

Humanities and Natural Sciences College Assembly
December 9, 2010
MINUTES

I. Call to Order

The Assembly was called to order by Dean Jo Ann Cruz at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, December 9, 2010 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall. Attended: Abboud, Adams, Altschul, B. Anderson, R. Anderson, Beard, Bednarz, Bell, Berendzen, Biguenet, Birdwhistell, Biswas, Blundell, Brazier, Brice, Brungardt, Butler, Cahill, Calzada, Dewell, Dittrich, Dupuis, Eklund, Ewell, Farge, Fernandez, Fiddler, Gauthier, Hauber, Henne, Hoffman, Jordan, Kelly, Kornovich, Lewis, Locke (ENGL student rep), Mabe, McCormack, Melancon, Meyer, Moazami, Moore, Mui, Murphy, Nielsen, Nystrom, Philip, Quesada, Rodriguez, Rowntree, Rosenbecker, Saxton, Schwartz, Sebastian, Spence, Spevack, Thum, Tucci, Underwood, Walkenhorst, Well, Wessinger, Willems, Yakich, Zucker, and Associate Dean Hunt (Hardy proxy).

II. Invocation

The invocation was given by Rev. Stephen Rowntree, S.J.

III. Approval of Minutes of November 18, 2010

The minutes were approved, with a clarification from Dr. Walkenhorst: "*We propose...*" changed to "*The Departments of Philosophy and Religions Studies propose... .*"

IV. Announcements

1. Dean Cruz reminded faculty of the HNS Christmas party on December 16 at 3:30 p.m.
2. Dear Cruz said that the travel budget, although low, had a final deadline of February 28.

V. Reports

1. Report on Course Releases for Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty

Dean Cruz reported on HNS's policy as distributed with the agenda and at the assembly (attached). She said the policy was agreed upon by the Council of Chairs and CPT, and was posted on the intranet as college policy. She said that each department needs to develop a protocol.

2. Report on Common Curriculum

Dean Cruz said the report was moving forward to SCAP, though one college was not voting until December 9. Dean Cruz and the CCITF Representatives updated points from the colleges of Business, Social Sciences, Music and Fine Arts, and discussed the creative arts component and language requirement. Faculty voiced concerns that HNS's roles had been misunderstood. Dean Cruz said the language requirement would go to a subcommittee; Dr. Butler suggested that additional HNS department representatives get involved on the subcommittee. Dr. Fernandez commended the committee members from HNS (applause).

VI. New Business

1. Report on UC & CC Vote and Response to Dr. Lydia Voigt's Memo on the Common Curriculum

Dean Cruz said the CPT has not given an official response to Dr. Voigt's memo (attached), which was distributed with the agenda and at the assembly. She listed CPT's concerns. Faculty commented upon Dr. Voigt's "holistic" approach. Dean Cruz said the Passport Program needs more clarification from CCITF.

2. Motion to Equalize Salaries for Extraordinary Faculty (Dean Cruz)

The wording given below was distributed with the agenda and introduced at the assembly. Dr. Robert Bell credited Drs. Oliver Ranner, Alice Kornovich and Kathleen Crago.

Preamble

Loyola University subscribes to the ideal of the "cura personalis," the education of the whole person, which instills in students a sense of responsibility to act justly for their fellow human beings and to work to create a more just and humane world. Ideals are only as credible as the actions that accompany them, and it is damaging to a university if, in managing its own affairs, it does not heed the very principles with which it seeks to advertise itself to the public.

An institution with an avowed concern for the value and dignity inherent in each person must demonstrate this in its dealings with its extraordinary faculty. There is widespread inequality in the compensation of extraordinary faculty across the colleges. Many of the most work-intensive courses in the university are taught by the extraordinary faculty, and unfair compensation conveys the message that their efforts are little valued.

To address this situation, the following motion is proposed:

Motion

We move that the university act to establish salary equity for extraordinary faculty across the colleges, both for the base salaries of new hires and for the salary range of longer-term employees.

Dr. Calzada moved to suspend the rules. Her move was seconded and passed by voice vote. Discussion on the main motion ensued. Friendly amendment from Dr. Fernandez was accepted by Dr. Bell, to insert "and equity in teaching loads." Amended motion: *We move that the university act to establish salary equity and equity in teaching loads for extraordinary faculty across the colleges, both for the base salaries of new hires and for the salary range of longer-term employees.*

Motion to call the question was made, seconded, and passed by voice vote. Vote on the amended main motion was passed by voice vote.

VII. Old Business

1. College of Humanities and Natural Sciences Mission Statement (Dr. Mark Fernandez)

In fulfilling its role to provide all Loyola students with a foundation in the liberal arts and sciences, the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences has as its mission to educate and graduate students who are prepared to lead meaningful lives with and for others; who appreciate and contribute to the understanding of global cultures; who comprehend the interrelated nature of all knowledge; who are able to think critically and make decisions for the common good; and who have a commitment to the Ignatian tradition of a life of justice and service to others. It is the mission of the college to contribute to the expansion of knowledge through the scholarly and creative activities of its faculty and students.

Motion to call the question was made, seconded and passed by voice vote. Vote on the motion was by voice. The motion passed.

2. CPT Motion on Faculty Handbook Revision, Section V, Page 12, regarding College Planning Team membership (inset “ordinary”): “*Five **Ordinary** Faculty members serve on this committee....*” Motion was made and seconded. Motion to call the question was made and seconded. Brief discussion clarified that extraordinary faculty could be invited to discuss extraordinary topics, while being protected from a heavy committee workload. Vote on the motion was by voice, with none opposed, and two announced abstentions. The motion passed.
3. Motion on Parking (Dr. Mary McCay)
Amended motion to bring to the University Senate: “*Enforce the parking-space vehicle size restrictions.*” Parking Committee member Dr. Mary Brazier described difficulties establishing size categories previously set according to vehicle lengths and currently concerning widths. Dean Cruz recommended calling extension 3000 if a larger vehicle prohibits parking. In the absence of the motion’s maker and lateness of the hour, the motion was not called.

VIII. Move to Adjourn

The assembly adjourned at 1:45 PM.

Attachments

(From Dean Cruz via 12/6/10 email and hard copy at Assembly)

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

First year Tenure-track faculty: 2-2 course load

Tenure-track faculty from year 2 through the year of tenure and promotion: 3-2/2-3 course load

Tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty once the decision on tenure and promotion has been made¹:

- 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 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.

Departments are requested to develop, as part of the departmental protocol, the method for selecting those faculty who will receive research course releases.²

¹ Including those faculty who have received a favorable vote for tenure but have not yet formally received tenure.

² Faculty cannot buy themselves out of courses, except with grant monies. 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.



To: Dr. Edward J. Kvet, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Academic Affairs

Dr. Donald R. Boomgaarden, Dean
College of Music and Fine Arts

Dr. JoAnn Moran Cruz, Dean
College of Humanities and Natural Sciences

Dr. William Locander, Dean
College of Business

Dr. Luis Miron, Dean
College of Social Sciences

From: Dr. Lydia Voigt, Chair
Common Curriculum Implementation Task Force (CCITF)

Subject: CCITF Response to Issues Raised by the Colleges' Review of the Proposed
Common Curriculum Implementation Plan

Date: November 12, 2010

This report is offered on behalf of the Common Curriculum Implementation Task Force (CCITF) and represents its unanimous support. Responses and comments to the Proposed Common Curriculum Implementation Plan were received by the CCITF in the form of official and unofficial reports, notes of meetings with departments and CCITF members as well as meetings with faculty, and individual correspondence. Issues and concerns were entered into the CCITF record and discussed and considered in the composition of this Response. The CCITF would like to acknowledge and thank everyone for participating in this review process. An abbreviated list, Appendix A, includes the following formal reports: the College of Business Comments on the Common Curriculum (November 1, 2010), the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences Response to the Proposed Revisions to the Common Curriculum (draft of November 8, 2010), the College of Music and Fine Arts Response to the Common Curriculum Proposal (October 29, 2010), the College of Social Sciences Response to the Common Curriculum Revision (October 28, 2010), and the School of Nursing Response to the Common Curriculum Proposal (October 8, 2010).

The CCITF analysis of responses began with a review of all of the materials submitted followed by a discussion of the various issues raised. In addition a grid was created listing all of the issues noted with tallies of the number of times each item was named as a concern by various college reports and other materials. Greater attention has been given to the college reports, since they serve to summarize other materials submitted from their respective colleges. The most commonly named issues are listed below; these are followed by other issues noted in the various materials. In some instances several concerns are addressed under a more general question or heading.

Most frequently referenced concerns:

- **What will be the structure of the Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum?** The CCITF is currently working on a proposal for appropriate committee structures and processes for course approvals (e.g., approval of introductory and advanced CC courses and RAC (“check-off”) courses (i.e., designated Diversity, Catholic Tradition, and Pre-modern courses)).
 - Determination of the structure and constitution of the Standing Common Curriculum Committee as well as its processes and procedures will be well vetted and transparent. A proposal will be sent to the Handbook Revision Committee as part of the final review process for establishing the standing committee. The committee structure is expected to be similar to the current CCITF. The present committee consists of nine voting faculty members with representatives from each of the colleges (i.e., HuNS – 2 representatives from the Humanities and 2 from the Natural Sciences, CSS – 3 representatives, CoB – 1 representative, and CMFA – 1 representative). However, consideration will be given for including a representative from the Jesuit Community as a nonvoting faculty member on the standing committee and the chairperson will be selected from among the voting faculty representatives. Also, a resource support group of faculty/staff/students and a deans’ representative as currently exists on the CCITF are expected to serve as nonvoting members.
 - Initially, subcommittees will be formed to establish criteria and procedures for review of proposals (e.g., Ethics, Science Process, Writing about Literature, Social Sciences, Creative Arts and Cultures, Languages, Diversity, Catholic Tradition, and Pre-modern) and to develop recommendations that will be brought forward to the Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum for final consideration. These subcommittees will include relevant specialists from participating disciplines or the appropriate curricular areas. Subcommittee membership and the decision-making processes and procedures that will guide the work of these subcommittees will also be well vetted and transparent.

- **How will curricular exceptions/substitutions to the revised CC be handled?**
 Once the proposal is approved, the CCITF college representatives will work with their respective colleges and programs including their respective deans and department heads to develop the necessary CC articulation/modification for certain majors/programs such as the “elective-challenged” majors (i.e., majors that are restricted by outside accreditation requirements or heavy programmatic requirements leaving them with few electives thus requiring some double-dipping or adjustments to the proposed CC requirements). Special subcommittees of the CCITF will work with the University Honors Advisory Board and also the Professional and Continuing Studies Committee to adapt the CC to the needs of these programs. It is worth noting that adaptation of the CC to the needs of a select few programs is a current practice; this necessary flexibility is important to maintain as we move forward.

 - Some responses raise the question of how “common” will the CC be if exceptions are made to accommodate programs. Again, this is a current practice, but one that is not used extensively. We need to ensure that students can complete a degree in four years. Some programs are elective-challenged and completing the major requirements and the CC with no exceptions or flexibility would require potentially an extra semester or year of study. To ensure on-time graduation rates requires agreeing to flexibility for some majors. It is important for us to find agreement regarding the criteria for exceptions and the process for developing adjustments (i.e., determining where accommodations are necessary and how modifications of the CC will be implemented across colleges while avoiding a general exodus from the requirements). A major objective is to allow flexibility for those programs that are elective-challenged while striving to keep the Common Curriculum as common as possible.

- **How will the various elements contained in the Common Curriculum Implementation Plan be resourced? What assurance is there that the CC revision will not be an unfunded mandate?** The implementation of a new common curriculum is a top priority of the University. Given that the University’s financial condition is tuition-driven, our ability to financially meet the demand of our curricular vision is largely dependent on our success to realize our modest projections in the growth of enrollment (i.e., the annual number of first-time, fulltime students who enroll and the corresponding retention/persistence rates). Having said this, there is full commitment on the part of the University’s administration to support and sustain the implementation of the new CC. It is important to remember that the implementation plan extends over a five-year span of time. Some elements of the new CC will take a longer period of time to fully

implement (e.g., the full implementation of the Science Lab requirement will be contingent on some new faculty hires and the construction of new laboratories).

