

FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, September 23, 2015
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 206, WTC; IC 332, LSC; Cuneo 405, SSOM

Members Present: Battaglia, G.; Bohanon, H.; Bryn, M.; Classen, T.; Conley, J.; Gillespie, L.; Graham, D.; Holschen, J.; Jellish, S.; Keller, R.; Knight, A.; Langman, L.; Lash, N.; Lombardo, R.; Miller, H.; Morris, P.; Ruppman, T.; Shoenberger, A.; Singh, S.; Stemen, D.; Thomas, A.; Uprichard, S. (NB: Technical failures by ITS prevented remote two-way participation of members from Maywood and LSC campuses, who were only able to hear.)

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:20pm by Tim Classen.
2. Approval of April minutes. Moved: Lash. Seconded: Morris. Motion passed 16-0-0.
3. SSOM/HSD (for Battaglia): Addressing the concern of the clinical faculty (~500) at Maywood about the move from LUC to Trinity health insurance: spoke with Tom Kelly. The Trinity insurance system actually offers more plans and options than are available to faculty at the ROL (“Rest Of Loyola”). Tom Kelly estimates that year or the year after the University will be adding more plans (including HSA’s) to insurance for the ROL. I will continue to work with Tom Kelly, with George Battaglia, and with Susan Uprichard to try to resolve the still outstanding issues having to do with the BSI salary system.
4. University Senate report: We will meet for the first time this year on 9/25. The agenda includes approval of the new student demonstration guidelines, and a line item about the presidential search committee. The Senate seems to be dominated this year by student issues; few issues currently on the dock are of central concern to faculty.
5. Update on Presidential Search Committee: according to a letter written by the chair, Robert Parkinson, to the AAUP chapter dated 9/15/15, there seems to be no apparent willingness to add faculty members to the committee. There has been no response to our letter of 9/15 to Parkinson. I spoke to the only current faculty member of the search committee, David Embrick, last Sunday; according to him, the committee hasn’t met yet. The letter we sent to Parkinson is on Sakai.
6. Agenda Issues:
 - Faculty Handbook revisions: last year the AAUP sent by way of Paul Jay a list of suggested revisions to the handbook. We and the “Extraordinary Committee” of the University Senate worked until March on a list of revisions and submitted them to the President. As you recall, they were tabled pending the resolution of a faculty retention case than in process. I have met with Paul Jay and Noah Sobe since then. Paul was unclear on the process of Faculty Council revisions. By the end of November, I’d like a new

document to send to the President. This seems like something the Faculty Affairs committee could handle.

- Faculty salaries: nothing was mentioned at the Faculty Convocation about a supposed \$500K equity raise pool. It would probably be worthwhile to invite the new CFO of Loyola, Robert Munson, to come talk to Council about this and other budget issues.
- BSI and FAS implementation: we need further information on the BSI at Maywood and its relation to incomes. What are the current implementations of FAS across various schools? I've seen and been given to understand (TC) that there are different approaches in different schools. It would be good to have a more unified and consistent picture of how FAS is being deployed university-wide.
- IDEA: how are schools using IDEA? A general problem seems to have emerged, that of very low response rates (35% or less), even in schools (like Education) which earlier had had higher rates. And how much weight in faculty performance evaluation is being given to IDEA evaluations?
- TT/NTT hiring: the University faces numerous evaluation, ranking, and pay issues. It's also important that Faculty Council be kept apprised of the distribution of teaching, school by school and department by department, between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. The Provost's office has repeatedly voiced a commitment to a 75%/25% limit in this distribution. It needs to be confirmed.
- Faculty Council membership: are we "right-sized"? How do we represent HSD clinical faculty? Can (and should) the Provosts be added as ex officio members?

7. Discussion by Susan Malisch and Therese Lysaught of LUC Strategic Plan

- History/timeline of SP development (September/October 2013 – June 20, 2015): first, focus groups developed five institutional priorities and send this list around to faculty by way of chairs for comment. The responses were collated into about 250 pages and then boiled down to about 25. After administrative review, this material was handed over to the planners. The result is our document. Like the last SP, this plan shows a strong connection to the budgeting process. (The last plan has not been abandoned, but extended by this new one.)
 - Question: why was objective #5 dropped? (It read: Building a University Community of Dialogue and Justice. Faculty and staff are asked to reflect on how the University might become a more just and humane place and more sensitive to the needs of one another and the environment that surrounds us. What specific projects, structures, programs would advance this effort?) TL: I am not entirely sure, but I believe it was dropped because it was thought redundant upon the other four goals, including the eight sub-goals.

- Question: at the new Arrupe College, how firm are the new budget numbers? SM: they are hypothetical and subject to revision, but based upon what our planners and budget people think are reasonable estimates.
- Question: the steering committees for the SP seem to have some problems. For example, goal #4 focuses on the city's North side, specifically Rogers Park and Edgewater, not other parts of the city; and the steering committee does not have an HSD member.
- Please also see the new project proposal templates which are being produced for use by faculty who wish to come up with research, teaching, and service projects in line with the strategic plan goals.
 - Question: a long-standing issue at the University has to do with figuring out how to give junior tenure-track faculty credit for work that they are doing on goals mandated by the SP. Deans and chairpersons need to know what their junior faculty are doing and how this is to be credited to them when it comes time to evaluate them for tenure and/or promotion. In the past, junior faculty have had no incentive — indeed have been dis-incentivized — to undertake such projects, since none of their work got back to their department in a way that seemed to count for research, teaching, or service in a useful way.
 - SM and TL: we would be happy to return to counsel to talk about the SP implementation plan at greater length.
- 8. Motion to adjourn: Moved (Ruppman); second (Conley). Meeting adjourned 5:15pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary