

Faculty Council Agenda
September 29, 2021
3:00-5:00

Members in Attendance: Baber; Berg; Blackmond Larnell; Brown; Cornelius; Dahari; davis; Dentato; Devery; Dong; Dunderdale; Elsky; Gawlinski; Gupta-Mukherjee; Haske; Holschen; Johnson; Jules; Kang; McGuigan; Moran; Nicholas; O'Rourke; Ohsowski; Patel; Pope; Rosenblatt; Shoenberger; Silva; Tangarife; Todd; Heer (ex-officio)

Guests: Provost Margaret Callahan; Director of the Core Dana Garbarski

The meeting begins with a moment of silence for Professor Michael S. Kelly of the School of Social Work, who died by suicide on September 2. Photos of Kelly and his family were displayed, and a colleague from Social Work described his work and character; consistent with the wishes of Kelly's family, information about mental health assistance and suicidal tendencies were shared.

The minutes from the May and August meetings were approved, with minor corrections noted.

Jules welcomes University Core Curriculum Director Dana Garbarski. She begins by reiterating the framework of the core curriculum. The Core should hold true to the principles of the humanist Jesuit tradition but shape students to engage in the world's issues and complexities. There are some areas of the core for which students take one course, and others for which students take two courses. In the latter case, they take a foundational or tier one course and then they take a tier two course in those areas. The curriculum evolves over time given faculty turnover, so it should be regularly assessed. The current version has been in place since 2012, and assessed only once. Regular assessment is important both in substance and in terms of renewing accreditation. Two issues she wanted to fix when she became Director are the fact that we are the only school of our size with no requirement related to diversity and issues in terms of timing, meaning that some students put off core classes until later on in their studies, to their detriment. Last year she tried to gather feedback from departments and schools, looked at past assessment. Feedback from ideas proposed by Provost Grywacz generated lots of smaller scale feedback from individual departments. She hopes that they can be incorporated. Some sense was conveyed of needing to incorporating courses that looked at values that cross the curriculum, particularly in terms of global diversity and diversity within American society. Social justice is not a mode of inquiry, but it is a value. Faculty expressed a uniform sense that the original timeline for revising the core was too rushed, with which she agrees. Changing structure of core was not supported, especially in terms of how interdisciplinary requirement would work. There was also strong support for maintaining the size of the core. Current provost agrees, and the structure will not be changed.

Working groups now will be looking at refining learning outcomes, making them amenable to assessment in the future in the same ways we assess departments and schools. Also wants departments to look at courses that haven't been offered, other courses that might be offered in the future. In response to question, she indicates that she is working with Office of Institutional Effectiveness. A Council member asks about philosophy and other requirements and where they stand. Garbarski says that they are staying the same, but in case of philosophy, they have 3 or 4 core courses that haven't been offered; that needs to be updated, either by teaching them or removing and perhaps replacing them. So there are opportunities for these sorts of updates. The member follows up by asking about making the core more anti-racist. Garbarski says that that should be part of the lens through which the core and its courses are currently being assessed. A larger change of the structure is a few years down the road. Now there is not a diversity requirement, but right now 30% of courses in core are listed as addressing themes of diversity. Provost Callahan asks about the numbers of students who take diversity-related core classes; she thinks it is about 60%. Garbarski indicates that she will get her that number. The members follows up on their previous questions, arguing that this aspect of the core should be made more intentional. A different member asks about inclusion of library faculty in these efforts. Some past efforts have included them, some not. Although they do not teach in the core, in a sense they see across is; they notice a lack of explicit outcomes about information literacy. This members hopes that library faculty will be included in this process. Garbarski says that she has reached out to Dean of Libraries after last spring's letter from the Council made a similar point, but has received no response yet. They agree to follow up on this matter.

A different Council member observes that some changes are philosophical, like incorporating diversity or anti-racism. Others are structural, like changing sequence. Could any of these be piloted, they ask? They arrived at start of the current core, and remember some staged implementation. Garbarski expresses enthusiasm for this idea. Another member thanks her for her presentation and responsiveness to the Council's earlier concerns.

Jules offers a set of updates to the Council. He acknowledges that the provost is in attendance. The Management, Policy, and Command (MPC) structure is the first subject. The MPC Committee itself has only met once over the summer, and once the school year began, is not making academic decisions in the ways the Council felt it was previously. Such decisions are now going through the Academic Continuity Working Group (ACWG). Jules notes that federal regulations mandate the existence of such an MPC structure, which was activated for the pandemic. President Rooney open to considering shared governance sit on these structures going forward. The Chair of the Council's Academic Affairs Committee is now on the ACWG, and can be a voice for our concerns and priorities. One member argues that we are not in an emergency in anymore, and shared governance bodies such as the Council are regularly meeting, so they do not understand why any aspect of the MPC structure is still in operation. Callahan says that they are still operating under it, but discussing when it would be abandoned. The hope is to leave it as soon as possible.

