

University Senate
General Assembly
Meeting Minutes
February 23, 2018

Present: Terrence Boyle, Pamela Caughie, Diane Jokinen, Tisha Rajendra, Maria Udo, Stephen Todd, Lorraine Ozar, Zelda Harris, Margaret Heller, Francis Alonzo, Susan Uprichard, Kim Oosterhouse, Ginny McCarthy, Ariana Lewis, Laura Baker, Tim Love Sergio Ortiz, Anusha Manam, Shannon McDonnell, Max Mifsud, Kathleen Meis, Ugo Okere, Phil Hale, Margaret Callahan, Kathleen Steinfels, and Tim Classen.

Delayed: Kathleen Steinfels, Sergio Ortiz, and Ariana Lewis.

Absent: Lisa Gillespie, Richelle Rogers, Marta Lundy, Peter Jones, Michael Simonet, Becky Ramsey, Don Heider, Nancy Tuchman, Jo Ann Rooney, and John Pelissero.

Quorum (16/31): Attendance varied throughout the meeting, with 20-23 voting members present at any time, but quorum was always **satisfied**.

Remote Appearance: Susan Uprichard

Excused Departures: Steven Todd and Sergio Ortiz

Chairperson Zelda Harris opened meeting at 3:06 PM.

I. Welcome Remarks (Prof. Zelda Harris, Chair)

Chairperson Harris reminded Senate of Bylaws, specifically asking for stricter adherence to basic elements of decorum and Rules of Order referenced therein (e.g., waiting to be recognized, not engaging in personal attack, etc.). Given the tense and sometimes spirited discourse that comes with Senate business, Senators are asked to familiarize themselves with terms and processes such as point of order, point of clarification, etc.

II. Review of preliminary agenda and call for motions to amend

Result: Preliminary agenda approved unanimously and without amendment.

III. Review draft minutes from January 26, 2018, and call for motions to amend

Result: Sen. Oosterhouse moved to approve minutes, Sen. Ortiz seconded; motion passed with 21 in favor, 1 abstention.

IV. Information: Student Retention Efforts

Presented by Dr. David Slavsky and Dr. Shawna Cooper-Gibson

**See also, slides provided.*

Dr. Slavsky introduced the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (“OIE”) and its mission to assist the University

Speaking to retention generally, the biggest predictor of retention is ACT score. At Loyola, we outperform our ACT-based retention prediction, which is good. However, we are still not where we would like to be.

A word of caution: focusing on retention may take away from our educational mission. This is to be avoided (hence, why we do not simply raise our retention rate by declining admission to low-ACT applicants).

At Loyola, our retention rate for 2016 is 83.6%. We have the highest retention rate compared to comparable schools. The most critical time is the time between first and second year. Approximately, 53% of students that would graduate within 4 years - leave during this time.

Dr. Slavsky suggested that though there is some targeted work to be done with lower retention sub-groups, OIE suggests that we may not want to focus on the student’s groupings, but rather increasing student-by-student retention efforts across the University (faculty and staff).

Discussion:

Q. What is our “ACT cutoff” and how does this compare with peer institutions?

A. We don’t have one, but we do have an ACT distribution.

Q. What is the correlation between financial aid and retention?

A. If we want to bring in higher ACT students, we would need to divert funding from other sources to offer them more discount. This not financially feasible at Loyola, nor would it be consistent with our mission at LUC.

Dr. Cooper-Gibson then took up the presentation and reported how LUC is enhancing retention efforts. Plan 2020 called upon us to increase retention and graduation rates. Unfortunately, we have dipped slightly by 3% during 2016. Graduation rates, instead, are sitting at about 85% (heading in the right direction).

Tinto's research, National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) benchmarks, and Chickering and Gamson ("7 Principles of Good Practice") all underscore the key role that faculty and staff have in affecting student retention. High-impact practices are one place to look for inspiration and ideas but must be tailored to what is helpful for our students at LUC.

