



Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

**Faculty Council Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, October 28 2020 3 – 5 pm**

Via zoom: Meeting ID: 955 8922 0565
Password: sharedgov

Member Present: T. Artemchik; L. Baber; T. Blackmond Larnell; D. Borys; J. Brown; P. Caughie; I. Cornelius; H. Dahari; t. davis; M. Dentato; Q. Dong; J. Donoghue; J. Elsky; J. Holschen; B. Johnson; T. Jules, N. Lash; C. Martin; K. Mirza; K. Moore; G. Moran; J Nicholas; B Ohsowski; J. O'Rourke; P. Patel; L. Pope; E. Roberts; P. Rosenblatt; A. Shoenberger; A. Silva; W. Tangarife; G. Thiruvathukal; S. Todd; S. Uprichard (*ex officio*),

Guests: Badia Ahad (Vice Provost); Laura Buchs (Equity and Title IX Investigator); Norberto Gryzwacz (Provost); Tim Love (Executive Director for Equity & Compliance, Title IX Coordinator)

1. Minutes and Agenda.

It is moved and seconded that the minutes from the September meeting be adopted. Jules asks members if other items need to be added to the agenda. A councilor mentions the report from the Academic Affairs Committee; Jules indicates it can be discussed at November's meeting and perhaps at the end of this meeting. Jules indicates that he wants to discuss the addition of a member to the executive committee during new business. Procedurally, Jules urges council members to check updates on Teams. We have requests from administrators for faculty to serve on committees, which is good for the Council but only if we are forthcoming.

2. Faculty Handbook Revisions.

Jules opens up with a history of the handbook and how these changes came about. Under the provisions of the handbook, the Faculty Council can initiate revisions. Jules began this process after consulting with then provost Callahan, realizing that the move to a one-provost model left the handbook out of date. He then appointed a committee that worked through last academic

year. The President also established a task force on shared governance to examine all of the shared governance institutions. President Rooney put revisions to the handbook on hold pending the report of that task force. Jules also learned that the administration would prefer a handbook committee more representative of the entire faculty.

A councilor asks about the timeline of the task force and its report. Jules indicates that they started in the fall of 2019 but were delayed by the pandemic. He hopes for a final report by the next Council meeting, so that we have the chance to give feedback.

Another member indicates that we are not being asked to accept the handbook revisions made by the committee as a final document, but rather to ensure that the Council continues work based on the revisions already made; they are taking notes about thoughts or feedback. Several members stress how important the handbook is as a guarantee of faculty rights and shared governance.

Adoption of this motion is made and seconded: “The Faculty Council endorses the revision of the Faculty Handbook drafted by the 2019-20 Faculty Handbook Ad Hoc Committee, with the suggested changes mentioned below. We also approve the formation of a 2020-21 Handbook Ad Hoc Committee to continue this work.” The resolution passes, with 34 yeases and one abstention.

3. Tim Love and Laura Buchs, from the Office of Equity and Compliance (OEC).

Jules introduces Love and Buchs. Love indicates that the office was founded in January 2019; Buchs has been here for 18 months, came here for this job. Love gives background on Title IX; his office not the same as Title IX office. Pursuant to Federal Government regulations issued in May 2020 regulations, they focused on Title IX compliance and comprehensive policy.

OEC distinguishes between formal complaints and reports. Reports can come from multiple sources, be anonymous. Complaint comes formally by member of community. All complains investigated, but not all reports are. There is no longer a legal mandate for all Loyola employees to report information about sexual misconduct. Decided to maintain most of obligation, but took into account the possible chilling effect in particular classes, of disclosures of past events that did not take place on campus or involve Loyola. But still must report when person who experienced misconduct is a minor (mandated by Illinois law), while survivor is or was a Loyola student, or when an alleged perpetrator affiliated with LUC.

The floor is yielded to Laura Buchs. She explains that the department of education has narrowed what constitutes Title IX sexual harassment. There is now a requirement that the conduct be “bold, severe, and pervasive.” She lays out process on graphic. A hearing is held, parties must be able to see or hear one another. Hearings conducted by somebody who was not involved as an investigator. Both parties can cross-examine directly or through advisors (which are required). The board makes a finding of responsible or not. There is a right to appeal, and bases for such appeals. This appeals process hasn’t been triggered yet, but they are ready to go.

Love looks forward to revisions in faculty handbook, understands importance of this document. He stresses that the key take aways are that the OEC is one office, and part of the university's response to these issues. OEC handles student, faculty, and staff, if allegations are on equity-based and involved harassment. Decisions made in alliance with law and institutional values. He stresses sincere desire to find problems and address them in compliance with the law. Acknowledges current environment, commitment to anti-racism; if units think helpful, Love and Buchs are happy to come and discuss. He cannot talk about specific cases.

A councilor indicates that the current handbook discourages sexual relations between faculty and students. They ask if such cases fall under the purview of OEC. Love indicates that this is not something they have addressed, since there is no prohibition of such relationships at this time.

A councilor asks about whether an incident on Loyola's Rome campus would fall under the purview of OEC. Love clarifies that the university can address such matters, whether of Title IX or discrimination, but not under Title IX provisions because of the new mandates from the federal government. But absolutely it will be addressed by the university just under different provisions.