- Future projected budgets (both salary and operating budgets) include substantial allocations to support the implementation of the new CC. For example, the projected Academic Year (AY) 2012-2013 budget set-up includes significant resource allocations to support the launching/implementation of the new CC. New hires are anticipated over the next several years in consideration of increased enrollments and curricular needs.
 - In addition to salary and operating budgets, departmental/program development grants will be created (RFP's for development of new courses/adaptation of existing courses, faculty development, programmatic enhancements, facilitation of team teaching, and purchase of equipment, as well as summer stipends).
 - The new facilities plans include space/design accommodations related to various disciplinary/curricular/pedagogical applications, including smart classrooms and flexible classrooms, which permit small seminar and larger lecture hall configurations. For example, the Monroe renovation planning, which is nearing completion, will include new CC science labs, space for new faculty, as well as improved and expanded facilities for the creative arts. Information Technology, which is already very education-centered and strives to implement state-of-the-art classrooms and teaching technology, is ratcheting up with the Monroe renovation.
- **Given the intensity of instruction and the implications of expanded resources, how will the large number of required course sections, which will be necessary to accommodate student demand, associated with the Science Process, Science Lab, and the Creative Arts and Cultures be sustained?**
 - Science Process: The idea for the Science Process course has been influenced by a growing appreciation of the importance of understanding and valuing different perspectives/paradigms of study/investigation of leading scientific problems. Increasingly interdisciplinary teams of scientists work to understand and solve problems. A subcommittee including natural, behavioral, and social science faculty will be formed; they will work to develop the criteria for development of potential thematic content as well as the logistical templates for organizing and structuring the courses and interdisciplinary teams. The focus will be on meeting the needs of students, facilitating interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty, maintaining consistency among the modules, and ensuring sustainability of offerings. An experimental version of this course is being offered in Spring 2011.
 - Science Lab: Concern has been expressed over the scheduling and implementation of the Science Lab course. The science departments are

unified in their support and commitment to teaching of the new CC science lab. They have pointed out that some lab sections will be scheduled flexibly including twice-a-week meetings in traditional TR time slots, as well as evening meeting times to meet the needs of those students with inflexible schedules. As mentioned earlier, the University administration has made a strong commitment to implementation of the lab course with plans for constructing two dedicated lab rooms in the Monroe renovation and the potential for hiring new faculty in the science departments. The science departments welcome suggestions and topics for possible inclusion in these labs.

- Creative Arts and Cultures: The main issues surrounding the Creative Arts requirement are: 1) whether there is enough support from CMFA to make the requirement sustainable and not kept afloat by the creative writing courses; and 2) whether there is funding to support the requirement. The report submitted by the CMFA indicates that there is college support for this requirement. The main concern of the college is for its role in determining the types of CMFA courses that will be eligible to meet this requirement. The recent CCITF decision to add cultures, i.e., “Creative Arts and Cultures” (which is how the requirement was originally described by the first task force committee) will open the requirement to the inclusion of select social science and humanities courses thus expanding the range of course choices and reducing the pressure on CMFA and the creative writing program. A subcommittee with faculty from CMFA participating departments and other participating departments in HuNS and CSS will be charged with working with respective college deans and faculty to develop the criteria for this requirement.

- **How will curricular rigor, which is associated with the Jesuit educational tradition, be maintained/enhanced and what is the overall plan for quality control of the CC program?**
 - To ensure that our students receive the highest quality of teaching, new faculty appointments are being predicated on the fulltime faculty participating in the CC. Participating departments/programs have committed to support the teaching in the common curriculum with ordinary faculty. This will better assure continuity and rigor. The new CC’s openness for course offerings coming from disciplines across colleges and its built-in opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration will serve to strengthen majors as well as foster interaction among the faculty and programs across colleges.
 - A commitment has been made to support components of the implementation plan designed for faculty development. This includes expanding opportunities for faculty development through the Faculty Academy as well as departmental/faculty grants for course

development/enhancement with special emphasis on educational excellence and state-of-the-arts pedagogical practices.

- The implementation plan includes the development of a formal, ongoing, and routine process of review/evaluation of the Common Curriculum (with a full evaluation to take place three years following implementation and every five years thereafter). The review of the Common Curriculum will be among the tasks of the Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum. It is important to underscore that the new common curriculum (as is the case of all curricula) will be constantly evolving and will be part of a continuous process of improvement.