Areas of focus for 2017-18 include policy review, collaboration, data needs, gaps in early and ongoing alerts, faculty and staff trainings. 56% of faculty participate in early alert initiative. In addition, engagement and persistence initiatives have focused on individual support for students (so far).

Council for Student Success is a major driver in this work. This group worked to remove barriers and increase student support. Goal is 360-degree "wrap around" support of students. Student Academic Services has adopted an "appreciative advising" approach that better enables advisors to have meaningful interactions with their advisees. SAS is also working to leverage technology. Some engagement and persistent initiatives include outreach to students with midterm alerts, and student success strategists connecting with students who are at risk to see what we can do to help them.

In addition, there are numerous high-impact practices taking place, including first-year seminars, writing intensive courses, diversity/global learning, and internships.

Discussion

Q. What interventions have been tried with Biology students?

A. Not much yet but we are intending to do so in the future to place students in sections to provide more contact with faculty.

Q. Have you considered mentorship programs? A Gallup poll done at Purdue suggests mentoring is a high-impact practice.

A. SDMA has mentorship programs, but there is more to be done. This is an area to explore.

Q. What does the exit interview look like?

A. Right now, it is an opt-in with advisor. Goal is to enable others (faculty, etc.) to conduct these interviews.

V. Information: Academic Program Review Process
Presented by Dr. Stacy Wenzel and Dr. David Slavsky

**See also, slides provided.*

Dr. Slavsky introduced a new process by which OIE hopes to evaluate the effectiveness and quality of academic programs, stimulate collaborative strategic improvement, and foster a campus-wide conversation about teaching and learning: the Academic Program Review (“APR”)!

The past Higher Learning Commission (“HLC”) accreditation process identified the absence of such a process as an area of deficiency at LUC. Recently, OIE completed a comprehensive review of the core curriculum, which led to identifying areas of improvement. The hope is that a systematic process of review will provide a similar opportunity for all areas of the institution.

An example of a recent win in this area is the introduction of the Neuroscience major, which was the result of advance planning and strategic planning. Dr. Slavsky’s question: “what is the ‘neuro-science’ of 2023?”

Overview of the APR process: will include accreditation-driven accountability measures, a coordinated infrastructure provided by OIE, and a focus on student learning. Assessment/review will include different elements of evidence, reflection, and action, including assessment of learning outcomes, institutional learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and institutional mission and identity. Over the next 5 years, all academic programs will be reviewed via the APR model. Subsequently, all programs will experience a review every 5 -7 years.

Dr. Stacy Wenzel then spoke to the nuts and bolts of the APR process, as proposed. Goal is to complete the APR process for all programs in the next 5 years. Roughly 8-12 units will be active in APR review process at any one time. To assist program leads, an “APR Guidelines” manual will provide guidance and a framework, drawing from existing “refreshed” LUC policies about assessment, but built out to enhance the institutional capacity for this initiative. Involved stakeholders will include units, their leaders and teams, OIE, University APR Committee, external reviewers, Provost, and the University Assessment Committee (recruiting for some of these committees will commence soon).

APR process is intended to be collaborative and cyclical, including focusing the APR, studying and reflecting on and within the unit, compiling feedback and action planning, and engaging in ongoing assessment and progress monitoring.

Topics of inquiry within the APR process will be layered, including those focused on unit mission and learning outcomes, strategic issues identified pre-APR by the unit and Provost, and those topics that are unit- or program-specific (related

to quality and feasibility of curriculum, governance, resources, financials, assessment, etc.).

Lastly, there will be a University Assessment Committee spearheaded by the Provost. More information will be forthcoming as nominees will be sought to be on a committee (spearheaded by the Program Academic Committee).

The University is also starting a University Assessment Committee (looking for diverse representation from departments and schools) – to assess student learning

Discussion

Q. Consideration is being given to possibly adding majors. Will there be a process where, as a result of the APR process, some majors may be removed?

A. APR process will not result directly in removing a major but may provide insight about what is and is not serving our students well. This insight may be helpful in making strategic determinations of this nature down the road.

Q. Might you consider recruiting faculty to assist with committees who have been external reviewers at other institutions?

