

Loyola Marymount University

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 28, 2008

Collins Center

3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Present: John Dorsey, Ellen Ensher, Rudy Fleck, Vicki Graf, Paul Harris, Christina Hennessey, Amir Hussain, Lily Khadjavi, Yvette Lapayese, Blake Mellor, Jennifer Pate, K. J. Peters, James Roe, Jonathan Rothchild, Patrick Shanahan, and Seth Thompson.

Excused: Jeffery Davis, Patricia Douglas, Charles Erven, Sonny Espinoza, Jok Madut Jok, Gary Kulek, Chun Lee, Damon Rago, Nina Reich, Susan Scheibler, Beth Serlin and Mel Mendelson.

### **Welcome**

President Peters called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. A moment of silence was observed for Father William Cain.

Call for approval of the February 14, 2008 meeting minutes.

### **Approval of Minutes**

**Motion 1: Approval of 2/14/08 minutes.**

**Motion passed: 14 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstain**

### **Announcements**

- Ellen Ensher announced that a summer mentoring and management course is being offered.
- Any faculty member interested in serving on the Frank Sullivan Social Justice Committee should contact KJ Peters. The committee is regrouping.
- Examination of the parking structure in University Hall revealed a number of non-registered vehicles. Another potential problem could be that faculty/staff are giving their parking stickers to their children. This issue is now infringing on the curriculum, therefore we must continue to press public safety on enforcement.
- All death notices sent to the faculty are vetted through University Relations. Please make sure that UR is notified in the event of a death.
- The Faculty Senate Executive had dinner with Provost Dave Burcham last night and discussed a number of issues related to the professoriate. We were impressed by his candor and support for the faculty.

### **Reports**

#### **1) Mentoring for Mission: Jane Brucker and Teresa Lenihan**

- Mentoring for Mission began as a grassroots program responding to the growing nature of the university. It has been used as a strategy for junior faculty to navigate the tenure path and become connected to the university. It also allows for senior faculty to celebrate the mission and make connections. The website was developed to allow the program to become more institutionalized and serve as a mentor network. A grant from the Lily Foundation was obtained and a number of campus groups including the CAO's Office, Mission and Identity, Center for Teaching Excellence and Cultural Affairs signed on.
- The Mentor Network has three parts, academic excellence, whole person, social justice/faith issues. Currently we are moving from college to college providing training and guidance for departments without mentors. Fifteen faculty members are being trained in both 07-08 and 08-09 to serve as a core group.
- The Model for Mentors is available on the website and includes three useful documents. The Roles and Goals worksheet assists you and your mentor in identifying the roles and responsibilities of the Mentoring relationship. The questionnaire provides the mentor with questions to help facilitate goal setting with the mentee. The goal setting worksheet assists mentees in facilitating discussion and goal setting with mentors.

These documents can be used formally and informally to determine what style of mentoring an individual appreciates. The heart of the program is geared around creative problem solving and addressing obstacles and challenges.

## **Discussion**

Q. Would this be a supplement/complement to departmental mentoring or a replacement?

A. It can be both. Individuals can go to the site for help separate from everything else. It is important to have a mentor outside of the department.

Q. Would you be interested in integrating other mentoring programs here at LMU?

A. Yes, this is really the point of this program. We are open to making connections.

Q. How are individuals chosen for topics?

A. They sign up to participate and indicate their interests.

Q. What sort of oversight is in place?

A. The training addresses how to provide effective mentoring. Mentors are not assigned making it more informal. If the individual being mentored feels the style is not appropriate, they are encouraged to find another mentor.

Q. Is there an evaluation component to see how people value their experiences?

A. Yes, we are starting to address this.

## **2) Faculty Vote Procedures: KJ Peters**

- The ballot is still open for suggestions and revisions and any non-substantive revisions will be accepted until Monday March 10<sup>th</sup>. A decision has been made to send this out clean without any other motions attached. A simple majority of the faculty that actually vote will allow the motion to pass. Senator Rudy Fleck prefers that the motions go out with Damon's name in order not make changes at the last minute. The returned ballots will be handled by senator Fleck here on campus.

## **3) President's Task Force on Rank and Tenure: Vicki Graf**

- The Task Force includes members Jennifer Abe-Kim (Associate Dean of the Bellarmine College of Liberal Arts), Stephan Duncan (School of Film and Television), Renee Florsheim (College of Business Administration), Garland Kirkpatrick (College of Communication and Fine Arts), Larry Trittle (Bellarmine College of Liberal Arts), and Bill Trott (Seaver College of Science and Engineering). The group is currently looking at appeals, current procedures and guidelines on standards and expectations. We are looking for input on the appeals process. Last year there was an interim appeals process that received mixed reviews. I would like to open the floor to welcome suggestions, concerns and issues.

## **Discussion**

Comment: The appeals from last year should have not been sent back to the Rank and Tenure Committee.

