

Faculty Senate
January 31, 2013
3:00pm-5:00pm

Present: Hawley Almstedt, Sean D'Evelyn, Elizabeth Drummond, Richard Fox, Paul Harris, Karen Huchting, Mladen Milicevic, Katherine Noon, Judy Park, John Parrish, Ralph Quinones, Robert Rovetti, , Marta Sanchez, Sue Scheibler, Tim Shanahan, Thomas White and Amy Woodson-Boulton.

Excused: Laurel Burks, Omar Es-Said, Jamie Hazlitt, Michele Hammers, George Hess, Diane Meyer, Patricia Oliver, Jennifer Pate, Gregory Ruzzin and Carl Urbinati.

Moment of Silence

- By unanimous consent, Elizabeth Drummond was elected Acting Secretary for the meeting.

Motion to approve January 17, 2012 minutes
15 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions

Graduate Students of LMU (GSLMU)

Guest: Maggie Bove-LaMonica-President of the Graduate Students of Loyola Marymount University (GSLMU)

- The GSLMU was formed in the Spring of 2012 and had its inaugural semester in the Fall of 2012. GSLMU is an interdisciplinary group built from the students up and is the first body that officially represents graduate students. The group drafted a constitution and is represented by two senators from each college who each serve one semester with renewable terms. The group currently consists of 4 officers, 10 senators and 7 Committees (Academic and Research, Alumni, Communication, Election, Faith, Service, and Social).
- GSLMU is working with Career Development Services and developing panels to address specific topics. Student representation around the university is critical and the GSLMU is reaching out to all groups. Additionally the group is holding various campus events including a GSLMU social, service day, and Basketball Tailgates. The group has embraced social media and has a newsletter with a bi-monthly distribution.

Discussion

Why were there no elections for representation?

-We did not have a complete distribution list and we initially hoped to build continuity through those interested in becoming graduate student representatives. We are currently working on obtaining a distribution list for all graduate students.

What issues are of top concern for graduate students?

-Parking; the issue of little community presence after 6pm; lack of evening campus food services; more accessible ways to post work study and research assistant positions. Graduate students desire more engagement to do research with faculty. Evening class times are not easily conducive to research and creating an intellectual community. International travel is also difficult and we may want to look at opening alternative breaks.

Motion 2: Move that the Faculty Senate recognizes GSLMU as the voice of graduate students and their advisory to the administration, and pledges to assist them in obtaining their appropriate role in shared governance of the university.

14 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions

LMU Disruptive Student Policy

Guest: Curtiss Rooks: Associate Dean, Bellarmine College of Liberal Arts

- This policy came before the Associate Deans Council three years ago from various sources. There was no definitive policy that spoke to this area. We looked at various universities and pulled together a larger group who had discussion with the Student and Judiciary Affairs divisions. The latest draft is now being presented to the Faculty Senate to determine how this may get finalized and added to the university bulletin.

Discussion

- There are a number of paragraphs to assist in clarifying immediate threats and non- immediate threats. Asking the student to leave the classroom could potentially create further conflict.
- I'm concerned about the faculty member's obligation to inform the Chair and Dean within 24 hours when a student is asked to leave class. Faculty could potentially instead hold the judgment for deciding whether to create a written complaint. Additionally, requiring faculty to report within 24 hours could put the faculty member on the hook if s/he forgets to report within that specified period.
- I suggest changing the reporting obligation to "should" contact the Department Chair and Dean with a longer period to report such as 2-3 days.
- Does this apply to student abroad and alternative breaks?
-Yes, it is designed to apply to any classroom setting.
- I would like to see a clear distinction between disruptive and threatening behavior. Disruptive behavior results in a student being asked to leave. Any situation consisting of immediate danger can then become a criminal and/or LionsCode violation.

- I suggest we could revise the university-wide recommended syllabus language to address this point..
- There is no language asking for a student to be removed from an entire course.
 - Everything is on the table once the Dean is informed although not all options are listed.
 - Language above “expressing opinions” should be revised to clarify we are talking about conduct, not content.
- The Faculty Senate provided this feedback to the Associate Deans Council, and took no formal action regarding the policy.