- **How will the new CC serve to express our commitment to the Jesuit vision of education and its values?**

- The new CC addresses values that are central to the Ignatian vision of education both in terms of the curriculum as whole (i.e., with its emphasis on holistic and developmental education, academic rigor, and breadth and scope of knowledge, interdisciplinary connections, experiential learning, and values oriented education) and also in terms of the specific selection of courses (e.g., ethics, diversity, and Catholic tradition) as well as the enhancement areas (e.g., service learning, global understanding, and an increase in seminars). The amplification of Jesuit values will appear across the curriculum (e.g., FYS program, which is formed around “thinking critically and acting justly,” and courses on ethics, diversity, and Catholic tradition). Values associated with the Jesuit vision of education in the liberal arts and sciences will be more evident as new course descriptions and names are formed (e.g., the proposed new series of courses on the Philosophy of the Human Person (*cura personalis*), the revised English T122 (with its focus on *Eloquentia Perfecta*, which serves to integrate critical thinking, moral reflection, and articulate expression), and the social science courses (e.g., courses devoted to social justice and diversity issues).

- **How will the language requirement be handled?**

In view of the fact that placement data is needed in order to determine the level of students’ language abilities upon entrance to the university, the decision on the language requirement as part of the CC has been postponed. A subcommittee of CCITF is being formed to reconsider the questions related to the language requirement, e.g., what will be the minimum number of required hours, where in the curriculum will it be counted, and how best can this requirement be handled. The subcommittee will work in consultation with the Department of Languages and Culture and college deans.

Other issues and concerns coming from various departments/individuals:

- **Passport program**
 - There are several aspects of the vision of a Loyola education that cannot be met by common curriculum courses alone. The Passport program is an academic co-curricular program designed to enhance the Common Curriculum and other curricular initiatives. The purpose of the program is to enhance students' holistic educational experience at Loyola, to help underscore an important part of their common experience, and to demonstrate the many great benefits of our campus. The type of programming to be considered will be wrapped around the key values of the CC. The Passport program will consist of campus-wide programming and events that will be thematically linked (e.g., Bieber Guest Lectures, President's Forum, departmental seminars, centers of excellence programming, and Music and Fine Arts performances, etc.). Roll out of the CC will coincide with the University's centennial celebration in 2012 and will provide an opportunity to demonstrate the relevance of the Passport program to the educational mission of our university.

- **Loss of quality courses from existing CC**
 - Renaming the Creative Arts requirement to include Cultures (i.e., Creative Arts and Cultures) will address some of the concerns that many courses do not have a place in the proposed new CC; this will open opportunities for more of the current courses to remain part of the CC. It will allow examination of cultures from various disciplinary perspectives (e.g., social sciences and humanities). The overall reduction of the total number of required credit hours for the CC will allow more students to pursue interdisciplinary minors thereby increasing the demand for interdisciplinary courses. Many of the courses that are feared not to fit in the CC may actually find increased demand as a result of the revisions to the CC.

- **CC for nontraditional (professional and continuing studies) students, honors students, and transfers students**
 - Every effort will be made to work closely with relevant committees/program heads to develop plans of study that will capture the spirit of the common curriculum for these different student groups.

- **Loss of required credit hours in particular programs/need to increase credit hours in certain areas**
 - Due to the new interdisciplinary emphasis and greater flexibility for participation, there are more opportunities for various departments/disciplines to participate in the CC (e.g., FYS, Scientific Process, Natural Science in Context and the Science Lab, Ethics, Creative

Arts and Cultures, and the requirements across the curriculum (RAC) including designated diversity, Catholic tradition, and pre-modern courses.

- **Uncertainty/vagueness of new course content**
 - Departments/designated subcommittees (representing interdisciplinary participants) will need to submit more details on how courses will be defined. Ultimately there will be a need to produce and approve course proposals that will be submitted to the Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum. (See Appendix B, which offers some preliminary course descriptions that may require elaboration and updating and, in some instances, more interdisciplinary collaborative work in preparation of proposals for formal submission to the Standing Committee on the Common Curriculum).

- **Launch date**
 - The launch date for the new CC with the exception of some component parts that will require added time to implement (e.g., Science Lab) has been postponed to Fall 2012. The implementation plan is a five year plan, with the bulk of the implementation scheduled for AY2012-2013.