A councilor expresses appreciation for the greater leeway for classroom discussions of these matters, and not having them automatically trigger an obligation to report. Love indicates his support for this change as well. Love and Buchs close by stating their enthusiasm about coming to individual departments or units.

4. Sabbatical Policy.

Vice Provost Badia Ahad joins the meeting and is introduced. She begins a discussion of moving away from paid research leave policy, to more automatic policy more in line with every other university with somewhat of a research aspiration. She was asked by the provost to improve on what we have. She thinks the proposal circulated to the Council does so, but is happy to take feedback before taking to Dean's Council.

One councilor points out that the description of full pay for a semester sabbatical and half pay for a year's leave is reversed in the document. Another says long ago, there was a strong push on Faculty Council to get sabbatical policy approved. Based on concerns raised then, they have a question: for some, this move might reduce leaves that they can get. Ahad responds that that is accurate. The same councilor asks if there would be possibilities for other kinds of leaves to be approved, or would leaves strictly work along timeline laid out in this document. Ahad is not sure about a full response to the question – some faculty will have fewer leaves if this system is adopted. There is a real equity problem with current system. Provost Gryzwacz indicates that if faculty receive outside fellowships, from places like the Library of Congress, he definitely wants to make taking them possible. Ahad reaffirms this, says that that is a matter for the subvention policy. It would involve bringing the matter to a dean, as the funding for leave comes from colleges anyway.

Another councilor follows up on the topic of the impact of a sabbatical system on other leaves. Ahad notes that Vice Provost for Research Meharvan Singh is reviewing the current subvention policy, which does not work particularly well in the humanities. She will be getting his input.

Jules asks if the Faculty Development Review Committee (FDRC) would be reduced to just reviewing summer stipend applications, and whether current faculty would be “grandfathered” into the system, since they can now apply every three years. He also wonders about the 6 year timetable, and whether five years would be more appropriate. Finally, given that individual units are paying for the cost, will there be a policy about yearlong versus half year leaves?

Ahad indicates that she is open to new configuration of FDRC an that she has served on that committee. It is a lot of labor to review both summer stipend and leave applications. In terms of 5 versus 6 years, based on looking at twenty other institutions; she has never seen a 5 year policy. A whole year at full pay is not financially viable. She suggest that there will be a policy about that half or full year leave.

A discussion ensues about multiple leaves, including some funded by external fellowships, and how that would shape the six year count in the plan that Ahad is proposing. Ahad indicates that the six years applies to sabbaticals, not other leaves, as you do not want to disincentive faculty from applying for and securing such leaves.

Another councilor asks about post-tenure leaves, wondering if this meant that an assistant professor would receive a leave after a third year review, but then have to wait 6 years. Ahad indicates that under her proposal, this would not be the case, that a leave after mid-probationary review is not the same as a sabbatical; she will clarify.

Motion is made and seconded to indicate Council approval of the policy, with suggested changes mentioned in the discussion. A councilor indicate that they are still uncertain about how the clock works and how external funding would be factored in. The provost acknowledges that this is an important point, but that the answer is not obvious. There is a real question about equity on the faculty, but on the other hand, you want to reward people who secure outside fellowships and funding. Other councilors ask about the logistics, and indicate that it is important for leaves to be staggered. Ahad indicates she has another meeting and wonders if the objections and concerns could be written down.

Jules moves to table the motion and instead to compile comments and vote electronically. His motion to table is seconded and passed.

5. Spring Break and Election Day.

Jules summarizes the decision to have spring break be spread out across the spring semester, rather than coming as an entire week. He shifts the discussion to election day, whose status he understands will be left to the discretion of deans in terms of how much synchronous instruction to recommend. Provost Gryzwacz indicates that accreditation regulations constrained the school from making it a formal holiday this year.

Administration is considering whether to make it a holiday in the future. For Spring break, rationale was to not cancel break because of feedback from the Council in its last meeting; students also want it. Traveling can cause greater spreading of the virus, so wanted to limit that.

One councilor makes a strong plea for cancelling classes on election day. They say that it should be a national holiday and that we are battling voter suppression in this country. At Loyola we educate people to exercise the obligations of citizenship. Many students may be waiting in line for hour after hour in order to vote. They urge the provost to make a strong case for cancelling classes on election day in the future. The provost expresses agreement on the substance of the points and notes that making Juneteenth a holiday has contributed to the situation this year.

6. New Business.

Jules notes that a member of the Executive Committee is stepping down; this person has found it challenging being a non-tenure track faculty member on that committee, especially since the committee has been out in front on certain issues and signed public letters, and they do not enjoy the protections of tenure. At some point those dynamics need to be discussed, but for now we need a new member. A councilor nominated Graham Moran, and the nomination is accepted. Moran is elected by acclamation.

Discussion shifts to the committees. A chair for Faculty Affairs is needed? Peter Rosenblatt volunteers and is elected by acclamation. The handbook ad-hoc committee is then discussed. Jules will see if he is able to be chair, or if another member needs to be selected.

The meeting adjourns.