

PROVISIONAL UNIVERSITY SENATE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

of September 25, 2012

Members Present: Brittany Abraham, Dina Berger, Tim Classen, Shawna Cooper-Gibson, Cass Coughlin, Mary Dominiak, Alanah Fitch, Lisa Gillespie, Tyler Hough, Claudio Katz, Thomas Kelly, Vicki Keough, Muhammed Khan, Terri Kilbane, Joyce Knight, Sarah McDowell, Erin Moriarty, Christopher Peterson, Matthew Razek, Anne Sutter, Mary Van Houten, David Yellen

Ex Officio Members Present: Michael Garanzini, S.J., John Pelissero

Resource Persons Present: Marian Claffey

1. Provost John Pelissero welcomed the participants, opened the meeting, and invited Joyce Knight to say a prayer. Senate members then individually introduced themselves.
2. Fr. Garanzini shared his expectations regarding the Senate. The Senate was born out of a need to improve communication in a complex institution where campuses are separated by physical distances, and where there has been a long tradition of constituent representation (Faculty Council, Staff Council, etc.), but no tradition of coming together as a single body to discuss important issues that affect everyone. The Senate represents an experiment to see if it can be an effective, influential venue for coming together to debate and discuss such issues. Fr. Garanzini is open to how much work the group wants to do and the kind of topics it wants to take up as part of a process of making recommendations to him. In addition, although individual Senate members have natural constituencies that they represent, his hope is that Senators will consider issues from the broader perspective of what's in the best interests of the University.

Tom Kelly used University organizational charts to review how Loyola organizes the work of about 2,600 full-time faculty and staff. He reviewed 6 major organizational areas: administrative services across the university; areas that interact with external audiences (marketing, communication and advancement); academic affairs; student development; health sciences; finance; and capital planning and property management. In addition there are also staff to the President that play an important role with respect to mission, University trustees, and public affairs. The chart designates academic administrators, as well as those who sit on the President's cabinet.

John Pelissero reviewed the Provost's lakeside organizational chart, the organization of which is largely framed by the schools and administrative support areas. He also reviewed the Health Sciences Division (HSD) chart, which includes 800 faculty and staff in Maywood. There are also University centers and school-based centers, as well as free-standing institutes.

3. There was a motion made and seconded to approve the by-laws.
Discussion: While moderating the discussion, Pelissero briefly reviewed key points within the by-laws, noting that the proposed by-laws represent a starting point, and are likely to be amended in the future. Alanah Fitch noted that the procedure for voting to amend the by-laws should allow for voting by e-mail (see section 9).

The by-laws call for voting rights for *ex officio* members. *Ex officio* members are designated as such by virtue of their administrative role in the university (president and two provosts). It was recommended that voting members shall be the 30 elected/appointed members, excluding ex officio members.

It was also recommended that Senate members on leave or unavailable to participate for one or more semesters be replaced by a substitute selected by their unit and approved by the Senate.

It was also recommended that future elections/appointments include a process for staggering terms to insure continuity of membership during the initial years of the Senate.

The motion was called regarding approval of the by-laws as written, revised, and recommended.

The by-laws were unanimously approved by acclamation.

4. Pelissero then moderated a review of the flow chart of advisory groups within shared governance, all of which make recommendations to the President directly, as well as to the Lakeside and HSD Provosts. The President suggested that some of the advisory groups designated in green (as noted on the chart) might want to bring issues directly to the Senate. For example, should the Senate consider the assumptions that the Budget Review Team uses in building the University budget? Also, these groups may wish to come to the Senate to discuss issues that impact everyone (e.g., the Information Technology Executive Steering Committee regarding changes in Groupwise or Blackboard). There are also important issues that the Unified Student Government Association is working on of which the Senate should be aware. The President suggested an Executive Committee of the Senate that helps to organize the work of the larger committee.

Pelissero asked whether meeting 6 times a year would be often enough. He also asked how this group would strike a balance between being inundated with every issue of concern and being advised of significant issues. It could be that this group will want to ask the other advisory groups to present a list of issues. The Chart of Academic Approvals was also reviewed and Pelissero noted that this process captures the review of academic matters only, and is subject to revision.

5. As meeting moderator, Pelissero opened discussion for the election of officers. It was recommended that nominations come from the floor and that Senate members vote by ballot.

Nominations for Chairperson:

Dina Berger
Alanah Fitch
Claudio Katz

Claudio Katz was elected Chairperson.

Nominations for Vice Chairperson:

Dina Berger
Terri Kilbane
Anne Sutter

Anne Sutter was elected Vice Chairperson

Nominations for Secretary:

Shawna Cooper-Gibson

Cass Coughlin

Joyce Knight

Joyce Knight was elected Secretary. With the second highest number of votes, Shawna Cooper-Gibson was appointed Secretary *Pro Tem*.

Following the elections, Claudio Katz then chaired the remainder of the meeting.

6. At the Chair's request, Fr. Garanzini addressed the financial information included in the binders distributed to Senate members; he spent some time explaining the assumptions that underlie the annual building of the budget, e.g., how much in the budget should be set aside for depreciation of the physical plant. By way of background, the budget begins with enrollment projections, student retention rates, the physical capacity of our campuses, and so forth. The budget review process also includes demographic and enrollment considerations, which currently make it feasible for the University to continue to budget for 2,000 new traditional-aged students each year.

Then, with key assumptions and enrollment projections in place, budget modeling begins. For example, one model might consider if tuition is raised x percent, how much of that will translate into salary increases, after taking tuition discounting into account? In addition, there are operating costs that drive up the overall cost of higher education, such as items like salaries and benefits.

Fr. Garanzini stopped at this point so that the Chair could review with the committee possible future agenda items as noted on the agenda. There was a recommendation that the items on the October agenda include:

- a) Task Force Report on Positioning Loyola for the future
- b) Teacher Course Evaluation tool
- c) 15-minute continuation of a discussion of University finances
- d) Discussion of subcommittees

It was also recommended that the Executive Committee be enlarged to include 1 student (Sarah McDowell).

With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Marian Allen Claffey

Assistant Provost for Administration

October 15, 2012