

Loyola Marymount University

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 10, 2008

Collins Center

3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Present: John Dorsey, Ellen Ensher, Rudy Fleck, Vicki Graf, Paul Harris, Christina Hennessey, Lily Khadjavi, Chun Lee, Blake Mellor, Jennifer Pate, K. J. Peters, James Roe, Susan Scheibler, Patrick Shanahan, Seth Thompson and Philip Wander.

Excused: Jeffery Davis, Patricia Douglas, Charles Erven, Sonny Espinoza, Amir Hussain, Jok Madut Jok, Gary Kuleck, Yvette Lapayese, Damon Rago, Jonathan Rothchild, Nina Reich, Beth Serlin and Mel Mendelson.

Motion 1: Approval of the 3/27/08 meeting minutes.

Motion passed 12 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

Resolution 1: Be resolved that the senate thanks the secretaries Patrick Shanahan and Robert Houghtaling.

Motion passed 12 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

Announcements

- There is now a searchable database of senate motions and resolutions available at lmu.edu/Page6366.aspx
- The final senate meeting this year will be on May 1st at which time new senators will be invited as guests.

Reports

1) Governance Task Force report

- A full audit was not feasible with such a small group and short time-frame, however it will be recommended. We did an extensive literature search reviewing AAUP, WASC resources and focused on sister Jesuit schools. We also met with both the CAO and provost and utilized the campus climate survey. The report presents principles and characteristics for a healthy shared governance system.

Principles:

1. Strengthens academic excellence and Catholic/Jesuit identity
2. Defined by atmosphere of good faith and mutual trust
3. Establishes a decision making process that is open, accessible, and understandable to all
4. Depends on a decision making process that involves multiple stakeholders
5. Guided by policy documents
6. Linked to academic freedom

7. Characterized by the attitude that speed is not always an asset
8. Dedicated to transparency, openness, and accountability
9. Dedicated to the important of evaluation and assessment
10. Embodied by an effective senate
11. Embodied by a committee structure that reflects faculty areas of responsibility

Recommendations:

We recommend the following:

1. That the Senate adopts the principles and characteristics of a healthy shared governance system as a framework for discussing and assessing shared governance at LMU,
2. That the Senate establishes a permanent Governance Committee,
3. That the initial charge of the Governance Committee be to conduct a full governance audit of the faculty role in governance,
4. That the Governance Committee of the Senate would have a continuing mandate to monitor the state of faculty participation in shared governance and develop recommendations for improvement.

Discussion

Q. Can we get clarification for item ten especially in regards to “participation in all decisions pertaining to academic resource allocation, including the determination of faculty salaries and benefits?”

A. This is a starting point of an ongoing conversation regarding areas where faculty need to have more voice and push for collection of hard data.

Comment: Great document and great work. Two years ago the senate began with a retreat, I wonder if a retreat next year would be a good opportunity to discuss these 11 principles. It could really be a great way to use this document.

Q. Have you discussed with the provost specific structures for input and governance?

A. We discussed with the provost the importance of communication between the faculty and Board of Trustees. The meeting was just a brief explanation of what we are doing. We did not discuss a lot of specifics, however if the senate accepts we will forward the document to him.

Q. I like that the report uses the AAUP as a starting point. Are you in communication with senates at other Jesuit institutions? This could lead to further analogues for you work.

A. No, we have only looked at their minutes and handbooks, but this would be an important part in an audit.

Comment: All of the CAO’s from Jesuit universities get together to meet annually. It may be possible to organize an effort for at least the west coast Faculty Senate Presidents to meet. AJCU has an office of faculty which could possibly help facilitate.

Motion 2: Move that the Faculty Senate adopt the report by the Governance Task Force of the senate.

Motion passed 16 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

Motion 3: Move that the Faculty Senate approve the four recommendations made on page two of the governance report.

Motion passed 16 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

2) Academic Calendar

- There are still some questions about the approach we want to take. A decision has been made to table the J-term and nail down 2009-2010 calendar. We will gather more feedback to plan more carefully for the following three years. We need input on the implementation of reading days. Student representation has really been pushing for reading days. There is a concern however that this really leads to some misbehavior by some students during reading days.

Discussion

Comment: I would suggest that that more research be done by the students in order to justify their request.

Comment: A dead week usually ends up in a party atmosphere and it may be difficult for students to study in the dorms.

Motion 4: Move that the Faculty Senate support the principle of one or more weekday reading days.

Motion passed 8 for, 5 against, 3 abstain

3) Committee on Committee report

- The report summarizes committee work and any recommendations made on the change of charter. The deadline for committee requests is coming soon. The committee on committee does take requests and will accommodate faculty members if slots are available. The committee also looks at department balance and gender. The appointee list members are vetted through the CAO and the senate president.
- The appointee list needs more chair and dean input to protect faculty. One good idea is to present deans and chairs with list of names without the committee names listed in order to get feedback on workload issues. This would ensure deans and chairs would not be in the position to stack committees. Deans and chairs should also only comment on faculty within their colleges and departments.

Discussion

Comment: Some committees require much more commitment and work than others. This also needs to be taken into account.

Comment: The report will assist the next senate in their work. Some issues such as changes in the number of members will require senate action.

4) Student Evaluation of Teaching: Jennifer Pate

- The committee has come up with a new form which was piloted for selected faculty this Fall. We tested for correlation with old form and the analysis indicated the new form did well. The graduate focus group loved the new form, while the undergraduates provided mixed reviews. Most thought the new form was clearer and more effective in evaluating teaching. We will pilot again this Spring then hold faculty forums in the Fall to discuss improvements. The form will then pilot once again and hopefully come to a faculty vote in the Spring 2010.

5) Rank and Tenure Task Force: Vicki Graf

- Two charts outlining the departmental and dean review and proposed appeal process were provided. The goal is for more transparency and sensitivity for feedback. Vicki has met with the deans, CAO and provost on these efforts.
- The chairs letter is to serve as a rebuttal for the candidate. Any negative outcome would trigger an automatic review by an independent committee who would only deal with procedure or bias not content. The Rank and Tenure committee can reconsider their decision based on new and compelling evidence.

Discussion

Comment: There is still a lack of opportunity to respond to the Dean's letter. I feel this is important as the Dean is likely the last person who has an actual working relationship with the candidate.

Q. What is the trigger that would allow the candidate to receive the chair letter?

A. We are proposing that this is a shared letter no matter what.

Comment: The chair voting in the departmental vote and writing a letter could potentially be problematic.

Comment: I would like to suggest that any appeal be handled at the CAO level.

Comment: An automatic review of procedures may present a challenge. If for example looking at 4 cases the independent committee decides 1 case had a procedural issue, it would be difficult to say the other three did not. I believe that training for the Rank and Tenure committee members may be the answer especially since a lot of their procedures are unwritten.

Motion 5: Move to adjourn

Motion passed 14 for, 0 against, 0 abstain