A. Yes, this is a great idea!

Q. Is regulatory compliance covered/considered in the APR process?

A. Not at this time, but there have been discussions at the Cabinet level about whether there may be a need for a similar process for administrative units/programs at the institution.

**VI. Action Item for Vote: Amendment to Section VII(E) of the University Senate Bylaws as relates to Agenda and Matters for Consideration
*Presented by Sen. Caughie***

The Bylaws concerning various types of voting procedures were read for clarification by Sen. Love.

Motion by Sen. Boyle for **vote by roll call**; seconded by Sen. Ortiz. Discussion about difficulty with voting based on roll call given relatively low attendance presently. **9 in favor, 12 opposed, 0 abstentions. Motion fails.**

Motion by Sen. Rajendra for **vote by email**, with deadline by 5:00pm on Friday, March 2, 2018; seconded by Chairperson Harris. **17 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstention. Motion passes; vote will be solicited by email.**

VII. Number of NTT faculty new hires and breakdown according to college and school
Presented by Provost Callahan

**See also, slides provided.*

Respectively, there were 53 (HSD) and 52 (Lakeside) NTT faculty members hired. Senators requested the information in relation to tenure-track hires (percentage of NTT's and T/TT's among all new hires in schools and departments). In addition, it was requested to know how many NTT's are in temporary one year versus regular lines.

VIII. Information: Policy and practice for hiring deans and directors
Presented by Provost Callahan

Dr. Callahan confirmed the presentation regarding the search process for deans will be posted on the Provost website soon.

IX. Information: Convening of the extraordinary subcommittee to review revised changes to grievance procedure in the Faculty Handbook as prepared by Faculty Council

Chairperson Harris informed members of the extraordinary subcommittee that they will be invited to a meeting to discuss recommended changes to the grievance procedure in the Faculty Handbook. Look out for an email; your participation and attendance is strongly requested.

X. New business and announcements

- **Provost search committee update** – The Provost Search Committee Chaired by Vickie Keough is underway. In the short term, the committee will convene to discuss the scope, etc. In preparation for candidate reviews, etc., Dean Keough would like to share a presentation with the University Senate during the March meeting. This will provide the committee with insight regarding University Senate's suggestions about the professional and personal qualities the group would like to see in the next Provost.
- **Bylaws and Elections Committee** – As we approach election season, please notify Sen. Baker whether you intend to run for re-election.

Motion to adjourn at 5:11 PM, Sen. Mifsud; Sen. Lewis seconded. No objection. Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting: **March 23, 2018, 3-5pm**

- **University Senate Schedule:**
 - ~~September 8~~ ~~3-6pm~~ ~~IC 4th Floor, LSC (?) *combination~~
~~Retreat / First General Meeting~~
 - ~~October 6~~ ~~3-5pm~~ ~~IC 4th Floor, LSC~~
 - ~~November 3~~ ~~3-5pm~~ ~~IC 4th Floor, LSC~~
 - ~~January 26~~ ~~3-5pm~~ ~~IES 123/124~~
 - **February 23** **3-5pm** **IC 4th Floor, LSC *current meeting**
 - ~~March 23~~ ~~3-5pm~~ ~~IES 123/124~~
 - ~~April 27~~ ~~3-5pm~~ ~~IC 4th Floor, LSC~~

- **Executive Committee Schedule:**
 - ~~August 18~~ ~~3-4pm~~ ~~CLC 1233, WTC~~
 - ~~September 22~~ ~~3-4pm~~ ~~CLC 1233, WTC~~
 - ~~October 20~~ ~~3-4pm~~ ~~CLC 1233, WTC~~
 - ~~January 12~~ ~~3-4pm~~ ~~CLC 1233, WTC~~
 - ~~February 9~~ ~~3-4pm~~ ~~CLC 1233, WTC~~
 - ~~March 9~~ ~~3-4pm~~ ~~CLC 1233, WTC~~
 - ~~April 13~~ ~~3-4pm~~ ~~CLC 1233, WTC~~

Respectfully submitted 3/16/2018, AL and TL