Comment: What about expanding the grievance committee to be the body that handles the appeals.

Comment: We have been looking at several other institutions including Boston College and Georgetown and the policies vary greatly. We will also take a look at the role of the CAO since there are two parallel processes going on simultaneously.

Q. Has the interim process that was in place last year expired.

A. Yes, it was an ad hoc process. Any appeals would now go to grievance.

Comment: The School of Business is unique as faculty are given performance reviews. This may raise the issue of an implied contract in the event the faculty member is told they are on track and the Rank and Tenure committee makes another decision.

Comment: The Task Force's charge is to clarify every step of the process including reviews, roles of chairs, deans, the CAO and the president.

Q. Can you elaborate on the parallel process that occurs?

A. The Deans, Rank and Tenure Committee and the CAO all see the same material independently of each other. The CAO makes a recommendation to the president after the Rank and Tenure Committee's decision.

Q. Does the Provost play a role in the process?

A. This year the provost has no role and he has indicated that he doesn't see himself involved in the future process.

Comment: I question the timeline on making an appeal after the president's decision. It would be more appropriate to appeal after the Rank and Tenure Committee's decision.

Comment: The Faculty Service Reports provide a basis for merit decisions. Since chairs generally want the best merit for faculty, any negative aspects are therefore minimized.

Comment: The Work Load Task Force would take the lead on merit decisions.

Comment: The Grievance Committee now holds the greatest respect of the faculty and should be the final court in the appeals process as it is in academic freedom. The committee has the authority to establish a review board, but also only reports to the president. Procedures and judgments of the Rank and Tenure Committee should be subject for review. Lastly, every new Rank and Tenure Committee member needs training in conjunction with grievance.

Comment: The Grievance Committee can't second guess on the judgment of the Rank and Tenure Committee but can look at procedure. A distinction needs to be made between procedure and substance as this is a very fine line.

Comment: The Rank and Tenure Committee is private, therefore you can not see their procedures in practice. We need procedures and there should not be compromising of judgment of the committee members.

Comment: The Task Force has developed a matrix which shows that college/school guidelines are all over the map. The guidelines for publications differ between each. I'm currently meeting with all of the deans to triangulate the data.

Q. There seemed to be a functioning process for years, what has gone wrong?

A. There were never major concerns until recently. The campus climate survey brought a sense of urgency and the CAO subsequently commissioned the work. There are a lot of potential cracks and we want to level the playing field.

Q. How is the Rank and Tenure Committee setup?

A. Members are appointed by the Committee on Committees for five year terms.

Comment: Once the expectations for each college are standardized and this needs to be filed with the Rank and Tenure Committee.

Comment: There should possibly be a requirement that any negative decision is subject to an automatic review.

Comment: The value of electronic journals and how these are counted is important to clarify.

Comment: If the judgment of the Rank and Tenure Committee can't be questioned, then the training of these committee members is critical.

Comment: This is a question of due process. Any shortcomings are brought up to faculty in advance and a chance is given to address these.

Comment: It is important to clarify which items (Faculty Service Reports, publications) count.

Comment: The Task Force is looking back to the initial university job announcement to lay out clear guidelines.

## **New Business**

Q. The topic of budgeting responsibilities in regards to chairs came up with Provost Burcham. Do you think there will be difficulty finding individuals to become chair?

Comment: Vicki Graf is holding focus groups with chairs, and recommendations regarding support for chairs will be made.

Q. What are the reasons no one wants to take the chair position?

A. There are a number of concerns:

Faculty managing other faculty without being trained, lack of administrative support, long meetings, paperwork, and inadequate compensation. The position also takes faculty away from teaching/research/curriculum development and puts them into a management type position dealing with problems/issues. Increased 'administrivia' is another issue and in many departments the number of faculty have grown considerably with no comparable growth in administrative support.

Comment: The senate should coordinate with the deans to come up with recommendations for a 5 year departmental plan and submit it to the Provost.

Comment: Providing more administrative assistants should be a first and easy fix.

Comment: Just before Easter break some recommendations will be written up and brought to the senate to move forward.

Comment: A reconstruction plan for committees will be brought to the senate shortly. This will not entail huge changes, we are just looking at condensing as necessary.

Comment: A three week January term is being considered by the calendar committee. I'm leaning towards supporting it as long a time between semesters remains reasonable and it is handled as a summer course, not written into the 10 month contract. The goal is to generate a calendar in which the senate will have a ruling.

Q. What would be taught?

A. An intense three credit course.

Comment: This would also possibly allow for moderately priced study abroad trips to be implemented and made available for students.

Comment: This is a curricular issue and we should determine if a three week course works for the faculty and students.

Q. What's the background on this, when is the faculty consultation going to happen?

A. President Peters will push the calendar committee to come address the senate.

## **Motion 2: Move to adjourn**

**Motion passed: 12 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstain**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Submitted by: Patrick Shanahan

Prepared by: Robert Houghtaling