-2 load the first year, the additional course release will be made available to the faculty member in a subsequent year.

In the case of a faculty member receiving a research grant or fellowship for an unpaid research leave for a semester or a year, the junior semester research leave will normally be relinquished.

II. Research Course Releases for tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty once the decision on tenure and promotion has been made<sup>2</sup>:

- For departments with 1-3 tenured faculty: no more than 1 research course release per year for the tenured faculty
- For departments with 4-6 tenured faculty: no more than 2 research course releases per year for the tenured faculty
- For departments with 7-9 tenured faculty: no more than 3 research course releases per year for the tenured faculty
- For departments with 10-12 tenured faculty: no more than 4 research course releases per year for the tenured faculty

All research course releases for the tenured faculty depend on a department first meeting its curricular requirements. Any exceptions to the above require the signature of the department chair and the dean of the college. If a department finds that, due to curricular demands, it cannot take advantage of research course releases for its tenured or non-tenured faculty, SORC must take this under advisement in determining merit for faculty in that department. The CRTC also needs to be advised when candidates come up for rank and tenure.

---

<sup>2</sup> Including those faculty who have received a favorable vote for tenure but have not yet formally received tenure. When a department has a faculty member with an endowed chair or a university professorship who is receiving course releases for research as part of his or her contract, that faculty member is not eligible for this research release in addition to the contractual releases; nor can that faculty member be counted toward the totals for each department.

Departments are requested to develop, as part of the departmental protocol, the method for selecting those faculty who will receive research course releases.<sup>3</sup>

Departmental protocols should include a research committee that solicits and reviews proposals based on clear criteria.<sup>4</sup>

Department protocols for determining research course releases need to include a list of priorities. A faculty member with a current research project and who has not recently had a research course release, research leave or sabbatical should have highest priority.

Faculty who have recently had a sabbatical or an paid or unpaid research leave should be lower in the priority list.

If a faculty member receives a research course release and does not report or show results from the release, that faculty member should also be lower in the priority list.

Faculty with no research projects over a three year period are not eligible.

---

<sup>3</sup> Faculty cannot buy themselves out of courses, except when grant monies cover course releases. Faculty cannot double up their courses one semester and not teach the following semester. No faculty member who is not on leave or sabbatical can teach 0 courses in any given semester.

<sup>4</sup> The following protocol is based upon the protocol for the Department of Mathematics: "Course releases for research activities are awarded to faculty as outlined in the protocol for the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences. For tenured faculty these are awarded on a competitive basis. In the spring of the academic year before any future release is available the Chair will submit to the tenured faculty a request for research proposals for a course release. The chair, together with one member of the tenured faculty elected by the ordinary faculty, will rank the applications based on the quality of the proposal, past course releases/sabbaticals or leaves and recent research activity. Recommendations for course releases will be submitted to the Dean for approval."

## Motion to Change Handbook Regarding Dean's Search (Dr. Maria Calzada) 4/19/12

### **Handbook of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences**

#### **Search Procedures for New Dean**

1. In the event of a vacancy occurring in the office of the Dean, a Search Committee will be formed. The Committee will be composed of one full-time faculty member from each department in the College, a student from the College, one staff member from the College, and a dean from another College in the University, who will be the ex officio, non-voting chair of the Committee. DSAC will recommend three students representatives to the Provost / Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will select one to serve on the Dean's Search Committee. The student recommendations need not be limited to DSAC representatives but could be any Humanities & Natural Sciences students.
2. As soon as the committee can assemble, the Provost / Vice President for Academic Affairs will issue its mandate. ~~At this organizational meeting a chairperson will be nominated by the committee and elected in a secret ballot. Also a~~At this meeting, a time table will be agreed upon.
3. The presidents and rectors of every Jesuit university in the USA should be contacted to request nominations for the position. Letters requesting nominations will be sent to every Jesuit provincial and every Jesuit president and rector of the Jesuit universities in the USA.  
Nominations will also be requested from the university administration and from the faculty, staff and student body of the College. An announcement to this effect should also be placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education and other appropriate national journals and bulletins. Among the qualifications listed for the position should be all of the following: An earned doctorate or its equivalent in an academic field; tenure; administrative experience in an academic institution at level of Dean, Assistant Dean, chairperson, or program director; background of academic teaching and research; basic commitment to the values and vision of Loyola University as an educational institution operating in a context of Jesuit and Catholic mission. A deadline for accepting applications will be clearly stated in the announcement. It may also be stated that the search will continue until the position is filled.
4. Each application and nomination will be acknowledged by return mail/e-mail. Candidates rejected by the committee will also be notified by mail/e-mail as soon as possible. Candidates in whom the committee, after an initial screening, are still interested, will be so informed and specific requests for additional information, will be made as necessary.
5. The committee will begin to hold its meetings just as soon as the number of applications warrants it. Ideally the committee will meet weekly. Nominees will be contacted as quickly as possible to determine whether they are interested in applying formally for the position.