Campus numbers look great, but COVID is still here. So are emergency management procedures, for the short term. Federal mandates require that we have this structure. Having faculty on it is a good place to start. We have learned from implementation, she says, and administrators have heard loud and clear about desire for faculty participation. As soon as she knows when they will come out of emergency management, she will let us know. Right now we are not done yet.

Jules turns to the question of speaker contracts. What should be happening is not what is actually happening. Speakers coming to speak to a class and getting an honorarium should sign a piece of paper, not a contract per se. Otherwise, there should be no contract. He is awaiting the actual contract for commencement speakers and keynote speakers. The provost thought this had been sorted out years ago. She says that the General Counsel is working on a memo for deans and business managers. If faculty know of a situation where this is being misapplied, she encourages us to contact her directly. One member says they do not understand why this has been so confusing for so many units over so many years. The concern is not just the clause about a speech adhering to "Jesuit, Catholic values," but also provisions for intellectual property rights, which are an issue in a current CAS situation. Like other Loyola faculty, this member regularly gives talks at other universities, and they have never been asked to sign a contract like this. Callahan asks this member to directly send her the correspondence about the CAS situation.

Jules turns to the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, who begins discussing faculty concerns about COVID protocol compliance. The Committee has received particular concerns about students reporting that they are COVID positive, but never being contacted by contact tracers. They point to the fact that the guidelines indicate contact tracers will make contact only if there are symptoms or a positive test and the student has been in class with them within 48 hours of a positive test. So it is quite possible that faculty will have COVID positive students but not be contacted. In any event, it is helpful for faculty to encourage students who test positive to report the results to the university. Another member indicates that the positivity rate is very low, .48%, which is reassuring. But the university is considering perhaps mandating weekly COVID tests for everybody. Another members says that around Thanksgiving, the administration will decide whether current protocols stay in place. The classroom set up, however, is fixed for the year. The university is working with Shield to try to speed up testing results, especially since Friday tests have been slow in arriving.

Committee reports begin. Faculty Affairs reports that they are working with the Office of the Provost on matters of recruitment and retention of faculty from underrepresented groups. They also want to look at differential service commitments between white faculty and faculty of color. As of the academic year 2018-19, 41% of undergraduates are from underrepresented groups, but only 17% of tenure track faculty are, with only 4% being either Black or Latinx. There are also significant gender disparities, with fewer and fewer female faculty as one goes up the ranks. Significant losses of faculty from underrepresented groups occur over time, with a much higher percentage of white faculty who enter as assistant professors remaining at Loyola and earning tenure than those from other backgrounds. So it is reasonable to think that improving the climate and support on

campus could end up making a substantial difference in terms of composition of the faculty. The Faculty Affairs Committee is pleased that the administration takes these issues as seriously as it seems to at this moment.

The Chair of Academic Affairs indicates that they have just received information from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness about faculty evaluations and how they differ by gender.

The Faculty Handbook Committee reports that it now has fifteen members, given new additions from the School of Communication and Continuing Studies. The full committee has been meeting Thursday afternoons, and has been divided into four working groups, reviewing the text that they have to written and revised to date. They hope to finish that in a few weeks, and to send a revised draft document to the administration to begin their review. Jules indicates that he has been speaking with Provost and President, they are currently on track. Provost Callahan clarifies that proposals come to her office first, rather than to the General Counsel. She is looking forward to seeing the work and anxious to move through this process. A member points out that one the faculty member from School of Communication is actually an administrator; the Handbook Committee Chair says they will look into this.

A Council representative on the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) indicates that it met last week, and that a survey about health insurance will be coming out. This is a follow up but a more extensive one than the one that Council did. The contents were vetted by BAC, and they encourage us to encourage faculty members to respond. The committee will be considering whether to maintain a discount for health care screening. They also report that the BAC looked at some complaints that came out of original survey. Many issues are in fact issues pertaining to all health care companies. The lead time for changes is about a year ahead of time. Lastly, there is a system at Aetna to allow a provider to register with Aetna. They are trying to expand network, especially in mental health, the area of the most complaints. A Council member asks about need to check in with staff. The survey is going to staff as well, and there are staff members of BAC. Furthermore, there will be a tweaking of salary grades for current enrollment, from 3 slots to 4. A Council member pushes back on the question of all health plans being inconvenient – that was not the conclusion from the survey done by the Council. Another member echoes these concerns. A third member observes we weren't notified in advance when switch made from Blue Cross to Aetna, so they are confused about why this takes so long. The brevity of the enrollment period is another issue, and they wonder if that is mandated. The BAC representative indicates that the deadline is instituted as late as it is because of possible tax changes, so that they can be considered. This member indicates that there is some concern about sharing data with Loyola.

Jules changes discussion to the question of extending the withdrawal ('W') deadline from November 5 to November 12. He reminds the Council that Provost Gryzwacz brought this issue to us, and we agreed to move it but were promised it would not be moved again. Council, Senate, Provost, and student interests discussed these matters, and Gryzwacz moved it, against consensus of the Council. This year the issue has come up again. The ACWG proposed to move it by a week. By the time W deadline arrives, many students only have one data point or grade. That is one

issue. We cannot dictate what and how people teach, but this is a serious issue. The other issue is around the W and a process for determining it. He and the Provost have a proposal for a process. He yields to Callahan. She praises the summary. She met with students, the issue came up from them. Yes, in the midst of COVID, even though we are meeting on campus, our lives still stressed by the pandemic – students, faculty, staff alike. She does not want anything permanent, that would require serious long-term study. She proposes that for this term only that we agree to extension. Understands we had understanding with previous provost, but the pandemic has lingered. Needs detailed study for longer term, and then we could make a decision with detailed information.

One member indicates that students should be incorporated into the process. Another indicated that they have changed their teaching to ensure that there are more assessments well before the W deadline, which students seem to have appreciated. A third member indicates that they are hesitant to approve any change to academic policies made outside of the shared governance structures, as a matter of process rather than substance. Provost Callahan replies that she brought this to the ACWG, so perhaps this point is her fault. Since she was not Provost last year, she did not realize that the matter had been brought before them last year. The Council representative on the ACWG indicated that they pushed back on the question of process before the ACWG. Provost Callahan expresses her appreciation for their doing so.

Another Council member observes that the mid-term grade function on LOCUS could be used more; many faculty do not. An additional member supports this point, arguing for the importance of mid-term grade alerts – C- and below is the norm.

LG says mid-term grade on Locus could be used more, many faculty don't. BO echoes on mid-term grade alerts. C- and below is the usual norm. Another member expresses appreciation that the Provost is not simply letting ACWG decide this, but rather working through the matter with faculty. They agree that it is an irresponsible pedagogically to not have feedback pretty consistently throughout the term. But this does leave the role of the Council unclear, at least to them: the normal structure of Deans and departments could convey this message, but should the Council write to faculty directly to urge them to give assessments early in the semester. They observe that nobody has weighed in on the question of the changed deadline itself, which to them is immaterial. They make a formal motion that the Council passes on the motion to move the W deadline by a week, and to work with the Provost in studying this for the future. Extensive discussion ensues about whether this motion should be voted on. Many comments underscore the importance of the faculty giving timely assessments; this issue will be incorporated into the Handbook as well. Callahan praises the discussion as one of the best she's seen the Council engage in and says she looks forward to working with Academic Affairs on this matter. The member who made the motion withdraws it.

The agenda shifts back to a committee report from Service and Communications. They need to evaluate four deans this year. The committee Chair their predecessor as head of the committee. Will be meeting to discuss short-term and long-term tasks. They review results of a survey of the Council members. There

is a strong consensus that results of faculty surveys of deans should be shared. They met with the Provost this morning and emphasize this is a healthy process, all about helping the deans. The committee also needs to start sending out the newsletter, Council members should send items they want included.

Discussion about evaluations of Deans continues. One member notes that every faculty member is evaluated by chairs and deans annually. They find this helpful, so why not give faculty a chance to provide feedback to chair or dean? Jules refers to the Jamaican psychic Ms. Clio, since just had a conversation about this with the Provost. Provost Callahan clarifies that she does evaluate deans every year. Every 3 years for surveying faculty is more common, but that does not preclude a unit doing it more often. Callahan encourages faculty with issues to go straight to chair or dean. She does offer coaching when deans encounter difficulties.

Another member raises an issue with undergraduate stipends. In at least some cases, stipend and fellowship awards are being applied to outstanding balances first, rather than coming to students as a paycheck. Other members echo this concern. It will be referred to a Council committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin H. Johnson, Secretary