Merit Evaluation: Identifying Questions and Priorities

- There are four broad areas to consider; more differentiated categories; more sensitivity to all three areas of performance; a multiyear review for tenured faculty; and clarity on who decides and make the recommendations and how quality assessment fits into it.

Multi-year review

- Can multiyear review be addressed separately from the other 2-3 dimensions?
- Prospective or retrospective: are we talking about the last 3 years, or the next 3?
- How multiyear reviews work at other universities
- What problem is it trying to solve, and are there other possible ways to resolve the problem

More sensitivity to all three areas of performance

- Citizenship, sense of duty, collegiality
- Factors that tend to lead to devaluing of service and teaching in merit process specifically
- Measures that will pick up teaching and service more specifically and sensitively

More differentiated scale/categories

- What would a point system look like (examples)
- How many merit categories and how to weight them

Who decides and makes the recommendations/quality assessment

- Outline the general options for possible changes here

Discussion

- Collegiality needs to be closely defined and how it is being used in merit is troublesome. Should it be part of merit review and is this captured in service?
- This is not just about better balancing teaching and service, but also the question of whether

university citizenship is covered by the category of service. Citizenship entails duties and responsibilities to the university even beyond service activities and is different from collegiality.

- It is difficult to measure citizenship/collegiality and we need a way to quantify. More differentiated scales could take into account the engagement in the issues of the university. We should determine how to not reduce this to personality and if it should it be part of merit at all.
- We can think of citizenship in terms of measurable forms of professional engagement which may be easier to assign merit once we have greater differentiation.
- We need to value the idea of selfless service, where people work for the good of the university, not just look out for themselves. Otherwise, we risk creating a system where people focus on own work and do not develop a sense of citizenship.
- We need to explore how we account for difference in time and labor commitment demanded by different committees?
- We should separate out the issue of the multi-year review from other aspects. There is the question of whether the review is prospective (what I will do) or retrospective (what I have done)
- We need clarity on what problems a multi-year review will solve.
- It would be useful to find out how other universities deal with multi-year reviews. What approaches do they take and how do they deal with the potential logistical problems (e.g., pool of money available in any given year)?
- I feel that department assessments of quality can be achieved, but it is more of a challenge university wide.
- We cannot solve all of the problems now, so need to focus on what we can do now by separating out those issues that can be resolved quickly.
- I believe going to true 40-40-20 system would solve a lot of problems.
- Most of the bullet points (greater differentiation, points-system, multi-year reviews) seem to have broad support. Who decides and makes recommendations regarding merit and how they would deal with quality is more difficult.
- The committee could outline several different broad options as regards how assess quality in the 3 categories and who makes decisions.

- Regarding quality, we could rely on the R&T standards for departments/programs. Since all departments/programs are being asked to deal with this issue of quality in revising R&T standards, they could speak to how quality assessed in the department/program.

Partner/Spousal Hires: Sean D'Evelyn, Assistant Professor of Economics

- The AAUP addresses partner policies outlining the pros and cons. I would like to open a discussion as to whether these hires help or hinder the LMU mission. The current process is a completely ad hoc process supervised by the Deans.
- The issue can be problematic as some partners are forced into departments without support of faculty. Having clear policies can assist with family stability, as well as diversity hiring
- A clear policy could assist dual academic career households. Concern for fairness and lack of clear policy may be inhibiting these types of hires.
- The English department created a process where an ad hoc committee evaluates the academic merit of any proposed spousal hire.
- Each situation is unique and departments should have veto power. This creates conflict of interest issues around evaluations and administrative roles.
- The benefit to having a policy could be consistency, uniformity and fairness. A lack of a policy leads to arbitrary decisions while a firm policy creates a commitment.
- This could also apply to staff hiring.
- The permanency of faculty hires should be considered as compared to staff, and I recommend that staff hires not be included in this conversation. The particularities of the academic job market should make spousal hires for faculty the primary issue.
- What counts as a partner also needs to be closely considered.
- I would like to ask the Deans Council what their general sense of this topic is. This topic speaks to faculty governance issues and some concrete recommendations and feedback from current faculty would be useful.

Adjourned at 5:02pm

Submitted by: Elizabeth Drummond (Acting Secretary)

Prepared by: Robert Houghtaling