

FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, January 27, 2016
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 206, WTC; IC 332, LSC; Cuneo 499, SSOM

Members Present: Bryn, M.; Classen, T.; Conley, J.; Engberg, M.; Gillespie, L.; Graham, D.; Holschen, J.; Knight, A.; Langman, L.; Lash, N.; Melian, E.; Miller, H.; Morris, P.; Ruppman, T.; Shanahan, A.; Shoenberger, A.; Shriberg, D.; Singh, S.; Stemen, D.; Thomas, A.; Uprichard, S.

(NB: technical difficulties in communication with SSOM occurred around 3:30pm; video from SSOM to WTC was lost, but two-way audio was preserved.)

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:05pm by Tim Classen.
2. Approval of December minutes. Some minor edits. Moved: Classen. Seconded: Miller. Motion passed 21-0-0.
3. University Senate (Classen): Last meeting was 12/4/15; the December meeting spent most of its time on the student on the demonstration policy, and the controversy over the Aramark demonstration in particular. Next meeting will be on 2/5/16, with the Extraordinary Committee meeting beforehand on the Handbook revisions. (This is an open meeting.) We have the prerogative to go forward with our revisions on our own, of course; but US support (which we are likely to get) will strengthen the likelihood of their eventual acceptance by the Administration. Any differences in edits can be reconciled, I believe.
4. SSOM/HSD (Uprichard): No updates. I will approach and contact the BSI committee about our motion to create survey on faculty feedback. (It might be a good idea to have AAUP check out the survey before it goes out.) A new BSI committee chair will be coming in in February. (Things are slow on the Maywood campus due to the move into the new building.) JH: this year (July 2015-June 2016) is the first year clinical faculty will be submitting data for point calculation under the (somewhat different) plan. Clinical faculty may want to do something like the survey once they see how points are allocated.
5. Chair's Report (Classen):
 - Presidential Search Committee: We're meeting next on 2/12. At that time we should see the first pool of applicants from the initial ads on the Isaacson Miller and Loyola websites. By the end of March we should have winnowed that pool down to about 10 applicants, whom we will meet in two hour interviews out at O'Hare. In April, we should have our finalists to campus for on-campus (nonpublic) interviews.
 - Question: What do you expect to be the size of the pool? TC: hard to tell. The ad requires the applicants to be Catholic, which will shape the pool importantly. Will have to see what they think about the issues currently on campus, (such as for example the large

number of “Dreamers,” undocumented students, at SSOM, almost 10% of the class)and what they have been able to learn from other sources, such as social media.

- Comment: one of the points that emerged at the US discussion was the need to have a president who is broad-minded, tolerant of different perspectives, open to an understanding of new ideas in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary studies – perhaps not a progressive, but certainly not a traditionalist. TC: the Senate was pretty clear that the new president should be an academic, well published, someone who is personally familiar with academic life, not primarily a business person.

6. SEIU/Faculty Forward issue:

- Union vote passed 142-82. 69% of those eligible (326 in all, FT/PT NTT in CAS) voted; 63% of these in favor. Union chapter and CBU will probably be formed this coming fall. The University still has the option of appealing the NLRB ruling concerning our exemption on religious grounds. It is at this point unclear whether or not they intend to do this. (St. Xavier U. locally has such an appeal ongoing.) This of course poses problems to us about the relationship of these newly unionized faculty to the Faculty Handbook, and to what extent its provisions (and protections) still extend to them, in the event that the union becomes the negotiating agent with the University administration. Also, it is an open question how the increased salaries which (it is to be expected) will result from the new union contract may impact regular departmental faculty salary budgets. (Or whether the union will demand equal salaries regardless of discipline, possibly affecting competitive hiring in some areas.) The whole matter may require Faculty Handbook discussions and revisions. (It may also affect FC representation numbers.) We can also perhaps expect further extensions of union coverage into other schools at LUC. TC: I will try to find out more from SEIU on its understanding of the issues.

7. Handbook Revisions (TC):

- Paul Jay (CAS English) expressed a concern that faculty members serving on these committees (Faculty Appeals and Faculty Hearing) be *elected* faculty representatives. The Hearing Committee language reads: “*The Faculty Hearing Committee shall be comprised of five tenured faculty members, of whom at least three will be members elected by Faculty Council from among its members, and of whom at most two may be faculty members who are not current members of the Council but who will have been nominated by Council members on the basis of specialty or expertise. Two alternates will also be chosen. The choice of members of the hearing committee should be on the basis of their objectivity and competence and of the regard in which they are held in the academic community.*” I have inserted language asking that Appeals Committee be members of the Senate; I am

worried that we will be unable to staff a total of 14 positions on 2 committees out of exclusively FC and US members. Also, issue of legal counsel at hearings; if students can have legal counsel present at adjudications, why not faculty? We will hear from the next US meeting what its concerns (and possible modification suggestions, if any) are.

8. Hiring process for Deans

- Faculty have expressed concerns about recent decanal appointments (Edu, CAS, QSB). Interim deans have been promoted to permanent posts without national searches (or *any* searches). Will ask Faculty Affairs Cttee. to consider a motion calling for the University to establish a standardized, university-wide policy/process for replacing deans (and provosts). Might also have an impact on high rate of turnover of deans recently, which is not good for the University.

9. Paid research leaves, summer research stipends, lack of equity salary adjustment pool

- Research leaves '16-'17: 14 funded, 19 not. (Back in '11-'12 it was 21 funded; since then it has been 14.) Discussion of resumption of sabbatical proposal, under a new president.
- Summer stipends '16: 32 funded, 36 not.
- No equity pay adjustment pool for FY16 (confirmed by an email from Acting President Pelissero); discussions are under way for such a pool in '17. Goal is still 70th percentile of peer group for FT TT faculty. Enrolments are impacting such funds; hoping for a March visit from Robert Munson & Paul Roberts to address these issues.

10. Committee Reports

- Academic Affairs (TC): Faculty assessment issues. Members should collect data on FAS and IDEA implementation in different schools.
 - Comment: IDEA has been a huge issue in CAS. Student course evaluations were left open during exam weeks and final grade submissions window; IDEA criteria input by instructors at the beginning of term for evaluation were in many instances lost and/or not reported in eval reports to the chairs. Many complicated email exchanges between chairs, Center for Ignatian Pedagogy, and Provost's office about implementation problems of IDEA. Move to Campus Labs IDEA platform/interface for input has been extremely problematic for chairs.
- Service (JC): Representation issues for FC
 - Right now it's one seat per 30 faculty (except for clinical in SSOM). Still, we get vacancies (particularly in CAS). Should we change the ratio from 1/30 to 1/35 or 1/40? This would not impact

larger schools and units, but *would* impact smaller ones (like Libraries). We might consider selective application of higher ratios to larger units with regular vacancies.

- How do faculty perceive FC? How can we promote FC representation? Strategies for promotion of FC's work: in January, annualized reports on FC results, things being worked on, request for concerns; also reps should speak to their Deans and program directors and solicit help for promoting FC activities and initiatives.
- Seeing that elections are coming up soon, should we proceed with these initiatives this year or wait for next? Discussion, especially of ways to promote nominations for election to FC. Not ready to make a decision about numbers at this time; we will review the numbers in expectation of changes next year.

11. Motion to adjourn: Lash. Second: Miller. Meeting adjourned 4:56pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary