

Loyola Marymount University

Faculty Senate Minutes

March 27, 2008

Bellarmino Dean's Conference Room

3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Present: John Dorsey, Ellen Ensher, Charles Erven, Rudy Fleck, Paul Harris, Christina Hennessey, Lily Khadjavi, Blake Mellor, Jennifer Pate, K. J. Peters, Jonathan Rothchild, Susan Scheibler, Patrick Shanahan, and Seth Thompson.

Excused: Jeffery Davis, Patricia Douglas, Sonny Espinoza, Vicki Graf, Amir Hussain, Jok Madut Jok, Gary Kulek, Yvette Lapayese, Chun Lee, Damon Rago, Nina Reich, James Roe, Beth Serlin and Mel Mendelson.

Welcome

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

Call for approval of the March 13, 2008 meeting minutes.

Approval of Minutes

Motion 1: Approval of 3/13/08 minutes.

Motion passed: 11 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstain

Announcements

- The new well organized CAO page is up and running. It houses a number important faculty related documents including a faculty committee preference form which can be filled out and submitted on-line.
- Voting ends tomorrow for faculty handbook revision. Ballots will be counted on Tuesday April 1st. Please remind your constituents to vote.
- The committee restructuring report will be in by April 10. The next Faculty Senate administration will have to implement any changes. Mary McCullough is going on sabbatical next semester we therefore need to appoint a new committee on committees chair.
- A faculty housing survey is being created on surveymonkey.com and will hopefully be online by next week. Please encourage faculty, particularly junior faculty to participate.
- The calendar committee recently met and it looks like J-term is off the table for next year. It will likely be a standard calendar next academic year. The proposed Easter Monday holiday is probably out; however split finals are a definite possibility.
- The Foley Bookstore contract is up in 2010. LMU is considering opening the contract to open bidding.

Reports

1) Core Curriculum Discussion: Matt Dillon and Judy Scalin

- The core curriculum revision is at an exciting time as we continue to move forward with this collaborative effort. We have a document that distills two years of thinking and research. It also sets up why we are doing this, what the process will be and provides some models. This will eventually become a web document and include a diagram.
- The faculty controls the core and we need the Faculty Senate to both endorse this document and determine how the new core will go into place. We also need the senate to set in motion what votes are needed working back from 2011 and determine which model to ultimately go with. The committee is currently meeting with target groups and will later meet with every department. The departments will ultimately be developing the core and courses.

Discussion

Q. You have planned backwards from 2011, at what point is it appropriate for the senate to approve the models and recommendations?

A. The models are set. We will be implementing a 10 plus or a 3 plus (more radical) core experience.

Q. Do you anticipate the faculty voting on a single model endorsed by the senate?

A. This is a decision for the senate. All faculty should be informed and by next November the committee will have met with all departments.

Comment: Models A and B represent two different philosophies and I think the faculty should be consulted independently (of the models) of whether we should change the core in this way.

Q. In terms of the categories, is it the case that Model B places an inordinate burden on certain departments? It seems just the mechanism of offering courses would be easier for some departments.

A. Model B is a skeletal core. Logistics would likely be a challenge, but it is worthy to look at and do the work. We have not crunched any numbers at this point.

Comment: The departmental planning may take years, therefore it maybe a healthier attitude to grow it more organically piece by piece.

Comment: Other universities such as Loyola Chicago revised their core in 18 months. It can be done with the will of the faculty and the administration. The President's Core Curriculum institute (PCCI) is focused specifically on growing these courses.

Comment: I imagine this process entailing making certain strategic changes leading to a revised Model A and Model B by November 15, 2008. We could then proceed with one of two routes; presenting to the senate, which separately makes a decision on model A or model B. The other option is to present to the senate and then let the faculty vote on model A or model B.

Comment: I admire the committee's work and I'm thinking about the process. What could go wrong is what happens with propositions in CA when not enough information is provided. We need to really lay out the case. The resulting negotiations may really raise the role of the senate.

Comment: I agree, we anticipate that the website and provided links will provide a resource to get more information.

Comment: The faculty workload committee has also struggled with the question of process. We created a flow chart of how the decision is made and we could share it with you. The senate and core curriculum committee could work together to collaboratively revise it.

Q. Where in the core do you see the basic courses fitting in? In particular, English, Math, and Foreign Language courses.

A. They are in here and we want to reinforce writing and dealing with quantitative reasoning in two or more places in core.

Q. As far as the newly developed courses, how do we institutionalize these courses and plan for retirement and sabbaticals?

A. The PCCI addresses how these courses will become institutionalized.

Comment: In the new core, many of the courses currently running will still be taught or re-imagined.

2) Library moving journal subscription to electronic: Glenn Johnson-Grau, Tobeylynn Birch, and Kristine Brancolini

- The Library's movement from paper to electronic-only subscriptions will initially consider a relatively small number of titles, approximately 400-500 for which we are assured perpetual access. Many academic libraries have moved more aggressively to an electronic-only format due to constraints on budgets and space. Publishers are increasingly moving to an electronic-based business model because it is simply becoming too expensive to maintain the infrastructure to support dual formats.

Discussion

Q. If we have an electronic subscription and we unsubscribe, do we lose access to those years?

A. No, we look for subscriptions that provide perpetual access so that we can keep access to those copies.

Q. What if a publishing company goes bankrupt, do we lose access?

A. No, many publishers are now members of portico a third party electronic archiving service. If a company goes belly-up, there is still access to old copies.

Q: The Cal State universities bought subscriptions as part of a consortium giving them a better deal and access to a collection of journals. Is there a similar option for LMU?

A. Yes, we do a lot of our purchasing this way. We are in a part consortium of private colleges.

Comment: Some of the database search tools change and are replaced by tools that are not as good. There should be some consideration of the search agent as well.

Comment: Unfortunately, some search tools only have one interface and if the vendor changes the site the users are forced to use the new tool.

3) New Business

- The search for a new honors program director has been paused due to a communication issue.

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