6. During the weekly meetings of the committee there will be an ongoing review of the applications and a screening process to come up with a manageable list of candidates. A positive vote of five or more members will be needed to keep a candidate's name on the list of those who are to be given serious consideration.

7. After the deadline for receiving applications has passed, a study will be made of the names designated "for serious consideration." A simple majority of votes will suffice for an applicant to qualify as a semi-finalist. After the Dean's Search Committee's selection of the semi-finalists, the candidates' vitas and accompanying materials will be sent to the appropriate departments for review with the prior permission of the candidates. After a departmental review is completed, the department should send its recommendation to the search committee along with a letter addressed to the CRTC to be used in the event the candidate makes the final cut and is among the finalists. Once the finalists are determined, the CRTC will be convened and all necessary documentation (including departmental recommendations) will be supplied by the search committee to the CRTC. Results of the CRTC will then be sent back to the search committee who in making their final decision/recommendation will forward a rank ordered list of the finalists along with appropriate documents regarding their tenure to the Provost /Academic Vice President and the President.

8. At the next meeting, after a review of each candidate's qualifications in relation to the specific needs of the College, the number of finalists should be established. Each of the finalists should be contacted by phone and/or mail/e-mail and be invited to Loyola for an on-campus interview. These finalists should be sent a copy of the following documents: the University Faculty Handbook, the College Handbook, and the University Bulletin. Finalists should submit a written statement of their educational philosophy in light of the previous documents, especially the Loyola Goals and Character & Commitment Statements. While on campus each of the finalists shall have an opportunity to be interviewed by the following officers and groups:

President of the University

Provost / Vice president for Academic Affairs

All other Vice Presidents

Deans

Chairpersons of the College

Faculty of the College

Candidates' respective departments

Representatives of DSAC

Dean's Office staff

Search Committee

A meeting with the Jesuit Community is recommended to be included in the itinerary of the finalists. Some systematic effort should be made by the committee to obtain the evaluations of candidates by the Deans, chairpersons, faculty, students, and Dean's Office Staff.

11. The deliberations by the committee about the candidates are to be kept secret. The publication of the committee's recommendations is to be left to the discretion of the Provost / Vice President for Academic Affairs who will inform the finalists as to the outcome of the search and his or her ultimate decision.

Revised and Approved by College Assembly 11-20-2008

**Motion to Revise College Handbook re Assembly Voting Eligibility  
(Dr. Maria Calzada)**

**See proposed changes to articles II and VI below.**

**ARTICLE II**

**Membership**

The membership of the Assembly shall be composed of the Dean, the Assistant/Associate Dean, and all members of the faculty. Full-time faculty members have one (1) vote and ~~part time~~<sup>half-time</sup> faculty<sup>1</sup> members have one-half (1/2) vote.

---

<sup>1</sup> A part-time faculty is defined as a faculty member who is expected to teach (or who teaches) at least one course each semester of an academic year. The office of the dean will compile a list of such part-time faculty in August each academic year. The list will be updated the following January.

## **ARTICLE VI**

### **Voting at Assembly Meetings**

1. In order to vote at Assembly meetings, members must be either present or submit notification in writing to the secretary designating who in that member's voting unit may cast his or her proxy.

| Proxies are allowed only for [full-time](#) members teaching a regularly scheduled class that conflicts with the meeting time of the Assembly and for faculty absent on University business. The proxy must be submitted one working day in advance of the meeting.